

Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania

College of Education and Human  
Services

NCATE Accreditation

Unit Assessment System Protocol for Data  
Collection, Analysis and Evaluation

Dr. José Ricardo-Osorio, Chair  
Dr. Lynn Baynum, co-Chair  
Dr. Chris Keys, co-Chair

Unit-Wide Assessment Committee

2016-2017

1871 Old Main Dr. Shippensburg, PA 17257

## Introduction

The NCATE Accreditation Report from the spring 2015 visit indicated that the Unit must strengthen its assessment system and unit evaluation processes to ensure program quality at the initial and advanced levels. The Unit must provide evidence that assessment data are collected systematically and that the data are analyzed and discussed for program improvement. To maintain its accreditation status, the Unit must implement a comprehensive plan that targets all the areas for improvement (AFI) pertaining to assessment identified by the review team. To this end, a Unit-wide Assessment Committee has been created. The committee is comprised by faculty members from education programs across the Unit and members from the professional community. The committee is chaired by Dr. José Ricardo (Academic Affairs Assessment Team co-chair, Secondary Education), Dr. Lynn Baynum (Teacher Education) and Dr. Chris Keys (Teacher Education). The main goal of the committee is to facilitate assessment data collection, analysis and discussion across the Unit. A second goal is to foster a culture of assessment among the programs to improve candidate performance. Third, the committee will facilitate discussion on the effectiveness of the Unit's operation.

It is imperative that all key constituencies within the Unit take an active role in the implementation of the Assessment System described in this protocol. To aid in this process, the following procedures have been delineated. The guidelines stated herein are based on the following four (4) assumptions:

- a. Education programs have created their curricular maps to identify data-rich courses and key assessments.
- b. Faculty members teaching data-rich courses have aligned their syllabi with the goals of the conceptual framework (See below) and their respective SPA's, if any. Thus, key assessments and accompanying rubrics will yield relevant data.
- c. Faculty members teaching data-rich courses have included at least one key assessment within their course(s). Some examples of course key assessments are: student research papers, student reflections on dispositions, faculty reflections on student dispositions, Impact on Student Learning projects, written observations on classroom visitations (i.e., PDE 430), student journals on diversity, student work portfolios that include lesson plans and assessment tasks, capstone projects, practicum projects, etc.
- d. The rubrics from course key assessments are aligned with the rubrics already uploaded to *TK-20*.

### Goals for the Conceptual Framework Apprenticeship Model

#### 1. National Standards

- a. Candidates are familiar with national standards including those from CAEP, the SPA governing their academic area, and the Pennsylvania Department of Education program guidelines.

#### 2. Content Knowledge

a. Candidates are familiar with the content standards of their discipline and use them to create a positive learning environment guiding candidate's achievement to expert knowledge.

### **3. Diversity**

a. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of and respect for the differences in how students learn and know how to accommodate diverse learning needs in educational settings including exceptionalities, ethnicity, race, gender, language, religion, socioeconomic and geographic origins.

b. Candidates show respect for diverse learning needs and talents of all students and demonstrate a commitment to helping students achieve academic success.

### **4. Assessment**

a. Candidates know, understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous development of intellectual, social, emotional and physical skills of P-12 students.

b. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the purpose and procedures for implementing summative, formative, diagnostic, norm-referenced, criterion referenced, and interim benchmark assessment measures for informing instruction for P-12 students in classrooms and clinical settings.

c. Candidates understand the concept of data driven decision-making and using it in creating an authentic assessment environment.

### **5. Instructional Planning**

a. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of how students learn and are able to differentiate instruction that is responsive to individual differences.

b. Candidates understand and use a variety of instructional methods to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving and performance skills.

### **6. Theory and Research**

a. Candidates are able to apply theory and research to support classroom decision-making within the Conceptual Framework Apprenticeship Model.

### **7. Dispositions**

a. Candidates systematically reflect upon their attitudes, professional dispositions and skills to create a classroom environment p-12 that reflects fairness to all learners.

b. Candidates affirm the University's educational and ethical responsibility to create environments where all students can learn.

## **8. Professional Standards and Pedagogy**

- a. Candidates actively and purposefully plan and implement relevant learning opportunities for P12 students in educational and clinical settings.
- b. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the range of technology tools that influence classroom practice, learner knowledge and achievement.
- c. Candidates reflect upon their own professional practice and are able to identify areas of growth toward expert knowledge in their field.
- d. Candidates show a respect for ever-changing P-12 environments and clinical settings and are able to modify their behavior to support student growth.
- e. Candidates continually and purposefully reflect on their content knowledge, pedagogical skills and professional dispositions.

**SHIPPENSBURG UNIVERSITY**  
**Unit Assessment System Procedures**

**Roles and Responsibilities**

TK20 coordinators create assessment data reports in collaboration with faculty members and coordinate with program directors to ensure all needed forms are posted. Program directors/SPA writers ensure that the TK20 coordinators have all the necessary assessments data for the report. TK20 coordinators remind instructors to enter and analyze data as needed.

**Beginning of each semester**

1. TK20 coordinators will encourage faculty teaching data-rich courses to follow the syllabus checklist to ensure that the course SLOs and assessments are aligned with the CF.
2. By the end of the first month of classes, each program will analyze data collected the previous year.

**During each semester**

1. The Unit-Wide Assessment Committee tri- chairs will monitor TK20 activity and encourage school-based and university-based personnel to complete assignments according to suggested deadlines.
2. Potential new key assessments for the following semester must be submitted to the Unit-Wide Assessment Committee co-chairs by November 1/April 1 to create TK20 rubrics for use the following semester.
3. Candidates will be reminded to encourage their cooperating teachers to complete assessments sent to them through TK20.

**End of each semester**

1. All faculty members need to complete all key assessments associated with their courses by the end of the week of finals each year. See timeline for specific dates.
2. TK20 coordinators will send reminder notices to assessors as necessary so that the assessments collected are as complete as possible.
3. By the end of semester, TK20 liaisons from each program in the teacher education unit will help faculty members teaching a data-rich course prepare and submit via email a Course Assessment Rubric (CAR) and a course data report to the Unit-Wide Assessment Committee co-chairs. Reports must state how the assessment is linked to the Conceptual Framework and the NCATE Standards. It should also provide a brief description of the assessment and a summary of what program changes, if any, will be made based on the data analysis. If no changes are deemed necessary, the rationale for not making any changes must be included in the report. Copies of the actual data need NOT be included with the report as the co-chairs will have access to them as needed. (See timeline for specific dates and *Appendix A* for a report template).

## Course Level, Programmatic Level, and Unit

### Data Collection, Analysis, and Recommendations

09/11/2016

NCATE Standard 2: The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

Unit Goal(s): The unit implements a comprehensive assessment system congruent with university assessment and reporting protocols. The assessment system provides data on student learning outcomes and other non-academic outcomes for initial and advanced programs. The data inform decision-making within the unit and the university at large.

#### Key Terms

Initial and advanced candidates/completers

SPA and CF competencies

Levels of Mastery: unacceptable, developing, and acceptable

Data Report Form

Key Assessment Subcommittees

#### Unit Key Assessments for Analysis (fall 2016)

Impact on Student Learning Project (ITP) and Capstone Project (ADV)

Professional Dispositions Forms -University Supervisor, Cooperating Teacher, and Candidate (ITP and ADV)

Field Experiences: Student Teaching (ITP) and Practicum (ADV)

Exit Survey (ITP and ADV)

Diversity Surveys-Unit-wide and ECC 207 (ITP and ADV)

### Data Collection, Analysis, and Recommendations

The Unit's Assessment System data collection, analysis and recommendations are overseen by the Unit Wide Assessment Committee tri-chairs. The Director of Field Experiences & Partnerships with the help of one of the committee chairs oversees TK20 operations. They will also run and prepare data reports as requested by the committee and/or the deans.

Competencies and outcomes in Unit key assessments are the basis for both programmatic and Unit data documentation and analysis. Data collection and analysis begins on the course level. In designated courses, faculty link both SPA and Conceptual Framework (CF) competencies to structure and evaluate initial and advanced candidates'/completers' outcomes. **Once the Unit-Wide Assessment tri-chairs and the deans decide which assessment data will be analyzed**, using the Course Assessment Rubric –CAR (See Appendix B) and the Data Report Form, faculty members collect, analyze, and report course level competencies. The program/department's TK20 liaison will help faculty with this process. Faculty submits a copy of the CAR with its accompanying Data Report Form to the tri-chairs by the deadline established in the assessment cycle timeline.

Programs meet to discuss course level and programmatic level competencies for initial and advanced candidates'/completers'. Programs use the Program Assessment Rubric –PAR (See Appendix C) and the Data Report Form to collect, analyze, and report programmatic levels of mastery of SPA and CF competencies. Programs use the Data Report Form to document discussions of strengths, limitations, and changes to key assessments, courses, and/or programs. Programs follow the SU policy for course/programmatic redesign or development. Programs report strengths and limitations, including changes to courses and programs, during NCATE meetings and Teacher Education Council. Programs also collect, analyze and report on other data described in the gates (transition points). See Appendix E for each initial program transition points illustrating requirements and key programs assessments and Appendix F for advanced programs. Department chair/program directors submit a copy of the PAR with its accompanying Data Report Form to the tri-chairs by the deadline established in the assessment cycle timeline.

The Unit supports the Unit-wide Assessment Committee to oversee the process for data collection, analysis and recommendations. The assessment committee may create subcommittees for each key assessment. Key Assessment Subcommittees meet to discuss all programmatic level data to determine initial and advanced candidates'/completers' levels of mastery. The Unit key assessment subcommittees use the Unit Assessment Rubric –UAR (See Appendix D) and the Data Report Form to document discussions of strengths, limitations, and changes to key assessments, courses, and/or programs. The Unit follows the SU policy for course/programmatic redesign or development. The Unit reports strengths and limitations, including changes to courses and programs, during NCATE meetings and Teacher Education Council and to the COEHS dean and SU provost. The dean (or his designees) integrates strengths, limitations, and recommendations from Unit evidence on the Data Report Form to create the NCATE assessment report. At the end of an assessment cycle (Fall-Spring), the Unit-wide Assessment Committee also assesses the Unit Assessment System and the Unit's Effectiveness using the Meta-Assessment Rubric (MAR) found in Appendix G.

### **Steps for Data Analysis within Courses, Programs, and as a Unit**

All data are tabulated into percentages based on the number (N) of initial and advanced candidates/completers

All personal data (names, IDs) are removed from data

### **Course Level Data Collection, Analysis and Recommendations**

1. Faculty create assignments/assessments and apply (link) SPA and Conceptual Framework (CF) competencies to course assignments/assessments.
2. Faculty in programs determine data-rich courses and key assessments that align with SPA and CF competencies.
  - a. Faculty in each program create matrices of competencies and courses to determine a scope and sequence of curricular competencies.
  - b. Faculty identify key assessments for programmatic evaluation.
    - i. Faculty write key assessment descriptions and rubrics that reflect levels of mastery based on SPA and CF competencies.
    - ii. Faculty share assessment descriptions and rubrics with candidates/completers.

*Assumptions: faculty are familiar with the SPA and CF competencies, and can apply those competencies to specific assignments and assessments.*

3. Faculty collect and score individual initial and advanced candidate's/completers' mastery of SPA and CF competencies within key assessments. The TK 20 liaison helps the faculty with this process.
  - a. Faculty use TK20 to score individual candidate's/completer's results.
  - b. Faculty report outcomes, discussions and recommendations using the CAR and the Data Report Form. All the materials are sent via email to the committee tri-chairs.

*Assumption: faculty receive training in programs in using rubrics on TK20 to evaluate individual initial and advanced candidates/completers.*

### **Program Level**

1. All faculty in a program and the department chair/program coordinator synthesize individual candidate/section/course results into a combined perspective of mastery for SPA and CF competencies to reflect programmatic outcomes.
2. Faculty use the PAR and the Data Report Form to documents data analysis.
  - a. Faculty examine (TK20) individual initial and advanced candidate's/completer's results from across sections, courses and within the program to determine levels of mastery.
  - b. If there is a discrepancy in the number (N) of initial and advanced candidates/completers and the number reported in the data, faculty discuss and describe the limitations.
3. Faculty and department chairs/program coordinators within each program report (NCATE meetings, Teacher Education Council) percentages of initial and advanced candidates'/completers' programmatic mastery in three performance levels: unacceptable, developing, and acceptable.
  - a. If SPA levels of mastery do not reflect the three qualifiers, faculty agree to a conversion of course level and program level qualifiers to the three levels of mastery: unacceptable, developing, and acceptable.
  - b. Faculty and department chairs within each program also collect, analyze and report on other data described in the gates (transition points). Internally, these data are reviewed to monitor candidate progress and program effectiveness.



4. Faculty and department chairs/program coordinators discuss and report assessment results and determine program strengths and limitations using the PAR and its accompanying Data Report Form. All the materials are sent via email to the committee tri-chairs.

- a. Faculty propose changes to the key assessment, course, and/or program.

5. Faculty follow SU policies for course, program or unit changes to the curricular structure.

*Assumptions: program faculty understand links between course level key assessments and programmatic outcomes.*

### **Unit Level**

1. Faculty in the Unit identify key assessments to match SPA and CF competencies.
  - a. Faculty as a Unit create matrices of competencies and key assessments to determine a scope and sequence of curricular competencies for initial and advanced candidates/completers across the unit.
    - i. Key Assessments Linked to Unit Data
      1. Impact on Student Learning (ITP) or Capstone Project (ADV),
      2. Professional Dispositions (ITP and ADV),
      3. Field Experiences: Student Teaching (ITP) and Practicum (ADV)
      4. Exit Survey (ITP and ADV)
      5. Diversity Surveys-Unit-wide and ECC 207 (ITP and ADV)
2. The assessment committee groups into subcommittees from different disciplines and programs to examine each key assessment.
  - a. The subcommittees meet to analyze and make recommendations according to the Cycle of Data Collection, Analysis, and Recommendations Timeline for each academic year and semester. SEE Timeline.
3. Using the Data Reports from each program, the assessment committee examines all programmatic outcomes to determine three levels (unacceptable, developing, and acceptable) of mastery across the Unit.
  - a. Each subcommittee uses the UAR to analyze levels of mastery. SEE Rubric.
    - i. Under direction of the assessment chairs, in interdisciplinary (programmatic) key assessment subcommittees, using UAR and the Data Report Form:
      1. Review competencies of the key assessment.
      2. Review and discuss competencies for a combined perspective.
      3. Examine and discuss initial and advanced program's levels of mastery for each program in the unit.
      4. Use the Data Report Form to record a synthesis (percentage and N) of all programs' levels of mastery.
      5. Discuss unit levels of mastery.
        - a. Discuss unit level competency-based strengths.
        - b. Discuss recommendations for unit level competency-based alterations to the assessment and/or unit.
      6. Using the Data Report Form, each key assessment subcommittee presents to the unit's three (unacceptable, developing, and acceptable) levels of mastery, unit level strengths and recommendations for alterations.

7. Committee members use SU policies for course, program or unit changes to the curricular structure.
8. Committee members report results to the dean of the COEHS and provost.
  - a. The dean or his designee use information from the Unit key assessment Data Report Forms to generate the NCATE assessment report.
9. At the end of the Fall-Spring assessment cycle, Committee members use the Meta Assessment Rubric-MAR (Appendix F) to assess the Unit Assessment System and the Unit's Effectiveness. The committee provides recommendations for improvement.

*Assumptions: faculty understand links between key assessment measures as they relate to the unit strengths and limitations.*

### **Provisions For Data Sharing**

Once the Unit Wide Assessment Committee, the department chairs/program coordinators and the deans have drafted an Assessment Data Executive Summary (ADES), the document will be shared with the following constituents. The sharing is carried out via email, newsletters and/or meetings. Data results and recommendations must be discussed accordingly by each constituent. The committee tri-chairs can receive feedback or concerns via email.

- University Provost
- Unit Candidates
- All unit faculty
- Members of the professional community

### **Guidelines for Implementation and Accountability**

As stated earlier, the oversight of the 2016-2017 Unit's Assessment System relies on the Unit Wide Assessment Committee tri-chairs. However, the entire implementation is everyone's responsibility. If a faculty member teaching a data-rich course is not able to comply with the data request and report submission deadline, he/she must contact the committee tri-chairs as soon as possible and explain the situation. The tri-chairs may be able to provide an extension. If the issue is beyond the tri-chairs purview, they may seek the involvement of the dean and/or the provost.

If a program is unable to submit its PAR within the deadline, a similar protocol must be followed. Keeping the tri-chairs informed about any data collection issues is key to the success of the Unit's Assessment System. Failing to submit the data using the formatting prescribed within this manual will obligate the tri-chairs to send the data back for revisions. Tri-chairs can visit directly with departments/programs for trouble-shooting.

If a program does not provide data at all, the program will be reported as No Data Available. At the next assessment cycle, the program must provide the old and the new data properly analyzed. If more than two assessment cycles go without program data, the tri-chairs will seek the involvement of the deans and/or the provost accordingly.

**Timeline of the Assessment System Cycle for fall 2016-spring 2017**

<b>ACTION</b>	<b>IMPLEMENTATION DATE (S)</b>	<b>WHO</b>
Discuss communication from the dean's office and how the department will follow through. Meeting minutes should document the discussion.	August 24 <sup>th</sup> (Department Meetings)	Entire department at their respective meetings.
Unit-Wide Accreditation Plan Unveiling	September 9 <sup>th</sup>	All education programs faculty from across the Unit.
<b>Phase I</b>  Unit-Wide Discussion on Spring 2016 Assessment Results (Assessment Retreat). Meeting minutes should document the discussion.	November 11 <sup>th</sup>	Since this is the first Assessment Retreat, all education programs faculty from across the Unit are invited.
<b>Phase II</b>  Unit-Wide Discussion on Spring 2016 Assessment Results (Assessment Retreat). Meeting minutes should document the discussion.	December 2 <sup>nd</sup>	All education programs faculty from across the Unit.
University/Professional Community Dissemination of Spring 2016 Assessment Results	Week of December 19 <sup>th</sup>	Dean Office via electronic Assessment Newsletter and report on Unit's website.  Dean Office submits an executive summary to the Provost's Office. Executive summary may have

and Corrective Measures to Improve Students' Performance.		<p>budget allocation request based on assessment data.</p> <p>The executive summary is also shared with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Unit Candidates</li> <li>-All unit faculty</li> <li>-Members of the professional community</li> </ul>
<b>Fall 2016 Assessment Data Collection</b>	Week of Dec 12 <sup>th</sup> (Finals)	Faculty who have been identified as teaching a data-rich course.
Score Reporting on TK-20  Course Data Report (Appendix A) to Unit-wide Assessment Committee tri-Chairs due.	No later than Dec 23 <sup>rd</sup>	<p>Faculty who have been identified as teaching a data-rich course.</p> <p>TK20 liaisons from each program in the teacher education unit will help faculty members analyze course outcome data using the Course Assessment Rubric (CAR), prepare and submit via email a brief Course Data Report to the Unit-Wide Assessment Committee tri-chairs. Reports must state how the assessment is linked to the Conceptual Framework and the NCATE Standards. It should also provide a brief description of the assessment and a summary of what program changes, if any, will be made based on the data analysis. If no changes are deemed necessary, the rationale for not making any changes must be included in the report. Copies of the actual data need NOT be included with the report as the tri-chairs will have access to them as needed. (See Appendix A for a report template).</p>
Departmental Discussion on Fall 2016 Assessment Results. Meeting minutes should document the discussion.	By the end of the first month of classes in the Spring semester.	Entire department

Department Data Report with information on analysis of other data from the gates requirements (transition points)		Department chairs/program coordinators with the help of the TK20 liaison prepare a report per program including a Program Assessment Rubric (PAR) per program. The PAR is submitted to the tri-chairs via email. PAR will be analyzed at the Assessment Retreat (Data Analysis Meeting).
Unit-Wide Discussion on Fall 2016 Assessment Results (Assessment Retreat). Meeting minutes should document the discussion.	Week of March 6 <sup>th</sup> (Assessment Retreat)	Deans, Dept. Chairs and Unit-Wide Assessment Committee Members
University/Professional Community Dissemination of Fall 2016 Assessment Results and Corrective Measures to Improve Students' Performance.	Week of March 20 <sup>th</sup>	Dean Office via electronic Assessment Newsletter and report on Unit's website.  Dean Office submits an executive summary to the Provost's Office. Executive summary may have a budget allocation request based on assessment data.  <b>The executive summary is also shared with</b>  <b>-Unit Candidates</b>  <b>-All unit faculty</b>  <b>-Members of the professional community</b>
<b>Spring 2017 Assessment Data Collection</b>	Week of May 8 <sup>th</sup> (Finals)	Faculty who have been identified as teaching a data-rich course.
Score Reporting on TK-20  Course Data Report (Appendix A) to Unit-wide Assessment	No later than May 26 <sup>th</sup>	Faculty who have been identified as teaching a data-mining course.  TK20 liaisons from each program in the teacher education unit will help faculty members analyze course outcome data using the Course Assessment

<p>Committee tri-Chairs due.</p>		<p>Rubric (CAR), prepare and submit via email a brief Course Data Report to the Unit-Wide Assessment Committee tri-chairs. Reports must state how the assessment is linked to the Conceptual Framework and the NCATE Standards. It should also provide a brief description of the assessment and a summary of what program changes, if any, will be made based on the data analysis. If no changes are deemed necessary, the rationale for not making any changes must be included in the report. Copies of the actual data need NOT be included with the report as the tri-chairs will have access to them as needed. (See Appendix A for a report template).</p>
<p>Departmental Discussion on Fall 2016 Assessment Results. Meeting minutes should document the discussion.</p> <p>Department Data Report with information on analysis of other data from the gates requirements (transition points)</p>	<p>By the end of the first month of classes in the Fall 2017 semester.</p>	<p>Entire department</p> <p>Department chairs/program coordinators with the help of the TK20 liaison prepare a report per program including a Program Assessment Rubric (PAR) per program. The PAR is submitted to the tri-chairs via email. PAR will be analyzed at the Assessment Retreat (Data Analysis Meeting).</p>
<p>Unit-Wide Discussion on Spring 2017 Assessment Results and Assessment of Unit Assessment System &amp; the Unit's Effectiveness (Assessment Retreat). Meeting minutes should document the discussion.</p>	<p>Sixth Week of Fall 2017 classes (Assessment Retreat)</p>	<p>Deans, Dept. Chairs and Unit-Wide Assessment Committee Members</p>
<p>University/Professional</p>	<p>Eighth week of Fall</p>	<p>Dean Office via electronic Assessment Newsletter</p>

<p>Community Dissemination of Spring 2017 Assessment Results and Corrective Measures to Improve Students' Performance.</p>	<p>2017 classes</p>	<p>and report on Unit's website.</p> <p>Dean Office submits an executive summary to the Provost's Office. Executive summary may have budget allocation request based on assessment da</p> <p>The executive summary is also shared with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Unit Candidates</li> <li>-All unit faculty</li> <li>-Members of the professional community.</li> </ul>
--	---------------------	---

## Appendix A

### NCATE Data Report Form

See Directions on Cover Sheet

Date/Semester

Check One:

Level of Analysis

Course level analysis

Program level analysis

Unit level analysis

Name of course/program:

Faculty Committee

Course level faculty analysis

Program level faculty analysis

Unit level, key assessment subcommittee analysis

Name of faculty members and program:

Candidate Data

Initial candidates

Advanced candidates

N:

Key Assessment Title

Key Assessment Description

Key Competencies from Program or Unit Matrices (SPA, NCATE, CF)

Rubric Title (SPA, NCATE, CF)

Percentage of Levels of Mastery (unacceptable, developing, and acceptable)

Discussion Notes (strengths and limitations):

Data Discrepancies (outliners): candidate/completer irregularities

Recommendations:

No change to course, program and/or unit assessment

Reinvestigate perceived limitations across another semester to determine trends

Timeline for reinvestigation

Competency focus for reinvestigation

Recommended change

Program assessment

Unit requirements/assessment

Summary of Recommendations:



## Appendix B

### CAR

#### Course Rubric for Assessing the Attainment of the Conceptual Framework Goals

#### Shippensburg University \*

Devised on 11/04/16

**Course Goal(s):** The course implements a comprehensive assessment system congruent with the Unit assessment and reporting protocols. The course assessment provides data on student learning outcomes for initial and advanced programs. The data inform decision-making within the program, the Unit and the university at large.

**ITP:** Initial Program

**ADV:** Advanced Program

*The Professional Standards & Pedagogy goal from the Conceptual Framework is included in the items pertaining to National Standards, Content Knowledge, Theory & Research and Instructional Planning.*

<b>Name of the Program:</b>						
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Unacceptable 1</b>	<b>Developing 2</b>	<b>Target 3</b>	<b>Rating</b>		<b>Comments</b>
				<b>ITP</b>	<b>ADV</b>	
<b>National Standards</b>	The course rarely implements instruction of national standards. Less than 70% of candidates identify, explain and implement standards in multiple assignments systematically throughout the course. The course rarely determines candidates' understanding and application of relevant National Standards.	The course inconsistently implements programmatic instruction of national standards. Between 70%-80% of candidates identify, explain and implement standards in multiple assignments systematically throughout the course. The course inconsistently determines candidates' understanding and application of relevant National Standards.	The course regularly implements programmatic instruction of national standards. Over 80% of candidates identify, explain and implement standards in multiple assignments systematically throughout the course. The course regularly determines candidates' understanding and application of relevant National Standards.			

<b>Content Knowledge</b>	The course rarely assesses candidates' content knowledge rooted in state and SPA Standards through a variety of performance-based measures and other modalities of assessment. The course rarely determines candidates' understanding and application of content knowledge.	The course inconsistently assesses candidates' content knowledge rooted in state and SPA Standards through a variety of performance-based measures and other modalities of assessment. The course inconsistently determines candidates' understanding and application of content knowledge.	The course regularly assesses candidates' content knowledge rooted in state and SPA Standards through a variety of performance-based measures and other modalities of assessment. The course regularly determines candidates' understanding and application of content knowledge.			
<b>Diversity</b>	The course rarely provides multiple experiential opportunities for candidates in diverse settings with opportunities to differentiate, accommodate needs, and demonstrate respect for diverse learning needs and talents. The course rarely determines candidates' understanding and application of diversity.	The course inconsistently provides multiple experiential opportunities for candidates in diverse settings with opportunities to differentiate, accommodate needs, and demonstrate respect for diverse learning needs and talents. The course inconsistently determines candidates' understanding and application of diversity.	The course regularly provides multiple experiential opportunities for candidates in diverse settings with opportunities to differentiate, accommodate needs, and demonstrate respect for diverse learning needs and talents. The course regularly determines candidates' understanding and application of diversity.			

<b>Assessment</b>	The course rarely collects candidates' assessments and never analyses data that drive and improve instruction. The course rarely determines candidates' understanding and application of assessment of student learning outcomes.	The course inconsistently collects candidates' assessments and analyses data that drive and improve instruction. The course inconsistently determines candidates' understanding and application of assessment of student learning outcomes.	The course comprehensively collects candidates' assessments and analyses data that drive and improve instruction. The course regularly determines candidates' understanding and application of assessment of student learning outcomes.			
<b>Dispositions</b>	The course rarely collects candidates' dispositions data and never analyses data to improve program quality. The course rarely addresses candidates' professional dispositions.	The course inconsistently collects candidates' dispositions data and analyses data to improve program quality. The course inconsistently addresses candidates' professional dispositions.	The course comprehensively collects candidates' dispositions data and analyses data to improve program quality. The course regularly addresses candidates' professional dispositions (especially fairness and the belief that all students can learn).			
<b>Theory &amp; Research</b>	The course rarely assesses candidates' use of theory and application of research through a variety of performance-based measures and other modalities of assessment. The course rarely addresses candidates' understanding and application of theory and research.	The course inconsistently assesses candidates' use of theory and application of research through a variety of performance-based measures and other modalities of assessment. The course inconsistently addresses candidates' understanding and application of theory and research.	The course regularly assesses candidates' use of theory and application of research through a variety of performance-based measures and other modalities of assessment. The course regularly addresses candidates' understanding and application of theory and research.			

<b>Instructional Planning</b>	The course rarely assesses candidates' use of instructional planning through a variety of performance-based measures and other modalities of assessment. The course rarely addresses candidates' knowledge of instructional planning.	The course inconsistently assesses candidates' use of instructional planning through a variety of performance-based measures and other modalities of assessment. The course inconsistently addresses candidates' knowledge of instructional planning.	The course regularly assesses candidates' use of instructional planning through a variety of performance-based measures and other modalities of assessment. The course regularly addresses candidates' knowledge of instructional planning.			
-------------------------------	---	---	---	--	--	--

*\*Adapted from a model developed by James Madison University.*

**Appendix C**

**PAR**  
**Program Rubric for Assessing the Attainment of the Conceptual Framework Goals**  
**Shippensburg University \***

Revised on 03/20/17

**Program Goal(s):** The program implements a comprehensive assessment system congruent with the Unit assessment and reporting protocols. The assessment system provides data on student learning outcomes for initial and advanced programs. The data inform decision-making within the program, the Unit and the university at large.

**ITP:** Initial Program

**ADV:** Advanced Program

*The Professional Standards & Pedagogy goal from the Conceptual Framework is included in the items pertaining to National Standards, Content Knowledge, Theory & Research and Instructional Planning.*

<b>Name of the Program:</b>						
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Unacceptable 1</b>	<b>Developing 2</b>	<b>Target 3</b>	<b>Rating</b>		<b>Comments</b>
				<b>ITP</b>	<b>ADV</b>	
<b>National Standards</b>  a. Candidates are familiar with national standards including those from NCATE, the SPA governing their academic area, and the Pennsylvania Department of Education program guidelines.	Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates identify, explain, implement, analyze and/or reflect on the use of standards to determine PK-12 instructional and intervention decisions in classrooms and clinical settings.	Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates identify, explain, implement, analyze and/or reflect on the use of standards to determine PK-12 instructional and intervention decisions in classrooms and clinical settings.	Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates identify, explain, implement, analyze and/or reflect on the use of standards to determine PK-12 instructional and intervention decisions in classrooms and clinical settings.			

<p><b>Content Knowledge</b></p> <p>Candidates are familiar with the content standards of their discipline and use them to create a positive learning environment guiding candidate's achievement to expert knowledge.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates' content knowledge is not clearly evident in performance-based measures and other modalities of assessment that document subject areas and disciplines in PK-12 classroom and/or clinical settings.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates' content knowledge is evident in performance-based measures and other modalities of assessment that document subject areas and disciplines in PK-12 classroom and/or clinical settings.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates' content knowledge is clearly evident in performance-based measures and other modalities of assessment that document subject areas and disciplines in PK-12 classroom and/or clinical settings.</p>			
<p><b>Diversity</b></p> <p>a. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of and respect for the differences in how students learn and know how to accommodate diverse learning needs in educational settings including exceptionalities, ethnicity, race, gender, language, religion, socioeconomic and geographic origins.</p> <p>b. Candidates show respect for diverse learning needs and talents of all students and demonstrate a commitment to helping students achieve academic success.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates are placed in diverse settings.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates differentiate, accommodate needs, and demonstrate respect for PK-12 diverse learners' knowledge, skills and talents.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates are placed in diverse settings.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates differentiate, accommodate needs, and demonstrate respect for PK-12 diverse learners' knowledge, skills and talents.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates are placed in diverse settings.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates differentiate, accommodate needs, and demonstrate respect for PK-12 diverse learners' knowledge, skills and talents.</p>			

<p><b>Assessment</b></p> <p>a. Candidates know, understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous development of intellectual, social, emotional and physical skills of P-12 students.</p> <p>b. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the purpose and procedures for implementing summative, formative, diagnostic, norm-referenced, criterion referenced, and interim benchmark assessment measures for informing instruction for P-12 students in classrooms and clinical settings.</p> <p>c. Candidates understand the concept of data driven decision-making and use it in creating an authentic assessment environment.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates' understanding and implementation of assessment tools to determine data-driven instruction and interventions for all PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings is unacceptable.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates' understanding and implementation of assessment tools to determine data-driven instruction and interventions for all PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings is developing.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates' understanding and implementation of assessment tools to determine data-driven instruction and interventions for all PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings is rated at the highest mark on the assessment rubric.</p>			
---	---	--	---	--	--	--

<p><b>Theory &amp; Research</b>  a. Candidates are able to apply theory and research to support classroom decision-making within the Conceptual Framework Apprenticeship Model.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates' effectively demonstrate an ability to use research-based best practices during systematic and explicit instruction and clinical practice.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates' effectively demonstrate an ability to use research-based best practices during systematic and explicit instruction and clinical practice.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates' effectively demonstrate an ability to use research-based best practices during systematic and explicit instruction and clinical practice.</p>			
<p><b>Dispositions</b>  a. Candidates systematically reflect upon their attitudes, professional dispositions and skills to create a classroom environment p-12 that reflects fairness to all learners.  b. Candidates affirm the University's educational and ethical responsibility to create environments where all students can learn.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates' demonstrate professionalism when working with all stakeholders, and especially PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates' demonstrate professionalism when working with all stakeholders, and especially PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates' demonstrate professionalism when working with all stakeholders, and especially PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings.</p>			



<p><b>Professional Standards &amp; Pedagogy</b></p> <p>a. Candidates actively and purposefully plan and implement relevant learning opportunities for P12 students in educational and clinical settings.</p> <p>b. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the range of technology tools that influence classroom practice, learner knowledge and achievement.</p> <p>c. Candidates reflect upon their own professional practice and are able to identify areas of growth toward expert knowledge in their field.</p> <p>d. Candidates show a respect for ever-changing P-12 environments and clinical settings and are able to modify their behavior to support student growth.</p> <p>e. Candidates continually and purposefully reflect on their content knowledge, pedagogical skills and professional dispositions.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates identify, explain, implement, analyze and/or reflect on the use of professional standards and pedagogy to determine PK-12 instructional and intervention decisions in classrooms and clinical settings.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that than <b>70%-80%</b> of candidates identify, explain, implement, analyze and/or reflect on the use of professional standards and pedagogy to determine PK-12 instructional and intervention decisions in classrooms and clinical settings.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates identify, explain, implement, analyze and/or reflect on the use of professional standards and pedagogy to determine PK-12 instructional and intervention decisions in classrooms and clinical settings.</p>			
---	---	--	---	--	--	--

<p><b>Instructional Planning</b></p> <p>a. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of how students learn and are able to differentiate instruction that is responsive to individual differences.</p> <p>b. Candidates understand and use a variety of instructional methods to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving and performance skills.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates' demonstrate an ability to plan, implement, adjust, evaluate and reflect on systematic and explicit lessons, units, and/or intervention for PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates' demonstrate an ability to plan, implement, adjust, evaluate and reflect on systematic and explicit lessons, units, and/or intervention for PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings.</p>	<p>Based on data from programmatic and Unit level key assessments, the Program's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates' demonstrate an ability to plan, implement, adjust, evaluate and reflect on systematic and explicit lessons, units, and/or intervention for PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

*\*Adapted from a model developed by James Madison University.*

**Appendix D**

**UAR**

**Unit Rubric for Assessing the Attainment of the Conceptual Framework Goals and the Unit's Effectiveness**

**Shippensburg University \***

Revised on 03/20/17

**NCATE Standard 2:** The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

**Unit Goal(s):** The unit implements a comprehensive assessment system congruent with university assessment and reporting protocols. The assessment system provides data on student learning outcomes and other non-academic outcomes for initial and advanced programs. The data inform decision-making within the unit and the university at large.

**ITP:** Initial Program

**ADV:** Advanced Program

Indicator	Unacceptable 1	Developing 2	Target 3	Rating		Comments
				ITP	ADV	
<b>National Standards</b>  a. Candidates are familiar with national standards including those from NCATE, the SPA governing their academic area, and the Pennsylvania Department of Education program guidelines.	Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates identify, explain, implement, analyze and/or reflect on the use of standards to determine PK-12 instructional and intervention decisions in classrooms and clinical settings.	Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates identify, explain, implement, analyze and/or reflect on the use of standards to determine PK-12 instructional and intervention decisions in classrooms and clinical settings.	Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates identify, explain, implement, analyze and/or reflect on the use of standards to determine PK-12 instructional and intervention decisions in classrooms and clinical settings.			

<p><b>Content Knowledge</b></p> <p>Candidates are familiar with the content standards of their discipline and use them to create a positive learning environment guiding candidate's achievement to expert knowledge.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates' content knowledge is not clearly evident in performance-based measures and other modalities of assessment that document subject areas and disciplines in PK-12 classroom and/or clinical settings.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates' content knowledge is evident in performance-based measures and other modalities of assessment that document subject areas and disciplines in PK-12 classroom and/or clinical settings.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates' content knowledge is clearly evident in performance-based measures and other modalities of assessment that document subject areas and disciplines in PK-12 classroom and/or clinical settings.</p>			
<p><b>Diversity</b></p> <p>a. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of and respect for the differences in how students learn and know how to accommodate diverse learning needs in educational settings including exceptionalities, ethnicity, race, gender, language, religion, socioeconomic and geographic origins.</p> <p>b. Candidates show respect for diverse learning needs and talents of all students and demonstrate a commitment to helping students achieve academic success.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates are placed in diverse settings.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates differentiate, accommodate needs, and demonstrate respect for PK-12 diverse learners' knowledge, skills and talents.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates are placed in diverse settings.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates differentiate, accommodate needs, and demonstrate respect for PK-12 diverse learners' knowledge, skills and talents.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates are placed in diverse settings.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates differentiate, accommodate needs, and demonstrate respect for PK-12 diverse learners' knowledge, skills and talents.</p>			

<p><b>Assessment</b></p> <p>a. Candidates know, understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous development of intellectual, social, emotional and physical skills of P-12 students.</p> <p>b. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the purpose and procedures for implementing summative, formative, diagnostic, norm-referenced, criterion referenced, and interim benchmark assessment measures for informing instruction for P-12 students in classrooms and clinical settings.</p> <p>c. Candidates understand the concept of data driven decision-making and use it in creating an authentic assessment environment.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates' understanding and implementation of assessment tools to determine data-driven instruction and interventions for all PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings is unacceptable.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates' understanding and implementation of assessment tools to determine data-driven instruction and interventions for all PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings is developing.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates' understanding and implementation of assessment tools to determine data-driven instruction and interventions for all PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings is rated at the highest mark on the assessment rubric.</p>			
---	---	--	---	--	--	--

<p><b>Theory &amp; Research</b>  a. Candidates are able to apply theory and research to support classroom decision-making within the Conceptual Framework Apprenticeship Model.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates' effectively demonstrate an ability to use research-based best practices during systematic and explicit instruction and clinical practice.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates' effectively demonstrate an ability to use research-based best practices during systematic and explicit instruction and clinical practice.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates' effectively demonstrate an ability to use research-based best practices during systematic and explicit instruction and clinical practice.</p>			
<p><b>Dispositions</b>  a. Candidates systematically reflect upon their attitudes, professional dispositions and skills to create a classroom environment p-12 that reflects fairness to all learners.  b. Candidates affirm the University's educational and ethical responsibility to create environments where all students can learn.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates' demonstrate professionalism when working with all stakeholders, and especially PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates' demonstrate professionalism when working with all stakeholders, and especially PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates' demonstrate professionalism when working with all stakeholders, and especially PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings.</p>			

<p><b>Professional Standards &amp; Pedagogy</b></p> <p>a. Candidates actively and purposefully plan and implement relevant learning opportunities for P12 students in educational and clinical settings.</p> <p>b. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the range of technology tools that influence classroom practice, learner knowledge and achievement.</p> <p>c. Candidates reflect upon their own professional practice and are able to identify areas of growth toward expert knowledge in their field.</p> <p>d. Candidates show a respect for ever-changing P-12 environments and clinical settings and are able to modify their behavior to support student growth.</p> <p>e. Candidates continually and purposefully reflect on their content knowledge, pedagogical skills and professional dispositions.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates identify, explain, implement, analyze and/or reflect on the use of professional standards and pedagogy to determine PK-12 instructional and intervention decisions in classrooms and clinical settings.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that than <b>70%-80%</b> of candidates identify, explain, implement, analyze and/or reflect on the use of professional standards and pedagogy to determine PK-12 instructional and intervention decisions in classrooms and clinical settings.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates identify, explain, implement, analyze and/or reflect on the use of professional standards and pedagogy to determine PK-12 instructional and intervention decisions in classrooms and clinical settings.</p>			
---	---	--	---	--	--	--

<p><b>Instructional Planning</b></p> <p>a. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of how students learn and are able to differentiate instruction that is responsive to individual differences.</p> <p>b. Candidates understand and use a variety of instructional methods to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving and performance skills.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates' demonstrate an ability to plan, implement, adjust, evaluate and reflect on systematic and explicit lessons, units, and/or intervention for PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates' demonstrate an ability to plan, implement, adjust, evaluate and reflect on systematic and explicit lessons, units, and/or intervention for PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates' demonstrate an ability to plan, implement, adjust, evaluate and reflect on systematic and explicit lessons, units, and/or intervention for PK-12 learners in classrooms and/or clinical settings.</p>			
<p><b>Program Completers</b></p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates that complete the program. The Unit rarely provides career guidance to candidates that cannot complete the program.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates that complete the program. The Unit inconsistently provides career guidance to candidates that cannot complete the program.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates complete the program. The Unit regularly provides career guidance to candidates that cannot complete the program.</p>			
<p><b>Candidates' Certification</b></p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates obtain certification. The Unit rarely provides guidance to candidates that cannot obtain certification.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates obtain certification. The Unit inconsistently provides guidance to candidates that cannot obtain certification.</p>	<p>Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit's evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates obtain certification. The Unit regularly provides guidance to candidates that cannot obtain certification.</p>			



<b>Candidates’ Gainful Employment</b>	Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit’s evidence indicates that less than <b>70%</b> of candidates obtain gainful employment. The Unit rarely provides employment guidance to candidates that cannot get a job.	Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit’s evidence indicates that <b>70-80%</b> of candidates obtain gainful employment. The Unit inconsistently provides employment guidance to candidates that cannot get a job	Based on data from Unit level key assessments, the Unit’s evidence indicates that more than <b>80%</b> of candidates obtain gainful employment. The Unit regularly provides employment guidance to candidates that cannot get a job			
---------------------------------------	---	---	---	--	--	--

*\*Adapted from a model developed by James Madison University.*

**Appendix E**

**Shippensburg University  
College of Education and Human Services  
Unit Assessment System for Initial Programs  
Aligned with the Gates Document**

*Revised on 12/16/2016*

Initial Program	Initial Requirements	Gate 1 Pre-Admission to the ECH Program (ECH 210 & ECH 220) Requirements	Gate 2 Admission to the ECH Program (ECH 320, ECH 333 & ECH 343) Requirements	Gate 3 Admissions to Student Teaching Requirements	Gate 4 Program Completion Requirements	Unit Operation Effectiveness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Early Childhood/Elementary Education</u></li> </ul>	<p>Basic Skills assessment Math, Reading and Writing. Or CORE Test</p> <p>Two dispositions forms by two faculty members.</p> <p>C or better in all department course requirements.</p> <p>3.0 minimum GPA.</p> <p>Clearances (Act 24, 34, 114, 151)</p> <p>TB Test (negative)</p> <p>Professional Liability Insurance</p> <p>TK20 Account</p>	<p>Two additional dispositions forms by education professors and/or field experience teachers.</p> <p>3.0 minimum GPA</p> <p>All clearances in hand.</p> <p>Pass all Basic Skills or CORE Test.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Basic Skills or CORE Test Disposition Forms GPA Field Experience I Projects</p>	<p>Two additional dispositions forms by field experience teachers.</p> <p>3.0 minimum GPA</p> <p>Pass all 3 PK-4 PECT Test Modules.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> PK-4 PECT Test Scores Disposition Forms GPA Field Experience II Projects</p>	<p>File PDE Teacher Certification on TIMS</p> <p>Two additional dispositions forms by University Supervisor &amp; Coop.</p> <p>Complete Exit Survey (TK20)</p> <p>Earn 4 points minimum on the final PDE-430 evaluation.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Exit Survey Results PDE-430 Results Disposition Forms Student Teaching Projects (i.e., Impact on Student Learning)</p>	<p>All requirements for Gate 3 must have been fully completed.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Number of students who completed the program.</p> <p>Number of students who were recommended for Instructional I Certificate.</p> <p>Number of students who have obtained gainful employment in their field.</p>	<p><b>Assessment</b> Alumni Survey Results</p> <p>Number of alumni who are still teaching in their field after two years.</p> <p>School Partners Survey Results</p> <p>SPA Results</p> <p>PDE Program Evaluations (when available)</p>

	<b>Assessment</b> Basic Skills or CORE Test Scores Disposition Forms GPA					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Initial Program	Initial Requirements	Gate 1 Pre-Admission to the ECH Program (ECH 210 & ECH 253) Requirements	Gate 2 Admission to the ECH Program (ECH 320, ECH 333 & ECH 343) Requirements	Gate 3 Admissions to Student Teaching Requirements	Gate 4 Program Completion Requirements	Unit Operation Effectiveness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Dual Early Childhood/Special Education</u></li> </ul>	<p>Basic Skills assessment Math, Reading and Writing. Or CORE Test</p> <p>Two dispositions forms by two faculty members.</p> <p>C or better in all department course requirements.</p> <p>3.0 minimum GPA.</p> <p>Clearances (Act 24, 34, 114, 151)</p> <p>TB Test (negative)</p> <p>Professional Liability Insurance</p>	<p>Two additional dispositions forms by education professors and/or field experience teachers.</p> <p>3.0 minimum GPA</p> <p>All clearances in hand.</p> <p>Pass all PAPA or CORE Test.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Basic Skills or CORE Test Disposition Forms GPA Field Experience I Projects</p>	<p>Two additional dispositions forms by field experience teachers.</p> <p>3.0 minimum GPA</p> <p>Pass all 3 PK-4 PECT Test Modules.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> PK-4 PECT Test Scores Disposition Forms GPA Field Experience II Projects</p>	<p>File PDE Teacher Certification on TIMS</p> <p>Two additional dispositions forms by University Supervisor &amp; Coop.</p> <p>Complete Exit Survey (TK20)</p> <p>Earn 4 points minimum on the final PDE-430 evaluation.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Exit Survey Results PDE-430 Results Disposition Forms Student Teaching Projects (i.e., Impact on Student</p>	<p>All requirements for Gate 3 must have been fully completed.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Number of students who completed the program.</p> <p>Number of students who were recommended for Instructional I Certificate.</p> <p>Number of students who have obtained gainful employment in their field.</p>	<p><b>Assessment</b> Alumni Survey Results</p> <p>Number of alumni who are still teaching in their field after two years.</p> <p>School Partners Survey Results</p> <p>SPA Results</p> <p>PDE Program Evaluations (when available)</p>

	TK20 Account			Learning)		
	<b>Assessment</b> Basic Skills or CORE Test Scores Disposition Forms GPA					

Initial Program	Initial Requirements Freshman Year	Gate 1 Pre-Admission to the Middle Level Program (TCH 206) Requirements	Gate 2 Admission to the Middle Level Program (TCH 322, TCH 342, TCH 348, TCH 366) Requirements	Gate 3 Admissions to Student Teaching Requirements	Gate 4 Program Completion Requirements	Unit Operation Effectiveness Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Elementary/Middle Level (4-8) Education</u></li> </ul>	<p>Basic Skills assessment Math, Reading and Writing. Or CORE Test</p> <p>Two dispositions forms by two faculty members.</p> <p>C or better in all department course requirements.</p> <p>3.0 minimum GPA.</p> <p>Clearances (Act 24, 34, 114, 151)</p> <p>TB Test (negative)</p> <p>Professional</p>	<p>Two additional dispositions forms by education professors and/or field experience teachers.</p> <p>3.0 minimum GPA</p> <p>All clearances in hand.</p> <p>Pass all Basic Skills or CORE Test.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Basic Skills or CORE Test Disposition</p>	<p>Two additional dispositions forms by field experience teachers.</p> <p>3.0 minimum GPA</p> <p>Pass PRAXI Test 5152 (PA 4-8) and Pass one or two of the following: PRAXIS Test ELA 5156; SS 5157; MAT 5158; SCI 5159.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b></p>	<p>File PDE Teacher Certification on TIMS</p> <p>Two additional dispositions forms by University Supervisor &amp; Coop.</p> <p>Complete Exit Survey (TK20)</p> <p>Earn 4 points minimum on the final PDE-430 evaluation.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Exit Survey Results PDE-430 Results Disposition Forms Student</p>	<p>All requirements for Gate 3 must have been fully completed.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Number of students who completed the program.</p> <p>Number of students who were recommended for Instructional I Certificate.</p> <p>Number of students who have obtained gainful employment in their field.</p>	<p>Alumni Survey Results</p> <p>Number of alumni who are still teaching in their field after two years.</p> <p>School Partners Survey Results</p> <p>SPA Results</p> <p>PDE Program Evaluations (when available)</p>

	Liability Insurance  TK20 Account  <b>Assessment</b> Basic Skills or CORE Test Scores Disposition Forms GPA	Forms GPA Field Experience I Projects	<b>t</b> PRAXIS Tests Scores Disposition Forms GPA Field Experience II Projects	Teaching Projects (i.e., Impact on Student Learning)		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Initial Program	Initial Requirements	Gate 1 Pre-Admission to the Secondary (K-12) Ed. Program (TCH 207) Requirements	Gate 2 Professional Standing (ART 400, EDU 412, EDU 422, EDU 426, EDU 431, EDU 434, EDU 440) Requirements	Gate 3 Admissions to Student Teaching (EDU 495) Requirements	Gate 4 Program Completion Requirements	Unit Operation Effectiveness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Secondary *(K-12) and (7-12) Education</u></li> <li>*Art and Modern Languages</li> </ul>	<b>Freshman Year</b> Basic Skills assessment Math, Reading and Writing. Or CORE Test  Two dispositions forms by two faculty members.  C or better in all department course requirements.  3.0 minimum GPA.  Clearances (Act 24, 34, 114, 151)  TB Test	Two additional dispositions forms by education professors and/or field experience teachers.  3.0 minimum GPA  All clearances in hand.  Pass all PAPA or CORE Test.  <b>Assessment</b> Basic Skills or CORE Test	<b>Requirements</b> Two additional dispositions forms by field experience teachers.  3.0 minimum GPA  Pass PRAXI Test candidate's major areas and PRAXIS Test 0511/5511 Fundamentals Subjects  <b>Assessment</b> PRAXIS Tests Scores	<b>Requirements</b> File PDE Teacher Certification on TIMS  Two additional dispositions forms by University Supervisor & Coop.  Complete Exit Survey (TK20)  Earn 4 points minimum on the final PDE-430 evaluation.  <b>Assessment</b> Exit Survey Results PDE-430	<b>Requirements</b> All requirements for Gate 3 must have been fully completed.  <b>Assessment</b> Number of students who completed the program.  Number of students who were recommended for Instructional I Certificate.  Number of students who have obtained gainful employment in their field.	<b>Assessment</b> Alumni Survey Results  Number of alumni who are still teaching in their field after two years.  School Partners Survey Results  SPA Results  PDE Program Evaluations (when available)

	(negative) Professional Liability Insurance  TK20 Account  <b>Assessment</b> Basic Skills or CORE Test Scores Disposition Forms GPA	Disposition Forms GPA Field Experience I Projects	Disposition Forms GPA Field Experience II Projects	Results Disposition Forms Student Teaching Projects (i.e., Impact on Student Learning)		
--	---	--	---	--	--	--

## Appendix F

### Shippensburg University College of Education and Human Services Unit Assessment System for Advanced Programs

Advanced Programs	Gate 1 Admission to the Program	Gate 2 Advancement to Candidacy	Gate 3 Program Completion	Unit Operation Effectiveness (Employment and Follow- up)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curriculum &amp; Instruction, MEd Clusters:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Biology</li> <li>○ Early Childhood Education</li> <li>○ Elementary Education</li> <li>○ Geography/Earth Science</li> <li>○ History</li> <li>○ Mathematics</li> <li>○ Middle School Education</li> <li>○ Modern Languages</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Requirements</b></p> <p>-Online application to Graduate School. -Bachelor's degree from an accredited university. -3.0 GPA minimum in undergraduate or graduate coursework. -Official transcripts. -GRE or MAT if undergraduate GPA is lower than 3.0 -Reference Forms -Personal Data Forms -Résumé -Interview with program faculty</p> <p><b>Assessment</b></p> <p>GPA References Résumé: Life, work and academic experiences. Interview</p>	<p><b>Requirements</b></p> <p>-Successful coursework completion from core courses and discipline specific courses with a B or better.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Discipline specific assessments embedded in courses.</p>	<p><b>Requirements</b></p> <p>-Planning sheet on file in the Graduate Office. -Internship and Action Research for candidates in the Early Childhood, Elementary or Middle School clusters.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Discipline specific assessments such as research projects from TCH 575; TCH 600 &amp; TCH 609</p>	<p><b>Assessment</b> Alumni Survey Results</p> <p>Number of alumni who are still in their field after two years.</p> <p>School Partners Survey Results</p>

--	--	--	--	--

Advanced Programs	Admission to the Program Requirements	Gate 1 Foundation Status Requirements	Gate 2 Practicum Status Requirements	Gate 3 Program Completion Requirements	Unit Operation Effectiveness (Employment and Follow-up)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Master's in Reading</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Online application to Graduate School.</li> <li>-Bachelor's degree from an accredited university.</li> <li>-3.0 GPA minimum in undergraduate or graduate coursework.</li> <li>-Official transcripts.</li> <li>-Literacy course at the undergrad or graduate level.</li> <li>-Reference Forms</li> <li>-Personal Data Forms</li> <li>-Résumé</li> <li>-Interview with program faculty</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(RDG 524; RDG 527; RDG 528; RDG 529 and RDG 520)</li> <li>-B minimum in all courses.</li> <li>-Pass Foundation written exam</li> <li>-Purchase TK20</li> <li>-Membership in KSRA</li> <li>-Purchase textbook: <i>Preparing Reading Professionals</i></li> <li><b>Assessment</b> Data from Foundation written exam</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(RDG 537; RDG 532; RDG 533; RDG 534 and RDG 535)</li> <li>RDG 533 and 534 must be taken together.</li> <li>Pass Reading Specialist PRAXIS Test</li> <li><b>Assessment</b> PRAXIS Test Scores Disposition Form GPA Course Specific Projects from RDG 534 (Practicum in Reading)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Application for Graduation</li> <li><b>Assessment</b> Disposition form GPA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Assessment</b> Alumni Survey Results</li> <li>Number of alumni who are still in their field after two years.</li> <li>School Partners Survey Results</li> <li>SPA Results</li> <li>PDE Program Evaluations (when available)</li> </ul>



	<p>-All clearances in hand (if applicant is not employed by a school district).</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Department Committee reviews: GPA References Interview performance</p>				
--	---	--	--	--	--

<b>Advanced Programs</b>	<b>Gate 1 Admission to the Program</b>	<b>Gate 2 Advancement to Candidacy</b>	<b>Gate 3 Program Completion</b>	<b>Unit Operation Effectiveness (Employment and Follow-up)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STEM M.A.T (with Teacher Certification)</li> </ul> <p><i>Since this program is new and no data are available yet, the information presented here only illustrates how the program fits the Unit Assessment System.</i></p>	<p><b>Requirements</b></p> <p>-Online application to Graduate School. -Application to the STEM Master's program -Statement of Intent -Bachelor's degree from an accredited university. -3.0 GPA minimum in undergraduate or graduate coursework. -Official Transcripts -Two letters of recommendation -PRAXIS I and PRAXIS II</p>	<p><b>Requirements</b> 15 credits from core courses: STEM 510 STEM 520 STEM 530 STEM 540 STEM 560 One elective from: SCED 550 STEM 555 MAT 527</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Disposition Form GPA Course Specific Projects</p>	<p><b>Requirements</b> STEM 590 (Student Teaching)</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Data from two capstone projects Research project Professional Portfolio</p> <p>Disposition form</p>	<p><b>Assessment</b> Alumni Survey Results</p> <p>Number of alumni who are still in their field after two years.</p> <p>School Partners Survey Results</p> <p>PDE Program Evaluations (when available)</p>

	<b>Assessment</b> M.A.T directors review: GPA Letters of recommendation PRAXIS scores			
--	---	--	--	--

<b>Advanced Programs</b>	<b>Gate 1 Admission to the Program</b>	<b>Gate 2 Advancement to Candidacy</b>	<b>Gate 3 Program Completion</b>	<b>Unit Operation Effectiveness (Employment and Follow-up)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Master's in Educational Leadership (Certificate of K-12 Principals)</li> </ul>	<b>Requirements</b> -Online application to Graduate School. -Instructional or Educational Specialist Certificate -Program Application form -Bachelor's degree from an accredited university. -3.0 GPA minimum in undergraduate or graduate coursework. -Official Transcripts -Reference Forms (One from Chief School Officer and one from another administrator, often a principal) -Disposition form	<b>Requirements</b> Follow approved individual student program plan and maintain a B average (minimum) in the first two courses (6 credit-hours minimum). To advance to candidacy, students must successfully complete Candidacy Interview.  <b>Assessment</b> GPA Course Specific Projects	<b>Requirements</b> Follow approved individual student program plan: a total of 33 credits minimum. Pre-Practicum I Self-Mentor Assessment (CAEP Assessment #4) ELP 514 (Practicum I) Pre-Practicum II Professional Leadership Skills Assessment (CAEP Assessment #5) ELP 522 (Practicum II)  <b>Assessment</b> Data from the two Practicum courses	<b>Assessment</b> Alumni feedback  Number of alumni who are still in their field after two years.  School Partners feedback  SPA results  PDE Program Evaluations (when available)

	<p>completed by two current administrators. -Signed copy of Memorandum of Understanding for Practicum &amp; Mentoring</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Ed Leadership faculty and/or Department Chair review: GPA Letters of recommendation and a review of official transcripts.</p>		Disposition form to be completed by Practicum I and Practicum II school district mentor(s)	
--	--	--	--	--

<b>Advanced Programs</b>	<b>Gate 1 Admission to the Program</b>	<b>Gate 2 Advancement to Candidacy</b>	<b>Gate 3 Program Completion</b>	<b>Unit Operation Effectiveness (Employment and Follow-up)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Master's in Educational Leadership (School Administrator-Building Level)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Requirements</b></p> <p>-Online application to Graduate School. -Instructional or Supervisory Certificate -Program Application form -Bachelor's degree from an accredited university. -3.0 GPA minimum in undergraduate or graduate coursework. -Official Transcripts - 2 References -Disposition form completed by</p>	<p><b>Requirements</b></p> <p>Follow approved individual student program plan and maintain a B average (minimum) in the first two courses (6 credit-hours minimum). To advance to candidacy, students must successfully complete Candidacy Interview (ELP 514).</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> GPA</p>	<p><b>Requirements</b></p> <p>Follow approved individual student program plan: a total of 33 credits minimum. Pre-Practicum I Self-Mentor Assessment (CAEP Assessment #4) ELP 514 (Practicum I) Pre-Practicum II Professional Leadership Skills Assessment (CAEP Assessment #5) ELP 521</p>	<p><b>Assessment</b> Alumni feedback</p> <p>Number of alumni who are still in their field after two years.</p> <p>School Partners feedback</p>

	<p>two current administrators.          -Complete initial Unit-wide diversity survey          -Signed copy of Memorandum of Understanding for Practicum &amp; Mentoring          -2 years of teaching experience or equivalent experience.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b>          Ed Leadership faculty and/or Department Chair review:          GPA          Letters of recommendation and a review of official transcripts.</p>	Course Specific Projects	<p>(Practicum II)</p> <p><b>Assessment</b>          Data from the two Practicum courses</p> <p>Disposition form to be completed by Practicum I and Practicum II school district mentor(s)</p> <p>School Leaders Licensure Assessment</p>	
--	--	--------------------------	--	--

<b>Advanced Programs</b>	<b>Gate 1 Admission to the Program</b>	<b>Gate 2 Advancement to Candidacy</b>	<b>Gate 3 Program Completion</b>	<b>Unit Operation Effectiveness (Employment and Follow-up)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Master's in Educational Leadership (Superintendent's Letter of Eligibility Program-District Level) Post Master's</li> </ul>	<p><b>Requirements</b></p> <p>-Online application to Graduate School.          -PA Administrative or Supervisory Certificate          -Program Application form          -Master's degree from an accredited university.          -3.0 GPA minimum in undergraduate</p>	<p><b>Requirements</b></p> <p>Follow approved individual student program plan and maintain a B average (minimum) in the first two courses (6 credit-hours minimum). To advance to candidacy, students must successfully complete</p>	<p><b>Requirements</b></p> <p>Follow approved individual student program plan: a total of 33 credits minimum.          Superintendent's Letter of Eligibility Exit Defense          Curriculum Redesign Project (ELP 727)          School &amp;</p>	<p><b>Assessment</b></p> <p>Alumni feedback/Graduate Survey</p> <p>Number of alumni who are still in their field after two years.</p> <p>School Partners feedback</p> <p>Results from Superintendent's Licensure Exam</p>

	<p>or graduate coursework.  -Official undergrad and grad Transcripts  - 2 References  -Disposition form completed by two current administrators.  -Complete initial Unit-wide diversity survey  -Signed copy of Memorandum of Understanding for Practicum &amp; Mentoring  -Currently serve in an administrative or supervisory position  -3 years of administrative or supervisory experience.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b>  Ed Leadership faculty and/or Department Chair review:  GPA  Letters of recommendation and a review of official transcripts.</p>	<p>Candidacy Interview</p> <p><b>Assessment</b>  GPA  Course Specific Projects</p>	<p>Community /School-Community Partnership Assessment (ELP 721)</p> <p><b>Assessment</b>  Data from ELP 721 &amp; ELP 727</p> <p>Data from Exit Defense</p>	
--	---	--	---	--

Advanced Programs	Gate 1 Admission to the Program	Gate 2 Advancement to Candidacy	Gate 3 Program Completion	Unit Operation Effectiveness (Employment and Follow- up)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Master's in Special Education (7-12 Certificate)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Requirements</b></p> <p>-Online application to Graduate School.</p> <p>-Program Application form</p> <p>-Program Planning Sheet Approved by Advisor</p> <p>-Bachelor's degree from an accredited university.</p> <p>-3.0 GPA minimum in undergraduate or graduate coursework.</p> <p>-Official Transcripts. Transcripts must show that candidate took courses dealing with exceptionalities, student with disabilities, assessment of students with disabilities and English Language Learners.</p> <p>-Interview with a faculty member</p> <p><b>Assessment</b></p> <p>GPA</p> <p>Transcripts</p> <p>Program Planning Sheet</p>	<p><b>Requirements</b></p> <p>Follow approved individual program planning sheet.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b></p> <p>Disposition Form</p> <p>GPA</p> <p>Course Specific Projects</p>	<p><b>Requirements</b></p> <p>Follow approved individual program planning sheet for a total of 33 credits minimum.</p> <p>Successful completion of EDU 495 (Student Teaching)</p> <p><b>Assessment</b></p> <p>Data from EDU 495</p> <p>Disposition form</p>	<p><b>Assessment</b></p> <p>Alumni Survey Results</p> <p>Number of alumni who are still in their field after two years.</p> <p>School Partners Survey Results</p> <p>SPA results</p> <p>PDE Program Evaluations (when available)</p>

Advanced Programs	Phase I Admission to the Program	Phase II Pre-Admission to Candidacy (CNS 504 & CNS 585)	Phase III Pre-Program Completion (CNS 505 & CNS 580, 589)	Phase IV Program Completion	Unit Operation Effectiveness (Employment and Follow- up)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PreK-12 School Counseling</li> </ul>	<p><b>Requirements</b> Admissions Packet screened by school counseling coordinator.</p> <p>Group admissions interviews</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Faculty assess dispositions &amp; interpersonal skills; requires faculty consensus for admissions, &amp; candidates are assessed on admissions rating form.</p>	<p><b>Requirements</b> Reflection paper in 504. Minimum 3.0; GPA; TK20 acct.</p> <p>Clearances (Act 34, etc.) &amp; Professional Liability Insurance</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Skills rubric w/ dispositions assessment in preprac and prac; supervisor evals of candidates; diversity &amp; advocacy rubric; candidacy rubric with dispositions assessment; e-portfolio. Faculty consensus for admission to candidacy.</p>	<p><b>Requirements</b> Comprehensive school counseling program website rubric; data driven project.</p> <p>3.0 GPA min.; clearances &amp; insurance.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Skills and diversity rubrics with dispositions; supervisor evaluation rubrics; e-portfolio.</p> <p>Complete Exit Survey (TK20).</p> <p>PRAXIS II.</p>	<p><b>Requirements</b> Prior phase requirements must be met.</p> <p>File PDE School Counselor Certification on TIMS.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> Number of candidates who completed the program.</p> <p>Number of candidates who have obtained gainful employment in their field.</p>	<p><b>Assessment</b> Alumni Survey Results</p> <p>Number of alumni who are still counseling in their field after two years.</p> <p>SPA results</p> <p>PDE Program Evaluations (when available)</p>

**Appendix G**

**MAR**

**Meta Assessment Rubric for the Assessment of the Unit's Assessment System & the Unit's Effectiveness**

**Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania**

NCATE Standard 2: The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

Unit Goal(s): The unit implements a comprehensive assessment system congruent with university assessment and reporting protocols. The assessment system provides data on student learning outcomes and other non-academic outcomes for initial and advanced programs. The data inform decision-making within the unit and the university at large.

*\* Adapted from a model developed by James Madison University*

<b>1. UNIT'S ASSESSMENT SYSTEM</b>						
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Unacceptable 1</b>	<b>Developing 2</b>	<b>Acceptable 3</b>	<b>Rating</b>		<b>Comments</b>
				<b>ITP</b>	<b>ADV</b>	
<b>1.1 Involvement of professional community</b>	The unit assessment system was not developed with, and is not reviewed by, the broader professional community (P-12 and arts and sciences faculty).	The unit assessment system was developed with some input from, but is not systematically reviewed by, the broader professional community on a regular basis.	The unit assessment system was developed with, and is systematically reviewed by, the broader professional community on a regular basis.			
<b>1.2 Alignment with conceptual framework, professional, state standards</b>	The unit assessment system does not reflect the conceptual frameworks and professional and state standards.	The unit assessment system is aligned with the conceptual frameworks and professional and state standards.	The unit assessment system is aligned with conceptual frameworks and professional and state standards, and is regularly re-evaluated.			



<b>1.3 Comprehensive and integrated measures</b>	The assessment system consists of a collection of individual measures that are neither comprehensive nor integrated.	The assessment system includes some comprehensive assessment measures, but they are not integrated or lack relevant scoring criteria.	The assessment system includes comprehensive and integrated measures with relevant scoring criteria that are regularly re-evaluated.			
<b>1.4 Identified decision gates (Transition Points)</b>	The unit has not identified the major decision points (admission, appropriate transition points, and program completion) at which candidate performance data will be collected for each program.	The unit has identified the major decision points at which candidate performance data will be collected for each program.	The unit has identified, and collects candidate performance data at, the major decision points for each program.			
<b>1.5 Multiple assessment measures</b>	The unit assesses its candidates using single or unaligned assessment measures at some decision points in their programs.	The unit uses multiple aligned and appropriate measures to assess its candidates at most decision points in their programs.	The unit systematically uses multiple aligned measures to assess its candidates at all major decision points in its programs.			
<b>1.6 Assessment of unit operations</b>	The unit has not defined and does not measure factors impacting unit operations.	The unit has defined unit operations and developed appropriate assessment measures, but the assessments are not conducted on a regular basis.	The unit systematically assesses unit operations on a regular basis.			
<b>1.7 Fairness, accuracy, consistency, lack of bias</b>	No steps have been taken to establish that assessments are fair, accurate, consistent, and free from bias.	Preliminary steps have been taken to establish that assessments are fair, accurate, consistent, and free from bias.	Assessments have been established as fair, accurate, consistent, and free from bias. Assessments are regularly reviewed for bias, fairness, etc.			

## 2. DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND EVALUATION

Indicator	Unacceptable 1	Developing 2	Acceptable 3	Rating		Comments
				ITP	ADV	
<b>2.1 Unit-wide data management system</b>	The unit does not have a unit-wide electronic data system to collect and store candidate performance and program/unit operations data. Data collection systems at the program level do not interface with a unit-wide system.	A unit-wide electronic data system is in place that can collect and store all candidate performance and unit operations data over time. Program-level data collection systems interface with the unit-wide data system.	A unit-wide electronic data system is in place that can collect, store, and process all candidate performance and unit operations data over time. Maintenance and enhancement needs are anticipated.			
<b>2.2 Collecting, analyzing, and evaluating candidate performance data</b>	The unit does not collect, analyze, or evaluate candidate assessment data at identified decision points.	The unit collects, analyzes, and evaluates candidate assessment data at some decision points in candidates' programs.	The unit collects, analyzes, and evaluates candidate assessment data at all decision points in candidates' programs.			
<b>2.3 Collecting, analyzing, and evaluating program quality data</b>	The unit does not collect, analyze, or evaluate program quality data on a regular basis.	The unit informally collects, analyzes, and evaluates program quality data on a sporadic basis.	The unit collects, analyzes, and evaluates program quality data at regularly scheduled intervals as part of a comprehensive unit assessment plan.			
<b>2.4 Collecting, analyzing, and evaluating unit operations data</b>	The unit does not collect, analyze, or evaluate unit operations data on a regular basis.	The unit informally collects, analyzes, and evaluates unit operations data on a sporadic basis.	The unit collects, analyzes, and evaluates unit operations data at regularly scheduled intervals as part of a comprehensive unit assessment plan.			
<b>2.5 Multiple sources of data collection</b>	Limited or no assessment data are collected from some, but not all, of the following groups: applicants, candidates, faculty, graduates, employers, and other professionals.	Minimal assessment data are periodically collected from all of the following groups: applicants, candidates, faculty, graduates, employers, and other professionals.	Comprehensive assessment data are systematically collected from all of the following groups: applicants, candidates, faculty, graduates, employers, and other professionals.			

<b>2.6 Internal and external assessments</b>	The unit generates data only for external accountability reports (NCATE, SPA's, state, etc.). Programs administer some internal assessments but do not share data with the unit.	The unit generates some data based on internal unit standards, but does not attempt to integrate external and internal data as part of a comprehensive assessment system. External and internal assessments may duplicate each other or leave gaps.	A strong rationale guides the combination of internal and external assessment sources used in the assessment system. External and internal assessments complement, but do not duplicate each other and address all assessment needs.			
<b>2.7 Compiling, summarizing, and analyzing assessment data</b>	Data are not regularly and systematically compiled and summarized.	Data are regularly and systematically summarized, but are not analyzed for program improvement.	Data are regularly and systematically compiled, summarized, and analyzed for program improvement. A strong rationale guides data analysis.			

### 3. USE OF DATA FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Indicator	Unacceptable 1	Developing 2	Acceptable 3	Rating		Comments
				ITP	ADV	
<b>3.1 - Unit-wide process for using data for program improvement</b>	The unit makes assessment results available only to administrators as needed, and does not use the data for unit or program improvement.	The unit uses assessment results for individual program improvement, but there is no systematic process for making changes or improvements across programs or at the program or unit level.	An ongoing, systematic, standards-based process is in place for reporting and using data to make decisions and improve programs both unit- and university-wide. Data are regularly collected and stored, analyzed, and reported in user-friendly formats. Changes based on data are evident.			

<b>3.2 - Evaluation of courses</b>	The unit does not use data from a variety of sources to evaluate its courses.	The unit reviews data from a variety of sources to evaluate its courses.	The unit reviews data from a variety of sources to evaluate its courses. Course revisions based on evaluation data are evident.			
<b>3.3 - Evaluation of programs</b>	The unit does not use data from a variety of sources to evaluate its programs.	The unit reviews data from a variety of sources to evaluate its programs.	The unit reviews data from a variety of sources to evaluate its programs. Program revisions based on evaluation data are evident.			
<b>3.4 - Evaluation of field and clinical experiences</b>	The unit does not use data from a variety of sources to evaluate its field and clinical experiences.	The unit reviews data from a variety of sources to evaluate its field and clinical experiences.	The unit reviews data from a variety of sources to evaluate its field and clinical experiences. Revisions to field and clinical experiences based on evaluation data are evident.			
<b>3.5 - Evaluation of unit operations</b>	The unit does not use data from a variety of sources to evaluate its unit operations.	The unit reviews data from a variety of sources to evaluate its unit operations.	The unit reviews data from a variety of sources to evaluate its unit operations. Revisions to unit operations based on evaluation data are evident.			
<b>3.6 - Candidate reflection and improvement</b>	Candidate assessment data are not shared with candidates.	Candidate assessment data are shared with candidates, but with little or no guidance for reflection and improvement.	Candidate assessment data are shared with candidates with guidance for reflection and improvement. The unit provides candidates with opportunities for remediation.			