

**Assessment Task Force: Assessment Initiatives**

<b>WHAT</b>	<b>PRINCIPLES/ OUTCOMES/ ACTIONS/ ACTIVITIES</b>
<b>Principles to Guide Work</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment should be tied to outcomes and the conceptual framework.</li> <li>• Assessment should provide a means of setting appropriate targets, focusing on professional development, changing curriculum, improving instruction and instructional materials.</li> <li>• We will not over complicate our process; focus on documents and processes that can be used across all programs; more detail can be provided at the program level</li> <li>• Whatever is agreed upon must be a process and product that can be supported by technology.</li> <li>• We will make an effort not to re-invent the wheel; but instead will consider what already exists either here or in other places.</li> <li>• We will incorporate the transition points that we identified prior to the NCATE visit. These are admission, pre-clinical, clinical, exit, and follow-up.</li> <li>• We will tie the process and product to the conceptual framework of the college, GSTEP, and existing standards.</li> <li>• For accreditation purposes, the focus is on aggregated data.</li> <li>• We need to assure that the language used will work across all certification programs.</li> </ul>
<b>Final Outcomes Needed</b> (Source: NCATE Spring 2007 BOE Update)	<p>Need an assessment system that is as streamlined as possible with a limited number of KEY assessments at the unit and program levels, easy to manage, and includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have a clearly articulated unit assessment system</li> <li>• Involve P-12 educators and professional community in effort (PEAC group, others?)</li> <li>• Reflects the conceptual framework – outcomes articulated in the framework are being assessed (means that the GA Framework is accepted as the specific outcomes identified in the larger conceptual framework – at the level of domains?)</li> <li>• Uses a comprehensive and integrated set of evaluation measures to monitor candidate performance and manage and improve unit operations and programs (need strategy for how to monitor and improve operations and programs)</li> <li>• Uses multiple candidate assessments at key decision points (admission, continuation in, completion)</li> <li>• Ensures that assessments at decision points are predictive of candidate success</li> <li>• Ensures fairness, accuracy, consistency, and elimination of bias in procedures/instruments</li> <li>• Program assessments need to be aligned to the unit’s conceptual framework (including GA Framework) and national professional standards</li> </ul> <p><u>Required program assessment data for national SPA’s and/or PSC:</u> 6-8 assessments including (1) assessments; (2) scoring guides; (3) data tables</p>
<b>Assessment Task Force</b>	<p><b><u>ACCOMPLISHMENTS</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Created set of principles for developing a unit assessment system</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Created experimental draft of GA Framework for educators</li> <li>• Created decision making principles for identifying program focus areas on framework (Sally) – look for points that may not be appropriate for pre-service (Linda sent items from self assessment not able to be rated on GSTEP Self-Assessment for Accomplished Teaching Instrument)</li> <li>• Conceptual map of technology needed for aggregating at program and unit level (Sandi)</li> <li>• Created plan for broad input for experimental framework for educators (Sally, Linda, Frances)</li> <li>• Aligned middle school program with framework as model (Gayle &amp; Sally – part finished)</li> </ul> <p><b><u>NEW ACTIONS:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Get broad input for experimental framework for use in all educator preparation programs (who?)</li> <li>• Area F Committee to identify focus areas on framework for those courses (Jamie to lead work with this committee)</li> <li>• Invite P-12 representatives to work with task force as we develop unit assessment system (Pam &amp; Kathleen)</li> <li>• Need strategy for involving P-12 personnel throughout assessment system development and implementation</li> <li>• Need to discuss required elements of unit assessment system</li> <li>• Need to work through issue of identifying language for use in assessing levels of candidates’ accomplishment (i.e. beginning, developing, acceptable, target, qualified, exemplary, whatever)-common across educator preparation programs for program and unit level aggregation</li> <li>• Need to look at PSC PAAR and PRS system to see how this will impact the work of the programs and unit (system is still being refined)</li> <li>• Need communications plan for disseminating information and getting feedback as we go along (<b>need subcommittee</b>)</li> <li>• Need thorough example for teacher education/other school personnel</li> <li>• Get full agreement that the extended GA Framework is the elaboration of the COE conceptual framework (at the principle and domain level)</li> <li>• Program and unit aggregation document (partially completed)</li> <li>• Field experience evaluations (<b>need subcommittee for teacher ed and one for OSP</b>)</li> <li>• Develop extended exit survey to include OSP (<b>need subcommittee</b>)</li> </ul>
<b>Possible actions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examine unit assessment systems recognized by NCATE as models</li> </ul>
<b>GTSM Program Pilots (March – Fall, 2007)</b>	Gayle and Todd work with Mike Hannafin & Art Recesso to pilot align program level outcomes with GA pre-service framework, develop rubrics to assess candidate progress toward standards in preservice framework (perhaps field observation tool?), integrate VAT as tool to support assessment, pilot, disseminate to COE & USG
<b>Board of Regents EPAAC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aligned BOR Principles for Teachers with NCATE Standards</li> <li>• Established set of decision points and common categories of assessments</li> <li>• Collected graduate and employer surveys from USG institutions to attempt to create common instruments</li> </ul>

	<p>that would be administered by the BOR and results provided to institutions (not to be compared across institutions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Need to come up with common forms for use across all (BOR assessment committee)</li></ul>
--	--