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**School of Education History, Overview, and Organizational Structure**

## **History**

State University of New York (SUNY) at Oswego is one of 13 compressive colleges in SUNY, the nation’s most extensive system of public higher education with 64 campuses. The governing body of SUNY, the Board of Trustees, regulated the potation of all SUNY campuses. Additionally, teacher, educational leadership, and other school professional preparatory programs are directed by the New York State Education Department (NYSED).

Founded by Edward Austin Sheldon in 1861, Oswego promoted a process of hands-on learning labeled object method of teaching, which became the pedagogical foundation for what is now Technology Education and the basis for other programs emphasizing authentic learning including Childhood and Adolescence Education. The Oswego Primary Teachers Training School was incorporated as the Oswego State Normal & Training School in 1865. In 1938, state normal schools were converted to teacher’s colleges. Oswego granted its first Bachelor of Science in Education degrees to graduates in Industrial Arts in 1940. Today, the School of Education consists of six departments offering programs leading to initial and advanced teacher certification and other school professional certifications.

## **SUNY Oswego School of Education Vision Statement**

The School of Education cultivates graduates who:

* are committed to the work of their chosen profession
* value diversity in all its forms and advocate for social justice
* engage in ongoing professional development
* possess a strong sense of professional identity

To this end, the School of Education fosters a vibrant intellectual community that values teaching, collaboration, and scholarship, as well as promotes and supports socially just policies and practices.

## **SUNY Oswego School of Education Mission Statement**

The faculty of the School of Education, working in partnership with citizens of the world, supports and promotes extraordinary educators and learners.

Building on the wisdom of the past, the realities of the present, and the promise of the future, innovative educational programs will prepare individuals who will continually strive for personal growth and become socially-conscious catalysts for change.

We will instruct, involve, challenge and care for all learners, children, and adults, in the legacy of Edward Austin Sheldon.

## **Organizational Structure of the School of Education**

The School of Education consists of the Dean’s Office, the Field Placement Office, and six academic departments.

Our six academic departments and their programs:

* Career and Technical Educator Preparation: certificate, initial and advanced programs in Agricultural Education, Business and Marketing, Career and Technical Education, Family and Consumer Science Education, Health Careers Education, Technical Education, and Trade Education.
* Counseling & Psychological Services: three advanced programs (School Counseling, School Psychology, and Mental Health Counseling), and a graduate certificate for Certified Play Therapists
* Curriculum & Instruction (C&I): initial and advanced programs in Childhood Education, Adolescence Education (Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics, English, French, German, Spanish, Mathematics, and Social Studies), and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, Art Education, Literacy Education, and Special Education are offered for initial certification.
* Educational Leadership: two Certificates of Advanced Study leading to School Building Leader and School District Leader. A non-degree Superintendent Development program.
* Health Promotion and Wellness: a degree in Wellness Management and a minor in Athletic Coaching and Health Sciences.
* Technology: initial and advanced programs in Technology Education, Technology Management, and minor in Technology

## **Committees**

### Administrative Advisory Council

The faculty of the School of Education are organized into six departments. Each department in the School of Education elects a chairperson (confirmed by administrative appointment) who represents the faculty of that department on the School of Education Administrative Advisory Council (AAC). The Associate Deans, Field Placement Director, Data Manager for Assessment, and the chair of Faculty Council are also members of the AAC, which meets with the Dean regularly.

### School of Education Faculty Council

Composed of faculty representatives from each of the six academic departments in the School of Education plus professional staff and candidate representatives.

* Makes recommendations to the Dean and provides faculty leadership to accomplish the long and short-term goals of the School of Education;
* Develops and implements unit-wide academic policies and procedures;
* Reviews and makes recommendations regarding departmental curriculum and program initiatives to the Dean; and
* Organizes faculty participation in the SOE's Standing Committees and General SOE Faculty meetings.

### Standing Committees

Membership on any of the SOE's **Standing Committees** listed below is open to all SOE faculty and professional staff. Candidate and school partner participation are encouraged. Faculty Council and the Dean work together to ensure that there is Faculty Council and Administrative Advisory Committee representation on each committee to facilitate unit-wide communication on these essential issues:

* The **Assessment Committee** develops policies and procedures for implementing our Unit Assessment System and using data to improve programs across the unit. The group meets regularly to review policies/procedures and data summaries and makes recommendations to the Dean and departments.
* The **Diversity Committee** makes recommendations to the Dean and Faculty Council to increase the diversity of the student body, the faculty, and field placements; and to increase attention to diversity issues in curriculum/programs, professional development, campus culture, and the broader community. It meets regularly and also sponsors campus-wide diversity events (e.g., presentations, brown bag lunches).
* The **Educational Technology Committee** concerns itself with supporting faculty and candidates in their use of technology in instruction, both on campus and in school settings. The committee meets as needed, usually once or twice a semester.
* The **Field Placement Committee** serves as an advisory group to the Field Placement Office, supporting unit-wide efforts to enhance collaborative relationships with school partners to increase the number of high-quality placements for candidates. The group also makes recommendations on field placement policies and procedures and seeks to improve the speed and efficiency of making placements. School administrators regularly participate in monthly meetings.
* The **Professional Development School Committee** is composed of faculty and school personnel involved in our Professional Development Schools (PDS) and Professional Development Partnership Schools (PDPS). The group meets two or three times each semester, convened by the faculty member serving as the SOE's PDS Liaison.
* The SOE's **Peer Review Committee** makes recommendations to the Dean about personnel decisions concerning Discretionary Salary Increases (DSI), promotions, retention, and continuing appointment (tenure). It has membership from each department and follows procedures defined by the [SUNY Policies of the Board of Trustees](http://www.suny.edu/SUNYPP/documents.cfm?directory=pol_proc&cat_id=3) and [SUNY Oswego's Faculty Assembly Bylaws](http://www.oswego.edu/academics/faculty/assembly/bylaws.html).

# **Foundation of SUNY Oswego Quality Assurance System**

The quality assurance system is designed to collect and analyze data regarding the effectiveness of the School of Education (also known as the unit), its educational programs, and candidate performance. The foundation for the system is our conceptual framework, professional and state standards. The foundation serves as a basis to measure the effectiveness based on internal and external expectations of the profession.

## Figure 1: Foundation of SUNY Oswego Quality Assurance System: Unit Quality, Program, Quality and Candidate Performance

## **SUNY Oswego Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework at SUNY Oswego contains six core principles. Each principle is present and serves as a foundation in our quality assurance system. The six core principles are:

## **New York State Education Department (NYSED)**

New York State Education Department (NYSED) regulations 52.21 Registration of Curricula in teacher education states:

Part B: Programs leading to certification in the classroom teaching service, 2 General Requirements, iv Institutional Accountability

*Institutions shall be accountable for the quality of their programs leading to certification in teacher education and the candidates who complete such programs and shall demonstrate that their teacher education programs are evaluated regularly and that such evaluations are considered for making program improvements.*

Part C: Programs leading to certification in education leadership service, 6: Institutional accountability

*Regular program evaluations by the institution. Institutions shall be accountable for the quality of their programs leading to certification of education leaders and the candidates who complete such programs, and shall demonstrate that their programs are evaluated regularly and that such evaluations are considered for making program improvements.*

Part D: Programs leading to certification as a school counselor: 4 Institution Accountability

*Institutions shall be accountable for the quality of their programs leading to certification in school counseling and the candidates who complete such programs, and shall demonstrate that their school counseling programs are evaluated regularly and that such evaluations are considered for making program improvements.*

## **The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)**

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) accredited the School of Education through December 2021. On July 1, 2013, NCATE consolidated with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) to form the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). CAEP became the sole accrediting body for educator preparation providers (EPP). The School of Education will have a CAEP site visit for continuing accreditation in Spring 2021. The quality assurance system has been in place since before the formation of CAEP standards; however, the standard (listed below) serves as one of the foundations for revisions made to the system.

**Standard 5. Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates’ and completers’ positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers’ impact on P-12 student learning and development.

**Quality and Strategic Evaluation:**

5.1 The provider’s quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP standards.

5.2 The provider’s quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

**Continuous Improvement:**

5.3. The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

5.4. Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.

5.5. The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.

# **Characteristics of the Quality Assurance System**

## **Goals of the Quality Assurance System**

The purpose of the Quality Assurance System at SUNY Oswego School of Education is to promote continuous improvement of candidate knowledge and performance to enhance P-12 student learning. It is designed to offer credible evidence to guide improvements in three areas:

## **Guiding Principles of the Quality Assurance System**

The following principles guide the candidate and program assessment process in the School of Education:

* Assessment is continuous and systematic
* Assessment is formative and summative
* Summative assessment occurs at defined multiple decision points
* Assessments align with applicable national, state, and professional standards
* Assessment is fair, consistent, accurate, and free from bias
* Candidate assessments are based on multiple measures of performance over time on tasks related to professional responsibilities in the field
* Aggregated, analyzed, summarized assessment data is and regularly shared with stakeholders to guide program and unit improvement efforts
* In the creation of rubrics, faculty attend to the content validity of the assessed criteria
* Efforts are made to ensure the reliability of raters

## **Key Assessments**

### **Development of Key Assessments**

1. Each program or group of similar programs define critical performance tasks that:

* Focus on the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions identified by Professional Association standards; the appropriate Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards or National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS); the appropriate New York State Education Department (NYSED) regulations; and the SOE’s Conceptual Framework
* Are assigned and evaluated within required courses by college faculty, clinical faculty, and field supervisors
* Are based on (and or predictive of) authentic, research-based, professional-level work with P-12 students, teachers, administrators, and other professionals

2. Measure a variety of critical outcomes, including:

* Assessment of content knowledge
* Assessment of candidates ability to plan instruction
* Assessments of professional/pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions, including performance evaluations during field experiences, student teaching, or internships
* Assessment of candidates impact on P-12 student learning, including Teacher Work Samples and or edTPA

3. Include professional-specific performance requirements (e.g., instructional planning ability for all initial teacher preparation programs; ability to develop a supervisory plan for classroom-based instruction for school leadership, etc.).

4. Contain a variety of measurement types, including:

* Quantitative measures, such as maintenance of GPA requirements; standardized state licensure content and pedagogy test scores; ratings of candidate performance by faculty, field supervisors and or self-ratings; opinion surveys of candidates/alumni on program quality; and opinion surveys of employers on the performance of alumni and program quality
* Qualitative measures, such as evaluations of admission essays or interviews, culminating or comprehensive examinations, reflective essays, and curriculum units
* Validation measures, such as completion of required courses or workshops, completion of prerequisite degrees or certifications

5. Provide relevant information about candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions that:

* At the candidate, level to provide formative and summative feedback to individual candidates to improve performance or to advise unsuccessful candidates out of the program.
* At the program level as the basis of a unit-wide, data-driven continuous improvement program review process.

### **Key Assessment Requirements**

Aligning with the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP Created Assessments, <http://caepnet.org/~/media/Files/caep/accreditation-resources/caep-assessment-tool.pdf?la=en>

Each key assessments contains:

 a. Description of the Administration and Purpose

* The point or points when the assessment is administered during the preparation program are explicit.
* The purpose of the assessment and its use in candidate monitoring or decisions on progression are specified and appropriate.
* Instructions provided to candidates (or respondents to surveys) about what they are expected to do are informative and unambiguous.
* The basis for judgment (criterion for success, or what is “good enough”) is made explicit for candidates (or respondents to surveys).
* Evaluation categories or assessment tasks are aligned with CAEP, InTASC, national/professional, and state standards.

b. Content of Assessment

* Indicators assess explicitly identified aspects of CAEP, InTASC, national/professional, and state standards.
* Indicators reflect the degree of difficulty or level of effort described in the standards.
* Indicators unambiguously describe the proficiencies to be evaluated.
* When the standards being informed address higher-level functioning, the indicators require higher levels of intellectual behavior (e.g., create, evaluate, analyze, & apply). For example, when a standard specifies that candidates’ students “demonstrate” problem solving, then the indicator is specific to candidates’ application of knowledge to solve problems.
* Most indicators (at least those comprising 80% of the total score) require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies in the standards

c. Scoring

* The basis for judging candidate performance is well defined.
* Each Proficiency Level Descriptor (PLD) is qualitatively defined by specific criteria aligned with indicators.
* PLDs represent a developmental sequence from level to level (to provide raters with explicit guidelines for evaluating candidate performance and for providing candidates with explicit feedback on their performance).
* Feedback provided to candidates is actionable—it is directly related to the preparation program and can be used for program improvement as well as for feedback to the candidate.
* Proficiency level attributes are defined in actionable, performance-based, or observable behavior terms. [NOTE: If a less actionable term is used, such as “engaged,” criteria are provided to define the use of the term in the context of the category or indicator.]

d. If the key assessment is a survey, the content will:

* Questions or topics are explicitly aligned with aspects of the EPP’s mission and also CAEP, InTASC, national/professional, and state standards.
* Individual items have a single subject; language is unambiguous.
* Leading questions are avoided.
* Items are stated in terms of behaviors or practices instead of opinions, whenever possible.
* Surveys of dispositions make clear to candidates how the survey is related to effective teaching

### **Data Collection**

Data collection for key assessments identified for each program:

* Completed each semester by college faculty with appropriate expertise and experience; or by clinical faculty and field supervisors with proper credentials and experience.
* Submitted electronically promptly each semester, directly into the SOE’s online data management system, Tk20, by Watermark, keeping in mind that
* The completeness of data entry by all faculty or field supervisors is a departmental responsibility supervised by the department chair, with support from the SOE’s Data Manager for Assessment and Associate Dean of Assessment and Accreditation.
* Departmental data collected and stored electronically for each program is archived at the end of each semester by the Data Manager for Assessment and Associate Dean of Assessment and Accreditation.

### **Data Analyses**

Data analyses of key assessment data:

* Are conducted regularly (annual or other) for each program.
* Involve aggregating performance data from candidates over multiple courses and periods; and may involve disaggregating performance data from candidate groupings of interest (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity, methods versus student teaching experience, native versus transfer candidates).
* Are integrated with data from other critical performance tasks and institutional data of various types to conclude candidate content knowledge, professional or pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions, impact on P-12 student learning, etc.
* Are regularly shared with stakeholders to guide program and unit improvement efforts

# **Quality Assurance System Support and Resources**

## **The School of Education’s Assessment Committee**

The School of Education’s Assessment Committee is responsible for:

* Developing recommendations on policies, procedures, and priorities to implement and enhance the Unit Assessment System, which produces data on candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations that are used to improve the School of Education and its programs.
* Reviewing data on the quality of programs and unit operations
* Reviewing program assessment plans and annual program assessment reports generated by the program faculty within departments
* Coordinate collaborative efforts across departments to improve program and unit operations
* Monitor the implementation of the program and operational improvement initiatives

## **Data Management System: Tk20 by Watermark**

The implementation of an integrated computer-based School of Education Data Management System to collect, store, and analyze candidate performance data over time ensures valid candidate, program, and unit-level assessment within the assessment system. The implementation of Tk20 by Watermark is:

* Developmental (occurs in stages)
* Evolutionary (improves the application of later stages; customizable)

Employing the data management system to support the unit assessment system enables:

* Collecting data on the unit and program-level assessments through an online electronic software system
* Ability to create customizable reporting that summarizes individual candidate performance or aggregated performance
* The ability to institutionalize data archiving and retrieval

### **Components of the School of Education Data Management System**

The School of Education Data Management System specifications outlined above describe an integrated online data management system for the School of Education that interacts seamlessly with the institution’s comprehensive student data management (Banner). Tk20 by Watermark is:

* A comprehensive system for outcomes-based assessment, accountability, and reporting designed explicitly for education.
* Able to generate valuable reports leading to candidate, faculty, program, and unit successfully achieving SOE goals and objectives.
* a set of tools for managing outcomes-based assessment and measurement of candidate learning as well as management of activities such as curriculum mapping, and accreditation self-study report builder

Customizable to accurately reflect institutional processes. It allows for immediate, and future assessment needs to be met, including communicating across and between departments, meeting the needs for state and national accreditation, and supporting the work of academic advising and field experience

### **Specifications for the security of the Data Management System**

Tk20 by Watermark is the data management system based on specifications defined by faculty, administrators, and institutional researchers and adopted by the School of Education. It implements the key operational and analytical requirements of a computing system that supports teacher education assessment and continuous, data-driven program improvements as follows:

* Faculty and program coordinators have the same secure access to the Tk20 by Watermark as they do to the institutional student information system, BANNER.
* Tk20 by Watermark supports varying levels of access depending on the user (i.e., each candidate only sees her or his record; faculty only see records of their candidates or advisees; clinical faculty only see appropriate assessment input; as appropriate, administrators may see all individual data or aggregated data).
* Access is identical to the user’s access level and username/password in the existing institutional student data management system.

### ***Operational Functionality***

The SOE data management system requires a blend of functional and analytical capabilities. Candidate reporting is from an up-to-date practical data source. Analytical reports are better stored in a data warehouse environment, where reports are assembled over time and information stored in a stable/consistent format.

Tk20 by Watermark captures all data electronically, when and where it is entered the first time. Operational functions interface in real-time with other campus databases that store relevant data for candidate management. Additional data is imported regularly from various external sources of candidate performance data such as state licensure test scores from NYSED and post-graduation NYSED certification.

### **Candidate Management/Reporting**

Tk20 by Watermark system tracks the performance of individuals against program standards overtime at defined checkpoints. Real-time candidate reports identify assessment standards, observable measures for each, and display if the standard has been met or not met. Candidates, faculty, and college administrators can view the appropriate up-to-date candidate-level record(s) online at any time.

### **Program Analyses/Reporting Functionality**

Tk20 by Watermark is capable of:

* Mining data and aggregating and disaggregating data by program and candidate characteristics (e.g., demographic data, transfer versus native, candidates who failed a field experience versus those who did not).
* Linking, sorting, selecting, and exporting data from various sources within the system to provide samples of individuals based on candidate characteristics for analyses within the system and export to other analytical applications (e.g., SPSS).
* Reporting progress of individual candidates and groups of candidate’s overtime on detailed assessments.

#  Appendix A: SUNY Oswego Assessment At-A-Glace with CAEP Standards

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | CAEP Standard | Cross-Cutting Themes |
| Data Inputs: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Technology | Diversity |
| Data from the New York State Education Department Teacher Certification Exam:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| edTPA | x | x | x | x | x | X |  |
| Educating All Students | x |  | x | x | X |  | X |
| Content Specialty Test (by discipline) | x |  | x |  | X |  |  |
| Data from EPP Created Assessments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student Teaching Evaluation  | x | x | x | x | x | x |  |
| Disposition Assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Exit Survey |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alumni Survey |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employer Survey |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Quantitative Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Admissions Data |  |  | x |  |  |  | X |
| Enrollment Data |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Retention Data |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Graduation Data |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| GPA Data  | x |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Field Placement Data |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Qualitative Data  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Completer Case Study |  |  |  | x | x |  |  |
| DASA and SSHS Workshop  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| Professional Development Schools (Partnership)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual Assessment Report by Program  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Appendix B: SUNY Oswego School of Education Quality Assurance System Graphic



PROGRAM QUALITY

Assess program quality and support evidence based decisions by aggregated data of candidate performance on key assessments aligned to program specific standards.

UNIT QUALITY

Assess unit operations to support evidence based decisions on aggregated data analyses. Data sources may include EPP created assessments, university generated data, NYSED and Title II data.

CANDIDATE

To enhance candidate performance effective feedback to individual candidates at designated checkpoints throughout academic program.

# Appendix C: Program Assessment Plan (Adolescence Education: Social Studies example)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SPA Assessment Number** | **Type of Assessment** | **Name of Assessment** | **When Administered**  | **Standards Alignment** |
| 1 | Licensure assessment, or other content based assessment (required) | NYS Teacher Certification Exams:Educating All Students Test (EAS) | Post-Graduation Candidate registers with NYSTCE - exams taken after content courses are completed |  |
| 1 | Licensure assessment, or other content based assessment (required)  | NYS Teacher Certification Exams:005 Social StudiesC115 Social Studies | Post-Graduation Candidate registers with NYSTCE - exams taken after content courses are completed | C005: NCSS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10 |
| 1 | Licensure assessment, or other content based assessment (required)  | NYS Teacher Certification Exams:edTPA Secondary History-Social Studies | Post-Graduation Candidate registers with NYSTCE - exams taken after content courses are completed | NCSS 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3InTASC 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 |
| 2 | Content knowledge in Social Studies (required)  | Benchmarked Content GPA Comparisons |  | NCSS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10 |
| 3 | Candidate ability to plan instruction (required)  | edTPA Secondary History-Social Studies DRAFT MethodsTask 1, Task 2; Rubric 1-10 | ADO 350 Methods semester | NCSS 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5InTASC 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 |
| 4 | Student teaching (required)  | Adolescence Social StudiesStudent Teaching Assessment | ADO 420 Student Teaching semester  | NCSS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10 |
| 4 | Student teaching (required)  | Adolescence Social StudiesStudent Teaching Assessment | ADO 421 Student Teaching semester  | NCSS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10 |
| 5 | Candidate effect on student leaning (required)  | edTPA Secondary History-Social Studies DRAFT Student TeachingTask 3; Rubric 11-15 | ADO421 Student Teaching semester | NCSS 3.1, 3.2, 3.3InTASC 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 |
| 6 | Additional assessment that addresses NCSS standards (required) | NCSS Standards Portfolio Project - Part I | ADO 350 Methods semester | NCSS 1.8, 1.9 |
| 6 | Additional assessment that addresses NCSS standards (required) | NCSS Standards Portfolio Project - Part II | ADO 350 Methods semester | NCSS 1.8, 1.9 |
| Unit Assessment | Additional Assessment that addresses Unit assessment (Professional dispositions) | Candidate ***Initial*** Self-Evaluation of Professional Dispositions  | EDU 303 First semester of education coursework |  |
| Unit Assessment | Additional Assessment that addresses Unit assessment (Professional dispositions) | Candidate ***Final*** Self-Evaluation of Professional Dispositions  | ADO 421Last semester of education coursework |  |
| Unit Assessment | Additional Assessment that addresses Unit assessment (Professional dispositions) | (Faculty & Cooperating Teacher) Candidate Dispositions Assessment | ADO 420 Student Teaching semester  |  |
| Unit Assessment | Additional Assessment that addresses Unit assessment (Professional dispositions) | (Faculty & Cooperating Teacher) Candidate Dispositions Assessment | ADO 421 Student Teaching semester  |  |
| Unit Assessment | Additional Assessment that addresses Unit assessment (Exit from Program Survey: Assessment of Field Experience, Program and Unit Governances) | Candidate Exit Survey | ADO 421 Student Teaching semester  |  |

# Appendix D: Annual Program Assessment Review Report (example)

***School of Education***

***State University of New York at Oswego***

***September 1, 2018– August 31, 2019***

***End of Year Data Statement***

***Curriculum & Instruction: English***

***External Review Option: SPA***

***Reviewer/Standards: National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)***

I. Program Context

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
| Candidates Enrolled – BS |  |  |  |  |
| Candidates Enrolled – MST |  |  |  |  |
| Program Completers – BS |  |  |  |  |
| Program Completers – MST |  |  |  |  |

II. Key Assessments

|  |
| --- |
| Specialized Professional Association (SPA)/Program Review with Feedback  |
| 1. Certification results
2. Content Knowledge
3. Assessment of candidates ability to plan instruction
4. Assessment of student teaching
5. Assessment of candidate effect on **P-12** student learning
6. Additional assessment that addresses NCTE standards (required)
7. Optional assessment
8. Optional assessment
 |
| UNIT Assessments |
| 1. Professional Disposition – Self-evaluation by candidate (start of program)
2. Professional Disposition – Self-evaluation by candidate (end of program)
3. Professional Disposition – Completed by Faculty during program
4. Student Satisfaction Survey – End of program
5. Employer Survey
6. Alumni Survey
 |

III. Assessment Activities

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment | Undergraduate/Graduate | Course Number |
| 1 New York State Certification TestsContent Based TestC03 English Language ArtsC903 Safety Net English Language Arts C201 Educating All StudentsedTPA  Secondary English (SEL) |  |  |
| 3 SEL Draft edTPA Methods, Task 1 |  |  |
| 4 Student Teaching Assessment |  |  |
| 5 SEL Draft edTPA Student Teaching, Task 3 |  |  |
| 6 Language Learning Center |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 9 Candidate Disposition Survey –Initial |  |  |
| 10 Candidate Dispositions Survey - Final |  |  |
| 11 Candidate Dispositions Survey – by Faculty and CT |  |  |
| 12 Candidate Exit Survey |  |  |
| 13Employer Survey |  |  |
| 14Alumni Survey |  |  |

 IV. Data Interpretation -

*Briefly discuss data interpretation. This may include any emerging, expected or unexpected trends, weakness observed, etc.*

V. Evidence-based Continuous Improvement

*Discuss any program and/or curricular changes based on data.*

VI. Assessment - Planned Changes

**Will there be any changes in assessments during 2019-20?**  󠇯\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  *If yes, discuss reasons for changes (e.g. refine instrument to align with standards, supplemental assessment added to provide evidence for all SPA standards, etc.)*

VII. Sharing of Data

*Discuss activates in the last year (or upcoming planned activities) where the program shares data with stakeholders. Example may include Program Advisor Group (PAG) meetings, steering committees, or P-12 partner focus groups.*
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