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The School of Education at Georgia Southwestern State University employs a comprehensive and systematic data collection process that the faculty and other stakeholders use to make program and unit level performance decisions. Specifically, the assessment system is designed to do the following:

- Provide a tool to track candidates across the unit’s transition points.
- Provide feedback to faculty advisors as well as program faculty regarding candidate performance.
- Provide data about unit and program performance relative to the School of Education’s student learning outcomes.
- Provide a tool by which faculty can identify strengths and weaknesses and work to make data-based improvements.
- Provide the framework for the national accreditation, state program approval, report writing, and evaluation process.
- Provide a comprehensive and systematic way to analyze unit and program operations for strategic planning and goal setting.
- Provide a means by which the faculty can track progress on those goals.

Accordingly, the School of Education focuses its assessment system around the unit’s mission statement, conceptual framework, and student learning outcomes with the goal of improving candidates’ preparation to teach p-12 learners.

**Mission Statement**

The mission of the School of Education is to prepare effective teachers who demonstrate the essential knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to promote student achievement. The School of Education is committed to:

- Developing leaders in education who have the essential knowledge, skills, and dispositions to make skilled, reflective decisions and who view student learning as the focus of their work.
- Motivating life-long learning to adapt to the evolving needs of a global society and its diverse populations through high quality programs based upon exemplary instruction, knowledge of content, emergent technologies, and relevant research.
- Developing candidates who accurately assess, reflect, and make appropriate decisions about instruction resulting in achievement for all learners.
- Professional collaboration with families, schools, community partners, and others to improve the preparation of candidates and the effectiveness of practicing teachers.
The School of Education endorses the mission statement of Georgia Southwestern State University and envisions its mission within the context of those principles (see institutional report).

**Conceptual Framework**

The Conceptual Framework elaborates on the values, beliefs, guiding principles, and performance outcomes through which this mission is enacted. The guiding vision of the Conceptual Framework is succinctly captured in the theme of our programs to prepare educators who are skilled, reflective decision makers. The beliefs and values that are the basis for this vision and are explicitly noted in the Conceptual Framework include:

- Human beings are holistic, constructive learners deserving of respect, care, encouragement, and support.
- High quality educational opportunities are a right of every individual and the central responsibility of educators.
- Learning is continuous, situational, affected by both heredity and environment, and influenced by both intrinsic and extrinsic forces.
- Educators affect their students through the knowledge, skills, and dispositions they bring to bear on their work. Educators must, therefore, continue to expand and deepen their knowledge and skills, as well as examine and reflect on their personal and professional dispositions.

**Philosophy, Purpose, and Goals**

The philosophical tenets, comprehensive goals and purposes of the Conceptual Framework are illustrated in the four key concepts that guide the School of Education’s curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation. These concepts are:

1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions
2. Diversity
3. Continuous Reflection and Assessment
4. Professionalism

**Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions**

Candidates should have an extensive understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the academic disciplines they will be teaching as specified by professional, national, state and institutional standards. These standards provide the framework for the School of Education Unit assessment system and facilitate assessment and revision of individual programs.

We believe candidates need a thorough understanding of human development and various learning theories to improve instruction. Learning is continuous and affected by nature and the environment. Candidates need to recognize the impact of this combination of factors as they plan, deliver, and evaluate instruction to ensure achievement of all students.
We believe faculty and candidates should be aware of their own dispositions and personal characteristics combined with other factors within the teaching/learning environment that directly affect the management of the classroom. Candidates should demonstrate knowledge of effective classroom instruction and management based on current research as it relates to teacher characteristics, physical environment, social factors, and learning characteristics of students.

We believe the demonstration and assessment of effective communication strategies fostering active inquiry, collaboration and interaction within the classroom are essential skills for teachers. Teacher preparation programs must also provide opportunities for active and effective communication with professional peers, administrators, parents, and members of the community as essential components of best practices.

In summary, we believe candidates need specialized knowledge in the content of the academic disciplines they are to teach. Candidates also need background knowledge of the history and philosophy of American public education in order to help guide their decision-making; and being able to communicate these beliefs to parents, students and other professionals as a professional teacher, candidates must also develop a knowledge base of human growth and development and how people learn. This will further support their development of the knowledge, skills and dispositions for effective teaching and learning including the use of current technology, and in applying best practices in classroom organization and management, and assessing student learning. All of these factors in combination will lead to mastery and the demonstration of essential skills needed for effective teaching.

**Diversity**

We recognize our society is diverse, complex, and ever changing. Faculty and candidates see such diversity and complexity as a source of enrichment and are committed to capitalizing on this strength to advance life-long learning for all students. We believe candidates must recognize that teaching and learning are affected by one’s own cultural attitudes and beliefs and that it is important to be aware of and sensitive to the diversity of attitudes and beliefs that students bring to the classroom. Effective educators will recognize these differences and demonstrate the skills necessary to support learning across diverse populations. They will apply the most effective instructional strategies for all learners based on current best practice and knowledge. Candidates should be prepared to use instructional strategies that promote critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills of all students regardless of their differences.

**Continuous Reflection and Assessment**

We believe the educational preparation of candidates must involve continuous reflection and assessment. Candidates should be involved in extensive authentic clinical experiences and be immersed in a learning process involving continuous assessment and reflection of themselves, their teaching skills, and the results of their instruction during supervised clinical practice. These essential components lead to effective teaching and increase student achievement. Clinical experiences should represent a continuum of ever increasing responsibility in which candidates begin as engaged, reflective observers and progress to assume authentic teaching roles.
We believe candidates should have numerous opportunities to practice the art and discipline of reflection throughout the teacher preparation program both in the university classroom and throughout clinical experiences. Candidates must continuously reflect upon personal feelings and beliefs during their teacher preparation program, including: their general experiences with students’ parents and other professionals within authentic settings, their progress in developing effective teaching skills, their personal assessment of their strengths and weaknesses, and the progress of students under their direction. Candidates should demonstrate the ability to reflect on and revise their practices as necessary to accommodate the educational needs of all students.

**Professionalism**

We believe candidates should demonstrate professional behavior as an integral part of their preparation program. Professional dispositions are explored, discussed, demonstrated, and assessed within the university classroom and throughout clinical experiences. Candidates should be members of professional organizations for their disciplines and encouraged to continue this alliance upon becoming employed professionals.

We believe in collaborative partnerships with families, schools, community stakeholders, and others as integral to professional behavior. Candidates should be prepared to support and enhance the achievement of students by actively seeking input from all educational stakeholders, reflecting upon information received, and revising instructional practice to include recommendations from stakeholders.

**Knowledge Base**

The Conceptual Framework is grounded in both classical and current scholarly literature in the areas of social, historical and philosophic foundations of education in a democratic pluralistic society, learning theory, assessment theory and research, subject matter and content knowledge, curriculum and instructional theory, critical and complex skill development, cultural influences on learning and teaching, and the literature on the characteristics and ethics of education professionals. The standards of the national professional specialty associations, national educator associations, INTASC, NBPTS, and the Georgia Professional Standards Commission’s Code of Professional Ethics also inform this document. A representative bibliography of sources used to inform and ground the Conceptual Framework is provided at the end of this section of the Institutional Report.

**Student Learning Outcomes (Undergraduate Programs) (Initial)**

The following outcomes detail the expectations for teacher candidates graduating from the undergraduate teacher preparation programs in the School of Education at Georgia Southwestern State University.

Graduates of the School of Education will demonstrate:

1. The skills and central concepts of his/her discipline and the abilities to incorporate those concepts into an integrated curriculum to facilitate holistic learning (CONTENT).
2. A knowledge of the growth and development characteristics of children and adolescents and a knowledge of content and critical, historical, philosophical, and theoretical themes in education (KNOWLEDGE OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND LEARNING).

3. An ability to effectively instruct pupils from diverse populations who vary in rate, ability, compatibility, cultural background, and style of learning (ADAPTING INSTRUCTION FOR DIVERSE LEARNERS).

4. Critical and reflective thinking skills and the ability to use a variety of instructional strategies to promote critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills in pupils (INSTRUCTION).

5. Classroom management skills using various techniques including the ability to manage the physical classroom environment (CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT).

6. Effective communication strategies to insure active participation of diverse learners (COMMUNICATION SKILLS).

7. The ability to make skilled, reflective decisions in planning, creating, and evaluating materials appropriate for effective instruction using a variety of teaching strategies and technologies (REFLECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING).

8. Effective assessment techniques for the purpose of diagnosing and prescribing teaching strategies resulting in high levels of pupil achievement (ASSESSMENT).

9. Professionalism and the knowledge and ability to use reflection, research, and inquiry to refine their own development to support professional practice (PROFESSIONALISM).

10. Appropriate and effective collaboration, communication, and interpersonal skills with pupils, teachers, parents, administrators, and others in the community (COLLABORATION).

11. Dispositions, including beliefs, values, and behaviors that guide ethical practice (DISPOSITIONS).

12. Integration of instructional technology to foster learning and high levels of pupil achievement (TECHNOLOGY).

Student Learning Outcomes (Masters Program) (Advanced)

The following outcomes detail the expectations for teacher candidates graduating from the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction program in the School of Education at Georgia Southwestern State University.

Graduates of the School of Education will demonstrate:

1. Commitment to students and their learning.
2. Knowledge of the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.
4. Systematic thinking about their practice and learn from experience.
5. Leadership as members of their learning communities.
Student Learning Outcomes (Education Specialist Program) (Advanced)

The following outcomes detail the expectations for teacher candidates graduating from the Ed.S. in Teacher Leadership program in the School of Education at Georgia Southwestern State University.

The School of Education will prepare a teacher leader candidate who:

1. **Understands adults as learners to support professional learning communities.**
   - The teacher leader candidate will describe how adults acquire and apply knowledge and will use this information to promote a culture of shared accountability for school outcomes that maximizes teacher effectiveness, promotes collaboration, enlist colleagues to be a part of a leadership team, and drives continuous improvement in instruction and learning.

2. **Accesses and uses research to improve practice and student achievement.**
   - The teacher leader candidate will be able to discuss how educational research is used to create new knowledge, promote specific policies and practices, improve instructional practices, make inquiry a critical component in teacher learning and school redesign, and use this knowledge to model and facilitate colleagues’ use of research-based strategies and data-driven action.

3. **Promotes professional learning and continuous improvement.**
   - The teacher leader candidate will be able to explain the constantly evolving nature of teaching and learning, new and emerging technologies, and changing community demographics, and use this knowledge to promote and facilitate structured and job-embedded professional learning initiatives that are aligned to school improvement goals.

4. **Facilitates improvements in instruction and student learning.**
   - The teacher leader candidate will be able to apply the teaching and learning process and use this knowledge to advance the professional skills of colleagues by being continuous learners, modeling reflective practice based on student results, and working collaboratively with colleagues to ensure instructional practices that are aligned to a shared vision, mission, and goals.

5. **Uses assessments and data for school and district improvement.**
   - The teacher leader candidate will be able to identify current research on assessment methods, design and/or select effective formative and summative assessment practices and use assessment data to make informed decisions that
improve student learning; and uses this knowledge to promote appropriate strategies that support continuous and sustainable organization improvement.

6. **Improves outreach and collaboration with families and community.**

   - The teacher leader candidate will be able to recognize that families, cultures, and communities have a significant impact on educational processes and student achievement, and use this knowledge to promote frequent and more effective outreach with families, community members, business and community leaders, and other stakeholders in the educational system.

7. **Advocates for student learning and the profession.**

   - The teacher leader candidate will be able to describe how educational policy is made at the local, state, and national level as well as the roles of school leaders, boards of education, legislators and other stakeholders in formulating those policies, and uses this knowledge to advocate for student needs and for practices that support effective teaching and increase student learning and to serve as an individual of influence and respect with the school, community, and profession.
Assessment Mission Statement
What should the assessment system do?

A primary concern of the School of Education is the faculty’s ability to monitor, assess, and interpret the work of our preservice and in-service teacher education candidates and graduates. As such, the School of Education’s assessment system is founded on the NCATE framework for successful teacher education programs. Specifically, this handbook is concerned with NCATE Standard 2: Assessment and Unit Evaluation\(^1\) which states the following:

\[
\text{The Unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and Unit operations to evaluate and improve the Unit and its programs.}
\]

Element 1: Assessment System

- The Unit has developed an assessment system with its professional community that reflects the conceptual framework(s) and professional and state standards.
- The Unit’s system includes a comprehensive and integrated set of evaluation measures that are used to monitor candidate performance and manage and improve operations and programs.
- Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments made at admission into programs, at appropriate transition points, and at program completion.
- Assessments used to determine admission, continuation in, and completion of programs are predictors of candidate success.
- The Unit takes effective steps to eliminate sources of bias in performance assessments and works to establish the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures.

Element 2: Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

- The Unit maintains an assessment system that provides regular and comprehensive information on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, competence of graduates, unit operations, and program quality.
- Using multiple assessments from internal and external sources, the Unit collects data from applicants, candidates, recent graduates, faculty, and other members of the professional community.
- The Unit maintains a record of formal candidate complaints and documentation of their resolution.

\(^1\) This information is reported in the NCATE Institutional Report (see Standard 2) which is a supplement to this document and is listed in document list in the Appendix.
• These data are regularly and systematically complied, summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance, program quality, and Unit operations.
• The Unit maintains its assessment system through the use of information technologies.

Element 3: Use of Data for Program Improvement

• The Unit regularly and systematically uses data, including candidate and graduate performance information, to evaluate the efficacy of its courses, programs, and clinical experiences.
• The Unit analyzes program evaluation and performance assessment data to initiate changes where indicated.
• Candidate and faculty assessment data are regularly shared with candidates and faculty representatives to help them reflect on their performance and improve it.

Using these standards as a guide, the School of Education monitors, assesses, and interprets the progress that our candidates and programs make toward meeting our conceptual framework and student learning outcomes. Accordingly, the faculty focus on a series of questions to guide their analysis and evaluation. These questions are:

• How do we prepare our candidates to accomplish our student learning outcomes and exhibit the behaviors outlined in the conceptual framework?
• What are our candidates’ weaknesses and how can we improve our instructional practices and program curriculums to address these weaknesses?
• What are our candidates’ strengths and how can we build on those strengths with our instructional practices and program curriculums?

• What are we doing? How do we do what we are doing? Why do we do what we do?
• What are we not doing? Why are we not doing what we are not doing?
• What does what we are doing accomplish? What does what we are doing not accomplish? What might what we are not doing accomplish? How do we know?
History of the Assessment System

In 2000, Georgia Southwestern State University required each department/unit to develop an assessment plan and submit yearly reports about department/unit operations. The assessment system developed by the School of Education at that time – although functional – had not been fully embraced by all faculty in the unit nor had the system been shared with all members of the professional community. As such, the School of Education’s leadership asked the faculty to redesign its assessment system in 2006. The goal of this 2006 redesign was to encourage faculty participation across the unit as well as to engage the unit’s community stakeholders. The 2006 assessment plan built upon the academic performance and program evaluation measures that were already in place. During the 2006 redesign, School of Education faculty and leadership aligned the performance outcomes and conceptual framework to the assessment system and data collection tools. The redesigned assessment system was presented to, voted on, and approved by unit faculty in Fall 2006. Throughout the assessment system redesign, the School of Education’s school partners as well as faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences provided feedback on the process and emerging plan.

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC) reviewed the School of Education in Spring 2007. The unit was commended for the progress the faculty had made with the initial certification programs (all undergraduate at GSW). However, the 2007 NCATE/PSC report outlined several continuing problems in the unit’s advanced programs (all graduate at GSW).

Although the unit had made much progress on the assessment system between 2000 and 2006, NCATE/PSC found the unit did not have sufficient resources to fully implement the system. At the same time, NCATE/PSC found the School of Education did not regularly and systematically analyze data for unit and program improvement.

Based on the outcome of the 2007 NCATE/PSC visit for Advanced level programs, the School of Education faculty made the decision to collapse the Master of Education programs (in Early Childhood Education, Middle Grades Education, Health and Physical Education, Secondary Mathematics, Secondary History, and Reading Education) into a Master of Education degree in Curriculum and Instruction. The Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction would have three concentrations: Early Childhood Education, Special Education, and General Content Education (all fields). Also, the GSW School of Education faculty voted to collapse the Specialist in Education degree with a major in Early Childhood Education and Middle Grades Education into one Specialist in Education degree in Learning and Leading with concentrations in Early Childhood Education, Special Education, and General Content Education (all fields).

From March 2007 through January 2008, the GSW School of Education Graduate Committee met to consider curriculum as aligned with chosen standards (National Board Standards) or outcomes, assessments, admission policies, and other policies and procedures for the MEd in Curriculum and Instruction and for the EdS in Learning and Leading (now titled Teacher
Leadership). The GSW SoE Graduate Committee consisted of Julia Dorminey, Greg Hawver, YeVette McWhorter, Judy Spann, Wanda Thompson, and Lettie Watford.

In the process of designing and approving curricula for the MEd in Curriculum and Instruction and EdS in Learning and Leading, the SoE Graduate Committee also designed and approved the Key Assessments for the two degrees based on admission information and artifacts in the classes. Since 2008, before each new cohort has been admitted for summer (MEd) and fall (EdS) terms, the GSW SoE Graduate Committee has analyzed data and revised key assessments for content knowledge, planning, effects on student learning, dispositions for practice, and clinical practice. Transition points and assessments for the assessment system for the MEd and EdS were drafted, revised, and approved.

The 2007 NCATE/PSC report also outlined problems with the unit’s ability to execute its assessment system effectively. Although the unit had made much progress on the assessment system between 2000 and 2006, NCATE/PSC found the unit did not have sufficient resources to fully implement the system. At the same time, NCATE/PSC found the School of Education did not regularly and systematically analyze data for unit and program improvement.

Responding to the NCATE/PSC findings, the School of Education began using LiveText to help facilitate data collection, analysis, and reporting in Summer 2008 (full implementation, Fall 2009). The School of Education also hired an Assessment Director in Fall 2010. The Assessment Director was charged with reviewing the unit’s assessment system and developing a long-term plan to move that system forward. As such, the Assessment Director began studying the unit’s assessment system in Fall 2010. The goals of this study were to:

- Better systematize the assessment system so the system can efficiently and effectively support faculty decision making about program and unit operations.
- Document the unit’s assessment policies and procedures so unit personnel are aware of how the assessment system works and their role in the assessment process.
- Identify gaps within the assessment system and develop a long-term plan for addressing those gaps.

During this process, the Assessment Director wrote an assessment policies and procedures handbook (this document) as well as long-term assessment plan. These documents resulted from the Assessment Director:

- Study and evaluation of the existing assessment system.
- Study of the 2007 NCATE/PSC Board of Examiner’s reports.
- Participation in annual meetings of the American Association of College for Teacher Education as well as state level assessment meetings such as the bi-annual Georgia Educator Preparation Programs meeting.
- Study of other university’s assessment policies and procedures.
- Networking and conversations with other university assessment directors.
- Several informal meetings with faculty (from School of Education as well as College of Arts and Sciences) as well as formal faculty meeting discussions.
At the same time, the Assessment Director began implementing the assessment policies and procedures to improve the unit assessment process. For example, the Assessment Director presented the new assessment cycle to faculty and the assessment committee in Fall 2010. Furthermore, the School of Education piloted an assessment day as well as using program action plans in the 2010-2011 academic year. This review and reporting process was formalized for the 2011-2012 academic year and has been fully employed.

While writing this handbook, the Assessment Director also asked faculty to complete a series of tasks that included:

- Creating matrices illustrating how the unit’s key assessments align with program coursework.
- Updating and creating matrices illustrating alignment between program coursework and the School of Education’s performance outcomes.
- Updating and creating matrices that illustrate how program coursework aligns with PSC standards and GACE frameworks

As such, the assessment policies and procedures found within this handbook have been and will continue to be a work in progress.

The results of the Assessment Director’s study of the assessment system were presented to faculty at the Spring 2012 unit assessment day on March 9, 2012. Faculty were charged with reviewing this policies and procedures handbook as well as the long-term assessment plan. Faculty provided feedback on this work to the Assessment Director. The Assessment Director then finalized and submitted this policies and procedures handbook as well as the long-term assessment plan to the Dean of the School of Education on May 16, 2012. The finalized copies of these documents was submitted to the faculty during planning week in August 2012.

At the same time, the policies outlined in this handbook as well as the long-term assessment plan were in the process of being implemented by the School of Education. These policies and procedures were partially implemented during the 2010-2011 academic year (e.g., the redesign of the assessment cycle, piloting the action planning process on undergraduate initial preparation programs). These policies were further implemented during the 2011-2012 academic year (e.g., full employment of the new assessment cycle, implementation of the new action planning process for all programs and the unit). Finally, the policies and procedures outlined in his handbook were fully implemented during the 2012-2013 academic year (e.g., full employment of the new assessment cycle, implementation of the new action planning process for all programs and the unit, closing the loop component of the action planning process, student progress/transition reporting system, data summary charts for assessment days).
The School of Education’s unit operations consist of several academic and governance-related components. These operations include unit reports to university as well as state and federal agencies, the process by which information is used by unit leadership to make unit decisions, the faculty evaluation process, and faculty and student appeals.

**School of Education Data Reporting Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Every Semester</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of Semester</td>
<td>Yolanda West</td>
<td>Faculty Instruction Roster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of Semester</td>
<td>Wanda Thompson</td>
<td>Faculty Productivity Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of Semester</td>
<td>Wanda Thompson</td>
<td>Enrollment Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of Semester</td>
<td>Yolanda West</td>
<td>Advisement Load Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Semester</td>
<td>Wanda Thompson</td>
<td>PSC Certification Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Semester</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty Activity Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall Semester</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td><strong>Joseph Nichols; Yolanda West</strong></td>
<td>Run Reports on Program Level Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td><strong>Joseph Nichols; Yolanda West</strong></td>
<td>Student Progress Reports (Transition Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols; <strong>Program Coordinators</strong>; Faculty</td>
<td>Program Level Data Evaluation Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols; <strong>Program Coordinators</strong>; Faculty</td>
<td>Program Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols</td>
<td>Annual Assessment Summary (using program level data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td><strong>Lettie Watford; Greg Hawver; YeVette McWhorter; Joseph Nichols</strong></td>
<td>GSW Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td><strong>Katy Nichols; Wanda Kirkland</strong></td>
<td>Semester CaPE Reports; Field Experience Summary Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td><strong>Wanda Thompson; Program Coordinators</strong></td>
<td>PSC Preparation Approval Annual Report (PAAR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Faculty Advisors</td>
<td>Student Progress Report Findings/Actions Summary Report (Transition Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Person Responsible</td>
<td>Operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Semester</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Lettie Watford; Greg Hawver; YeVette McWhorter</td>
<td>Budget Finance Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols; Yolanda West</td>
<td>Run Reports on Unit Level Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols; Yolanda West</td>
<td>Student Progress Reports (Transition Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols; Lettie Watford; Greg Hawver; YeVette McWhorter; Faculty</td>
<td>Unit Level Data Evaluation Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols; Lettie Watford; Greg Hawver; YeVette McWhorter; Faculty</td>
<td>Unit Level Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Faculty Advisors</td>
<td>Student Progress Report Findings/Actions Summary Report (Transition Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Katy Nichols; Wanda Kirkland</td>
<td>Semester CaPE Reports; Field Experience Summary Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Wanda Thompson; Lettie Watford</td>
<td>AACTE Professional Education Data System (PEDS) Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Wanda Thompson; Lettie Watford; Rachel Abbott; Joseph Nichols</td>
<td>NCATE Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Wanda Thompson</td>
<td>Title II Institutional and Program Report Card (IPRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols</td>
<td>Annual Assessment Summary (using unit level data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Semester</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols; Lettie Watford</td>
<td>School of Education Goals Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols</td>
<td>Compile and File All Reports for Academic Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Unit Decision Making Process**

The following table outlines the professional unit decisions made each academic term and a summary of the process by which the decision is made. Unit, program, faculty/staff changes are made based on the implementation of this assessment system.

**Fall Semester**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Decision</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Goals for the year are discussed with the School of Education faculty</td>
<td>* Unit goals were determined in the previous year’s annual report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the first week of the semester.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests for new faculty</td>
<td>* Use enrollment and documented program needs for the current term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Compare to enrollment in the past academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Consult with Department Chairs about needs for new faculty positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Including the proposed rank and salary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* The request is submitted to the VPAA office on the University Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* to Fill form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests to fill vacant faculty positions to the VPAA</td>
<td>* Consult with Department Chairs about needs for filling a vacant faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Position including the proposed rank and salary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine the spring semester schedule</td>
<td>* Compare current enrollment to the previous academic year enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* in the courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Department Chairs consult with program/curriculum chairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Department Chairs consult with the Dean.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FALL SEMESTER (Con’t)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Decision</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Promotion/Tenure evaluation process for faculty begins. | * Faculty express their desire to the Department Chair and Dean to go through the promotion/tenure process, if applicable.  
* Faculty prepare a portfolio of documentation of their work in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship.  
* Department Chairs evaluate the portfolio and make recommendations for changes. The Department Chair decides to approve or not approve the promotion/tenure.  
* The School of Education Promotion/Tenure Committee receives the portfolio and makes recommendations and decides to approve or not.  
* The Dean then receives the portfolio and makes recommendations and decides to approve or not.  
* The process continues through the University-wide committee, Vice-President of Academic Affairs and ultimately, the President of the University makes the decision to approve promotion/tenure of the faculty member. |

Data gathering of assessments begins for the academic year. Information from the assessments are compiled and analyzed beginning fall semester of each year. Information that affects faculty hires and faculty evaluations are collected during the fall term. Common points of unit decisions include sharing unit goals as established in the previous summer based on assessments of programs, candidates, partnerships with P-12 schools, and faculty/staff of the previous academic year, turning in requests for new positions as needed, turning in requests to fill vacant faculty/staff positions as needed, and determining the spring schedule, which courses will be offered, who will teach courses, the times courses are offered, etc.

** The evaluation process for the Department Chairs and Dean is listed in the Dean’s unit operations material.
| SPRING SEMESTER |
|-----------------|------------------|
| **Unit Decision** | **Process** |
| Evaluations of Faculty members | * Faculty document their work in three areas – teaching, service to the institution, and scholarship.  
* Department Chairs evaluate the three areas using the University Annual Evaluation form.  
* Department Chairs discuss Annual Evaluations of faculty with the Dean with a recommended merit increase (if applicable).  
* The Dean makes recommendations of merit increases to the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA).  
* Copies of Annual Evaluations with comments from faculty are submitted for file in the VPAA office and in the file of each faculty member. |
| Evaluations of Assessment Director, Clinical Director, and Staff | * The Assessment Director, Clinical Director, and Staff prepare a report with a summary of their strengths.  
* The Dean evaluates the Assessment Director, Clinical Director, and Staff and submits the evaluations to the VPAA office or to the University office of Human Resources. |
### SPRING SEMESTER (Con’t)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Decision</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Program/Curriculum Changes are made for the next year. | * Program Committees or the Director of Teacher Education make recommendations for changes  
* The Director of Teacher Education makes the proposal for changes to the Teacher Education Council (consisting of faculty in the School of Education, College of Arts and Sciences, School of Computing and Mathematics, P-12 School Personnel, Candidates in Education programs)  
* If approved, the Teacher Education Council sends proposal to the School of Education Faculty.  
* Program/curriculum changes for the initial-level are sent to the University-wide Academic Affairs Committee (advanced level changes in curriculum are sent to the Graduate Affairs Committee) and then to Faculty Senate, and, finally, to University faculty for approval. |

| Determine the summer and fall semester schedules | * Compare program needs (based on program assessments) and current enrollment to the previous academic year enrollment in the courses.  
* Department Chairs consult with program/curriculum chairs concerning the schedules, time, faculty assigned, etc.  
* Department Chairs consult with the Dean. |

During spring semester, program/curriculum committees submit reports with a summary of the analysis of assessment data to Department Chairs and the Dean (action plans). These analyses with recommendations for changes in programs, candidates and PDS partnerships are reported to the Dean. The Dean makes recommendations to the Teacher Education Council who sends recommendations forward to the School of Education faculty.

At the end of spring semester, the Dean writes an annual report with a summary of the unit’s accomplishments based on the goals set the previous year, goals for the next year, and an action plan for meeting the goals for the next year. The annual report is submitted in at the end of spring.
semester or at the beginning of the summer term. (This annual report for the Unit will be due October, 2012, beginning a new cycle of reporting each October.)

**Summer Semester**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMER SEMESTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Decision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisement decisions for the next academic year are made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoE goals are set for the next academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summer semester is a time for reflection of the past year’s accomplishments and determination of the goals for the next year. The Annual Report submitted by the SoE each year is a culmination of the accomplishments with a focus on what needs to be done to make the School of Education even more productive. This process is effective in that it causes us to reflect on areas of success and need, resulting in a more productive unit.

**Faculty Evaluation Process** (text from Faculty Handbook)

The purpose of faculty evaluation is to provide regular feedback to faculty members regarding their performance so they can provide high quality service to the University. Regular evaluations provide an opportunity to assess strengths and weaknesses of faculty performance. There are three major components of the evaluation system for tenure track faculty - the annual evaluation, pre-tenure review, and post-tenure review. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers will be provided with an annual evaluation. A primary purpose for the evaluation system is the professional growth, development and progress of the individual faculty member. This insures
that each member is an important part of the University's accomplishment of its goals and objectives.

Annual Evaluation

To insure each faculty member is aware of the expectation of his or her supervisor and is informed of his or her progress as a member of Georgia Southwestern State University faculty, each faculty member is evaluated on an annual basis. The annual evaluation serves as an evaluation of progress and a discussion of expectations. Achievement of objectives and goals of the individual and of the University will be a major part of the evaluation. The annual evaluations provide the foundation for developing recommendations for promotion, tenure, salary increases, termination, and other tangible or intangible rewards.

The department chairs, academic deans, and the Director of the Library are responsible for continuing development of the evaluation program and for insuring that annual evaluations are conducted. The following minimum requirements of the evaluation program may be supplemented to meet particular needs of the academic units:

1. The department or school faculty must be involved in administering the evaluation program.

2. The evaluation must emphasize excellence in teaching.

3. The evaluation must include student input. The faculty has adopted a campus wide instrument entitled "Student Opinionnaire" which is to be used for student input and must be used in a minimum of one-half of the courses taught by an individual instructor each year. The courses should be selected from a variety of the courses taught by each instructor.

4. The evaluation must include an evaluation of the faculty member's participation in academic advisement. The faculty has adopted (May 26, 1982) a procedure for this part of the evaluation and an instrument for use by department chairs and academic deans.

5. The written evaluation must include a listing of faculty development activities of the faculty member for the year and a listing of planned development activities for the upcoming year.

6. The written evaluation will be discussed by the faculty member's supervisor with the faculty member. The faculty member will sign the evaluation indicating that he or she is aware of its contents.

7. The faculty member will be given the opportunity to respond in writing to the annual evaluation and this response will be attached to the evaluation. The evaluator will acknowledge in writing his/her receipt of this response, noting changes, if any, in the annual evaluation made as a result of either the conference or the faculty member's
written responses. This acknowledgment will also become a part of the record which is forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

8. The annual evaluation summary must be written by the academic dean or department chair or Director of the Library and will address the specific criteria in the three broad areas of achievement listed below.

**Criteria**

The broad areas of achievement for faculty are Teaching, Service to the Institution, and Scholarship, including academic achievement and professional development. The level of performance will be determined by individual academic units based on criteria established by those units.²

**Support Staff Evaluation Process** (from staff evaluation documents)

Performance evaluation is an important aspect of personnel management because it facilitates professional growth and institutional improvement. The primary objective of the university’s performance evaluation process is employee development through methods which identify actions required to promote more effective job performance and maximize employee potential. The performance evaluation process incorporates not only a review of past performance, but also provides an opportunity to identify performance goals for the future. Evaluation is an ongoing process, and comments about individual performance are best communicated at the time of specific observation. A formal performance evaluation, however, is required on an annual basis. The purpose of the annual performance evaluation is to encourage and facilitate improvement in the job performance of all employees. It provides a documented record of the employee’s job performance, a means of defining strengths and weaknesses in job performance, and an opportunity for communication between supervisor and employee on the subjects of job requirements, work expectation, and potential for personal development. The performance evaluation specifies the direction for work improvement, assures the employee that objective criteria are used in performance assessment, demonstrates that exceptional or unsatisfactory performance will be noted, and expresses the supervisor’s and University’s continuing appreciation of good performance.

The annual evaluation must include a face-to-face meeting between the employee and the employee’s immediate supervisor to discuss position responsibilities, performance expectations for the future, and the performance ratings. The written record of the evaluation should be reviewed by the next level of supervision. Department heads are required to affirm by the time salary recommendations are submitted that all performance evaluations have been conducted and copies are on file in the employing unit and in the Office of Human Resources. The written records of all employee evaluations are subject to request under the Georgia Open Records Act.

---

² A detailed description of the Teaching, Service, and Scholarship categories can be found in the Faculty Handbook at [http://gsw.edu/Academics/Academic-Affairs/Faculty-Handbook/index](http://gsw.edu/Academics/Academic-Affairs/Faculty-Handbook/index).
Process for Handling Candidate Complaints and Appeals

The School of Education’s process for handling candidate complaints and appeals consist of three-tracks. As such, the nature of the complaint/appeal determines who the candidate should speak so that the complaint/appeal can be resolved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaints / Advising Appeals</th>
<th>Admissions Appeals</th>
<th>Field Experience Complaints / Appeals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process Within the School of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* General complaints (e.g., grades, behavior of faculty, etc.) should begin with the faculty member in question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Advising appeals should begin with the advisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The faculty/advisors are expected to document the nature of the complaint/appeal and how they resolved it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Admissions appeals (e.g., teacher education, student teaching) should be directed to the candidate’s advisor so that the advisor can explain the appeals process to the candidate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Field experience complaints/appeals should be directed to the Clinical Director.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The Clinical Director is expected to document the nature of the complaint/appeal and how she resolved it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Complaints/appeals can be brought to the attention of the candidate’s Department Chair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Candidates must submit a written statement of complaint/appeal to the Department Chair that explains why they are complaining/appealing, outlines the faculty/advisor’s decision, and why they believe that decision should be overturned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The Department Chair is expected to document his/her decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Appeals are directed to the School of Education Admissions Appeals Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The candidate must submit the appeal to the committee in writing and must appear in front of the committee to state his/her case.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The committee makes a decisions, documents that decision, and presents that decision to the Dean of the School of Education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Complaints/appeals can be brought to the attention of the candidate’s Department Chair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Candidates must submit a written statement of complaint/appeal to the Department Chair that explains why they are complaining/appealing, outlines the Clinical Director’s decision, and why they believe that decision should be overturned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The Department Chair is expected to document his/her decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 The appeals forms are supplemental to this policies and procedures handbook (list in Appendix).
4 A detailed description of the university’s process for handling complaints/appeals can be found in the student handbook at http://gsu.edu/Campus-Life/ResourcesInformation/StudentHandbook/index.
## Process Within the School of Education (Con’t)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaints / Advising Appeals</th>
<th>Admissions Appeals</th>
<th>Field Experience Complaints / Appeals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Complaints/appeals can be brought to the attention of the Dean of the School of Education. * Candidates must submit a written statement of complaint/appeal to the Dean that explains why they are complaining/appealing, outlines the faculty/advisor’s decision, the decision of the Department Chair, and why they believe those decisions should be overturned. * The Dean is expected to document his/her decision.</td>
<td>* The Dean considers the recommendation of the appeals committee, the candidate’s case, and makes a decision. * The Dean communicates this decision to the candidate and his/her advisor in writing.</td>
<td>* Complaints/appeals can be brought to the attention of the Dean of the School of Education. * Candidates must submit a written statement of complaint/appeal to the Dean that explains why they are complaining/appealing, outlines the decisions that were made by the Clinical Director and Department Chair, and why they believe those decisions should be overturned. * The Dean is expected to document his/her decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Process Outside the School of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaints / Advising Appeals</th>
<th>Admissions Appeals</th>
<th>Field Experience Complaints / Appeals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Complaints/appeals can be brought to the attention of the Vice-President of Academic Affairs. * Candidates must submit a written statement of complaint/appeal to the VPAA that explains why they are complaining/appealing, outlines the decisions that were made in the School of Education, and why they believe those decisions should be overturned.</td>
<td>* Appeals can be directed to the Vice-President of Academic Affairs. * Candidates must submit a written statement of appeal to the VPAA that explains why they are appealing, outlines the decisions that were made in the School of Education, and why they believe those decisions should be overturned.</td>
<td>* Complaints/appeals can be brought to the attention of the Vice-President of Academic Affairs. * Candidates must submit a written statement of complaint/appeal to the VPAA that explains why they are complaining/appealing, outlines the decisions that were made in the School of Education, and why they believe those decisions should be overturned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Appeals can be directed to the President of the university.</td>
<td>* Appeals can be directed to the President of the university.</td>
<td>* Complaints/appeals can be brought to the attention of the President of the university.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The School of Education’s academic assessment cycle consists of one full academic year that spans fall, spring, and summer semesters. During this cycle, the School of Education collects data, analyzes that data, write program and unit reports, and implements data driven changes at the program and unit levels. As such, the academic assessment cycle is divided into two sections. The first section encompasses the fall semester and focuses on the program level. The second section focuses on the School of Education as a unit and takes place during the spring. The following timelines and cycles guides this work.

Program Level Assessment Cycle

Fall Semester

In the fall semester, the School of Education focuses on the program level component of this cycle. As such, the faculty is responsible for analyzing data, writing reports, and making data based decisions for the following areas:

- Early Childhood Education
- Middle Grades Education
- Special Education
- History w/ Teacher Certification
- English w/ Teacher Certification
- Music w/ Teacher Certification
Specifically, the Assessment Director is charged with implementing and managing the program level assessment processes according to the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Individual(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Run program data from previous academic year (fall, spring, summer) for undergraduate programs</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols; Yolanda West</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run program data from previous academic year (fall, spring, summer) for graduate programs</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols; Yolanda West</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run student progress reports (transition points) (initial programs) for candidates who are matriculating through their teacher education coursework</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols; Yolanda West</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Programs Assessment Day</td>
<td>Lettie Watford; Joseph Nichols; Yolanda West; Faculty</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Programs Assessment Day</td>
<td>Lettie Watford; Joseph Nichols; Yolanda West; Faculty</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual program assessment meetings for graduate and undergraduate programs</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols; Program Coordinators</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action plans and program level data evaluation reports for graduate and undergraduate programs</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols; Program Coordinators</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual program level assessment summary report</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Individual(s) Responsible</td>
<td>Target Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run semester CaPE reports and write field experience summary report</td>
<td><strong>Katy Nichols; Wanda Kirkland; Joseph Nichols</strong></td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment meeting with the Office of Clinical and Field Experiences</td>
<td><strong>Joseph Nichols; Katy Nichols</strong></td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student progress report findings/actions summary report (transition points) (initial programs)</td>
<td><strong>Faculty Advisors; Joseph Nichols</strong></td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-out fall semester assessment processes; compile all reports and data; summarize faculty advisor’s student progress report findings/actions summary reports (transition points) (initial programs)</td>
<td><strong>Joseph Nichols; Yolanda West</strong></td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Student progress reports for admission to teacher education and admission to student teaching are run as candidates apply and are uploaded into the advisor course.

** Faculty advisors are responsible for discussing the student progress reports with their advisees throughout the semester.
Unit Level Assessment Cycle

Spring Semester

In the spring semester, the School of Education focuses on the unit level component of this cycle. As such, the faculty is responsible for analyzing data, writing reports, and making data based decisions for the teacher education unit. Specifically, the Assessment Director is charged with implementing and managing the unit level assessment processes according to the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Individual(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Run program data from previous academic year (fall, spring, summer) for the unit</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols; Yolanda West</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run student progress reports (transition points) (initial programs) for candidates who are matriculating through their teacher education coursework</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols; Yolanda West</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Individual(s) Responsible</td>
<td>Target Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial review of unit assessment data</td>
<td><strong>Joseph Nichols; Lettie Watford</strong></td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit assessment day</td>
<td>Lettie Watford; <strong>Joseph Nichols; Yolanda West; Faculty</strong></td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit level data evaluation reports</td>
<td><strong>Joseph Nichols; Lettie Watford; Faculty</strong></td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit leadership assessment meeting</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols; <strong>Lettie Watford; Greg Hawver; YeVette McWhorter; Rachel Abbott; Katy Nichols</strong></td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit action plan</td>
<td><strong>Lettie Watford; Joseph Nichols</strong></td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual unit level assessment summary report</td>
<td>Joseph Nichols</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run semester CaPE reports and write field experience summary report</td>
<td><strong>Katy Nichols; Wanda Kirkland; Joseph Nichols</strong></td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment meeting with the Office of Clinical and Field Experiences</td>
<td><strong>Joseph Nichols; Katy Nichols</strong></td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student progress report findings/actions summary report (transition points) (initial programs)</td>
<td><strong>Faculty Advisors; Joseph Nichols</strong></td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-out spring semester assessment processes; compile all reports and data; summarize faculty advisor’s student progress report findings/actions summary reports (transition points) (initial programs)</td>
<td><strong>Joseph Nichols; Yolanda West</strong></td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Student progress reports for admission to teacher education and admission to student teaching are run as candidates apply and are uploaded into the advisor course.**

** Faculty advisors are responsible for discussing the student progress reports with their advisees throughout the semester.
May Term / Summer Semester

In the summer semester, the School of Education focuses on compiling all reports, discussing those reports, and goal setting for the next academic year. Specifically, the Assessment Director is charged with implementing and managing this part of the assessment processes according to the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Individual(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compile all action plans, assessment reports, and write year-end summary report; file in one complete file</td>
<td><strong>Joseph Nichols; Yolanda West</strong></td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end assessment meeting. *Purpose of this meeting is to discuss all action plans, assessment reports, summary reports, and discuss progress on goals and the setting of new goals, if necessary (unit).</td>
<td><strong>Joseph Nichols; Yolanda West; Greg Hawver; YeVette McWhorter; Rachel Abbott; Katy Nichols</strong></td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete the School of Education goal’s report</td>
<td><strong>Lettie Watford; Joseph Nichols</strong></td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The School of Education is committed to monitoring program and unit performance via data that are collected at the course, program, and unit level. Through a series of unit-wide and program-specific assessments, the School of Education monitors student, program, and unit progress toward meeting the student learning outcomes outlined at the beginning of this policy document.

Data Collection, Reporting, Analysis, and Evaluation

The School of Education uses the LiveText online platform to facilitate its data collection, analysis, and evaluation processes. The faculty input data into LiveText each semester. At the same time, the faculty use LiveText to manage the key assessments they have identified for each course in their program. For undergraduate programs, these assessments include:

- CaPE
- Lesson Planning
- Dispositions
- GACE II (Part 1, Part 2)
- GPA
- ISL
- Portfolio
- Program Artifact 1 / Program Artifact 2 / Work Samples

Although data from these assessments are collected every semester, the faculty analyze and evaluate the data for program and unit improvement on an annual basis. The Assessment Director runs reports and provides them to faculty for review at the annual program and unit assessment days.

The School of Education also uses the LiveText progress reporting tool feature to track and evaluation candidate progress across transition points. The Assessment Director runs these progress reports every semester. These reports are given to faculty advisors who then review their candidates progress and develop remediation plans as necessary.

Data Collection

The School of Education’s data collection processes for undergraduate programs are shared tasks that merge to provide a holistic picture of how well the unit and programs are meeting curriculum goals. As the following graphic illustrates, each party responsible for a candidate’s development produces data on that candidate:
Undergraduate Programs (Initial)

Instructional Faculty → Courses → Lesson Planning, Dispositions, ISL, Program Artifacts and Work Samples

Field Supervisors → Observations of Practice → CaPE → Candidates

Mentor Teachers → Observations of Practice → CaPE

Faculty Advisors → Advisement Meetings → Dispositions, Transition Point Progress Reports → Program and Unit Data → Program and Unit Decision Making
The School of Education also collects operational data to measure program and unit performance. These data are:

- School Surveys
- Student Teaching Surveys
- Graduate Surveys
- Employer Surveys
- Student Opinionnaires

The Office of Clinical and Field Experiences is responsible for collecting the school and student teaching surveys. This data is collected via the LiveText Field Experience Management Module. Once this data has been collected, the Clinical Director is responsible for forwarding it to the Assessment Director so that it can be reported to faculty on the appropriate assessment days.

The Database Manager is responsible for collecting the graduate and employer surveys. Once data from the graduate and employer surveys has been collected, the Database Manager is responsible for uploading it into LiveText and forwarding it to the Assessment Director so that it can be reported to faculty on the appropriate assessment days.

The Database Manager is also responsible for collecting and reporting student opinionnaire data. Once this data has been collected, the Database Manager is responsible for forwarding it to the appropriate faculty, department heads, and the Dean.

Note on CaPE Data

The Office of Clinical and Field Experiences is responsible for the collection of CaPE data from field supervisors and mentor teachers. This process is facilitated via the LiveText Field Experience Management Module. Data is shared with program faculty, field supervisors, mentor teachers, and candidates within the module. The Office of Clinical and Field Experiences is responsible for running reports on the CaPE data and forwarding those reports to the Assessment Director so that they can be reported to faculty on the appropriate assessment days.

Note on GACE II Data

The GACE is Georgia’s certification exam. As such, GACE data is compiled by Pearson and forwarded to Georgia Southwestern State University. The Database Manager compiles these data into summary reports by program and forwards those reports to the Assessment Director. The Assessment Director then reports this data to faculty on the appropriate assessment days.
Data Reporting

Data reports are presented to faculty at the annual program and unit assessment days. Data is reported to faculty via a LiveText Exhibit Room. The exhibit room serves as an electronic file folder for data that is not collected via LiveText (GACE II, for example) as evidenced in the following screenshot:
The Assessment Director is responsible for running LiveText reports on the key assessment data collected by the programs and unit. These reports are then uploaded into the Exhibit Room as evidenced by the following screenshot:
At the same time, the Database Manager translates the key assessment data into summary longitudinal reports. And even though these reports are uploaded into the electronic Exhibit Room, the Assessment Director also provides each faculty member with a hard copy on the appropriate assessment day. An example of one of these reports is evidenced in the following screenshot:

The Assessment Director is responsible for managing the data reporting process. As previously mentioned, data are shared annually with faculty via a series of assessment days:

- **Fall Assessment Day** – The Assessment Director coordinates and reports program-level data to faculty so that they can then make data-based decisions about their program’s performance.
- **Spring Assessment Day** – The Assessment Director coordinates and reports unit-level data to faculty so that they can them make data-based decisions about the unit’s performance.

In addition to the fall and spring assessment days, the Assessment Director reports data to the School of Education’s stakeholders. Data is reported to school partners via the bi-annual PDS
Liaison and mentor teacher meetings. Data is reported to College of Arts and Sciences as well as School of Computing and Mathematics faculty via annual meetings between the Assessment Director and appropriate program coordinators in Education and the content departments.

The Assessment Director also distributes data to program faculty and unit leadership as the need arises. A summary of academic data from the previous academic year and the programs’ action plans from that data is reported to the Director of Institutional Effectiveness annually in October.5

Analysis and Evaluation

School of Education faculty, support staff, and shareholders analyze and evaluate program and unit data on an annual basis (program data in fall / unit data in spring). For both program and unit analysis, the School of Education employs two working templates. The first template asks that faculty review and relevant stakeholders review the data by key assessment. This template is illustrated below:

5 The reporting template that the Assessment Director forwards to the Director of Institutional Effectives is supplemental to this policies and procedures handbook and is listed in the document list in the Appendix.
The second template asks that faculty and relevant stakeholders review the data relative to the School of Education’s conceptual framework and student learning outcomes. This template is illustrated below:

The assessment days provide dedicated space for School of Education faculty and stakeholders to review program and unit data. After each assessment day, the School of Education faculty is responsible for forwarding their completed review forms to the Assessment Director. This analysis and evaluation process is then used to make program and unit improvement decisions.

### Program and Unit Improvement

The School of Education uses data for unit and program improvement. As previously mentioned, the Assessment Director coordinates two assessment days per academic year (one for programs / one for unit) so that School of Education faculty and stakeholders can analyze and evaluate program and unit-level data. To ensure data-based program and unit improvement, program

---

6 Both data interpretation documents (data analysis tools) are supplemental to this handbook and are listed in the document list in the appendix.
coordinators and unit leadership are responsible for submitting action plans and data evaluation reports after the respective assessment days.

After the fall assessment day, program faculty and stakeholders are required to identify and report one data-informed program change that program faculty will implement for program improvement. The Assessment Director sets-up individual program assessment meetings to help facilitate this stage of the assessment cycle. However, program coordinators are responsible for forwarding their program’s action plan to the Assessment Director. The Assessment Director compiles this information into a summary report and distributes it to School of Education faculty and shareholders on the Spring unit assessment day.

After the spring assessment day, unit faculty, leadership, and stakeholders are required to identify and report one data-informed unit-level change that the unit will implement to promote overall unit improvement. The Assessment Director sets-up unit leadership meetings to help facilitate this stage of the assessment cycle. However, the Dean of the School of Education is responsible for forwarding the unit’s action plan to the Assessment Director. The Assessment Director compiles this information into a summary report and distributes it to School of Education faculty and shareholders during planning week the next academic year.

The program and unit action plans include the following components:

- Information on the contact person who will oversee the action’s implementation as well as all parties involved in the implementation process.
- The School of Education student learning outcome that the action should help improve.
- A statement of the proposed action, rationale for the action, and expected results.
- A timeline for implementation of the action and a plan for how the program and/or unit will review the implementation and effectiveness of the action.
- An explanation of the resources needed to implement the action plan and a justification for those resources.

At the end of each semester, the Assessment Director and the Database Administrator compile all reports and assessment materials into one file. In May, the Assessment Director facilitates School of Education leadership meetings to discuss goals for the next academic year. The Dean is charged with writing a goals report and presenting it to faculty during planning week of the next academic year. In May, the Assessment Director and the Database Administrator compile and fill all reports and assessment materials from the academic year into one file. The Assessment Director then writes a summary report that outlines all of the assessment work that was accomplished during the year.

---

7 This summary report is also the summary report that the Assessment Director submits to the Director of Institutional Effectives in October.
8 The action plan reporting template is supplemental to this handbook and is listed in the document list in the Appendix.
Candidate Progress Across Transition Points

Along with the processes listed in the previous section, the School of Education’s assessment system tracks and measures candidate progress across the transition points. The purpose of tracking candidate progress is so that the faculty can identify and remediate candidate weaknesses while those candidates are matriculating through their coursework. At the same time, this information is shared with candidates’ faculty advisors so they can share the information with the candidates, discuss their strengths and weaknesses with them, and provide general feedback to their advisees as they matriculate through their programs.

Specifically, the School of Education monitors the following transition points and keeps track of candidate GPAs as well as the key assessments that are listed by each stage:

* Transitions are listed in bold.

**Application to Teacher Education**
- ISL
- Dispositions
- Lesson Plan
- CaPE
- Program Artifacts
- GPA

**Application to Student Teaching**
- ISL
- GPA
- CaPE (Student Teaching)
- Lesson Plan
- Portfolio
- GACE II (Part 1 & 2)

- Employee Survey
- Graduate Survey
The Database Manager runs candidate progress reports each semester. These progress reports are run by transition point such that every semester the Database Manager generates candidate progress reports for candidates who are:

- Candidates admitted to the teacher education program. Georgia Southwestern State University students will have work sample data; whereas, transfer students will only have the dispositions data (which may be only self-assessment data) that is attached to the teacher education application.
- Candidates who are taking teacher education coursework. Each program has identified a course that the Database Manager uses to run these reports.
- Candidates who are admitted to student teaching.
- Candidates who are currently student teaching. These reports are at midterm.

These reports are run in LiveText and are presented to faculty, program coordinators, and candidates in the following format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Standard Set</th>
<th>Standard Date</th>
<th>Fabric Title</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Assessor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-10-23</td>
<td>Ace Study Part 1 - Initial Pre-Test</td>
<td>Students’ Interests</td>
<td>Rebecca Short</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-11-24</td>
<td>Ace Study Part 2 - Reflection Chart</td>
<td>Description of Activity</td>
<td>Rebecca Short</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-11-24</td>
<td>Ace Study Part 3 - Reflection Chart</td>
<td>Description of Activity</td>
<td>Rebecca Short</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-12-07</td>
<td>Ace Study Part 4 - Parent Letter</td>
<td>Description of activities, skills, and goals</td>
<td>Rebecca Short</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-09-30</td>
<td>Undergraduate Dispositions’ Rubric - Fall 2016</td>
<td>Collaboration - Interpersonal and Collaborative Effectiveness</td>
<td>Rebecca Short</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-06-27</td>
<td>Undergraduate Dispositions’ Rubric - Fall 2016</td>
<td>Collaboration - Interpersonal and Collaborative Effectiveness</td>
<td>Rebecca Short</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-06-20</td>
<td>Undergraduate Dispositions’ Rubric - Fall 2016</td>
<td>Collaboration - Interpersonal and Collaborative Effectiveness</td>
<td>Sheryl Voss</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-12-05</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>Collaboration - Interpersonal and Collaborative Effectiveness</td>
<td>Carol Klein</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-12-08</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>Collaboration - Interpersonal and Collaborative Effectiveness</td>
<td>Lynda Lassen</td>
<td>Exceptional (Dramatically Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-12-05</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>Collaboration - Interpersonal and Collaborative Effectiveness</td>
<td>Rebecca Short</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-12-10</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>Collaboration - Interpersonal and Collaborative Effectiveness</td>
<td>Julie Hemmey</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-12-12</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>Collaboration - Interpersonal and Collaborative Effectiveness</td>
<td>Janice Brown</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2011-05-03</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>Collaboration - Interpersonal and Collaborative Effectiveness</td>
<td>Rebecca Short</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2011-09-07</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>Collaboration - Interpersonal and Collaborative Effectiveness</td>
<td>Julie Hemmey</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2011-06-17</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>Collaboration - Interpersonal and Collaborative Effectiveness</td>
<td>Edith Duk</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-11-24</td>
<td>Ace Study Part 2 - Reflection Chart</td>
<td>Description of Activity</td>
<td>Rebecca Short</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-11-24</td>
<td>Ace Study Part 3 - Reflection Chart</td>
<td>Description of Activity</td>
<td>Rebecca Short</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-10-23</td>
<td>Ace Study Part 1 - Initial Pre-Test</td>
<td>Students’ Interests</td>
<td>Rebecca Short</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-11-24</td>
<td>Ace Study Part 2 - Reflection Chart</td>
<td>Description of Activity</td>
<td>Rebecca Short</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-10-23</td>
<td>Ace Study Part 1 - Initial Pre-Test</td>
<td>Students’ Interests</td>
<td>Rebecca Short</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>DGA6GA5000FO</td>
<td>2016-11-24</td>
<td>Ace Study Part 2 - Reflection Chart</td>
<td>Description of Activity</td>
<td>Rebecca Short</td>
<td>Outstanding (Effectively Demonstrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Database Manager then forwards those progress reports to program coordinators and faculty advisors via a LiveText advising course. The program coordinators and faculty advisors use these reports to keep track of how their candidates are matriculating through their programs. Specifically, the candidate progress reports allow faculty advisors to keep up with individual candidates’ progress toward meeting the School of Education’s student learning outcomes. As such, faculty can begin to develop a picture for how well they and their individual candidates are able to meet the learning criteria outlined by the School of Education’s key assessments and the program’s work samples.
Faculty advisors are responsible for discussing their candidates’ progress reports with each candidate in their advisement meetings. The faculty advisors use these progress reports to identify and remediate candidate weaknesses while the candidates are matriculating through their programs. Each faculty advisor is responsible for setting-up meetings to discuss candidate progress reports with their advisees, develop remediation plans as necessary, and file a copy of those plans with the Assessment Director. Faculty advisors are also responsible for ensuring that their candidates receive a copy of their progress reports. Furthermore, faculty advisors are responsible for placing a copy of each candidates progress report and remediation plan (if one) in the candidate’s file. At the end of each semester, faculty advisor are required to fill-out a student progress report action/findings summary report outlining remediation actions that may have been required of candidates by advisors.

**Field Experience and Clinical Practice**

To ensure that CaPE data reports are compiled in a timely manner, the Office of Clinical and Field Experiences runs CaPE data reports every semester (November and April). The Clinical Director is responsible for forwarding those reports to the Assessment Director. The Clinical Director is also responsible for submitting a field experience summary report that outlines that semesters work to the Assessment Director. At the same time, program coordinators and field supervisors have “real-time” access to their candidates’ CaPE data. The CaPE data is also outlined in the progress reports that are uploaded into the advising course.

The CaPE data reports are represented in the following screenshot:

---

9 The student progress report findings/actions summary report is supplemental to this handbook and is listed in the document list in the Appendix.

10 The field experience summary report is supplemental to this handbook and is listed in the document list in the Appendix.
Academic Assessment Procedures Graduate Programs (Advanced)

The School of Education is committed to monitoring program and unit performance via data that are collected at the course, program, and unit level. Through a series of unit-wide and program-specific assessments, the School of Education monitors student, program, and unit progress toward meeting the student learning outcomes outlined at the beginning of this policy document.

Data Collection, Reporting, Analysis, and Evaluation

The School of Education uses the LiveText online platform to facilitate its data collection, analysis, and evaluation processes. The faculty input data into LiveText each semester. At the same time, the faculty use LiveText to manage the key assessments they have identified for each course in their program.

The Masters in Curriculum and Instruction program’s assessments include:

- GPA
- Content Analysis
- Assessment Plan
- Instructional Strategy Profile
- Professional Profile
- Administrative Evaluations
- Self-Assessment Survey
- Presentation
- Workshop
- Instructional Strategy (Practicum)

For the Specialist in Teacher Leadership program, these assessments include:

- GPA
- Assessment Plan
- Teacher Leader Work Samples
- Issues Survey
- Research Manuscript
- Leading Profile
- Mentor-Mentee Project
- Self-Assessment Survey
- Issues Survey (Practicum)
- Data Collection

The key assessments are supplemental to this policies and procedures handbook and are listed in the document list in the Appendix.
Although data from these assessments are collected every semester, the faculty analyze and evaluate the data for program improvement on an annual basis. The Assessment Director runs reports and provides them to faculty for review at the annual graduate programs assessment day.

Data Collection

The School of Education’s data collection processes are shared tasks that merge to provide a holistic picture of how well the graduate programs are meeting their curriculum goals. The following graphic illustrate these processes:
The School of Education also collects operational data to measure the graduate programs’ effectiveness. These data are:

- Graduate Surveys
- Employer Surveys
- Student Opinionnaires

The Database Manager is responsible for collecting the graduate and employer surveys. Once data from the graduate and employer surveys has been collected, the Database Manager is responsible for uploading it into LiveText and forwarding it to the Assessment Director so it can be reported to faculty on the appropriate assessment days.

The Database Manager is also responsible for collecting and reporting student opinionnaire data. Once this data has been collected, the Database Manager is responsible for forwarding it to the appropriate faculty, department heads, and the Dean.

Data Reporting

Data reports are presented to faculty at the annual program and unit assessment days. Data is reported to faculty via a LiveText Exhibit Room. These reports are then uploaded into the Exhibit Room as evidenced by the following screenshot:
The Assessment Director is responsible for managing the data reporting process. As previously mentioned, data are shared annually with faculty on the graduate assessment day.

The Assessment Director also distributes data to program faculty and unit leadership as the need arises. A summary of academic data from the previous academic year and the graduate programs’ action plans from that data is reported to the Director of Institutional Effectiveness annually in October.  

Analysis and Evaluation

School of Education faculty, support staff, and shareholders analyze and evaluate graduate program data on an annual basis (fall semester). The School of Education employs two working templates. The first template asks faculty and relevant stakeholders to review the data by key assessment. This template is illustrated below:

Masters in Curriculum and Instruction

---

11 The reporting template that the Assessment Director forwards to the Director of Institutional Effectives is supplemental to this handbook and is listed in the document list in the Appendix.

12 The data analysis forms in this section are supplemental to this handbook and are listed in the document list in the Appendix.
Specialist in Teacher Leadership

The second template asks that faculty and relevant stakeholders review the data relative to the School of Education’s conceptual framework and program’s student learning outcomes. This template is illustrated below:

Masters in Curriculum and Instruction
The assessment day provides dedicated space for School of Education faculty and stakeholders to review data from the graduate programs. After each assessment day, the graduate program coordinators are responsible for forwarding their completed review forms to the Assessment Director. This analysis and evaluation process is then used to make program and unit improvement decisions.
Candidate Progress Across Transition Points (Graduate) (advanced programs)

The School of Education collects data across several transitions points in both the masters and specialist programs.

Masters Program

1. Application and Admission
   - GPA
   - GRE

2. Matriculation and Application for Graduation
   - Content Analysis
   - Instructional Strategies Profile
   - Professional Profile
   - Administrative Evaluations
   - Self-Assessment Survey
   - Presentation
   - Workshop
   - Instructional Strategy (Practicum)
   - GPA

3. Completion of Program and Exit
   - Portfolio of Work
   - GPA

4. Induction and Beyond
   - Graduate Surveys
   - Employer Surveys
Specialist Program

The transition point data from the masters and specialist program is discussed on graduate assessment day.

Program Improvement

The School of Education uses data for program improvement. As previously mentioned, the Assessment Director coordinates a graduate assessment day once per academic year so that School of Education faculty and stakeholders can analyze the programs’ effectiveness. To ensure data-based improvement, program coordinators are responsible for submitting action plans and data evaluation reports after the assessment day.

After the fall graduate program assessment day, program faculty and stakeholders are required to identify and report one data-informed program change that program faculty will implement for program improvement. The Assessment Director sets-up individual program assessment
meetings to help facilitate this stage of the assessment cycle. However, program coordinators are responsible for forwarding their program’s action plan to the Assessment Director. The Assessment Director compiles this information into a summary report\(^\text{13}\) and distributes it to School of Education faculty and shareholders on the Spring unit assessment day. Like the action plans for undergraduate programs, the graduate program action plans\(^\text{14}\) include the following components:

- Information on the contact person who will oversee the action’s implementation as well as all parties involved in the implementation process.
- The School of Education student learning outcome that the action should help improve.
- A statement of the proposed action, rationale for the action, and expected results.
- A timeline for implementation of the action and a plan for how the program and/or unit will review the implementation and effectiveness of the action.
- An explanation of the resources needed to implement the action plan and a justification for those resources.

At the end of each semester, the Assessment Director and the Database Administrator compile all reports and assessment materials into one file. In May, the Assessment Director facilitates School of Education leadership meetings to discuss goals for the next academic year. The Dean is charged with writing a goals report and presenting it to faculty during planning week of the next academic year. In May, the Assessment Director and the Database Administrator compile and fill all reports and assessment materials from the academic year into one file. The Assessment Director then writes a summary report that outlines all of the assessment work that was accomplished during the year.

---

\(^\text{13}\) This summary report is also the summary report that the Assessment Director submits to the Director of Institutional Effectives in October.

\(^\text{14}\) The action plan reporting template is supplemental to this handbook and is listed in the document list in the appendix.
The School of Education employs several processes to ensure its assessment system operates with fairness, accuracy, consistency, and in avoidance of bias.

**Fairness, Accuracy, Consistency, and Avoidance of Bias**

Fairness, accuracy, consistency, and avoidance of bias are important components of the School of Education’s assessment system. As such, the School of Education is committed to the following processes:

- Each program (undergraduate and graduate) as well as the unit operates under the same assessment system, employs the same data collection and analysis procedures, and uses the same criteria standards for program and unit improvement.
- The School of Education has procedures in place to document, track, and resolve student complaints and appeals.
- The unit systematically reviews (beginning in 2013) each individual assessment on a periodic basis.
- The School of Education employs assessment training sessions about the assessment system, the key assessments, and how to evaluate student work.\(^{15}\)
- The unit uses a multiple assessor format to evaluate candidates’ portfolios.\(^{16}\)
- The unit’s assessment committee reviews (beginning in 2014) each program to ensure the assessment processes are being carried out in an efficient and effective manner.
- The School of Education regularly communicates with its professional community about the assessment system and the work of the unit as part of the feedback loop.

**The Assessment Committee\(^{17}\)**

The Assessment Committee’s purpose is to ensure the assessment system is working efficiently and effectively. The committee acts as a “quality control” force to hold the unit and each program within the unit accountable for the assessment work. Specifically, the committee is charged with looking at:

- The program/unit’s action plans and how the program/unit has worked to close the loop on those action plans.
- The data and data analysis tools the program/unit used to create the action plans and close the loop on those action plans.

---

\(^{15}\) See the assessment plan (supplemental document) for more details about this point.

\(^{16}\) See the assessment plan (supplemental document) for more details about this point.

\(^{17}\) For more information about the assessment committee, see the assessment committee purpose and procedures statement. The statement is a supplement to this handbook and is listed in the document list in the Appendix.
• How effectively the program/unit followed its assessment procedures and used its data to make program improvement.

While reviewing these items, the committee is expected to provide the program/unit with feedback on its assessment processes as well as generate “food-for-thought” questions for the program/unit to consider.

As such, the assessment committee reviews the School of Education’s assessment processes according to the following four-year cycle:

**Year 1**

• Early Childhood Education
• History w/ Teacher Certification
• Political Science w/ Teacher Certification

**Year 2**

• Middle Grades Education
• Health and Physical Education
• Music w/ Teacher Certification

**Year 3**

• Masters in Curriculum and Instruction
• Math w/ Teacher Certification
• English w/ Teacher Certification

**Year 4**

• Unit
• Special Education
• Specialist in Teacher Leadership
Appendix

The documents outlined within this appendix are the supplemental documents to this policies and procedures handbook. These documents are the additional assessment materials that the School of Education uses to organize, make sense of, and employ the assessment system.

Unit Documents

- Assessment Policies and Procedures Handbook (this document)
- Assessment Plan
- Assessment Committee Purpose and Procedures Statement
- Dispositions Plan
- Professional Intervention Plan

Reporting Documents

- Annual Assessment Summary Report Template
- Field/Clinical Experiences Summary Report Template
- GSW Annual Report Template
- PSC Program Approval Report Procedures (PAAR)
- Student Progress Report Findings/Actions Summary Report Template
- Faculty Activity Report Template
- AACTE Professional Education Data System Report Procedures (PEDS)
- NCATE Annual Report Procedures
- Title II Institutional Report Procedures
- School of Education Goals Report

Analysis, Interpretation, and Action Planning Documents

- Conceptual Framework/Student Learning Outcomes Data Analysis Form (Initial)
- Conceptual Framework/Student Learning Outcomes Data Analysis Form (MA)
- Conceptual Framework/Student Learning Outcomes Data Analysis Form (EDS)
- Key Assessment Data Analysis Form (Initial)
- Key Assessment Data Analysis Form (MA)
- Key Assessment Data Analysis Form (EDS)
- Action Plan Template
Initial Certification Program Matrices

- Early Childhood
  - GACE/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Conceptual Framework/Student Learning Outcomes/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Key Assessment/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Program Standards/Course Alignment Matrix

- Special Education
  - GACE/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Conceptual Framework/Student Learning Outcomes/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Key Assessment/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Program Standards/Course Alignment Matrix

- Middle Grades
  - GACE/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Conceptual Framework/Student Learning Outcomes/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Key Assessment/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Program Standards/Course Alignment Matrix

- Health and Physical Education
  - GACE/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Conceptual Framework/Student Learning Outcomes/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Key Assessment/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Program Standards/Course Alignment Matrix

- History w/ Teacher Certification
  - GACE/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Conceptual Framework/Student Learning Outcomes/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Key Assessment/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Program Standards/Course Alignment Matrix

- Political Science w/ Teacher Certification
  - GACE/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Conceptual Framework/Student Learning Outcomes/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Key Assessment/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Program Standards/Course Alignment Matrix

- Music w/ Teacher Certification
  - GACE/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Conceptual Framework/Student Learning Outcomes/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Key Assessment/Course Alignment Matrix
  - Program Standards/Course Alignment Matrix
• Math with Teacher Certification
  o GACE/Course Alignment Matrix
  o Conceptual Framework/Student Learning Outcomes/Course Alignment Matrix
  o Key Assessment/Course Alignment Matrix
  o Program Standards/Course Alignment Matrix

• English with Teacher Certification
  o GACE/Course Alignment Matrix
  o Conceptual Framework/Student Learning Outcomes/Course Alignment Matrix
  o Key Assessment/Course Alignment Matrix
  o Program Standards/Course Alignment Matrix

Advanced Program Matrices

• Masters in Curriculum and Instruction
  o Conceptual Framework/Student Learning Outcomes/Course Alignment Matrix
  o Key Assessment/Course Alignment Matrix

• Specialist in Teacher Leadership
  o Conceptual Framework/Student Learning Outcomes/Course Alignment Matrix
  o Key Assessment/Course Alignment Matrix

Initial Program Key Assessments

• CaPE
• Lesson Planning
• Dispositions
• GACE II (Part 1, Part 2)
• GPA
• ISL
• Portfolio
• Program Specific Artifacts

Advanced Program Key Assessments

• Masters in Curriculum and Instruction
  o GPA
  o Content Analysis
  o Assessment Plan
  o Instructional Strategy Profile
  o Professional Profile
  o Administrative Evaluations
  o Self-Assessment Survey
  o Presentation
  o Workshop
- **Specialist in Teacher Leadership**
  - GPA
  - Assessment Plan
  - Teacher Leader Work Samples
  - Issues Survey
  - Research Manuscript
  - Leading Profile
  - Mentor-Mentee Project
  - Self-Assessment Survey
  - Issues Survey (Practicum)
  - Data Collection

**Other Assessment Materials**

- School Surveys
- Student Teaching Surveys
- Graduate Surveys
- Employer Surveys
- Student Opinionnaries