College or Unit Level Annual Assessment Report
Final Template and Guidelines
(Rev. May 8, 2017)

College or Unit Name: College of Education

Report Year: 2016-17

Submitted by: Beth Kubitskey

Submitted on (date): June 26, 2017

EMU's Mission and Expectation for Assessment
(https://www.emich.edu/assessment/)

Mission
EMU creates a culture of assessment through collaborative planning, systematic implementation, and rigorous analysis of collected data to make informed decisions that enhance opportunities for students to learn and to strengthen all curricular and co-curricular areas.

Expectation
EMU expects all curricular and co-curricular areas to generate and implement learning goals, collect relevant data, and use on-going assessment processes for continuous improvement.

Purpose of Unit Reports on Assessment of Student Learning
The nine units that report on assessment of student learning (see the list below), list their goals for the academic year, describe what goals were accomplished, and provide examples of how assessment data were used to enhance programs (i.e., to "close of the loop" of the assessment cycle).

Unit Reports and Final Preparation for HLC's Campus Visit (October 23-24, 2017)
EMU is preparing its self-study and accreditation report for the Higher Learning Commission. By the beginning of July, a draft of the report will be submitted to the Board of Regents, the University President, and Provost. A final draft should be ready by September 1. The information you provide will be useful to the HLC Planning Teams, particularly teams #3 (Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support) and #4 (Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Support).

For links to the assessment page for each of the following, go to
https://www.emich.edu/assessment/unitsaaessment.php
- College of Arts and Sciences
- College of Business
- College of Education
- College of Health and Human Services
- College of Technology
- General Education
- Graduate School
- Student Affairs & Student Services
- University Library

1. **Description of Council/Committee.** The Assessment Committee in the College of Education is a subcommittee of the College of Education Faculty Council. It includes a representative from each of the COE departments as well as a member from outside the college, but part of the initial teacher preparation program. In addition, the COE Associate Dean of Student and Curriculum participates. The committee meets monthly to discuss issues of college assessment. This includes, but is not limited to, data collection for accrediting purposes. This year the focus of the group was to provide feedback and information about the CAEP report, submitted on March 17, 2017.

   o Dr. Martha Baiyee   Teacher Education
   o Professor Jennifer Desiderio   Special Education
   o Dr. David Anderson   Leadership and Counseling
   o Dr. Cam McComb   Chair, CAS Methods Group (Art)
   o Dr. Beth Kubitskey   Associate Dean, COE

2. **Assessment Goals.** In addition to the primary goals of assessing student learning and using gathered information to improve programs and opportunities for students to learn, list other 2016-17 unit goals that were designed to support student learning or assessment of student learning. (Please note whether these were direct, indirect or operational.) Goals from 2015-16 updated. Goals set in 2015-16 report for 2016-17 noted with an "*".

   Goal 1.   Improve student teaching experience and assessment.
   a. ✓ Completed from 2015-16: Adapt capstone assessment for initial teacher preparation programs. (direct)
   b. ✓ Completed from 2015-16: Train student teacher supervisors in the new assignment and scoring. (operational)
   c. Align assessments in curriculum, reading, practicum and technology with edTPA (operational).* - Analysis completed and alignment in process.

   Goal 2.   Recreate the program review process for non-accredited programs.* (operational)
   a. ✓ Completed from 2015-16 Education Leadership sharing protocol for their program review process*.
   b. Creating Professional Assessment Documents (PADs) portals for data dissemination for non-accredited programs (direct)*.

   Goal 3.   Improve support for faculty to make data driven decisions about their program in annual program evaluations.
   a. ✓ Completed from 2015-16. Created livetext data portal for each program that includes student learning data (rubrics from course assignments, MTTC test data, GPAs) (direct) as well as program level data (enrollment etc) (operational) and State data (indirect).
   b. ✓ Completed from 2015-16. Created protocol for programs to use the data. (procedural)

Goal 4.   Maintain national recognition of program by submitting Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) reports [1]
- Special Education Programs (direct) (Submitting fall 2017)
- Educational Technology Program (direct) (Submitted Winter 2017)
- Reading – program shelved and rebooted.
- Early Childhood (submitted Winter 2017)
- (CAS also submitted reports – not included in this report)

Goal 5.   Create mechanism for collecting data on completers' preparedness to inform programs.
- ✓ Completed from 2015-16 Developed and piloted principal survey*. (indirect).
- ✓ Designed case-study approach to survey our completers in their first 3 years out.
  - o Initial focus group interview conducted.
  - o Continued follow up and classroom observations and data collection of student learning data to follow. *(indirect)

Summary of Accomplishments. Summarize the accomplishments your unit achieved during 2016-17 toward assessing student learning and "closing the loop" of the assessment cycle. Next, summarize the activities your unit engaged in during 2016-17 toward meeting other assessment goals listed above in #2.
- The COE completed the CAEP report. This report focuses on program level examination of student learning to inform the program design and implementation. The visit is in November, 2017. The initial formative feedback report resulted in two areas for improvement, neither of which involved assessment of student learning. ((AFI 1) Std 2: The EPP does not currently provide sufficient evidence that clinical experiences are of sufficient coherence and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate a positive impact on P-12 students' learning. (AFI 2) Std 3: Lack of 5-year recruitment plan with baseline points, goals, data, or plan to collect data to show results of recruitment efforts.).
- Goals' status
  - o Goal 1: Adopted new capstone assessment (student teaching unit is now local evaluation of edTPA) and have trained supervisors in using the rubric.
  - o Goal 2: Program review process for non-accredited programs still in process.
  - o Goal 3: Data portal complete, but adding data from this past year for fall implementation by faculty.
  - o Goal 4: All SPA reports submitted, approved, conditionally approved. Many resubmitted if conditionally approved or submitting in fall. Data analysis of student learning integral for these report.
  - o Goal 5: Principal survey examining employer satisfaction with our completers as indirect measure of student learning piloted and data analyzed. First focus group of completers to examine self reported learning and its application to their job.

3. **Examples.** Provide 2-3 descriptive examples from your unit's activities that highlight how you (1) assessed student learning and, (2) "closed the loop." (This is a critical part!)
   - Exam*ple 1: Special Education Departments – Initial Teacher Preparation rubric rewrite.* Special Education programs all have key assessments of student learning embedded in the coursework of their programs. The intent of these assessments

---

[1] Elementary program SPA is no longer involved with CAEP and review is transition to the CAEP board. Early childhood is submitting this year.

is to demonstrate that students are learning the standards deemed necessary by their professional organization. The rubrics created for the last accreditation visit were adapted to measure the new standards, however the CEC had shifted its preference for format for rubrics. The rubrics were created by experts in the field to align with the CEC standards. As such, the assignment and resulting rubrics have *content validity*. Face validity: *Old instrument*: The old rubric was specifically adapted and defined to measure student learning with respect to CEC standards for all teachers. Faculty experts worked together to create the rubric. The rubric was used in the successful NCATE 2010 visit and was deemed adequate by both the SPA and NCATE examiners.   With a change in CEC requirements, new instruments had to be created (adopted Fall, 2016): In response to the conditions of the SPA report (approved with conditions), the faculty of the Special Education Department convened two rubric design retreats in the spring of 2016 (Moskal, 2000). The rubric language needed to be a measure of candidate performance, in other words the knowledge and skills demonstrated, not the product/project itself or its parts. The anchors of the rubrics were adapted to capture the candidate performance demonstrated. This process can be similar to the IEP process in the field of special education, where the anchor language is a behavioral objective. Just as special education educators think of objectives in the IEP, the knowledge and skills of the candidate must be observable and measurable. (CEC, 2015).

- *Evaluations of Student Teaching* (closing the loop): The student teaching office examine the assessments of students who were not successful in student teaching as a way to uncover what key competencies seem to be missing, trends etc. This analysis is intended to inform both the program (direct) as well as the design of the rubrics evaluating the students. Through this analysis, we identified common challenges faced by many student teachers, as well as issues unique to unsuccessful student teachers. We also identified holes in our existing formal assessment protocol – things we didn't measure and ultimately impacted the successful completion of student teaching. We are now in the process of using this data to inform our program. Sample findings:
    - o Many of the issues surrounding unsuccessful student teaching are dispositional in nature.
    - o Redesign disposition rubric and implementation to capture critical more specific, nuanced information while allowing for measurement of growth over time.

    Example actions based on these findings include, but are not limited to:
    - o Created a pre-student teaching workshop the week before student teaching to attend to issues discovered in the analysis.
    - o Create a working group looking at design and implementation of the dispositional assessment and setting this as our continuous improvement goal for our accrediting body (CAEP).

4. **Closing the Loop: Over Time Analysis.** For the past few years, we have focused on how information collected and analyzed during assessment of student performances is used to close the loop of assessment. Peruse your past two or three annual reports and describe how programs in your unit have strived to close the loop. You might consider processes coordinated by your assessment council/committee (e.g., how you ensured quality across assessments, etc.); patterns of actions; or how you have improved upon the process of closing the loop over time.

Over the last 3 years, the focus was on coordinating our data collection, analysis and use of the analysis in response to the new CAEP standards. Our report of national accreditation was

submitted on March 17, 2017 for a Nov. 14, 2017 visit (available upon request). The following are examples of closing the loop over these years.

- edTPA implementation: The capstone assignment for the general education student teaching has shifted to edTPA. The assessment is aligned with the national standards. Supervisors have been trained in scoring and we have completed our first round of reliability work. The data was analyzed and disaggregated by program and is being reported back to the programs for Fall 2017 review. Loop not completely closed, but the process if moving forward.
- Specialized Program Association (SPA) evaluation. Nearly all initial teacher preparation programs have submitted their SPA reports. Most have received feedback. The Special Education Departments used this feedback to revamp their rubrics through a robust faculty driven procedure. The new rubrics are in place, the data is being analyzed and used to inform the programs this summer. A new report is being submitted in the fall (initial report "approved with conditions").
- Professional Assessment Documents (PADs) livetext portals for each program are populated and being updated this summer for fall analysis by the program coordinators. This is a way to supply each program with the relevant data collected in house and at the state level. Next step is to provide feedback to the programs in the spring.

5. **Next Year's Goals.** As you turn toward the next academic year (2017-18), list and briefly describe goals that emerged from the current year and that you will focus on next year?

- Host college-wide program group analysis working time to begin examining data in this format.
- Work on dispositional assessment and application.
- Investigating improving MTTC test scores.

6. **Provide the Template used for Reporting.** Finally, please provide a copy of a representative template that you used for programs to report their assessment findings.

References

Moskal, Barbara M. & Jon A. Leydens (2000). Scoring rubric development: validity and reliability. Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 7(10). Available online: http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=10.