

2008 NCATE Accreditation Focused Visit
Institutional Report

Educator Preparation Unit



1945 N. High Street
Columbus, OH 43210

<https://ncate.osu.edu/docs/>

April 20-22, 2008

Robert R. Hite, Ph.D., D.P.S.
NCATE Coordinator
(614) 292-7623
hite.44@osu.edu

PLEASE NOTE:

The Institutional Report (IR) references documents available at <https://ncate.osu.edu/docs/>

The documents at this site include the following:

[**INSTITUTIONAL REPORT**]
[**CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS**]
[**UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM**]
[**UNIT PROFILE**]
[**PROGRAM PROFILES**]
[**EVIDENCE FOR STANDARD 2: ELEMENT 1**]
[**EVIDENCE FOR STANDARD 2: ELEMENT 2**]
[**EVIDENCE FOR STANDARD 2: ELEMENT 3**]
[**EVIDENCE FOR AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT FROM 2005 REVIEW**]

The IR directs the reader to <https://ncate.osu.edu/docs/> through one or more of the above references.
The respective documents may be accessed by clicking on the desired document title.

TABLE of CONTENTS

Overview: The Institution.....	4
Overview: The Unit.....	6
Conceptual Framework.....	14
Element 1: Assessment System.....	17
Element 2: Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation.....	25
Element 3: Use of Data for Program Improvement.....	31
Other: NCATE March 2006 Accreditation Action Report - Standard 2 Area for Improvement.....	50
Glossary of Terms.....	55

OVERVIEW

The Institution

Historical Context

The roots of The Ohio State University go back to 1870 when the Ohio General Assembly established the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College. The new college was made possible through the provisions of the Land-Grant Act, signed by President Lincoln on July 2, 1862. The first classes were taught in 1873, with the institution receiving its present name in 1878, the year of its first graduating class. The University's land-grant status has a significant impact yet today on how it views its responsibility for outreach. The Institution is one of 13 public universities in Ohio.

The Institution's Mission

The purpose of The Ohio State University is *to advance the well-being of the people of Ohio and the global community through the creation and dissemination of knowledge*. The core values of the University are to pursue knowledge for its own sake, ignite in students a lifelong love of learning, produce discoveries that make the world a better place, celebrate and learn from diversity, and open the world to students. The overarching goal of the Institution is to be among the world's truly great universities.

Characteristics of the Institution

The Ohio State University is a public, land-grant, research institution accredited by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). Dr. E. Gordon Gee, among the most highly experienced and respected university presidents in the nation, serves as the University's president. Dr. Gee returned to the Institution October 1, 2007, having served in the same capacity from 1990-1997.

The 1,756 acre main campus is located in Columbus, Ohio (Franklin County). The Institution has four regional campuses located in the cities of Lima, Mansfield, Marion, and Newark. These communities are located within geographic regions having minority populations ranging from 4.1 to 15.0 percent. The minority population of Franklin County, the state's largest urban center, is 24.5 percent. In addition to these campus sites, there is an Agricultural Technical Institute in the city of Wooster, a University golf course located in Upper Arlington, and a University airport located in the Columbus area. Likewise, the F.T. Stone Laboratory, the nation's oldest freshwater biological field station and the Island Campus of The Ohio State University, is located on Gibraltar Island in Put-in-Bay harbor. This site serves as the Lake Erie teaching and research laboratory of the Ohio Sea Grant College Program. In total, the University owns 15,893 acres of land on which 927 buildings sit.

The Ohio State University is considered by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as a "very high research activity" institution. During the 2006-2007 academic year, University research expenditures totaled \$720.2 million. This figure includes expenditures of \$512.1 million for the research foundation, \$52.5 million for the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, \$39.6 million for the Transportation Research Center, and \$27.1 million for the Research Institute at Nationwide Children's Hospital.

As noted above, the Institution has four regional campuses. These sites contribute to the Institution's land-grant tradition of open enrollment by allowing nearly 30 percent of Ohio State's new first-quarter freshmen and some 16 percent of *all* undergraduates access to higher education. All four regional campuses have multiple partnerships with the communities they serve, collaborating in countless economic development

activities and providing learning and career opportunities for students who might otherwise be underserved. Regional campus students are traditional and non-traditional, typically first-generation, and employed while attending school. The regional campus experience allows for average class sizes of 22, honors programs, and extensive academic support. Mansfield and Newark offer campus-sponsored housing opportunities.

In particular, The Ohio State University at Lima was founded in 1960. Its 565-acre campus is located south of Toledo and consists of nine buildings. Six undergraduate majors, degree completion programs in Nursing and Dental Hygiene, and four master's degree programs may be fully completed on the Lima campus. In addition, several of its undergraduate and graduate programs are offered at its nearby Bellefontaine and Putnam County Centers. Some 90 faculty and staff served the 1,340 students enrolled at this regional campus autumn quarter 2007.

The Ohio State University at Mansfield was founded in the early 1960s. Its 700-acre campus is located in northeast central Ohio and consists of nine buildings. Five undergraduate majors and three master's degree programs may be fully completed on this campus. Some 150 faculty and staff served the 1,533 students enrolled at the Mansfield site during autumn quarter 2007.

The Ohio State University at Marion was founded in the early 1960s. Its 186-acre campus is located north of Columbus. Autumn 2007 enrollment consisted of 1,633 students, served by some 180 faculty and staff. Six undergraduate majors and two master's degree programs may be fully completed at this regional campus. It also offers undergraduate and graduate programs at its nearby Delaware Center.

The largest of the four regional campuses, The Ohio State University at Newark, was founded in 1957 as the first OSU regional campus. Classes were initially held at the old Newark High School until 1966, when 7,000 citizens pledged over one million dollars to match funds from the state legislature toward the cost of buying 155 acres of land and constructing the first building which opened in 1968. The Central Ohio Technical College (COTC) was founded in 1971 to help meet the state's growing need for skilled technicians. COTC now shares the land and facilities of the OSU Newark campus located 35 miles east of Columbus. Autumn 2007 OSU Newark campus enrollment consisted of 2,505 students coming from 71 of Ohio's 88 counties and from 26 different countries. Some 230 faculty and staff served these students. Six undergraduate majors and three master's degree programs may be fully completed on the Newark campus.

As of autumn quarter 2007, The Ohio State University had the largest enrollment of any institution in the country with 60,347 students. Of that population, 29,752 were women; 46,690 were undergraduates; 10,395 were graduate students; 3,262 were professional students; 51,049 were Ohioans; 3,648 were international students; and 1,052 were students with disabilities. Fourteen percent of the student body is minority. Of this 14 percent, 6.4 percent is African American, 4.8 percent is Asian American, 2.4 percent is Hispanic, and 0.4 percent is American Indian. The Institution has approximately 430,000 alumni, many of whom now serve as college and university professors and administrators across the country and throughout the world.

The Institution offers 167 undergraduate majors, 130 master's degree programs, 103 doctoral programs, and seven professional degree programs. Students in these programs are engaged in outreach with such partnerships as agricultural extension, Nationwide Children's Hospital, the Weinland Park Early Childhood Development project, the Sophie Rogers Lab School, and the Metro High School, a small and intellectually vibrant learning community open to students in Franklin County. The Metro High School is designed to serve students who want a personalized and extraordinary learning experience that prepares them for a connected world where math, science, and technology are vitally important.

Total University employee headcount is 39,120. Of this number, 3,047 are regular faculty; 494 are clinical faculty; 49 are research faculty; 2,017 are auxiliary faculty; 15,010 are administrative and professional staff; 5,538 are civil service staff; and 12,965 are students. The annual payroll for 2006-2007 was \$1.522 billion. The University budget for 2007-2008 includes \$4.9 billion of income and \$4.2 billion of expenditures. As of October 31, 2007, the University endowment was \$1.636 billion. During the 2006-2007 academic year, 121,173 donors contributed \$225 million to the Institution.

The Unit

The educator preparation programs of the unit are offered on the main campus and at the four regional campuses. These programs reside in the College of the Arts; College of Education and Human Ecology; College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences; College of Social and Behavioral Sciences; and College of Social Work. Each of these colleges also house non-educator preparation programs; that is, programs which do not prepare individuals to work in P-12 schools. For example, while there are three schools and three departments within the College of Education and Human Ecology, it is only the three schools which offer educator preparation programs. Within these three *schools*, only 24 of the 90 programs offered are educator preparation. None of the 23 programs within the *departments* prepare individuals to work in P-12 schools. Similarly, most of the programs within the Colleges of the Arts; Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences; Social and Behavioral Sciences; and Social Work are non-educator preparation.

The dean of the College of Education and Human Ecology serves as the head of the unit.

Programs Offered for the Preparation of School Professionals

Tables 1-3 delineate the programs offered for the preparation of school professionals to work in P-12 schools. These tables include the number of candidates enrolled during the 2006-2007 academic year and the status of program reviews.

The abbreviations and grade levels of the licensure areas referenced in the tables are found below:

Abbreviations and Grade Levels of Licensure Areas		
AP	Advanced Preparation	NA
ATP	Advanced Teacher Preparation	NA
AYA	Adolescence to Young Adult	grades 7-12
CT	Career Technical	grades 4-12
ECE	Early Childhood Education	grades PK-3
IS	Intervention Specialist: <i>Early Childhood</i>	grades PK-3
IS	Intervention Specialist: <i>Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Intensive</i>	grades K-12
IS	Intervention Specialist: <i>Hearing Impaired and Visually Impaired</i>	grades PK-12
ITP	Initial Teacher Preparation	NA
MCE	Middle Childhood Education	grades 4-9
MA	Multi-age	grades PK-12
OPSR	Other Professional School Roles	NA

Table 1: Programs Offered for the Preparation of School Professionals – Initial Teacher Preparation

Program Name	Award Level	Program Level	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted 2006-2007	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs	Program Review Submitted (Yes or No)	State Approval Status	National Recognition Status by NCATE*
AYA: Integrated Language Arts	M	ITP	30	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
AYA: Integrated Mathematics	M	ITP	14	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
AYA: Integrated Science	M	ITP	16	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
AYA: Earth Science	M	ITP	0	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
AYA: Earth Science / Chemistry	M	ITP	0	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
AYA: Earth Science / Physics	M	ITP	0	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
AYA: Life Science	M	ITP	1	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
AYA: Life Science / Chemistry	M	ITP	1	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
AYA: Life Science / Earth Science	M	ITP	0	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
AYA: Life Science / Physics	M	ITP	0	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
AYA: Physical Science: Chemistry	M	ITP	0	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
AYA: Physical Science: Physics	M	ITP	0	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
AYA: Physical Science: Chemistry and Physics	M	ITP	0	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
AYA: Integrated Social Studies	M	ITP	27	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
ECE	M	ITP	166	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
IS: Early Childhood	B	ITP	13	ODE	Yes	Approved	Yes
IS: Hearing Impaired**	M	ITP	12	ODE	Yes	Approved	Yes
IS: Mild / Moderate	B	ITP	27	ODE	Yes	Approved	Yes
IS: Moderate / Intensive	B	ITP	17	ODE	Yes	Approved	Yes
IS: Visually Impaired**	M	ITP	1	ODE	Yes	Approved	Yes
MCE: Reading & Language Arts***	M	ITP	44	ODE	Yes	Approved	Yes
MCE: Mathematics***	MEd	ITP	55	ODE	Yes	Approved	Yes
MCE: Science***	M	ITP	58	ODE	Yes	Approved	Yes

Table 1 (continued)

Program Name	Award Level	Program Level	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted 2006-2007	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs	Program Review Submitted (Yes or No)	State Approval Status	National Recognition Status by NCATE*
MCE: Social Studies***	M	ITP	61	ODE	Yes	Approved	Yes
MA: Dance	B	ITP	4	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
MA: Drama / Theatre	M	ITP	3	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
MA: Arabic	M	ITP	0	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
MA: Chinese****	M	ITP	23	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
MA: French	M	ITP	4	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
MA: German	M	ITP	5	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
MA: Hebrew	M	ITP	0	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
MA: Italian	M	ITP	1	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
MA: Japanese	M	ITP	0	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
MA: Latin	M	ITP	1	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
MA: Russian	M	ITP	0	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
MA: Spanish	M	ITP	11	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
MA: Swahili	M	ITP	0	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
MA: Music	B	ITP	42	NASM	Yes	Approved	Accrd.
MA: Physical Education	B	ITP	38	AAHPERD/ NASPE	Yes	Approved	Yes w/ conditions
MA: Visual Arts	B	ITP	48	NASAD	Yes	Approved	Accrd.
CT: Agriscience	B	ITP	53	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
CT: Family Consumer Sciences	B	ITP	11	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
CT: Integrated Business Education	B	ITP	15	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
CT: Technology Education	B/M	ITP	9	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
TOTAL ENROLLMENT			686 (see *s on page 10)				

Note: B = bachelor's level, M = master's level, B/M = bachelor's and master's level

Table 2: Programs Offered for the Preparation of School Professionals – Advanced Teacher Preparation

Program Name	Award Level	Program Level	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted 2006-2007	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs	Program Review Submitted (Yes or No)	State Approval Status	National Recognition Status by NCATE*
CT: Agriscience [ROUTE B]	ND/B/M	AP (ATP)	10	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
CT: Family Consumer Sciences [ROUTE B]	ND/B/M	AP (ATP)	12	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
CT: Health Occupations Education [ROUTE B]	ND/B/M	AP (ATP)	22	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
CT: Integrated Business [ROUTE B]	ND/B/M	AP (ATP)	22	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
CT: Marketing Education [ROUTE B]	ND/B/M	AP (ATP)	7	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
CT: Trade and Industrial Education [ROUTE B]	ND/B/M	AP (ATP)	50	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
IS: Gifted Education	M	AP	0	ODE	YES	Approved	Yes
IS: Hearing Impaired	M	AP (ATP)	1	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
IS: Visually Impaired	M	AP (ATP)	11	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
Music Education	M	AP (ATP)	21	NASM	Yes	N/A	Accrd.
TOTAL ENROLLMENT			156				

Note: ND/B/M = non-degree, bachelor's, and master's levels and M = master's level

Table 3: Programs Offered for the Preparation of School Professionals – Other Professional School Roles Preparation

Program Name	Award Level	Program Level	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted 2006-2007	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs	Program Review Submitted (Yes or No)	State Approval Status	National Recognition Status by NCATE*
Principal Grades PK-6*****	M	AP (OPSR)	22	ODE	Yes	Approved	Yes
Principal Grades 4-9*****	M	AP (OPSR)	43	ODE	Yes	Approved	Yes
Principal Grades 5-12*****	M	AP (OPSR)	26	ODE	Yes	Approved	Yes
Superintendent	M	AP (OPSR)	5	ODE	Yes	Approved	Yes
School Audiologist*****	M	AP (OPSR)	18	ASHA	Yes	Approved	Accd.
School Counselor	M	AP (OPSR)	22	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
School Psychologist	M	AP (OPSR)	26	ODE	Yes	Approved	No
School Speech-Language Pathologist*****	M	AP (OPSR)	18	ASHA	Yes	Approved	Accd.
TOTAL ENROLLMENT			114 (see *s below)				

Note: M = master's levels

- * The past Ohio NCATE agreement called for program reviews to take place at the state level. The new agreement calls for such reviews, beginning 2010, to be submitted at the national level.
- ** IS initial preparation for hearing impaired and visually impaired have a duplicate count with one individual seeking both licenses; therefore, the total enrollment for these two areas was 12.
- *** MCE has duplicate counts since a candidate must prepare to teach in at least two content areas; therefore, there were 94 MCE candidates.
- **** These 23 candidates for Chinese licensure were engaged in an alternative pathway to licensure, a pilot project funded through the Ohio Department of Education.
- ***** The principalship licensure programs have duplicate counts since an individual may seek more than one level of licensure; therefore, there were 43 candidates in the principalship program.
- ***** These are duplicate counts since the candidates in the School Audiologist and School Speech-Language Pathologist programs were seeking both licensures.

In addition, please note that in accordance with Ohio Department of Education policy, data regarding endorsements which fall under Advanced Teacher Preparation are to be collected beginning fall 2008; therefore, approved endorsements are not listed above. Likewise, school nurse and school social work programs are not listed under Other Professional School Roles preparation programs because, according to the *Board of Examiners Update Spring 2004*, page 5, these programs are not included in NCATE reviews. It is also noted that under the NCATE-State Partnership agreement at the time of the November 2005 visit, unit and program assessments were not tied to program approval. Under the most recent NCATE-State Partnership agreement, assessment data will be critical to the program approval process for 2010 submissions.

Professional Education Faculty

Table 4 reports the size of the professional education faculty (including adjuncts, emeriti, lecturers, visiting professors, etc.), the number of graduate teaching associates who taught education courses and/or supervised field placements, and the number of unit administrators as of autumn quarter 2007. The table shows comparisons of the size of the professional education faculty with the full-time equivalency (FTE) of faculty within the respective college or department in which the professional education faculty are housed.

Table 4: Size of the Professional Education Faculty

College or Department	FTE Faculty in College or Department	Full-Time Professional Education Faculty	Part-Time Professional Education Faculty	Professional Education Graduate Teaching Associates	Unit Administration
The Arts (Art, Dance, and Music)	150	27	4	6	3*
Human and Community Resource Development (Agricultural Education)	42	5	1	4	1*
Education and Human Ecology	291	146	68	48	9**
Social and Behavioral Sciences (Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology)	14	5	4	1	1*
TOTALS	497	183	77	59	14
GRAND TOTAL of Professional Education Faculty		319			

* full-time within the unit, but part-time administrator

** five full-time administrators and four part-time regional campus administrators

Academic Rank of Professional Education Faculty

Table 5 reports the academic rank, as of autumn quarter 2007, for the 319 professional education faculty listed above.

Table 5: Academic Rank of Professional Education Faculty

	Number of Faculty with Tenure	Number of Faculty on Tenure Track	Number of Faculty Not on Tenure Track
Professors	47	0	0
Associate Professors	69	2	1
Assistant Professors	1	39	3
Visiting Faculty	0	0	8
Lecturers	0	0	65
Adjunct Faculty	0	0	2
Graduate Teaching Associates	0	0	59
Other (<i>includes Temporary Emeriti Faculty</i>)	3	0	20
Total	120	41	158
GRAND TOTAL of Professional Education Faculty	319		

Programs Offered Off-Campus or Via Distance Learning Technologies

All programs are offered on the Columbus campus. The four regional campuses provide *initial* and *advanced* teacher preparation in Early Childhood Education and Middle Childhood Education. No programs are offered via distance learning technologies.

Substantive Changes that have Taken Place Since the Last Visit

Just prior to and since the November 2005 NCATE Board of Examiners visit, substantive changes impacting the unit that have taken place include:

Date	Change
July 2005	Dr. David A. Andrews appointed interim dean of College of Education and interim head of educator preparation unit while serving as dean of College of Human Ecology.
December 2005	NCATE data manager position created.
January 2006	Dr. Rebecca Kantor-Martin named director of School of Teaching and Learning.
January 2006	Responsibility for unit assessment system transferred from an ad hoc task force to University Teacher Education Council (UTEC).
Spring 2006	Endorsements approved through the Ohio Department of Education for Gifted Intervention Specialist, Literacy Specialist, and Middle Childhood Education Generalist (Language Arts and Reading, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies).

Substantive Changes that have Taken Place Since the Last Visit (continued)

Date	Change
Spring 2006	UTEC approved new conceptual frameworks.
July 2006	College of Education merged with College of Human Ecology to become College of Education and Human Ecology (EHE) and Dr. David Andrews appointed dean of EHE
Summer 2006	Unit assessment system redesigned to align with the three new conceptual frameworks.
Autumn 2006	Technology used to maintain unit assessment system reconfigured to document the ongoing use of candidate assessment data for making decisions regarding a candidate's movement from one decision point to the next.
Winter 2007	Dr. Bruce Kimball named director of School of Educational Policy and Leadership.
October 1, 2007	Dr. Gordon Gee became president of The Ohio State University for second time.
December 2007	Dr. David A. Andrews resigned as dean of EHE and head of the educator preparation unit; Dr. Sandra Stroot named interim dean and interim head of the unit.
Winter 2008	Annual educator preparation assessment retreat instituted to provide formal structure to ensure assessment data are analyzed and used for making decisions.

Summary

The Ohio State University is a complex institution in and of itself. Likewise, so is the educator preparation unit. As decisions and changes are made within the unit, they must often be done so in the context of the structures and issues occurring within the Colleges of the unit, and in dialogue with the approximately 230 non-professional education faculty in those Colleges.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

At the time of the 2005 NCATE visit, there was one conceptual framework serving all three preparation levels – *initial* teacher preparation, *continuing* teacher preparation, and *other professional school roles* preparation. Early 2006, this one document was rewritten, resulting in three different frameworks, one for each preparation level. The vision, mission, philosophy, and purpose are the same for all three preparation levels; however, the institutional goals, knowledge-bases, candidate proficiencies, and assessment systems are different across the three levels. Thus, it may be viewed from the perspective that there is one conceptual framework in which the vision, mission, philosophy, and purpose are held, and three prongs (*initial* teacher preparation, *advanced* teacher preparation, and *other professional school roles* preparation) which hold the institutional goals, knowledge-bases, candidate proficiencies, and assessment systems for each of the three different preparation levels.

The **vision** of The Ohio State University educator preparation unit *is to produce the best educators in the nation and throughout the world who have the passion, efficacy, and expertise for educating all P-12 school age and demographic groups.*

The **mission** of the educator preparation unit of The Ohio State University *is to prepare educators, through the generation and use of research, who are highly qualified for and who are passionate about maximizing student learning across all P-12 school age and demographic groups.*

The propensity to learn is the unique, defining characteristic of one's humanity. The University values learning, and the unit stands at the heart of this intention. This commitment to learning serves as the unit's **philosophical** foundation. Drawing upon various disciplines and methodologies, the unit's central focus is to address learning across all P-12 school age and demographic groups.

The unit's faculty, staff, and candidates dedicate themselves to developing a thorough understanding of education and the various goals, assumptions, and policies that undergird it. Members of the unit commit to improving the practice of education so that teaching and learning are effective and meaningful to educators, learners, and the broader community. Furthermore, the unit is intent on assisting professionals in becoming informed and effective educational leaders.

Philosophically, the unit is committed to ensuring that its candidates in *initial* and *advanced* teacher preparation and in *other professional school roles* preparation develop a specific set of knowledge, skills, and dispositions. These expectations may be found on pages 3 and 4 of each conceptual framework.

The **purpose** of the educator preparation unit at The Ohio State University *is to generate and implement research-based practices that support and sustain the development of educational professionals across their careers.*

Coherent with the philosophy and purpose described above, **institutional goals** provide direction for developing and aligning curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practices/internships, and candidate assessments. The goals call for candidates to have a commitment to:

Initial Teacher Preparation

- General and Subject-Matter Knowledge
- Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills
- Professional Dispositions

Advanced Teacher Preparation

- General and Subject-Matter Knowledge
- Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills
- Professional Dispositions

Other Professional School Roles Preparation

- General and Field of Work Knowledge
- Professional Knowledge and Skills
- Professional Dispositions

The **knowledge-base** for each conceptual framework may be found at <https://ncate.osu.edu/docs/> [CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS]. The knowledge-bases are designed to synthesize the theories, research, wisdom of practice, and educational policies which support the need for each goal of the respective conceptual framework. In particular, the knowledge-base for *initial* teacher preparation gives attention to a general education foundation, knowledge of subject-matter, conducive environments, fairness, culturally responsive teaching, efficacy, reflective practice, dispositions, and technology. The knowledge-base for *advanced* teacher preparation focuses on a general education foundation, deep knowledge, efficacy, culturally responsive teaching, data-driven decision making, and dispositions. The knowledge-base for *other professional school roles* preparation centers on a general education foundation, deep knowledge, culturally responsive teaching, efficacy, cognitive development, technology, data driven decision making, and dispositions.

In keeping with the mission, philosophy, and knowledge-bases of each conceptual framework, **candidate proficiencies** are articulated, specifying what a candidate is expected to know and be able to do and the dispositions he/she is expected to demonstrate by the conclusion of a program. The proficiencies align with the respective institutional goals, and the professional and state standards noted below:

Initial Teacher Preparation

- NCATE Standard 2: Elements 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 (NCATE Standards 2002 Edition)
- Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession
- Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching Test
- Praxis III Classroom Performance Assessment Domains and Criteria

Advanced Teacher Preparation

- NCATE Standard 2: Elements 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 (NCATE Standards 2002 Edition)
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

Other Professional School Roles Preparation

- NCATE Standards2: Elements 2, 5, 6, and 8 (NCATE Standards 2002 Edition)
- Respective Specialized Professional Association (SPA) Standards
- Respective Praxis II Specialty Area Test

As with the knowledge-bases, the specific candidate proficiencies for each preparation level may be accessed at [CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS].

The **unit assessment system** is described in detail in the document, Unit Assessment System, which may be accessed at [UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM]. In general, there are two phases to the unit assessment system. Phase One of the system is designed to gather candidate data to help candidates improve their

performances and determine their movement from one decision point to the next. Phase Two is designed to gather data regarding candidates, program completers, the programs of the unit, and the unit as a whole. This second set of data is used to make programmatic decisions and decisions about the overall management and operations of the unit.

STANDARD 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

A full description of the Unit Assessment System may be found at [**UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM**].

Element 1: Assessment System

Where may the evidence be found for Element 1?

The chart below is a screen shot of the documents found at [EVIDENCE FOR STANDARD 2: ELEMENT 1]. Under the Acceptable Level Competency column is a listing of the components of the Acceptable Level of Competency rubric found within the NCATE Standards for this element. When visiting the web site, <https://ncate.osu.edu/docs/>, the reader may click on the documents listed under the Evidence column to access a particular artifact.

Chart 1: Evidence for Element 1 - Assessment System

	Acceptable Level Competency		Evidence
1	<i>Assessment system built with input from professional community</i>	1.1	Previous Assessment System Task Force membership list – <i>highlight non-OSU people</i>
		1.2	2006-2007 UTEC membership list – <i>highlight non-OSU people</i>
		1.3	UTEC Approval of new conceptual frameworks and unit assessment system
		1.4	UTEC Minutes 11.29.07 <i>re: New UTEC sub-committee of assessment users</i>
2	<i>Assessment system reflects conceptual framework</i>	2.1	Alignment of assessment system with conceptual framework ATP
		2.2	Alignment of assessment system with conceptual framework ITP
		2.3	Alignment of assessment system with conceptual framework OPSR
3	<i>Assessment system reflects professional and state standards</i>	3.1	ATP alignment with state and professional standards
		3.2	ITP alignment with state and professional standards
		3.3	Educational Administration alignment with state and professional standards
		3.4	School Audiologist alignment with state and professional standards
		3.5	School Counselor alignment with state and professional standards
		3.6	School Psychologist alignment with state and professional standards
		3.7	Speech Language alignment with state and professional standards
4	<i>Assessment system monitors candidate performance</i>	4.1	Assessment System and Assessments for ATP
		4.2	Assessment System and Assessments for ITP
		4.3	Assessment System and Assessments for OPSR

Chart 1(continued)

	Acceptable Level Competency		Evidence
--	------------------------------------	--	-----------------

5	<i>Assessment system data used to manage and improve operations</i>	5.1	Unit Management and Operations Assessment System
		5.2	Unit Management and Operations Assessment System Forms
6	<i>Assessment system data used to manage and improve programs</i>	6.1	Unit Management and Operations Assessment System
		6.2	Unit Management and Operations Assessment System Forms
7	<i>Assessment system includes multiple assessments at each decision point</i>	7.1	Assessment System for ATP
		7.2	Assessment System for ITP
		7.3	Assessment System for OPSR
8	<i>Assessment system includes decision points at admission, at appropriate transition points, and completion</i>	8.1	Assessment System for ATP
		8.2	Assessment System for ITP
		8.3	Assessment System for OPSR
9	<i>Assessments are used to make decisions at each decision point</i>	9.1	UTEC policy and procedures <i>re: use of data to make decisions</i>
		9.2	Screen shot of linear progression
		9.3	Screen shots of decisions made regarding candidate performance
		9.4	Aggregation of decision point data
10	<i>Assessments are predictors of candidate success</i>	10.1	Alignment of ITP General Knowledge and SMK assessments with Praxis III
		10.2	Praxis III domains, criteria, and passage rates for ITP
		10.3	Passage Rates praxis II PLT Tests for ITP
		10.4	Passage Rates Praxis II Specialty Area Tests for ITP
		10.5	Passage Rates Praxis II Specialty Area Tests for OPSR
11	<i>Assessments are bias free</i>	11.1	Freedom-of-Bias Study Report
12	<i>The fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessments have been established</i>	12.1	Reliability Report

How is the unit assessment system evaluated and refined? Who is involved?

The unit assessment system was originally developed during the 2003-2004 academic year by an ad hoc task force. In early 2006, oversight of the system was transferred to the University Teacher Education Council (UTEC). UTEC membership includes representatives of the professional education faculty, arts and sciences faculty, and partner school districts. With the re-conceptualization of the conceptual framework into three different frameworks – one for *initial* teacher preparation, one for *advanced* teacher preparation, and one for *other professional school roles* preparation – the phase of the unit assessment designed to gather data regarding candidate performances was reconfigured to be aligned with the respective conceptual frameworks. These reconfigurations were completed through and approved by UTEC.

In addition, since the 2005 NCATE Board of Examiners visit, an annual educator preparation assessment retreat has been instituted. At this annual session, the unit assessment system is evaluated. Recommendations from this retreat are forwarded to UTEC for final approval. The head of the unit is then charged with facilitating the implementation of those recommendations approved by UTEC.

How does the unit ensure that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit’s conceptual frameworks, state standards, and professional standards?

Each of the three conceptual frameworks [CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS] articulates the proficiencies candidates are expected to achieve by the conclusion of their respective programs. The proficiencies are aligned with professional and state standards as shown in the appendices of the respective frameworks. Each proficiency appears as an assessment item on one or more of the assessment instruments. Pages 4-5 of the Unit Assessment System document [UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM] provide the alignment between the assessment instruments and the candidate proficiencies.

What are the key assessments used to monitor candidate performance on standards and at what points are they administered in programs?

Key assessments used for *initial* teacher preparation include *General Knowledge Assessments I, II, and III; Subject-Matter and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessments I and II; Professional Dispositions Assessments I, II, and III; respective Praxis II Specialty Area and Principles of Learning and Teaching Tests; and Clinical Practice Grade.*

Key assessments for *advanced* teacher preparation include *General Knowledge Assessments I, II, and III; Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessments I and II; Subject-Matter Assessment; and Professional Dispositions Assessments I, II, and III.*

The key assessments for *other professional school roles* preparation are *General Knowledge Assessments I, II, and III; Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessments I and II; Professional Dispositions Assessments I, II, and III; and respective Praxis II Specialty Area Test.*

Pages 4-5 of the Unit Assessment System document [UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM] provide the alignment between the assessment instruments and the respective decision points.

What are the major transition points during programs and what assessments are used?

As stated in NCATE Standard 2: Element 1, assessments are to be “used to determine admission to, continuation in, and completion of programs.” Tables 6, 7, and 8 outline the decision points and respective assessments for each preparation level.

Table 6: Decision Points and Assessments for Initial Teacher Preparation

Decision Point 1:	Decision Point 2:	Decision Point 3:	Decision Point 4:
-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

Admission to the Program	Completion of Unit Assessment Field Experience	Admission to Clinical Practice	Completion of Clinical Practice
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Knowledge Assessment I • Professional Dispositions Assessment I 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I • Professional Dispositions Assessment II 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Knowledge Assessment II • Respective Praxis II Specialty Area Test 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Knowledge Assessment III • Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II • Professional Dispositions Assessment III • Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) Test • Clinical Practice Grade

Table 7: Decision Points and Assessments for Advanced Teacher Preparation

Decision Point 1: Admission to the Program	Decision Point 2: Admission to Culminating Experience	Decision Point 3: Completion of Culminating Experience
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Knowledge Assessment I • Professional Dispositions Assessment I 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Knowledge Assessment II • Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I • Professional Dispositions Assessment II 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Knowledge Assessment III • Subject-Matter Knowledge Assessment • Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II • Professional Dispositions Assessment III

Table 8: Decision Points and Assessments for Other Professional School Roles Preparation

Decision Point 1: Admission to the Program	Decision Point 2: Admission to Culminating	Decision Point 3: Completion of Culminating

	Internship	Internship
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Knowledge Assessment I • Professional Dispositions Assessment I 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Knowledge Assessment II • Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment I • Professional Dispositions Assessment II 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Knowledge Assessment III • Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment II • Respective Praxis II Specialty Area Test • Professional Dispositions Assessment III

How are candidates performing on the assessments not reported in national/state program reports?

Table 9 summarizes the success of applicants and candidates in *initial* teacher preparation from September 1, 2006-August 31, 2007 in meeting the expected criterion level for each assessment noted above.

Table 9: Success Level of Applicants and Candidates in Initial Teacher Preparation

Assessment	Criterion	Success Rate
<i>Decision Point 1</i>		
General Knowledge Assessment I	2.75 (undergraduate) / 3.00 (graduate)	92.24%
Professional Dispositions Assessment I	4 of the 7 dispositions rated at level 3 or higher	54.97%
<i>Decision Point 2</i>		
Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I	16 of the 23 criteria rated at level 2 or higher	US/M*: 97.4% C*: 99.8%
Professional Dispositions Assessment II	5 of the 7 dispositions rated at level 3 or higher	US*: 87.92% M*: 95.16% C: 98.02%
<i>Decision Point 3</i>		
General Knowledge Assessment II	2.75 (undergraduate) / 3.00 (graduate)	99.036%
Praxis II Specialty Area Test	Qualifying score set by State Board of Education	100 %
<i>Decision Point 4</i>		
General Knowledge Assessment III	2.75 (undergraduate) / 3.00 (graduate)	98.582%
Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II	20 of the 23 criteria rated at level 2 or higher	US: 97.91% M: 96.13% C: 99.01%
Professional Dispositions Assessment III	6 of the 7 dispositions rated at level 4	US: 59.82% M: 68.08% C: 66.53%

Table 9 (continued)

<i>Decision Point 4 (continued)</i>		
Praxis II Principles of Learning and	Qualifying score set by State Board of	94.33 %

Teaching (PLT) Test	Education	
Clinical Practice Grade	Grade of B or S	97.975 %

* US/M = assessment completed by university supervisor or mentor, US = assessment completed by university supervisor, M = assessment completed by mentor, and C = assessment completed by candidate

Table 10 summarizes the success of applicants and candidates in *advanced* teacher preparation from September 1, 2006-August 31, 2007 in meeting the expected criterion level for each assessment.

Table 10: Success Level of Applicants and Candidates in Advanced Teacher Preparation

Assessment	Criterion	Success Rate
Decision Point 1		
General Knowledge Assessment I	3.00	92.06%
Professional Dispositions Assessment I	4 of the 7 dispositions rated at level 3 or higher	97.50%
Decision Point 2		
General Knowledge Assessment II	3.00	100%
Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I	4 of the 5 criteria rated at level 2 or higher	FA*: 100% C*: 100%
Professional Dispositions Assessment II	6 of the 7 dispositions rated at level 3 or higher	FA: 100% C: 100%
Decision Point 3		
General Knowledge Assessment III	3.00	100%
Subject-Matter Knowledge Assessment	District documentation or qualifying score set by State Board of Education	100%
Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II	4 of the 5 criteria rated at level 3 or higher	US*: 81.25% C: 87.5%
Professional Dispositions Assessment III	6 of the 7 dispositions rated at level 4	US: 64.29% C: 40%

* FA = assessment completed by Faculty Advisor, C = assessment completed by candidate, and US = assessment completed by culminating experience supervisor

Table 11 summarizes the success of applicants and candidates in *other professional school roles* preparation from September 1, 2006-August 31, 2007 in meeting the expected criterion level for each assessment.

Table 11: Success Level of Applicants and Candidates in Other Professional Schools Roles Preparation

Assessment	Criterion	Success Rate
Decision Point 1		
General Knowledge Assessment I	3.00	100%
Professional Dispositions Assessment I	4 of the 7 dispositions rated at level 3 or higher	41.62%
Decision Point 2		
General Knowledge Assessment II	3.00	100%
Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment I	6 of the 8 criteria rated at level 2 or higher	FA*: 99.17% C*: 100%

Table 11 (continued)

Decision Point 2 (continued)

Professional Dispositions Assessment II	6 of the 7 dispositions rated at level 3 or higher	FA: 98.32% C: 98.63%
Decision Point 3		
General Knowledge Assessment III	3.00	100%
Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment II	6 of the 8 criteria rated at level 3 or higher	US*: 98.86% M*: 90.91% C: 97.78%
Praxis II Specialty Area Test	Qualifying score set by State Board of Education	65.217%
Professional Dispositions Assessment III	6 of the 7 dispositions rated at level 4	US: 78.65% M: 54.55% C: 71.74%

* FA = assessment completed by Faculty Advisor, C = assessment completed by candidate, US = assessment completed by culminating experience supervisor, and M = assessment completed by mentor

The achievement of candidates according to each competency on the above assessments may be accessed at [UNIT PROFILE] and [PROGRAM PROFILES].

What process has the unit adopted to ensure its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias?

The issues of fair, accurate, consistent, and unbiased assessment instruments are addressed through establishing content validity, reliability, and freedom-of-bias.

Content validity is established by the alignment of candidate proficiencies with professional and state standards. These alignments may be found in the appendices of the conceptual frameworks [CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS].

Reliability studies using 2003-2004 data were conducted for the previous assessment instrument. Likewise, reliability studies for the new assessment instruments were conducted using data from the past calendar year. Data regarding these studies may be accessed at [EVIDENCE FOR STANDARD 2: ELEMENT 1] by referring to the Reliability Report identified for competency 12.

The freedom-of-bias study was conducted by a group of doctoral students from the School of Educational Policy and Leadership reviewing each question on the following assessments in terms of bias toward ethnicity/race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographic area.

- Initial Teacher Preparation: *Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills*
- Advanced Teacher Preparation: *Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills*
- Other Professional School Roles Preparation: *Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills*
- All Preparation Levels: *Professional Dispositions*

Data regarding this study may be accessed at [EVIDENCE FOR STANDARD 2: ELEMENT 1] by referring to the Freedom-of-Bias Study Report identified for competency 11.

What assessments and evaluations are used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit?

The system for the regular assessment of the management and operations of the unit has as its foundation the NCATE unit capacity standards, standards 3-6. The schematic of this system appears in Appendix IV, page 13, of the Unit Assessment System document [**UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM**]. These assessments seek input from candidates, field placement coordinators, full-time professional education faculty, mentors, and university supervisors. Each population is asked to assess the unit management and operations within the assumed scope of their professional knowledge and expertise. The instruments used for these assessments may be accessed at [**EVIDENCE FOR STANDARD 2: ELEMENT 1**] by referring to competency 5, evidence 5.2: Unit Management and Operations Assessment System Forms, or the contents of these instruments may be viewed on pages 66-79 of [**UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM**].

In addition to these assessments, data regarding the competency of program completers and the efficiency and quality of the management and operations of the unit and its programs, are gathered through data from Praxis III Classroom Performance Assessments of Beginning Teachers, surveys of partner school districts, and the Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) initiative. The Praxis III Classroom Performance Assessments of Beginning Teachers instrument may be found in the Exhibit Room, while the content of the partner school district survey may be found on pages 86-87 of [**UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM**], and the content of the TQP surveys may be found on pages 80-85 of this same document.

Element 2: Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

Where may the evidence be found for Element 2?

The chart below is a screen shot of the documents found at [EVIDENCE FOR STANDARD 2: ELEMENT 2]. Under the Acceptable Level Competency column is a listing of the components of the Acceptable Level of Competency rubric found within the NCATE Standards for this element. When visiting the web site, <https://ncate.osu.edu/docs/>, the reader may click on the documents listed under the Evidence column to access a particular artifact.

Chart 2: Evidence for Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

	Acceptable Level Competency		Evidence
1	<i>Assessment system provides data regarding applicant qualifications</i>	1.1	ATP Assessment System, ATP PD 01 AC Assessment, and Decision Point 1 Data
		1.2	ITP Assessment System, ITP PD 01 AC Assessment, and Decision Point 1 Data
		1.3	OPSR Assessment System, OPSR PD 01 AC Assessments, and Decision Point 1 Data
2	<i>Assessment system provides data regarding candidate proficiencies</i>	2.1	Assessment Systems for ATP, ITP, OPSR
		2.2	ITP Subject Matter Knowledge (SMK) Assessment Decision Point 2
		2.3	ITP Subject Matter Knowledge (SMK) Assessment Decision Point 4
		2.4	ATP Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge (PPK) Assessment Decision Point 2
		2.5	ATP Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge (PPK) Assessment Decision Point 3
		2.6	OPSR Professional Knowledge (PK) Assessment Decision Point 2
		2.7	OPSR Professional Knowledge (PK) Assessment Decision Point 3
		2.8	ATP Professional Dispositions (PD) Assessments beyond Decision Point 1
		2.9	ITP Professional Dispositions (PD) Assessment beyond Decision Point 1
		2.10	OPSR Professional Dispositions (PD) Assessments beyond Decision Point 1
		2.11	Calculated Means ITP SMK Assessment Decision Point 2
		2.12	Calculated Means ITP SMK Assessment Decision Point 4
		2.13	Calculated Means ATP PPK Assessment Decision Point 2
		2.14	Calculated Means ATP PPK Assessment Decision Point 3
		2.15	Calculated Means OPSR PK Assessment Decision Point 2
		2.16	Calculated Means OPSR PK Assessment Decision Point 3
		2.17	Calculated Means ATP PD Assessment Decision Points 2 & 3

Chart 2 (continued)

	Acceptable Level Competency		Evidence
2	<i>Assessment system provides data regarding candidate proficiencies (continued)</i>	2.18	Calculated Means ITP PD Assessment Decision Points 2 & 4
		2.19	Calculated Means OPSR PD Assessment Decision Points 2 & 3
		2.20	Passage Rates Praxis II Specialty Tests ITP
		2.21	Passage Rates Praxis II Specialty Tests OPSR
		2.22	Passage Rates Praxis II PLT ITP
		2.23	Clinical Practice Passage Rates ITP
3	<i>Assessment system provides data regarding competency of graduates</i>	3.1	Passage rates for Praxis III assessment (historical data)
		3.2	Summary of school district personnel follow-up study
4	<i>Assessment system provides data regarding unit operations</i>	4.1	Unit Management and Operations Assessment System
		4.2	Unit Management and Operations Assessments
		4.3	Calculated means for Unit Management and Operations Assessments
		4.4	TQP Data
5	<i>Assessment system provides data regarding program quality</i>	5.1	2006-2007 Program Profile Reports
6	<i>Assessment data are collected from applicants</i>	6.1	Screen shot of Applicant Scores in MARX - Current ITP
		6.2	Screen shot of Applicant Scores in MARX - Current ATP
		6.3	Screen shot of Applicant Scores in MARX – Current OPSR
		6.4	Professional Dispositions Assessment I
		6.5	Application for admission forms
		6.6	Copies of letters of recommendations
		6.7	Summary of Decision Point 1: Admission to the Program Data - ATP
		6.8	Summary of Decision Point 1: Admission to the Program Data - ITP
		6.9	Summary of Decision Point 1: Admission to the Program Data - OPSR
7	<i>Assessment data are collected from candidates</i>	7.1	Assessment System and Candidate Assessments ATP
		7.2	Assessment System and Candidate Assessments ITP
		7.3	Assessment System and Candidate Assessments OPSR
		7.4	Calculated Means ITP SMK Decision Point 2
		7.5	Calculated Means ITP SMK Decision Point 4
		7.6	Calculated Means ATP PPK Decision Point 2
		7.7	Calculated Means ATP PPK Decision Point 3
		7.8	Calculated Means OPSR PK Decision Point 2
		7.9	Calculated Means OPSR PK Decision Point 3

Chart 2 (continued)

	Acceptable Level Competency		Evidence
7	<i>Assessment data are collected from candidates (continued)</i>	7.10	Calculated Means ITP PD Decision Points 2 & 4
		7.11	Calculated Means ATP PD Decision Points 2 & 3
		7.12	Calculated Means OPSR PD Decision Points 2 & 3
		7.13	Unit Management and Operations Candidate Assessment
		7.14	Calculated Means for Unit Management and Operations Candidate Assessment
		7.15	Calculated means from TQP preservice teacher data
8	<i>Assessment data are collected from recent graduates</i>	8.1	Calculated means from TQP inservice teacher data
9	<i>Assessment data are collected from faculty using internal sources</i>	9.1	Assessment System and University Supervisor/ Faculty Advisor Assessments ATP
		9.2	Assessment System and University Supervisor Assessments ITP
		9.3	Assessment System and University Supervisor/ Faculty Advisor Assessments OPSR
		9.4	Calculated Means ITP SMK Decision Point 2
		9.5	Calculated Means ITP SMK Decision Point 4
		9.6	Calculated Means ATP PPK Decision Point 2
		9.7	Calculated Means ATP PPK Decision Point 3
		9.8	Calculated Means OPSR PK Decision Point 2
		9.9	Calculated Means OPSR PK Decision Point 3
		9.10	Calculated Means ITP PD Decision Points 2 & 4
		9.11	Calculated Means ATP PD Decision Points 2 & 3
		9.12	Calculated Means OPSR PD Decision Points 2 & 3
		9.13	Educator Preparation Placement feedback/ discussion
		9.14	Unit Management and Operations Professional Education Faculty, Field Placement Coordinator, and University Supervisor Assessments
		9.15	Calculated Means for Unit Management and Operations Education Professional Education Faculty, Field Placement Coordinator, and University Supervisor Assessments
10	<i>Assessment data are collected from other members of professional community</i>	10.1	Assessment System and Mentor Assessments of Candidates ITP
		10.2	Assessment System and Mentor Assessments of Candidates OPSR
		10.3	Calculated Means ITP SMK Decision Point 4
		10.4	Calculated Means OPSR PK Decision Point 3
		10.5	Calculated Means ITP PD Decision Points 2 & 4
		10.6	Calculated Means OPSR PD Decision Points 3
		10.7	Passage rates for Praxis III assessment (historical data)

Chart 2 (continued)

	Acceptable Level Competency		Evidence
10	<i>Assessment data are collected from other members of professional community (continued)</i>	10.8	Calculated means from School Personnel Questionnaires
		10.9	Educator Preparation Student Placement feedback/discussion
		10.10	Unit Management and Operations Mentor Assessment
		10.11	Calculated Means for Unit Management and Operations Mentor Assessment
11	<i>Unit maintains a record of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions</i>	11.1	University policies regarding formal candidate complaints, maintenance, and resolutions
		11.2	Unit policy regarding formal candidate complaints, maintenance, and resolutions
		11.3	Unidentified copies of formal candidate complaints and resolutions
12	<i>Data are regularly and systematically compiled, summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance</i>	12.1	Screen shots of web-based assessment system
		12.2	Program Profile Reports
		12.3	Unit Profile Report
13	<i>Data are regularly and systematically compiled, summarized, and analyzed to improve program quality</i>	13.1	Program Profile Reports
14	<i>Data are regularly and systematically compiled, summarized, and analyzed to improve unit operations</i>	14.1	Unit Profile Report
15	<i>Unit maintains its assessment system through the use of information technologies</i>	15.1	Screen shots of web-based assessment system

What is the unit's timeline for collecting key assessment data related to candidates meeting standards and unit operations?

Pages 14-19 of the [UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM] provide the timeline for the collection of assessment data related to candidates and the management and operations of the unit.

What are the process and timeline used by the unit to collect, summarize, and analyze data?

- ***How are the data collected?***

Pages 14-19 of the [UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM] identify the process for data collection, most of which is completed through the in-house designed web-based data collection system, the OSU Educator Preparation Assessment System. The NCATE data manager is responsible for assigning candidate performance assessments each quarter to respective assessors using information provided by the Field Placement Office. Assignments are made and assessments are disseminated via the OSU Educator Preparation Assessment System.

In addition, the NCATE data manager is responsible for the electronic distribution of surveys via email to partner school districts each January using contact information provided by the Field Placement Office. Likewise, the data manager is responsible for assigning unit management and operations assessments via the OSU Educator Preparation Assessment System to the respective respondent groups (candidates, field placement coordinators, full-time professional education faculty, mentors, and university supervisors) each spring.

Praxis III Classroom Performance Assessment data collected for beginning teachers (January-May) are received via email attachment from the Ohio Department of Education each summer, and Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) survey data collected during the previous academic year are obtained from the Partnership leaders each fall at the Ohio Confederation of Teacher Education Organizations (OCTEO) Conference and electronically.

- ***Whose responsibility is it to summarize the data?***

The NCATE data manager, under the supervision of the NCATE Coordinator, is responsible for the annual summarization of data. Through the OSU Educator Preparation Assessment System, data may be summarized at any point by data facilitators.

- ***Whose responsibility is it to analyze and interpret the data?***

It is the responsibility of the unit faculty and leadership, university supervisors, school partners, and candidates to analyze and interpret the data that are collected and summarized. This is formally done at the annual educator preparation assessment retreat.

- ***In what format are the data summarized?***

The Unit Profile Report and Program Profile Report templates found on pages 20-134 of the [UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM] serve as the frameworks for the annual summarization of data. These reports, for the most part, consist of tables providing mean scores for assessment items and percentages of candidates meeting expected criterion levels.

- ***In what format are the data analyzed and interpreted?***

Because data may be summarized at any point by using the OSU Educator Preparation Assessment System, those interested may informally analyze and interpret the data. However, in response to the report following the November 2005 NCATE BOE visit, the unit instituted an annual educator preparation assessment retreat for the purpose of providing a formal structure for analyzing the data collected over the previous year. Unit faculty and leadership, university supervisors, school partners, and candidates engage in analyzing and interpreting unit and respective program data. They are then involved in making recommendations regarding the management and operations of the unit, the programs of the unit, and the unit assessment system.

- ***How often are the data summarized?***

Data are summarized annually in preparation for the annual educator preparation assessment retreat. However, they may be summarized at any point by using the OSU Educator Preparation Assessment System for informal review.

- ***How often are the data analyzed and interpreted?***

In response to the Report of the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board following the November 2005 NCATE BOE visit, the unit instituted an annual educator preparation assessment retreat for the purpose of providing a formal structure for analyzing the data collected over the previous year.

Unit faculty and leadership, university supervisors, school partners, and candidates engage in analyzing unit and respective program data. They are then involved in making recommendations regarding the management and operations of the unit, the programs of the unit, and the unit assessment system.

However, by using the OSU Educator Preparation Assessment System, data may be informally analyzed and interpreted at any point.

- ***What information technologies are used to maintain the unit's assessment system?***

During summer and fall 2004, the College's Office of Technology and Enhanced Learning built the web-based technology data collection system specifically for the purpose of collecting and summarizing unit assessment data. This system is known as the OSU Educator Preparation Assessment System.

Refinements to the system have been ongoing. Consideration has been given during the past year to the possibility of contracting with an outside vendor who has built technology specifically designed for the collection and summarization of the data called for in the NCATE standards. At this time no decision has been made regarding such action.

How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions?

Pages 8-9 of [UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM] articulate the procedures used by the unit in acting on and maintaining records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions.

Element 3: Use of Data for Program Improvement

Where may the evidence be found for Element 3?

The chart below is a screen shot of the documents found at [EVIDENCE FOR STANDARD 2: ELEMENT 3]. Under the Acceptable Level Competency column is a listing of the components of the Acceptable Level of Competency rubric found within the NCATE Standards for this element. When visiting the web site, <https://ncate.osu.edu/docs/>, the reader may click on the documents listed under the Evidence column to access a particular artifact.

Chart 3: Evidence for Use of Data for Program Improvement

	Acceptable Level Competency		Evidence
1	<i>Unit uses candidate data to evaluate the efficacy of its courses</i>	1.1	Program Profile Reports
		1.2	Unit Profile Report
		1.3	Report of Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat
2	<i>Unit uses graduate performance data to evaluate the efficacy of its courses</i>	2.1	Program Profile Reports
		2.2	Unit Profile Report
		2.3	Report of Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat
3	<i>Unit uses candidate data to evaluate the efficacy of its programs</i>	3.1	Program Profile Reports
		3.2	Unit Profile Report
		3.3	Report of Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat
4	<i>Unit uses graduate performance data to evaluate the efficacy of its programs</i>	4.1	Program Profile Reports
		4.2	Unit Profile Report
		4.3	Report of Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat
5	<i>Unit uses candidate data to evaluate the efficacy of its clinical experiences</i>	5.1	Program Profile Reports
		5.2	Unit Profile Report
		5.3	Report of Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat
6	<i>Unit uses graduate performance data to evaluate the efficacy of its clinical experiences</i>	6.1	Program Profile Reports
		6.2	Unit Profile Report
		6.3	Report of Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat

Chart 3 (continued)

	Acceptable Level Competency		Evidence
--	-----------------------------	--	----------

7	<i>Unit analyzes program evaluation and performance assessment data to initiate changes where indicated</i>	7.1	Process, rationale, and data used to make decisions regarding advanced teacher preparation programs
		7.2	Report of Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat
8	<i>Candidate assessment data are shared regularly with candidates to help reflect on their performance and improve it</i>	8.1	Screen shot of candidate log-in to unit assessment system to own data
9	<i>Assessment data are regularly shared with faculty to help reflect on performance and improve it</i>	9.1	Screen shot of faculty log-in to unit assessment system to own data
		9.2	Program profile reports
		9.3	Unit profile report

What do assessment data indicate about candidate performance?

Candidate performance assessment data for 2006-2007 may be found in the [UNIT PROFILE] for each decision point. These data, collected for the first time using the new assessment instruments developed after the three new conceptual frameworks were written, are summarized below according to the three preparation levels.

Initial Teacher Preparation (reference Table 9, pages 21-22 of IR)

On the Decision Point 2 Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I, 97.4 percent of the candidates were rated as meeting the criterion by university supervisors/mentors, while 99.8 percent of the candidates rated themselves as meeting the criterion. At this same decision point, 87.92 percent of the university supervisors rated candidates as meeting the criterion for Professional Dispositions Assessment II, while 95.16 percent of the mentors rated candidates as meeting the criterion, and 98.02 percent of the candidates rated themselves as meeting the criterion.

At Decision Point 3, 99.036 percent of the candidates met the criterion for General Knowledge Assessment II. The percentage of candidates passing the Praxis II Specialty Area test at this decision point was 88.82; however, the requirement to pass this Praxis II assessment was added to the assessment system spring 2006. The majority of candidates had already been admitted to programs for 2006-2007 by this point so this requirement was viewed as a new condition following admission; thus, in some cases this requirement was waived for movement to Decision Point 4. For the 88.82 percent who took the test, there was a 100 percent passage rate. It should also be noted that there is no Praxis II content test in Ohio for agricultural education.

At Decision Point 4, 98.582 percent of the candidates met the criterion for General Knowledge Assessment III. At the same decision point, 97.91 percent of the university supervisors rated candidates as meeting the criterion for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II while 96.13 percent of the mentors rated candidates as meeting the criterion and 99.01 percent of the candidates rated themselves as meeting the criterion. Likewise, for Professional Dispositions Assessment III at Decision Point 4, 59.82 percent of the university supervisors rated candidates as meeting the criterion, while

68.08 percent of the mentors rated candidates as meeting the criterion, and 66.53 percent of the candidates rated themselves as meeting the criterion.

In addition to the above Decision Point 4 data, 94.33 percent of the candidates passed the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching Test (PLT). Those candidates who passed this test were considered Decision Point 4 completers as well as program completers. This percentage only represents the percentage of candidates who took this assessment by the conclusion of the 2006-2007 academic year. One hundred percent of those 94.33 percent who took the test passed it. Decision Point 4 also includes the completion of Clinical Practice with a grade of B or S. There was a 97.975 percent passage rate on this assessment.

As noted on page 5 of [UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM], a benchmark has been set that the aggregate ratings of candidate assessments, based on the established criterion for each decision point assessment, should be at least 80 percent. In reference to the data summarized above, this benchmark was met in all cases except for Professional Dispositions Assessment III. The reader will find later in this IR (page 40) a recommendation (23.3) made at the First Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat regarding the criterion set for this assessment as well as others. In reviewing the passage rates for all assessments other than Professional Dispositions Assessment III, the rates range from 87.92 to 99.8; thus providing documentation that those candidates in initial teacher preparation performed well above the expected benchmark.

The unit assessment system also looks beyond candidate performances while in the program to their performances as beginning teachers. A review of Praxis III Classroom Performance Assessment data, a state assessment completed by external assessors regarding the performances of program completers in their first year of teaching, documented that 98.576 percent passed this assessment during the 2006-2007 academic year. These data represent the performances of the 2005-2006 cohort of program completers who were beginning teachers during 2006-2007. More detailed results of this assessment may be found on page 29 of the [UNIT PROFILE].

Pages 68-69 of the [UNIT PROFILE] present the results of the questionnaire completed by school district partners. On a four-point scale (1-4), with "4" being high, all but one of the proficiencies of program graduates had mean scores of 3.000 or above. The proficiency not receiving a score in this range (2.875) was "work with parents." The reader will find later in this IR (page 39) three recommendations (8, 10, and 19.3) made at the First Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat regarding this proficiency.

Advanced Teacher Preparation (reference Table 10, page 22 of IR)

At Decision Point 2, 100 percent of the candidates met the criterion for General Knowledge Assessment II. On the Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I at this same decision point, 100 percent of the candidates were rated as meeting the criterion by faculty advisors, while 100 percent of the candidates rated themselves as meeting the criterion. Again, at this same decision point, 100 percent of the faculty advisors rated candidates as meeting the criterion for Professional Dispositions Assessment II, as did 100 percent of the candidates themselves.

At Decision Point 3, 100 percent of the candidates met the criterion for General Knowledge Assessment III. On the Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II at this same decision point, 81.25 percent of the candidates were rated as meeting the criterion by university supervisors, while 87.50 percent of the candidates rated themselves as meeting the criterion. Again, at this same decision point, 64.29 percent of the university supervisors rated candidates as meeting the criterion for Professional Dispositions Assessment III, while 40 percent of the candidates rated themselves as meeting the criterion.

This same decision point includes a Subject Matter Assessment. It is noted that a Career Technical Education candidate's satisfactory level of subject matter is determined by school district personnel prior to the district's recommendation that the individual pursue the Career Technical Education licensure program. Likewise, in

order to enroll in the advanced teacher preparation music education program, the applicant must currently hold a license to teach music; thus, documentation of the applicant's subject matter knowledge is derived from their having passed the Praxis II Specialty Area Test in Music prior to being recommended for initial licensure. In both of these cases, Career Technical Education and Music Education, there will always be a 100 percent passage rate because of these stated entrance requirements into the respective programs. The passage rate on the Subject Matter Assessment (respective Praxis II Specialty Area Test) was 100 percent for those in the Visually Impaired program. There were no candidates at Decision Point 3 in Adapted Physical Education nor in the Hearing Impaired program during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Looking beyond the decision points to when candidates are program completers, data from school district partners provided mean scores on eight of the nine assessed proficiencies ranging from 3.000-3.750 using a four-point scale (1-4), with "4" being high. The proficiency not receiving a score in this range (2.875) was "synthesize research and policies that impact their work." The reader will find later in this IR (page 39) a recommendation (19.4) made at the First Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat regarding this proficiency.

Other Professional School Roles Preparation (reference Table 11, pages 22-23 of IR)

At Decision Point 2, 100 percent of the candidates met the criterion for General Knowledge Assessment II. On the Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment I at this same decision point, 99.17 percent of the candidates were rated as meeting the criterion by faculty advisors, while 100 percent of the candidates rated themselves as meeting the criterion. Again, at this same decision point, 98.32 percent of the faculty advisors rated candidates as meeting the criterion for Professional Dispositions Assessment II, while 98.63 percent of the candidates themselves as meeting the criterion.

At Decision Point 3, 100 percent of the candidates met the criterion for General Knowledge Assessment III. On the Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment II at this same decision point, 98.86 percent of the candidates were rated as meeting the criterion by university supervisors, 90.91 percent of the candidates were rated as meeting the criterion by mentors, and 97.78 percent of the candidates rated themselves as meeting the criterion. Again, at this same decision point, 78.65 percent of the university supervisors rated candidates as meeting the criterion for Professional Dispositions Assessment III, while only 54.55 of the mentors rated candidates as meeting the criterion and only 71.74 percent of the candidates rated themselves as meeting the criterion.

In addition to the above Decision Point 3 data, only 65.217 percent of the candidates passed the Praxis II Specialty Area Test. One explanation for this low percentage is that the aggregate is based on Praxis II test takers as well as on those who were at this decision point, but who did not take the test. Many candidates at this preparation level wait to take the Praxis II assessment and seek licensure until such time that they decide to seek employment in the respective "other professional school role." Thus, the low percentage is not based on the poor performance of test takers, but on the fact that those at the decision point who have not taken the test are considered as having not passed the test. For those taking the test by the conclusion of the 2006-2007 academic year, there was a 100 percent passage rate.

Based on the above data, concern exists with the percentage of candidates (54.55 and 71.74) not meeting the criterion for the Professional Dispositions Assessment III. As with Initial Teacher Preparation, frustration exists with the current criterion for this particular assessment. As noted earlier, the reader will find later in the IR (page 40) a recommendation (23.3) made at the First Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat regarding the criterion set for this assessment.

How are data used by candidates and faculty to improve their performance?

The General Knowledge Assessments are used by faculty advisors in advising students about the quality of their overall academic work.

Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessments for *initial* teacher preparation, Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessments for *advanced* teacher preparation, Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessments for *other professional school roles* preparation, and Professional Dispositions Assessments for all three preparation levels are used to promote productive reflection in two- and three-way conferences between and among candidates, university supervisors, faculty advisors, and mentors.

Educational Testing Service (ETS) reports regarding performance on Praxis II assessments are used to focus the remedial work of those candidates not passing the respective test(s). Dr. Christopher Zirkle of the Career Technical Integrated Business program has produced a DVD available to all students to use as a tool for preparing for the Praxis II PLT Test. A copy of this DVD is available in the exhibit room.

How are data used to discuss or initiate program or unit changes on a regular basis?

While slow in coming, the First Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat was held; was well received; and was productive in using data to make decisions. Program areas have long had the tradition of retreating to make programmatic changes based on program data. Finding an efficient structure for bringing together a large group of representatives to review unit data and make unit decisions has been a challenge. The First Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat provided a productive setting in which to accomplish the intended goals – analyzing the data and making decisions based upon the data. Thus, the format is in place, and initial planning has already begun for the Second Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat scheduled for Friday, January 30, 2009.

The agenda for the First Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat follows:

First Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat

Friday, February 1, 2008

11:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

807 Kinnear Road, Room 201

AGENDA

- 11:00 Registration Begins
- 11:30 Lunch and Table Group Review of Unit Profile
- 12:00 Welcome, the Accreditation Status of the Educator Preparation Program, and Overview of the Afternoon and Introductions
- 12:15 Preparation for the April 20-22, 2008 Focused Visit
- 12:25 Use of Candidate Data to Make Decisions re: Candidates
- 12:30 Review of Unit Profile
- 12:45 Table Group Identification of Unit Level Areas for Improvement
- 1:30 Reaching Consensus on Unit Level Areas for Improvement
- 2:00 BREAK and Regroup by Program Areas
- 2:15 Review of Program Profiles and Making Program Decisions

What data-driven changes have occurred since the November 2005 visit?

Data-Driven Unit Changes made 2005-2008

1. While the unit conceptual framework developed spring 2003 brought together the sectors of the unit to jointly develop a framework to provide direction for the unit, it was soon discovered that the same goals and candidate proficiencies across all preparation levels were not serving the different levels well due to distinct differences among the levels. Because of this ongoing concern, the conceptual framework developed spring quarter 2003 was revisited in early 2006 resulting in three different frameworks – one for *initial* teacher preparation, one for *advanced* teacher preparation, and one for *other professional school roles* preparation. While the vision, mission, philosophy, and purpose of the unit remained the same across the unit, the goals and candidate proficiencies were written to be more specific to the respective preparation levels. The newly developed conceptual frameworks were approved by the University Teacher Education Council (UTEC) during spring quarter 2006.
2. With the writing of the new conceptual frameworks, new assessments were developed for each preparation level to align with the new sets of candidate proficiencies. The new assessments were then implemented beginning autumn quarter 2006.
3. Following the implementation of the unit assessment system in 2004, feedback from the populations responsible for completing the assessments designed to assess candidate performances noted a lack of understanding of the prescribed rating scale – a six-point scale ranging from 1 to 6. In question was

the meaning of each point on the scale. While the reliability studies of these instruments were strong, those required to use the instruments were frustrated in completing the assessments. Because of this feedback, the scale was revised when the new assessment instruments were developed to align with the new conceptual frameworks. The six-point scale was replaced with a five-point scale, with a descriptor for each point, and each question having different descriptors. This new scale was implemented autumn quarter 2006 at the time the new assessments were put into place.

4. As the new assessments were developed for the unit assessment system, changes in terminology were applied to the assessment system. “Transition point” was re-titled “decision point” and “benchmark” was re-titled “criterion.” These changes were made to explicitly communicate to program areas that the intent of the assessment system is that it is to be used for thoughtful decision-making regarding a candidate’s progression across a program. The expectation is that decisions will be made at each decision point based on a specified set of criteria, rather than simply moving from one point to the next. While program areas may use their professional judgments in making decisions about candidate progression, they are held accountable for documenting, as appropriate, why a candidate may move to the next decision point even though the criteria for movement have not been met. This aspect of the assessment system was implemented beginning autumn quarter 2006.
5. In preparation for autumn quarter 2006, the web-based data collection system used to maintain assessment data, the OSU Educator Preparation Assessment System, was modified to allow for the ongoing recording of decisions made regarding the movement of a candidate across her/his program from one decision point to the next. The System now provides a horizontal view of each candidate’s progression.
6. As of autumn quarter 2006, data facilitators were identified for each program area(s) and regional campuses. The individuals named to these roles are held accountable for working with the NCATE Data Manager in the ongoing dissemination and collection of candidate performance assessments. This role was created due to the large number of programs and candidates at the various decision points each quarter across the five campuses. These individuals are held responsible for monitoring the completion of assessments and ensuring candidate decisions are made.
7. Two populations asked to complete the unit management and operations assessments were dropped spring quarter 2006. These populations were “unit administrators” and “graduates.” The reason for this change was duplication of collected data. Unit administrators are considered part of the professional education faculty and were asked to complete two assessments regarding the same basic issues. Input from graduates was gathered through the Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) survey; again, a duplication of collected data, resulting in non-responses.
8. Advanced teacher preparation includes those individuals who possess a certificate and/or license to teach, but who return or enroll for the first time in the institution for the purpose of enhancing their skills as a P-12 teacher. During 2006-2007, each program was asked to respond to the following set of questions for the purpose of determining whether the program(s) they offer should be considered advanced teacher preparation.
 - a. Is the *purpose* of your graduate program to allow those holding a teaching license to obtain one or more additional licensure areas?
 - b. Is the *purpose* of your graduate program to allow those holding a teaching license to enhance their current knowledge and skills as a P-12 teacher?
 - c. Is the *purpose* of your graduate program to prepare individuals for enrollment in advanced graduate studies?

As a result of this study, the following programs were labeled Advanced Teacher Preparation:

- Adapted Physical Education
- Hearing Impaired
- Music Education
- Route B Career and Technical Education
- Visually Impaired

In addition, the following endorsement programs have been approved through the Ohio Department of Education as Advanced Teacher Preparation.

- Adapted Physical Education
- Career-Based Intervention
- Gifted Intervention Specialist
- Language Arts and Reading 4-6 Generalist
- Literacy Specialist
- Mathematics 4-6 Generalist
- Pre-Kindergarten Special Needs
- Reading K-12
- Science 4-6 Generalist
- Social Studies 4-6 Generalist
- Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

In accordance with the guidelines of the Ohio Department of Education, data regarding the candidates in these endorsement programs need not be collected until fall 2008 in preparation for the 2011 NCATE BOE visit.

9. A significant change since the November 2005 NCATE BOE visit has been the implementation of the annual educator preparation assessment retreat. While the first retreat was not held until February 1, 2008, it proved to provide a structure to facilitate unit analysis and interpretation of assessment data as well as unit decision-making. Previous efforts of sharing unit data through program area heads and expecting decisions to be made proved to be futile. Likewise, UTEC analysis, interpretation, and decision-making were not effective due to the small number of individuals involved. The retreat, with 106 attendees from across all program areas and representing all populations, provided a formal and efficient structure to achieve its purposes.

Data-Driven Unit Changes made at February 1, 2008 First Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat

1. Field placement handbooks should include the conceptual framework, unit assessments used to monitor candidate performances, and criteria for movement from one decision point to the next.
2. Revise rubrics used for the admission of students into programs to align more closely with Professional Dispositions Assessment I.
3. Ensure that all candidates have opportunities for multiple placements in diverse environments.
4. Professors must consistently model best educational practices in their own teaching.
5. An entire program faculty should assess a candidate's readiness to begin the initial field experience.

6. Opportunities need to be increased for candidates to demonstrate a variety of teacher generated assessments and to explain how those assessments influence future lessons and state testing.
7. Each program area needs to identify where and when classroom management is addressed in their program.
8. Opportunities need to be increased for candidates to meet with parents and discuss student progress.
9. Mentors need to be more involved in making field placement decisions.
10. During field placements, candidates need to provide evidence of their abilities to communicate with parents by using a variety of methods.
11. Conferences with candidates and respective parties (mentors, university supervisors, etc.) need to be held to jointly complete assessments, discuss issues raised in evaluations, create plans to address such issues, and schedule follow-up meetings.
12. Placement schedules need to be reviewed to allow for consecutive days in the field.
13. Candidates should develop portfolios aligned with the candidate proficiencies assessed in the respective candidate assessments.
14. Communication needs to be enhanced with mentors.
15. Faculty need to help candidates more.
16. Candidates need to be provided with strategies for more meaningful reflection.
17. The professional dispositions, *schools as a reflection of society and teachers as agents of change and a belief that all students can learn and achieve reasonable standards and expectations*, need to be better articulated to candidates.
18. Each program area needs to identify where and when scope and sequence is addressed in their program.
19. Work with mentors to emphasize, in their work with candidates, the following:
 - 19.1 reflecting on practice
 - 19.2 planning and organizing meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn
 - 19.3 working with parents
 - 19.4 synthesizing research and policies that impact their work
 - 19.5 using data to make instructional decisions.
20. Change the grading system for internships, where applicable, from S/U to A-E to allow reflection on how satisfactory is a candidate's performance.
21. Ensure that those expected to complete unit assessment forms clearly understand the content and criterion of the respective assessment instrument.

22. Make revisions to the web-based data collection system used to maintain the unit assessment system as follows:
 - 22.1 add the criterion for each assessment at each decision point on the respective assessments.
 - 22.2 add a “comment” box at the bottom of each assessment.
 - 22.3 add an “alert system” when specific action by an assessor needs to be taken.
 - 22.4 add an “alert system” for program heads when candidates do not meet assessment criteria.
 - 22.5 review window tabs to identify those needing to be reworded to make their functions clearer and to add window tabs to distinguish between completion tracking and decision making.
 - 22.6 move “Preview All Forms” and add other public unit assessment system documents, such as guidelines for sample letters of recommendations aligned with Professional Dispositions Assessment proficiencies, to the initial screen of the <https://ncate.osu.edu> web site for public review.
23. Make revisions the unit assessment system as follows:
 - 23.1 consider having the program head determine whether ITP Professional Dispositions Assessment II should be optional for completion by a mentor.
 - 23.2 the value of the statement *Insufficient evidence is available to make a judgment about the applicant being able to develop the expectation* in Professional Dispositions Assessment I should be changed from “0” to NA so as to have no value when the mean for an item is calculated.
 - 23.3 review the “criterion levels” for each decision point to assess whether the expectations are currently too high.
 - 23.4 review the statistical analyses used for presentation of the data in unit and program profiles for the Annual Educator Preparation Retreat.
 - 23.5 require passage of the Praxis II PLT as a requirement for admission to clinical practice.

These recommendations have been forwarded to the University Teacher Education Council (UTEC) for final review. They will then be forwarded to the respective areas for action.

Data-Driven Programmatic Changes made 2005-2008

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

1. Student Teaching Handbook was updated based on feedback from cooperating teachers indicating that students were doing assignments at the last minute and feedback from university supervisors indicating that the records of evidence turned in at the completion of student teaching were declining in quality.
2. Modifications were made to program planning course based on Student Evaluation of Instruction Reports (SEIs) and qualitative feedback accompanying SEIs.

3. The Early Field Experience (EFE) Guidebook rubric was revised based on grades issued on the EFE were noted as less than quality work and from input from the focus group involved with grading the EFEs

ART EDUCATION

1. The criteria for admission items were revised based upon the new Decision Point 1 Professional Disposition Assessment I
2. Focused on “delivery and creation of instruction for all students” with candidates and mentors prior to Decision Point 2, based on revisions to the unit assessment system.
3. Introduced, as a pilot, candidates and mentors to all aspects of the new unit assessment system in the fall quarter orientation to assist them in preparation for the first student teaching site.

DRAMA EDUCATION

1. Because conversations with candidates confirmed that they were not “seeing” learning and teaching in field placements, a form was created for candidates to use their observations
2. Because of the realization from discussions with candidates that they were not seeing their field experiences as individual experiences, initiated use of Carmen site to record observations, allowing candidates to reflect collaboratively on field experiences.
3. Following an analysis of course work that candidates wanted to and needed to reflect back on work from previous assignments in the major, the decision was made to have course work used cumulatively.
4. Because students’ abilities to articulate their growth was significantly supported when they would use digital images and video clips presented in slideshows and digital stories, the decision was made to use electronic data for assignments and final portfolios.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

1. Based on feedback from principals and mentors, an advisory board was institutionalized.
2. Based on feedback from principals and mentors, developed a formative checklist based on PRAXIS III domains and criteria to be completed bi-monthly.
3. Based on feedback from professors, mentors, and candidates that candidates were not prepared to teach mathematics and science in preschool-grade 3, designed an additional mathematics course and an additional science course.
4. Based on meetings with program manager and aggregated data, revised technology from developing websites to more classroom practices.
5. Based on the need for increased consistency and improved candidate performance, developed template for meetings.
6. To ensure candidates receive necessary experiences prior to student teaching, developed suggested sequence for field placement from beginning of program through student teaching.

7. Based on candidate perceptions of lack of course relevance and lack of opportunities to implement practices, placed Inclusion course and Families and Communities course the same quarter to allow for integrated field placements.
8. Because candidates need to demonstrate competency to student teach, case study capstone was redesigned and placed at end of winter quarter.

EARLY AND MIDDLE CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (MARION CAMPUS)

1. Moved EDU T&L 739.xx to final quarter, based on comments from candidates and mentors.
2. Restructured schedule to sequence first and second method courses for MCE candidates.
3. Restructured student teacher evaluations to reflect the conceptual framework.
4. Changed student teacher handbook to reflect the conceptual framework.
5. Changed admissions application written response to speak to the professional dispositions.
6. Added topics to student teachers seminar based on student comments as to needed information.
7. Aligned student teacher evaluations with the conceptual framework, NCATE proficiencies, and Praxis domains and criteria.

EARLY AND MIDDLE CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (NEWARK CAMPUS)

1. Based on an analysis of the existing exit project, the exit project was revised.
2. Because of lack of student support in the content areas, focused assignment of faculty advisors.
3. Due to data gathered from course content review and evaluation of exit projects, better attention is given to selected topics in courses.
4. Based on feedback from school personnel, the delivery model has been restructured.
5. Based on an analysis of previous project assignments, pre- and post-assessments of student work to candidate projects has been added.
6. Based on research that showed the value of the field component to the development of teacher candidates, the timing of the field placement has been restructured to overlap quarters.
7. Due to candidate feedback and low enrollments, there is now flexible scheduling based on candidate and student needs.
8. Based on feedback from school personnel, there is now flexibly scheduling for some courses to be outside the regular university calendar.
9. Based on qualitative cases, and feedback from candidates and school personnel, a pilot a team-teaching course between special education and inclusion content and child guidance is in place.

10. Based on the analysis of exit projects, there is now a professional day for candidates on special education.
11. Based on the analysis of exit projects, and the need to support candidates' professional writing in how to appropriately integrated research, a writing instructor has been added to the program.
12. Based on the analysis of exit projects and program course content, a reflective thinking component to EDU PAES 289, EDU T&L 489, and EDU T&L 607.
13. Based on the lack of data on which to make decisions about student progress and readiness for student teaching, faculty retreats are held to discuss candidate progress.

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

1. Because passport assessments were dropped and it is burdensome for one person to complete assessment, readiness assessment for the field experience is assessed as a faculty group.
2. Based on the need for many of the accelerated program candidates to work during the day, courses have been moved to the evening during the second summer of the program.

ENGLISH EDUCATION

1. Based on other institutional tools and prior capstone projects, revised the portfolio rubric to better align with Praxis III criteria.
2. Based on mentor feedback regarding the need for candidates to develop better methods for shared knowledge and communication, candidates, supervisors, mentor teachers and faculty have participated in shared readings in order to facilitate collaboration across roles and responsibilities.
3. Based on the professional standards of NCTE, the evaluative tools for the multi-day teaching project and end of quarter evaluations were revised to align with NCTE and Praxis standards.
4. Because past experiences and practice indicate a need to increase communication that directly addresses candidate development, the decision was made to create a dialogic journal book during student teaching. Pre-service teachers, university supervisors, and mentor teachers write observations and reflections about the candidates' progress and competency levels.

FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES

1. Because candidates needed to encounter learning/teaching effective practices earlier in the program, EDU P & L 309 Educational Psychology and teaching models like cooperative learning were added as course/experience requirements.
2. To align with the unit assessment system, candidates must complete and pass the PRAXIS II assessments as called for in the system.
3. To align with the unit assessment system, candidates must hold a 2.75 g.p.a.
4. In an effort to recruit more candidates into the program, FCS ED 640 is conducted online.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

1. Based on results from target language interviews at Decision Point 1, now seat candidates with degrees in less commonly taught level 2 plus German foreign language dept for informal oral assessments.
2. Because the “extra” capstone component was found to be non-productive, the capstone was revised.

MATHEMATICS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION

1. After 11 years of seeing that end-of-program comprehensive examination proved to be an ineffective exercise, the combination research project and comprehension examination was changed a research project only.

MIDDLE CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

1. Since 1998, the middle childhood license has been the license for those seeking preparation to teach grades 4-9. This license called for candidates to be prepared to teach two of the four major subject areas (mathematics, reading and language arts, science, and social studies). Because of the ongoing concern from school district leadership across the state, legislative action was taken to permit middle childhood education generalist endorsements to allow a candidate to expand their employability beyond the initial two content areas. Because program completers with the two subject area limitation were finding it difficult to find employment, the unit sought approval to offer middle childhood endorsements in each of the four content areas, allowing program completers to return through advanced teacher preparation to broaden the areas for which they were licensed. Approval was granted for all four endorsements.
2. Based on discussions with candidates and mentor reports during quarterly meetings with university faculty, three additional meetings were held with mentors to find ways to incorporate more on classroom management into the MCE curriculum.
3. Based on a student teacher’s lack of submission of acceptable lesson plans, student teacher was pulled from student teaching, he was provided with a refresher in writing lesson plans, and later reassigned to a new mentor. Student teaching was completed after an additional quarter.
4. Based on data from B.3.3, an additional course on diversity, EDU T&L 815 was added to the program requirements.
5. Because of low scores on grade 4 mathematics and language arts proficiency tests, second methods courses were added for mathematics, science and social studies.
6. Based on a review of the course content for EDU T&L 601, the number of credit hours was reduced from four to three.
7. Based on a review of the course content for EDU T&L 701, the course was dropped and the content was placed in EDU T&L 601 and EDU T&L 603 to enhance integration of the content.

MUSIC EDUCATION

1. Based on the standards for admission, data (e.g. teaching sample, observations from discussions and interactions with children on schools) from Music 470 (2nd year Music Ed. Course) is included in the decision for admission into initial teacher preparation.
2. Based on discussions with program completers, additional elective coursework was added in content/specialty areas: general, choral, wind, and string music education.
3. Based on data from advising reports and passage rates on Praxis II PLT test, more attention is being placed on the Praxis II learning and teaching principles in upper level method courses.

SCHOOL COUNSELING

1. Based on feedback from candidates and best practices in supervision, the decision was made to expand the centers for placements to include elementary and middle schools.
2. Based on informal data regarding the performance of candidates, admission criteria have been discussed to provide greater consistency in the evaluation of applications.
3. Based on conversations about candidates' strengths and challenges in field placements, a performance rubric was created for school counseling field experiences that makes all professional expectations clear.
4. Because inaccurate information in handbooks and lack of a handbook for supervisors creates differential expectations and communication problems, the student handbook was revised and site supervision handbook was created.

SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION

1. Candidate evaluation and suggestions from meetings with field professors drive changes in content of methods courses.
2. Three-way conferences, observation forms, and one-on-one interviews with candidates drive topics for student teaching seminar.

TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION

1. Because candidate anecdotal feedback that some undergraduate/graduate courses were at too high a level, revised professional curriculum in undergraduate program.
2. Based on formal feedback from candidates and mentors, candidates may stay in the same placement twice.
3. Based on formal feedback from supervisors, make group placements in middle schools autumn quarter and in high schools winter quarter.

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

1. Assist mentors in consulting data for the EFE and provide an opportunity for the cooperating teacher feedback based on because of lack of mentor assessments and because feedback from mentor is critical to professional growth

DRAMA EDUCATION

1. With the realization that a candidate had “failed” when assessments showed them as competent, need to show how criteria for admission to program is used to guide admission decisions.
2. With the realization that a candidate had “failed” when assessments showed them as competent, need to show how criteria for successful completion of field experience and clinical practice are used.
3. Need to follow the agreed upon criteria at each decision point.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

1. Based on data from Decision Points 2 and 4 regarding candidate proficiency B.4.4, consider requiring family participation course EDU T&L 674 even if candidates have had parenting class as undergraduates.
2. Based on data from Decision Points 2 and 4 regarding candidate proficiency B.1.1, university supervisors need to instigate conversations with candidates and mentors regarding students’ backgrounds and experiences to better see how candidates can better meet this proficiency.
3. Based on data from Decision Points 2 and 4 regarding candidate proficiency B.3.4, increase conversations among mentors, university supervisors, and candidates about what it means to be culturally responsive to all students.

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

1. Due to lack of data to assess candidates prior to the field experience, return to use of passports that faculty completed at end of courses.
2. Because passports reflect dispositions, decouple passport assessments from course grades.

FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES

1. Based on program data for Decision Point 4 and the 100 percent passage rates on Praxis II and III, the program structure will continue as is.
2. Based on data that most candidates are rated as having “some evidence” of the Professional Dispositions at Decision Point 1, additional evidence needs to be collected on the seven dispositions in first course (FCS ED 289).
3. Based on the languages used on the conceptual framework, change the language used in program from “action research triangulation” to “multiple data sources” and when discussing “effective teaching practice” need to use “best and most promising”

FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

1. Based on the need to review the data more frequently, add regularly scheduled meetings of GTAs, Program Manager, and Program Faculty.
2. Due to the alarming nature of discrepancies between ratings of university supervisors/mentors and candidates, conversations need to occur among university supervisors, mentors, the program manager, and faculty to establish consistency of key words and statements.
3. Based on the data reviewed, establish annual/semi-annual meeting of Foreign Second Language Education faculty and staff to discuss alignment of goals, expectations descriptors, and objectives for program.

INTEGRATED BUSINESS EDUCATION

1. Based on data for B.1.1 and B.1.3, explore ways to strengthen candidates subject matter expertise.
2. Based on data for B.1.4 and B.1.5, program needs to have subject-specific methods course for business disciplines.
3. Based on data for B.1.4, program should have faculty with appropriate content/pedagogy expertise to improve student performance.

MATHEMATICS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION

1. Based on Decision Point 2 data, candidates struggle with assessment, EDU P & L 607 instructors designed assignments for assessment.
2. Based on Decision Point 2 data (B.1.2, B.1.4, and B.1.5), EDU P&L 607 instructors will adjust the content of the course to address perceived student proficiencies related to learning expectations.
3. Based on proficiency B.1.5, assessment content now included as part of EDU T&L 742.02.
4. Because interns not making growth as shown by supervisor reports and seminar discussion, interns now write three goals for each quarter connected to standards.

MUSIC EDUCATION

1. Based on the percentage of candidates not passing Praxis II PLT test, postpone, through student advising, Psych and EDU P&L courses to the final year of the program, closer to the time of taking the test.

SPEECH AUDIOLOGY and PATHOLOGY

1. Though ratings are very good on Professional Dispositions Assessments, continue to review candidates' records and meet with each one individually for an admissions conference as has been done.
2. Although Professional Dispositions Assessment I ratings are high, include in a new candidate application form that will serve as an information giving and mutual commitment making document that focuses on the Unit's conceptual framework and the Unit's assessment system.

3. Although Professional Dispositions Assessment I ratings are high, determine pool/selection of candidates earlier in their graduate careers, having one-on-one conferences by second quarter of 1st year of MA year versus first quarter of 2nd year.
4. Based on Field of Work Professional Knowledge Assessment D.2.2, incorporate our departmental coursework and clinical experience check sheet to help assess status of each candidate re: understanding of field work.
5. Based on Field of Work Professional Knowledge Assessment D.2.2, explicitly tie in, during initial admission conference, the relationship between performance in courses/clinical with candidacy preparation status.
6. Based on Field of Work Professional Knowledge Assessment B.1.2, have candidates go into the schools with technology packets showing mentors how they can incorporate technology (writing in symbols, boardmaker, digital recorders, IEP software).

TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION

1. Collect feedback from candidates and mentors regarding the placement of candidates five days per week instead of four days per week autumn quarter.

Program recommendations made February 1 have been forwarded back to the respective program areas for final review and action.

How are assessment data shared with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders?

General Knowledge Assessments (cumulative grade point averages) are available to candidates at the conclusion of each quarter through online access to grades for the quarter. Likewise, clinical practice grades are available to candidates through online access to grades for the quarter.

Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessments and clinical practice grades for *initial* teacher preparation; Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessments for *advanced* teacher preparation; Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessments for *other professional school roles* preparation; and Professional Dispositions Assessments for all three preparation levels are used to promote productive reflection in two- and three-way conferences between and among candidates, university supervisors, faculty advisors, and mentors.

Praxis II Specialty Area and Principles of Learning and Teaching assessment results are disseminated to candidates by Educational Testing Service (ETS) following each test administration. In addition, ETS sends electronic reports to the University following each test administration. Test results are then uploaded from the University's data-base to the unit's web-based data collection system, the OSU Educator Preparation Assessment System, each evening. These data are then available to each program area through data facilitators.

While individual and aggregated data may be accessed via the web-based data collection system at any point, unit and program profiles prepared for the annual educator preparation assessment retreat provide a formal venue for sharing assessment data with unit faculty and administration, university supervisors, UTEC membership, school partners, and candidates. In addition, program level data are shared with like populations in individual program retreats.

Other

Operating under the 2002 edition of the NCATE Standards for the November 2005 visit and the current focused visit, unit data have been used to drive unit and program decisions. In addition to unit data, programs have collected their own data which have been used to drive program decisions. As the move is made to the 2008 standards, the unit assessment system will be adjusted to reverse this process; that is, to use program data to generate unit level data and thus drive unit level as well as program level decisions.

Other: NCATE March 2006 Accreditation Action Report: Standard 2 Areas for Improvement

Where may the evidence be found for Areas for Improvement from 2005 Review?

The chart below is a screen shot of the documents found at [EVIDENCE FOR AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT FROM 2005 REVIEW]. Under the Areas for Improvement column is a listing of those areas identified for improvement at the 2005 NCATE BOE visit and as reported in the NCATE March 2006 Accreditation Action Report: Standard 2 Areas for Improvement. When visiting the web site, <https://ncate.osu.edu/docs/>, the reader may click on the documents listed under the Evidence column to access a particular artifact.

Chart 4: Evidence for Areas for Improvement from 2005 Review

	Areas for Improvement		Evidence
1	<i>Unit-wide assessment system has not been fully implemented</i>	1.1	Copies of completed assessments for each assessment of the assessment system (candidate and the unit management and operations)
		1.2	Program Profile Reports
		1.3	Unit Profile Report
2	<i>Unit does not systemically use assessments to make decisions about candidates</i>	2.1	UTEC policy and procedures <i>re: use of data to make decisions</i>
		2.2	Screen shots of decisions made regarding candidate performance
		2.3	Screen shots of program status data regarding students removed from programs
3	<i>Unit does not systemically use assessments to make decisions about programs</i>	3.1	Report of Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat
4	<i>Unit does not systemically use assessments to make decisions about the unit</i>	4.1	Report of Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat
		4.2	UTEC Minutes 11.29.07 <i>re: New UTEC sub-committee of assessment users</i>
5	<i>Candidates adequately informed across all programs about the evaluation criteria at each assessment point in the system</i>	5.1	Memo from Data Manager <i>re: the dissemination of assessment forms</i>
		5.2	Screen shot of CRITERIA and PREVIEW ALL FORMS
		5.3	Screen shot of Unit Assessment Schematics

Chart 4 (continued)

	Areas for Improvement		Evidence
6	<i>Unit does not require all candidates to meet criteria delineated within each transition point as a requirement for progressing to the next level</i>	6.1	UTEC policy and procedures <i>re: use of data to make decisions</i>
		6.2	Screen shots of decisions made regarding candidate performance
		6.3	Screen shots of program status data regarding students removed from programs
		6.4	Actions taken regarding movement from one Decision Point to the next

Has the unit-wide assessment system been fully implemented?

The data housed in the web-based data collection system, the program profiles, and the unit profile demonstrate that all aspects of both phases of the unit assessment system have been fully implemented. “Both phases” reference the fact that candidate data have been collected for all decision point components for each of the three preparation levels, and unit management and operations data have been collected from all populations (candidates, professional education faculty, field placement coordinators, mentors, and university supervisors), and identified sources (Praxis III Classroom Performance results, school district personnel surveys, and Teacher Quality Partnership data).

One exception to implementation needs to be noted. On page 10 of this document, the following reference is made as a sub-note: “These 23 candidates for Chinese licensure were engaged in an alternative pathway to licensure, a pilot project funded through the Ohio Department of Education.” When the program began during the 2005-2006 academic year, it was done so with the understanding that it was to be an alternative licensure program; however, in the end, the program provided an alternative pathway to licensure. In Ohio, alternative licensure completers are recommended for licensure through a local school district or administrative service center, while program completers of alternative pathway programs are recommended for licensure by an institution. Thus, data are not collected by institutions for those seeking an alternative license because coursework may be taken course-by-course across institutions. Data are to be gathered for those enrolled in alternative pathways to licensure since those candidates are part of an institutional program or an institutional cooperative, and the institution recommends program completers for licensure. Data across the program, in this case, were not gathered for the 23 individuals noted earlier since the program functioned with the understanding that program completers would be recommended for licensure by the Franklin County Educational Service Center. In the end, the institution recommended these program completers for licensure, making them completers of an alternative pathway to licensure. This has now been rectified, and data are being gathered according to the unit assessment system for the new cohort of candidates in this program.

Does the unit systemically use assessments to make decisions about candidates?

Since the 2005 NCATE BOE visit, the web-based data collection system has been refined to include a new component under *Make Decisions – Make Decisions on Candidates based on Assessments for a given Year/Quarter/Preparation Level*. This component is used at the end of each quarter to document the status of

respective candidates with regard to movement to the next decision point. Program personnel are required to render one of the following decisions based on the data collected for the quarter:

- candidate may move to next decision point,
- candidate needs to demonstrate further performances before moving to next decision point, or
- candidate to be removed from program.

The following provides a screen shot of this feature:

The OSU Educator Preparation Assessment System - Windows Internet Explorer

https://ncube.osu.edu/secure/df/index.cfm?function=editDecisionPointForCandidate&id=5&candidateID=30236&yyyy=2008&preparationLevelID=1

The OSU Educator Preparation Assessment System

System Administration My Forms Preview All Forms Completion Tracking Help Log out

Decision Point for

Instrument Name	Benchmark Summary	Score	Recommendation
CUM GPA at this quarter	4.000 - Passes requirement of 3 GPA checkpoint.		
Praxis Scores	• NTPSP: Y (Passes)		
<i>ITP-SMK.02.C</i>	20 of 23 must be 2 or higher	23 / 23	Pass
<i>ITP-PD.03.C</i>	6 of 7 must be 4 or higher	5 / 7	Fail
<i>ITP-SMK.02.US</i>	20 of 23 must be 2 or higher	23 / 23	Pass
<i>ITP-PD.03.US</i>	6 of 7 must be 4 or higher	7 / 7	Pass
<i>ITP-SMK.02.M</i>	20 of 23 must be 2 or higher	23 / 23	Pass
<i>ITP-PD.03.M</i>	6 of 7 must be 4 or higher	2 / 7	Fail

EDU T&L 885.70 : 5

Decision: Candidate needs to demonstrate further performances prior to moving to the next decision point

Comments: No decision selected - please make a decision choice
Candidate may move to next decision point
Candidate needs to demonstrate further performances prior to moving to the next decision point
Candidate to be removed from program

_____ will be taking further classes, and we will continue to assess her progress. Her field supervisor believes she is doing well and should be ready to teach before long.

save Cancel

Done Internet 100%

start Microsoft Outlook Ve... The OSU Educator Pr... Institution Report 2.4... 12:44 AM

Does the unit systemically use assessments to make decisions about programs?

Pages 40-48 of this document provide evidence of program decisions made since the last visit as well as those made at the First Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat.

Does the unit systemically use assessments to make decisions about the unit?

Pages 36-40 of this document provide evidence of unit decisions made since the last visit as well as those made at the First Annual Educator Preparation Assessment Retreat.

Are candidates adequately informed across all programs about the evaluation criteria at each assessment point in the system?

Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessments for *initial* teacher preparation, Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessments for *advanced* teacher preparation, Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessments for *other professional school roles* preparation, and Professional Dispositions Assessments for all three preparation levels are used to promote productive reflection in two- and three-way conferences between and among candidates, university supervisors, faculty advisors, and mentors at the beginning of a decision point.

In addition, upon admission to a program, candidates, as well as others assigned to complete assessments, have access to the web-based data collection system, the OSU Educator Preparation Assessment System. One of the tabs on this site is CRITERIA and PREVIEW ALL FORMS. Within this tab is a listing of the three preparation levels. Under each preparation level is a link to the unit assessment system schematic which identifies the criteria for each decision point for the respective level and links to each assessment for each decision point of the level.

Does the unit require all candidates to meet criteria delineated within each transition point as a requirement for progressing to the next level?

As noted above, the web-based data collection system has been refined to include a new component under *Make Decisions – Make Decisions on Candidates based on Assessments for a given Year/Quarter/Preparation Level*. This component is used at the end of each quarter to document the status of candidates with regard to movement to the next decision point. Program personnel are required to render one of the following decisions based on the data collected for the quarter:

- candidate may move to next decision point,
- candidate needs to demonstrate further performances before moving to next decision point, or
- candidate to be removed from program.

The intent is for program personnel to use the data gathered to make decisions. Should a criterion at a particular decision point not be fully met, program personnel may use their professional judgment to move a candidate to the next decision point, but in doing so must provide justification for such action. The screen shot on the following page provides an example of such action and justification.

The screenshot displays the 'The OSU Educator Preparation Assessment System' interface. At the top, there is a navigation menu with links for 'System Administration', 'My Forms', 'Preview All Forms', 'Completion Tracking', 'Help', and 'Log out'. Below this is a red header bar with the text 'Decision Point for'. A table follows, listing assessment instruments, benchmark summaries, scores, and recommendations. The table has four columns: 'Instrument Name', 'Benchmark Summary', 'Score', and 'Recommendation'. The first row shows 'CUM GPA at this quarter' with a score of 4.000 and a 'Pass' recommendation. The next two rows show 'ITP PD.01.AC' with a benchmark of '4 of 7 must be 3 or higher'; the first has a score of 0/7 and a 'Fail' recommendation, while the second has a score of 4/7 and a 'Pass' recommendation. Below the table is a 'Decision' dropdown menu set to 'Candidate may move to next decision point' and a 'Comments' text area containing the text: 'Candidate was granted admission by our admission committee based on a personal interview. Her work is fine. She should move on.' At the bottom of the decision area are 'save' and 'Cancel' buttons. The status bar at the bottom of the page indicates 'Logged in as hite.44@osu.edu'. The Windows taskbar at the very bottom shows the Start button, several open applications, and the system clock at 12:35 PM.

Instrument Name	Benchmark Summary	Score	Recommendation
CUM GPA at this quarter	4.000 - Passes requirement of 3 GPA checkpoint.		Pass
<i>ITP PD.01.AC</i>	4 of 7 must be 3 or higher	0 / 7	Fail
<i>ITP PD.01.AC</i>	4 of 7 must be 3 or higher	4 / 7	Pass

Decision: Candidate may move to next decision point

Comments: Candidate was granted admission by our admission committee based on a personal interview. Her work is fine. She should move on.

save Cancel

Logged in as hite.44@osu.edu

GLOSSARY of TERMS

Adjunct Faculty	unpaid part-time faculty employed on a quarter-by-quarter basis
AP	advanced preparation, including advanced teacher preparation and other professional school roles preparation
ATP	advanced teacher preparation; that is, educator preparation programs designed to advance the teaching skills of candidates beyond initial teacher preparation
ATP PD 01 AC	Advanced Teacher Preparation assessment of Professional Dispositions completed by Admission Committees (AC) at Decision Point 1
ATP PD 02 C ATP PD 02 FA	Advanced Teacher Preparation assessment of Professional Dispositions completed by candidates (C) and faculty advisors (FA) at Decision Point 2
ATP PD 03 C ATP PD 03 US	Advanced Teacher Preparation assessment of Professional Dispositions completed by candidates (C) and culminating experience supervisors (US) at Decision Point 3
ATP PPK 01 C ATP PPK 01 FA	Advanced Teacher Preparation assessment of Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills completed by candidates (C) and faculty advisors (FA) at Decision Point 2
ATP PPK 02 C ATP PPK 02 US	Advanced Teacher Preparation assessment of Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills completed by candidates (C) and culminating experience supervisors (US) at Decision Point 3
AYA	adolescent to young adults; that is, Ohio licensure for teaching grades 7-12
B	bachelor's degree
Data Facilitators	faculty and administrative/professional staff assigned responsibility for the management of collecting candidate data and making decisions regarding the movement of candidates from one decisions point to the next
Decision Points	the transition points across each program preparation level; that is, those points at which decisions are to be made regarding the performance of each candidate
ECE	early childhood education; that is, Ohio licensure for teaching preschool through grade 3
EHE	College of Education and Human Ecology
Field Placement Coordinators	faculty and program managers assigned responsibility for helping to facilitate the placement of candidates in respective field experiences and clinical practice/internships

GTA	graduate teaching associate; that is, a graduate student employed as a part-time faculty to teach and/or supervise field placements
IS	intervention specialist; that is, Ohio licensure for teaching preschool-3 special needs students, kindergarden-12 students with mild/moderate needs, kindergarden-12 students with moderate/intensive needs, PK-12 students with hearing impairments, preschool-12 students with visual impairments, and kindergarden-12 students identified as gifted
ITP	initial teacher preparation; that is, preparation for those candidates seeking their first teaching license
ITP PD 01 AC	Initial Teacher Preparation assessment of Professional Dispositions completed by Admission Committees (AC) at Decision Point 1
ITP PD 02 C ITP PD 02 M ITP PD 02 US	Initial Teacher Preparation assessment of Professional Dispositions completed by candidates (C), mentors (M), and university supervisors (US) at Decision Point 2
ITP PD 03 C ITP PD 03 M ITP PD 03 US	Initial Teacher Preparation assessment of Professional Dispositions completed by candidates (C), mentors (M), and university supervisors (US) at Decision Point 3
ITP SMK 01 C ITP SMK 01 US/M	Initial Teacher Preparation assessments of Subject Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills completed by candidates (C), and university supervisors (US/M) at Decision Point 2
ITP SMK 02 C ITP SMK 02 M ITP SMK 02 US	Initial Teacher Preparation assessments of Subject Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills completed by candidates (C), mentors (M), and university supervisors (US) at Decision Point 3
Lecturers	paid part-time faculty employed on a quarter-by-quarter basis
M	master's degree
MA	multi-age; that is, Ohio licensure for teaching specific subject areas in grades PK-12
MARX	the student information data system of The Ohio State University
MCE	middle childhood education; that is, Ohio licensure for teaching grades 4-9
MEd	Master of Education degree; that is, the degree awarded to candidates seeking initial licensure at the graduate level
Mentors	school partners who serve as field placement supervisors of candidates
ND	non-degree

OPSR	other professional school roles; that is, programs to prepare audiologists, principals, school counselors, school nurses, school psychologists, school social workers, speech-language pathologists, and superintendents of schools
OPSR PD 01 AC	Other Professional School Roles Preparation assessment of Professional Dispositions completed by Admission Committees (AC) at Decision Point 1
OPSR PD 02 C OPSR PD 02 FA	Other Professional School Roles Preparation assessment of Professional Dispositions completed by candidates (C) and faculty advisors (FA) at Decision Point 2
OPSR PD 03 C OPSR PD 03 M OPSR PD 03 US	Other Professional School Roles Preparation assessment of Professional Dispositions completed by candidates (C), mentors (M), and culminating internship supervisors (US) at Decision Point 3
OPSR PK 01 C OPSR PK 01 FA	Other Professional School Roles Preparation assessment of Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills completed by candidates (C) and faculty advisors (FA) at Decision Point 2
OPSR PK 02 C OPSR PK 02 M OPSR PK 02 US	Other Professional School Roles Preparation assessment of Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills completed by candidates (C), mentors (M), and culminating internship supervisors (US) at Decision Point 2
OSU	The Ohio State University
PD	professional dispositions
PK	professional knowledge
PPK	professional and pedagogical knowledge
Praxis II PLT Test	Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching test; that is, the pedagogical assessment administered through Educational Testing Service required of those seeking initial license in Ohio
Praxis II Specialty Area Test	the subject matter assessment administered through Educational Testing Service required of those, in most program areas, seeking initial license in Ohio
Praxis III	the classroom observation assessment administered through the Ohio Department of Education required of beginning teachers to move from provisional to professional licensure
Program Managers	administrative/professional staff employed to oversee, in conjunction with faculty, program area administrative tasks

Program Profiles	annual reports which compile program level data regarding the performance of candidates
Professional Education Faculty	those faculty, full and part-time, including GTAs, employed to teach professional education courses and/or supervise field placements
School Mentors	See MENTORS above
SMK	subject matter knowledge
the OSU Educator Preparation Assessment System	the web-based data collection system used to collect and manage candidate performance and unit management and operations data
TQP	Teacher Quality Partnership; that is, a study of program completers and inservice teachers regarding their preparation programs
Unit	the umbrella which houses all educator preparation programs at The Ohio State University
Unit Profile	the annual report which compiles unit level data regarding the performance of candidates and the management and operations of the unit
UTEC	University Teacher Education Council; that is, the body charged with decision-making authority regarding the educator preparation unit
Visiting Faculty	paid faculty with benefits employed for an extended period of time of no more than three-years