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7. Additional assessment that addresses ACEI standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, tutoring assignments, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

See Attachments panel below.

8. Additional assessment that addresses ACEI standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, tutoring assignments, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

1. Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty’s interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

During the past two years, Niagara University’s program underwent changes that addressed faculty concerns shown in candidates’ performance and their analysis of assessment data. The following improvements have been made based on the assessment results within the program.

Content Knowledge

Assessments for content knowledge included the New York State licensure examinations Liberal Arts and Science Test (LAST), the Elementary Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (ATS-W), and the
Content Specialty Test-Multi Subject Exam (CST), Unit Resource Report, Consecutive Lesson Plans, Literacy Instructional Strategies Unit Plan, and the Final Student Teaching Report. The Unit Resource Report, Consecutive Lesson Plans, and the Literacy Instructional Strategies Unit Plan evaluate candidates understanding, knowledge and skills prior to student teaching while the Final Student Teaching Report provides evidence of candidates’ ability to put their knowledge, understanding, and skills into practice in the classroom.

Candidates demonstrated passing rates for the Exams. One hundred percent of the candidates passed the LAST, 100% of candidates passed the ATS-W, and over 87% of the candidates passed the CST. Faculty noted that candidates score lower on the constructed response portion of the CST exam. As students progress through the program assignments require less essays and constructed response answers. Faculty have begun to revamp their assignments to include more constructed responses in their assignments.

Prior to the 2007-08 academic year candidates submitted portfolio reflections to demonstrate their understanding of content knowledge. In the fall 2007 the Unit Resource Report, and the Consecutive Lesson Plans were implemented in methods courses, EDU 529 and EDU 767. Because these assignments are specifically aligned with ACEI standards they provide a more accurate picture of candidates’ knowledge.

The Unit Resource Report and Consecutive Lesson Plan assignments were designed to evaluate candidates’ Knowledge of Content and Curriculum and Instruction. These assessments were first implemented in the 2007-08 academic year. The data for these assessments indicate that candidates understand and can successfully plan instruction. Over 92% of the candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of all content areas as indicated by the percentage scoring satisfactory or exceptional on the Unit resource Report. The Consecutive Lesson Plan assessment data indicates that over 92% of the candidates understand and successfully apply instructional strategies such as adapting for diverse learners, plan for the development of problem solving, critical thinking, and actively engaging the learner. Faculty continues to monitor students who do not demonstrate subject matter knowledge through program checkpoints. The College of Education requires candidates to maintain a GPA of 2.5 in their academic concentration and in their educational courses. This requirement is monitored throughout the program through the advisement process.

The Literacy Instructional Strategies Unit Plan assignment has been used in some form for several years. In fall 2007 a rubric specifically aligned with ACEI standards was put into place. The data for this assessment provides evidence that candidates demonstrate knowledge of literacy and English Language Arts. Faculty are pleased with the change from a general portfolio reflection evaluation to a more specific rubric and the candidates' performance on many elements of this assignment rubric.

Candidates have been successful in their student teaching field experience as evidenced by the results of the Final Student Teaching Report. This provides additional evidence of our candidates’ content knowledge and their ability to apply their understanding and skills to ongoing, actual classroom practice. One concern is the percentage of candidates that are rated “not observable” for “the ability to create instructional opportunities that were adapted to learners from diverse cultural backgrounds.” Candidates have always been advised to participate in a variety of placements. Based on fall 2007 and other data, candidates are now required to complete 30 hours of field experience in a New York State defined high needs school or one of their student teaching placements will occur in this type of school. The faculty wants to insure candidates’ ability to plan for and teach diverse learners. Faculty will continue to monitor all data sources to make informed decisions and adjustments to insure candidates have opportunities to demonstrate understanding of all ACEI standards.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions
Assessments for professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions, include the Unit Resource Report, the Consecutive Lesson Plans, the Child Case Study, the Measurement Report, and the Student Teaching Final Report. Candidates demonstrate strong ability to plan lessons using a variety of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies and to actually teach them. This is evident in our course assessments requiring planning (the Unit Resource Report, the Measurement Project, and Consecutive Lesson Plans) and in the application during student teaching.

The student teaching Final Report changed from a general college wide form to one aligned with ACEI’s standards in the fall 2007. A weakness of the Report is that it is completed by cooperating teachers and not university supervisors. Data may be skewed by personality differences or cooperating teacher expectations that differ from those of a university supervisor. The final grade is assigned by the Director of Student Teaching based on the final field placement report, the field reports and conferencing with the university supervisor. Based on current data, faculty believe candidates are well prepared for the rigors of student teaching.

Although faculty are pleased with candidates' overall performance in “becoming a professional,” they are monitoring candidates’ performance throughout the program and in student teaching. Candidates demonstrate their ability to engage in continuous learning and the ability to be reflective in a wide variety of assessments including the Measurement Project, the Unit Resource Report, the Consecutive Lesson Plans, and the Child Case Study.

Student Learning

Assessments for student learning include the Child Case Study Report, Measurement Project, and the Final Student Teaching Report. The Child Case Study Report was developed for fall 2007 to be closely aligned with ACEI Standard 1: Development, Learning, and Motivation, Standard 3: Instruction, and Standard 5: Professionalism. Results indicate candidates are able demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of child development and learning and using appropriate assessment tools and approaches. The candidates know about, understand, and value professional guidelines in their work.

The Measurement Report has been used in some form for a few years. The candidates were evaluated using a general portfolio reflection. For fall 2007 faculty developed a rubric aligned with ACEI standards. Faculty are pleased that candidates are highly successful at demonstrating their understanding of Standards 1, 4, and 5 with this assessment.

The Final Student Teaching Report is completed during student teaching providing evidence of candidates’ ability to apply their knowledge, skills, and understandings and successfully affect student learning. Niagara University has a long history of a Vincentian Mission. The College of Education wants its candidates to be prepared to work with diverse populations. Based on analysis of field placement data, the faculty adopted a policy regarding placements in 2007. Although faculty advised students to choose a variety of diverse placement settings not all candidates did. Candidates are now required to complete 30 hours of field experience in a New York State defined high needs school or one of their student teaching placements will occur in this type of school.

Conclusions

Some of the assessments within the program have been existence in some form for a few years. The scoring rubrics have been in an on-going refinement process of standardization. Faculty has more clearly aligned the sub-elements of the assessments and rubrics to ACEI standards. Their efforts have resulted in the data provided in assessments 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 from fall 2007 to present. Additionally, the generic
Final Student Teaching Report has been replaced with a form that is closely aligned to ACEI standards. Our focus is now on continuously improving the inter-rater reliability using the standardized assessment rubrics.

SECTION VI - FOR REVISED REPORTS OR RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORTS ONLY

1. Describe what changes or additions have been made in response to issues cited in previous recognition report. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made. Specific instructions for preparing a revised report or a response to condition report are available on the NCATE web site at http://www.ncate.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=4 (Response limited to 24,000 characters.)

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.
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Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 7

See Attachments panel below.

8. Additional assessment that addresses CEC standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 8

See Attachments panel below.

SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

1. Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

Introduction
The results of our assessment data are quite positive across each of our program assessment measures. We recognize a few challenges that we have faced in using assessment results to improve candidate and program performance. The following changes have been made based on the assessment results for candidates within this program.

Content Knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
We have 2 core assessments of candidate content knowledge in Special Education. The New York State Teacher Certification Examination Content Specialty Test – Students with Disabilities provides external validation of our program. The Exceptionality Project completed in EDU 239 provides additional validation of each candidate’s knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to CEC standard 1. We are pleased that more than 98% of our candidates have passed the Content Specialty Test and only 1 candidate failed to reach the minimum criteria on an element of the Exceptionality Project. The consistency across these two measures of content knowledge provides an indication of reliability and validity.

The Exceptionality Project itself has used as a course-embedded assessment in this program for a number of years. In the fall of 2007 a more structured rubric to consistently evaluate this project was developed and aligned to CEC standards. This enabled us to gather information on specific sub-elements of the assessment and further detail candidate pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
Planning (Assessment 3)
We assess each candidate’s ability to plan instruction using the IEP Planning Project. We believe the results of this assessment indicate that our candidates are skilled at planning based on knowledge of the content, diversity, and planning. The IEP project itself has been in existence for a number of years. In the fall of 2007 a more structured rubric was developed and aligned to CEC standards. This enabled us to gather information on specific sub-elements of the assessment and further detail candidate pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Student Teaching (Assessment 4)
Candidates have been successful in their student teaching field experiences as evidenced by results of the final Student Teaching Report. After reviewing the results from the 2006-2007 academic year, we recognized that our student teaching evaluation process was too general to effectively measure special education content knowledge, skills and dispositions. We therefore consulted the CEC Standards and subdivided the previous indicator of content knowledge into 7 specific inquiries aligned to CEC Standard 1. We felt that this revision provided additional detail from which we could determine candidate and program strength and weakness as it related to content knowledge. We also slightly revised and updated the remaining inquiries to more closely align with CEC standards. Furthermore, we have worked closely with our Office of Field Experiences to ensure that our annual reports are broken down by grade level certification area and not simply presented as a comprehensive report of all candidates in undergraduate special education. The Office of Field Experience has also directly assigned staff to the data collection and review of student teaching experiences.

Impact on Student Learning (Assessment 5)
Assessment of impact on student learning is integrated throughout the program and the 8 assessments we use for program review. More specifically, the Measurement Project in EDU 451 enables candidates to focus on assessment and instructional planning for students within the Teaching Assistantship field experience. The requirement for EDU 451 was created 2 years ago and the first cohort of candidates progressed through the course in fall 2008. The data gathered prior to this semester in the Teaching Assistantship Evaluation generally indicated that our candidates were effective in “using informal/formal assessment strategies to monitor student learning and adjust instructional strategies”. We are hopeful that as more candidates complete EDU 451, they will take a more comprehensive look at their impact on student learning further demonstrating their pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions as it relates to all aspects of CEC standard 8.

Additional Assessments that Address CEC Standards (Assessments 6-8)

The Achievement Testing Project required in EDU 455 Assessment of Students with Exceptionalities has been required for a number of years. In the fall semester of 2007 a standardized rubric was developed and implemented to document candidate competencies. Prior to this semester the project was evaluated as a component of the final course grade.

The Case Study Project required in EDU 236 Human Learning, Development and Motivation has also been required for a number of years. Prior to the fall of 2007 this project was evaluated as a component of the program portfolio using a very generalized rubric aligned to program expectations. In the fall of 2007 a standardized rubric was also developed and implemented for this project.

The Assessment of Teaching Skills - Written is an additional external assessment of pedagogical skill required of candidates applying for New York State Certification. Our candidates have been 100% successful on this exam. Despite this on-going success, we continuously monitor the results as they are
provided to us for all candidates, regardless of their program completion status.

Summary of Program Changes

Standardization of Rubric Scoring Guides
The signature assessments within the program have been used to assess learning outcomes in this program for many years. The scoring rubrics have been in an on-going process of continuous improvement to enhance the reliability and validity of the assessment process. Faculty within the program have more clearly aligned the sub-elements of the assignments and rubrics to CEC standards. Their efforts have resulted in the data provided in assessments 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 from fall 2007 to present. Our focus is now on continuously improving the inter-rater reliability using the standardized assessment rubrics.

Revision of Program Offerings
Data have indicated the need to enhance assessment knowledge and skills in the special education and childhood initial teacher preparation program. As a result, the faculty added an additional required course, EDU 451 Assessment of Learning, for candidates entering the program in fall 2006. The first group of candidates has just progressed to this course level and completed the Measurement Project with its standardized rubric in fall 2008.

Field Experience Evaluation Changes
The final student teaching report has been expanded upon such that specific indicators have been subdivided to provide more detailed results. This is especially important as it relates to identifying candidate content knowledge in special education. The aggregated results of the student teaching reports have been broken down to a grade specific level rather than an annual report for all special education undergraduate students.

Conclusions
All program completers have met or exceeded the CEC program standards. We are very satisfied with our candidate performance on the identified program assessments and the evidence of program quality the assessments provide related to CEC standards. We are focused on continuous improvement and will annually examine the assessments themselves, and the information they offer to us regarding our programs and candidates.

SECTION VI— FOR REVISED REPORTS OR RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORTS ONLY

1. Describe what changes or additions have been made in response to issues cited in previous recognition report. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made. Specific instructions for preparing a revised report or a response to condition report are available on the NCATE web site at http://www.nicte.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=4 (Response limited to 24,000 characters.)
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evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

See Attachments panel below.

**SECTION V – USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM**

1. Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty’s interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The results of our assessment data are quite positive across each of our program assessment measures. We recognize a few challenges that we have faced in using assessment results to improve candidate and program performance. Our primary focus over the last few years has been a move from depending on courses grades, to developing formal and standardized assessment rubrics for course-embedded assignments. Another challenge has been the small number of candidates within the program. It is difficult to make any broad changes based on little data. The following changes have been made based on the assessment results for candidates within this program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Content Knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)**

We have 2 core assessments of candidate content knowledge in special education. The New York State Teacher Certification Examination Content Specialty Test -- Students with Disabilities (Field 60) provides external validation of our program, as its data compares our program with other programs throughout New York State and demonstrates candidate knowledge of the foundations of special education. The Comprehensive Portfolio completed and defended by all candidates at the conclusion of the program provides internal validation using authentic information about each candidate’s knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to program expectations.

We are pleased that more than 98% of our candidates have passed the CST and 100% have passed the portfolio. Subscore analysis does not reveal any common areas for concern. In other words, program candidates who did demonstrate an area of weakness did not do so in the same subarea. The consistency across these two measures provides an indication of reliability and validity. The Content Specialty Test is revealing because it demonstrates that our candidates have a strong knowledge base in special education. The Comprehensive Portfolio demonstrates the practical application of this knowledge base. One concern revealed in the 2006-2007 comprehensive portfolio reviews was in the area of “technology.” This appears to be an anomaly based on the inclusion of a new program expectation which was not consistently applied to all candidates in the first year of implementation.
Planning (Assessment 3)

We assess each candidate’s ability to plan instruction using the IEP Planning Project/Instructional Strategies Resource Packet. We believe the results of this assessment indicate that our candidates are skilled at planning based on knowledge of the human development, instructional strategies, assessment, and planning. The project itself has been in existence for a number of years. In the fall of 2007 a more structured and standardized rubric was developed and aligned to CEC standards. Instead of using course or project grades, this enabled us to gather information on specific sub-elements of the assessment and further detail candidate pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Practicum (Assessment 4)

Candidates have continuously been successful in their special education practicum field experiences as evidenced by the final Special Education Practicum Report. Only 1 candidate in the last 2 years has demonstrated any rating less than satisfactory.

Impact on Student Learning (Assessment 5 and 6)

Assessment of impact on student learning is integrated throughout the program and the 8 assessments we use for program review. More specifically, the Achievement Test Administration Project in EDU 565 focuses candidates on the roles and responsibilities associated with formalized testing and the Literacy Case Study in EDU 572 enables candidates to focus on assessment and instructional planning for a student with known or suspected reading difficulties. The Literacy Case Study was revised in the fall of 2007 to include written reports that communicate the results of the assessments to specific individuals; including families (CEC 8 and10). Prior to this time, the program candidates did not consistently and specifically demonstrate this communication skill. In addition standard rubrics were developed and aligned to CEC standards to enable us to gather more structured information on specific sub-elements of the assessment and further detail candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions in this area.

Other (7 and 8)

The Comprehensive Disabilities Handbook completed by candidates in EDU 539 was revised in the fall of 2007 to focus more on the ability of candidates to utilize assistive technology and available community resources. A standardized rubric also implemented in fall 2007 enables us to more specifically assess candidate competencies on this assignment and therefore improve candidate practices and the program.

The Learning Environment Plan created in EDU 530 Motivation and Management charges candidates with planning inclusive, caring, and challenging learning environmental; that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, self-motivation/regulation and values diversities. This assessment was developed in response to employer and alumni surveys indicating that our candidates needed to develop skills in classroom management and student motivation.

Summary of Program Changes

Standardization of Rubric Scoring Guides

The signature assessments within the program have been used to measure candidate performance for a number of years. Continuous improvements have been made to the scoring rubrics to strengthen the reliability and validity of these assessments (standardization across faculty). Faculty within the program have more clearly aligned the sub-elements of the assignments and rubrics to CEC standards. Their efforts have resulted in the data provided in assessments 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 from fall 2007 to present. Our focus is now on continuously improving the inter-rater reliability using the standardized assessment rubrics.

Course-based Changes
The final practicum report data provides some indication that a few candidates in the 1-6 program were less able to demonstrate their interactions with families and communities. It is for this reason that we have enhanced the assignment in EDU 539 and 572 so that candidates are required to identify community resources to support student learning, and communicate with families.

Conclusions
All program completers have met or exceeded the CEC program standards. We are very satisfied with our candidate performance on the identified program assessments and the evidence of program quality the assessments provide related to CEC standards. We are focused on continuous improvement and will annually examine the assessments themselves, and the information they offer to us regarding our programs and candidates.

SECTION VI – FOR REVISED REPORTS OR RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORTS ONLY

1. Describe what changes or additions have been made in response to issues cited in previous recognition report. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made. Specific instructions for preparing a revised report or a response to condition report are available on the NCATE web site at http://www.ncate.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=4
(Response limited to 24,000 characters.)

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.
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SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

1. Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

Introduction
Although the results of our assessment data are quite positive across each of our program assessment measures, we recognize a few challenges that we have faced in using assessment results to improve candidate performance and program quality. The following improvements have been made based on the assessment results for candidates within this program.

Content Knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
We have 2 core assessments of candidate content knowledge in English Language Arts. The New York State Teacher Certification Examination Content Specialty Test – English (Field 03) provides external validation of our program. The GPA in ELA and ELA/Pedagogy Coursework evaluated prior to student teaching provides additional validation of each candidate’s knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to NCTE standards.

We are pleased that more than 88% of our candidates have passed the Content Specialty Test and candidate GPA in content and content pedagogy coursework is above average. We have always been concerned with relying on GPA for content knowledge because the courses in the ELA concentration are managed by the English Department outside of our direct Unit structure. The consistency across these two measures of content knowledge provides an indication of reliability and validity that eases this concern. It appears that our mutual partnership efforts with the English Department have resulted in strong content knowledge on the part of our candidates. These partnership initiatives have included discussing assessment results, sharing instructors, and scheduling courses at times that do not conflict with field experiences.

Since the last program review we have added 2 required undergraduate courses within the department that focus on ELA instruction: EDU 271 Foundations of Literacy Instruction and 377 Literacy Development Across the Secondary Curriculum. These courses enhance candidate skills in each of NCTE standards 3.1-3.7.
Planning (Assessment 3)
We assess each candidate's ability to plan instruction using the Consecutive Lesson Planning Project. Candidates are required to plan 2 lessons for a secondary classroom that integrate ELA standards. We believe the results of this assessment indicate that our candidates are skilled at planning based on knowledge of the content and knowledge of interdisciplinary connections. They plan instructional strategies that encourage problem-solving and critical thinking and integrate appropriate technologies.

The assessment itself has been in existence for a number of years. In the fall of 2007 a more structured rubric was developed and aligned to NCTE standards. This enabled us to gather information on specific sub-elements of the assessment and further detail candidate pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Student Teaching (Assessment 4)
Candidates have continuously been successful in their student teaching field experiences as evidenced by results of the Final Student Teaching Report. After reviewing the results from the 2006-2007 academic year, we recognized that our student teaching evaluation process was too general to effectively measure content knowledge within the specific discipline of ELA. We therefore consulted the NCTE standards and subdivided the previous indicator of content knowledge into 7 specific inquiries aligned to NCTE standards 3.1-3.7, respectively. We feel that this revision provided additional detail from which we could determine candidate and program strength and weakness as it related to content knowledge. The other indicators were also subdivided to reveal additional detail. Furthermore, we have worked closely with our Office of Field Experiences to ensure that our annual reports are broken out by content area and not simply presented as a comprehensive report of candidates in secondary education. The Office of Field Experience has also directly assigned one full time student teaching supervisor to the data collection and review of student teaching experiences in secondary English. Based on the 2007-2008 student teaching data indicating that 62.5% of the candidates were not observable on the program expectation that they interact with families and communities to support student learning, one priority of this supervisor will be to work with cooperating teachers to reinforce this expectation.

Impact on Student Learning (Assessment 5)
Assessment of impact on student learning is integrated throughout the program and the 8 assessments we use for program review. More specifically, the Measurement Project in EDU 451 enables candidates to focus on assessment and instructional planning for students within the Teaching Assistantship field experience. The requirement for EDU 451 was initiated 2 years ago and the first cohort of candidates progressed to the course in fall 2008. Unfortunately, we did not have any ELA candidates in the fall semester in this class. The data gathered prior to this semester in the Teaching Assistantship Evaluation generally indicated that our candidates were effective in "using informal/formal assessment strategies to monitor student learning and adjust instructional strategies." We are hopeful that as more candidates complete EDU 451, they will take a more comprehensive look at their impact on student learning further demonstrating their pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions as it relates to all aspects of NCTE standard 4.10.

Additional Assessments that Address NCTE Standards (Assessments 6-8)
The Content Area Resource Packet completed by candidates in EDU 461 Special Methods of ELA requires candidates to identify instructional resources, plan and assess instructional activities in each of the strands of the discipline. This is a very comprehensive assessment integrating content knowledge, planning, and assessment. The standardized rubric implemented in fall 2007 enables us to more specifically assess candidate competencies on this assignment and therefore improve candidate practice and the program.
The Literacy Instructional Strategy Project in EDU 377 Literacy Content Methods charges candidates with developing the listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills of all students. These skills were previously assessed using the portfolio review format. A standardized rubric was developed and implemented in the fall of 2007 allowing us to more specifically assess candidate competencies on this assignment.

The Assessment of Teaching Skills—Written is an additional external assessment of pedagogical skill required of candidates applying for New York State Certification. Our candidates have been 100% successful on this exam. Despite this on-going success, we continuously monitor the results as they are provided to us for all candidates, regardless of their program completion status.

Summary of Program Changes
Review of Content Knowledge
We have added a course within the program to focus instruction and planning as they relate to NCTE standards 3.1-3.7. We also have had open and on-going communication with the English Department to enhance and improve our content course offerings both in scheduling and instructor credentials.

Standardization of Rubric Scoring Guides
The signature course-based assessments within the program have been existence in some form for many years. Prior to the fall of 2007 the assignments were reviewed using a portfolio model with a more general rubric assessing program expectations assigned to the course. The scoring rubrics have been in an on-going refinement process of standardization. Faculty within the program have more clearly aligned the sub-elements of the assignments and rubrics to NCTE standards. Their efforts have resulted in the data provided in assessments 3, 5, 6, and 7 from fall 2007 to present. Our focus is now on continuously improving inter-rater reliability using the standardized assessment rubrics.

Field Experience Evaluation Changes
The final student teaching report has been expanded upon such that specific indicators have been subdivided to provide more detailed results. This is especially important as it relates to identifying candidate content knowledge. The aggregated results of the student teaching reports have been broken down to a discipline specific level rather than an annual report for all secondary education graduate students.

Assessment of Impact on Student Learning
We added an additional required course, EDU 451 Assessment of Learning, for candidates entering the program in fall 2006. The first group of candidates has just progressed to this course level and will complete the Measurement Project with its standardized rubric in spring 2009.

Conclusions
All program completers have met or exceeded the NCTE program standards. We are very satisfied with our candidate performance on the identified program assessments and the evidence of program quality the assessments provide related to NCTE standards. We are focused on continuous improvement and will annually examine the assessments themselves, and the information they offer to us regarding our programs and candidates.
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Assessment 8

See Attachments panel below.
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**SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM**

1. Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

---

**Content Knowledge:**

Evaluation of program assessment results is part of the program’s and the unit’s continuous improvement process. It should be noted that in 2006 the State of New York changed the requirements for certification of New York State School administrators. Candidates entering the program are now required to have a Masters degree. This altered the focus from a first masters program to either an Advanced Study Program or a second masters program depending on the program option selected by the candidate. Candidates accepted into the leadership program are well qualified and have demonstrated capacity for doing graduate level study. Accordingly, faculty review of data and assessments improve program ability to provide the highest level of academic experience.

The Niagara University Educational Leadership faculty continuously reviews the quality of the program. As a result of the continuous assessment process the faculty changed program elements. The comprehensive exam was restructured into two (2) parts, one addressing knowledge, and the other application. Each part specifically aligned with the ELCC Standards. In addition, two person blind scoring was employed to assure rater reliability. The Supervision and Professional Learning Project has been made more comprehensive and is utilized as a course embedded authentic learning experience. Up to ten (10) hours from the experience may be credited toward the candidate’s internship requirement. The School Improvement Project was redesigned to incorporate strategic planning which involves the collaboration with all stakeholders and additional research.

A review of the assessment data reveals that results are very positive in all the assessment areas. This is an indication of the quality of the program and improvements to assessments and rubrics. Initially the rubrics and related scoring guides did not provide data that were specific enough to indicate the needed
program changes. Assessment was improved for 2007 by moving from a 3 point Likert scale to a 5 point Likert scale. Similarly, evaluations from site mentors did not provide enough range in rubric scoring to identify the specific areas for candidate improvement. Improvements will also be made through increased communication with site mentors to clarify the purpose and design of the assessment.

A review of the data also resulted in an agreement on the part of the faculty that content knowledge is essential prerequisite to practice. Therefore, candidates must now complete their required core courses prior to enrollment into the internship course.

For the first time starting in Feb 2009 candidates will be required to take and pass the New York State Educational Leadership qualifying exam in order to be eligible for New York State certification. Beginning in May 2009 the New York State test will be used as the Assessment of Knowledge (#1) for School Building Leader and School District Leader. Moving forward, the results of this exam will assist the program in evaluation of content knowledge.

Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions:

The internship requirements have been substantially increased with particular emphasis on Standard VII. The internship experience must be carefully documented to assure that each candidate’s experience is intensive, authentic, and aligned with ELCC Standards. Certain identified administrative tasks have been incorporated into the internship experience to assure that candidate’s experience is comprehensive. This includes, but is not limited to attendance and participation at Board of Education meetings, Committee on Special Education meetings, multiple interviews with administrative personnel at various levels of the organization, interviews with external educational agency representatives, and analysis of collective bargaining issues. As a additional means of monitoring performance during the internship candidates are required to submit their experience log weekly, via e-mail, to the University Supervisor of Educational Leadership. The log must contain a reflection that connects theory with practice.

Two very specific areas of concern were revealed in reviewing candidate success in their internships. Candidates do not score as high as expected in Standard 3 “management of resources.” This is in part because institutions are very reluctant to offer this kind of hands-on experience to an intern. Therefore, the program will improve the situational settings for leadership interns and develop specific required tasks that must be accomplished as part of the internship and artifact portfolio that insure greater success in the area addressed in Standard 3.

We also found that candidates did not perform well the development of a “structured entry plan.” This was revealed in Assessment #7. Since this is an important experience for candidates preparing to enter into administration program changes include multiple seminar sessions established to review all aspects for the plan and to assure that each candidate can successfully develop a plan in an authentic situation.

Student Learning:

All ELCC Standards speak to the promotion of the success of all students. Reviewing our assessments data we determined that we want to have an additional program requirement that effectively assess our candidates’ readiness for administration, and the responsibility of the promotion of student learning. The Educational Leadership Program will establish an oral defense interface for all candidates seeking to complete the program beginning May 2009. This interface will require each candidate to demonstrate how he or she has met all the ELCC Standards by providing specific evidence within each standard and indicate the direct connection of this evidence to student success. The interface review panel will consist of at one Educational Leadership faculty member, one faculty member within the College of Education, and one practicing school administrator who previously served as a site mentor for at least one Niagara
University Educational Leadership Candidate.

Conclusion:

Every aspect of the Niagara University Educational Leadership Program is aligned with the ELCC Standards. Accordingly, Niagara University candidates have a rich educational experience that is focused and directed while framed within the ELCC Standards. The program assessments are specifically aligned with the ELCC standards. Therefore the assessments effectively measure candidates' success in meeting the ELCC Standards. Given assessment results, improvement focus will continue to focus on reliability and validity, assessment instruments and rubrics, course curriculum and internship experiences and portfolio artifacts.

Niagara University, College of Education and Department of Educational Leadership demonstrate a strong commitment to continuous improvement.

SECTION VI - FOR REVISED REPORTS OR RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORTS ONLY

1. Describe what changes or additions have been made in the report to address the standards that were not met in the original submission. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made. Specific instructions for preparing a revised report are available on the NCATE web site at http://www.ncate.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=4. (Response limited to 24,000 characters.)
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Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 6

See Attachments panel below.

7. Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 7

See Attachments panel below.

8. Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 8

See Attachments panel below.

SECTION V USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

1. Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)
Introduction
Our greatest challenge in using assessment results to improve candidate and program performance has been the small enrollment numbers within this program. The highest count for any one assessment in any given year has been 11 candidates. Our most recent assessments are currently analyzed on a semester by semester basis so that we may examine the results of revised scoring guides. This yields even smaller candidate counts. Beginning with the 2008-2009 academic year, these will be reviewed on an annual basis which will result in higher aggregated counts. The following improvements have been made based on the assessment results for candidates within this program and analogous Birth to Grade 6 program with greater enrollment numbers.

Content Knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
We have 2 core assessments of candidate content knowledge in reading/literacy education. The New York State Teacher Certification Examination Content Specialty Test - Literacy (Field 65) provides external validation of our program, as its data compares our program with other programs throughout New York State and demonstrates candidate knowledge of the foundations of literacy. The Comprehensive Portfolio completed and defended by all candidates at the conclusion of the program provides internal validation using authentic information about each candidate’s knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to program expectations.

We are pleased that 100% of our candidates have passed both assessments. The consistency across these two measures provides an indication of reliability and validity. The Content Specialty Test is revealing because it demonstrates that our candidates outperform the state average in their knowledge of literacy foundations. The Comprehensive Portfolio demonstrates the practical application of this knowledge base. Despite the concurrent validity evidenced by the scores on the CST, we have continuously structured the scoring rubric on the comprehensive examination and therefore over the 2007-2008 academic year developed additional detail in the scoring guide for this assessment. We believe the data indicating fewer “exceptional” ratings and more “satisfactory” ratings on the portfolio is a result of this effort. The final version of this rubric has been implemented with the fall 2008 portfolio candidates and we anticipate greater differentiation in scoring based on this more detailed calibration.

Although there is not any direct information from these assessments indicating a need to improve instruction in the area of literacy content knowledge, we have examined our programs according to IRA expectations and revised our elective offerings to focus more directly on issues of literacy. Currently, candidates entering the program have a more restricted set of electives of which they choose three. We hope that this will further expand their knowledge and skills in the foundations of literacy.

Planning (Assessment 3)
We assess each candidate’s ability to plan literacy instruction using the Literacy Strategies Handbook. Since candidates enter the program with an initial general branch teaching certificate we assume that they know general lesson and unit planning and therefore expect them to broaden their planning skills by focusing on research-based, literacy instructional strategies. Candidates demonstrate their learning by developing lesson plans for 5 or more such strategies. We believe the results of this assessment indicate that our candidates are skilled at planning, identifying a wide range of curriculum materials, and assessing student learning within the context of a lesson or unit.

The assessment itself has been in existence for a number of years. In the fall of 2007 a more structured rubric was developed and aligned to IRA standards. This enabled us to gather information on specific sub-elements of the assessment and further detail candidate pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Although this assessment indicates that our candidates are successful in planning literacy instruction, we believe, in the interest of continuous improvement, that 6 of the 7 more recently revised
electives within this program will enhance our candidates’ abilities to plan using research-based reading strategies (EDU 515 and 516); that integrate math, science and technology (EDU 557) and multicultural literature (EDU 579); and develop students’ writing strategies (EDU 574).

Practicum (Assessment 4)
Candidates have continuously been successful in their literacy practicum field experiences as evidenced by the final Literacy Practicum Report. The one candidate not meeting all criteria on the practicum was rated as emerging in the “professional community” program expectation on the practicum report. All candidates enter the program with an initial general branch teaching certificate, but some have no independent classroom experience. As a result of New York State regulations requiring them to complete a master’s degree and 2 years of teaching within a five year time frame of initial certification, a small few have moved from full time undergraduate education students recently completing student teaching, to full time graduate students focusing on literacy instruction. Based on their level of experience these candidates are challenged to meet IRA Standard 5 initiatives such as evaluating and providing feedback on the practice of others, and implementing professional development programs. In addition IRA standard 3.4 communicating assessment results to colleagues, administrators, policy makers, officials and the community is difficult for novice teachers to demonstrate. To address these issues in Fall 2007 we revised Assessment 8 the Foundations of Literacy Project. See the information provided in “Other” below. We also included a new elective option for candidates; EDU 747 Consultation and Collaboration. This course offers candidates the opportunity to explore the role of the Reading Coach and the collaborative strategies that are required for improving student and faculty learning. We are advising our less experienced candidates to select this option.

Impact on Student Learning (Assessment 5 and 6)
Assessment of impact on student learning is integrated throughout the program and the 8 assessments we use for program review. More specifically, the Literacy Case Study in EDU 572 enables candidates to focus on assessment and instructional planning for a student with known or suspected reading difficulties. The Reading Assessment and Differentiated Instruction assignment in EDU 575 examines assessment and instruction from a developmental continuum. These assignments were revised in the fall of 2007 to include written reports that communicate the results of the assessments to specific individuals (IRA 3.4). Prior to this time, the program candidates did not consistently and specifically demonstrate this communication skill. In addition standard rubrics were developed to enable us to gather more structured information on specific sub-elements of the assessment and further detail candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions in this area.

Other (7 and 8)
The Classroom Analysis and Motivation Plan completed by candidates in EDU 798 Literacy Seminar was revised in the fall of 2007 to focus more on the ability of candidates to enhance the literacy practices of school colleagues (teachers and paraprofessionals). In short, it requires candidates to foster literate environments and model strategies that will enhance the practices of others. A standardized rubric also implemented in Fall 2007 enables us to more specifically assess candidate competencies on this assignment and therefore improve candidate practices and the program.

The Foundations of Literacy Project in EDU 555 charges candidates with accessing recent literacy theory and research and implementing a simulated professional development workshop to improve candidate competency in communicating and collaborating with other professionals and initiating professional development programs. This assessment was developed in response to candidates’ need to communicate with colleagues and other professionals, and institute professional development programs. A number of our literacy faculty have taken this a step further and in the summer and fall semesters of 2008 they have had candidates in EDU 555 Literacy Foundations plan and implement Professional Development Summits wherein candidates offer their workshops to individuals outside of the program.
including practicing teachers, teacher candidates, and faculty. The Summits have had impressive attendance and been very positively received by the professional community.

Summary of Program Changes
Revision of Elective Offerings
The program has offered 8 (3 credit hour) electives since its registration in 2002. These electives were recently revised and reduced to focus more directly on literacy foundations. There are currently 7 (3 credit hour) elective options. One is a new course in the Department and Unit EDU 557 Math, Science, and Literacy Technology. This course was developed and approved within the program in the fall of 2008 in an effort to enhance candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions in these areas (IRA 2.2, 3.1, and 4.2). Another course, EDU 747 Consultation and Collaboration has been an offering in our special education programs for some time. After cross-program conversations it was decided that the course objectives and assignments matched well with IRA expectations for working with colleagues (IRA 5.3) and communicating the results of assessments to educational professionals (IRA 3.4).

Standardization of Rubric Scoring Guides
The signature assessments within the program have been existence in some form for many years. The scoring rubrics have been in an on-going refinement process of standardization. Faculty within the program have more clearly aligned the sub-elements of the assignments and rubrics to IRA standards. Their efforts have resulted in the data provided in assessments 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 from fall 2007 to present. Our focus is now on continuously improving the inter-rater reliability using the standardized assessment rubrics.

Course-based Changes
The final practicum report data provides some indication that a few of our candidates are less able to demonstrate their interactions with the professional community. It is for this reason that we have enhanced the assignment in EDU 555 Literacy Foundations. Candidates are now required to develop teaching guides and implement professional development workshops, therefore demonstrating their ability to communicate with other professionals. A similar revision was instituted in the Literacy Case Study assignment in EDU 572 and the Reading Assessment and Differentiated Instruction assignment in EDU 575 which requires candidates to develop a written report that communicates the results of assessments to various audiences for both accountability and instructional purposes. As a result, our novice candidates will have additional opportunities to gain experience in supporting the professional community.

Conclusions
All program completers have met or exceeded the IRA program standards. We are very satisfied with our candidate performance on the identified program assessments and the evidence of program quality the assessments provide related to IRA standards. We are focused on continuous improvement and will annually examine the assessments themselves, and the information they offer to us regarding our programs and candidates.
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1. Describe what changes or additions have been made in response to issues cited in previous recognition report. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made. Specific instructions for preparing a revised report or a response to condition report are available on the NCATE web site at http://www.ncate.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=4 (Response limited to 24,000 characters.)
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SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

1. Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)
Introduction
Although the results of our assessment data are generally positive across each of our program assessment measures we recognize a few challenges that we have faced in using assessment results to improve candidate performance and program quality. Our central focus has been on refining the assessment measures and scoring guides. In the interest of continuous improvement, the following changes have been made.

Content Knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
We have 2 core assessments of candidate content knowledge. The New York State Teacher Certification Examination Content Specialty Tests in Mathematics provides external validation of our program. The GPA in Mathematics and Math/Pedagogy coursework evaluated prior to student teaching provides additional validation of each candidate’s knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to NCTM standards.

We are pleased that 97% of our candidates have passed the Content Specialty Test. In addition, candidate GPA in math coursework appears to be relatively high and this finding is consistent with the GPA in pedagogical coursework aligned to NCTM standards. We have always been concerned with relying on GPA for content knowledge because the courses in the mathematics concentration are managed by the Department of Mathematics; outside of our direct Unit structure. The consistency across these two measures of content knowledge provides an indication of reliability and validity that eases this concern. It appears that our mutual partnership efforts with the Mathematics Department have resulted in strong content knowledge on the part of our candidates. These partnership initiatives have included discussing assessment results, sharing instructors, updating content area coursework, and scheduling courses at times that do not conflict with field experiences.

Planning (Assessment 3)
We assess each candidate’s ability to plan instruction using the Consecutive Lesson Planning Project. Candidates are required to plan 2 lessons for a secondary classroom that integrate mathematics learning standards. The plans must include appropriate learning goals based on state curricula, a variety of instructional strategies, and on-going assessment. The assessment itself has been in existence for a number of years. In the fall of 2007 a more structured rubric was developed and aligned to NCTM standards. This enabled us to gather information on specific sub-elements of the assessment and further detail candidate pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Student Teaching (Assessment 4)
Candidates have continuously been successful in their student teaching field experiences as evidenced by results of the Final Student Teaching Report. After reviewing the results from the 2006-2007 academic year, we recognized that our student teaching evaluation process was too general to effectively measure content knowledge within the specific discipline of mathematics. We therefore consulted the NCTM standards and subdivided the previous indicator of content knowledge. We feel that this revision provided additional detail from which we could determine candidate and program strength and weakness as it relates to content knowledge. Other indicators were also subdivided to reveal additional detail. Furthermore, we have worked closely with our Office of Field Experiences to ensure that our annual reports are broken out by content area and not simply presented as a comprehensive report of candidates in secondary education. The Office of Field Experience has also directly assigned one full time student teaching supervisor to the data collection and review of student teaching experiences in secondary mathematics instruction.

Impact on Student Learning (Assessment 5)
Assessment of impact on student learning is integrated throughout the program. Assessments 3-7 include evaluations of impact on student learning. More specifically, the Measurement Project in EDU
451 enables candidates to focus on assessment and instructional planning for students within the Teaching Assistantship field experience. The requirement for EDU 451 was initiated 3 years ago and the first cohort of candidates progressed to the course in fall 2008. Unfortunately there were not any math candidates in the course that semester. The data gathered prior to this semester in the Teaching Assistantship Evaluation generally indicate that our candidates are effective in “using informal/formal assessment strategies to monitor student learning and adjust instructional strategies.” We are hopeful that as more candidates progress to and complete EDU 451, they will take a more cognizant and reflective look at their impact on student learning; further demonstrating their pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions as they relate to NCTM standards.

Additional Assessments that Address NCTM Standards (Assessments 6-8)
The Content Area Resource Packet completed by candidates in EDU 463 Special Methods of Teaching Mathematics requires candidates to identify instructional resources, plan, and assess instructional activities in each of the strands of the discipline. This is a very comprehensive assessment integrating content knowledge, planning, and assessment. The new, standardized rubric aligned to NCTM standards implemented in fall 2007 enables us to more specifically assess candidate competencies on this assignment and therefore improve candidate practice and the program.

The Assessment of Teaching Skills – Written and Liberal Arts and Sciences Test are additional external assessments of pedagogical skill and content knowledge required of candidates applying for New York State Certification. Our candidates have been 100% successful on these exams. Despite this on-going success, we continuously monitor the results as they are provided to us for all candidates, regardless of their program completion status, to gain insight into potential needs for program improvement.

Summary of Program Changes
Review of Content Knowledge
We have continued our partnership with the Mathematics Department to improve candidate content knowledge. These initiatives have included discussing assessment results, updating content area curricula, sharing instructors, and scheduling courses at times that do not conflict with field experiences.

Standardization of Rubric Scoring Guides
The signature course-based assessments within the program have been existence in some form for many years. Prior to the fall of 2007 the assignments were reviewed using a portfolio model with a more general rubric assessing program expectations assigned to the course. The scoring rubrics have been in an on-going refinement and standardization process. Faculty members within the program have more clearly aligned the sub-elements of the assignments and rubrics to NCTM standards. Their efforts have resulted in the data provided in assessments 3, 5, and 6 from fall 2007 to present. Our focus is now on continuously improving inter-rater reliability using these standardized assessment rubrics.

Field Experience Evaluation Changes
The final student teaching report has been expanded upon such that specific indicators have been subdivided to provide more detailed results. This is especially important as it relates to identifying candidate content knowledge. The aggregated results of the student teaching reports have been broken down to a discipline specific level rather than an annual report for all secondary education graduate students.

Conclusions
We are satisfied with the assessments we are currently implementing as a measure of candidate and program quality. Our program completers generally meet or exceeded the NCTM standards. We are focused on continuous improvement and will annually examine the assessments themselves, and the information they offer to us regarding our programs and candidates.
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