NEAG ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Agenda
October 19, 2010

Charge: Help foster an assessment culture for the Neag School. To do this, the committee will assist in development, implementation, and refinement of the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan so that we ensure a participatory model across all departments and programs; help assist in the development of instruments and protocols, the implementation of assessment designs, and the analyses and reporting of data; and, provide feedback and input on assessment initiatives.

Objectives for 2009-2010:
- Transitioned to an advisory committee with off-shoot assessment working groups.
- Fine-tuned the communication with faculty on assessment system and culture (based, in part, on survey results).
- Formulated all questions for alumni (and employee) survey questions for dissemination in fall 2010.

Objectives for 2010-2011:
- Continue to support further coordination of various subcommittees.
- Distribute the alumni survey and provide feedback on the initial drafts of the report.
- Distribute the employer survey and provide feedback on the initial drafts of the report.
- Begin initial discussion on school climate survey(s) to be administered in 2011-2012.
- Review and discuss the completed Annual Concentration/Program Report for Assessment.
- Update The Neag School of Education Assessment Plan (2nd edition) for the next edition distributed in September 2011.

11:00-11:30 Lunch

11:30-11:45 Welcoming

During the welcoming section of the Neag Assessment Committee (NAC) meeting, participants will be introduced, the charge will be shared, the objectives that were accomplished last year will be imparted, and the objectives for the 2010-2011 academic year will be communicated. (Mary Y. and all)

11:45-12:10 Subcommittee and Spotlight on Assessment Reports

Beginning in 2009-2010, the NAC has various subcommittees. In addition, we have the Spotlight on Assessment strategic initiative that comes under this committee. Routinely, the NAC will have updates from various sources. Mary will start with a blueprint of the conceptual model of the sub-groups and an outline of the Spotlight on Assessment initiative.
Spotlight for Assessment – Participation in a Process, Conference, Series of Colloquium, News Brief

✓ Neag Assessment Subcommittee on Teacher Education (Mike A.)
✓ Neag Assessment Subcommittee for Administration Preparation (Shuana)
✓ Neag Assessment Critical Friends Virtual Group on Clinic Evaluations and Surveys Using Checkbox (Mary Y.)
✓ Neag Assessment Subcommittee on Fostering Assessment through Technology (Mary Y.)
✓ Neag Assessment Subcommittee OATS Assessment Planning (Tammy, Craig, Mary Y.)

12:10-12:20 Updates on Assessment as it relates to Accreditation

Last year was NCATE visitation; this year it will be CAPTE. All accreditation processes now rely heavily on assessment data and assessment use. (That is why this committee is so important!) Today, the committee will get an update on these two accreditation processes.

✓ CAPTE – Commission for Accreditation of Physical Therapy Education (Craig)
✓ NCATE – National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (Marijke, Yuhang)

12:20-12:35 Alumni and Employer Surveys

October is “Alumni Survey Month.” Through various avenues, we have broadcasted the availability of the survey. Last spring, the NAC designed the alumni survey to be and aligned with our conceptual framework and made up of four components. The first three sections developed by committee members are: General Perspectives on the Neag School of Education, Employment Information, and Background Information. The fourth component consists of program-specific information. To develop questions in this fourth section, the NAC members approached faculty in various programs. For example, there are program-specific questions for Athletic Training, School Psychology, UCAPP, School Counseling, Teacher Education, Executive Leadership, Sports Training, G&T, and others. A “model” survey that incorporates Checkbox is available at: http://uconn.checkboxonline.com/demo.aspx.

During this meeting, the associated tasks and timeline will be reviewed and discussed with the committee. The plans for the employer survey(s) (aligned with the alumni survey) will be presented and discussed. For the spring meeting, we are anticipating initial results and will look to the NAC for further guidance. (Mary; Austin)

12:35-12:50 Fine-tuning the Neag Assessment Plan (3rd edition)

In September of 2008, the 2nd edition of The Neag School of Education Assessment Plan was produced and distributed. To accomplish this, the NAC did a thorough review of the 400+ pages of the 2004-2005 Assessment Plan. The NAC determined that this initial plan had a heavy emphasis on the initial teacher education programs, while excluding other departments/programs. Additionally, it was agreed that much of the data and analyses included in this document could be reserved for appendices or electronic web retrieval of data and/or reports. The NAC set a goal of creating a document that would succinctly (<50 pages) articulate the plan for all departments/programs. To obtain feedback from a larger audience, the NAC took a draft outline and subsequent draft versions to departmental faculty meetings. The NAC then brought the plan to the entire Neag faculty meeting, monthly department meetings, clinical or field experience teachers/supervisors, alumni, and employers.

This plan is slated to be updated every three years (2008, 2011, 2014, etc.).
After putting much energy into the 2nd edition, minor modifications are envisioned for the 3rd edition which is to be distributed in September of 2011. Two areas that are discussed in the plan are the Neag Assessment Review Survey and the End-of-Year Concentration/Program Report.

The Modifications Logistics – Timeline, Process (*Marisa, Mary*)

The Results of the Neag Assessment Review Survey (*facilitators – Jean, Stephanie*)

  The Committee Results
  The School Results

The Commendations and Areas for Improvement

The End-of-Year Concentration/Program Report (*Mary*)

  The Form and Submissions

**12:50-1:15** Neag Student Database System

Slowly but surely, the Neag School is developing its own student database. It was introduced last spring. Many of the administrative assistants have received an hour of training on the database. The NAC members will receive an overview of the major functions, both current and projected for the future. (*facilitator- Mary Ann, demonstrator- Matt*)

**1:15-1:25** Down the road ....

The Direction for the School Climate Survey

Updating the Database for CT Alumni in Public Schools (so that the reports – *Where are our Alumni from The Neag School of Education Employed during 2009-2010 in Connecticut Public Schools?* and *Where Are 2009 Neag School’s Teacher Education Graduates in CT Public Schools* can be completed this year)

**1:25-1:30** Through the Year and Wrap-up
NEAG ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
October 19, 2010 Minutes

The fall 2010 meeting for the Neag Assessment Committee (NAC) commenced at 11:40. Participants were introduced, the charge was shared, and the objectives for the 2010-2011 academic year were communicated to the committee.

Highlights on the NAC Subcommittees and Briefing on the Spotlight on Assessment Initiative

Mary explained that this is the second year that the NAC will have a number of subgroups encompassing some NAC members and some others outside of NAC. Each group will only meet two times to limit the amount of workload. A handout was used to illustrate the structure of NAC and its subcommittees in the format of a graphic organizer. This handout will also be placed on our assessment committee website for the Neag community to view.

Updates were then provided from representatives of several of these subcommittees. For example, Mike shared the happenings during the fall meeting of the Teacher Education subcommittee. After discussing the key findings of the Common Exit Survey, Mike reported on the new clinic evaluation forms, which now incorporate rubrics and are administered using an online system (Checkbox). He also reported on the revision of the supplemental surveys and shared information about Educational Expansions, an initiative geared toward conducting research on the student achievement of the K-12 pupils of teachers who are alumni of our teacher education program. Reference was made to a handout which included abstracts on five studies on the initiative. Many then explained that the Neag Critical Friends on Clinic Evaluations and Surveys using Checkbox met “virtually” to identify program-specific needs and applications in the future development of assessment instruments and reports in Checkbox. Shuana then provided an update on the newest group, the Administration Preparation Assessment Subcommittee. She shared that the committee recently developed seven new surveys/evaluation forms in Checkbox to be used by UCAPP. Six of the seven applications dovetailed with what is done with Teacher Education. Mary provided a briefing of the Spotlight on Assessment initiative. She reviewed the key components of this initiative: 1) an assessment participatory process; 2) an annual assessment conference; 3) a series of colloquium in the fall and spring of each year; and 4) the “News Brief” newsletter highlighting current events related to assessment at the Neag School. Mary gave an overview of this summer’s statewide conference and indicated that it was “sold out” three weeks prior to the event. This fall’s colloquium series was discussed with an outline of the planning process for the spring sessions. Based on input from student representatives, faculty committee members are requested to share at faculty meetings the request by students for faculty to share the listserv emails which discuss our colloquia with students.

Accreditation

Last spring we had the NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) visitation; this year it will be CAPTE (Commission for Accreditation of Physical Therapy Education). It was shared with
the NAC that all accreditation processes now rely heavily on assessment data and use and therefore the NAC has a vital role in assisting with oversight for these very important processes. While Mary then provided the status of the spring visitation team for NCATE, Craig provided an overview of the impending CAPTE.

The Alumni/Employer Surveys

It was shared that the NAC designed the alumni survey last spring to be aligned with our conceptual framework and comprised of four components. The first three sections developed collectively by committee members are: General Perspectives on the Neag School of Education, Employment Information, and Background Information. The fourth component consists of program-specific information. To develop questions in this fourth section, the NAC members approached faculty in various programs. For example, there are program-specific questions for Athletic Training, School Psychology, UCAPP, School Counseling, Teacher Education, Executive Leadership, Sports Training, Gifted and Talented, and others.

Mary shared that October is dubbed the “Alumni Survey Month.” A “model” survey in Checkbox is available at http://uconn.checkboxonline.com/demo.aspx for faculty and staff.

Austin shared that many attempts have been made to broadcast the availability of the survey to targeted alumni through various avenues. We are continuing to make efforts to track down as many alumni as possible through various means such as postcards, email communication, and web postings. The process used for developing the database and for calculating the denominator (to report on the response rate) was described. As a result of discussion generated at this meeting, it was decided to look into Facebook as an additional method of contact.

Associated tasks and timelines tied to the alumni survey were reviewed and discussed with the committee. All faculty committee members were asked to share information about the alumni survey at the upcoming department meeting. For this purpose, a handout was provided which may be useful as a reference and/or handout during the meeting.

Additionally, the plans for the employer survey(s), aligned with the alumni survey, were presented and discussed. Upon the employer survey(s) development, NAC members may be asked to assist in various capacities. For the spring meeting, members should anticipate initial alumni and employer survey results. Guidance on further analysis and reporting will be requested from the committee at that time.

The Neag School of Education Assessment Plan

To provide a background for the members new to the committee in the last two years, Mary explained that the 2nd edition of The Neag School of Education Assessment Plan was distributed in September of 2008. To accomplish this, during the 2007-08 school year, the NAC did a thorough review of the 400+ pages of the 2004-2005 Assessment Plan. The NAC had determined that this initial plan had a heavy emphasis on the initial teacher education programs, while excluding other departments/programs. Additionally, it was agreed that much of the data and analyses included in this document could be reserved for appendices or electronic web retrieval of data and/or reports. The NAC set a goal of creating a document that would succinctly (<50 pages) articulate the plan for all departments/programs. To obtain feedback from a larger audience, the NAC took a draft outline and subsequent draft versions to departmental faculty meetings. The NAC then brought the plan to the
entire Neag faculty meeting, monthly department meetings, clinical or field experience teachers/supervisors, alumni, and employers. The final version was distributed in September of 2008.

Mary explained that the plan is slated to be updated every three years (2005, 2008, 2011, 2014, etc). The revisions will be made this school year with the next target date for release of the 3rd edition in September of 2011.

In today’s meeting, the committee reviewed a first draft of the 3rd version and offered initial discussion and feedback. In particular, there was discussion around the complaint process section in the appendix, and what should be included and omitted. It was brought up that there would be a need to be certain that this section was aligned to the University’s guidelines as well. Following the meeting, an email will be sent out inviting each committee member to a “drop box” and seeking those interested in further discussion of the complaint process. The document will be located in the drop box and all will have access to making modifications on the same version. All modifications by committee members will be due November 30.

Two areas that are discussed in the plan are the Neag Assessment Review Survey and the End-of-Year Concentration/Program Report. The results of the Neag Assessment Review Survey were disaggregated by responses from the entire school faculty and responses from the committee alone. These results were shared with the committee. Members will receive information on how to submit additional feedback by November 30 to significant questions that were posed by Jean regarding these survey results. The committee was then given a summary the End-of-Year Concentration/Program Report with an explanation of the form and submissions process.

The School Climate Survey

The school climate survey(s) to be possibly administrated next year were then discussed. This included the distribution of the last faculty/staff climate survey. A student version of a climate survey, published in the special edition on higher education journal because it had a theoretical foundation and technical properties (factor analysis and reliability), was then shared. Committee members were asked which groups they thought should be surveyed: Faculty? Staff? Students? After discussions, the committee wanted to recommend all three stakeholder groups. The committee then focused their discussion on the content. Members felt that the various versions would need to be connected. It was decided that as a follow-up homework assignment, an email would be sent to committee members asking for further commentary and suggestions on the items.

The Database and Subsequent Analyses of CT Alumni in Public Schools

Last spring, the committee reviewed and provided feedback to two reports: Where are our Alumni from The Neag School of Education Employed during 2009-2010 in Connecticut Public Schools? and Where Are 2009 Neag School’s Teacher Education Graduates in CT Public Schools? Committee members were told that this year we would again be asking the CSDE to supply information on the employment of our alumni in CT public schools. We will also ask them if information from when alumni were functioning under a previous certification can also be supplied so that we can get an index of employment longevity.

Neag School of Education Student Database
Slowly but surely, the Neag School is developing its own student database which was introduced last year. Many of the administrative assistants have received an hour of training on the database. Matt provided a demonstration of this database by focusing on the application process. *The membership will be asked for a demonstration of one feature each of the next three meetings.*

**Meeting Follow-up**

After the meeting:
- ✓ An email will be sent out inviting each committee member to a “drop box.” When entering the “drop box,” you will see the preliminary version of the 3rd edition of the *Neag Assessment Plan.*
  
  *Drop box is being used so that all members can use the MS Word Edit feature on the same version.*
  
  All modifications by committee members will be due November 30.
- ✓ An email will be sent out soliciting additional feedback, due November 30, to the significant questions that were posed by Jean regarding the results of this year’s annual assessment survey.
- ✓ An email will be sent out for a subgroup to meet on the complaint process used in the plan.

**Mary has agreed to:**
- ✓ Explore the use of Facebook as an additional method of notification of alumni about the survey.
- ✓ Request the CSDE to supply information on the employment of our alumni in CT public schools this year.
- ✓ Continue processing the database so that we will have a “denominator” for calculating the response rate for the alumni survey.

**Committee members have agreed to:**
- ✓ Share at faculty meetings:
  - ✓ The request from student committee members for faculty to share with students the listserv emails which discuss our colloquia.
  - ✓ Information about the alumni survey during the upcoming department meeting. (For this purpose, a handout was provided which may be useful as a reference and/or handout during the meeting.)
  - ✓ With the employer survey(s) development, committee members may be asked to assist.

**The following items will be included on future meeting agendas:**
- ✓ Updates from the various committees/groups working on assessment
- ✓ Demonstration of an additional feature on the new school’s database (at least 3 of the next meetings)
- ✓ Initial alumni and employer survey results (spring meeting)

The official meeting concluded at 1:30.
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PART I: INTRODUCTION

Within the overview section of this report, the role and purpose of assessment in the teacher-learning paradigm, along with key strategic documents, are presented.

THE TEACHING-LEARNING PARADIGM AND WHY ASSESSMENT IS IMPORTANT

In a teaching-learning university in a comprehensive research extensive land and sea grant institution, assessment is focused on describing very explicit outcomes expected of the students and adopts reliable and valid procedures for assessing this achievement, according to the New England Association of Schools and Colleges’ policy statement on institutional effectiveness, http://www.assessment.uconn.edu/accreditation.htm. The University of Connecticut (herein, UConn), and specifically the Neag School of Education (herein, the Neag School), embraces this paradigm shift for learning and assessment.

A key ingredient in the learner-centered environment is where the mission and conceptual framework is used as a process that focuses on the learner. Thus, the focus is on what a student learns by providing consistent, continual, and interactive feedback. The goal is to understand not only what students know, but also how they know it. Learner-centered professors coach and facilitate, intertwining teaching and assessing. In a learner-centered environment teaching and assessment are not separate, episodic events, but rather, they are ongoing, interrelated activities focused on providing guidance for improvement (Freed & Huba, 2000). In such an environment, assessment is important for a number of reasons.

Assessment is crucial for helping people learn. Assessment should mirror good instruction; happen continuously as part of instruction; and provide information about the levels of understanding that students are reaching. In order for learners to gain insight into their learning and their understanding, frequent feedback is critical: students need to monitor their learning and actively evaluate their strategies and their current levels of understanding (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 1999).

Assessment is needed for effective teaching. According to Bain (2004), people tend to learn most effectively in ways that make a sustained, substantial, and positive influence on the way they think, act, or feel when they:

• are trying to solve problems (intellectual, physical, artistic, practical, abstract, etc.) or create something new that they find intriguing, beautiful, and/or important;
are able to do so in a challenging yet supportive environment in which they can feel a sense of control over their own education;

can work collaboratively with other learners to grapple with the problems;

believe that their work will be considered fairly and honestly; and,

can try, fail, and receive feedback from expert learners in advance of and separate from any summative judgment of their efforts.

Assessment is needed for a quality learning environment. Quality learning environments are learning, knowledge, assessment, and community-centered. Learner-centered is paying careful attention to the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and beliefs that learners bring to the educational setting. Knowledge-centered is taking seriously the need to help students become knowledgeable by learning in ways that lead to understanding. Assessment-centered is providing opportunities for feedback and revision and what is assessed is congruent with the students’ learning goals. While formative assessment involves the use of assessments as sources of feedback to improve teaching and learning, summative assessment measures what students have learned at the end of some set of learning activities. Finally, community-centered is referring to several aspects of community, including the classroom as community, the school as a community, and the degree to which students, teachers, and administrators feel connected to the larger community of homes, business, states, the nation, and even the world (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 1999).

MULTIPLE PURPOSES FOR ASSESSMENTS

Assessment serves multiple purposes. As displayed in Figure 1, the level of assessment (Who?), the purpose of assessment (Why?), and the object of assessment (What?) must be taken into account (http://www.assessment.uconn.edu/why2.htm).

There are many questions which can be addressed through assessment. For student learning, how well do course objectives track with curricula objectives and, to what extent are key curricula goals introduced and reinforced from course to course? For curricula efficiency, to what extent are objectives based on documented evidence on what students need to know and do? For student success, what is our track record in attracting and retaining students, and how they do after they graduate?
ASSESSMENT AS CONNECTIONS

Assessment cannot stand alone; it needs grounding in strategic and systematic processes. For example, the assessment plan needs to be grounded in the UConn’s and the Neag School’s missions.

The University of Connecticut is a flagship public research institution for the State of Connecticut and enrolls almost 30,000 students at its multiple campuses. In addition to a comprehensive undergraduate program, it is a land and sea grant university with a wide range of graduate programs, professional schools, research centers and institutes. Since the drafting of the 1994 university mission statement and the strategic planning that laid its foundation for the UConn 2000 and 21st Century UConn programs, the University of Connecticut has periodically reviewed its mission statement, and its activities, to ensure that they are in alignment.

The latest revision of the mission statement was adopted by the Board of Trustees in 2006. This mission statement serves as a guide as the transformation of the University of Connecticut into a major nationally-recognized comprehensive research institution continues. The mission of the University of Connecticut states:
The University of Connecticut is dedicated to excellence demonstrated through national and international recognition. As Connecticut’s public research university, through freedom of academic inquiry and expression, we create and disseminate knowledge by means of scholarly and creative achievements, graduate and professional education, and outreach. Through our focus on teaching and learning, the University helps every student grow intellectually and become a contributing member of the state, national, and world communities. Through research, teaching, service, and outreach, we embrace diversity and cultivate leadership, integrity, and engaged citizenship in our students, faculty, staff, and alumni. As our state’s flagship public university, and as a land and sea grant institution, we promote the health and well being of Connecticut’s citizens through enhancing the social, economic, cultural, and natural environments of the state and beyond (http://www.neasc.uconn.edu/std1.htm). The mission of the University of Connecticut is guided by The Academic Plan which is:

... a set of goals and strategic steps that will advance the University’s standing in five interrelated areas: Undergraduate Education, Graduate and Professional Education, Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, Diversity, and, Public Engagement. In each of these five areas, the plan articulates an overarching goal, describes the relationship between that goal and the values and themes underlying the plan, and then enumerates the strategies that we will use to achieve our goals (http://academicplan.uconn.edu/files/UConnAcademicPlan.pdf).

Aligned with the University’s mission, is the Neag School of Education’s mission which is:

Develop students with strong ethical standards who become teachers and leaders dedicated to improving education for all children, and by doing so, will strive to improve and enhance the quality of life in our ever changing society (http://www.education.uconn.edu/about/mission.cfm).

The Neag School achieves its mission through leadership, scholarship, inquiry, and service, under the three principle themes of learning, leading, and lighting the way in its conceptual framework. The conceptual framework themes permeate all programs and are defined by the five strands. As stated within the conceptual framework (April, 2008),

**Theme One: Learning**

*Element One: Professional Knowledge Base*

... ensure an understanding of both the theoretical and practical dimensions of the profession, working in culturally and linguistically diverse settings...

*Element Two: Evidence-Based Professional Practice*

... ensure a deep understanding of the theoretical and practical dimensions of professional practice and integrate theory, research, and practice..., a comprehensive knowledge of professional practice includes student knowledge of, and familiarity with, relevant professional “codes of ethics,” an understanding of moral and ethical decision making, and professional behaviors in accordance with ethical norms of the profession.

**Theme Two: Leading**

*Element One: Inquiry*
... provide the opportunity to become both intelligent and informed consumers of research and producers of new knowledge, informing professional practice with evidence resulting from empirical investigations.

**Element Two: Leadership**

(facilitate)...leadership to effect growth and development within the student’s chosen profession in particular, and in American democracy in general.

**Theme Three: Lighting the Way**

**Element One: Inspiration and Diversity**

... inspire our candidates to become educational leaders who are capable of lighting a fire for future leaders and practitioners so that [they] are passionate about equity and human rights.

---

**THE PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT**

This document, in alignment with the conceptual framework, presents our *Neag School of Education Assessment Plan* across all four departments and the teacher education unit. The plan is achieved through cooperation, collaboration, reflective and thoughtful practice, and performance-based assessment measures that drive improvements in current practice in this teaching-learner environment.
PART II: THE PLAN

The development of the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan to collect and analyze data for the purpose of understanding teaching, learning and student development is discussed in this section. Also, the system to ensure psychometric properties and how the plan is informally assessed is presented.

DEVELOPMENT OF ASSESSMENT PLAN

The assessment plan for the Neag School has its roots in 2004-2005 and was developed by the Teaching Certification Assessment Committee.

Following individual meetings with each department leader and the Associate Dean for the Neag School, in the winter of 2006 the Director of Assessment configured the Neag Assessment Committee to consist of two or three faculty members and two students appointed by each department leader, and a cadre of individuals representing the education preparation programs appointed by the Associate Dean. During the spring of 2007, the Neag Assessment Committee starting an outline for the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan and worked to accomplish objectives for the year (see Appendix A). A thorough review of the 400+ pages of the 2004-2005 assessment plan was undertaken by this committee. The first finding was that this initial plan had a heavy emphasis on the initial teacher education programs but minimally addressed the advanced programs in school counselor education, school psychology, speech, reading, and the school administrator preparation programs. The second finding was the Kinesiology was excluded. The third finding was that much data and analyses could be reserved for appendices or electronic web retrieval of data and/or reports. Therefore, the committee decided that their goal was to create a document that would succinctly articulate the assessment plan for the constituent programs across all departments and various units (e.g. NCATE) in the Neag School.

Given these three major findings, an outline of the 2nd version of the Neag Assessment Plan was developed by the committee with input from department and program leaders in the fall of 2007. To obtain feedback from a larger audience, this draft outline, and subsequent draft versions, was further discussed during the monthly department faculty meetings. In the spring of 2008, the committee finished the revision of the plan and then brought the plan to the entire Neag faculty meeting, monthly department meetings, and to clinical or field experience teachers/supervisors, alumni, and employers. The 2nd edition of the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan was distributed in September of 2008.
While the committee continued to make strives at realizing their objectives, it was during the 2010-2011 that the Neag Assessment Committee to a 3rd edition of the plan.

**KEY COMPONENTS OF THE ASSESSMENT PLAN**

Within this assessment plan, we centered on the conceptual framework of the Neag School and incorporated the state and national standards that are appropriate to each program. An essential feature of the assessment plan is that it manifests differently for each program. Thus, while there is a general assessment plan for the Neag School, there are multiple assessment systems that reflect the different foci and needs of our programs.

The assessment plan employs multiple measures of assessment to monitor candidate progress at various key points called “components” of their educational processes. Borrowing from NCATE, the Neag School has decided on transition points at entry, during the program (major points prior to entering clinical practice, when appropriate), immediately prior to program completion, and post graduation follow-up for all of the programs within the Neag School. The mid-program and program completion are considered to be most important. Measures are taken to build on strengths and problem areas addressed. The specific timing and nature of the evaluations does differ slightly by program. The specifics for each program are detailed in each program’s assessment plan. A summary of major assessments for the Neag School plan is presented in Table 1.
### Table 1
**Major Assessments by Key Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Components</th>
<th>Types of Assessments</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Admissions</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAT or other test data</td>
<td>Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Reference forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews, personal statements, etc.</td>
<td>Program personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRE or MAT (graduate only)</td>
<td>Test vendors (e.g., ETS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mid-program (also called preparation program)</td>
<td>Coursework</td>
<td>Plans of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course grades</td>
<td>Faculty/Peoplesoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects, tests etc.</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-portfolio (teacher ed, admin)</td>
<td>Taskstream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student evaluations</td>
<td>Institution Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-cycle Evaluation</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program completion (also called clinical, student teacher, internship, practicum experiences)</td>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test Scores (Praxis II)</td>
<td>ETS/Student/As. Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Portfolio (teacher ed, admin only)</td>
<td>Taskstream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inquiry Project (teacher ed only)</td>
<td>Field/Supv., As. Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Exams (Ph.D. only)</td>
<td>Major advisor/Grantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thesis/Dissertation (Grad only)</td>
<td>Major advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time to Graduate</td>
<td>Major advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certification/license</td>
<td>Major Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End-of-Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Major Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Post graduation (also called follow-up)</td>
<td>Surveys of Graduates</td>
<td>Assessment Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surveys of Employers</td>
<td>Assessment Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PreK-12 Student Outcomes (e.g., BEST study, Ed. Expansions study)</td>
<td>Assessment Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 For those undergoing a SPA for NCATE, the detail plan is noted in Appendix D.

Also, the conceptual framework is embedded in each of the key components. While it is important to note that while embedded, each component is best addressed by the one element in the conceptual framework as displayed in Table 2.

**Examining Reliability, Validity, and Avoiding Bias**

Instead of a single assessment, the assessment plan uses multiple assessments and methods to examine candidate performance at admission, mid-program, program completion, and post-graduation. Multiple methods help to ensure that assessments are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias. While assessments cannot promise this, we hope to strive for these properties.
For example, for standardized assessment instruments such as PRAXIS and Connecticut Administrator Test (CAT), we examine reliability, validity, and freedom of bias as contained within the technical manual produced by the developer.

### Table 2

**ALIGNMENT OF CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK TO KEY COMPONENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Element One: Professional Knowledge Base</th>
<th>Key component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme One: Learning</td>
<td>... ensure an understanding of both the theoretical and practical dimensions of the profession, working in culturally and linguistically diverse settings...</td>
<td>Admissions Mid-program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Element Two: Evidence-Based Professional Practice</strong></td>
<td>Mid-program Program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... ensure a deep understanding of the theoretical and practical dimensions of professional practice and integrate theory, research, and practice... a comprehensive knowledge of professional practice includes student knowledge of, and familiarity with, relevant professional “codes of ethics,” an understanding of moral and ethical decision making, and professional behaviors in accordance with ethical norms of the profession.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme Two: Leading</td>
<td><strong>Element One: Inquiry</strong></td>
<td>Mid-program Program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... provide the opportunity to become both intelligent and informed consumers of research and producers of new knowledge, informing professional practice with evidence resulting from empirical investigations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Element Two: Leadership (facilitate) ... leadership to effect growth and development within the student’s chosen profession in particular, and in American democracy in general.</strong></td>
<td>Program completion Post-graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme Three: Lighting the Way</td>
<td><strong>Element One: Inspiration and Diversity</strong></td>
<td>Program completion Post-graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... inspire our candidates to become educational leaders who are capable of lighting a fire for future leaders and practitioners so they are passionate about equity and human rights.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classroom assessments, including those on TaskStream, are developed according to the University of Connecticut policies. Procedures are adopted by faculty members to ensure that evaluations of students are consistent, equitable, and fair. For example, as part of the syllabus, faculty are encouraged to specify University policies including their procedures regarding equity and fairness in matters of race/ethnicity, gender; special needs, limited language competence; academic dishonesty; absences; confidentiality; grading; and, reporting procedures. These are consistent with the APA standards for assessment. This has resulted in an increased number of faculty using performance rubrics and elected to display those rubrics in the syllabus or on Taskstream.

For various survey instruments, there are multiple contributors to each draft including the Neag Assessment Committee or a related subcommittee, and the department and program leaders. When necessary, a content validation study (e.g., diversity survey)
and/or factor analyses are conducted to ensure construct validity and reliability properties (e.g., alumni survey).

Also, predictive validity is examined. This is evident in the teacher preparation program where student performances on PRAXIS tests, the clinical and student teaching activities, and the Inquiry Project have become good predictors of candidate success. The CAT examination and internship experience for UCAPP while the mastery learning application of the Executive Leadership Program are predictors of leadership candidate success. Programs in School Counseling, School Psychology, and Gifted and Talented contend that the practicum/internship is the best predictor. The Communication Disorders Program holds that the ASHA-endorsed formative and summative assessments of the clinic experience along with the ongoing knowledge and skills student assessments are key predictors for student success. All of these predictors are the result of faculty input, clinic/internship/practicum feedback, and student and alumni information.

**On-going Review of the Plan**

There are three ways that we evaluate the assessment plan to fine-tune this document. Evaluation begins with reviewing the individual complaints, continues with the annual review by the committee, and followed by the completion of the annual program reports. It is this latter report that is also mentioned in the next section of this plan, *Data Collection and Reporting*.

The first process for reviewing an assessment plan is the annual review of filing complaints. Each department has a process of formal complaints, including those tied to the assessment plan. Face-to-face meetings with the parties involved are held when complaints are from teachers, clinical supervisors, or mentors about students. When faculty members are the subject of complaints, the department leader or Associate Dean meets with the faculty member to address and resolve the issue. More specifically, in policy manuals, student manuals, and publications of our programs (all of which are on our website), potential and current students and others know that we review their academic and non-academic performance each semester for purposes of determining their continuing retention in the program. Students who do not meet the expectations are not retained in the program; although we attempt to assist them with finding another graduate program that may better suit their needs. In the case of the Communication Disorders Program, an alternative path, rather than certification, is recommended (see Appendix C).

The second process utilized is the annual review by committee members. The assessment committee uses a survey each spring. Adopted for NCATE, each member of the Neag Assessment Committee is asked to rate the assessment system; the data collection, analysis, and evaluation; and the use of data for program improvement. The committee, which has representatives across all four departments, is provided with a
summary of their ratings. These are discussed at the first meeting of the committee in the fall.

The third process is the annual reporting on all programs. Contained within Appendix E, is a report request for all programs to succinctly summarize data from the four components in the assessment plan. This form also captures the program meetings (or the department meetings) where data discussions were on the agenda. The leader is also asked what changes occurred as part of their exploration on data. These reports are shared with the Neag Assessment Committee.

**Next Steps**

In this section, we discussed how key components are alignment to the conceptual model, and the process by which our plan is reviewed. We will now focus the next section on data collection and reporting.
PART III: DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING

How the assessment plan incorporates a system that has a wide range of assessment tools to provide information about individual candidate performance and collectively about the quality of our programs, departments, and units were shared in the last section of this plan. In this section, the information on the data collection and reporting of these assessment tools is provided. Some of these are regularly scheduled activities, while others are episodic, often related to internal program review self-studies or in response to external program-specific accreditation agencies.

KEY ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES

The assessment plan has a cycle for collection and reporting when the diversified tools are summarized. Some of this is conducted annually, some systematically, and others in a defined cycle. The following describes each assessment- and evaluation-related activity. Also summarized are what the activity is, when it is submitted, and who are involved in the dissemination and interpretation.

Annual Assessment Activities

A. U.S. News and World Report

This annual report focuses on key indicators used for national ranking. By having a direct focus on these indicators, the school has climbed from a rank of 50 to the top 25 over the last decade. The annual cycle of reporting includes obtaining indicators in the fall, edits to the indicators in the winter, and the results announced in March. All results are shared by the Dean with the faculty and school community. They are also disseminated through various means such as the Internet and the newsletter, Spotlight.

B. NEASC Reporting

This university-wide annual report requires each program to submit information tied to the NEASC accreditation. The annual cycle for each program’s report includes submission of the mission, goals, and at least 6 objectives in the fall; and, the data collected tied to each objective and what has been the result to the program based upon the results. These reports are available at the university on the OATS database system and are internally facilitated and disseminated by the Neag Assessment Office with the Dean’s Office, departments, and the Neag Assessment Committee. These reports may be summarized and shared with a wider audience through different vehicles such as Spotlight on Assessment News Brief (which is detailed under Part V of
this report). With this requirement, the following graphic represents the program improvement cycle that begins with the mission.
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**Figure 2.** The program improvement cycle for the university.

C. Academic Plan

D. Neag Program Reports

The Neag School’s annual report for each program captures a deeper, synthesized self-assessment. All programs submit reports that succinctly summarize data from each of the four components in the assessment plan. This form also captures the program meetings (or the department meetings) where data discussions were on the agenda. Contained in Appendix C, the form includes reporting on alignment studies, time frames, dissemination, results, and information used in association with program improvement. The form is due each year. Coordinated through the Assessment Office, these reports are shared with the Dean’s Office, departments, and the Neag Assessment Committee. These reports may be summarized and shared with a wider audience through different vehicles such as *Spotlight on Assessment News Brief*.

E. Neag Reports

Produced annually are a number of reports facilitated by the Assessment Office. This includes test summary reports; the entry and exit survey reports; and, the evaluation reports on clinical practices and practicum/internship evaluations. These reports are shared by the Assessment Office with the Dean’s Office and the program and/or department leaders. They are also disseminated to the Neag Assessment Committee, as other subcommittees, as applicable. These reports may be summarized and shared with a wider audience through different vehicles such as *Spotlight on Assessment News Brief*. 
Systematic Reports

F. Neag Alumni Survey Report

At least once every four years, the Neag School administers a survey to alumni from our departments and the teacher education program. The survey data are analyzed and reported. This report is shared by the Assessment Office with the Dean’s Office, department leaders, and the Neag Assessment Committee and related subcommittees. The members of these committees are then asked to discuss results and implications at faculty meetings. These reports may be summarized and shared with a wider audience through different vehicles such as Spotlight on Assessment News Brief. To supplement the school-wide alumni survey, programs may administer an additional survey every two years.

G. Neag Alumni Employer Report

At least once every four years, the Neag School administers an employer survey. There are multiple forms for the employer survey to make sure we determine the unique characteristics of programs. The survey data are analyzed and reported. This report is shared by the Assessment Office with the Dean’s Office, department leaders, and the Neag Assessment Committee. The members of this committee are then asked to discuss results and implications at faculty meetings. These reports may be summarized and shared with a wider audience through different vehicles such as Spotlight on Assessment News Brief. To supplement the school-wide employer survey, programs may administer an additional survey every two years.

H. Program Accreditation Reports

Periodically, many of the programs go through accreditation process. In many ways this is similar to NEASC accreditation process but at a program(s) level. There is self review and then the school has a visit from their accreditation team as part of this process. While each program(s) has a different timeline for embarking on accreditation, there is much data gathered, analyzed, and interpreted leading to program improvement. (Each of the agencies sponsoring accreditation processes are detailed in the next section of this report.)

Ad Hoc Assessment Reports

I. Ad Hoc Reports

There is an occasionally a need for the Neag School to produce an ad hoc reports. These reports are based on surveys, focus groups or individual interviews, and studies.

For example, the Assessment Office analyzed UCAPP admission interview forms from three years and examined inter-rater agreement. The Neag School’s partnership with
Professional Development Schools was investigated by analyzing surveys. Similarly, student and teacher survey results about the teaching and counseling clinical experiences were studied. The Athletic Trainers Program was assisted in going through all of the instruments used. Based upon factor analyses, they could refine these instruments. Focus groups assisted the Physical Therapy program went through an evaluation of the program. Different follow-up studies have been produced with the Connecticut State Department of Education on the positions held by alumni in Connecticut public schools.

**Table 3**

**ALIGNMENT OF KEY ELEMENTS TO ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Components</th>
<th>Assessment Activities</th>
<th>Conceptual Framework Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Admissions</strong></td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>Professional Knowledge Base ... ensure an understanding of both the theoretical and practical dimensions of the profession, working in culturally and linguistically diverse settings...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Mid-program</strong> (also called preparation program)</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>Professional Knowledge Base (see above) Evidence-Based Professional Practice ... ensure a deep understanding of the theoretical and practical dimensions of professional practice and integrate theory, research, and practice... a comprehensive knowledge of professional practice includes student knowledge of, and familiarity with, relevant professional “codes of ethics,” an understanding of moral and ethical decision making, and professional behaviors in accordance with ethical norms of the profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Program completion</strong> (also called clinical, student teacher, internship, practicum experiences or authentic experiences)</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>Evidence-Based Professional Practice (see above) Inquiry ... provide the opportunity to become both intelligent and informed consumers of research and producers of new knowledge, informing professional practice with evidence resulting from empirical investigations Leadership (facilitate) ... leadership to effect growth and development within the student’s chosen profession in particular, and in American democracy in general. Inspiration and Diversity ... inspire our candidates to become educational leaders who are capable of lighting a fire for future leaders and practitioners so that are passionate about equity and human rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Post-graduation</strong> (also called follow-up)</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>Inquiry (see above) Leadership (see above) Inspiration and Diversity (see above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A-H refer to assessment activities earlier mentioned (i.e., A=U.S. News and World Reports, B=NEASC Reports, C=Neag Program Reports, D=Neag/TNE Reports, E=Neag/TNE Alumni Survey Reports, F=Neag/TNE Employer Survey Reports, G=Accreditation Reports, H=Systematic/Ad Hoc Assessment Activities).

**KEY EVALUATION ACTIVITIES**

In addition to these annual, biennial/triennial, and ad hoc reports, the most important report is discussions every three years that result in another edition of this plan.

As part of this cycle, the Neag Assessment Committee, facilitated by the Director of Assessment, takes the lead in formulating evaluation questions and proposing methods during the “reviewing and modifying” year. The process starts with questions such as structure, mission, goals, objectives, and standard alignment; faculty load; admittance, acceptance, and articulation statistics; student work artifacts and rubric scores; course grades; student evaluations; clinic, student teacher, practicum, and internship experiences and success; SPA/Program annual reports; thesis and dissertations; degrees; certification; alumni and employer surveys; and, special studies.

Both quantitative and qualitative paradigms for data collection, analysis, and reporting are used (e.g., Borg, Borg, & Gall, 1996; Kerlinger, 1973; Isaac & Michael, 1995). We make wide use of technology including planning (e.g., Visio, MS Project), creating and reporting surveys (e.g., Checkbox), our university database (e.g., PeopleSoft), Neag School database (Oracle), analysis (e.g., Brio, Excel, SPSS), presenting results (e.g., MS Office, MS Publisher), and posting the findings (e.g., Internet/Intranet).
The development of the assessment plan with the collecting and reporting system is aligned with the requirement of various accreditation agencies. In this section, we have a description about the university academic plan and each accreditation organization (or SPAs or state requirements). This includes how long the agency has conducted reviews; when we were last reviewed; when we will expect the next review; the number of years the “status” is for; what areas are generally reviewed; and, how it is reviewed. Also described is the important role of assessment in the accreditation organization’s review process.

The University of Connecticut Academic Plan

The University of Connecticut Academic Plan is a set of goals and strategic steps which will improve the university’s performance in teaching, research, and service. The Academic Plan has a holistic goal, describes the values and themes underlying the plan, and listed the strategies used to achieve each goal. There are five interrelated areas emphasized in the Academic Plan:

- **Undergraduate Education:** engage undergraduates in an intellectually challenging and diverse learning environment that combines excellent opportunities in the liberal arts and sciences with strong pre-professional education, co-curricular activities, and research collaborations with members of the faculty
- **Graduate and Professional Education:** sustain and develop select graduate and professional programs of national and international distinction.
- **Research, Scholarship, and Creativity Activity:** enhance the benefits to the state, nation, and world from faculty, staff, and student research, scholarship, and creative activity by increasing productivity, building on our existing strengths and focused areas of excellence, developing a stronger extramural funding portfolio, and expanding the infrastructure that supports research and strengthens our ability to translate new discoveries into practical applications, including our capacity in the area of technology transfer.
- **Diversity:** ensure an enriched learning and work environment by creating a more inclusive community that recognizes and celebrates individual differences
- **Public Engagement:** enhance the contributions of UConn faculty, staff, and students to the state, nation, and world through appropriate collaboration with partners in both the public and private sectors (http://academicplan.uconn.edu/files/UConnAcademicPlan.pdf)

The Neag School and all schools have flushed out their own Academic Plan (see http://www.education.uconn.edu/ncate/eer/).
NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

The University of Connecticut, including the Neag School, is accredited by the New England Association of Schools & Colleges, Inc. (NEASC).

Founded in 1885, NEASC is the nation’s oldest regional accrediting association whose mission is the establishment and maintenance of high levels of education, from pre-kindergarten through the higher education doctoral level. The NEASC Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NEASC CIHE) is the regional accrediting agency for over 200 colleges and universities in the six New England states: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont.

The University of Connecticut started with a self-study process leading up to the 2007 re-accreditation. The Steering Committee appointments were made in 2004, and the 11 Standards committees were appointed and began working. To facilitate transparency and encourage university-wide contribution to the self-study effort, a NEASC Accreditation website, www.neasc.uconn.edu, was established. In mid-spring of 2006, all committees submitted their chapters. In the summer of 2006, the document was then submitted to the staff of the NEASC CIHE for its comments. After revision based on the NEASC CIHE staff comments, the entire draft self-study was put on the Re-accreditation website in October of 2006, and university community comment solicited. Based on this input, the self-study was revised for the final time and sent to the review team and NEASC in early December of 2006. Third party comment, to be sent to the NEASC CIHE, was solicited in mid-December, 2006. The plan is available at: http://www.neasc.uconn.edu/docs/standards_for_accreditation_2005.pdf

The following are the assessment principles NEASC enunciates: there is no one best way to assess institutional effectiveness; there is no prescription that an institution must use in measuring or demonstrating its effectiveness; successful assessment efforts are compatible with the institution's mission and its available resources; assessment is evolutionary, ongoing, and incremental; and ultimately, assessment and accreditation share the common goal of enabling the institution to reach its fullest academic potential by providing the highest quality education possible.

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) is a national accrediting body for schools, colleges, and departments of education authorized by the U.S. Department of Education. NCATE determines which schools, colleges, and departments of education meet rigorous national standards in preparing teachers and other school specialists for the schools.
Accreditation, once granted, is continuous as long as the institution fulfills its responsibilities under NCATE's continuing accreditation process. Continuing accreditation status is granted after an institution has been accredited. Continuing accreditation requires institutions to file annual reports and host an on-site Board of Examiners team every five years. Official NCATE policy is to have a visit every 7 years. However, a few states use a 5-year visit cycle based on previous NCATE policy. With the last review in 2004, the next review for the Neag School will be in 2010.

NCATE encompassing administrator education, school counseling, school psychology, speech, and teacher education in various fields such as elementary, English, mathematics, social studies, world languages and special education. Each of these areas has sponsoring agencies which are noted below. Each also has been aligned with this Neag School of Education Assessment Plan.

ASSOCIATION FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION INTERNATIONAL (ACEI)

The Elementary Teacher Education program is a Specialty Professional Association (SPA) through the Association for Early Childhood Education International (ACEI) which is a constituent member of NCATE. ACEI is responsible for the Program Review process for NCATE. Information on the ACEI/NCATE partnership can be found at (http://www.acei.org/standhp.htm). ACEI requires that teacher preparation programs must have a broad foundation in the sciences, humanities and social sciences, with advanced study in at least one specialty area, in order to be able to optimally expand children's ability to grow and develop in all areas. There are 11 broad areas of preparation for elementary teachers. Additionally, ACEI looks for evidence in of learning in the areas of foundations, child development, and learning and teaching. Perhaps most importantly, they note that teacher preparation programs for preservice elementary teachers should provide carefully administered, sequenced and supervised clinical/field experiences in all areas of the elementary curriculum. Preservice teachers should have gradually increased responsibilities in the classroom. They should be provided with opportunities to work with children at various grade levels, with a variety of culturally diverse backgrounds, and with different capabilities, including mainstreamed or included special education children, and in activities that link course content to practice. They should be expected to critically select and use appropriate materials, resources and technology, and to have experiences with classroom management and a variety of evaluation techniques. Collaboration with other professionals in the school setting should be encouraged in order to develop team building skills and utilization of all resources to enhance children's learning. Opportunities to be coached and to coach should be provided. They should have the opportunity to interact with parents and to develop skills for communicating with parents.

The elementary education program at the Neag School strives to offer each candidate experiences consistent or exceeding the ACEI standards making use of our Professional
Development School (PDS) network for quality school placements in each year of the program and Taskstream for documenting the work of candidates in their university coursework and clinic experiences. This is in alignment with the *Neag School of Education Assessment Plan*. ACEI/NCATE standards and rubrics can be found at [http://www.acei.org/ncateindex.htm](http://www.acei.org/ncateindex.htm).

**NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH**

The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) has articulated the standards for future English language arts teachers and is a SPA through NCATE. The NCTE Guidelines, now called Program Standards, were first approved by NCATE in April 1987, with the most recent revision approved in August 2007. The Program Standards apply to all initial programs for the preparation of secondary English language arts teachers, Grades 7–12. The NCTE/NCATE program standards are easily accessible at: [http://www.ncte.org/prog/ncate/107902.htm](http://www.ncte.org/prog/ncate/107902.htm).

The NCTE Program Standards for the preparation of English language arts teachers (Grades 7-12) are comprised of four (4) components:

1. **Program Structure:** Candidates follow a specific curriculum and are expected to meet appropriate performance assessments for pre-service English language arts teachers.

2. **Candidate Attitudes:** Through modeling, advisement, instruction, field experiences, assessment of performance, and involvement in professional organizations, candidates adopt and strengthen professional attitudes needed by English language arts teachers.

3. **Candidate Knowledge:** Candidates are knowledgeable about language; literature; oral, visual, and written literacy; print and non-print media; technology; and research theory and findings.

4. **Candidate Pedagogy:** Candidates acquire and demonstrate the dispositions and skills needed to integrate knowledge of English language arts, students, and teaching.

Six to eight assessments are required as evidence for demonstrating pre-service teacher competence across the NCTE Program Standards. To meet the NCTE Program Standards, pre-service English education students in the teacher preparation program at our institution are assessed through several data sources, ranging from standardized test performance (Praxis) to transcript analysis (for content courses) to field experience evaluations (particularly student teaching and Master’s internship experiences), along with demonstrations of ability to prepare instructional materials and work with diverse populations of students (lesson plans and unit designs) and capacity for research and reflective teaching (i.e., inquiry project). This is in alignment with the *Neag School of*
The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics has supplied the standards for future Prekindergarten-12 teachers of mathematics since 1982 and is a SPA through NCATE. The program standards have been reviewed and updated four times including most recently in 2003. The NCTM/NCATE program standards are available at http://www.nctm.org/ncate.aspx. The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics identifies ten standards of mathematic achievement to be carried through four divisions (Prekindergarten-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12) of the education system. The standards are divided into both Content Standards and Process Standards which are each accompanied by two to four specified goals and multiple indicators that apply across each grade level.

To meet NCTM Program Standards, program reports must be submitted to NCATE and reviewed by NCTM-trained reviewers. The program report must demonstrate that 80% of indicators are addressed with at least one indicator addressed in each of the ten Standards. Each program must also provide evidence of a state-required licensure or certification exam. Unless using the Praxis II mathematics content exam, which has already been aligned to the NCTM Standards and Indicators, programs must show evidence of alignment to the NCTM Standards and Indicators by providing a thorough description of the exam with specific explanations as to how it aligns to the NCTM Standards and Indicators. This is in alignment with the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan.

The National Science Teachers Association (NSTA), a SPA through NCATE, has articulated the standards for future K-12 science teachers even before the publication of the National Science Education Standards in 1996. Because “science teacher” represents a broad array of disciplines, the NSTA Standards for Science Teacher Preparation have relied upon recommendations supplied by the American Association of Physics Teachers, the American Chemical Society, the National Association of Biology Teachers, and the National Earth Science Teachers Association. Consequently, areas under review include Biology, Physics, Chemistry, Earth Science, and General Science – all at the secondary level. Guidelines can be easily accessed by visiting the NSTA site, “Standards for Teacher Preparation” (http://www.nsta.org/pd/ncate).

The NSTA Standards fall into these categories: content knowledge, instructional
preparation, field experiences, as well as content specific considerations (e.g., safety and welfare, conducting scientific research). This information is detailed in the NSTA Assessment Matrix (http://www.nsta.org/pdfs/NCATE-AssessmentsMatrix.pdf).

The expectation is that teacher candidates will be assessed through a combination of standardized test performance (Praxis), transcript analysis (for content courses), and field experience evaluations (esp. student teaching and internship), along with demonstrations of an ability to prepare instructional materials (lesson plans and unit designs). This is in alignment with the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan.

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES

The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) provides the standards for future Social Studies teachers and is a SPA through NCATE. The NCSS Guidelines were developed in 1997 and updated in 2002. The Program Standards apply to all initial programs for the preparation of secondary social studies teachers, Grades 7–12. The NCSS/NCATE program standards are available at http://www.socialstudies.org/ncate/.

The NCSS Program Standards for the preparation of social studies grades 7-12 teachers are comprised of 3 components for 10 themes. The components are:

1. **Programmatic Evidence**: Content knowledge and skills; Pedagogical knowledge and skills

2. **Test Evidence**: Internal test evidence; External test evidence

3. **Performance Evidence**: Candidate abilities to develop effective lesson plans; Candidate abilities to apply pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills; Dispositions effectively in a clinical setting; Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

To meet the NCSS Program Standards, pre-service social studies education students in the teacher preparation program at our institution are assessed through a variety of data sources including, but not limited to the Praxis Exam (standardized test performance), field experience evaluations, analysis of transcripts, demonstrations of ability to prepare instructional materials and work with diverse populations of students (lesson plans and unit designs), and capacity for research and reflective teaching. This is in alignment with the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan.
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON THE TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES (ACTFL)

The World Language Education program is accredited by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and is a SPA through NCATE. While the ACTFL was founded in 2002, it has only been responsible for the Program Review process for NCATE since 2004. Information on the ACTFL/NCATE partnership, including the 2005 revisions, can be found at http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3384. The current Standards of the ACTFL are comprised of six content sections. Each of the six Standards is supplemented with supporting standards, supporting explanations, and rubrics. To meet ACTFL Program Standards, programs must show that candidates are proficient in each of the six Standards above. Explicit and detailed explanations can be found in the Program Standard webpage listed above. More generally, though, candidates must submit a list of assessments, explanations of the relationships of the assessments to the Standards, evidence for meeting the Standards, and documentation showing the use of assessment results to improve candidate and program performance to the ACTFL. This is in alignment with the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan. More information can be found on the ACTFL webpage at http://www.actfl.org/files/public/ACTFLNCATEStandardsRevised713.pdf.

COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

The Special Education Teacher Preparation Program within the Department of Educational Psychology is reviewed by the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) and is a SPA through NCATE. CEC is the largest international professional organization dedicated to improving educational outcomes for individuals with exceptionalities, students with disabilities, and/or the gifted.

The NCATE recently approved new CEC performance-based standards for the preparation and licensure of special educators. The new CEC standards are divided into three parts: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice Standard, Assessment System Standards, and Special Education Content Standards.

The CEC Special Education Content Standards are made up of standards in ten domain areas. These include (1) Foundations, (2) Development and Characteristics of Learners, (3) Individual Learning Differences, (4) Learning Environments and Social Interactions, (5) Instructional Strategies, (6) Language, (7) Instructional Planning, (8) Assessment, (9) Professional and Ethical Practice, and (10) Collaboration. These domain areas parallel those of the ten Interstate New Teacher and Assessment Consortium (INTASC) principles. The narrative Content Standards were written to reflect the content of validated knowledge and skills.
The International Reading Association has managed the standards for future reading professionals including paraprofessionals, classroom teachers, reading specialists, teacher educators, and administrators. A SPA through NCATE, IRA has managed these standards through their partnership with NCATE since 1980. The most recent revisions occurred in 2003 and can be found on the IRA site, http://www.reading.org/resources/community/ncate_standards.html.

There are five core Standards presented by the IRA: foundational knowledge; instructional strategies and curriculum materials; assessment, diagnosis, and evaluation; creating a literate environment; and, professional development. The IRA requires that candidates provide contextual information about the program, examples of assessments (seven to eight, with scoring guides), a Standards assessment chart (showing which assessments connect with which Standards), evidence for meeting the Standards, and evidence that the assessment results are used to improve candidate and program performance. State-licensure or certification exams should be presented as an example of assessment alongside the other seven to eight assessments. This is in alignment with the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan.

The School Counseling Program in The Department of Education Psychology at the Neag School is accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and is a part of NCATE. CACREP was created by the ACA to develop, implement and maintain standards of preparation for graduate level degree programs in counseling. Its purpose is to work with such programs so that they might achieve accreditation status. CACREP has held status as a nationally recognized accrediting agency since 1987.

The multi-step accreditation process involves: (a) programmatic self-study; (b) documentation of a program’s compliance with the standards; (c) validation of the submitted documentation by an on-site visiting team; (d) rendering of accreditation decisions by the CACREP Board based upon the written self-study, on-site team report, and institutional response to the team report; and (e) interim reports as needed and mid-cycle reports to provide for periodic review of a program’s compliance with specified standards. CACREP’s accreditation process includes the assessment of a program’s ability to meet the profession’s standards at: (http://www.doe.state.in.us/dps/Standards/CounselorContStds.html).
CACREP accredited UConn’s School Counseling master’s program for a two-year period through October 31, 2009, with one condition; that is, evidence that a newly developed course entitled, “Human Growth and Development over the Lifespan: Implications for Counseling” has been taught. This condition will be satisfied at the completion of the spring 2008 semester at which time the program will most likely be permitted to continue its accreditation status until October 31, 2015.

As the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan articulates the importance of assessment, this plays a prominent role in CACREP’s review process. An entire section of the programmatic self-study entitled “Evaluations in the Program” is focused on assessment. For example, the program is expected to conduct a series of regularly scheduled formal and informal assessments annually. Data for these assessments are gathered from multiple sources and include input from program faculty, current and former students, personnel in cooperating agencies and program graduate employers. In addition, an official report that documents outcomes of these assessments is prepared and distributed on a systematic basis to students currently in the program, program faculty, institutional administrators, and personnel in cooperating agencies (e.g., employers, site supervisors). At least once every three years program faculty must document an evaluation of this program.

The major 2007 findings the most recent triennial evaluation, done in aligned with the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan, revealed the following: (a) the program’s goals/objectives are aligned with the goals/objectives of CACREP, (b) the courses in the curriculum are consistent with CACREP standards as well as with state and national standards for school counselor training and certification, (c) there is increasing diversity represented by the program applicants as well as those admitted to the program, (d) program graduates are satisfied with the program as well as with their levels of preparation for their careers, (e) internships add a “real life” component to the program, and (f) employers are pleased with the program’s graduates.

COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC ACCREDITATION IN AUDIOLOGY AND SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY

The Communication Disorders Program of the Department of Communication Sciences is reviewed by the Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology (CAA) and is a part of NCATE. This is an activity of the ASHA, the professional organization that oversees and issues certification of practicing speech-language pathologists and audiologists and of educational programs that prepare them.

The CAA accreditation model has been the single nationally recognized accreditor for the professions of audiology and speech-language pathology since the 1960s. Today, the

---

2 While not part of the Neag School of Education, this program is included in this assessment plan because it is part of the “unit” for NCATE accreditation for the University of Connecticut.
accreditation activities for programs that prepare individuals to enter the professions are conducted by the Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology (CAA).

The review process comprises three parts: self-study, on-site visit(s) by a team of evaluators appointed by the CAA, and an analysis and evaluation of the data collected from both the self-study and the visit(s), along with any correspondence generated by interviews with stakeholders (i.e., students, consumers of the clinic’s services, employers of graduates of the program, and so forth).

The Communication Disorders Program was initially accredited in speech-language pathology by this agency in 1966 and for audiology in 1969; the current accreditation cycle is for the period of 2002–2009. The process of applying for continued accreditation, or re-accreditation, will commence in 2008; new standards for accrediting programs in communication sciences and disorders were approved by ASHA in July 2006 with an implementation date of January 1, 2008. Hence, new standards will be applied for this upcoming reaccreditation process; they are accessed through this link: http://www.asha.org/NR/rdonlyres/686AF94D-5DA9-4D2C-96FB-2CA5E047527F/0/AccreditationStds0307.pdf

The outcomes of the self-study and external review are used to inform the university’s administration of the program’s strengths and weaknesses, to validate the contributions that the program makes to the profession and disciplines, and to be applied as an assurance to other accrediting agencies that the program meets the highest standards recognized for the education of future practitioners.

Outcomes of the CAA and university-related self-study led to many substantive changes to both the content and the administration of the graduate program in Communication Disorders and to the Speech and Hearing Clinic. The program was recognized for its use of a school setting directly linked to the program; it provided students an excellent model for service delivery within a public school setting. Further, the clinic’s provision of an accent modification program provides students with an increased exposure to diversity within the curriculum. Strengths of the program were cited as effective leadership, commitment of the faculty, strong student support, thorough and consistent supervision of students in their assessment and treatment activities, a robust record of scholarship and publications from the faculty, support by clients of the clinic, and an exemplary supervisor-clinician model that fosters a sense of professionalism for students.

Over the years, both the audiology and speech-language pathology programs at the University of Connecticut have enjoyed a strong reputation academically and clinically. The graduate program in speech-language pathology has been ranked in the top ten percent of programs nationally and in the top 20 percent of 125 master’s programs in audiology in the system used for ranking prior to 2007.
The School Psychology Doctoral Program in the Department of Educational Psychology is accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA) and is a SPA through NCATE through the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP).

**Doctoral Program in School Psychology**

The APA in December 1945 was asked by the Veterans' Administration for a list of Universities that could provide doctoral level preparation of clinical psychologists. Subsequently, 22 universities were identified as meeting faculty and facilities criteria. Currently, there are 360 accredited doctoral programs in professional psychology that encompasses the traditional substantive areas of clinical, counseling, and school psychology.

The doctoral program in school psychology at the University of Connecticut initially gained APA accreditation May 1, 2001. The next reaccreditation review is scheduled for fall, 2009. The accreditation process involves self-study and external review intended to evaluate, enhance, and publicly recognize the quality of the program. Both a site visit team and the CoA review the degree the program complies with accreditation domains and standards which include: eligibility; program philosophy, objectives, and curriculum plan; program resources; sensitivity to cultural and individual differences and diversity; student-faculty relations; program self-assessment and quality enhancement; public disclosure; and relationship with APA. For a complete description of domains and standards for accreditation see: [http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/](http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/).

In concert with CoA guidelines and standards, the program’s assessment procedures were adopted on the bases that they possessed both acceptable face validity and utility, and that they addressed the program’s philosophy, department and university requirements, and desired student outcomes. Further, selection and design of assessment procedures were influenced by the need to have continuous monitoring of students’ satisfactory progression through the program that incorporated different methods, varied data sources, and different environments. Consequently, multiple and continual qualitative and quantitative procedures designed to allow both formative and summative assessments are used to determine the degree the program is meeting its goals, and complying with departmental and university requirements, and the standards espoused by the APA. The data derived from these assessments are also used to promote informed decision-making to allow for further development and quality enhancement of the program.

Students are assessed throughout their programs of study relative to their professional characteristics, academic knowledge, and practitioner competencies through a variety of methods beginning with: (a) pre-admission assessments; (b) formal evaluations such as course grades; (c) faculty reviews of student progress; (d) performance on the
Master's Qualifying Examinations (if students entered the doctoral program at the baccalaureate level); (e) performance on the General Examination that incorporates both the National School Psychology Examination, and an applied, research-related, examination that may include both written and oral components; (f) assessments of student progress through feedback from practica and internship field-based supervisors; (h) conduction and defense of dissertations; and (i) an alumni survey that functions to obtain an anonymous student critique of the program, and a self-assessment of their competencies relative to stated program goals from a distal vantage point. These assessment activities are in alignment with the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan.

Master's/Sixth-Year Program in School Psychology

The NASP was founded in 1969. Consistent with its mission, NASP adopted and promotes an integrated set of comprehensive standards for preparation, credentialing, and professional practice of school psychology. NASP training standards were initially approved by the NCATE in 1982 for the review and accreditation of school psychology programs at the sixth-year/specialist and doctoral levels. In 1988, NCATE began to accredit education “units” (i.e., the administrative unit that houses professional education programs, typically the college of education), rather than programs. Concurrently, NCATE authorized the review of programs by professional member associations such as NASP for whom standards had been approved by NCATE. The Master's/Sixth-Year School Psychology Program at the University of Connecticut gained full approval in 1991, and NASP Approved status and NCATE Nationally Recognized status for the period January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2013. NCATE/NASP's Program Approval Board reviews programs to ensure they provide students with a knowledge base in psychology and education, including theories, models, empirical findings, and techniques in each of the following domains: data-based decision-making consultation; effective instruction; human development; diversity; systems organization; prevention; research and program development; history and foundations; and information technology. The programs are also reviewed to ensure students demonstrate the professional skills necessary to deliver effective services that result in positive outcomes. For a complete description of standards see http://nasponline.org/.

**NATIONAL POLICY BOARD FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION**

The National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) is used for the UCAPP and Executive Leadership Programs in the Department of Educational Leadership. Their link is available at: http://www.npbea.org/ELCC/ELCCStandards%20_5-02.pdf.

Assessment is an important component of the review process. Several forms of assessment are used for our programs: admissions information, course grades, reports from clinical supervisors, and assessments from on-site mentors who supervise
internships, field-projects, cumulative e-portfolio for each student, follow-up student surveys, and follow-up employer surveys. In fact, based on 2007-2008 information, we have fine-tuned key assessment-related activities. This has included: a rubric for rating students during the admissions process; a curriculum map that links each of the NPBEA standards with course requirements; an internship assessment that documents how well students addressed the NPBEA standards in practice; on Taskstream we have multiple rubrics that document student progress in each course and in each clinical placement; and, on Taskstream we have an e-portfolio of student work.

**COMMISSION FOR ACCREDITATION OF PHYSICAL THERAPY EDUCATION**

The Physical Therapy Program at the Neag School is accredited by the Commission for Accreditation of Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE).

CAPTE began accrediting Physical Therapy Education programs in 1987. The program at the University of Connecticut was last accredited for a 10 year period in 2002. The next cycle of self-study and on-site evaluation will occur in 2010 and 2011. The program evaluation is comprehensive. The CAPTE accreditation process details are available at in the CAPTE Accreditation Handbook at: [http://www.apta.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=CAPTE1&CONTENTID=40794&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm](http://www.apta.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=CAPTE1&CONTENTID=40794&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm).

In order for a Physical Therapy Education program to be accredited, progressive, and train students to be successful professionals and leaders in their field, it is necessary for programs to use assessment tools for improvement and innovation. Under CAPTE criteria assessment occurs at a number of levels that include, but are not limited to: graduation rates and attrition, passing rate on the Physical Therapy Licensure Examination, data gathered from students and clinical instructors during the program and information gathered from graduates and the employers of graduates. Specific information regarding the evaluation criteria is found at: [http://www.apta.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=CAPTE1&Template=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=19980](http://www.apta.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=CAPTE1&Template=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=19980).

The Physical Therapy Program, the first in a public university, has maintained an accredited status since the inception of CAPTE. Substantial changes continue to occur in the physical therapy profession including a vision of autonomous practice for physical therapists. These changes have also resulted in significant revisions of the education criteria. This vision of autonomous practice has also raised the bar of physical therapy education programs. Presently more than 80% of institutions sponsoring physical therapy education award a Doctor of Physical Therapy degree.
The Athletic Training Education Program in the Department of Kinesology at the Neag School is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE).

The JRC-AT was incorporated in Texas in October 1991. The JRC-AT was a Committee on Accreditation under the CAAHEP; effective June 30, 2006, the JRC-AT became independent from CAAHEP and changed its name to the CAATE.

The program underwent the reaccreditation process in the fall of 2007, and received the full seven years of accreditation.

As outlined in the Accreditation Standards for Entry-Level Athletic Training established by CAATE, programs must routinely secure qualitative and quantitative data to determine the outcomes and effectiveness of the program. These outcomes must relate to the program’s stated educational mission and goals and include measures related to didactic and clinical instruction, student learning (both clinical and didactic), and overall program effectiveness: [http://caate.net/documents/standards.12.7.07.pdf](http://caate.net/documents/standards.12.7.07.pdf).

There are several ways the athletic training program currently evaluates its overall effectiveness as a program and is in alignment with the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan.

Student progress is evaluated each semester three ways: completing each course with a “C” or better, performance on clinical proficiency skills sheets, and evaluation performance rubric. The clinical instructors/clinical sites are evaluated twice each academic semester by conducting routine site visits by faculty as well as having student’s complete a mid-semester and final evaluation of their CI/Clinical Site.

Overall program effectiveness is then evaluated by the clinical instructors and the students. All assessment tools, which are reviewed annually for program improvements, can be found on the athletic training website at: [http://www.education.uconn.edu/departments/ekin/ATHL.cfm](http://www.education.uconn.edu/departments/ekin/ATHL.cfm).
PART V: SPOTLIGHT ON ASSESSMENT

In the summer of 2007, the Neag School of Education’s Assessment Office, began a multifaceted strategic initiative, Spotlight on Assessment, to spread the word on assessment-related topics and foster a culture of assessment. Elements of Spotlight on Assessment include: participatory involvement on issues about assessment, department meetings covering assessment agenda items, a newsletter and website for Neag faculty, a series of assessment colloquia, and statewide conferences on assessment.

DISCUSSION ON ASSESSMENT AT FACULTY MEETINGS

As part of the Spotlight on Assessment initiative, each department leader is now asked to place “assessment” on many monthly faculty meetings regularly. Starting in the spring of 2008, the Neag Assessment Committee is available to assist with this agenda item. The Assessment Office is also available for these presentations and discussions. Additionally, assessment agenda items are presented to the Neag Assessment Committee members to consider for departmental faculty meetings.

ACTIVE PARTICIPATION THROUGH COMMITTEES ON ASSESSMENT

As stated in the last section, assessment is not a one-time activity; rather, it is evolutionary, ongoing, and incremental. Over time, assessment efforts will be more comprehensive, systematic, integrative, and organic. Ultimately, assessment and accreditation share the common goal of enabling the school/institution to reach its fullest academic potential by providing the highest quality education possible. At the Neag School, a participatory model is sought regarding assessment. As such, we now have the Neag Assessment Committee and related subcommittees focused on assessment as part of the Spotlight on Assessment initiative. Please refer to the appendices for annual objectives for this committee and a conceptual model of the groups involved in this participatory process.

The Neag Assessment Committee’s general charge is to assist in development, implementation, and refinement of the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan so that we ensure a participatory model across all departments and programs. Outcomes of this process may include the development of instruments and protocols, the implementation of assessment designs, the analyses of data, and feedback on assessment initiatives. The make-up of this committee is about 25 members which includes two to three faculty and up to three students from the teacher education program and all 4 departments.
Information on Assessment Disseminated through News Briefs and the Web

As part of the Spotlight on Assessment initiative, various avenues are taken to inform our “community” about assessment.

For example, a faculty newsletter, News Brief, is published throughout the year. It was started in January of 2008 with the purpose of the News Brief is to disseminate information about assessment to Neag faculty members and others, and providing updates on recent assessment news and events.

For example, content covered in News Brief has included student summaries of assessment colloquia presentations and announcements of upcoming assessment events. Additionally, News Brief and the website, shares results from recent assessment projects as well as other interesting information about assessment.

We also have a web site with many reports, colloquium sessions, News Briefs, and other assessment-related items.

Figure 3. The Web Assessment Homepage.
SPONSORSHIP FOR ASSESSMENT COLLOQUIA SERIES

A series of colloquia have been established as part of the *Spotlight on Assessment* initiative. These colloquia focus on important topics concerning assessment. More specifically, they focus on the diverse range of assessment across each of the programs in the five departments of Neag.

Presenters include faculty and other professionals with knowledge of timely and pertinent assessment topics. For example, past presenters have included University of Connecticut faculty, Connecticut State Department of Education managers, and representatives from companies, and other institutions. All announcements are posted on the website and all presenters’ PowerPoints. All PowerPoints are maintained as archives.
Figure 4. Web pages tied to the colloquium sessions.

CONFERENCES ON ASSESSMENT

The final aspects of the Spotlight on Assessment initiative are the statewide conferences. The annual assessment conferences invite speakers from national, state, local and university organizations. Past speakers have been from the U.S. Department of Education, Council of Chief State School Officers, Connecticut State Department of Education, and local education agencies.

We use the Internet to display all conference-related activities. This includes the publishing of all PowerPoint presentations after the conference is held.
Figure 5. Web pages tied to the conference.
This 3rd edition of *Neag School of Education Assessment Plan*, facilitated by the Neag Assessment Committee, was collaboration among many including the Neag faculty, staff, and students, current and alumni students, employers, clinic faculty, and other schools. The *Neag School of Education Assessment Plan* has incorporated many best practices including embracing the following:

- Focusing on facilitating an assessment culture.
- A system of participatory participation in assessment development and reporting by the Neag Assessment Committee and others.
- Formative and summative assessments at both the candidate and program level embrace ongoing feedback on a continual basis.
- Internal data with efforts made to ensure that assessments are credible, fair, consistent, accurate, and unbiased leading to multiangulation.
- Information available from external sources such as state licensing exams, evaluation through clinic experiences, employer reports, and alumni studies.
- Alignment to all accreditation processes from the university to program levels.
- A concerted effort to provide a spotlight on assessment.
- A system for reviewing and approving the plan.
- Assessment research opportunities.
APPENDIX A:

NEAG ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE YEARLY OBJECTIVES

In 2010-11, we plan to use e-mail and have two meetings. Our major objectives will be to:

- Continue to support further coordination of various subcommittees (i.e., all mentioned in the organizational framework),
- Administer the alumni survey and provide feedback on the initial drafts of the report,
- Administer the employer survey and provide feedback on the initial drafts of the report,
- Begin initial discussion on school climate survey(s) to be administered in 2011-2012,
- Review the completed Annual Concentration Report for Assessment, and
- Fine tune/Revise The Neag School of Education Assessment Plan (2nd edition) incorporating three years of survey data and accreditation information gathered in preparation for the publication on the 3rd edition in September 2011.

In 2009-10, we used e-mail and had two meetings. Our major objectives were to:

- Transitions to an advisory committee with off-shoot assessment working groups (teacher education, clinic evaluation and surveys using Checkbox, assessment alignment, advisory group on Spotlight on Assessment, OATS, fostering assessment through technology),
- Fine-tune the communication with faculty on assessment system and culture, and
- Formulate all questions for alumni (and employee) survey questions for dissemination in fall 2010.

In 2008-09, we used e-mail and had two meetings. Our objectives were to:

- Provide final edits, share and communicate with faculty on our final edition of the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan,
- Provide feedback on the employer survey report which will be published to all respected
groups,

Discuss and determine plans for our next alumni survey,

Provide feedback to the faculty and staff climate survey and work on the final report,

Provide feedback to finalize the Neag School Profile Report, and

Ensure that each department developed NEASC Assessment Plans in the fall and report findings in the spring.

In 2007-08, we used e-mail and had two meetings. Our objectives were to:

Provide feedback on the alumni survey report,

Develop and administer employer surveys,

Solidify our Neag School of Education Assessment Plan, and

Ensure that each department’s assessment plans are tied to objectives for 2007-08.
APPENDIX B: NEAG ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE STRUCTURE
APPENDIX C:
COMPLAINT PROCEDURE

In policy manuals, student manuals, and publications of the Neag School programs (all of which are on the website), potential and current students, and others know that we review their academic and non-academic performance each semester for purposes of determining their continuing retention in the program. Students that do not meet our expectations are not retained in the program(s); although we attempt to assist them with finding another graduate program that may be better suit their needs. In the case of the Communication Disorders Program, an alternative path, rather than certification, is recommended.

These procedures are in concert with the UConn Graduate School’s policies regarding students who feel aggrieved or uncertain about whether they have been treated fairly by a faculty or staff member. Students have several routes that can be taken to seek resolution. Because many difficulties can result from misunderstandings, clear communication and informal mediation are believed to be the most effective and the least anxiety-provoking. Usually, the first approach is for the student to request a meeting with the faculty or staff member to state the problem and to attempt a direct solution. If that proves unsatisfactory or should such a meeting seem undesirable given the particular circumstance, there are several options. Sometimes appropriate mediation can be provided by other faculty or staff in the Neag School, at other campus units such as the Women’s Center, at a cultural center, or a religious institution. Alternatively, the student may consult with the Director of the Graduate Program, the Department Head, or the Associate Dean, usually in that order. It is the responsibility of the academic administrator to then gather the facts in the case and seek a mutually acceptable resolution. All faculty and staff in the Neag School report ultimately to the Associate Dean and formal action can be taken at that level, if appropriate. In the event that the initial collection of facts suggests a violation of law or of explicit university policy concerning prejudice or harassment, the administrator will immediately consult with appropriate staff in Human Resources or the Provost’s Office regarding appropriate action. The following steps can be taken.

Step 1. If a student has a grievance with faculty or staff associated with the program, the student should meet first with the person who is believed responsible for the grievance in an attempt to informally resolve the problem. It is believed that most student concerns can be resolved through direct and open communication between the parties concerned.

Step 2. If the student is not satisfied with the results of the informal meeting, s/he should submit a written complaint to the primary faculty, along with a request for a meeting with the primary faculty. A faculty member, who is not involved in the grievance, will be selected to serve as a mediator. The written grievance should be
presented promptly to the primary faculty and prior to the scheduled meeting. The student grievant may be accompanied by a representative of his/her choice at any step of the process. Subsequent to this meeting, the program director will return a written response to the student grievant within 10 working days. If the grievance is resolved, a copy of the written resolution should be included in the student’s file.

**Step 3.** If the student grievant is dissatisfied with the results of Step 2, s/he may appeal in writing to the Department Head within 10 working days of the date of receipt of the complaint. Upon receipt of the appeal, the Department Head will schedule a meeting with the grievant and the individual at whom the grievance is directed within 10 working days. After the Step 3 meeting, a written response will be issued to both parties within 15 working days.

**Step 4.** If either party is dissatisfied with the results from Step 3, s/he may appeal in writing to the Associate Dean of the Neag School within 10 working days from the date of the Step 3 response. Upon receipt of the appeal, the Associate Dean will schedule a meeting with the grievant and the individual at whom the grievance is directed within 10 working days. A written response will be issued to both parties within 15 working days. This decision shall be deemed final and binding with copy maintained in the files.
APPENDIX D: ANNUAL SELF-EVALUATION REPORT

Note: This form was from NCATE and adopted school-wide. It might be refined, as needed.
NEAG ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE:
SELF-ASSESSMENT OF THE ASSESSMENT PLAN

(Rubric and questions adapted from NCATE)

What position best describes you?

____ Faculty/Clinician
____ Neag Administrator
____ Student
____ District/State Representative

Are you on the Neag Assessment Committee or any subgroup associated with this committee?

____ Yes
____ No

What is the department with which you are most aligned?

____ Educational Leadership
____ Curriculum and Instruction
____ Physical Therapy
____ Educational Psychology
____ Kinesiology
____ None of the above.

Directions for Part A: Using the rubric, please "grade" our current assessment system. Please keep in mind the assessment system is described in The Neag School of Education Assessment Plan (2nd edition) published in September, 2008 and discussed in each department's faculty meeting last fall.

WE HAVE AN ASSESSMENT SYSTEM THAT COLLECTS AND ANALYZES DATA (for example, on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, Neag School operations ).

UNACCEPTABLE
We have not involved our professional community in the development of our assessment system; it is limited to monitor candidate performance, school's operations, and programs; and, it does not reflect professional, state, and institutional standards. Decisions are based on a single or few assessments and have not examined bias in its assessments, nor made an effort to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures and school's operations.
**ACCEPTABLE**
We have an assessment system that reflects the conceptual framework, and professional and state standards and is regularly evaluated by our professional community; includes a comprehensive integrated assessment and evaluation measures to monitor candidate performance and manage/improve the school’s operations and programs; and decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments at admission into programs, appropriate transition points, and program completion. We have taken effective steps to eliminate bias in assessments and working to establish the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures and school’s operations.

**TARGET**
With the involvement of its professional community, we regularly evaluate the capacity and effectiveness of our assessment system, which reflects the conceptual framework and incorporates candidate proficiencies outlined in professional and state standards. We regularly examine the validity and utility of the data and make modifications to keep abreast of changes in technology and in professional standards. Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments. Data show a strong relationship of performance assessments to candidate success throughout their programs and later upon graduation. We conduct thorough studies and make changes to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures and school’s operations.

Rating:

_____Unacceptable   _____Acceptable   _____Target

**Strengths:**

**Areas for Improvement:**

**DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND EVALUATION**

**UNACCEPTABLE**
We do not regularly and comprehensively gather, aggregate, summarize, and analyze assessment and evaluation information on the school’s operations, its programs, or candidates.
We do not maintain a record of formal candidate complaints or document the resolution of complaints. We do not use appropriate information technologies to maintain our assessment system. We do not use multiple assessments from internal and external sources to collect data on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, graduates, school operations, and program quality.

**ACCEPTABLE**
We maintain an assessment system that provides regular and comprehensive information on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, competence of graduates, school operations, and program quality. Using multiple assessments from internal and external sources, we collect data from applicants, candidates, recent graduates, faculty, and other members of the professional community. Candidate assessment data are regularly and systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance, program quality, and school operations. We maintain records of formal candidate complaints and documentation of their resolution. We maintain our assessment system through the use of information technologies.

**TARGET**
We provide regular and comprehensive data on program quality, school’s operations, and candidate performance at each stage of its programs, extending into the first years of completers’ practice. Assessment data from candidates, graduates, faculty, and other members of the professional community are based on multiple assessments from both internal and external sources that are systematically collected as candidates progress through programs. These data are regularly and systematically compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and reported publicly for the purpose of improving candidate performance, program quality, and school operations. We have a system for effectively maintaining records of formal candidate complaints and their resolution. We develop and test different information technologies to improve our assessment system.

**Rating:**

| _____ Unacceptable | _____ Acceptable | _____ Target |

**Strengths:**

**Areas for Improvement:**
USE OF DATA FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

UNACCEPTABLE
We make limited or no use of data collected, including candidate and graduate performance information, to evaluate the efficacy of its courses, programs, and clinical experiences. We fail to make changes in its courses, programs, and clinical experiences when evaluations indicate that modifications would strengthen candidate preparation to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. No one has access to candidate assessment data and/or data systems. We are not regularly provided formative feedback based on our assessments.

ACCEPTABLE
We regularly and systematically use data, including candidate and graduate performance information, to evaluate the efficacy of its courses, programs, and clinical experiences. We analyze program evaluation and performance assessment data to initiate changes in programs and school operations. We have access to candidate assessment data and/or data systems. Candidate assessment data are regularly shared with us to help them reflect on and improve their performance and programs.

TARGET
We have fully developed evaluations and continuously search for stronger relationships in the evaluations, revising both the underlying data systems and analytic techniques as necessary. We not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. We review data on candidate performance regularly and develop plans for improvement based on the data.

Rating:
_____Unacceptable  _____Acceptable  _____Target

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement:
Part B. Please answer the following questions by selecting the best option.

We align curriculum, instruction, and assessments with professional, state, and/or institutional standards.

_We do not do this._  
_We do this minimally._  
_We do this acceptably._  
_We do this extremely well._

We examine the efficacy of courses, field experiences, and programs.

_We do not do this._  
_We do this minimally._  
_We do this acceptably._  
_We do this extremely well._

We assess students on content knowledge, pedagogical and/or professional knowledge and skills, professional dispositions, and their effects as outlined in professional, state, and institutional standards.

_We do not do this._  
_We do this minimally._  
_We do this acceptably._  
_We do this extremely well._

We review our programs and make refinement where needed, over time, to ensure quality.

_We do not do this._  
_We do this minimally._  
_We do this acceptably._  
_We do this extremely well._

Our student assessments and evaluations are purposeful, evolving from missions, the conceptual framework, and/or program goals.

_We do not do this._  
_We do this minimally._  
_We do this acceptably._
Our assessments are comprehensive, including measures related to faculty, the curriculum, and instruction, as well as what students know and can do.

We address fairness, consistency, accuracy, and avoidance of bias in assessments to the degree possible.

We gather and use assessments from various sources - for example, field experiences, clinical sites, content courses, faculty, candidates, graduates, and employers.

We use technology in our data gathering and analysis, as well as more broadly in planning and evaluation.

We use information available from external sources such as state licensing exams, evaluations during an induction or mentoring year, and employer reports.

In the evaluation of operations and programs, we collect, analyze, and use a broad array of information and data from course evaluations and evaluations of clinical practice, faculty, admissions process, advising system, school partnerships, program quality, Neag School governance, etc.
_We do not do this._
_We do this minimally._
_We do this acceptably._
_We do this extremely well._

Optional: If you are a Neag faculty member, what program are you in? Check all that apply.

☐ Integrated Bachelor’s/Master’s Program (IB/M)
☐ Teacher Certification Program for College Graduates (TCPCG)
☐ Reading/Language Arts
☐ Adult Learning
☐ Higher Education – Student Affairs
☐ UCAPPS
☐ Executive Leadership
☐ Cognition and Instruction
☐ Gifted and Talented
☐ School Counseling
☐ Educational Technology
☐ Measurement, Evaluation, and Assessment
☐ School Psychology
☐ Special Education
☐ Athletic Training
☐ Exercise Science
☐ Sport Management
☐ Physical Therapy

Thank you for your honest answers.
APPENDIX E:

ANNUAL CONCENTRATION REPORTS
ANNUAL CONCENTRATION REPORT

Name of Concentration: __________________________
Concentration Leader: __________________________
Department Leader: __________________________

Please provide your completed electronic copy to your department leader and to Mary Yakimowski, Neag Assessment Office.

1. Indicate the month(s) when the Neag School’s assessment/evaluation system was discussed as documented in agendas and minutes. This may include, but not limited to department, program, teacher education program, and other meetings.

   August 2009 _____ December _____ April _____
   September _____ January 2010 _____ May _____
   October _____ February _____ June _____
   November _____ March _____

2. Indicate your alignment studies of courses completed this year. This may involve course objectives and/or assessments tied to the revised conceptual framework, and professional or state standards. More specifically, indicate what course(s) and briefly describe the findings.

3. Offer a brief summary of this past year’s pertinent results in two of the four areas noted below from in the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan.
   a. Admissions assessment data and interpretation.
   b. Midterm assessment data and interpretation.
   c. Program completion data and interpretations.
   d. Post-graduation data and interpretations.
4. What significant changes will the program make based on data? (Include what data you used and what you are changing in the following chart.) What did you keep maintain because of data?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>What will be changed/maintained?</th>
<th>How will it be changed?</th>
<th>How you will assess change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Results indicate there was little $(r=.05 \text{ to } .12)$ interrater agreement among those on the selection committee.</td>
<td>The program will implement directions and rubrics to enhance the interrater agreement.</td>
<td>Next year, we will reassess the interrater correlations as we are hoping for $r &gt; .80$.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.
2.
3.
4.
APPENDIX F:  
FIELD-SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT PLANS
# Appendix F1: Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Components</th>
<th>Types of Assessments</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Admissions</strong></td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAT or other test data</td>
<td>Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Reference forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews, personal statements, etc. <em>varies</em></td>
<td>Program personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRE or MAT <em>graduate only</em></td>
<td>Test vendors <em>(e.g., ETS)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2. Mid-program</strong> <em>(also called preparation program)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coursework</td>
<td>Plans of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course grades</td>
<td>Faculty/Peoplesoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects, tests etc.</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-portfolio <em>teacher ed, admin</em></td>
<td>Taskstream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student evaluations</td>
<td>Institution Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-cycle Evaluation</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics #2 Content knowledge in secondary mathematics education: content knowledge assessment: core mathematics course assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics #3 Candidate ability to plan Instruction: mathematics methods assessment: mathematics methods unit plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics #6 Additional assessment that addresses NCTM standards: assessment of student understanding: student understanding assessments (IB/M, pilot for TCPCG)</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics #7 Additional assessment that addresses NCTM standards: assessment of using technology: technology microteaching (IB/M, pilot for TCPCG)</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Program completion</strong> <em>(also called clinical, student teacher, internship, practicum experiences)</em></td>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test Scores <em>Praxis II</em></td>
<td>ETS/Student/As. Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Portfolio <em>teacher ed, admin only</em></td>
<td>Taskstream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inquiry Project <em>teacher ed only</em></td>
<td>Field/Supv., As. Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Exams <em>Ph.D. only</em></td>
<td>Faculty/Grantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thesis/Dissertation <em>Grad only</em></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time to Graduate</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certification/license</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End-of-Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics #4 Student teaching: student teaching evaluations: student teaching evaluations from university supervisor/cooperating teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics #5 Candidate effect on student learning: Candidate effect on student learning assessments: student teaching videotaped lesson reflection project</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics #1 License assessment: Praxis II (10061)</td>
<td>ETS/Student/As. Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Post graduation</strong> (also called follow-up)</td>
<td>Assessment Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys of Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys of Employers</td>
<td>Assessment Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreK-12 Student Outcomes (e.g., BEST study, Ed. Expansions study)</td>
<td>Assessment Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION III - RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS

1. For each NCTM standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple NCTM standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mathematics Preparation for All Mathematics Teacher Candidates</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowledge of Problem Solving. Candidates know, understand and apply the process of mathematical problem solving. [Indicators are listed at <a href="http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm">http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm</a>]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowledge of Reasoning and Proof. Candidates reason, construct, and evaluate mathematical arguments and develop an appreciation for mathematical rigor and inquiry. [Indicators are listed at <a href="http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm">http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm</a>]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Knowledge of Mathematical Communication. Candidates communicate their mathematical thinking orally and in writing to peers, faculty and others. [Indicators are listed at <a href="http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm">http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm</a>]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Knowledge of Mathematical Connections. Candidates recognize, use, and make connections between and among mathematical ideas and in contexts outside mathematics to build mathematical understanding. [Indicators are listed at <a href="http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm">http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm</a>]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Knowledge of Mathematical Representation. Candidates use varied representations of mathematical ideas to support anddeepen students' mathematical understanding. [Indicators are listed at <a href="http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm">http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm</a>]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Knowledge of Technology. Candidates embrace technology as an essential tool for teaching and learning mathematics. [Indicators are listed at <a href="http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm">http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm</a>]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dispositions. Candidates support a positive disposition toward mathematical processes and mathematical learning. [Indicators are listed at <a href="http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm">http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm</a>]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Knowledge of Mathematics Pedagogy. Candidates possess a deep understanding of how students learn mathematics and of the pedagogical knowledge specific to mathematics teaching and learning. [Indicators are listed at <a href="http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm">http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm</a>]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Knowledge of Number and Operations. Candidates demonstrate computational proficiency, including a conceptual understanding of numbers, ways of representing number, relationships among number andquantitative systems, and the meaning of operations. [Indicators are listed at <a href="http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm">http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm</a>]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Knowledge of Different Perspectives on Algebra. Candidates emphasize relationships among quantities including functions, ways of representing mathematical relationships, and the analysis of change. [Indicators are listed at <a href="http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm">http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm</a>]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Knowledge of Geometry. Candidates use spatial visualization and geometric modeling to explore and analyze geometric shapes, structures, and their properties. [Indicators are listed at <a href="http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm">http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm</a>]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Knowledge of Calculus. Candidates demonstrate a conceptual understanding of limit, continuity, differentiation, and integration and a thorough background in techniques and application of the calculus. [Indicators are listed at <a href="http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm">http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm</a>]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Knowledge of Data Analysis, Statistics and Probability. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of concepts and practices related to data analysis, statistics, and probability. [Indicators are listed at <a href="http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm">http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm</a>]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Knowledge of Measurement. Candidates apply and use measurement concepts and tools. [Indicators are listed at <a href="http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm">http://www.nctm.org/about/ncate/secondary_indic.htm</a>]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ATTACHMENT: ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACA</td>
<td>American Counseling Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACEI</td>
<td>Association for Early Childhood Education International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTFL</td>
<td>American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA</td>
<td>American Psychological Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHA</td>
<td>American Speech-Language-Hearing Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEST</td>
<td>Beginning Educator Support and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoA</td>
<td>Commission on Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA</td>
<td>Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAHEP</td>
<td>Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Educational Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAATE</td>
<td>Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Trainer Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACREP</td>
<td>Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPTE</td>
<td>Commission for Accreditation of Physical Therapy Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>Connecticut Administrator Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIHE</td>
<td>Commission on Institutions of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETS</td>
<td>Educational Testing Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Grade Point Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>Graduate Record Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA</td>
<td>International Reading Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRC-AT</td>
<td>Joint Review Committee on Educational Programs in Athletic Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>Miller Analogies Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASP</td>
<td>National Association of School Psychologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSS</td>
<td>National Council for the Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTE</td>
<td>National Council of Teachers of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTM</td>
<td>National Council of Teachers of Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEASC</td>
<td>New England Association for Schools and Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPBEA</td>
<td>National Policy Board for Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA</td>
<td>National Science Teachers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OATS</td>
<td>Online Assessment Tracking System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDS</td>
<td>Professional Development School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Specialized Professional Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCAC</td>
<td>Teaching Certification Assessment Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNE</td>
<td>Teachers for a New Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAPP</td>
<td>University of Connecticut Administrator Preparation Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RESULTS FROM THE NEAG ASSESSMENT REVIEW SURVEY BY THE NEAG ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Fall 2010

In accordance with the guidelines put forth in the 2nd version of the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan, each year the Neag Assessment Committee participates in an annual self-assessment. The Neag Assessment Committee is comprised of students, faculty, and administration that represent each of the departments within the Neag School of Education and the teacher education program. The committee takes the view that assessment cannot be governed by a single individual or group of individuals; rather, it is enhanced and refined through involvement and contributions from multiple and diverse perspectives. Therefore, members are committed to collaboration with the full school community in the culture and process of assessment.

Modeled on the rubric used by NCATE, this survey addresses multiple facets of assessment at the Neag School of Education. Three essential questions serve as a framework to guide the objectives of the survey. These questions focus on the assessment system; data collection, analysis, and evaluation; and the use of data for program improvement. For each question, there is a corresponding rubric that specifies key standards associated with it. Open-ended questions are also posed that ask individuals to describe strengths, areas for improvement, and other comments relevant to each of these three questions. Additionally, individuals are asked to rate the extent to which the Neag School of Education addresses and utilizes assessment data along several dimensions.

As part of a pilot, the committee members were asked in the fall of 2008 to submit survey responses in reference to the 2006-2007 school year. Then, in the spring, the committee was asked again to complete the survey as it applied to the 2007-2008 school year. It was during this year that committee members drafted the 2nd version of the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan. The results of these surveys were presented and discussed at a committee meeting, where it was established that they would serve as baseline data for future administrations.

In the fall of 2009, committee members were asked to complete a survey referencing the 2008-2009 school year. During this year the committee recommended that all faculty should also complete the survey. This opportunity was extended once more in the fall of 2010 for the most recent release of the survey. There were a total of 49 respondents, 35 faculty members and 14 committee members completed the annual assessment survey. This report contains the results for
the committee only, followed by the results of all participating faculty members, including those who are on the committee.

Responses from the Neag Assessment Committee Members (n=14)

What position best describes you? (14 Responses)

- Neag Faculty/Clinician: 12 (85.71%)
- Neag Administrator: 2 (14.29%)

What is the department with which you are most aligned? (14 Responses)

- Educational Leadership: 3 (21.43%)
- Educational Psychology: 5 (35.71%)
- Curriculum and Instruction: 2 (14.29%)
- Kinesiology: 2 (14.29%)
- None of the above: 2 (14.29%)
Please rate our Assessment System that collects and analyzes data (for example, on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, Neag School operations).

### Rating:
(10 Responses)

- **Acceptable**: 8 (80.00%)
- **Target**: 2 (20.00%)

**Strengths:**
(1 response)
comprehensiveness of system; links to Conceptual Framework and standards; general buy-in in several programs

**Areas for Improvement:**
(1 response)
more widespread involvement; streamlining the system
Please rate our Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation.

Rating:
(10 Responses)

Strengths:
(0 responses)

Areas for Improvement:
(1 response)

We could do a better job of sharing specific information with each department so that the departments can use this data to make meaningful changes.
Please rate our use of Data for Program Improvement.

Rating:
(9 Responses)

- Unacceptable: 4 (44.44%)
- Acceptable: 2 (22.22%)
- Target: 3 (33.33%)

Strengths: (0 response)

Areas for Improvement:
(2 responses)

See previous comment [We could do a better job of sharing specific information with each department so that the departments can use this data to make meaningful changes.]

Departments need to take more time using the results to make effective changes for program/dept improvement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline 2007-08</th>
<th>Baseline 2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment system</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection, analysis, and evaluation</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of data for program improvement</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**We align curriculum, instruction, and assessments with professional, state, and/or institutional standards.**  
(9 Responses)

- 6 (66.67%) We do this acceptably.  
- 3 (33.33%) We do this extremely well.
We examine the efficacy of courses, field experiences, and programs. (9 Responses)

- 7 (77.78%) We do this acceptably.
- 1 (11.11%) We do this minimally.
- 1 (11.11%) We do not do this.

We assess students on content knowledge, pedagogical and/or professional knowledge and skills, professional dispositions, and their effects as outlined in professional, state, and institutional standards. (9 Responses)

- 5 (55.56%) We are really good at this.
- 2 (22.22%) We do this acceptably.
- 2 (22.22%) We do this minimally.
We review our programs and make refinement where needed, over time, to ensure quality.
(9 Responses)

- We do not do this. 3 (33.33%)
- We do this minimally. 3 (33.33%)
- We do this acceptably. 2 (22.22%)
- We are really good at this. 1 (11.11%)

Our student assessments and evaluations are purposeful, evolving from missions, the conceptual framework, and/or program goals.
(9 Responses)

- We do this minimally. 5 (55.56%)
- We do this acceptably. 2 (22.22%)
- We are really good at this. 2 (22.22%)
Our assessments are comprehensive, including measures related to faculty, the curriculum, and instruction, as well as what students know and can do.
(9 Responses)

- Blue: We do this minimally. 4 (44.44%)
- Yellow: We do this acceptably. 2 (22.22%)
- Orange: We are really good at this. 3 (33.33%)

We address fairness, consistency, accuracy, and avoidance of bias in assessments to the degree possible.
(8 Responses)

- Light blue: We do not do this. 1 (12.50%)
- Yellow: We do this minimally. 2 (25.00%)
- Orange: We do this acceptably. 4 (50.00%)
- Dark blue: We are really good at this. 1 (12.50%)
We gather and use assessments from various sources - for example, field experiences, clinical sites, content courses, faculty, candidates, graduates, and employers. (9 Responses)

- We do this minimally.
- We do this acceptably.
- We are really good at this.

We use technology in our data gathering and analysis, as well as more broadly in planning and evaluation. (9 Responses)

- We do this acceptably.
- We are really good at this.
We use information available from external sources such as state licensing exams, evaluations during an induction or mentoring year, and employer reports. (9 Responses)

- 8 (88.89%) We do this minimally.
- 1 (11.11%) We do this acceptably.
In the evaluation of operations and programs, we collect, analyze, and use a broad array of information and data from course evaluations and evaluations of clinical practice, faculty, admissions process, advising system, school partnerships, program quality, Neag School governance, etc. (9 Responses)

- **Blue**: We do this minimally.
- **Yellow**: We do this acceptably.
- **Red**: We are really good at this.
All Responses (n=35)

What position best describes you? (34 Responses)

- Neag Faculty/Clinician: 31 (91.82%)
- Neag Administrator: 3 (8.82%)

What is the department with which you are most aligned? (35 Responses)

- Educational Leadership: 10 (28.57%)
- Educational Psychology: 4 (11.43%)
- Curriculum and Instruction: 13 (37.14%)
- Kinesiology: 4 (11.43%)
- Physical Therapy: 4 (11.43%)
- None of the above: 2 (5.71%)
Please rate our Assessment System that collects and analyzes data (for example, on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, Neag School operations).

**Rating:**
(24 Responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**
(4 responses)

- I appreciate the reports prepared for us by the Assessment team. I appreciate the willingness of the assessment team to be available for consultation.
- Input, data available, multiple forms of data collected, assessment at multiple points, consistency
- The instrument measures the performance of the candidate with state standards
- Comprehensiveness of system; links to Conceptual Framework and standards; general buy-in in several programs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas for Improvement: (5 responses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There seems too many &quot;disconnected&quot; initiatives. I'm not certain how OATS, NCATE, NEASC, etc... all relate. Thus, each year I find myself entering or updating data, but I'm not certain its purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no real connection with Kinesiology, its application pool nor its outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Process. The cooperating teacher should be able to send the document directly to the supervisor who then would use the feedback from the cooperating and his/her own feedback to submit. As it is now, if the cooperating teachers submits the document the supervisor does not see it. What I have been doing is giving the document to the cooperating teacher in hard copy, they give it to be and I submit a join assessment more widespread involvement; streamlining the system using the data to make programmatic changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate our Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(22 Responses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 (77.27%)</td>
<td>5 (22.73%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Areas for Improvement:**
(2 responses)

It's time to move past Taskstream and find something else.

We could do a better job of sharing specific information with each department so that the departments can use this data to make meaningful changes.

**Strengths:**
(2 responses)

A high point is this area and the communication with the faculty individual student data is good.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A high point is this area and the communication with the faculty individual student data is good.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate our use of Data for Program Improvement.

**Rating:**
(20 Responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**
(1 response)
Data has been used to set initiatives in motion.

**Areas for Improvement:**
(3 responses)

1. I do no see any clear indication of the use of data to make decisions in graduate programs.
2. See previous comment: (We could do a better job of sharing specific information with each department so that the departments can use this data to make meaningful changes.)
3. Departments need to take more time using the results to make effective changes for program/dept improvement.
We align curriculum, instruction, and assessments with professional, state, and/or institutional standards.
(19 Responses)

- We do this minimally: 1 (5.26%)
- We do this acceptably: 12 (63.16%)
- We do this extremely well: 5 (26.32%)

We examine the efficacy of courses, field experiences, and programs.
(19 Responses)

- We do not do this: 12 (63.16%)
- We do this minimally: 5 (26.32%)
- We do this acceptably: 2 (10.53%)
We assess students on content knowledge, pedagogical and/or professional knowledge and skills, professional dispositions, and their effects as outlined in professional, state, and institutional standards.
(19 Responses)

- **11** (57.89%) - We do this minimally.
- **6** (31.58%) - We do this acceptably.
- **2** (10.53%) - We are really good at this.

---

We review our programs and make refinement where needed, over time, to ensure quality.
(18 Responses)

- **8** (44.44%) - We do not do this.
- **4** (22.22%) - We do this acceptably.
- **4** (22.22%) - We do this minimally.
- **2** (11.11%) - We are really good at this.
Our student assessments and evaluations are purposeful, evolving from missions, the conceptual framework, and/or program goals. (19 Responses)

- We do not do this.
- We do this minimally.
- We do this acceptably.
- We are really good at this.

Our assessments are comprehensive, including measures related to faculty, the curriculum, and instruction, as well as what students know and can do. (19 Responses)

- We do this minimally.
- We do this acceptably.
- We are really good at this.
We address fairness, consistency, accuracy, and avoidance of bias in assessments to the degree possible.
(17 Responses)

- We do not do this. 9 (52.94%)
- We do this minimally. 4 (23.53%)
- We do this acceptably. 1 (5.88%)
- We are really good at this. 3 (17.65%)

We gather and use assessments from various sources - for example, field experiences, clinical sites, content courses, faculty, candidates, graduates, and employers.
(19 Responses)

- We do this minimally. 7 (36.84%)
- We do this acceptably. 3 (15.79%)
- We are really good at this. 9 (47.37%)
We use technology in our data gathering and analysis, as well as more broadly in planning and evaluation. (19 Responses)

- We do this minimally: 6 (31.58%)
- We do this acceptably: 12 (63.16%)
- We are really good at this: 1 (5.26%)

We use information available from external sources such as state licensing exams, evaluations during an induction or mentoring year, and employer reports. (19 Responses)

- We do this minimally: 5 (26.32%)
- We do this acceptably: 12 (63.16%)
- We are really good at this: 2 (10.53%)
In the evaluation of operations and programs, we collect, analyze, and use a broad array of information and data from course evaluations and evaluations of clinical practice, faculty, admissions process, advising system, school partnerships, program quality, Neag School governance, etc.

(19 Responses)

- **9 (47.37%)** (We do this acceptably)
- **6 (31.58%)**
- **3 (15.79%)**
- **1 (5.26%)** (We are really good at this)
- **We do not do this.**
Neag School of Education Climate Survey
- Faculty/Staff Edition

As we survey our alumni, students, and employers, it is also important to get feedback from faculty and staff when conducting a school evaluation for the Neag School of Education. Your participation is voluntary and anonymous, but we do hope that you will take 5 minutes to complete this important survey. The Neag Assessment Committee, with representation from each department and teacher education, has modified this survey from the last one administered in 2005. They will see preliminary results and will have opportunities to provide feedback to these various drafts. The final report will be shared by representatives at departmental meetings.

Section A: Using the following scale, please rate the degree to which you agree with the following statements. Please circle your rating for each statement using:

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4=strongly agree

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hard work is usually recognized</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel appreciated</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My work load is reasonable</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am reasonably compensated</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am informed about significant changes in the Neag School</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am accepting of significant changes in the Neag School</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I receive opportunities for professional development</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My professional development is supported</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Information on technology is available</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Information on assessment is available</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I feel respected by the Neag community</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am satisfied with communication in the Neag School</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The performance evaluation process is clear and objective</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. The performance evaluation system provides constructive feedback
15. The merit process is clear and objective
16. I am treated fairly by faculty and administration
17. I can offer input in major decisions at the Neag School
18. Interactions with my colleagues are positive
19. There are opportunities for team building
20. There are opportunities for networking
21. There are adequate avenues for social functions
22. Morale is high
23. Resources are distributed fairly
24. There is a sense of equity among colleagues
25. The mentoring process is well-established
26. I am clear on the structure of faculty governance*
27. Undergraduate student satisfaction is strong
28. Graduate student satisfaction is strong
29. I am familiar with the conceptual framework
30. My job responsibilities are clear
31. I am aware of the mission of our school
32. I am aware of the goals of the department

*According to AAUP website on governance, “the faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.”

Section B: Open-ended questions.

1. What are the 2-4 most important reasons you choose to work at the Neag School?

2. Overall, what are the 2-4 best things for you about working for the Neag School?
3. What are 2-4 things that you would improve? How would you improve them?

4. If there is anything important about climate that we have not asked, tell us. Please note that your suggestions could be considered as part of future climate surveys.

Section C: Other Information.

What is your position?

- Tenured
- Not tenured, but faculty member on the tenured track
- Not tenured and a faculty/clinician not on the tenured track
- Not tenured and not a faculty/clinician

Years working at the Neag School:

- 0-2 years
- 3-5 years
- 6-8 years
- 9 or more years

Thank you for taking the survey.
Neag School of Education Climate Survey
- Student Edition

It is important to get feedback from students when conducting a school evaluation for the Neag School of Education. Your participation is voluntary and anonymous, but we do hope that you will take 5 minutes to complete this important survey.

Section A: Faculty Support

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements below by marking the appropriate response:

(1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4=strongly agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I have received adequate guidance from faculty members at this university</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I have a concern or problem, I feel that there is a faculty member or administrator at this university whom I can talk to</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My current academic advisor is sensitive to my needs and concerns</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members at this university are approachable outside of the classroom</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that there are faculty or administrator role models for me at this university</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I have the opportunity to succeed at this university</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members are sensitive to the needs of all students</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section B: University Commitment to Diversity

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements below by marking the appropriate response:

(1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4=strongly agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and administrators seem to be committed to promoting respect for and understanding of group differences</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a climate that fosters diversity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty administrators are genuinely committed to increasing diversity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a good place to gain understanding about multicultural issues and perspectives</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section C: Race- and Gender-Based Relations

Please rate the following aspects of the climate at this university in general using the following scale:

(poor = 1, fair = 2, good = 3, excellent = 4, no opinion = N)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic integration on campus</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for students of different racial and ethnic groups</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the success of students of different racial and ethnic groups</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect by students for faculty of different racial and ethnic groups</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the success of women students</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic relations in the classroom</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity of faculty and staff to gender issues</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of diverse group perspectives into classroom learning</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section D: Climate for Diverse Groups

Please rate the climate at this university in general for persons from diverse backgrounds by indicating your response using the following scale:

(Hostile = 1, Somewhat Hostile = 2, Neutral = 3, Somewhat Welcoming = 4, Welcoming = 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students with disabilities</th>
<th>Hostile</th>
<th>Somewhat Hostile</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Welcoming</th>
<th>Welcoming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic minority students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay, lesbian, bi-sexual, and transgendered students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with different religious beliefs and backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section E: Unfair Treatment

How often have you been treated unfairly or harassed at this university because of each of the personal characteristics listed below:

(Never = N, Rarely = R, Sometimes = S, Often = O)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accent/dialect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic/income level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section F: Experiencing Insensitive Remarks and Materials

*How often have you read, heard, or seen insensitive or negative comments or materials in the Neag School:*

(Never = N, Rarely = R, Sometimes = S, Often = O)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic minority students</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with disabilities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonheterosexuals</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals from different national origins</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious groups</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section G: Fair Treatment

*How fair do you feel you have been treated by the following groups in the Neag School:*

(Very fairly = 1, Somewhat fairly = 2, Fairly = 3, Very fairly = 4, Not applicable = N)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Very fairly</th>
<th>Somewhat fairly</th>
<th>Fairly</th>
<th>Very fairly</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors/instructors</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/top administrators</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other students</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the local community</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking the survey.
Neag Alumni Survey Distribution

Survey Creation

Last spring, the Neag Assessment Committee designed an alumni survey which aligns with our conceptual framework, and is made up of key components including:

1. General perspectives of the Neag School of Education
   a. Rating satisfaction
      i. Education received
      ii. Culture of the school
      iii. Facilities
      iv. Preparation for employment
      v. Diversity
   b. Open-ended questions (e.g., most and least valuable experiences at the Neag School)

2. Employment
   a. Field currently working in
   b. Current position
   c. Extent to which skills developed at UConn were used

3. Background information
   a. Demographics
   b. Degree/Field

4. Program-specific questions for:
   a. Teacher Education
      -- English/LA Education
   b. Physical Therapy
   c. Athletic Training
   d. Executive Leadership
   e. School Counseling
   f. School Psychology
   g. UCAPP
   h. Sports Management
   i. Gifted and Talented
   j. Also ask if they have a second degree from Neag, and if so, answer program-specific questions about that second degree

5. Creation of mock survey for faculty and staff (http://uconn.checkboxonline.com/demo.aspx)

Database Creation

Making the database

1. Already possessed a list of alumni from 1985-86 to 2008-09, which we used to conduct the Where Are Neag Alumni study last year; created through a combination of graduate school, in-house, and CSDE records
2. We were only concerned about alumni from the last 10 years, so cut down list to 2000-01 to 2009-10
3. IT provided us with records for the 2009-10 graduates
Finding alumni current contact information

1. Four sources:
   a. UConn Foundation: asked them if they had addresses and emails for these alumni
   b. Existing databases: e.g., database we sent to the state last year for Where Are Alumni study
   c. Exit surveys:
      ii. School Psychology
      iii. School Counseling
   d. Program sources - Athletic Training had past 5 years contact information

2. Combined information from all sources
   a. Emailed faculty and staff for those emails and addresses of alumni who were missing
   b. Updated database
   c. Emailed faculty and staff with final list to make sure we had contact information for as many alumni as possible
   d. Updated database

ALUMNI COMMUNICATION

1. Mail out first postcard announcing survey

   Dear Alumni,

   The Neag School of Education is proud to receive many honors including being ranked in the top 25 graduate schools of education in the U.S. You hold a unique perspective about our programs. We’d greatly appreciate your input as to what could be done to make us even better. You are invited to take a few minutes from your busy schedule to complete a very important survey. The survey is at:

   http://uconn.checkboxonline.com/alum.aspx

   Please complete the survey by November 1, 2010. By participating, you will have a chance to win one $100 or one of the four $25 Amazon.com gift cards!

   Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey and help us advance the quality of programs at the Neag School of Education.

2. Sent electronically email to some alumni
3. Posted the announcement at various sites including our website
4. Emailed faculty and staff with request to send information to alumni
5. This month, will email two more emails
6. This month, will send out a second postcard
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full Title</th>
<th>Contact Person(s)</th>
<th>Verified</th>
<th>Scheduled Completion</th>
<th>Review by Program</th>
<th>Scheduled Revision</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Special Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.10 IB/M</td>
<td>Evaluation IB/M Junior Fall Clinic Midterm Evaluation</td>
<td>Robin Hands, Wendy Glenn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/1/10</td>
<td>Early Sept</td>
<td>Mid Sept</td>
<td>11/29/10</td>
<td>12/10/10</td>
<td>12/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11 IB/M</td>
<td>Evaluation IB/M Junior Fall Clinic Final Evaluation</td>
<td>Robin Hands, Wendy Glenn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/1/10</td>
<td>Early Sept</td>
<td>Mid Sept</td>
<td>11/29/10</td>
<td>12/10/10</td>
<td>12/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 IB/M</td>
<td>Evaluation IB/M Junior Spring Clinic Final Evaluation</td>
<td>Robin Hands, Wendy Glenn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12/1/10</td>
<td>Early Nov</td>
<td>Late Nov</td>
<td>4/11/11</td>
<td>4/29/11</td>
<td>5/2/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 IB/M</td>
<td>Evaluation IB/M Senior Fall Clinic Midterm Evaluation</td>
<td>Robin Hands, Wendy Glenn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/1/10</td>
<td>10/1/10</td>
<td>10/1/10</td>
<td>10/4/10</td>
<td>10/15/10</td>
<td>10/18/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 IB/M</td>
<td>Evaluation IB/M Senior Fall Clinic Final Evaluation</td>
<td>Robin Hands, Wendy Glenn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/1/10</td>
<td>10/1/10</td>
<td>10/1/10</td>
<td>11/29/10</td>
<td>12/10/10</td>
<td>12/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15 IB/M</td>
<td>Evaluation IB/M 5th year Midterm Internship Evaluation</td>
<td>Robin Hands, Wendy Glenn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/15/10</td>
<td>Early Sept</td>
<td>Mid Sept</td>
<td>11/29/10</td>
<td>12/10/10</td>
<td>12/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16 IB/M</td>
<td>Evaluation IB/M 5th year Final Internship Evaluation</td>
<td>Robin Hands, Wendy Glenn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/15/10</td>
<td>Early Sept</td>
<td>Mid Sept</td>
<td>11/29/10</td>
<td>12/10/10</td>
<td>12/13/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full Title</th>
<th>Contact Person(s)</th>
<th>Verified</th>
<th>Scheduled Completion</th>
<th>Review by Program</th>
<th>Scheduled Revision</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Special Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.17 TNE IB/M</td>
<td>Survey Common Entry Survey</td>
<td>M Yakimowski &amp; Teacher Ed Subcommittee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8/15/10</td>
<td>Sept 2010</td>
<td>Sept 2010</td>
<td>8/15/10</td>
<td>9/5/10</td>
<td>9/15/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.18 TNE IB/M</td>
<td>Survey Common Exit Survey</td>
<td>M Yakimowski &amp; Teacher Ed Subcommittee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2/5/11</td>
<td>2/5/11</td>
<td>2/10/11</td>
<td>2/15/11</td>
<td>4/29/11</td>
<td>5/2/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19 IB/M</td>
<td>Survey Junior through Masters Student Clinic Survey</td>
<td>M Yakimowski &amp; Teacher Ed Subcommittee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/1/10</td>
<td>9/15/10</td>
<td>10/1/10</td>
<td>4/1/11</td>
<td>4/20/11</td>
<td>5/1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20 IB/M</td>
<td>Survey Junior through Masters Cooperating Teacher Survey</td>
<td>M Yakimowski &amp; Teacher Ed Subcommittee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2/1/10</td>
<td>9/15/10</td>
<td>10/1/10</td>
<td>4/1/11</td>
<td>4/20/11</td>
<td>5/1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.21 IB/M</td>
<td>Survey Professional Development School (PDS) Partnership Survey</td>
<td>Wendy Glenn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2/1/10</td>
<td>9/15/10</td>
<td>10/1/10</td>
<td>4/1/11</td>
<td>4/20/11</td>
<td>5/1/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Educational Psychology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full Title</th>
<th>Contact Person(s)</th>
<th>Verified</th>
<th>Scheduled Completion</th>
<th>Review by Program</th>
<th>Scheduled Revision</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Special Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.11 School Counseling</td>
<td>Evaluation Internship Evaluation for Interns (Fall)</td>
<td>Orv Karan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/1/10</td>
<td>Early Sept</td>
<td>Mid Sept</td>
<td>11/29/10</td>
<td>12/10/10</td>
<td>12/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12 School Counseling</td>
<td>Evaluation Internship Evaluation for Supervisors (Fall)</td>
<td>Orv Karan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/1/10</td>
<td>Early Sept</td>
<td>Mid Sept</td>
<td>11/29/10</td>
<td>12/10/10</td>
<td>12/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13 School Counseling</td>
<td>Evaluation Internship Evaluation for Interns (Spring)</td>
<td>Orv Karan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12/1/10</td>
<td>Early Nov</td>
<td>Late Nov</td>
<td>4/11/11</td>
<td>4/29/11</td>
<td>5/2/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14 School Counseling</td>
<td>Evaluation Internship Evaluation for Supervisors (Spring)</td>
<td>Orv Karan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12/1/10</td>
<td>Early Nov</td>
<td>Late Nov</td>
<td>4/11/11</td>
<td>4/29/11</td>
<td>5/2/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.12 School Psychology</td>
<td>Evaluation School Psychology Practicum Student Self-Rating (Fall)</td>
<td>Melissa Bray</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/1/10</td>
<td>Early Sept</td>
<td>Mid Sept</td>
<td>11/29/10</td>
<td>12/10/10</td>
<td>12/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13 School Psychology</td>
<td>Evaluation School Psych Practicum Field Supervisor Evaluation (Fall)</td>
<td>Melissa Bray</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/1/10</td>
<td>Early Sept</td>
<td>Mid Sept</td>
<td>11/29/10</td>
<td>12/10/10</td>
<td>12/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.14 School Psychology</td>
<td>Evaluation School Psychology Practicum Student Self-Rating (Spring)</td>
<td>Melissa Bray</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12/1/10</td>
<td>Early Nov</td>
<td>Late Nov</td>
<td>4/11/11</td>
<td>4/29/11</td>
<td>5/2/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.15 School Psychology</td>
<td>Evaluation School Psych Practicum Field Supervisor Evaluation (Spring)</td>
<td>Melissa Bray</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12/1/10</td>
<td>Early Nov</td>
<td>Late Nov</td>
<td>4/11/11</td>
<td>4/29/11</td>
<td>5/2/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.16 School Psychology</td>
<td>Evaluation School Psychology Internship Evaluation (Spring)</td>
<td>Tom Kehoe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12/1/10</td>
<td>Early Nov</td>
<td>Late Nov</td>
<td>4/11/11</td>
<td>4/29/11</td>
<td>5/2/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Curriculum & Instruction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full Title</th>
<th>Contact Person(s)</th>
<th>Verified</th>
<th>Scheduled Completion</th>
<th>Review by Program</th>
<th>Scheduled Revision</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Special Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.11 Reading</td>
<td>Evaluation Reading Program Internship Evaluation</td>
<td>Mary Ann Doyle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/13/10</td>
<td>10/25/10</td>
<td>11/4/10</td>
<td>11/8/10</td>
<td>12/10/10</td>
<td>12/13/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UCAPP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full Title</th>
<th>Contact Person(s)</th>
<th>Verified</th>
<th>Scheduled Completion</th>
<th>Review by Program</th>
<th>Scheduled Revision</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Special Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.11 UCAPP</td>
<td>Evaluation UCAPP Internship Yr 1 Candidate Evaluation Form (Fall)</td>
<td>Shuana Tucker</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/13/10</td>
<td>10/25/10</td>
<td>11/4/10</td>
<td>11/8/10</td>
<td>12/10/10</td>
<td>12/13/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Educational Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full Title</th>
<th>Contact Person(s)</th>
<th>Verified</th>
<th>Scheduled Completion</th>
<th>Review by Program</th>
<th>Scheduled Revision</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Special Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 UCAPP</td>
<td>Evaluation UCAPP Internship Yr 1 Signed Administrator Evaluation Form (Fall)</td>
<td>Shuana Tucker</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/13/10</td>
<td>10/25/10</td>
<td>11/4/10</td>
<td>11/8/10</td>
<td>12/10/10</td>
<td>12/13/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAPP Evaluation</td>
<td>UCAPP Internship Yr 2 Candidate Evaluation Form (Fall)</td>
<td>Shuana Tucker</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/13/10</td>
<td>10/25/10</td>
<td>11/4/10</td>
<td>4/18/11</td>
<td>5/6/11</td>
<td>5/9/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAPP Evaluation</td>
<td>UCAPP Internship Yr 2 Signed Administrator Evaluation Form (Fall)</td>
<td>Shuana Tucker</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/13/10</td>
<td>10/25/10</td>
<td>11/4/10</td>
<td>4/18/11</td>
<td>5/6/11</td>
<td>5/9/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAPP Survey</td>
<td>UCAPP 2nd Year Feedback Form</td>
<td>Shuana Tucker</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAPP Survey</td>
<td>UCAPP Potential Adjunct Survey</td>
<td>Shuana Tucker</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/4/10</td>
<td>10/11/10</td>
<td>10/14/10</td>
<td>10/18/10</td>
<td>11/1/10</td>
<td>11/3/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAPP Survey</td>
<td>Common Entry Survey</td>
<td>Shuana Tucker</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/13/10</td>
<td>10/25/10</td>
<td>11/4/10</td>
<td>4/25/11</td>
<td>5/20/11</td>
<td>May each yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAPP Survey</td>
<td>UCAPP Alumini Survey</td>
<td>Shuana Tucker</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/13/10</td>
<td>10/25/10</td>
<td>11/4/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.11 Executive Leadership Evaluation</td>
<td>Executive Leadership Mentor/Intern Feedback Evaluation</td>
<td>Bob Villanova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.13 Executive Leadership Evaluation</td>
<td>Executive Leadership Student Internship Form</td>
<td>Bob Villanova</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/1/10</td>
<td>6/5/10</td>
<td>6/10/10</td>
<td>6/15/10</td>
<td>7/1/10</td>
<td>8/15/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15 Sport Mgmt Evaluation</td>
<td>Kinesiology Midpoint Internship Eval (Fall)</td>
<td>Laura Burton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/5/10</td>
<td>6/10/10</td>
<td>6/15/10</td>
<td>6/20/10</td>
<td>7/1/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.16 Sport Mgmt Evaluation</td>
<td>Kinesiology Final Internship Eval (Fall)</td>
<td>Laura Burton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/5/10</td>
<td>6/10/10</td>
<td>6/15/10</td>
<td>6/20/10</td>
<td>7/1/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.17 Sport Mgmt Evaluation</td>
<td>Kinesiology Midpoint Internship Evaluation (Spring)</td>
<td>Laura Burton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/5/10</td>
<td>6/10/10</td>
<td>6/15/10</td>
<td>6/20/10</td>
<td>7/1/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.18 Sport Mgmt Evaluation</td>
<td>Kinesiology Midpoint Internship Evaluation (1st Summer 2010)</td>
<td>Laura Burton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/5/10</td>
<td>6/10/10</td>
<td>6/15/10</td>
<td>6/20/10</td>
<td>7/1/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11 Sport Mgmt Evaluation</td>
<td>Kinesiology Final Internship Evaluation (1st Summer 2010)</td>
<td>Laura Burton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/5/10</td>
<td>6/10/10</td>
<td>6/15/10</td>
<td>6/20/10</td>
<td>7/1/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.12 Sport Mgmt Evaluation</td>
<td>Kinesiology Midpoint Internship Evaluation (1st Summer 2011)</td>
<td>Laura Burton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/5/10</td>
<td>6/10/10</td>
<td>6/15/10</td>
<td>6/20/10</td>
<td>7/1/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11 Sport Mgmt Evaluation</td>
<td>Kinesiology Final Internship Evaluation (2nd Summer 2011)</td>
<td>Laura Burton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8/25/10</td>
<td>9/5/10</td>
<td>9/10/10</td>
<td>10/15/10</td>
<td>11/10/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.12 Physical Therapy Survey</td>
<td>Physical Therapy Graduating Student Survey</td>
<td>Craig Denegar, Joe Smey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/1/10</td>
<td>10/15/10</td>
<td>11/1/10</td>
<td>11/15/10</td>
<td>12/15/10</td>
<td>2/1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.13 Physical Therapy Survey</td>
<td>Physical Therapy Student Professional Behavior Survey (Fall)</td>
<td>Craig Denegar, Joe Smey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/10/10</td>
<td>7/1/10</td>
<td>8/15/10</td>
<td>9/1/10</td>
<td>9/15/10</td>
<td>10/1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.14 School-wide</td>
<td>School-wide Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8/1/10</td>
<td>8/15/10</td>
<td>8/15/10</td>
<td>8/20/10</td>
<td>9/15/10</td>
<td>9/20/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.11 School-wide</td>
<td>Neag Faculty Mentoring Survey</td>
<td>Jennifer Bruening</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/1/10</td>
<td>9/5/10</td>
<td>9/23/10</td>
<td>9/23/10</td>
<td>9/20/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.12 School-wide</td>
<td>Neag Assessment Annual Review Survey</td>
<td>M Yakimowski &amp; Neag Assessment Cnt</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/1/10</td>
<td>9/5/10</td>
<td>10/7/10</td>
<td>10/7/10</td>
<td>10/14/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.13 School-wide</td>
<td>Community-Building Survey</td>
<td>Michelle Fenn-Sagawa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/1/10</td>
<td>9/5/10</td>
<td>10/12/10</td>
<td>10/12/10</td>
<td>10/19/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.14 School-wide</td>
<td>Information Committee</td>
<td>Doug Casa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/1/10</td>
<td>9/5/10</td>
<td>10/20/10</td>
<td>10/20/10</td>
<td>10/27/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-wide Survey</td>
<td>Middle School Humor Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/1/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-wide Survey</td>
<td>CommPACT School Student Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/1/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15 Assessment Evaluation</td>
<td>ELL's: Enhancing Vocabulary Through Cognate Awareness</td>
<td>M Yakimowski &amp; Kara Wolman</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/1/10</td>
<td>9/5/10</td>
<td>10/22/10</td>
<td>10/22/10</td>
<td>10/29/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.16 Assessment Evaluation</td>
<td>Forgiveness: An Important but Misunderstood Process</td>
<td>M Yakimowski &amp; Kara Wolman</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/1/10</td>
<td>9/5/10</td>
<td>11/18/10</td>
<td>11/18/10</td>
<td>11/25/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.17 Assessment Evaluation</td>
<td>Reviewing Adolescent Literacy Reports: Key Components &amp; Critical Questions</td>
<td>M Yakimowski &amp; Kara Wolman</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/1/10</td>
<td>9/5/10</td>
<td>10/25/10</td>
<td>10/26/10</td>
<td>10/27/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.11 Assessment Evaluation</td>
<td>Assessing The New Literacies of Online Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>M Yakimowski &amp; Kara Wolman</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/15/10</td>
<td>9/15/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The OATS Subcommittee of the Neag Assessment Committee held our fall meeting. This subcommittee has representatives from each of our departments and ensures that all programs have plans which are entered into the OATS system. Our fall meeting “wraps up” discussions about our 2009-2010 plans, and introduces the process we will use for the 2010-2011 plans.

In light of the upcoming NEASC visitation team midterm visit and the university re-starting the program review process, individuals had some interesting discussions and questions. They wish to know:

- What is the university is doing to ensure that all programs in each department has assessment plans? For instance, we have noticed that there is no significant difference in the number of assessment plans that have been submitted this year in comparison to three years ago.

- Given that there was been minimal communication, is the university still supporting the development and implementation of these plans? For example, the meetings of the school assessment liaisons have not convened in over two years and only one communication across all schools was distributed last year.

- Aside from the program/department levels, what is being done by the university with this assessment information? We have not had any communication in this area.

I pose these questions to you as our university contact.

Thank you very much. I look forward to your responses.

Mary
From: Soulsby, Eric  
Sent: Monday, September 20, 2010 1:18 PM  
To: Yakimowski, Mary  
Subject: RE: OATS Subcommittee Meeting Feedback

Mary,

You raise some good questions and point out the problem that we have had too little resources devoted to assessment. We had hoped that schools/colleges would have maintained the efforts initiated by the Assessment Liaisons but it is clear that in some areas the fiscal crisis has moved some activity to the back burner. Clearly, we need to turn up the heat and get things cooking in some departments. Assessment activity has been far below the level desired in many areas of the University and we hope to revisit this with many of the schools/colleges that are still moving slowly.

We have struggled through some administrative reorganization within the Provost’s office with the departure of Veronica Makowsky, the arrival of Doug Cooper, and the creation of the new Office of Institutional Effectiveness overseen by Karla Fox. Part of the concerns of the IE office will be the NEASC 5-year report and I am hoping that will prove to be a springboard to get those procrastinating with assessment to move forward and catch up with those, like Neag, that have been making progress for some time.

We continue to work with the schools/colleges to get them moving on assessment. Some have been doing so, but have yet to utilize OATS as we have asked them to do. Others continue to move very slowly. And some have yet to make any progress at all. The bulk of the “slow folks” are within the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences and they have recently moved forward to organize their assessment efforts along the lines of the responsibilities of each of their associate deans. They are hopeful that conversations within the humanities, sciences, interdisciplinary programs, etc. will lead to more progress being made by each degree program within each broad area. Some of the other professional schools are moving along, but only Business has been populating OATS in a sufficient manner.

The information on assessment is needed for NEASC but also is something that I have tried to get used in decision making. By this I mean that to be useful the information should be part of what is considered when looking at different directions to head for improvement of student learning. I know this is something you know. The trouble is that I am not getting much of a receptive ear to this sort of a view of using assessment information. Too many equate assessment with NEASC compliance. The idea of using assessment information to aid in curriculum committee decisions or in budget decision making seems foreign to most. Nevertheless, we are looking at how we could incorporate metrics on assessment into the Academic Plan.

As we are finding, changes in school/college leadership have led to some efforts that were underway becoming a bit slowed and in some cases stopping any forward movement. I had hoped that degree programs would keep moving forward, but in hindsight it seems that without prodding some will avoid doing so.

We had hoped for the need for the school/college Assessment Liaison group to diminish as the school/colleges distributed their assessment work out to each of their departments. Unfortunately, it seems that this has happened in some areas and not in others. As a result, communication that helps keep everyone on the same page has not occurred. We had hoped to identify assessment liaisons for
each individual degree program and work with them. Unfortunately, many deans procrastinated in identifying such individuals and the resulting progress has been slow. But, meetings within a particular school/college with those that were identified proved more productive than efforts by the school/college Assessment Liaison.

Despite saying this, it is apparent that progress is slow and that there may still be a value to the school/college Assessment Liaison group. I expect that we will be reinstating the Assessment Liaison group – either within each school/college or across all schools/colleges, or both – and revisiting what needs to be done. One area in need of addressing may be the replacement of OATS with a commercial product. (I can share more on this if you are curious.)

Finally, the new Institutional Effectiveness effort has been largely spurred on by needs arising from how NEASC has changed its expectations for what universities must do as a result of the pressure put on regional accreditors resulting from the Spellings Commission. I am hopeful that we may now be able to get assessment off the back burner in those programs that have lagged behind Neag and others. Progress has been far too slow and there have been too little resources made available to move forward at a faster pace. Utilizing Assessment Liaisons to help foster some refocusing may be what we do under the new Institutional Effectiveness model and may help garner resources necessary to accomplish what is needed.

~ Eric
## NEAG ASSESSMENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON TEACHER EDUCATION

### Agenda

**Date:** September 27th, 2010  **Time:** 11:30-1:30  **Location:** Gentry 144

**Committee Charge:** Assists in development, implementation, and analysis of assessment protocols for the Neag Teacher Education programs through various surveys and evaluation tools (e.g., Common Entry, Common Exit, Alumni, etc.); Provides assessment support and advice regarding research-related projects.

**Make-up:** Approximately 20-25. This committee is comprised of university experts (Neag, CLAS, and Agr), PreK-12 district and state representatives, undergraduate and graduate Neag students, and community members. This is a multi-disciplinary team of educational leaders, practitioners, and researchers working together collaboratively to address issues of measurement, assessment, evaluation, and statistical analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agenda Item</strong></th>
<th><strong>Presenter</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:15-11:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-11:35</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introductions, Purpose of the meeting, Agreement to rules, Follow-up to NCATE visit in the spring of last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:35-12:05</td>
<td>The Common Entry, Common Exit, and Alumni Survey Updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview of the history of these surveys and future administration plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of the Common Entry survey results for TCPCG for the Graduating Class of 2011 and IB/M for the Graduating Class of 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Exit survey results for TCPCG and IB/M for the Graduating Class of 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:05-12:25</td>
<td>Educational Expansions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview of the purpose of this initiative and brief overview of activities through the last four years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptions and results of last year’s first study and “the beginnings” of this year’s four studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:25-12:55</td>
<td>The Clinic Evaluations for Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview of the history of these evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TCPCG Student teaching evaluation form using an online application (Checkbox)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IBM Clinic evaluation system for Juniors, Seniors, and 5th Year Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*University of Connecticut Neag School of Education*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:55-1:15</td>
<td><strong>Supplemental Surveys</strong></td>
<td>Mary Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplemental surveys: Overview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Clinic Cooperating Teacher /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidates Surveys and Professional Development School Partnership Surveys</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback to draft survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15-1:23</td>
<td>Career Aspiration Surveys for</td>
<td>Mary Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLAS - HDFR, Biology, Chemistry,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics, Social Studies,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Language, etc.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An Example: Chemistry’s survey</td>
<td>Tyson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from last spring and this fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:23-1:30</td>
<td><strong>Teacher Education and Assessment: Future Directions</strong></td>
<td>Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Where is Teacher Ed Going and Where is Assessment Going?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:23-1:30</td>
<td><strong>Wrap Up</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quick Updates:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alumni survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clinic evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Next meeting in the Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**AN EXAMINATION OF GRADES 3-8 READING ACHIEVEMENT USING A LONGITUDINAL DESIGN IN EDUCATIONAL EXPANSIONS**

**Graduate Students:** Rohini Sen, Wei Xia, Melissa Eastwood  
**Faculty:** Mary E. Yakimowski, Scott W. Brown, Marijke Kehrhan  
**Completed:** April, 2010

Recently, there has been significant interest in achievement models with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 serving as the catalyst (USDE, 2008) and states such as Tennessee (e.g., Barone & Education, 2009) and Colorado (CSDE, 2008) seeking to move in that direction. This study looks at achievement patterns as measured by the Connecticut Mastery Test reading scores across four cohorts for three years, longitudinally. More specifically, in this study we assessed the degree there are differences in reading achievement patterns by examining race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status and special status. The results vary slightly depending on the pupil cohort; the concurrent validity by performing similar analysis on the Degrees of Reading Power test showed consistent results. The paper concludes by offering next steps to this research.

**THE ACHIEVEMENT GAP FOR LOWER AND UPPER GRADES: “MIND THE GAP” FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES**

**Graduate Student:** Rohini Sen, Wei Xia  
**Faculty:** Mary E. Yakimowski, Michael Alfano, Michael Faggella-Luby

The purpose of this investigation is to ascertain the presence and nature of the achievement gaps between students identified with disabilities and students not identified with disabilities. Two different cohorts - the third grade cohort (i.e., students grade 3 in Spring 2006, grade 4 in Spring 2007 and grade 5 in Spring 2008) and the sixth grade cohort (i.e., students in grade 6 in Spring 2006, grade 7 in Spring 2007 and grade 8 in Spring 2008) are examined. We observed statistically significant differences between the students with disabilities and students without disabilities in reading scores at each time point in order to “test” two theories – the first being that the reading achievement gap continues to increase over time and the second being that the reading achievement gap between students with and without disabilities is relatively static, though persistent over time. Preliminary findings show that there is no statistically significant difference in the gaps observed between the lower and upper grade students’ reading scores for both students with and without disabilities. Also, the results indicated similar reading growth trajectories for both students with and without disabilities when comparing the achievement gaps across cohorts. These findings support the second theory, the Deficit Model of Reading Growth.
DO DIFFERENT HIGHER EDUCATION TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS PRODUCE VARIATIONS IN GRADES 3-8 STUDENT PERFORMANCE IN MATHEMATICS?

Graduate Student: Wei Xia
Faculty: Mary E. Yakimowski, Mary Truxaw

The purpose of this study is to examine whether teacher education experiences at higher education levels (UConn vs. Other) have an impact on pupil performance in mathematics. The study is finding that UConn graduates had higher performance than the group with teachers who are not UConn graduates on the CMT-4 mathematics performance for 2008-09 controlling for 2007-08 performance. Results can be seen at the overall CMT-4 scale score level, the proficiency levels, the domain level, and for each of the 22 mathematics strands.

IS SCHOOL, TEACHER, AND/OR THE CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS MOST IMPORTANT AND WHY?

Graduate Student: Wei Xia
Faculty: Mary E. Yakimowski, Shuana Tucker

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between student growth in longitudinal reading literacy and its influencing factors (i.e., school, classroom teachers, and/or student characteristics) and follow-up with qualitative focus group discussions to explain the potential reasons for the patterns displayed through quantitative analyses. The preliminary quantitative analysis results showed that the student factor was the most influential. Within the student factor, socioeconomic status and race/ethnicity were the most important factors among demographic factors contributing to student reading vertical scale scores in 2008-09. Besides these two demographic variables, students’ teachers also play an important role in predicting student reading vertical scale scores in 2008-09 after controlling for initial differences in 2007-08 performance. Also, teacher effects were nested within school effects on student reading vertical scale scores in 2008-09. Based on the quantitative analysis results, the qualitative study will examine the “whys”.

PREDICTING MIDDLE SCHOOL READING ACHIEVEMENT GROWTH USING HIERARCHICAL LINEAR MODELS: AN EXAMINATION OF PUPIL READING ACHIEVEMENT TRAJECTORIES BY STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Graduate Student: Rohini Sen
Faculty: Mary E. Yakimowski, Betsy Mccoach

The purpose of this study is to investigate longitudinal reading achievement performance of a subsample of pupil performance on the Connecticut Mastery Test-Fourth Generation (CMT-4) in order to determine the extent to which scores vary between students of different genders and race/ethnicities over three years. The study seems to reveal that the average rate of growth in reading achievement is statistically significant and time accounts for significant variation in the reading scores. Also, race/ethnicity has a significant impact on the rate of growth of reading achievement scores. Finally, the study suggested that school or district level variables should better explain the variance in reading scores as well as growth in subsequent three level models after controlling for student level variables.