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: 2 (14.29%)
- Curriculum and Instruction: 2 (14.29%)
- Kinesiology: 5 (35.71%)
- 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 (80.00%)</td>
<td>2 (20.00%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 (70.00%)</td>
<td>3 (30.00%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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: 3 (33.33%)
- Target: 2 (22.22%)

**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</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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)

- We do this acceptably: 6 (66.67%)
- We do this extremely well: 3 (33.33%)
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)

Our student assessments and evaluations are purposeful, evolving from missions, the conceptual framework, and/or program goals.
(9 Responses)
Our assessments are comprehensive, including measures related to faculty, the curriculum, and instruction, as well as what students know and can do. (9 Responses)

We address fairness, consistency, accuracy, and avoidance of bias in assessments to the degree possible. (8 Responses)
We gather and use assessments from various sources - for example, field experiences, clinical sites, content courses, faculty, candidates, graduates, and employers.
(9 Responses)

We use technology in our data gathering and analysis, as well as more broadly in planning and evaluation.
(9 Responses)
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%)
1 (11.11%)
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.
- Orange: We are really good at this.
All Responses (n=35)

What position best describes you? (34 Responses)

- Neag Faculty/Clinician: 31 (91.18%)
- 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: 4 (11.43%)
- Kinesiology: 3 (8.57%)
- Physical Therapy: 13 (37.14%)
- None of the above: 1 (2.86%)
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>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more widespread involvement; streamlining the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using the data to make programmatic changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate our Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation.

Rating:
(22 Responses)

<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.
Please rate our use of Data for Program Improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating: (20 Responses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (60.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (15.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (25.00%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Areas for Improvement:**
(3 responses)
I do not see any clear indication of the use of data to make decisions in graduate programs.

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.
We align curriculum, instruction, and assessments with professional, state, and/or institutional standards. (19 Responses)

- 13 (68.42%) do this acceptably.
- 5 (26.32%) do this extremely well.
- 1 (5.26%) do this minimally.

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

- 12 (63.16%) do this acceptably.
- 5 (26.32%) do this extremely well.
- 2 (10.53%) do this minimally.
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 minimally.
- 4 (22.22%) We do this acceptably.
- 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)

- 13 (68.42%) We do this acceptably.
- 2 (10.53%) We do this minimally.
- 3 (15.79%) 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)

- 9 (47.37%) We do this acceptably.
- 4 (21.05%) We do this minimally.
- 6 (31.58%) 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: 3 (17.65%)
- We are really good at this: 1 (5.88%)

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)

- 12 (63.16%) We do this minimally.
- 6 (31.58%) We do this acceptably.
- 1 (5.26%) 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.  
(19 Responses)

- 12 (63.16%) We do this minimally.
- 5 (26.32%) We do this acceptably.
- 2 (10.53%) We are really good at this.
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 minimally.
- 6 (31.58%) We do this acceptably.
- 3 (15.79%) We are really good at this.
- 1 We do not do this.