

**THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK  
AT POTSDAM**



**SUNY POTSDAM  
INSTITUTIONAL REPORT**

**Prepared for the Campus Visit of the  
NCATE Board of Examiners  
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR  
ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION  
(NCATE)**

**October 13-17, 2007**

*A Tradition of Excellence:  
Preparing Creative and Reflective Educators*

[www.potsdam.edu/educ/framework](http://www.potsdam.edu/educ/framework)

- **Well Educated Citizen**
- **Reflective Practitioner**
- **Principled Educator**



In 1999, New York required all of its teacher education programs to be revised and re-registered. As part of this process, our education faculty revisited their mission statement and developed our current conceptual framework organized around three themes. In 2006, we revisited and updated the knowledge base.

**Well-Educated Citizen**

- Critically analyzes and solves problems
- Organizes thought and communicates effectively
- Understands history and our social and political institutions
- Understands and respects other cultures and our intercultural world
- Understands the impact of science and technology on our lives
- Appropriately uses technology
- Has experience creating and appreciating the arts
- Has a broad and deep understanding of the subject matter one teaches
- Models the skills, attitudes, and values of inquiry appropriate to one's discipline

**Reflective Practitioner**

- Models inquiry, practice, and reflection
- Effectively uses research-based models of curriculum, instruction, and assessment
- Meets the diverse learning needs of students
- Applies knowledge of local, state, and national standards
- Effectively uses instructional and assistive technology
- Promotes inquiry, critical thinking, and problem solving
- Creates positive learning environments for all students
- Uses research, reflection and discourse throughout one's career
- Prepared to become an instructional leader

**Principled Educator**

- Behaves in a professional manner
- Maintains a high level of competence and integrity in one's practice
- Willing to take risks, be flexible, and show comfort with uncertainty
- Works well with others
- Takes responsibility for one's own actions
- Recognizes and respects one's own diversity and that of others
- Fosters positive relationships with students, parents, administrators, colleagues, and agencies in the community to support student learning and well being

## **Our Conceptual Framework Considered**

***Shared Vision.*** In developing this framework, the six education departments concurred that they had similar goals and objectives for their graduates, and therefore, we developed one conceptual framework for the unit. In the fall of 2000, the faculty created the basis for the framework using a concept-mapping activity—generating and classifying the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that our candidates should develop and demonstrate. A group of faculty members then drafted and reviewed the philosophy and relevant knowledge base. This draft was reviewed by the Teacher Education Advisory Council, the Teacher Education Student Association, the St. Lawrence-Lewis County Chief School Administrators, student teaching supervisors, and sponsor teachers, and it was then presented for feedback at open forums for the college community. Our conceptual framework was formally adopted by the unit in April 2001. It is aligned with INTASC standards and New York State’s teacher education regulations, and it has continued to reflect our basic values and goals and to guide program development since that date.

***Coherence.*** The Teacher Education Assessment System reflects our framework, ensuring that there is coherence among the curricular, instructional, field-experience, student teaching, and professional development programs. The *Well Educated Citizen* regards the College’s general education requirements (through the undergraduate General Education Program and the admission requirements for graduate students) as the basis for the development of the SUNY Potsdam teacher education candidate. Candidates’ liberal arts majors, concentrations, and/or specializations provide them with in-depth knowledge of the subject matter they will teach. The *Reflective Practitioner* describes the pedagogical knowledge required of our graduates. After developing an understanding of their own learning styles and philosophies of education, SUNY Potsdam education unit graduates are prepared to create successful learning experiences for all students. They are asked to continually reflect on their practice as they move from the college classroom to their field experiences and student teaching. The *Principled Educator* describes the personal characteristics that teacher candidates need to develop to continue their growth as teachers and leaders in the field of education. To assure coherence, course requirements as described in course syllabi are aligned with this conceptual framework. Our field observation instruments are also aligned and annotated with these three components.

***Professional Commitments.*** The conceptual framework emphasizes our teacher candidates’ professional commitments to their disciplines, the field of education, and their communities. The attributes associated with the *Reflective Practitioner* and *Principled Educator* themes demonstrate our candidates’ commitment to reflect on and improve their practice. SUNY Potsdam’s future teachers are expected to develop classrooms and instructional opportunities for all students. In addition, graduates are prepared to work within their schools and communities as educational leaders. In 2003-04, a faculty task force developed our core dispositions document for the unit, using the *Principled Educator* attributes as the foundation. Candidates are assessed at key transition points on these professional commitments.

***Commitment to Diversity.*** The College’s commitment to diversity is inclusive of race, national or ethnic background, language, gender, sexual orientation, disability, age, religion and socioeconomic background as are the education programs offered by the education unit. This is reflected in the College’s efforts to recruit and retain students from under-represented groups such as the neighboring Akwesasne/Mohawk reservation and major urban areas including New York City and Syracuse. These outreach efforts have also led to the establishment and development of partnerships with local school districts serving Mohawk students, with districts

in the ethnically and culturally diverse communities surrounding Fort Drum, and with urban educational partnerships in New York City and Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. Twenty-eight of the 40 North Country school districts used for field experiences and student teaching have been identified by New York State Education Department as *high-needs school districts*, based primarily on population poverty rates and the proportion of English language learners. The College has embraced its responsibility to the students and teachers of those districts along with the other schools in the North Country. This work is evident in the College's federally and state funded educational outreach programs housed in the Center for Diversity and the Student Success Center, as well as the continued commitment of our education programs to establish strong professional development partnerships with the schools throughout our region.

Through ongoing and collective work, the programs of SUNY Potsdam's education unit have assured that the College and our graduates are committed to students of diverse backgrounds and their educational needs. Recognizing the need for preparing students to enter a global society, the College is committed to promoting awareness and sensitivity to the benefits and challenges associated with diversity throughout the campus, with efforts made to assure access to all. This includes recruiting and graduating a diverse student population as well as developing an understanding of and appreciation for diverse cultures. Access to higher education for all was a goal from our earliest years (Lahey, 1966). The College strives to ensure that our commitment to multiculturalism and diversity goes beyond the classroom and is "bound by a continuous thread that is sewn throughout the campus and our service community" (Robinson, 2001).

Our candidates' development begins with content knowledge preparation in support of diversity, and continues through education courses, field experiences, and student teaching as they develop as reflective practitioners and principled educators who understand that commitment to the principle that "all children can learn" requires a deep awareness of and respect for the diversity to be found in every classroom. Each program includes at least one course focused on meeting the special needs of students in diverse classrooms. Universal Design for Learning provides a conceptual framework for our candidates as they develop supportive and inclusive classroom environments. In addition, we strive to ensure that our commitment to diversity goes beyond the classroom and into our local communities.

***Commitment to Technology.*** Teacher candidates are required to demonstrate technological proficiency throughout their programs of study. The conceptual framework indicates that teacher education candidates are expected to be able to use educational technology in their classrooms. This technological knowledge focuses on discipline-specific uses as well as assistive technologies to meet the diverse learning needs of students, including adherence to the principles of Universal Design for Learning. All programs in the education unit require candidates to demonstrate technological proficiencies as part of each program's assessment plan.

***Candidate Proficiencies Aligned with Professional and State Standards.*** Our conceptual framework is explicitly aligned with INTASC principles for the preparation of beginning teachers, as well as the applicable specialized professional association standards. Our assessments are aligned with the conceptual framework elements as well as SPA and INTASC standards. The framework also reflects New York State regulations for teacher education programs as outlined in the New York State Board of Regents amendments to Subdivision 52.21(b) of the Commissioner's Regulation adopted on July 14, 2000. As we develop assessment plans for our new advanced programs, we will be exploring alignment with the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards as well.

**Table 12: Alignment of SUNY Potsdam’s Conceptual Framework with State and National Standards**

SUNY Potsdam Conceptual Framework	New York State Regulations	INTASC Principles	NBPTS Propositions
Well-Educated Citizen	New York State Learning Standards General Education Core in Arts and Sciences Content Core Requirements	1. Content Knowledge 2. Development and Learning 6. Communication	I: Commitment to students II: Subject matter knowledge IV: Expand knowledge base
Reflective Practitioner	Pedagogical Core Requirements	3. Diverse Learners 4. Instructional Strategies 5. Learning Environment/ Motivation 6. Communication 7. Planning Instruction 8. Assessment	I: Student Differences II: Instructional strategies III: Managing learning
Principled Educator	Field Experiences/ Student Teaching/ Practica Requirements New York State Code of Ethics for Educators	9. Professionalism/ Reflection 10. Collaboration	I: Commitment to students IV: Reflect on Experience V: Learning Communities

**NCATE 2000 STANDARDS AND EVIDENCE**

**STANDARD 1: CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS**

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Our academic programs at SUNY Potsdam offer candidates the opportunity to combine career preparation with a strong liberal-arts foundation needed for teaching. *The Potsdam Graduate*, one of the foundational documents of all curricular offerings on campus, describes the knowledge, skills, and experiences expected of all SUNY Potsdam students. “The College maintains its traditional emphasis upon the liberal arts because we believe that liberally educated persons are best equipped to respond to challenges and to take advantage of opportunities in all areas of living—within the family and the community.” (Undergraduate Catalog, 2006, p. 67-68). We enthusiastically embrace our College's vision for all graduates, and all undergraduate teacher candidates complete the college’s General Education Program requirements.

All education unit programs are grounded in the content knowledge foundation established in the *Well Educated Citizen* component of our Conceptual Framework. For undergraduate candidates, this means that all education candidates complete the College’s General Education Program. In addition, secondary education candidates complete a major in their academic discipline. Childhood and early childhood majors complete a 71-73 credit concentration in the arts and sciences that includes the equivalent of a multidisciplinary, liberal arts academic major in the

**Table 1.8.2 Educational Technology Specialist: Impact on Supportive Environments (2005-07; rated on a 1-4 scale with 3 = Proficient)**

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Criteria Average (n= 12)</i>	<i>% &gt;3.0</i>
Analysis of training needs documented	3.00	75%
Quality of instructional materials	2.60	66%
Evaluation by teachers	2.50	66%
Self-reflection on workshop	2.75	83%

---

**STANDARD 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION**

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

---

**Element 2.1: Assessment System**

In 2000-2001, our professional education unit created an Education Assessment System Action Plan to guide our creation of a fully functional performance assessment system. The departments in the education unit formally adopted the plan in Fall 2001, prior to our last NCATE visit. Building on a foundation of existing individual assessments, the plan called for re-examining the existing transition points and redefining them as needed. It also paid attention to the mechanical aspects of implementing and maintaining a functional data system.

Since 2002, the various components of the new system have gradually been put in place, with full implementation occurring in Spring 2006 [See Table 2.1.1]. A data-collection system has been developed, using our existing campus *Banner*® database and the implementation of a new system of electronic portfolios on *TaskStream*® for monitoring performance data. This system was collaboratively developed and reviewed by members of the departments in the education unit, the Teacher Education Chairs Council, the Teacher Education Advisory Council, and public school partners. We have also worked with our sister SUNY teacher education campuses on a variety of assessment issues as part of the FIPSE-funded SUNY Teacher Education Program Assessment Project (2003-2007).

Since Fall 2005, we have regularly collected and analyzed key outcome data from our component programs. Our programs have used the results initially to improve the assessments themselves, as well as the programs they are connected to. In response to trends revealed in recent data analysis, the education faculty is currently working with arts and sciences faculty to develop additional content assessments for teacher candidates. It is hoped that these new assessments will serve the outcome assessment needs in the content disciplines as well as within our education programs.

To complete the institutionalization of this process, we have hired a full-time Assessment Coordinator who joined our professional staff in July 2007. His primary responsibility is to support ongoing implementation of the system and to work with our Computer and Technology Services and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to complete the establishment of a fully

functional technological system for handling and reporting our data. He will also supervise the Graduate Assistant assigned to support our assessment efforts.

Future refinements are expected to include the investigation of ways to create effective interfaces between our Teacher Education Assessment System and the college's General Education Assessment and Major Program Assessment System, thereby maximizing the efficacy and efficiency of all campus assessment initiatives. We are also working with our *Banner*® programmers to establish a variety of more efficient reporting functions.

Table 2.1.2 provides an overview of the components of our assessment system for the education unit. Each program is charged establishing procedures for collecting their program assessment information and analyzing the data for the purposes of making program improvements.

### Components of Our Current Assessment System

**Candidate and Program Assessment.** At SUNY Potsdam, candidate assessment occurs most comprehensively at the program level, in light of the applicable specialized professional association (SPA) standards [Table 2.1.3]. The education unit then summarizes key measures from these program-level assessments as part of the unit's assessment program.

Each certification program at SUNY Potsdam has identified a series of gates at which candidate performance is assessed using multiple measures related to their discipline. Candidate performance is evaluated at the following points (Table 2.1.4):

- ✓ Admission to degree program/major
- ✓ Midpoint(s) in program (1-3 candidate review points/program)
- ✓ Entry into final clinical experience (student teaching or practicum)
- ✓ Completion of Student Teaching/Practicum
- ✓ Exit from the program (graduation)
- ✓ Certification (if applicable)

The results of these periodic evaluations are used to advise candidates about any deficiencies they may need to address to satisfactorily complete their programs. These data are collected and aggregated across the education unit to track candidates' progress at each of these gates and serves as part of our unit assessment as well as being a critical part of candidate and program assessment.

SUNY Potsdam's education unit aggregates and summarizes data from key program measures:

<b>Knowledge</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New York State Teacher Certification Examination scores (including the NYSTCE Content Specialty Tests; Liberal Arts and Sciences Test; Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written)</li> <li>• Additional Program-specific Content Knowledge Assessments</li> </ul>
<b>Skills</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance on the final clinical performance evaluations (INTASC) during student teaching or final internships/practica</li> <li>• Planning assignment, including instructional use of technology</li> <li>• Universal Design for Learning assignment</li> </ul>
<b>Dispositions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessments of candidate dispositions for teaching, based on the <i>Principled Educator</i> component of our Conceptual Framework</li> </ul>
<b>Impact on Student Learning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher Work Sample (or alternative), during student teaching/practicum</li> </ul>

Each program has tailored these measures to address their respective professional association standards (e.g., ACEI, CEC, NCTM, IRA) standards. Each program's assessment plan includes analysis of performance on the NYSTCE Content Specialty Test, a second content assessment, a planning assignment, the clinical performance evaluations keyed to their SPA standards, dispositional assessments based on our conceptual framework, and performance on the Teacher Work Sample. In addition, programs have implemented other key assessments as indicated in Section II of their SPA Program Review report. The general use of 4-point rubrics across the unit as well as routinely annotating rubrics with corresponding INTASC principles and conceptual framework elements allows these program-specific measures to be summarized across the unit.

***Validity and Consistency of Assessment Tools.*** Because of the importance of our key unit assessments in monitoring candidate progress and for guiding program improvements, it is crucial that our assessments measure what they are designed to and that assessment results are consistent over time and between evaluators. As we have implemented our assessment program, we have given careful attention to the degree to which they provide valid and consistent results.

***New York State Teacher Certification Examinations.*** New York has established its own teacher certification examinations, administered by National Evaluation Systems (NES). These tests were last revised in 2003-2004, based on frameworks developed with feedback from the field. All NYSTCE test development includes standard field-testing by NES to establish validity and reliability prior to implementation.

***Clinical Evaluation of Student Teaching/Practicum (Form 5).*** As programs began to work on their new assessment systems in 2002, attention first focused on the Form 5s in use at the time. At that time, all initial certification programs used a generic instrument based on the INTASC standards and modeled on the instrument created by PDK and Ball State. As faculty looked critically at that instrument in light of their SPA standards, it quickly became clear that one generic instrument was not serving our diverse disciplinary programs very well. From 2002-2006, revisions were made to the Form 5s, resulting in the program-specific instruments we use today. All are referenced to the INTASC principles and our Conceptual Framework, as well as to appropriate disciplinary standards. Adoption of a standard 4-point rating scale allows us to summarize data for unit evaluations while preserving the specific information needed by programs. Development of these instruments based on INTASC and SPA standards contributes significantly to the validity of the indicators. Consistency has improved as we have worked with our college supervisors and faculty on the "meaning" of each of the rating indicators during our supervisors' training sessions three times a year.

***Dispositions.*** Like most teacher preparation programs, we have become very concerned about the professional dispositions for teaching exhibited by our candidates. In 2003-4, a committee of faculty representing all programs was given the task of identifying the critical dispositional indicators that our candidates should be exhibiting, dispositions that are encompassed by our *Principled Educator* element of our conceptual framework. The committee defined, refined, and shared a list of indicators for each attribute with each department, culminating in adoption of the framework by the School of Education/Professional Studies Council in March 2004. Following that, departments created their own dispositional guidelines, starting with the SOEPS list as a

base. Since 2005, every student teacher has been assessed using a program-defined dispositions instrument. During the 2006-07 year, faculty turned their attention to developing procedures supporting fair and consistent responses to dispositional issues. This work is ongoing. The grounding of this process in our conceptual framework has increased the validity of the instruments. Consistency is being addressed as we develop procedures for timely feedback and support to remediate deficiencies, as well as training for our supervisors.

*Planning Assessment.* During student teaching/practicum, all candidates for initial certification are expected to demonstrate competence in instructional planning. Assignments and rubrics for these assessments were developed by the faculty, including attention to use of technology and differentiation of instruction in the plan. The training exercises completed by our college supervisors has increased the consistency of these ratings as well.

*Universal Design for Learning.* All programs at SUNY Potsdam are grounded in the principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) as a guide to creating instructional settings that are accessible to the widest variety of students possible. The required special needs courses all focus on UDL as an organizing framework, and candidates are given multiple classroom and field opportunities to develop their skills in this area. All initial certification candidates complete a UDL project during student teaching, based on this philosophy. The rubric used to evaluate these projects has been modified twice with feedback from the college supervisors.

*Teacher Work Sample.* A new assessment for us since 2005 is the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), used to evaluate our candidates' ability to use data to inform their instructional decision-making. Designed to parallel the work done over the past decade by the Renaissance institutions, core faculty members attending a summer 2005 workshop modified the Renaissance materials to create the SUNY Potsdam version of the TWS material for implementation in Fall 2005. After the first semester, we modified the rubric to simplify the level of analysis since our supervisors found the original rubric too complex to yield thoughtful results. To date, the TWS has been a uniform, generic assessment used in all initial preparation programs. This summer, some programs are beginning to look at ways to modify the candidate directions and rubrics to more specifically address disciplinary issues. Consistency has been addressed as we have implemented this new requirement. Initially, we focused on training our supervisors about the seven components since this evaluation went far beyond the simple unit plan assessment used previously. In 2006-07, we have conducted three consistency exercises with our evaluators; the most recent exercise had pairs and triads evaluate the same TWS projects and then discuss their ratings in small groups. As noted above, these training exercises are having the effect of helping define the standards for the TWS elements across disciplines, settings, and candidates. Next year, we plan to continue this process by having campus faculty evaluate TWSs and then meet with college supervisors to share perspectives. *TaskStream's* @ capabilities also provide a vehicle for us to perform inter-rater reliability exercises with our Teacher Work Samples over the next year.

**Table 2.1.1. SUNY Potsdam Education Assessment System Action Plan**

<b>Goal</b>	<b>Tasks to Achieve Goal</b>	<b>Date</b>
<i>Formation of Assessment Committee(s)</i>	Review of Assessment responsibilities across programs Establish Teacher Education Assessment Committee	12/2001
<i>Develop Assessment System Action Plan</i>	Create and finalize Action Plan	6/2001
<i>Develop performance-based assessments</i>	Develop performance-based assessment at course level based on professional area content standards	2002-2003
<i>Relate performance-based assessments to INTASC, SPA standards and conceptual framework</i>	Complete performance-based assessment scans at the program level based on INTASC standards, SPA standards, and the conceptual framework Develop model for unit-wide assessment system	2003 - 2004
<i>Identify entry level criteria</i>	Review, and if necessary, revise entry-level criteria Develop system to collect and summarize admissions data	2003-2004
<i>Identification of critical assessment points in programs</i>	Identify critical assessment points and performance-based criteria for gates Develop system for tracking candidates; implementation of assessment plan	2004 - 2005
<i>Development of Portfolio Assessment System</i>	Program groups develop/align criteria for portfolios based on program standards Develop system for collecting and analyzing data Pilot portfolio assessment; review and revise assessment system Implement portfolio assessment	2004 - 2005
<i>Develop system for providing assessment data</i>	Professional development for obtaining and using data, including external data Identify data that have been collected Pilot analysis of data Develop system for collecting and analyzing external data Revise external data plan based on pilot	9/2005-12/2006
<i>Implementation</i>	Fully implement plan	Fall, 2006

**Table 2.1.2. Education Unit Assessment Plan**

<i>Who does the assessment? Who provides the data?</i>	<i>What is assessed; NCATE Standard addressed</i>	<i>Form of assessment</i>	<i>When is data collected?</i>	<i>Who collects, reports data?</i>	<i>Who evaluates, interprets data?</i>	<i>Time Stored</i>
Candidate	<b>Faculty member/ course/program:</b> Qualified Faculty	Faculty course evaluations	Each course, each semester	Faculty member	Faculty member	3 years
	<b>Candidate/program</b> Candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions	Student Teacher evaluations- Form 5 (self evaluation)	Student Teaching Semester (Week 4, 8, 12, 16)	College supervisors (consensus ratings on <i>TaskStream</i> ®)	Program faculty	7 years
	<b>Supervisor/program</b> Qualified Faculty; Field Experience	Student teacher evaluation of college supervisor and student teaching program	End of Student Teaching Semester	Office of Teacher Education Student Services	Coordinator of Student Teaching; Program faculty	7 years
Faculty: (1) Arts & Sciences (content)	<b>Candidate/program</b> Candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions	Evaluation of course assignments; Course grades	Each semester, each course	Candidate and/or faculty member	Faculty member as part of candidate evaluation for course	7 years
(2) Education Unit	<b>Candidate/program</b> Candidate dispositions	Professional dispositions checklist	As indicated by the program assessment plan	As indicated by the program assessment plan ( <i>TaskStream</i> ®)	Programs and departments	7 years

**Table 2.1.2: Education Unit Assessment Plan (continued)**

<i>Who does the assessment? who provides the data?</i>	<i>What is assessed; Standards addressed</i>	<i>Form of assessment</i>	<i>When is data collected?</i>	<i>Who collects, reports data?</i>	<i>Who evaluates, interprets data?</i>	<i>Time Stored</i>
Mentor teacher (Pre-student teaching field experiences)	<b>Candidate:</b> Candidate knowledge skills and dispositions	Field experience evaluation of candidate performance (TaskStream)	At conclusion of pre-student teaching field experience	Candidate and faculty member responsible for field experience: <i>TaskStream®</i>	Faculty member supervising field experience	7 years
	<b>Program:</b> Field Experience	Evaluation of field experience process	Each semester	Programs and departments	Programs and departments	7 years
Sponsor teacher (student teaching semester)	<b>Candidate/program</b> Candidate knowledge skills and dispositions	Student teaching evaluation of student (Form 5)	Student Teaching Semester (Week 4, 8, 12, 16)	College supervisors (consensus ratings on TaskStream)	Coordinator of Student Teaching; Program faculty	7 years
	<b>Program:</b> Field Experience:	Evaluation of student teaching process	Each 8-week placement	Office of Field Exp & Teacher Certification	Coordinator of Student Teaching; Program faculty	7 years
College Supervisor (Student Teaching)	<b>Candidate/program</b> Candidate knowledge skills and dispositions	Student teaching evaluation of student (Form 5)	Student Teaching Semester (Week 4, 8, 12, 16)	College supervisors (consensus ratings on TaskStream)	Office of Field Exp./Certification; Programs and departments	7 years
	<b>Program:</b> Field Experience	Evaluation of ST process	Annually	Office of Field Exp/Certification	Programs and departments	7 years

**Table 2.1.2: Education Unit Assessment Plan (continued)**

<i>Who does the assessment? who provides the data?</i>	<i>What is assessed; Standards addressed</i>	<i>Form of assessment</i>	<i>When is data collected</i>	<i>Who collects, reports data?</i>	<i>Who evaluates, interprets data?</i>	<i>Time Stored</i>
New York State	<b>Candidate/Program</b> Candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions	NYSTCE Liberal Arts and Sciences Test (LAST)	7 times/year; aggregated annually	Banner®	Programs and Departments; TE Chairs Council; TEAC	On-going
		NYSTCE Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (ATS-W)	7 times/year; aggregated annually	Banner®	Programs and Departments; TE Chairs Council; TEAC	
		NYSTCE Content Specialty Tests (CST)	7 times/year; aggregated annually	Banner®	Programs and Departments; TE Chairs Council; TEAC	
Program/Department	<b>Candidate/Program</b> Candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions  <b>Program:</b> All standards	Portfolios (stored on TaskStream)	As indicated in program assessment plans	Advisor/supervisor	Programs and Departments	7 years
		Program review	Annually	Department Chair/Program coordinator	Department Chair/Program coordinator	7 years
Alumni	<b>Program:</b> All standards	Alumni Survey	Annually (1 year and 3 year out cohorts)	Associate Dean	Programs and Departments; TE Chairs Council	7 years
Advisory Boards	<b>Program:</b> All standards	Meeting minutes	Annually	Programs and Departments	Programs and Departments; TE Chairs Council	7 years
Employers	<b>Unit:</b> Candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions	Focus groups and paper surveys	Every five years	Dean (receive data focus group facilitator)	Dean, TEAC, TE Chairs Council	7 years

**Table 2.1.3. Program Assessments (for SPA Program Reviews)**

<i>Assessment</i>	<i>Early Childhood</i>	<i>Childhood BA</i>	<i>Childhood MST</i>	<i>Foreign Language BA</i>
<i>State Content Exam</i>	Content Specialty Test-Multisubject	Content Specialty Test-Multisubject	Content Specialty Test-Multisubject	Content Specialty Test-French or Spanish
<i>Content Knowledge</i>	DRF: Program Portfolio	Lesson Plans	Integrated Unit Plan	SECD 474 Content Portfolio
<i>Planning</i>	Thematic Unit	Unit Planning Rationale	Five Lesson Plans (different subject areas)	SECD 474 Unit Plan
<i>Clinical Evaluation</i>	Student Teaching Evaluation Form 5	Student Teaching Evaluation Form 5	Student Teaching Evaluation Form 5	Student Teaching Evaluation Form 5
<i>Impact on P-12 Learning</i>	Teacher Work Sample	Teacher Work Sample	Teacher Work Sample	Teacher Work Sample
<i>Other</i>	Literacy Family Kit and Assessments	Planned Activity Report	State Test: Assessment of Teaching Skills- Written (Elementary)	NYSTCE Content Specialty Test: Subtest VI: Oral Expression (French or Spanish)
<i>Other</i>	Lesson Plans from each grade/age level	Block I Final Clinical Evaluation Rubric	GRED 664 Practicum Portfolio	NYSTCE: Assessment of Teaching Skills- Written (Secondary)
<i>Other</i>	Case Study I & II (Special Needs)	Classroom Management Model	GRED 669 Professional Portfolio	--

**Table 2.1.3. Program Assessments (Continued)**

<i>Assessment</i>	<i>English BA</i>	<i>English MST</i>	<i>Math BA</i>	<i>Math MST</i>
<i>State Content Exam</i>	Content Specialty Test-English	Content Specialty Test-English	Content Specialty Test-Math	Content Specialty Test-Math
<i>Content Knowledge</i>	Content Knowledge Portfolio	Content Knowledge Portfolio	Grades in Math major courses	Grades in Math major courses
<i>Planning</i>	Pedagogical Content Knowledge Portfolio	Pedagogical Content Knowledge Portfolio	Lesson planning assignments	Lesson planning assignments
<i>Clinical Evaluation</i>	Student Teaching Evaluation Form 5	Student Teaching Evaluation Form 5	Student Teaching Evaluation Form 5	Student Teaching Evaluation Form 5
<i>Impact on P-12 Learning</i>	Teacher Work Sample	Teacher Work Sample	Teacher Work Sample	Teacher Work Sample
<i>Other</i>	Practicum Portfolio	Practicum Portfolio	Teaching Portfolio	Teaching Portfolio
<i>Other</i>	Professionalism Portfolio	Portfolio: Attitudes for ELA	Classroom Management Plan	Classroom Management Plan
<i>Other</i>	Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (Secondary)	Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (Secondary)	---	---

**Table 2.1.3. Program Assessments (Continued)**

<i>Assessment</i>	<i>Science BA</i>	<i>Science MST</i>	<i>Social Studies BA</i>	<i>Social Studies MST</i>
<i>State Content Exam</i>	Content Specialty Tests: Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science or Physics	Content Specialty Tests: Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science or Physics	Content Specialty Test: Social Studies	Content Specialty Test: Social Studies
<i>Content Knowledge</i>	Grades from Science Major	Grades from Science Major	Grades in Designated Course Areas	Grades in Designated Course Areas
<i>Planning</i>	Science Inquiry Unit and Curriculum Plan	Science Inquiry Unit and Curriculum Plan	Social Studies Unit Plan	Social Studies Unit Plan
<i>Clinical Evaluation</i>	Student Teaching Evaluation Form 5	Student Teaching Evaluation Form 5	Student Teaching Evaluation Form 5	Student Teaching Evaluation Form 5
<i>Impact on P-12 Learning</i>	Teacher Work Sample	Teacher Work Sample	Teacher Work Sample	Teacher Work Sample
<i>Other</i>	Classroom/Laboratory Safety Plan	Classroom/Laboratory Safety Plan	Social Studies Content Portfolio	Social Studies Content Portfolio
<i>Other</i>	Science major research seminar	Research paper and presentation	--	Culminating Experience
<i>Other</i>	Research Paper and Presentation	Research Paper and Presentation	--	--

**Table 2.1.3. Program Assessments (Continued)**

<i>Assessment</i>	<i>Special Education</i>	<i>Literacy Education</i>	<i>Technology Education</i>	<i>Music Education</i>
<i>State Content Exam</i>	Content Specialty Test- Students with Disabilities	Content Specialty Test - Literacy	Content Specialty Test – Technology Specialist	Content Specialty Test- Music
<i>Content Knowledge</i>	SPED 670: Culminating Experience Portfolio	Foundations Landmark Project	Standards-based Portfolio	Level A Auditions
<i>Planning</i>	SPED 649: Lesson Planning assignment	Literacy Interventions Project	Development of Training Materials	
<i>Clinical Evaluation</i>	SPED 669: Mentor Teacher Rating and College Supervisor Ratings	Practicum Portfolio	Evaluation: 100 hour Technology Practicum in a K-12 school	Student Teaching Summative Evaluation
<i>Impact on P-12 Learning</i>	SPED 669: Teacher Work Sample	Reflection: Instructional Effectiveness	Teacher Training Workshop	INTASC 7 and 8 components of Standards Portfolio
<i>Other</i>	SPED 601: Case Study	Theory to Practice Essay	Program Evaluation Plan	Standards Portfolio in Student Teaching
<i>Other</i>	SPED 607: Research Proposal	Assessment Profile Report	--	Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (NYSTCE)
<i>Other</i>	--	Literature Review/ Thematic unit	--	Sophomore evaluation

**Table 2.1.4 Assessment Schedule by Gates (Generic Unit Assessment Points)**

<i>Program Stage</i>	<i>Key Assessment (Gates)</i>	<i>Conceptual Framework</i>	<i>Evaluation Instruments</i>	<i>Evaluated by...</i>	<i>Aggregated (When)</i>
Admission/Entry	Admission to the College	WEC	(a)SAT/ H.S. GPA (b)Transfer GPA (c) Undergrad GPA; recommendations	(a) Admissions office (UG) (b) Admissions office (UG) (c) Office of Graduate Studies	Upon admission; individually, yearly, unit analysis
Admission/Entry	Admission to the Education Major	WEC	GPA	Teacher Education Advising Coordinator or Office of Graduate Studies	Individually, program, and unit; by semester
Midpoint	Dispositions	PE	Program Dispositions Checklist	Individual course professors and Field Experience supervisors	Individual, program; by semester
Midpoint	100-hour Field experiences	RP PE	Field Experience Assessments	Field Experience Supervisors and Mentor Teachers	Individually, program; by semester
Midpoint	Program-based assessment of content knowledge	WEC	Varies by program	Individual course professors (may include A&S faculty assessments)	Individually and by program; yearly
Midpoint	Additional program-based assessments	WEC, RP PE	Varies by program	Individual course professors	Individually and by program; yearly

Continued on next page

**Table 2.1.4 Assessment Schedule by Gates (Generic), continued**

<i>Program Stage</i>	<i>Key Assessment (Gates)</i>	<i>Conceptual Framework</i>	<i>Evaluation Instruments</i>	<i>Evaluated by...</i>	<i>Aggregated (When)</i>
Student Teaching	Entry into student teaching	WEC RP PE	Departmental recommendation, GPA, dispositions review, course audit	Program Coordinator/ Department Chair; Coordinator of Field Experiences/ Certification	Individually and by program; by semester
Student Teaching	Assessment of planning	RP	Evidence of Planning (5 exemplary lessons)	College Supervisors	Individually and by program; semester
Student Teaching	Dispositions	PE	Program Dispositions Checklist	College supervisors	Individually, program, unit; by semester
Student Teaching	Assessment of impact on P-12 learning	RP	Teacher Work Sample or other data-based assignment	College supervisors	Individually, by program, and unit; yearly
Student Teaching	Universal Design for Learning	RP PE	UDL Student Teaching Project	College supervisors	Individually, by program, unit; by semester
Student Teaching	Clinical Assessment of Student Teaching	WEC RP PE	Clinical Evaluation: Form 5	Consensus ratings by college supervisor, sponsor teacher, student teacher: Week 8, 16	Individually, program, and unit; by semester
Graduation	Graduation and recommendation for certification	WEC, RP	Degree audit, GPA, student teaching evaluation	Coordinator of Field Experiences/Certification	Individually, program, and unit; yearly
Certification	State Licensure Tests	WEC, RP WEC	LAST (General Education) ATS-W (Pedagogy) CSTs (Content Knowledge) Generally in Junior and Senior year; not required for graduation	NES NYSTCE NYSED	Individually, by program, by unit; yearly
Certification	Certification	WEC, RP PE	State Review of test scores, college recommendation, background checks	New York State Education Department	New York State

**Other Education Unit Assessments.** In addition to the performance assessments described above, the Office of Field Experiences and Certification regularly assesses the quality of the unit's teacher preparation programs during and at the end of the student teaching semester. Summaries of the Teacher Education Exit Survey (Form 13) completed by the student teachers and the Sponsor Teacher Survey (Form 14) are distributed to program chairs and coordinators each semester and provided to program leadership annually to provide feedback to the unit and the education unit's programs.

The unit assessment plan also includes several post-graduation opinion measures, including:

- Written/web surveys of graduates conducted by the unit two times after graduation;
- Focus group meetings with employers
- Paper survey of employers
- Office of Career Planning surveys of graduates.

*Alumni surveys.* Graduates are formally surveyed one year and three years after graduation. Our most recent survey, completed in 2006 was redesigned for web completion for the first time in an attempt to increase the response rate. The education unit continues to work with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to increase the return rate over the next five years.

*Employer focus groups and surveys.* We invite principals in our region to focus groups on a periodic basis (now done on a 5-year schedule). Superintendents and college supervisors are asked to nominate focus group participants who are then invited to a session in their area. At the focus group sessions, we ask them to think about a SUNY Potsdam graduate they have hired in the last 5 years (or have considered hiring) and to discuss our graduates' ability to perform the tasks of a beginning teacher. In June 2007, we also distributed a paper survey addressing the same questions to solicit feedback from every principal in our four-county area and the province of Ontario. The focus group questions and surveys are structured around the indicators in our conceptual framework. Analysis of and reflection on the information provided by these surveys has been built into the unit's assessment plan. These measures are analyzed for the unit as a whole. Results are given to programs for their information as they consider program modifications.

*Office of Career Planning.* The Office of Career Planning conducts an exit survey of graduates at four times: (1) at graduation; (2) in November by mail to those who did not attend graduation or who were still seeking employment; (3) in March to those who had not yet responded; and (4) phone follow-ups to non-responders in April/May. Use of these procedures has helped improve our response rate. The data from this survey helps us keep track of trends in employment and enrollment in graduate school. The Office of Career Planning distributes the results of this survey to all faculty and posts it on the campus' web site.

**Assessment of Faculty.** Academic and clinical faculty members on tenure-track lines are reviewed on a one- or two-year cycle prior to continuing appointment (tenure) based on evidence from student course evaluations, self-assessment, and the presentation of professional portfolios containing evidence of teaching excellence, scholarship, and service. The criteria for this review were collaboratively developed and can be found in the *School of Education and Professional Studies Personnel Policies, Promotion and Tenure*, and the *SUNY Potsdam Faculty Handbook*.

Faculty members with continuing appointment (i.e. tenure) are assessed in a similar manner for all personnel actions (e.g., promotions, sabbaticals). All faculty members submit annual reports (Faculty Information Forms) to their Dean at the end of each academic year. This form includes a self-assessment of faculty activities in teaching, scholarship, and service over the past year. Faculty members also include their student evaluations if they wish to be considered for merit salary increases. Professional staff, including clinical faculty, are evaluated on an annual basis based on their individual performance programs.

**Unit Operations.** The Dean of the School of Education/Professional Studies, in consultation with the Teacher Education Chairs Council, monitors allocation of resources on a regular basis, working collaboratively with the Dean of the Crane School of Music and the other members of the Academic Cabinet. The Deans work with departments within their individual schools to establish and manage equitable budgets. Their goal is to assure an equitable distribution of resources for faculty scholarship and departmental operations. During the past two years, a review of departmental resources was conducted with a significant restructuring of the allocation procedures. A campus-wide Transparency Committee was convened in 2006 and has been charged with a similar review of budget processes for the campus as a whole.

The Deans review faculty portfolios and make recommendations for reappointment, promotion, tenure, leaves, and sabbaticals, with input from department chairs and personnel committees. They also monitor program and course enrollments, consulting with department chairs and program coordinators to establish course schedules that meet our candidates' needs in the most cost-efficient manner.

### **Element 2.2: Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation**

As indicated above, individual programs and the education unit collect data throughout the year from multiple sources with respect to the performance of candidates, graduates, faculty, and other members of the professional community. These data are used to make decisions regarding candidate progress through programs and for making changes to programs and unit operations. Over the past few years, SUNY Potsdam has developed and refined a number of systems to manage these multiple sources of data regarding candidate qualifications and proficiencies, as well as the performance of our programs as a whole.

Three offices in the Education Unit provide a central location for the collection, summarization, and analysis of data within the unit:

- The Office of Field Experiences and Certification serves as the central point for data collection as candidates progress through field experiences, into and through the final clinical experience, and finally to graduation;
- The Office of Graduate Studies maintains data on graduate students and conducts graduation audits for MST and MSED candidates;
- The Music Education Office provides the same services for music education candidates.

The Coordinator of Office of Field Experiences and Certification with the assistance of the Education Unit Assessment Coordinator coordinates data collection at program entry and exit. Upon program completion, data on each candidate becomes the source for the mandated Title II reports, following the federal timeline (September 1 - August 31). At the conclusion of each reporting year, the Coordinator of the Office of Field Experiences and Certification in

consultation with the Assessment Coordinator analyzes and summarizes the data, sharing this information with department chairs and program coordinators.

The Office of Field Experiences and Certification has also developed databases for placements in pre-student teaching and student teaching experiences. During the 2007-08 year, these databases will be transitioned from the current *FileMaker Pro*® system into our *Banner*® system. It is expected that this change will facilitate more efficient data connections among data sources.

The Coordinator of Undergraduate Advising Services and the Coordinator of Graduate Studies coordinate the collection, recording, and compilation of data on candidates upon admission (screening) into teacher education programs. Upon screening into the program, a paper file is maintained on each candidate through program completion. The Crane Music Education Office currently performs the same functions for those candidates. As noted above, we expect that both of these data stores will be maintained electronically in the future as we migrate these files into the *Banner*® environment during the next year.

Aggregated data are collected at regular intervals by the unit and other offices within the college, including the following:

- The Office of Admissions compiles reports on the characteristics of the entering undergraduate class in terms of numbers, diversity, and descriptive data such as high school GPA and SAT averages. The Office of Graduate Studies compiles similar data for graduate applicants.
- The Teacher Education Advising Coordinator compiles a report to the Dean and the Teacher Education Chairs Council each semester by program with the numbers of undergraduate candidates admitted to the major, the number who applied but were not accepted, the number of candidates placed on probation or removed from the major, and the number who completed degree requirements for graduation. The Office of Graduate Studies compiles similar data for graduate programs.
- The Department Chair/Program Coordinator (or designee) for each education program oversees the collection and analysis of data for the 6-8 program-based (SPA) assessments. These data are collected and aggregated with the assistance of the Assessment Coordinator and distributed yearly to the department and dean (see SPA reports).
- The Clinical Evaluations (Form 5 or equivalent) are collected in *TaskStream*® by the Office of Field Experiences and Certification at Week 4, 8, 12, and 16 of the student teaching semester; data are aggregated at the program and unit level for reporting each semester to the individual program and the entire unit using the *TaskStream*® report generation function.
- The Coordinator of Field Experiences and Certification prepares a list of program completers each fall (Title II list). In the future, such data will routinely be entered into *Banner*®.
- All candidates for Initial certification complete an Evaluation of the Teacher Education Program on the last day of their student teaching semester. The Office of Field Experiences and Certification collects and summarizes data at the program and unit level for reporting each semester to the individual programs and the unit.
- The Office of Field Experiences and Certification also sends out a written survey to

sponsor teachers every semester, eliciting their feedback on candidate proficiencies and program effectiveness. The results are aggregated at the program and unit level for reporting to the programs and the unit.

- The Office of Institutional Effectiveness also provides regular reports on a semester and yearly basis on the numbers of students and faculty within each department, faculty load, faculty qualifications, and other data of use to administrative decision-making [e.g., Student Fact Book, Faculty Work Load Report].

**Assessment Support Personnel.** In July 2005, a new Associate Dean position was established within the School of Education/Professional Studies, with major responsibilities for oversight of assessment efforts for the education unit. Over the past two years, the Associate Dean has worked closely with programs, departments, and the Coordinator of the Office of Field Experiences and Certification to establish valid and implementable assessments. Supported by a secretary and a graduate assistant, the Associate Dean currently coordinates most program evaluation activities and data collection and analysis across the unit, including overseeing the regular entry and aggregation of assessment data in *Banner*® and on *TaskStream*®. The Associate Dean has assumed the responsibility for compiling and summarizing both qualitative and quantitative data generated through these assessments. She provided primary support to faculty preparing the Program Reviews required for accreditation. She also works closely with the Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness to complete surveys of alumni, principals, and other school-based partners to provide additional program assessment data.

As our system has evolved, it became apparent that it would be beneficial to the unit to hire a full-time professional Assessment Coordinator to provide more cohesion to these multiple and diverse assessment activities. The position was approved in Fall, 2006, culminating in the hiring of Dr. Bruce Brydges who joined our staff on July 1, 2007. One of his major responsibilities over the next year will be to provide a liaison between program faculty and staff and the technology services on campus to establish a more streamlined and coordinated assessment technology system.

Central to the continual improvement of our assessment system have been our efforts to use technology effectively and appropriately to help us collect and analyze data. As noted previously, we have made good use of our existing *Banner*® and *TaskStream*® systems for our program assessments plans. This fall, we expect to be phasing in a new degree audit system utilizing *Degree Works*® to assist us in making more effective use of data stored in *Banner*®. We will also begin uploading key assessment data from *TaskStream*® into *Banner*® over the next year, making individual candidate monitoring easier for candidates and advisors.

**Monitoring of Student Complaints.** Candidate complaints are always of serious import to the unit and its faculty. SUNY Potsdam has a reputation as a student-centered campus, and faculty and staff work hard to assure that each candidate has a positive educational experience. In the event of candidate dissatisfaction with an action of a unit or staff member, all candidates have access to established formal procedures for student complaints as described in the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs, as well as in the Education Unit Fair Process document which allows for special review of dismissal decisions. In general, candidates are directed to first appeal directly to the faculty member involved. If they are not satisfied at this level, they may then appeal to the

department chair, the academic dean of their school, and finally the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, in that order. Candidates alleging discrimination or sexual harassment can also contact the Affirmative Action Officer directly at any time. Candidates with disabilities are encouraged to contact the Office of Accommodative Services for assistance.

Faculty, department chairs, and the deans maintain an open door policy. All are committed to helping candidates resolve conflicts. Open communication between faculty and the deans allows for reasoned consideration of problems and solutions. The appropriate Dean and the Coordinator of Student Teaching and Field Experiences maintain records of complaints in confidential files. Patterns of complaints are investigated by the appropriate administrator.

**Element 2.3: Use of Data for Program Improvement**

Education programs at SUNY Potsdam regularly use data for program improvement. As our assessment system has been more fully implemented, data have been more available. Each program has now designated a time for formal review of their data for that year. Programs use data generated through program and unit assessments to modify and improve programs. Numerous changes have occurred since 2005 as programs have begun to engage more directly in data-driven decision making. (See Table 2.3.1 for samples of such changes at the unit level, and the exhibit room for a more complete listing for changes from 2005-07 at the program level.)

**Table 2.3.1 Examples of Data-Driven Changes: Unit Level**

<i>Data Source/ Assessment</i>	<i>Findings; Problem(s) identified</i>	<i>Changes made</i>	<i>Impact of changes on problem</i>
Student Teaching Form 5 evaluations (2004-5)	Some programs were still using generic instruments that did not match their SPA standards well; other programs had forms that were viewed by public school staff as too long or too difficult to evaluate.	All Form 5s were reviewed and significant changes made. All programs aligned forms with both INTASC and their respective SPA standards. Form 5s were shortened and tightened up, focusing on clearly observable indicators.	Forms used since Fall 2006 reflect the disciplinary demands of each program. Reduction in length has reduced number of complaints from the field.
Student Teaching Requirements (2004-05)	Candidates complained about excessive work load; supervisors were being asked to evaluate products not generated in student teaching.	Redesigned student teaching requirements to include only those products generated during and integral to the student teaching experience; program completion requirements (e.g., portfolios) were reassigned to campus faculty to evaluate.	Uniform work expectations across all programs and student teachers created equity in supervisor and candidate work load; lessened confusion among school partners about what we actually require; restored focus on the student teaching experience.
Student Teaching Form 5 evaluations (2005-06)	Review of clinical evaluations in student teaching indicated a skewed distribution of scores that were higher than anticipated.	Additional training was provided to College Supervisors in the expectations for use of the rubric rating levels.	Rubric ratings shifted in Fall 2006 semester, with an increase in # of scores at the Proficient level and reasonable reductions in the Distinguished level.

Teacher Work Sample Evaluations (Fall 2005)	College supervisors reported difficulty using the detailed analytical rubric used in the Fall 2005 semester.	A summary rubric was created with a holistic rating for the seven major components for piloting in Spring 2006.	Supervisors reported that form was clearer and more practical although some reported problems related to the loss of detail in the rubric performance levels.
Student Teaching Requirements (Spring 2006)	Work load was found to be unreasonable for both supervisors and candidates (Spring 2006).	Reduced requirements for 2006-7; realigned required elements to make work load more reasonable while maintaining data availability.	Fewer complaints; more on time completion of tasks by candidates and supervisors.
Teacher Work Sample (2005-06)	Candidates complained about lack of preparation for this assessment; supervisors found that candidates were not prepared to complete the project fully.	Included an expanded orientation to the TWS project (2-hour session in the student teaching seminar, beginning Fall 2006); actively involved candidates in identifying what evidence should go in each section.	Student Teachers evaluated value and usefulness of the TWS orientation Session (ratings of 4/5 and 5/5); Products in Fall 2006 were better prepared, with fewer complaints; next step will be to better integrate TWS concepts in campus programs.

Unit-wide data are discussed with the Teacher Education Chairs Council (TECC) on a regular basis with the purpose of making recommendations for unit changes. TECC provides a forum for discussion of assessment results and initiation of change proposals. TECC often initiates a request for departments and programs to review some particular data at the program level and for faculty to interact with the assessment data. One example of such unit decision-making involved the process of selecting *TaskStream®* to manage our performance data. Programs are also encouraged to involve appropriate P-12 stake-holders in these discussions as appropriate.

Selected assessment data are also shared with appropriate faculty from other campus departments, providing opportunities to discuss appropriate assessment data, receive feedback from different constituencies regarding our teacher preparation programs, and collaboratively design responses to patterns in the data. For example, during the 2006-07 year, state test score data reports were shared with academic content departments for the purpose of developing responses to identified patterns of weaker performance on certain sub-areas.

---

### **STANDARD 3: FIELD EXPERIENCE AND CLINICAL PRACTICE**

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

---

#### **Element 3.1: Collaboration between Unit and School Partners**

The education unit provides a variety of field experiences for teacher candidates preparing for