



## **Professional Education Unit**

### **WKU Program Review Document 2: Continuous Assessment Plan**

*Submitted to the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board  
February 15, 2009*

## Introduction to WKU'S Continuous Assessment Plan

As described in the WKU Conceptual Framework *Beliefs 9 and 10*, we believe that highly effective education units develop and maintain an assessment system that provides credible performance data on the progress and achievement of each candidate available for feedback and reporting to the candidate, faculty, and program. Such a system allows us to monitor and report overall candidate progress toward standards. To that end, the WKU professional education unit has developed the Professional Education Unit Electronic Accountability and Portfolio system in which key unit-wide and program level assessment data are electronically collected, stored, analyzed, and reported. The opening screen of the system can be viewed at <http://edtech2.wku.edu/accountability/>. As the *sample Critical Performance Assessment Matrix (Table 1)* reveals, the WKU professional education unit and associated programs continue to identify existing or to develop new assessments, called critical performances, to monitor candidate progress toward core knowledge, skills, and dispositions. In identifying and/or creating assessments, the unit and programs have sought to link them explicitly to Kentucky Teacher Standards and to develop rubrics that use benchmark or other standard language as part of the rubric scoring system. We also have adopted a common scoring scale for most of these assessments for easy entry of scores into a standards-based electronic system. It is important to note that these assessments are administered across *all* sections of the associated course, are *standards-based*, are typically *performance based* in that candidates must demonstrate their knowledge, and are *entered by faculty into the WKU Professional Education Unit Accountability System*.

Furthermore, as the **WKU Professional Education Unit Data Source Matrices (Initial and Advanced Preparation)** (Tables 2 & 3) demonstrate, we recognize that the critical performance assessments are but one piece (see Component 2: Course Based Assessment Data in the Matrices), albeit an important one, in the process of monitoring candidate progress throughout the education professional preparation process. Note that the Initial Preparation chart is completed in detail because these data points and sources are shared across all initial preparation programs. The Advanced Preparation Matrix provides the same structure as the initial programs for all advanced programs to follow. The X's indicate where advanced programs collect program specific data within the shared, unit-wide structure and related to the shared, unit wide standards and values--the Kentucky Teacher Standards, as well as other key Conceptual Framework values. **Table 4** provides an illustration of how the data from **Tables 2 & 3** currently fit within the electronic accountability system.



**Table 2** WKU Professional Education Unit Wide Continuous Assessment Matrix – Initial Preparation

WKU PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT WIDE CONTINUOUS ASSESSMENT MATRIX - INITIAL PREPARATION												
	Component 1: Admission Data		Component 2: Course Based Assessment Data	Component 3: Clinical Experiences Data		Component 4: Culminating Assessment Data		Component 5: Exit and Follow Up Data				
Conceptual Framework Standards/Values	Faculty Recs	KY REQ's	Critical Performances	Early Clinical Experiences	Final Clinical Experience	Final Clinical Evaluation	Capstone Assessment (TWS)	Exit Survey	Praxis II	Alumni Survey	Employer Survey	
Content Knowledge		Various Data Required by State for Admission into Teacher Preparation Programs	Aligned to Kentucky Teacher Standards			1a-d, Overall	DFI 2	1a-d	State Approved Certification Exams	1a-d	1a-d	
Designs/Plans							2a-e, Overall	CF 1-5, LG 1-4, DFI 1, 3-5		2a-e	2a-e	2a-e
Learning Climate							3a-e, Overall			3a-e	3a-e	3a-e
Implements/Manages							4a-e, Overall	IDM 1-3		4a-e	4a-e	4a-e
Assessment/Evaluation							5a-d, Overall	AP 1-5, ASL 1-4		5a-e	5a-e	5a-e
Technology							6a-d, Overall	DFI 6		6a-d	6a-d	6a-d
Reflection							7a-c, Overall	RSE 1-3		7a-c	7a-c	7a-c
Collaboration							8a-b, Overall			8a-d	8a-d	8a-d
Professional Development							9a-c, Overall	RSE 4-5		9a-d	9a-d	9a-d
Leadership							10a, Overall			10a-d	10a-d	10a-d
Dispositions	FR a-†					FX a-l		Disp a-l				
Field Experiences & Clinical Practice						Summary Form	OTS Data					
Diversity						Summary Form	OTS Data	Disp g	CF 1-5, AP 5, DFI 4, IDM 2			
Impacts P-12 Student Learning							AP 1-5, ASL 1-4					
<b>DATA MAINTAINED BY:</b>	OTS†		Faculty	C&I Staff	OTS	OTS/EdTech	C&I Staff/Ed Tech	Ed Tech	OTS	Ed Tech	Ed Tech	
<b>DATA HOUSED IN:</b>	CEBS ACCSYS		CEBS ACCSYS	CEBS ACCSYS		CEBS ACCSYS		CEBS ACCSYS				
<b>DATA REPORTING CYCLE:</b>	Semester		Yearly	Yearly	Yearly	Yearly	Yearly	Yearly	Yearly	Yearly	Biannually	
<b>DATA REVIEWED BY:</b>	PEC†		Faculty/Programs/PEC	Programs/PEC	Programs/PEC	Programs/PEC	Programs/PEC	Programs/PEC	PEC	Programs/PEC	Programs/PEC	
<b>TRANSITION POINTS:</b>	1: Program Admission		2: Admission to Culminating Assessment and Final Clinical Experience			3: Program Exit						

\* Cells reflect instruments or rubric/survey items keyed to CF Standards/Values.

†OTS = Office of Teacher Services; PEC = Professional Education Council

**Table 3** WKU Professional Education Unit Wide Continuous Assessment Matrix – Advanced Preparation

WKU PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT WIDE CONTINUOUS ASSESSMENT MATRIX - ADVANCED PREPARATION								
	Component 1: Admission Data	Component 2: Course Based Assessment Data	Component 3: Clinical Experiences Data		Component 4: Culminating Assessment Data	Component 5: Exit and Follow Up Data		
Conceptual Framework Standards/Values	REQS	Critical Performances	Early Clinical Experiences	Final Clinical Experience/Evaluation	Capstone Assessment	Exit Survey	Alumni Survey	Employer Survey
Content Knowledge	Various Data Required by Graduate Studies and/or Program	Aligned to Kentucky Teacher and Learned Society Standards		X	X	X	X	X
Designs/Plans				X	X	X	X	X
Learning Climate				X	X	X	X	X
Implements/Manages				X	X	X	X	X
Assessment/Evaluation				X	X	X	X	X
Technology				X	X	X	X	X
Reflection				X	X	X	X	X
Collaboration				X	X	X	X	X
Professional Development				X	X	X	X	X
Leadership				X	X	X	X	X
Dispositions				X	X			
Field Experiences & Clinical Practice				X	X			
Diversity				X	X	X		
Impacts P-12 Student Learning						X		
<b>DATA MAINTAINED BY:</b>	OTS	Faculty	Program	Program	Program	Program	Program	Program
<b>DATA HOUSED IN:</b>	CEBS ACCSYS	CEBS ACCSYS						
<b>DATA REPORTING CYCLE:</b>	Semester	Yearly	Yearly	Yearly	Yearly	Yearly	Yearly	Biannually
<b>DATA REVIEWED BY:</b>	Program	Faculty/Programs/PEC	Program	Program	Program/Dean	Program	Program	Program
<b>Transition Points:</b>	1: Program Admission	2: Admission to Culminating Assessment		(May be part of TP 2 or 3)	3: Program Exit			

\*Each advanced program has identified forms or associated questions/rubric items for each X.

**Table 4** How Data Fit and Are Used Within the Electronic Accountability System

		WKU Professional Education Unit Electronic Accountability System Components					REPORTS	
		COMPONENT 1	COMPONENT 2	COMPONENT 3		COMPONENT 4	COMPONENT 5	
		Admission Data	Electronic Portfolio System	Early Clinical Experiences	Final Clinical Experience	Culminating Assessment Data	Certification & Praxis	Follow Up Surveys
INITIAL PREPARATION	Data entered by Office of Teacher Services after Student Orientation	Course Based Critical Performances uploaded by candidates and scored by faculty	Data entered by Curriculum & Instruction staff after candidates submit Fieldwork Summary Form	Data entered by Office of Teacher Services	Teacher Work Sample Scores entered electronically by faculty & Ed Technology	Data entered by Office of Teacher Services	Electronic survey data merged into Accountability System	
ADVANCED PREPARATION	Data entered by Office of Teacher Services after Graduate Admission	Course Based Critical Performances uploaded by candidates and scored by faculty	<i>Data currently housed by each program</i>	<i>Data currently housed by each program</i>	Course Based Critical Performances uploaded by candidates and scored by faculty	Data entered by Office of Teacher Services	<i>Data currently housed by each program</i>	
TRANSITION POINTS	1: Program Admission	2: Admission to Culminating Assessment and/or Final Clinical Experience		(Overlap in some AP Programs)	3: Program Exit			

*\*Italics indicates data currently housed elsewhere that will be added to Accountability System in the future.*

## **A. The Continuous Assessment Plan is Integrated with WKU's Conceptual Framework**

During the development of the Conceptual Framework, committee members thought it important to outline all essential beliefs, ideas, and implications *even if they were difficult to measure or live out*. Thus, many beliefs, ideas, or implications reflect what the unit *aspires* to accomplish over time. During the current assessment cycle, however, the unit is focusing on the following key values:

### **Belief 3 – Diversity**

Recognizing and responding to student diversity represents both an *instructional opportunity* and *instructional necessity*. It is an *opportunity* to use what each child brings to the learning situation in order to facilitate learning (Au, 1993; Delpit, 1995; Gay, 2002). It is a *necessity* in that those who would attempt to ignore it risk marginalizing students, as diversity exists in every classroom and in every school (Banks, 2002). Thus, the unit's professional education courses provide candidates with both knowledge of and an experience base about differences in learning styles, strategies, and preferences of cultural, ethnic, economic, gender, and ability groups. In addition, education professional candidates are offered a variety of field experiences that reflect student diversity and demonstrate success with all students (Forrest, 2004; Sleeter, 2001).

### **Belief 5 – Reflection**

Highly effective education professionals have a rich understanding of and appreciation for student differences and contextual variables. Such understanding requires reflection as the means to improve professional practice (York-Barr, Sommers, Ghore, & Montie, 2001). Thus, the unit's professional education courses and field experiences provide candidates opportunities to acquire an understanding of various theories, models, and strategies of teaching and learning. These courses and experiences provide candidates multiple opportunities for reflection toward the goals of improving their skills and P-12 student learning. A final assessment shared by the initial education professional preparation programs during the student teaching semester is the Teacher Work Sample (The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project, 2002). Throughout this assessment, candidates have multiple opportunities to reflect: 1) Before developing a unit of instruction, candidates gather and write about key school, classroom, and student contextual factors. 2) Before and during instruction, candidates reflect on pre- and formative assessment data and contextual factors to refine their unit and to make instructional decisions. 3) After instruction, candidates reflect on their students' success in meeting unit goals and objectives, describe future modifications that could improve the unit, and contemplate appropriate professional development that would improve their teaching ability. Although advanced programs have flexibility in developing a culminating assessment that meets their candidates' needs, reflection remains a shared component of all advanced preparation culminating assessments.

### **Belief 7 – Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions**

National and state educational organizations have been able to identify core competencies that are necessary for educational professionals to be successful (e.g., Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, 1992; Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, 1996; Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board, 1999; National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, 2002; TSSA Collaborative, 2001). Although these organizations and other

education experts (Kounin, 1970; Marzano, 2003; McEwan, 2002) have developed various numbers of and names for these competencies, further analysis reveals a consensus about what knowledge, skills, and dispositions characterize successful educational professionals. In Kentucky, the Kentucky Teacher Standards embody these core professional education competencies. As such, WKU has adopted these standards as targets for all professional education programs. WKU has also adopted the following dispositional values: learning, personal integrity, diversity, collaboration, and professionalism, as key to the success of education professionals (Wayda & Lund, 2005). Although the Kentucky Teacher Standards serve as unit and program targets, **Table 6** (p. 16) demonstrates that our focus on these standards has not led us to lose sight of either our broader Conceptual Framework Beliefs or how our unit-wide efforts fit within the university's Mission and Vision (Strategic Plan).

### **Belief 8 – Technology**

Advances in technology have added a new dimension to processing information that permeates almost every aspect of our lives, including teaching, learning, and managing classrooms and schools. Technology provides teachers, school practitioners, and all educators extensions of their abilities to move toward new and higher performance levels (Pellegrino & Altman, 1997). Thus, the WKU education professional preparation unit strives to provide instruction in, model, and assess the use of technology tools considered essential for instruction, assessment, management, and research related to schools. As can be seen in **Tables 1-3**, key assessments and evaluation forms have been developed or designated to assess candidates' technology proficiency. Furthermore, the WKU professional education unit demonstrates its commitment to technology through the development of the Professional Education Unit Electronic Accountability and Portfolio systems in which key unit-wide and program level assessment data are electronically collected, stored, analyzed, and reported.

### **B. The Continuous Assessment Plan is Based on Standards**

As can be seen in **Tables 2 and 3**, the unit has developed a shared data collection structure built around shared standards. Furthermore, **Table 1** provides a sample of how all programs have aligned performances assessments to the shared standards. Even programs that prepare education professionals other than teachers have either adopted the core competencies described in the Kentucky Teacher Standards or have reviewed and aligned their professional standards through the lens of Kentucky Teacher Standards. Finally, as will be described later in this document, all programs have embedded opportunities to observe dispositions in their candidates.

### **C. The Continuous Assessment Plan has Monitoring Checkpoints**

The WKU Professional Education Unit has adopted the following components to monitor candidate progress toward Kentucky Teacher Standards, dispositions, and other Conceptual Framework values:

- Component 1: Admission Data
- Component 2: Course Based Assessment Data
- Component 3: Clinical Experiences Data
- Component 4: Culminating Assessment Data



- Component 5: Exit and Follow Up Data

**Tables 1-3** provide information about how the unit-wide and program-specific assessments and data collection forms work together to enable the unit and program faculty to monitor candidate progress toward the Kentucky Teacher Standards.

Within these components are three major transition checkpoints (**see Table 4**) where candidates are evaluated before their continuance in programs:

- Transition Point 1: Admission to Programs (related to Component 1) – Data collected prior to admission are reviewed to ensure candidates meet university, unit, and/or program criteria to be admitted. At the initial preparation level, the Office of Teacher Services collects data required for admission and recommends candidates for admission to the Professional Education Council (PEC) based on meeting the necessary criteria. The PEC approves these candidates for admission. At the advanced preparation level, candidates seek admission through the Office of Graduate Studies who forwards an admission packet to programs for approval.
- Transition Point 2: Admission into Culminating Assessment/Experience (related to Components 2 & 3) - Data collected during candidate progress through the program are reviewed to ensure candidate readiness for the final assessment/experience. At the initial preparation level, the Office of Teacher Services collects data required for student-teaching admission and recommends candidates to the Professional Education Council (PEC) based on meeting the necessary criteria. The PEC approves these candidates in light of these data, as well as course-based assessment and early clinical experience data, for student teaching. At the alternative certification and advanced preparation levels, the program faculty evaluates the readiness of candidates for the final assessment/experience based on course-based and early clinical experience data, as well as GPA, and approves their continuation.
- Transition Point 3: Program Exit (related to Components 3-5) – At both initial and advanced preparation levels, data collected from the final clinical experience and culminating assessment are reviewed by the Office of Teacher Services. Candidates are recommended for certification or rank change based on meeting all exit criteria.

#### **D. The Continuous Assessment Plan Identifies Dispositions and Modes of Assessment**

The WKU Conceptual Framework delineates the following critical dispositions associated with the education profession: valuing learning, personal integrity, diversity, collaboration, and professionalism (Wayda & Lund, 2005). **Table 5** on the next two pages provides the language and scoring matrix adopted by the WKU Professional Education Unit to guide the assessment of these dispositions. **Tables 2 and 3** identify key points where candidate dispositions data are collected.

**Table 5** WKU Professional Education Unit Dispositions Rubric

		<b>LEVEL 1: Dispositions assessed prior to Program Admission</b>				
<b>Rating → Indicator ↓</b>	<b>Below Standard 1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>At Standard 3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Target 5</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>a. Values learning: Attendance</b>	Exhibits a pattern of absence and/or tardiness. Fails to contact instructor to make up missed work. Gives no reason for missing class. Sometimes disrupts class by arriving late.		Occasionally misses class and is rarely tardy. Tries to notify instructor if going to be absent or contacts instructor following absence with reason for absence.		Consistently attends class and is on time. Usually notifies instructor in advance and arranges to meet instructor following a missed class. Usually gives reason for planned absence.	
<b>b. Values learning: Class participation</b>	Inattentive in class. Rarely participates in class discussions. May distract others in the class with behaviors or talking.		Is attentive in class. Attention is focused on class-related materials and activities. Responds appropriately when called on. Does not distract others in the classroom.		Actively engaged and interested in the class activities. Volunteers to respond to questions. Participates in discussions.	
<b>c. Values learning: Class preparation</b>	Work completed with little attention to quality. May be sloppy and/or contain errors. Emphasis on getting work done rather than learning. Assignments are sometimes late or missing. Comes unprepared to class (no text or class material, hasn't read, etc.)		Assignments are completed correctly and with accuracy. Work shows basic grasp of the assignments intent. Meets assignment deadlines adequately. Is prepared for class most of the time.		Work is completed with attention to detail, is sequential, and is logical. Shows evidence of thoughtful analysis of the assignment. Work shows that adequate time and planning were allocated. Consistently comes to class well prepared.	
<b>d. Values learning: Communication</b>	Uses incorrect grammar in oral and/or written communications. May use slang, profanity, inappropriate vocabulary, or offensive language. Does not express ideas clearly. May display distracting language habits.		Usually uses correct grammar in oral and written communication. Generally uses language that is appropriate and not offensive. Can convey ideas accurately.		Uses correct grammar in oral and/or written communication. Communication is free of offensive or inappropriate language. Uses language to express ideas very effectively regardless of the age of the listener.	
<b>e. Values personal integrity: Emotional control</b>	Emotions are not under control. May lose temper and show outbursts of anger. Is disrespectful of peers and others. Does not take personal responsibility for emotions and behaviors. Blames others or outside circumstances for loss of emotional control.		Maintains basic control of emotions. May show emotional reaction, but does not lose temper or control. Is able to listen to the perspectives of others. Is responsible for emotions and behaviors.		Displays steady emotional temperament. Is receptive to viewpoints of others and their suggestions. Holds self accountable for emotions and behaviors. Displays a sense of humor and/or willingness to get along with others.	
<b>f. Values personal integrity: Ethical behavior</b>	Shows pattern of dishonest or deceitful behavior. Fails to use discretion in keeping personal confidences. Cannot be counted on to keep word or to follow through as promised.		Is truthful and honest in dealing with others. Uses discretion in keeping personal or professional confidences. Strives to be trustworthy and to keep word.		Is honest in dealing with others. Puts truth above personal need or advantage. Always dependable in terms of keeping personal and professional confidences. Can be counted on to follow through and keep word. Shows self to be a person of strong character.	

LEVEL 2: Dispositions assessed along with Level 1 Dispositions after Program Admission						
Rating → Indicator ↓	Below Standard 1	2	At Standard 3	4	Target 5	Score
<b>g. Values diversity</b>	Rejects those who are different in ability, race, gender, or ethnicity. Displays intolerant, disrespectful, and unresponsive behavior toward the ideas and views of others. Interacts in an impolite or unprofessional manner with those perceived as different from self.		Accepts others who are different in ability, race, gender, or ethnicity. Displays respectful and responsive behavior toward the ideas and views of others. Interacts with others in a polite and professional manner with those perceived as different from self.		Willingly works with others from different ability, race, gender, or ethnic groups. Welcomes feedback and interaction with others. Listens carefully to others and respects the views of those perceived as different from self.	
<b>h. Values collaboration</b>	Does not collaborate or consult with others. Shows little regard for people and their ideas. Does not relate well with others. Does not share information or ideas.		Collaborates and consults with others. Accepts ideas of others. Relates adequately with others. Shares information and ideas.		Actively seeks out and incorporates ideas of others. Willingly works with others to improve the overall environment. Regularly shares information and ideas.	
<b>i. Values professionalism: Respect for school rules, policies, and norms</b>	Unaware of school rules and policies. Sometimes disregards known policies or restrictions. Wants exceptions to be made for self or tries to get around established rules of behavior, dress, etc. Thinks rules were made for others.		Aware of school rules and policies. Usually follows them without being reminded by others. Accepts reminders for breaches of rules or policies, and does not attempt to circumvent them in patterns of behavior, dress, etc.		Knows school rules and policies. Follows them consistently. Understands the purpose of regulations and respects their intent. Accepts responsibility for personally following them in patterns of dress, behavior, etc.	
<b>j. Values professionalism: Commitment to self-reflection and growth</b>	Does not recognize personal limitations or strengths. Does not accept suggestions and constructive criticism of others. Does not engage in critical thinking. Does not demonstrate ability to learn through self-reflection.		Recognizes personal limitations and strengths. Accepts suggestions and constructive criticism of others. Demonstrates ability to think critically. Demonstrates ability to learn through self-reflection.		Recognizes personal limitations and strengths and uses them to best professional advantage. Actively seeks suggestions and constructive criticism. Regularly practices critical thinking. Regularly engages in learning through self-reflection.	
<b>k. Values professionalism: Professional development and involvement</b>	Shows little interest in activities or events that promote professional development. Attends only when mandatory. Unaware of professional organizations, professional publications, or other educational resources.		Occasionally participates in professional activities or events that promote professional development. Aware of professional organizations, professional publications, and other educational resources.		Regularly and actively participates in professional activities or events that promote professional development. Makes use of information from professional organizations, professional publications, and educational resources.	
<b>l. Values professionalism: Professional responsibility</b>	Does not accept responsibility for own actions and for helping students learn. Holds low expectations for the success of some students. Consistently blames student lack of success on factors outside the control of self.		Accepts responsibility for own actions and for helping students learn. Usually holds high expectations for the success of all students. Often looks to explain and remedy student lack of success by factors within the control of self.		Accepts responsibility for own actions and for helping all students learn and actively seeks self-improvement. Consistently holds high expectations for the success of all students. Consistently looks to explain and remedy student lack of success by factors within the control of self.	

\*Rubric adapted from Wayda, V., & Lund, J. (2005). Assessing dispositions: An unresolved challenge in teacher education; Teacher candidates may know their subject, but are they suited for the job? *The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance*, 76, p. 34.

## E. The Continuous Assessment Plan Includes Multiple Assessments

As the WKU Conceptual Framework delineates and the introduction and sections A-D of this document reveal, WKU's professional education unit and its associated programs have developed and continue to develop and refine multiple assessments that are *standards-based*, typically *performance based* in that candidates must demonstrate their knowledge, are *entered by faculty into the WKU Professional Education Unit Accountability System*, and occur across all levels of program coursework. Furthermore, these multiple assessments are embedded within a more comprehensive, unit-wide structure that provides a framework for how data are entered, collected, analyzed, and reviewed for unit- and program-level improvement.

## F. The Continuous Assessment Plan Includes a Plan for Collecting P-12 Student Impact Data

As described in the WKU Conceptual Framework, highly effective education professionals hold themselves accountable for their students' learning results and use these results, as well as other data, to make decisions about professional development and program improvement (Reeves, 2002a, 2002b, 2004). Thus, all WKU education professional preparation programs provide opportunities for candidates to systematically collect and analyze assessment data as a means to demonstrate impact on P-12 student learning (see **Tables 2 & 3**).

At the initial preparation level, this has been largely accomplished through the adoption of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS; The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project, 2002) and its processes as a means both to guide and assess candidate development and to demonstrate impact on P-12 student learning. The TWS consists of seven processes considered key in order for teachers to impact student learning:

- Contextual Factors (CF): The teacher uses information about the learning-teaching context and student individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment.
- Learning Goals (LG): The teacher sets significant, challenging, varied, and appropriate learning goals.
- Assessment Plan (AP): The teacher uses multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during, and after instruction.
- Design for Instruction (DFI): The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.
- Instructional Decision-Making (IDM): The teacher uses regular and systematic evaluations of student learning to make instructional decisions.
- Analysis of Student Learning (ASL): The teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.
- Reflection and Self-Evaluation (RSE): The teacher reflects on his or her instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice.

Although all TWS sections are informative, as **Table 2** indicates, we look specifically to the Assessment Plan (AP rubric items 1-5) and Analysis of Student Learning (ASL rubric items 1-4) sections of the TWS to monitor our candidates' ability to impact P-12 student learning. In the Assessment Plan section, candidates must discuss how they plan to monitor their students' learning through pre-, formative-, and post-assessment. In the Analysis of Student Learning section, candidates must write about and use charts and graphs to demonstrate their students' progress toward learning goals. Furthermore, we are exploring ways to extract P-12 student learning data from the TWS in order

to monitor more explicitly our candidates' ability to impact P-12 student learning. Initial efforts on a small number of TWS have revealed promising results of significant pre-post assessment gains.

At the advanced preparation level, although these programs have flexibility in developing a culminating assessment that meets their candidates' needs, impact on P-12 student learning remains a shared component of all advanced preparation culminating assessments. All Program Assessment Plans are available at <http://edtech.wku.edu/peu/program-assessment-plans.htm>.

## **G. The Continuous Assessment Plan Contains Feedback Loops for Candidates and Programs**

As described in the WKU Conceptual Framework, highly effective education units develop and maintain an assessment system that provides credible performance data on the progress and achievement of each candidate available for feedback and reporting to the candidate, faculty, and program. Such a system allows us to monitor and report overall candidate progress toward standards. Unit data, including critical performance, dispositions, teacher work sample, student-teaching evaluation, fieldwork, and survey results, are reported annually to the unit and programs via a [Unit-Wide Assessment Report](#) developed by the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences Associate Dean of Accountability and Research. This report typically includes the following types of information:

- *Admission Data*
  - Number, percentage, and average GPA by program of teacher preparation candidates approved by the Professional Education Council for admission
  - Admission test score averages by program
  - Candidate dispositions data
- *Course Based Assessment Data*
  - Percentage of candidates scoring at each level of proficiency on critical performances
  - Number of critical performances for each Kentucky Teacher Standard
  - Percentage of candidates scoring at each level of proficiency on critical performances by Kentucky Teacher Standard
  - Counts of students scoring 2 or less on critical performances
- *Clinical Experiences Data*
  - Field Experience Summary Form information by type of experiences, context, working with students with special needs, and working with diverse students
  - Candidate dispositions data
- *Culminating Assessment Data*
  - Teacher Work Sample Scores by program, by TWS components, and by Kentucky Teacher Standards
  - Preliminary analysis of impact on P-12 student learning results
- *Exit and Follow Up Data*
  - Praxis results
  - WKU Teacher Survey results (student-teachers, 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup> year teachers)
  - Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) New Teacher Survey results

In section 1 of the report, results are reported by data collection point. In section 2, data are summarized based on what they tell us about candidate proficiency towards Kentucky Teacher Standards, as well as

other key Conceptual Framework values. Section 3 summarizes current and planned efforts to report and disseminate these results. Section 4 summarizes key decisions made or under consideration based on these results.

This report, as well as other data deemed important to the unit and programs, is disseminated through the WKU Professional Education Council. This council, consisting of faculty representatives from all education professional preparation programs, meets monthly to admit teacher candidates into the professional education program, to approve education-related program changes, to discuss state and national education trends, to recommend changes to the functioning of the unit, and to review, discuss, and make decisions based on accountability system and other education-related data. PEC minutes can be obtained at the following url: <http://edtech6.wku.edu/minutes/index.py>.

At the program level, designated program coordinators work with the Associate Dean of Accountability and Research to develop a program-level annual Assessment Report composed of the following outline:

1. Presentation of continuous assessment results in the following areas:
  - a. Admission Data
  - b. Course Based Assessment Data
  - c. Clinical Experiences Data – *Including dispositions assessment results, P-12 student diversity statistics, and results of efforts to ensure all candidates work with diverse students*
  - d. Culminating Assessment Data – *Including impact on P-12 student learning data*
  - e. Exit and Follow Up Data
2. Summary of results by Kentucky Teacher (Initial Programs) OR Program Standards (Advanced Programs) AND other key Conceptual Framework values - *Including a description of what results suggest about candidates' progress toward/proficiency on each standard/CF value*
3. Summary of efforts to report and disseminate results (Unit/College-wide meetings, department/program level meetings, written reports, presentations, etc.)
4. Summary of key discussions and/or decisions made based on assessment results:
  - a. Description of any assessment or data collection changes made/to be made based on assessment results
  - b. Description of any program curriculum or experience changes made/to be made based on assessment results
  - c. Description of any decisions about group/individual student progress made/to be made based on assessment results

The first of these reports was due September 2008. Finalized versions of these reports are available at <http://edtech.wku.edu/peu/reports/program-assessment-reports.htm>.

## **H. The Continuous Assessment Plan Contains Evidence of a Technology-Supported Assessment System**

The WKU Professional Education Unit has developed an electronic accountability system that holds all initial and most advanced education professional unit and program data (**See Tables 2-4**). At the undergraduate level, the system houses all teacher admission, critical performance (including TWS),

fieldwork summary, dispositions, student teaching evaluation, state required, Praxis, and survey data. As described earlier, these data are readily retrievable for monitoring candidate progress and analyzing and reporting results for program improvement. Currently, at the advanced level, the accountability system hosts critical performances, but other data (e.g., admission and survey data) are housed either on larger WKU electronic systems, such as Banner, or on program coordinator or departmental computers. The unique qualities of each advanced program does not allow for a “one-size-fits-all” accountability system, so each program’s needs are being evaluated and implemented within the system as program specific pages and databases are created.

### **I. The Continuous Assessment Plan Ensures its Assessments are Accurate, Fair, and Consistent**

The WKU Professional Education Unit is committed to an assessment process that is accurate, fair, and consistent. To ensure accuracy and fairness of assessments, critical performances are developed by all faculty members who frequently teach a particular course. They also work together to develop descriptive scoring rubrics and to determine which Kentucky Teacher Standard(s) the assessment measures. Use of descriptive rubrics represents best educational practice for consistent scoring of performance assessments in that behaviors or skills for each performance level are fully described so that assessors are less likely to use extraneous behaviors or “impressions” to score candidate performance. The use of multiple assessments and evaluation tools ensures that candidates are given every opportunity to demonstrate proficiency.

An example of WKU’s commitment to “accuracy, fairness, and consistency” has been the resources and research it has invested to ensure that these qualities exist in its development and scoring of the TWS, the culminating performance for initial preparation programs. Historically, research (Denner et al., 2004) has determined that educators view the TWS as a valid measure of key skills that prospective teachers need to be successful and that, with training, even raters from different institutions can independently reach agreement on the level of candidate proficiency. Currently, WKU has instituted a yearly process by which all TWS are scored by two additional independent trained scorers beyond the faculty of record. Research at WKU and other TWS institutions consistently demonstrate the validity of the TWS instrument and the ability of scorers to reach acceptable levels of agreement regarding candidate performance (Denner, Norman, & Lin, 2007; Norman, 2007).

**Table 6** Alignment Matrix: NCATE, Kentucky Teacher Standards, PEU Conceptual Framework, WKU Strategic Plans\*

NCATE Relationship	Standard Source		WKU PEU Conceptual Framework		WKU Strategic Planning Documents	
			Conceptual Framework Standards/Values	Conceptual Framework Beliefs	Academic Affairs Strategic Plan (Objectives)	WKU Strategic Plan (Goals)
NCATE Content/Pedagogical Content Knowledge	Conceptual Framework Aligned with Kentucky Teacher Standards	KTS1	Content Knowledge	3,5,7	1a,1e,2e	2
NCATE Pedagogical Knowledge & Skills		KTS 2	Designs/Plans	1-3,5,7	1e	1
		KTS 3	Learning Climate	1-3,7	1e	1
		KTS 4	Implements/Manages	2,3,5,7	1e	1
		KTS 5	Assessment/Evaluation	1,2,4,6,7,9	1e	1
		KTS 6	Technology	5,7-9	1g,3b	1,3
		KTS 7	Reflection	5,7-9	1a,1e	1
		KTS 8	Collaboration	1-3,6	4b	4
		KTS 9	Professional Development	4,5,7,9	3b	3
		KTS 10	Leadership	1,2,4,5,7,9	1b,d	1
		NCATE Dispositions	KTS 2-4	Dispositions	1-3,5-7,9	1a-c
NCATE Standard 3	Conceptual Framework		Field Experiences & Clinical Practice	3,5,6	1e	1
NCATE Standard 4		KTS 2-4	Diversity	1-3,6	1b,1c,2g,2h,3d	1-3
NCATE P-12 Learning			Impacts P-12 Student Learning	5,8,9	1b	1

\*Excerpted from WKU Program Review Document 1: Conceptual Framework



## References

- Au, K. H. (1993). *Literacy Instruction in Multicultural Settings*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Banks, J.A. (2002). *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gay, G. (2002). Culturally responsive teaching in special education for ethnically diverse students: Setting the stage. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 15(6), 613-629.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other People's Children*. New York: The New Press.
- Denner, P., Norman, A. D., & Linn, S. (2007). *Fairness and aspects of the consequential validity of performance assessments using a teacher work sample*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Denner, P., Norman, A. D., Salzman, S., Pankratz, R. & Evans, S. (2004). The Renaissance Partnership teacher work sample: Evidence supporting validity, score generalizability, and quality of student learning assessment. *ATE Yearbook XII*, 23-56.
- Forrest, S. N. (2004). Implications of No Child Left Behind on family literacy in a multicultural community. *Clearing House*, 78(1), 41-45.
- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (1992) *Model Standards for Beginning Teacher Licensing, Assessment and Development: A Resource for State Dialogue*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (1996). *Standards for School Leaders*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (1999). *Experienced Teacher Standards for Preparation & Certification*. Frankfort, KY: Author.
- Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (1999). *New Teacher Standards for Preparation & Certification*. Frankfort, KY.
- Kounin, J. (1970). *Discipline and Group Management in Classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What Works in Schools: Translating Research into Action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McEwan, E. K. (2002). *Ten Traits of Highly Effective Teachers: How to Hire, Coach, and Mentor Successful Teachers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. (2002). *What Teachers Should Know and Be Able to Do: The Five Core Propositions of the National Board*. Arlington, VA: NBPTS National Office.

- Norman, A. D. (2007). *WKU professional education unit assessment report – initial preparation programs, academic year 2006-07*. Western Kentucky University: College of Education and Behavioral Sciences.
- Pellegrino, J. W., & Altman, J. E. (1997). Information technology and teacher preparation: Some critical issues and illustrative solutions. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 72(1), 89-121.
- Reeves, D. B. (2004). *Accountability in Action: A Blueprint for Learning Organizations (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)*. Denver, CO: Advanced Learning Press (ALP).
- Reeves, D. B. (2002a). *The Daily Disciplines of Leadership: How to Improve Student Achievement, Staff Motivation, and Personal Organization*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Reeves, D. B. (March/April 2002b). Accountability-based reforms should lead to better teaching and learning-period. *Harvard Education Newsletter Online*.
- Sleeter, C. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 94-106.
- The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project. (2002). Renaissance teacher work sample: Performance prompt, teaching process standards, and scoring rubrics. Author.
- TSSA Collaborative. (2001). *Technology Standards for School Administrators*. Author.
- Wayda, V., & Lund, J. (2005). Assessing dispositions: An unresolved challenge in teacher education; Teacher candidates may know their subject, but are they suited for the job? *The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance*, 76, 34.
- York-Barr, J., Sommers, W. A., Ghere, G. S., & Montie, J. (2001). *Reflective Practice to Improve Schools: An Action Guide for Educators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.