

MOREHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
CONTINUOUS ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

Updated June 2009

Introduction

The Continuous Assessment System (CAS) is a system for both assessing candidates and evaluating the Professional Education Unit. Candidate assessment is only one means of evaluating the Unit.

The Continuous Assessment System (CAS) requires quantitative (e.g., Praxis II scores) and qualitative data (e.g., informal interview or focus group data) from faculty, candidates, alumni, and members of the professional community to triangulate measures of candidate and program success. As the system continues to be refined, predictors of candidate success are identified through descriptive and analytic analyses of both the quantitative and qualitative data (EPSB CAS Guide indicator 1.7).

The CAS is a procedural guide in accordance with NCATE Standard 2, which states, “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.” In addition, the assessment and evaluation system is designed to monitor and ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency as it is applied to all candidates (EPSB CAS Guide indicator 1.8).

Key to understanding candidate assessment is knowledge of the undergraduate and graduate transition points/gates/gates; these are articulated in the Initial and Advance Programs’ transition points/gates/gates Documents which are included in Appendix A, pages 11 through 13. Other means of evaluating the Unit include both internal and external program and Unit reviews as required by the university.

Morehead State University

MSU MISSION/VISION/VALUES/STRATEGIC GOALS

“ASPIRE to Greatness” is the theme of the MSU Strategic Plan 2006 – 2010. This plan, designed through an elaborate and broadly participatory process, guides all actions at the University. The stated vision of the university is “We aspire to be the best public regional university in the South.” The university’s mission statement, found on the MSU web site and in

strategic documents reads, “We are a diverse community of learners committed to student success. MSU is accredited as a comprehensive University offering quality higher education opportunities in a collegial and open environment. MSU pursues academic excellence, research, community engagement and life-long learning. MSU is dedicated to improving the quality of life while preserving and promoting the unique cultural heritage of East Kentucky.” We strive to exemplify the following core values: “PEOPLE come first and are encouraged to achieve their full potential; Commitment to SCHOLARSHIP, LEARNING and SERVICE is embraced; EXCELLENCE is achieved through TEAMWORK, LEADERSHIP, INNOVATION and ACCOUNTABILITY; DIVERSITY of people and thought is respected; PARTNERSHIPS are built on honesty, integrity and trust (www.moreheadstate.edu/aspire).

The themes of the university’s strategic goals are presented below. The “ASPIRE to Greatness” strategic planning document includes an action plan that has been implemented to ensure the intention of each theme is fulfilled. Specific theme goals have been articulated and integrated into a timeline that guides the implementation and assessment and status of each goal.

Academic Excellence

Student Success

Productive Partnerships

Improved Infrastructure

Resource Enhancement

Enrollment and Retention Gains

MOREHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT - MISSION AND GOALS

Mission

The Unit’s **Conceptual Framework** states that in our mission to prepare engaged educators in Eastern Kentucky, we promote the flow of “light to and from the mountains” in the form of many voices (perspectives) and resources that contribute to the generation of knowledge and recognize that integrating these resources in curricula leads to the effective preparation of educators who are interculturally competent regional stewards. Candidates must demonstrate the

understandings, skills and dispositions that have been set forth by state and national learned societies as being critical to success as an initial or advanced teacher, school counselor, or administrator. To ensure quality preparation, a Continuous Assessment System has been developed and implemented to ensure the goals of the Professional Education Unit are met, consistent with the mission of the University.

Goals and Objectives

To provide an intellectual framework and coherence for the pursuit of Unit goals and to support students, colleagues, public school practitioners and stakeholders' understanding of the Unit's commitment to prepare educators who are equipped to bring "Light to and from the Mountains" and to provide leadership through community engagement, four critical and grounding concepts have been identified by the Professional Education Unit: 1) informed decision-making, 2) diversity and holistic education, 3) collaboration/coalition building, and 4) empowerment. These concepts guide the directions of the Unit and inform our decisions regarding the work we do to prepare initial and advanced educators.

The Professional Education Unit's "To What Do We Aspire" action plan has been developed around seven critical performance areas and these are linked to MSU's goals and the Professional Education Unit's four core concepts described above, linked to educator preparation standards, including the Kentucky Teacher Standards, School Counselor Standards, and/or Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. The Unit and the faculty within individual programs assess the degree to which its graduates:

1. Master content knowledge, professional, and thinking skills needed to make an optimal contribution to "whole" student learning in educational settings.
2. Are competent in the collection and use of data to inform decision-making and to demonstrate accountability for student learning.
3. Demonstrate professional dispositions.
4. Are culturally competent and understand the regions from which they come, utilizing knowledge and experiences to effectively "bridge the gaps" (economic, achievement, geographic) ensuring optimal learning for all students.

5. Engage in authentic field-based experiences in collaboration with committed school-based partners and are empowered to improve the quality of education throughout this region and beyond.

Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

Continuous assessment is interwoven into curriculum and standards-driven instruction. It also plays an important role in Unit evaluation. While assessments occur at the individual level (pre-candidates, candidates, and advanced program candidates), evaluation occurs at the program and Unit level (including evaluation by alumni and the professional educational community). The Continuous Assessment System (CAS) provides for both the ongoing assessment of candidate achievement (knowledge, skills, dispositions) and the ongoing evaluation of program quality within the Professional Education Unit. Implementation of the CAS provides data used for decision-making focused on maintaining or extending the quality of programs as well as candidates' performance levels. Faculty, academic administrators, school-based personnel, and candidates are committed to, and invested in, the development and implementation of the Continuous Assessment System (EPSB CAS Guide indicator 1.1). Operationally, the plan is characterized by data feedback loops that ensure its ongoing evolution.

Candidate Assessments

The assessment of initial and advanced candidates is linked to the Unit's Conceptual Framework and state performance standards as articulated in the Kentucky Teacher Standards: IECE, KY Guidance Counselor Program Standards, KY Technology Standards for School Administrators, and Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards documents. Candidate assessments are comprehensive and integrated throughout the Teacher Education Program (EPSB generated Continuous Assessment System [CAS], guide indicator 1.3). Multiple assessments collected and used to determine candidate proficiency in relation to knowledge, skills, and disposition performance scores are used to base decisions about the candidate (EPSB CAS Guide indicators 1.4 and 1.6). Program specific assessments, referred to at MSU as "Critical Performances" represent the pedagogical and content knowledge, skills, and dispositions valued within each individual educator preparation program. Additionally, the Initial

and Advance Programs' Transition Points/Gates Documents explicitly articulate the required initial and advanced candidate Benchmark assessments that are common to all candidates at those levels (see Appendix A).

Program Assessments

Program evaluation is based on successful completion of the Educational Professional Standards Board (EPSB) and National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) mandated Program Review process (EPSB CAS Guide indicator 1.2). Program review is the evaluation of individual content, degree program, or certification area programs and occurs in several ways: 1) External: Every seven years, each educator preparation program undergoes a mandatory Program Review process by the EPSB and NCATE, and 2) Internal: Between 1998 and 2004, each degree-program was required to complete the Annual Assessment Report (Nichols Five Column Model) and Plan; between 2004 and 2007, each degree program completed the MSU Program Review, and during 2007-08, each degree program completed the MSU Curriculum Audit (institutionally required program reviews). Beginning 2008-09 the university moved to a comprehensive Academic Program Assessment Plan process which includes yearly assessment plan building, identification of student learning outcomes, measures, targets, findings, analyses, and yearly reporting through Weave software to measure progress and ensure continued adherence to university, state, and SACS' (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools) expectations. Additionally, Faculty180 software is used by the university community to document faculty qualifications, workload records, productivity in research and service activities, and to archive course syllabi. Each of the current assessment reviews used by the Unit has a different focus and serves a different evaluation function. Educator preparation program reviews require accountability for such things as an introduction to and integration of the Unit's **Conceptual Framework** to each educator preparation program as well as accountability for state standards, initiatives, national learned society standards, NCATE themes, candidate and program assessments. The Annual Assessment Report requires the use of candidate performance data to evaluate program quality and drives program change to ensure quality preparation experiences for all education program candidates.

All faculty members are evaluated annually, as required by the university, according to the process and framework set forth in the College of Education's Faculty Evaluation Plan

(approved January 2003). This plan is in compliance with the policies that govern faculty evaluation, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. The annual review serves two functions: 1) to inform faculty about professional strengths and weakness and the need to pursue faculty development activities, and 2) to determine merit pay shares, as the university budgets allow.

Evaluation of the progress of College of Education is ongoing and reflected in the annual review of the goals and objectives set forth, as a result of a self-study completed in 1999, to accomplish teacher education reform. These goals and objectives were identified in the **Transition Team Plan** (2000-2004). The Executive Committee for the Transformation of Teacher Education was responsible for overseeing the implementation of the objectives and conducting an annual review of the progress that had been made. When appropriate, this group made revisions, additions or deletions to the existing objectives. A new dean for the College of Education was hired in 2005 and at that time, the work of the Transition Team was reviewed by the Executive Committee and it was determined that the tasks of that committee had been successfully completed and the committee was disbanded. The Teacher Education Council and the dean of the College of Education have since overseen evaluation of progress for the Unit and Educator Preparation Program goals and objectives.

Generalized Timeline of Continuous Assessment System (CAS)

Pre-Phase I (the CAP document)

The former Continuous Assessment Plan (CAP) was drafted by the Educational Assessment Committee (October-November 2002) and moved through several stages of review: 1) It was first reviewed by the Executive Committee for the Transformation of Teacher Education with concerns generated by this group addressed by the Educational Assessment Committee. 2) The CAP was presented to members of the Teacher Education Council (TEC) with faculty, candidates, professional community representatives with recommendations for approval. 3) Next, the Continuous Assessment System was presented to the P-16 council (superintendents, principals and business leaders from the region) for input and simultaneously was posted on the COE website for faculty review and input. A final version was completed in May 2003

Phase I (early implementation)

The collection and analyses of numerous data points have been in place for many years (e.g., ACT scores of applicants, GPA of candidates, program assessment plans and reports). These data are maintained in the university-wide database maintained by Information Technology. Several new or revised data collection instruments were developed and piloted during this phase. These tools allowed for the tracking of important variables related to both candidate performance (e.g., disposition rubric) and program quality (e.g., alumni survey). In addition, the Professional Education Unit created a database within its Educational Service Unit that enabled more timely collection, analysis, and distribution of candidate performance data. The assessment system as a whole was created to allow for merging of existing data that is stored at the university level and the database in the College of Education. Timeline was May 2003-August 2006. At this time, the “Plan” was more formally designed as a “System,” leading to the Continuous Assessment System (CAS).

Phase II (implementation cycle)

The Unit’s Continuous Assessment System calls for cyclical evaluation (semester by semester, annually, or every five years). Oversight of the plan was the responsibility of the Educational Assessment Committee, which included an assessment coordinator, a candidate, and faculty from each degree program. In May 2007 it was determined that the assessment oversight should be held in the Teacher Education Council and a standing assessment committee, called the Assessment Management Committee, was added to the TEC bylaws. The implementation of the system is carried out within the Education Service Unit and the Dean’s Office, where staff are responsible for data entry, and the assessment coordinator is responsible for data analyses and data distribution. In an effort to centralize multiple data sources and to enhance data-driven decision making at the candidate and program levels, the Unit installed Tk20’s *CampusWide Tools Assessment, Accountability, and Reporting System*, that enables the Unit to collect data systematically, plan our assessments, compare them against specified outcomes/objectives, and generate detailed reports for compliance, analysis, and program improvement. As the assessment system was enhanced with the purchase of an online assessment software program,

implementation of the system became increasingly automated and the Unit has been moving gradually to enable faculty to take on responsibility for data entry for their own courses and candidates, and reporting is formatted so that it is available for just-in-time review and analysis. Thus, the changing role of the assessment coordinator has evolved to provide leadership in data analyses and to support reporting for programs, departments, the Dean's Office, the college's Leadership Team, and the Teacher Education Council. The following chart details the Unit's CAS reporting schedule. Timeline is August 2006-present.

MSU Continuous Assessment System - Reporting Schedule

WHICH REPORT	FREQUENCY	SUBMITTED TO	DATE	ACTIONS TAKEN	SUBMITTED TO
Critical Performances By course By program By dept. Overall Unit	One time per semester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructor • Assessment Coordinator • Chair 	December, May	Review; revision of critical performance components, implementation or processes, as needed	Dean Leadership Team
Disposition Report (Problems only) By student By dept Overall Unit	Two times per semester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student's advisor • Chair 	October, December, March, May	Review; Revision of processes, implementation, as needed	Dean Leadership Team
Field Experience Report By course By program By dept Overall Unit	One time per semester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructor • FE Office • Assessment Coordinator • Chair 	December, May	Review; Revision of processes, implementation, course assignments, as needed	Dean Leadership Team
Survey Results	Upon request	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Coordinators • Chair 	Ongoing	Review feedback; revise courses, programs, processes, as needed	Dean Leadership Team Advisory Groups
TEP Application By program By dept Overall Unit	One time per semester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment Coordinator • Chair 	October, April	Review for trends, processes, etc. Revise as needed	Dean TEC
PRAXIS II	After each test report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairs • Program faculty • Assessment Coordinator 	Ongoing	Review for trends, correlations; revise programs as needed; review and revise support mechanisms for students, as needed	Dean TEC Provost Deans Council
Teacher Performance Assessments	One time per year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairs • Program Faculty • Assessment Coordinator 	September	Review for trends, information on impact of student learning	Dean TEC
Clinical Practice Eligibility	One time per year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairs • Program Faculty • Assessment Coordinator 	August	Review for trends, correlations; revise programs as needed; review and revise support mechanisms for students, as needed	Dean TEC
Completion of Clinical Practice	One time per year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairs • Program Faculty • Assessment 	August	Review for trends, correlations; revise programs as needed; review and revise support	Dean TEC

		Coordinator		mechanisms for students, as needed	
Program Completion	One time per year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairs • Program Faculty • Assessment Coordinator 	August	Review for trends, correlations; revise programs as needed; review and revise support mechanisms for students, as needed	Dean TEC
		•			

APPENDIX A
INITIAL PROGRAMS: CANDIDATE TRANSITION POINTS/GATES

TRANSITION POINT	ASSESSMENT DATA	Decision Maker(s)	OUTCOME
1) Admission to TEP	Successful completion/fulfillment of Key Assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required ACT, PPST, or GRE Score(s), Praxis content • Philosophy of Education (EDF 207 Critical Performance) • Overall GPA (2.5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education Services Unit • Department/Program Faculty Interview Committee • Teacher Education Council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student meets minimum qualifications and requirements for TEP admission • Department/Program Committee recommends candidates for admission to Program. • Director of Educational Service Unit compiles lists from each program and presents whole list to Teacher Education Council • Teacher Education Council approves or does not approve recommendation made and candidates informed in writing of admission recommendation
2) Admission to Clinical Practice	Fulfillment of the following Key Assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of required PRAXIS Exam(s) • Demonstration of professional dispositions • Completion and success on Critical performances, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field Experiences Coordinator reviews information and Director of Educational Services Unit approves eligibility • Faculty member teaching course(s) with required critical performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eligible or not eligible to enroll in student teaching in Public schools • Informed in writing ESU Director. • When ineligible, deficiencies described in letter
3) Clinical Practice Evaluation	Fulfillment of the following Key Assessments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSU Supervisor • Cooperating Teacher • TPA Evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful completion of Student Teaching and Capstone

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KTIP Feedback • Success on Exit Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) 	Committee	
4) Program Completion	Fulfillment of the following Key Assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulfilled all program requirements (transcript) • Fulfilled all certification eligibility requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office of the Registrar • Certification Officer (ESU) tracks • EPSB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eligible for graduation, diploma (student informed in writing if ineligible for graduation) • Notified, in writing, (at last meeting of 499c classes) of any deficiencies that need to be handled to be recommended for certification • Letter of eligibility stating certification area(s)

ADVANCED PROGRAMS - CANDIDATE TRANSITION POINTS/GATES

TRANSITION POINT	ASSESSMENT DATA	Decision Maker(s)	OUTCOME
1) Admission to program	Fulfillment of the following Key Assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GRE/MAT Score • Undergraduate GPA • BA degree 	Department Chair or Department Designated faculty Program Coordinator	Informed in writing about admission status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unconditional Admission • Denied Admission
2) Eligibility for Practicum/mid-program	Fulfillment of the following Key Assessment(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPA 3.0 	Advisor	Continuation in program
3) Program Completion	Fulfillment of the following Key Assessment(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful completion of 	Department Chair Graduate Committee	Candidates informed in writing of exit exam results. Committee members

	<p>required exit exam(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPA 3.0 • Successful completion of all required course work 	<p>(program specific</p> <p>Coordinator of Graduate Programs</p>	<p>sign the “<i>Program Completion Form</i>”, filed upon successful completion of required Exit Exam(s)</p> <p>Eligibility for graduation</p>
--	---	--	--