

Standard 2: Program Assessment and Unit Capacity

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

Illinois State University's Office of Advancement Services and the Office of Alumni Services have long collaborated together as well as with colleges, departments, and programs to maintain contact with graduates. As of August 2003, these offices have informed the university that there are a total of 150,595 living alumni; of that total, the whereabouts and current status of 49,742 are "unknown." We do know, however, that of the known living alumni, 35,714 (23.72% of the total, 35.41% of the known) are in education. Those numbers are relatively similar to the current undergraduate student population, in that approximately 27% of enrollees at the university are in professional education. Further, of the known graduates from the College of Education (19,395), 78% are in education. This represents an impressive "retention" rate in the profession. (See exhibits.)

Element 1: Assessment System

Using standards to inform curriculum and instruction and using performance-based assessment to evaluate how well standards had been attained began in earnest at Illinois State University in 1996 when the university was selected as one of nine institutions in Illinois to pilot INTASC implementation in selected programs through a grant to the state from the MacArthur Foundation. Illinois State chose its largest secondary program (History Education) and Elementary Education for the pilot project. Participants in the pilot then facilitated the work of all other programs in implementing INTASC Principles throughout the unit.

In Fall 1998, Council for Teacher Education (CTE) approved a proposal to establish a Task Force on Performance-Based Assessment (CTE Policy #98:05). At the same time, CTE approved a five-year plan, 1998-2003; Item 5 on the plan requires that CTE would "establish a performance-based assessment system for all teacher education students by 2002." (CTE Policy #98:06) In addition, CTE approved a schedule of program implementation of INTASC Principles for all programs leading to initial certification.

The Phase I Task Force was charged to "develop a professional, sound system for assessing the performance of teacher and administrator candidates at Illinois State University. Phase I (a study phase) should be completed no later than July 1, 2000, and Phase II (the design phase) completed no later than December 2000. The co-chairs will report to the CTE on the progress of the task force at least twice a semester. The system should be fully in operation by July 1, 2002 and should be designed using the best knowledge available on performance-based assessment and **should reflect the moral and intellectual virtues associated with Illinois State's teacher education programs.**" To that end, the system that exists today reflects the conceptual framework throughout.

On June 29, 1999, the chair of CTE invited twenty-one members to join the Phase I Task Force on PBA: three outstanding classroom teachers (one was Illinois Teacher of the Year, and all three are NBCT/NBPTS); three faculty from CAS; one from COB; two from CAST, two from CFA, and seven from COE (representing both undergraduate and graduate programs). The Co-Chairs of the Phase I Task Force were Associate Deans from the College of Education and from the College of Arts and Sciences. An additional member representing the Office of the Provost also joined.

The Co-Chairs of Phase I submitted a Year-End Report on the work of the committee on July 3, 2000. The report included the committee's vision of Phase II: (1) to review the standards (e.g., IPTS, INTASC, NCATE, Content) to determine what outcomes to assess; (2) to define gateways (such as admission to teacher education, graduation) to specify when to assess; (3) to decide upon methods of or tools for assessment; and (4) to identify structures, oversight, governance, and coordination to manage the university-wide system.

A subset of Phase I participants plus a representative from Clinical Experiences and Certification Process prepared a draft document for review in Fall 2000. The Phase II PBA Task Force (essentially Phase I participants who wished to continue plus added participants) reviewed the document and oversaw its wide dissemination in four campus-wide PBA Presentations (9/15/00; 10/16/00; 10/19/00; and 10/27/00. (See Exhibits.)

The result of this process was a "Policy on Implementation of PBA of Teacher Candidates at Illinois State University" approved by CTE on April 3, 2001. The details of that policy are significant, in that they guided the development, implementation, and constant evaluation of the current system:

- Connects with the University's conceptual framework, Realizing the Democratic Ideal, state of Illinois, and national standards for beginning teachers and assures that all teacher candidates met these standards prior to being recommended for state certification
- Uses assessments that are valid, reliable, fair, and economic to administer
- Encourages individual programs to supplement or enhance common assessments across all teacher education programs
- Specifies four critical points for performance-based assessment as 1) admission to Illinois State; 2) admission to professional studies in education (PSE); 3) readiness for student teaching; and 4) exit performance from student teaching
- Culminates with the University's overall assessment of the candidate's readiness to be recommended for endorsement for certification as a beginning teacher.
- Maintains the right of the student to appeal decisions made as a result of the system.
- Further, the Council for Teacher Education retains the oversight and responsibility for periodic revision of the system and assigns the management of the system and the training in the use of the system by teacher education programs

coordinators to the Office of Clinical Experiences and Certification Processes (CECP). (CTE Policy #01:09)

Work groups from the Teacher Education Community were then established to identify specific and appropriate assessments according to the critical points identified in the policy and to recommend their use to CTE for its approval in building the system. The entire professional community was invited to join one of five work groups, chaired by a CTE representative:

1. Admission to Illinois State University (Mark Temple/CAST)
2. Admission to Professional Studies in Education (Jonathan Rosenthal/CAS)
3. Assessment of Readiness for Student Teaching (Sandra Zielinski/CFA)
4. Assessment of Readiness to Exit Student Teaching (Roger Day/CAS)
5. Design of Program Evaluation Assessment System (Deborah Curtis/CECP)

The chairs of each of these work groups, facilitated by the NCATE Coordinator, became the PBA Steering Committee. The groups worked throughout Summer 2001 and presented their final reports to Council for Teacher Education in December 2001 and to the entire professional community on January 18, 2002, at the CTE Spring Colloquium. The decision making/policy-setting process then began and continues as an on-going refinement of the unit-wide system. (See exhibits for CTE Action Items re: PBA.) (See PBA brochure for details.) See also website:

<http://www.coe.ilstu.edu/cecp/PBA/PBA%20Student%20Requirements%20Checklist.doc>

Candidates are assessed with multiple measures and at transition points within each program to assure proficiency before moving to the next level in the program. Multiple and varied assessments are used by each program and by the unit to monitor candidate performance and to determine that candidates have developed the knowledge, skills and disposition required by the profession, the state, and the institution for initial certification.

Table 16: Candidate Assessment: Comprehensive

	Professional Standards		Content Standards		Institutional Standards
	INTASC Principles	ISBE/IPTS Standards for all Teachers	SPA standards	ISBE Content Standards	Conceptual Framework Moral/Intellectual Virtues
knowledge	Program Unit PBA	Program Unit PBA ISBE/APT	Program	Program ISBE Content Test	Program Unit PBA
skills	Program Unit PBA	Program Unit PBA ISBE/APT	Program	Program ISBE Content Test	Program Unit PBA
dispositions	Program Unit PBA	Program Unit PBA ISBE/APT	Program	Program	Program Unit PBA

Syllabi specify how standards are met in a given required course; in general, syllabi address the institutional conceptual framework, INTASC Principles and/or IPTS standards, and SPA standards and/or Illinois content standards. All initial programs at the bachelors level use the electronic portfolio and the STT Evaluation form.

The unit's advanced programs are unique, in that each advanced certificate is focused on either administration (Principal, Superintendent, Chief School Business Official), support service (School Psychologist, Speech Pathologist), or advanced knowledge in teaching a discipline (Reading). The uniqueness of each program demands unique assessment pertinent to the role for which a candidate is preparing. For additional information about the assessment system for each advanced program, see the program reviews in the exhibits, as noted by page numbers cited.

For the principal and the superintendent, the Department of Educational Administration and Foundations has developed an assessment system for the collection, compilation, and analysis of results to demonstrate candidate progress toward mastery of the ELCC/NCATE standards. This assessment system utilizes both qualitative and quantitative data. Components of the system are 1) Required Performance Assessment Activities (Developmental); 2) Self Assessment Inventories from the WebCT Certification Portfolio Sites; 3) State Certification Content Tests; 4) Professional Portfolios completed in the EAF 498/598 Professional Practice Internships; and 5) EAF 498/598 field mentors' evaluation of candidates' strengths and weaknesses relative to the standards/elements. (See pages 9-13 of Principal/Superintendent Program Review prepared for ELCC; see also related appendices as noted in narrative of program review; see Appendix 118.6 for test results over the past five years. These programs are nationally recognized by ELCC.)

For the chief school business official, the Department of Educational Administration and Foundations has developed an assessment system for entry into the program and during the program. For entry, CSBO candidates must meet graduate college admission criteria. In addition, admission to the CSBO program requires a minimum of two years experience as a practicing administrator who must have had a master's degree with a Type 75 endorsement. Candidates must also complete a pre-self-assessment form that inventories the professional experiences they acquired while serving as an administrator; items on the inventory tie the items directly to CSBO standards and elements. Components of the assessment during the program are: required experiences based on the entry-pre-self-assessment; program and self-assessment inventories from the WebCT CSBO Assessment; and State Certification Content Tests at the end of the program. (See pages 13-22 of CSBO Program Review prepared for ISBE. This program is provisionally approved by ISBE.)

For the school psychologist, the Department of Psychology has established a performance-based assessment evaluation plan to monitor student progress in reaching program objectives and competencies (See Appendix N in School Psychology Program Review prepared for NASP.) The program is three years: in the first year, candidates prepare a "Case Study in Psychoeducational Assessment and Intervention" and a "Case

Study in Psychosocial Assessment and Intervention.” They participate in a collaborative consultation supervised by an advanced doctoral student and receive mid-and end-of-year assessments of progress from field supervisors and university supervisors, must maintain a minimal GPA, and complete a portfolio as part of PSY 472. In the second year, candidates conduct practicum case studies, and receive assessments of progress comparable to those in the first year; they also complete portfolio assessment as part of PSY 436.01. The third year constitutes a full-year internship that is evaluated throughout the experience based on each candidate’s internship plan. Candidates must pass the ISBE content test in school psychology and complete a portfolio assessment. This program is nationally recognized by NASP and accredited by APA.

For the speech pathologist, the Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology conducts both formative and summative assessments of candidates (See pp. 19-21 of the Speech-Language Pathology Review prepared for ISBE; see also Appendices A and B). This is an initial certificate offered in a master’s degree program. For admission to the program, candidates will have completed a bachelor’s degree in communication disorders or at least 25 hours of coursework in communication disorders, and once admitted, the remainder of undergraduate coursework deficiencies. To progress through the program, candidates must maintain at least a 3.0 GPA (on a 4.0 scale) and demonstrate ongoing development of clinical skills in clinical practicum courses that are supervised and evaluated. Candidates must complete at least 100 clinical hours on campus before they are eligible for external placements; when eligible, students are assigned to 10-week, full-time placements by the clinical coordinator. There are three formal methods by which student outcomes are assessed: candidates must elect to complete an independent study, a thesis, or a written comprehensive examination; candidates must take and pass the state Subject Matter Knowledge Test in Speech and Language Impaired; finally, as an ASHA accredited program, all candidates are encouraged to complete the National Examination in Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology. (See p. 21 of Speech Pathology program review for results.)

For reading specialization, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction Reading Masters Program has identified the following transition points in its performance-based assessment system: entry into the Reading Masters program, criteria for which are consistent with entry into the graduate school; in addition, candidates must purchase electronic portfolio software to track each their own performance assessments. Level 2 is the pre-practicum in which candidates must complete five major performance-based assessments in C&I 461, 462, and 463. Level 3 is the practicum level in which candidates complete one major performance-based assessment, direction for which is provided in C&I 467. Level 3 also includes specialization courses that include six performance-based assessments on which acceptable or exemplary levels must be demonstrated prior to proceeding to Level 4, the professional research component. At this level candidates complete six performance-based assessments, the major components of C&I 468 and 469, plus a comprehensive examination. Level 5 is that of the first year graduate who receives a survey to help assess the effectiveness of the Reading Masters program (see pp. 10-21 in the Reading Education Rejoinder prepared for IRA).

The University Teacher Education (UTE) Assessment Committee analyzes a variety of assessments and evaluations and reports to Council for Teacher Education, the governance body which manages and improves the operations of the unit. For example, CTE has analyzed alumni surveys consistently since 1998; beginning in 2003, CTE called additionally for results of formally conducted employer surveys. The University Assessment Office had agreed to conduct surveys on behalf of the professional education unit, but budget cuts across campus necessitated the Unit conducting its own surveys until further notice.

In addition, the UTE Assessment Committee also has access to SPA and ISBE program review information as well as Title II Data on candidate performance on Basic Skills and Content Area tests; beginning in October 2003, the state will require that candidates pass the Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) prior to certification. The UTE analyzes both internal and external data, with questions such as:

- Do candidate average scores on standards point to strong and weak courses or activities that contribute to achievement of specific standards?
- Are scores for a cohort of candidates consistently lower for some standards indicating that the contributing courses/activities need to be modified?
- Are some standards met consistently with high scores?
- Are there some standards for which achievement occurs primarily in student teaching/clinical practice? Is this appropriate or an indication that program changes might be needed?
- Do some standards consistently need additional attention for candidates near the end of the program? Is this appropriate or a problem?
- Do men and women and various racial/ethnic groups perform differently or the same on the standards? (from Ingersoll and Scannell, *Performance-Based Teacher Certification: Creating a Comprehensive Unit Assessment System*, 2002)

Further, the Illinois Board of Higher Education has mandated that by 2004 each academic program must be able to demonstrate a system for assessing student learning outcomes, and more importantly, how these results are used to improve programs. *Educating Illinois*, Recommendation #16 is consistent with that mandate: “Solicit input from our students about their educational experience at Illinois State; use the data to provide even more effective support to help students succeed.” To that end, the Provost’s Office asked that by June 1, 2001, all departments conduct a review of each program and its student learning objectives. The University Assessment Office (UAO) posted these program objectives on its website (www.assessment.ilstu.edu). By June 1, 2002, each program was to describe in one page or less the assessment system in place at the time. By June 1, 2003, each program should have demonstrated how their assessment system has led to program improvement. This university-wide effort reinforces and strengthens the unit efforts in using assessments and evaluations to improve programs. (See Exhibits.)

In addition, the Illinois Board of Higher Education conducts program reviews on an eight-year cycle; the IBHE accepts NCATE/ISBE program reviews for those programs which are certification granting only. In other words, if students might complete a particular program that does not culminate in a recommendation for certification, that program must submit an IBHE program review.

Programs also use multiple and varied assessments throughout the preparation of a candidate. Sources of evidence include actual classroom performance – for example, microteaching, early field experiences, and clinical practice/student teaching – either live observation or videotape. Other sources of evidence are artifacts from lessons planned and/or taught – for example, lesson/unit planning, original handouts, PowerPoint/transparency/slides for illustrations, and assessment/evaluation documents. On-Demand Tasks constitute another kind of performance assessment; many programs, particularly those at the advanced level, utilize simulations, case studies, and problems-based scenarios for candidate response.

Traditional measures such as paper and pen/pencil (or computer-based) tests of knowledge are another source of evaluation. In addition, university coursework is often assessed with tests throughout the semester and with an end-of-term examination. Program faculty also rely on interviews with candidates, sessions with advisors for admission and continuation in a program, debriefings after an individual assignment has been assessed, conferences on a regular basis with students, interviews of candidates in student teaching; some programs (in particular, History Education) have modeled a formal interview session, using P-12 teachers as part of the official interview process for exit from clinical practice/student teaching.

Programs also rely on testimonials from cooperating teachers and university supervisors for candidates in early field experience and in student teaching. These individuals can attest readily to a candidate's knowledge, skills and dispositions in the classroom with students.

Evidence of student learning, such as student artifacts, writing samples, even achievement data, are another form of candidate assessment. Such data are more meaningful, however, the longer the candidate is in an experience – for example, candidates who participate in a year-long Professional Development School setting are more likely to have gathered meaningful evidence of student learning than are those in a 12 week placement.

Finally, candidates also reflect on experiences; in many programs, candidates keep a journal, in some they respond to attitude scales and inventories; all candidates write their initial dispositions essay and later revise the same essay, based on reflections about experiences throughout their program.

The unit judges the quality and credibility of assessments in multiple and varied ways, as appropriate to each assessment. The state, working with National Evaluation Systems, prepares tests for teacher certification: Basic Skills, Content Area, and Assessment of

Professional Teaching. The process used by ISBE in validating all required tests is similar to that described below in a memo to the board regarding the Enhanced Basic Skills Test:

Test items assessing each standard are being developed and will be reviewed by the Basic Skills Content Advisory Committee and the Bias Review Committee in July 2000. The new standards and test item formats will be available for State Teacher Certification Board Review at its August retreat and the State Board at its August meeting. Beginning with the October 2000 test administration, the new test items will be field tested to gather data on their psychometric performance. A content validation survey of the standards will be conducted in fall 2000. The new test is on schedule to be ready for the October 2001 test administration.
<http://www.isbe.net/board/meetings/junemeeting/62000plsassess.isbe>

The University has determined that a grade of C or better in both English 101 and Communication 110, along with a minimal GPA of at least 2.0, assures that a student is capable of university level study. Further, the University has determined that passing the University Writing Exam assures that a student is able to express ideas coherently in an understandable written style.

The unit is in the process of gathering data on all “new” assessments in the performance-based assessment system to determine whether each meets the purpose for which it was designed and to determine whether all assessors have a common understanding of the elements for assessment (as in the Student Teaching Evaluation form). Ensuring inter-rater reliability as well as validity of assessments is a priority for the University Teacher Education assessment committee as well as for Council for Teacher Education.

Element 2: Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

The unit regularly and systematically collects the following information on an annual basis (or more frequently, if available):

1. Test results for state certification:
 Basic Skills Test Results (for admission to professional studies)
 Content Area Tests Results (for admission to clinical practice/student teaching)
 (Assessment of Professional Teaching beginning October 3, 2003)
2. Alumni Survey Results (reported annually to CTE in September)
3. Program Review Results (reported as received from SPAs and/or ISBE)
4. Trend Data by Program (# of clinical hours, # of student teachers, # of admissions to professional studies) (including candidates in alternate route to certification)
 (See CTE Calendar of Submissions Policy #00:11, revised as appropriate)

Data are collected from both internal and external sources through the unit wide performance based assessment system. The Office of Clinical Experiences and Certification Processes collects data for unit review by Council for Teacher Education; this information is presented systematically according to the CTE Calendar of

Submissions. Each program additionally collects data on its own candidates/from its own candidates to monitor progress from one transition point to the next level.

All candidates in initial programs use an e-portfolio system to store performance assessment information; administrative advanced programs use Web CT for essentially the same purposes. Currently, initial programs use the vendor LiveText, designed by educators for educators. The on-line service offers a collection of standards aligned content creation tools. Authored by college faculty in LiveText, educational templates (outlines) serve as a starting point and guideline for the development of lesson plans, curriculum based projects and portfolios. Content candidates authored in these templates can be added, deleted, or rearranged at anytime and anywhere. Once content has been produced, the candidate can share the material with professors and other teacher candidates. During the Spring 2003 semester, the COE Technology Team, along with instructors and PBA coordinators, presented approximately 40 LiveText workshops for candidates, faculty and staff. The training is generic to enable any attendee to create whatever type of LiveText document needed.

Currently there are 2,800 students and faculty using LiveText. The College of Education provides students and faculty with 80+ training sessions each semester. We began implementing LiveText in the fall of 2002. This phase-in process began with students who were in the earlier stages of the PBA system. Full student implementation will occur by the end of the 2003-2004 school year. The following unit assessments are required to be completed in LiveText: Initial and Final Reflective Essays, Instructional Analysis for Inclusion, Multicultural Assessment, Literacy Assessment, and the Realizing the Democratic Ideal Final Student Teaching Assessment. Beyond this, some programs are requiring other program evidence to be submitted in the electronic portfolio. This evidence will be available in the LiveText electronic exhibit center.

The Office of University Planning and Institutional Research provides aggregated data on program completers, faculty demographics, candidate demographics, program profiles, and other data needs as requested. This office is instrumental in the preparation of the annual AACTE Professional Education Data System (PEDS) report. The Office of Clinical Experiences and Certification Processes uses the University Mainframe to create screens which advisors and others can access for information input as well as analysis.

The state is in the process of developing the Teacher Data Warehouse for all institutions to monitor teacher employment after completing a certification program. That project has just received state funding through an Illinois Board of Higher Education/Higher Education Cooperation Act (IBHE/HECA) grant. The “keyholder” for Illinois State is Bill Cummins, University Data Manager. Datasets for candidates include the following (number of points refers to number of items per heading): individual information (6 points); certificate information (9 points); certificate endorsement information (4 points); institute information (3 points); degree information (6 points); certificate registration information (3 points); region information (2 points); certificate code information (3 points); endorsement code information (2 points); substitute information (5 points); teacher information (9 points); teacher assignment information (11 points); position

information (2 points); subject information (2 points); annual data from institutions (18 points); program data (9 points); Teacher Service Record - TSR (33 points); test pass fail information (5 points); test code table (2 points), FICE code (3 points); and school name table (13 points).

While the Teacher Data Warehouse is under development, the unit through Institutional Research also accesses the TSR - Teacher Service Record database for follow-up documentation. However, full implementation of the Teacher Data Warehouse will greatly facilitate the ability of each teacher preparation unit in the state to conduct follow-up research on program completers.

Table 16 illustrates the Unit Performance Based Assessment System. There are both external and internal assessments of candidates and programs. The system uses multiple and varied means for assessing the work of the unit. The system also includes a feedback loop to ensure that data are not only collected but are used for program improvement.

Element 3: Use of Data for Program Improvement

When Council for Teacher Education began reviewing state certification test results for Title II mandated reports, the council concluded that candidates should have passed basic skills tests for admission to professional studies and have passed content tests prior to clinical practice/student teaching. Until this point, CTE had required that candidates pass the ETS Praxis I: Pre-Professional Skills Test, based on research that indicated this test was more rigorous; however, once the state revised and “enhanced” its own basic skills test, requiring that test presented a benefit to candidates and to programs. The decision to require passing the content test prior to student teaching was not easily determined. Some council members argued that candidates learn so much about the subject when they teach it; other members countered that it would be unconscionable for Illinois State University to send out “student teachers” who did not know the subject they planned to teach. At any rate, analysis of the data led to the Council’s requiring these state-mandated tests prior to state rulings that such tests must be passed prior to program completion. Initial data following implementation of this policy indicate that approximately the same number of candidates pass the content tests taken prior to student teaching as passed when content tests were taken during student teaching. For the few who fail, programs then engage in individualized remediation.

Program reports, in particular those from elementary education and educational leadership, cite numerous instances in which data use initiated changes in programs. The ACEI and ELCC program review process relies more consistently on data than do some other program reviews; for example, the ACEI review process eliminates submission of syllabi entirely. In addition, alumni surveys suggest that the unit and its programs have paid attention. For example, the survey of 1997-1998 graduates shows that 63.1% felt they were well prepared to teach students with disabilities and that 62.8% felt they were well prepared to use computers in their job. The survey of ’99-’00 graduates shows that 68% felt well prepared to teach students with disabilities and 71.6% felt they were well prepared to use computers in their job.

Table 16: Unit PBA System				
External Assessments			Internal Assessments	
Programs	Candidates	Undergraduate/Graduate Benchmarks	Candidates	Programs
North Central Association Accreditation of University (10 year cycle; interim reports)	ACT/SAT scores H.S. transcript/ class rank/ GPA <u>Letters of recommendation</u> Associate Degree or <u>GPA plus HS credentials</u>	Freshman Admission to University Transfer Admission Grad. School Admission	Personal Statement	Campus-wide NCA Self-Study
President – Provost – Deans – Chairs – Program Liaisons - Faculty	Admissions - Departments	Feedback/Renewal	Admissions - Departments	Faculty – Program Liaisons – Chairs – Deans – Provost - President
Illinois Board of Higher Education Accreditation of All Programs (8 year cycle)	Criminal Background TB Test ISBE Basic Skills Test	Admission to Professional Studies in Education Grad. Program Admission	Successful Experience Legal/Ethical ITPS 1-4 English 101/Comm 110 (C or better) Departmental Approval Reflective Essay GPA (2.5 or better) Disposition Assessment	Campus-wide Program Self-Study Course Evaluations each semester Faculty Evaluations annually ASPT process
President – Provost – Deans – Chairs – Program Liaisons - Faculty	CECP – Chairs/Liaisons - UTE reports to CTE	Feedback/Renewal	CECP – Advisors – Program Chairs/Liaisons – UTE Reports to CTE	Faculty – Program Liaisons- Chairs – Deans – Provost - President
National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education – Unit Accreditation (7 year cycle)	Criminal Background TB Test ISBE Content Test	Admission to Student Teaching/Clinical Practice Grad.Internship Admission	Instructional/Inclusion Literacy Assess. GPA (2.5 or better) Disposition Assessment Departmental Approval Multicultural Assess. Univ. Writing Exam ITPS 5-9 100 Pre-STT clinical hrs	Unit-wide Self-Study Course Evaluations each semester Faculty Evaluations annually ASPT process
President – Provost - Unit Head/CTE – NCATE Coordinator – Deans – Chairs – Program Liaisons - Faculty	CECP – Chairs/Liaisons – UTE reports to CTE	Feedback/Renewal	CECP – Program Chairs/Liaisons – UTE reports to CTE	Faculty – Program Liaisons – Chairs – Deans – NCATE Coordinator – Unit Head/CTE – Provost - President
NCATE Specialized Professional Associations – SPA Recognition – National Accrediting Agencies		Exit from Student Teaching/Clinical Practice Grad. Internship Exit	Reflective Essay All Program Assessments STT (C or better) Final STT Evaluation ITPS 10 Completed e-portfolio	Unit Programs with SPAs – Self-Study Course Evaluations each semester Faculty Evaluations annually ASPT process
Unit Head/CTE – NCATE Coordinator – Program Liaisons and Program Chairs - Faculty		Feedback/Renewal	CECP – Program Chairs/Liaisons – UTE reports to CTE	Faculty – Program Liaisons and Program Chairs – NCATE Coordinator – Unit Head/CTE
Illinois State Board of Education – Unit /Program Approval	ISBE APT Test	Recommendation for certification (UG/G)	University Registrar Audit	Unit and Programs – Self-Study
Unit Head/CTE – NCATE Coordinator – Program Liaisons and Program Chairs - Faculty		Feedback/Renewal	Registrar reports to CECP	Faculty-Program Liaisons and program Chairs – NCATE Coordinator – Unit Head/CTE
Program External Advisory Ctes. CTE External Advisory Cte.		Alumni/Employer Follow-up (UG/G)		
		Feedback/Renewal		

Candidates work closely with program advisors to receive both external and internal assessment data and to discuss the ramifications of that data for timely progress through the program.

Teacher candidates receive regular and frequent feedback on assessment data entered in the electronic portfolio system. Faculty and supervisors have access to teacher candidate information in the electronic portfolio when the teacher candidate shares the account access with the instructor. In addition, these support professionals have access to the student database via the university mainframe computer system.

Title II data are published in the Undergraduate Catalog as well as on the teacher education website. Alumni survey data (1996-2001) are published on the teacher education website: www.coe.ilstu.edu/ramesh/Alumni/

The Student Information Access System (SIAS), accessed through the World Wide Web or any computer terminal with access to the University mainframe, allows students to register for classes and provides information on course availability, semester class schedule, Admission to Professional Studies and status, course articulation information, address verification or change, financial aid status, student accounts summary and academic records. Students are able to remain apprised of their progress through the teacher education program by consulting this database on a regular basis.

In Fall 2003 all students gained access to individualized web-based portals that provide even more convenient personalized monitoring of progress by each student. The portal also provides a means of communicating important information to identified groups of students (e.g., special education majors). Illinois State University Students can login to the iCampus Web portal that is a network of personal information and applications for Illinois State University students, faculty and staff. There teacher candidates can find information and tools needed to succeed in college, including: grades, class schedules, textbook listings, financial aid information, Redbird card balances, e-mail, calendars, confirmation of attendance, and more. As this system is developed further, the teacher education unit will be able to push out more information of interest and importance to teacher education majors through this on-line network. All students and faculty have access to the portal at this time. Within the 2003-2004 school year, the “push out” tools should become increasingly available.

At the current time, multiple avenues of delivering information to teacher candidates, faculty and staff are used. The Office of Clinical Experiences & Certification Processes (CECP) regularly sends letters, e-mails, and post cards to teacher candidates to apprise them of the status of their progress through teacher education at Illinois State University. In addition, advisors and coordinators in the teacher education programs communicate directly with the CECP Office through mail, e-mail, and regularly scheduled meetings to keep these support personnel fully informed of all necessary information. When the transition to the iCampus portal is complete, including full “push out” capabilities, the information communication process will be even more timely.

Student Teachers engaging in the clinical practice experience receive formative evaluative feedback during each visit and at mid-term. The summative evaluation for the clinical practice experience is the Realizing the Democratic Ideal Final Student Teaching Assessment. This assessment is completed for every teacher candidate and is being transitioned from paper copy to electronic submission in the electronic portfolio system. By the spring of 2004, all student teacher final assessments will be completed electronically.

Candidates use data to improve performance in multiple and varied ways: for example, test results on required state tests (currently, basic skills and content) suggest to candidates whether they are adequately prepared and what kinds of steps they need to take to pass tests prior to admission to either professional studies or to clinical practice/student teaching. Feedback from teaching and clinical faculty allows candidates to adjust performance according to advice based on faculty experience and expertise. Feedback from student learning is the most valuable data for candidates; this allows them to analyze every aspect of the classroom to determine why some students did better than others and what kinds of changes are necessary to re-teach and/or teach new material.

Resources available to candidates who are not successful on either Basic Skills or Content Tests on their first attempt include: tutoring through the University Center for Learning Assistance, study guides and test frameworks on-line (<http://www.icts.nesinc.com/>); in addition, the Teacher Education Center also distributes printed study guides and each program advisor works with individual candidates to select the most appropriate steps to take to assure future success.

Faculty use data to adjust course delivery and content. Since every section of every course is evaluated every semester, these data prove invaluable as faculty prepare for the next semester and as department chairs make decisions about teaching assignments. Program faculty use data from certification test results, from program review results, from candidate input, and from their own research and that available in the literature to adjust program curriculum, instruction, and evaluation to better serve candidates and the students they will teach.

In conclusion, the unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs. The system is under continuous review by the University Teacher Assessment subcommittee, which in turn, reports to Council for Teacher Education.

Table 18 illustrates a recently devised CECP system for tracking cohorts of candidates to determine how many candidates enter the university as teacher education majors, how many are admitted to professional studies, how many leave either the university or the program before completion, and how long it takes members of each cohort to complete a program. This system allows for not only tracking of numbers but investigation into explanations for why candidates do or do not complete programs and why some candidates complete in a more timely manner than others.

Table 18: Teacher Candidate Cohorts by year of admission to an education major 014= 2001/Fall; 021=2002/Spring; 022= 2002/Summer (there is no "3" semester)									
Cohort	014	021	022	024	031	032	034	041	042
A TEM 014	1,576	1,427	174	1,200	1,097	181			
ATE 014		73	11	119	0	0			
ASTT 014		11	0	193	0	0			
XSTT 014		0	0	11	193	0			
Total									
A TEM 021		380	78	328	293	65			
ATE 021			0	16	26	2			
ASTT 021			0	31	44	0			
XSTT 021			0	0	31	0			
Total									
A TEM 022			23	20	19	9			
ATE 022				1	2	0			
ASTT 022				0	3	0			
XSTT 022				0	0	0			
Total									
A TEM 024				1,392	1,262	135			
APS 024					194	540			
ASTT 024					53	309			
XSTT 024					0	0			
Total									
ASTT = Admission to Student Teaching; XSTT = Exit from Student Teaching; (ATE figures prior to 031 are estimated.)									

