

## Unit Assessment Framework

<i>Assessment Point</i>	<i>Evaluated by</i>	<i>Standards Focus</i>	<i>Instrument/ Performance Expectation</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Changes</i>
<b>Field Experience Debriefing at Methods Level</b>	Area Program Directors	Praxis/ Pathwise Domains and Criteria, Ohio P-12 standards, NCATE Standards, Program Standards	Survey— This is anecdotal and may give direction for program improvements, as well as help faculty assist candidates in reaching expected levels of functioning in student teaching.	Issues raised in the debriefing will be addressed through decisions made in a COE meeting.	The general process for changes resulting from unit assessment is that the Program Directors review their data and bring issues of concern to a Program Director's meeting. Issues are taken to a COE meeting for discussion and solutions. Also, issues may be taken to the Education Advisory Council and/or to focus groups. The COE votes on changes. Then, undergraduate curriculum changes must be approved by
<b>Exit Surveys of Student Teachers</b>	Area Program Directors, Dean	Praxis/ Pathwise Domains and Criteria, Ohio P-12 standards, NCATE Standards, Program Standards	Survey— This is reported on a Likert scale with room for comments. There is the expectation that a high percentage of candidates will respond in the highest categories on the scale and that this will demonstrate an upward trend over time as the college responds to suggestions with program changes.	Issues raised in the exit survey will be addressed through decisions made in a COE meeting.	
<b>Exit Surveys of Cooperating Teachers</b>	Area Program Directors, Dean	Praxis/ Pathwise Domains and Criteria, Ohio P-12 standards, NCATE Standards, Program Standards	Survey— This is reported on a Likert scale with room for comments. There is the expectation that a high percentage of candidates will respond in the highest categories on the scale and that this will demonstrate an	Issues raised in the exit survey will be addressed through decisions made in a COE meeting.	

<i>Assessment Point</i>	<i>Evaluated by</i>	<i>Standards Focus</i>	<i>Instrument/ Performance Expectation</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Changes</i>
			upward trend over time as the college responds to suggestions with program changes.		Faculty Senate. Graduate curriculum changes must be approved by the Curriculum Committee of Graduate Council and then by Graduate Council.
<b>Portfolio Reviews</b>	Area Program Directors	These portfolios will include documentation of impact on student learning, lesson planning and reflection, dispositions, accommodation for diversity and developmental or learning styles difference, and ability to address the Praxis/ Pathwise Domains and Criteria and the Ohio P-12 standards.	Electronic Portfolio in LiveText—This is developmental and begins with the Introduction to the Profession course in both the undergraduate (EDUC 161) and post-baccalaureate (EDUC 503) programs and is completed during student teaching. The expectation is that these reviews will show areas where there need to be program improvements.	Issues raised in the portfolio reviews will be addressed in Program Director and COE meetings to improve programs.	Program Directors report changes to the University Assessment Committee annually.  Changes are recorded in COE meeting minutes.
<b>Program/Content Portfolio Reviews</b>	Area Program Directors, Content Area Directors	Program Standards	Paper or Electronic Portfolio in LiveText—This is developmental and is revisited throughout the program, but finally assessed at student teaching level. The expectation is	Issues raised in the program/content portfolios will be addressed with the Area Program Directors and Content Area Directors and	

<i>Assessment Point</i>	<i>Evaluated by</i>	<i>Standards Focus</i>	<i>Instrument/ Performance Expectation</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Changes</i>
			that these reviews will show that candidates can address the SPA standards in their area of licensure and will reveal areas where there need to be program improvements.	addressed through decisions made in a COE meeting.	
<b>Reading Core Portfolio</b>	Reading Director, Area Program Directors	Reading Standards	Paper or Electronic Portfolio in LiveText—This is developmental and is revisited throughout the program, but finally assessed at student teaching level. AYA and Multi-Age programs have only one reading class, so the expectation is different for those programs. The expectation is that these reviews will show that candidates can address the SPA standards in their area of licensure and will reveal areas where there need to be program improvements.	Issues raised in the reading portfolios will be addressed through decisions made in a COE meeting.	Changes are reported to the University Assessment Committee and in COE meeting minutes.
<b>Praxis II Score Reviews</b>	Area Program Directors, Title II Coordinator, Praxis Coordinator,	Candidate PLT and Content Test results, Program Standards	Praxis test data—It is expected that each program area will monitor scores and make program changes to address problem areas.	Issues raised in the review of Praxis II scores will be addressed through decisions made in a COE meeting.	Changes are reported in COE meeting minutes.

<i>Assessment Point</i>	<i>Evaluated by</i>	<i>Standards Focus</i>	<i>Instrument/ Performance Expectation</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Changes</i>
	Dean				
<b>Program Approval</b>	Area Program Directors prepare documentation and review results. The Ohio Department of Education and/or NCATE determine whether the programs are approved.	Standards of the NCATE-approved Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) are the basis for program reviews.	State-approved program approval process— Currently, we are participating in pilots for a new NCATE program approval process. Programs must pass the approval process. If a program does not pass the first time, rejoinders are sent until the program does pass.	Programs that pass the approval process continue to be offered.  Programs that do not pass, even after rejoinders, are dropped.	Changes that may result from unit assessments are initiated in a number of ways (focus groups, Education Advisory Council, Program Directors meetings, Program Faculty meetings) and are approved through the COE, and then through either Graduate Council or Faculty Senate. Program changes are reported to the Education Advisory Council. They also appear in meeting minutes and in reports to the University Assessment Committee.
<b>Ohio P-12 Standards Alignment</b>	Area Program Directors prepare documentation and review results. The Ohio Department of Education determines whether the alignments are approved.	Ohio P-12 Academic Content Standards	Ohio Department of Education Standards Alignment Matrix.	Alignments that pass the approval process continue to be offered.  Alignments that do not pass the approval process, must be resubmitted.	
<b>Praxis III pass rates</b>	Outside evaluators	Praxis/ Pathwise Domains and	Praxis III assessment— It is expected that 100% of	Input from Praxis III is used to determine	

<i>Assessment Point</i>	<i>Evaluated by</i>	<i>Standards Focus</i>	<i>Instrument/ Performance Expectation</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Changes</i>
	who are trained in Praxis III	Criteria	candidates will pass and that the group averages for each criteria will be above the state averages.	program changes.	
<b>Employer Survey (initial and advanced)</b>	Dean, Administrative Assistant for Data and Reporting	Praxis/ Pathwise Domains and Criteria, Program Standards	Survey sent out every five years to prevent redundancy— It is expected that employers will be generally satisfied with UF program completers.	Suggestions of employers will be considered by the COE in determining program changes.	
<b>Education Advisory Council</b>	Dean, Area Program Directors, COE faculty, supervisors, school partners, and other stakeholders	Praxis/ Pathwise Domains and Criteria, NCATE Standards, Program Standards	This feedback is on a wide variety of issues related to the administration of the college and its programs. The expectation is that this feedback will be implemented when appropriate.	Suggestions of Education Advisory Council will be considered by the COE in determining program changes.	
<b>University-Level Director's Program Assessment Plan Reports</b>	Area Program Directors	Program Standards, COE Candidate Assessment Plan	This follows a format determined by the University Assessment Committee and is reported on an annual basis. The expectation is that program directors will describe in this report any changes they have made in their programs due to any assessments in	These reports allow Program Directors to summarize for the university archives any changes they have made to their programs in the previous year.	

<i>Assessment Point</i>	<i>Evaluated by</i>	<i>Standards Focus</i>	<i>Instrument/ Performance Expectation</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Changes</i>
			the unit plan.		
<b>Regional Accreditation/ Higher Learning Commission</b>	University Assessment Committee, and Higher Learning Commission Steering Committee, with input from faculty	Higher Learning Commission Standards	The Higher Learning Commission determines the format. The expectation is that there will be as few weaknesses as possible and that all weaknesses will be corrected.	Weaknesses that emerge from the self-study are addressed as indicated.	
<b>Candidate Complaints</b>	Program Directors, Dean, faculty	Any complaints will be evaluated against the standards of the candidate's area of licensure.	Complaints are handled on a case-by-case basis. The expectation is that the candidate's needs will be met within the expectations of the licensure program. Candidates are given the right to due process.	Weaknesses that emerge from candidate complaints are addressed at the appropriate level.	