

## **FSEHD UNIT ASSESSMENT REVISION PROCESS**

### INITIAL PROGRAMS

#### **EXIT ASSESSMENTS**

The Director of Assessment and the FSEHD Assessment and Program Improvement Committee began working in Spring 2008 to revise the assessment program for initial programs, beginning with the Exit transition point. In regular Spring 2008 meetings and during a week-long summer retreat, the committee designed a draft Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS) assessment to replace the unit's current Exit Portfolio. The committee drew on the resources of the Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality, as well as TWS resources from various states and institutions of higher education, in the design of the FSEHD's Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS). The TCWS was presented to all faculty during a unit-wide retreat in August 2008. Three faculty members field tested the TCWS with their student teaching candidates in Fall 2008. Faculty and student feedback on the TWS was used to make minor modifications to the TCWS in advance of further field tests by nine additional faculty members in Spring 2009. Pilot feedback was collected on an ongoing basis and at a May 2009 Pilot Debriefing Meeting to which all faculty were invited. Additionally, the TCWS was presented to faculty at an April 2009 faculty retreat. At the retreat, faculty examined the TCWS, discussed it in small groups, and were asked to give written feedback on the instrument. Faculty were again invited to offer feedback/ suggestions for improvement on the TCWS via a May 2009 electronic survey. Pilot faculty also forwarded candidate feedback on the TCWS to the Director of Assessment. In Summer 2009, the Director of Assessment and the Assessment and Program Improvement Committee examined faculty feedback gathered through various means and conducted analyses of pilot TCWS data collected in Fall 2008 and Spring 2009. Based on the above data, the TCWS was revised further for use in Fall 2009. In Fall 2009, the Assessment and Program Committee determined a preliminary cut score for passing candidate performance on the TCWS. By Spring and Fall 2010, the TCWS was in full implementation, with electronic data collected through CheckBox or Chalk & Wire.

In Summer and Fall 2008, the Director of Assessment and the FSEHD Assessment and Program Improvement Committee designed a Teacher Candidate Observation and Progress Report (OPR) to be completed by faculty supervisors and cooperating teachers during candidates' student teaching experience. The purpose of this assessment, which was to be counted among the unit's exit assessments, is to collect ongoing data on candidates' growth in teaching skills and professionalism during the student teaching experience. The Teacher Candidate Observation and Progress Report was piloted by eight faculty members (and respective cooperating teachers) in Spring 2009. Their feedback was collected on an ongoing basis and at a May 2009 Pilot Debriefing Meeting to which all faculty were invited. Additionally, the OPR was presented to faculty at an April 2009 faculty retreat. At the retreat, faculty examined the OPR, discussed it in small groups, and were asked to give written feedback on the instrument. Faculty were again invited to offer feedback/suggestions for improvement on the OPR via a May 2009 electronic survey. In Summer 2009, the Director of Assessment and the Assessment and Program Improvement Committee examined faculty feedback on the OPR gathered through various means and conducted analyses of pilot data collected in Spring 2009. Based on these data, the OPR was revised for use in Fall 2009. Faculty and cooperating teachers were encouraged to use the OPR in Fall 2009, with full scale implementation taking place in Spring 2010.

## **PREPARING TO TEACH ASSESSMENTS**

Beginning in Spring 2009, the Director of Assessment and the FSEHD Assessment and Program Improvement Committee began to examine the Preparing to Teach assessments and criteria for success. They subsequently worked in Summer 2009 to examine the status of unit assessment at the Preparing to Teach transition point and consider potential changes/improvements to assessment at this critical juncture. After careful consideration of existing Preparing to Teach assessments and input from faculty who had been using them, the workgroup proposed two major changes to assessment at the Preparing to Teach point.

First, it was observed that the current Implemented Lesson Plan assessment alone did not provide sufficient evidence of a candidate's teaching skills. It was therefore recommended that a Mini Work Sample be required of candidates wishing to student teach. (The inclusion of a Mini Work Sample prior to the full Teacher Candidate Work Sample is also standard practice at institutions nationally.) The Mini Work Sample, which consists of just three components of a full Teacher Candidate Work Sample (Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction), would provide additional evidence of a candidate's readiness to student teach. Using the same prompts and rubrics as the Teacher Candidate Work Sample at Exit, it was believed that the use of the Mini Work Sample would establish consistency in assessment expectations at FSEHD across time.

The workgroup proposed to retain the concept of an Implemented Lesson Plan assessment at Preparing to Teach, with a significant change. To foster greater consistency in assessment expectations at FSEHD across time, it was proposed that an abbreviated version of the OPR used at Exit be used to evaluate the implemented lesson at Preparing to Teach. An abbreviated version of the OPR for use at Preparing to Teach was created. This required sections of the Implemented Lesson Plan using the abbreviated OPR include all indicators for Planning, Implementation, Content, and Reflection, as well as selected indicators for Climate, Professionalism, Classroom Management, and Technology.

The Teacher Candidate Mini Work Sample and revised Implemented Lesson Plan were piloted in Fall 2009 for candidates at the Preparing to Teach transition point. By Spring 2010, all programs except for elementary education were fully implementing these new assessments. All data collection was conducted electronically, though CheckBox or Chalk and Wire. Elementary Education needed an additional semester of planning for implementation of the new assessments due to the varying routes by which elementary education candidates could arrive at the Preparing to Teach point. The Elementary Education program came to consensus regarding the implementation of revised unit assessments at Preparing to Teach and was on board for full participation as of Fall 2010.

The revised Preparing to Teach assessments were presented to and shared with faculty at an August 2009 faculty retreat, where they were also informed that full scale implementation of these assessments was anticipated take place in Spring 2010. Select faculty piloted the Mini Work Sample and revised Implemented Lesson Plan in Fall 2009. Data from this pilot are currently being analyzed (Spring 2010).

## **DISPOSITIONS ASSESSMENT**

A validity study conducted by the Director of Assessment of the unit's procedures for assessing candidate dispositions revealed that the Teacher Candidate Dispositions Assessment had poor content and construct validity, as well as other psychometric issues. Due to these findings, in addition to faculty input suggesting that the unit's dispositions did not represent faculty consensus, the Director of Assessment and the Assessment and Program Improvement Committee began working to revise the unit's dispositions and design new instruments to measure candidates' dispositions in Spring 2009. The

goal was to build on previous evaluations of dispositions assessments and work with faculty to develop dispositional assessments that reflect consensus and permit valid inferences. The following assumptions guided the process of developing revised unit Professional Dispositions: 1) Professional Dispositions are professional attitudes, values, and beliefs demonstrated through verbal and non-verbal behaviors; 2) Professional Dispositions are linked to the unit's Conceptual Framework; 3) Professional Dispositions are not assessed directly; rather, they are assessed based on observable verbal and non-verbal behaviors in college classroom and field settings.

From there, the work group consulted the INTASC Dispositions Indicators for Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and isolated from them indicators of candidates' attitudes, values, and beliefs, as opposed to indicators depicting actions or behaviors. The dispositions indicators were subsequently organized into a 35-item survey that was administered to FSEHD full-time faculty and administrators electronically (via SurveyMonkey.com) in June 2009. Each item depicted an INTASC disposition indicator and required respondents to rate it on a scale of 1 (Not at all critical) to 6 (Very critical) in terms of how critical that disposition was to a successful FSEHD candidate. The survey also allowed faculty the opportunity to suggest dispositions that were not included in the survey. 70 faculty members responded to the survey, for a response rate of 64%.

The Director of Assessment and Assessment and Program Improvement Committee reviewed faculty survey responses in Summer 2009. Preliminary analyses revealed no significant differences in the ratings of dispositions indicators by faculty who worked primarily with initial candidates versus those who worked primarily with advanced candidates. Additionally, the small number of open-ended suggestions overlapped completely with the INTASC indicators. While the data were examined from a number of perspectives, the Director of Assessment subsequently conducted a factor analysis of survey items with mean scores higher than the mean of all items. Five factors, or dispositions—Passion for Learning, Adaptability, Commitment to Equity, Caring Nature/Concern for Others, and Work Ethic—were identified. These dispositions were next defined using the values/attitudes/beliefs language contained in the survey. Finally, the dispositions were examined for their alignment with the unit's Conceptual Framework. The degree of alignment was very high.

The five revised dispositions were presented to faculty at a FSEHD faculty retreat in August 2009. The revised dispositions were positively received, and faculty were invited to offer feedback on the revised dispositions to the Director of Assessment and/or the Assessment and Program Improvement Committee. The group next began work on the assessment of the revised dispositions in Fall 2009. The working assumption was that assessment of the unit dispositions would be based on observable verbal and non-verbal behaviors in college classroom and field settings. Hence, the workgroup sent an electronic survey to all full-time faculty members and Fall 2009 cooperating teachers, asking them to suggest, from their experience, observable candidate behaviors (positive and negative) for each disposition in the college classroom and field setting. Respondents were also urged to identify behaviors typical of candidates at the beginning, middle, or end of their professional preparation. Twenty-four faculty members and 29 cooperating teachers provided extensive qualitative feedback to this survey. The workgroup is currently in the process of analyzing these data, with the goal of linking behaviors with dispositions in various settings and at various time points.

Once compiled, these lists of behaviors were reduced to a list of the most frequently mentioned behaviors and then scrutinized for their alignment with existing unit assessments, such as the Teacher Candidate Work Sample and the FSEHD Observation and Progress Report at Exit and the Teacher Candidate Mini Work Sample and Implemented Lesson Plan at Preparing to Teach. It was hypothesized that it would not be necessary to design new assessment instruments at the Preparing to Teach and Exit transition points if the existing assessments adequately assess behaviors that demonstrate the unit dispositions. Rather, data from these existing assessments would be aligned with the unit dispositions and reported at the level of dispositions. If, on the other hand, the behaviors

identified as demonstrating unit dispositions are different from those assessed in existing unit assessments, new dispositions assessments will be developed. In any case, it is anticipated that new dispositions assessments will need to be developed for use in the college classroom early in candidates' programs.

Alignment of the revised dispositions with existing unit assessments conducting in field settings (Mini Work Sample and Implemented Lesson Plan at Preparing to Teach and Teacher Candidate Work Sample and Observation and Progress Report at Exit) was subsequently examined. It was concluded that considerable alignment existed. In other words, the indicators in existing unit assessments reflected the same behaviors that faculty and cooperating teachers identified as demonstrating unit dispositions. The committee thus proposed that no new instrument be developed for assessment of dispositions in field settings at the Preparing to Teach and Exit transition points. Rather, it was proposed that the indicators from the Mini Work Sample, Implemented Lesson Plan, TCWS and OPR be coded to the dispositions and that reporting on dispositions in field settings at Preparing to Teach and Exit be derived from these existing assessments.

In order to gather baseline data on candidate dispositions in the field at Admission, the committee recommended that FNED 346 field evaluators assess applicant dispositions via the Professionalism indicators from the Observation and Progress Report. It was also suggested that the disposition assessment used for admissions purposes include an overall recommendation from the assessor: Recommended for admission to FSEHD; Recommended with reservations and concerns; or Not recommended for admission to FSEHD.

Based on the observable behaviors identified by faculty and cooperating teachers as indicative of unit dispositions in the college classroom, the committee developed a draft instrument in Spring 2010 for the assessment of dispositions indicators that can be observed in the college classroom. The format of the instrument is semantic differential, meaning that assessment items are designed to measure the direction (e.g., positive vs. negative) and intensity (slight through extreme) of candidate dispositions (as manifested through observable behaviors) in terms of ratings on scales with contrasting behaviors at each end. The committee proposed that the assessment of dispositions in the college classroom be administered for unit assessment at the following times Admission in FNED 346 and at Preparing to Teach in all methods or practicum courses (with just one being submitted to the unit).

In summer 2010, faculty input was solicited via an electronic survey on the draft FSEHD Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in the College Classroom. Specifically, faculty input was sought regarding the: Criticality and authenticity of the dispositional behaviors for each item; Suitability of the assessment for initial and/or advanced candidates; Ideal time points for administration of the assessment; and Ease/appropriateness of the rating scale; and Thoughts they had about the assessment of dispositions in the college classroom. Twenty faculty members provided qualitative and quantitative input, indicating that they found the dispositional behaviors to be critical and authentic and suitable for initial and advanced candidates. They also indicated that the instrument should be administered at the beginning of a candidate's program, prior to student teaching, and internship, and at program exit. 86% of respondents evaluated the semantic differential-type rating scale as "pretty much" to "very much" adequate and that it provided them with an appropriate way to respond to the dispositions items. Qualitative feedback from faculty suggested, however, that some of the assessment items were redundant. The assessment committee subsequently re-examined the instrument and reduced the number of items from 31 to 16.

In Fall 2010, three faculty members piloted the revised FSEHD Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in the College Classroom. This pilot data will be analyzed in Spring 2011. The pilot will continue in Spring 2011. Based on item analyses, the instrument may be revised/improved. It is anticipated that all initial candidates will be evaluated using the FSEHD Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in the College Classroom in Fall 2011.

## STUDENT TEACHING SURVEYS

In Fall 2009, the existing Student Teaching Mid Term Evaluation survey was phased out. This was in response to the fact that the data could not be analyzed and reported back to faculty and administration in time for it to be used to address any issues concerning a teacher candidate. Administered in the middle of a student teaching placement, the placement was almost over by the time the data were available for use. Rather, the OPR was used to report on teacher candidate progress at the student teaching mid-point.

In Summer 2010, the Director of Assessment, Assistant Dean for Partnerships and Placements, and assessment committee members met for one week to review existing student teaching evaluations and revise them as needed. Drawing on similar evaluations/surveys used nationally, the work group revised Student Teaching assessments as follows:

In Fall 2010, the existing Student Teaching Final Evaluation was phased out. It was determined that this instrument provided redundant information to other student teaching data that were collected during a candidate's placement. In its place, the third OPR is now used as a "final" evaluation of the student teacher because it assesses the candidate's teaching performance, ongoing professional and other behaviors, and affords the evaluator the opportunity to make a final recommendation for the candidate to pursue teacher preparation for a teaching license.

A Cooperating Teacher Survey was drafted to replace the existing Evaluation of the College Supervisor by the Cooperating Teacher. The Cooperating Teacher Survey, administered to Cooperating Teachers, provides FSEHD with cooperating teacher input regarding the specified College Supervisor and their experience as a Cooperating Teacher. It is administered to Cooperating Teachers at the end of the student teaching experience. This survey was adapted from the SUNY Cortland Student Teacher Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher (2008), the Lander University Cooperating Teacher Evaluation Form (2004), and Janet Johnson's Cooperating Teacher Survey (2010).

A Supervisor Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher was drafted to replace the existing Cooperating Teacher Evaluation completed by College Supervisor. This instrument is designed to inform FSEHD of supervisors' perceptions of the Cooperating Teacher. It is administered to supervisors at the end of their student teaching experience. This survey is adapted from the SUNY Cortland Student Teacher Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher (2008) and The Lander University Cooperating Teacher Evaluation Form (2004).

A Teacher Candidate Exit Survey was drafted to replace the existing Cooperating Teacher Evaluation completed by student teacher, School Site Evaluation, and Teacher Preparation Program Evaluation. The Exit Survey, administered to graduating students, is designed to provide input on teacher candidates' perceptions of their ability to function effectively as future teachers and their satisfaction with their Teacher Education program at FSEHD. This survey focuses particularly on: subject matter knowledge, pedagogy, teaching diverse learners, and their pre-practicum and practicum experiences. It is administered to teacher candidates graduating from initial teacher preparation programs. This survey was adapted from the validated Exit Survey developed by the Boston College Teachers for a New Era Evidence Team (2004), which in turn was drawn from established instruments that had been developed and used by other institutions. These other instruments included:

- Cooperative Institutional Research Program (Higher Education Research Institute)
- Perceptions of Excellent Teachers (University of Connecticut)
- Compendium of Items for Follow-Up Surveys of Teacher Education Programs (National Center for Research on Teacher Education, Michigan State University)
- College Survey for Graduates Currently Teaching (Bank Street College)

- Questions for Recent Graduates of Teaching Credential Programs (California State University)
- Curry School of Education Survey (University of Virginia)
- School and Staffing Survey of Current and Former Teachers (U.S. Department of Education)
- Teacher Quality Partnership Survey (Ohio Department of Education)

The new student teaching evaluations were administered electronically to all student teachers, supervisors, and cooperating teachers in Fall 2010. Electronic data collection will be continued in Spring 2011 and beyond.

## **ADMISSIONS ASSESSMENT**

The Career Commitment Essay requirement was eliminated due to longstanding validity and resource concerns in Spring 2010. In its place a new requirement of a grade of B or better in Writing 100 was instituted. The new RI Department of Education regulations concerning minimum passing scores on the Reading, Writing, and Mathematics sections of the Pre-Professional Skills Test of the PRAXIS I or SAT or ACT were implemented beginning in Fall 2010. Following approximately two years in which FSEHD faculty revised the unit's professional dispositions and dispositions assessments, assessment of candidate dispositions at admission was significantly revised. First, candidates were required to submit a completed Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in the College Classroom completed by their FNED 346 instructor. In order to gather baseline data on candidate dispositions in the field at Admission, candidates are also required to submit a revised Disposition Reference Form completed by their FNED 346 field evaluators. This form was revised to assess applicant dispositions via the Professionalism indicators from the Implemented Lesson Plan (ILP) used at Preparing to Teach and the Observation and Progress Report (OPR) at Exit. These new dispositions assessments at admissions went into effect in Spring 2011.

## **ADVANCED PROGRAMS**

### **SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT**

Significant accomplishments have been achieved at the advanced level, as well. A Feinstein Advanced Competencies Assessment subcommittee was formed in Fall 2008. This committee consisted of the Director of Graduate Studies, the Directors and Assistant Directors of Assessment, and two members of the Advanced Programs Coordinators committee. The subcommittee met regularly to review the current advanced program assessment system and design needed modifications to the system. The subcommittee began meeting in Fall 2008 to modify the advanced programs assessment system, beginning with the summative/exit transition point. In Fall 2008, the subcommittee drafted a FSEHD Professional Intervention Project (including descriptive rubrics) for Advanced Programs (PIP) to be completed by candidates at the end of their programs. The purpose of this assessment is for advanced program candidates to create a relevant Professional Intervention Project for Advanced Programs that includes all Practice aspects of the Advanced Competencies: Evidence-Based Decision Making; Technology Use; Diversity; Professional Identity Development. Through this Professional Intervention Project process, it is expected that advanced candidates will provide credible evidence of their ability to facilitate impact on constituents and reflect upon their practice. Several faculty members volunteered to field test the PIP in Spring 2009. Based on their feedback, the PIP was revised and subsequently implemented on the unit level in Fall 2009.

The timeline for the assessment revision process described in this document follows:

## FSEHD UNIT ASSESSMENT REVISION TIMELINE

SEMESTER	INITIAL PROGRAMS	ADVANCED PROGRAMS
SPRING 2008	<u>EXIT</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work undertaken to revise Exit Portfolio</li> </ul>	<u>OTHER</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advanced Competencies revised</li> </ul>
SUMMER 2008	<u>EXIT</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TCWS developed</li> </ul>	
FALL 2008	<u>EXIT</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TCWS piloted</li> <li>• Exit Portfolio still used by non-piloters</li> <li>• Existing Observation Report still used (but not incorporated into assessment system)</li> </ul>	<u>SUMMATIVE</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work undertaken to revise Capstone Assessment</li> </ul>
SPRING 2009	<u>EXIT</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TCWS piloted</li> <li>• Exit Portfolio still used by non-piloters</li> <li>• Observation Report still used (but not incorporated into assessment system)</li> </ul> <u>OTHER</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work undertaken to revise unit's Professional Dispositions</li> </ul>	<u>SUMMATIVE</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PIP in development</li> </ul>
SUMMER 2009	<u>EXIT</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TCWS revised</li> <li>• OPR developed</li> </ul>	
FALL 2009	<u>EXIT</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TCWS Pilot</li> <li>• Exit Portfolio still used by non-piloters</li> <li>• OPR Pilot</li> <li>• Observation report still used by non-piloters</li> <li>• Student Teaching Mid Term Evaluation phased out</li> </ul> <u>PTT</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mini TCWS and Revised IPL piloted</li> <li>• PTT Reflection Essay and existing IPL still used by non-piloters</li> </ul> <u>ADMISSIONS</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Career Commitment Essay or of B OR better in Writing 100 used at admissions</li> </ul> <u>OTHER</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revised Professional Dispositions adopted</li> <li>• Existing dispositions assessments</li> </ul>	<u>SUMMATIVE</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PIP in development</li> </ul>

SEMESTER	INITIAL PROGRAMS	ADVANCED PROGRAMS
	<p>procedures remained in effect until new procedures were developed</p>	
<p>SPRING 2010</p>	<p><u>EXIT</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full TCWS Implementation</li> <li>• Exit Portfolio phased out</li> <li>• Full OPR Implementation</li> <li>• Observation Report phased out</li> </ul> <p><u>PTT</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mini TCWS and Revised IPL piloted</li> <li>• PTT Reflection Essay and existing IPL still used by non-piloters</li> </ul> <p><u>ADMISSIONS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum grade of B or better in Writing 100 needed for Admissions</li> <li>• Career Commitment Essay requirement at admissions phased out</li> </ul>	<p><u>SUMMATIVE</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PIP piloted</li> <li>• Capstone Project still used by non-implementers</li> </ul>
<p>SUMMER 2010</p>	<p><u>EXIT</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Student Teaching Surveys developed</li> <li>• TCWS and OPR revised</li> </ul>	<p><u>SUMMATIVE</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PIP revised</li> </ul>
<p>FALL 2010</p>	<p><u>EXIT</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full TCWS Implementation</li> <li>• Full OPR Implementation</li> <li>• New Student Teaching Surveys piloted</li> <li>• Existing Student Teaching Surveys still used by non-piloters</li> <li>• Student Final Evaluation phased out</li> </ul> <p><u>PTT</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of Dispositions in College Classroom pilot at Preparing to Teach</li> <li>• Traditional dispositions assessments still used by non-piloters</li> <li>• Mini TCWS and Revised IPL in full implementation</li> </ul> <p><u>ADMISSIONS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of new RI Department of Education regulations concerning minimum passing scores on the Reading, Writing, and Mathematics sections of the Pre-Professional Skills Test of the PRAXIS I or SAT or ACT</li> </ul> <p><u>OTHER</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision made to assess Culturally Competent Teaching Areas via aligned indicators in unit assessments</li> </ul>	<p><u>SUMMATIVE</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full PIP Implementation</li> <li>• Capstone Project phased out</li> </ul>

SEMESTER	INITIAL PROGRAMS	ADVANCED PROGRAMS
SPRING 2011	<p><u>EXIT</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full TCWS Implementation</li> <li>• Full OPR Implementation</li> <li>• Full Implementation of new Student Teaching Surveys</li> <li>• Culturally Competent Teaching Areas to be reported on via aligned indicators in unit assessments</li> </ul> <p><u>PTT</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full Implementation of Assessment of Dispositions in College Classroom at admission and Preparing to Teach</li> <li>• Mini TCWS and Revised IPL in full implementation</li> <li>• Culturally Competent Teaching Areas to be reported on via aligned indicators in unit assessments</li> </ul> <p><u>ADMISSIONS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pilot of Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in Field Settings</li> </ul>	<p><u>SUMMATIVE</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full PIP Implementation</li> </ul>

Note: Assessments piloted in a fall semester were revised as necessary for use the subsequent spring.