

# **Feinstein School of Education and Human Development**

**Rhode Island College**  
**600 Mt. Pleasant Avenue**  
**Providence, Rhode Island**

[www.ric.edu/fsehd](http://www.ric.edu/fsehd)

**NCATE**

The Standard of Excellence  
in Teacher Preparation

## **Initial and Advanced Programs Assessment Plans and Descriptions**

**Initial and Advanced Programs Assessment Plans and Descriptions**



**Knowledge**

**Feinstein School of Education and Human Development**

**March 2011**

**Diversity**

**Pedagogy**

**REFLECT**

**Professionalism**

**Susan M. Gracia, Ph.D.**

**Director of Assessment**

**Feinstein School of Education and Human Development**

**Rhode Island College**

# Contents

Introduction .....	2
Learning Targets: Foundation of the FSEHD Assessment Systems.....	4
Conceptual Framework.....	4
Advanced Competencies .....	6
Unit Dispositions .....	8
Culturally Competent Teaching Areas .....	8
Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards .....	9
Assessment System and Unit Evaluation.....	10
Design.....	10
Guiding Principles .....	12
The assessments are relevant to announced learning targets.....	13
Each assessment has an announced purpose .....	13
The assessments are conducted at multiple time points .....	14
The system is made up of assessments that are initiated at multiple levels .....	14
Candidates are allowed multiple opportunities to demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and skill development.....	15
The assessments draw on multiple formats—“traditional” and “alternative” alike.....	15
Unit Assessments.....	16
Initial Programs.....	16
Admission.....	16
Preparing to Teach.....	17
Exit.....	19
SPA Assessments.....	21
Post-Graduation.....	21
Advanced Programs .....	22
Admissions .....	22
Formative .....	22
Summative .....	23
SPA Assessments.....	24
Post-Graduation.....	24
Performance Levels for Acceptable Performance .....	25
References .....	29

# Introduction

Rhode Island College is one of only 283 institutions that have been continuously accredited by NCATE for the past 50 years. The FSEHD continues to offer a full range of programs at the advanced level that provide either continuing preparation for teachers or advanced preparation of other professional school personnel. Standards for each program are carefully defined and they stem from concepts and values articulated in the Feinstein School of Education and Human Development Conceptual Framework, the Advanced Competencies, Unit Dispositions, and appropriate SPA and national standards.

The FSEHD faculty believes in the purposeful and systematic assessment of applicant, candidate, and graduate performance as well as careful attention to program evaluation. These assessments and evaluations provide valuable information that serves three purposes.

1. Assessment data are collected for ongoing formative evaluation of candidates as they proceed through the programs, identifying weaknesses so assistance can be offered in a timely fashion.
2. Assessment data also provide summative evaluation at the end of an advanced program to ensure that applicants and candidates are qualified to graduate from the advanced program.
3. Finally, assessment and evaluation data are collected in an ongoing and systematic fashion for the purpose of evaluating and improving the unit and its programs.

Revisions to the assessment systems were developed by faculty committees and through pilot programs. Summaries of the Initial and Advanced Programs Assessment Systems are displayed in the tables below: FSEHD has been engaged in intensive continuous improvement efforts related to the articulation of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for candidates, as well as the unit assessments that indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards. Since 2008, the unit's Professional Dispositions and Advanced Competencies have been revamped, and the unit has adopted a set of Culturally Competent Teaching Areas. In that time, the entire Initial Programs Assessment System has been revised, as have significant portions of the Advanced Programs Assessment System.

The revised Initial and Advanced Programs Assessment Systems are outlined in the following tables:

**Table 1. Initial Program Assessment System Summary**

INITIAL PROGRAMS UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM (2011)			
Program Admission (Initial Assessment)	Acceptance to Student Teaching (Formative Assessment)	Program Exit (Summative Assessment)	Post Graduation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Admissions Portfolio:</li> <li>An application form</li> <li>Transcripts</li> <li>Successful completion of FNED 346 with a minimum grade of "B-"</li> <li>Completion of at least 24 semester hours with a GPA of 2.50 in all college level courses</li> <li>Successful completion of the RIC Writing and Mathematics requirements</li> <li>Successful completion of the Reading, Mathematics, and Writing sections of the Pre-Professional Skills Test of the PRAXIS I (new minimum requirements) or SAT or ACT</li> <li>Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in Field Settings adapted from OPR</li> <li>Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in the College Classroom</li> <li>Proof of technology competency</li> <li>Two confidential recommendations</li> <li>B or better in Writing 100</li> <li>Other, program-specific requirements, as appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preparing to Teach Portfolio:</li> <li>GPA of 2.5 in all undergraduate coursework</li> <li>Passing scores on required PLT, Praxis II and/or Content tests</li> <li>Revised Implemented Lesson Plan</li> <li>Mini Teacher Candidate Work Sample</li> <li>Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in the College Classroom</li> <li>(Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in Field Settings derived from scores on ILP and Mini TCWS)</li> <li>(Assessment of Candidate Cultural Competence derived from ILP, Mini TCWS, and dispositions assessment)</li> <li>Community Service</li> <li>Other, program-specific requirements, as appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher Candidate Work Sample</li> <li>Teacher Candidate Observation and Progress Report (3)</li> <li>(Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in Field Settings derived from scores on OPR and TCWS)</li> <li>(Assessment of Candidate Cultural Competence derived from OPR &amp; TCWS)</li> <li>Other, program-specific requirements, as appropriate</li> <li>Supervisor Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher</li> <li>Teacher Candidate Exit Survey</li> <li>Cooperating Teacher Survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employer Surveys</li> <li>Alumni Surveys</li> </ul>

**Table 2. Advanced Programs Assessment System Summary**

ADVANCED PROGRAMS UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM (2011)			
Program Admission	Formative Transition Point	Summative Transition Point	Continuous Follow-up
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grade Point Average</li> <li>Official standardized test scores (Graduate Record Examination or the Miller Analogies Test)</li> <li>Professional Goals Essay</li> <li>Performance-based Evaluation</li> <li>Two Candidate Reference Forms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimum grade of B in courses/assessments tied to standards</li> <li>Individual work sample in key course/practicum</li> <li>Candidate's self-reflection of progress</li> <li>Faculty's reflection of candidate progress</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exit GPA of 3.0 or higher and comprehensive assessment</li> <li>Professional Impact Project</li> <li>Candidate's self-evaluation of outcome</li> <li>Faculty's evaluation of candidate achievement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Professional Licensure/ Certification Exam Results (as applicable)</li> <li>Valid certificate (as applicable)</li> <li>Surveys of Graduates &amp; Employers</li> </ul>

As of Spring 2011, the unit has fully implemented most features of the Initial and Advanced Programs Assessment System; a few aspects are partially implemented and a few aspects are in the planning stage.

This document describes the Initial and Advanced Programs Assessment Systems that have been designed to guide candidate assessment and program evaluation at the initial and advanced levels.

# Learning Targets: Foundation of the FSEHD Assessment Systems

“Standards are expected to specify what should be taught and what students should learn. Assessments make those expectations concrete. They turn the statements about what students should know and be able to do into action. They provide the basis on which students and educators may be held accountable” (Linn, 2001)

In the following section, the knowledge, dispositions, and skills appropriate for advanced education professionals, as defined by the shared vision of the FSEHD faculty are described. It is the responsibility of the unit as a whole and of specific program faculty to align specific program elements to the Conceptual Framework and the Rhode Island Professional Teacher Standards (initial programs), the Advanced Competencies and State of Rhode Island standards for advanced programs (advanced programs), and to professional association standards recognized by NCATE (initial and advanced programs).

The Initial and Advanced Programs Assessment Systems are built upon the knowledge, dispositions, and skills described here.

## ***Conceptual Framework***

The Initial Programs Assessment System at the Feinstein School of Education and Human Development (FSEHD) has been designed to reflect the *Conceptual Framework* and to measure candidate proficiencies on standards that stem from it.

The FSEHD Conceptual Framework serves as a foundation for all initial programs. It is aligned with Rhode Island Professional Teacher Standards and Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards. The Framework provides a basis for assessment of candidate qualifications and program quality. The Conceptual Framework, emphasizes three roles:

- The educator as a planner
- The educator as an implementer, and
- The educator as a reflective and collaborative practitioner.

The Conceptual Framework emphasizes the Feinstein School of Education and Human Development’s mission to develop reflective practitioners for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Candidates are introduced to Reflective Practice as they progress through FSEHD professional programs, and continue to grow as Reflective Practitioners throughout their careers.

There are two motifs – PAR and the Four Themes – that organize the Conceptual Framework. The first motif, PAR, an acronym for "Planning, Acting, and Reflecting," represents the recursive process involved in reflective educational practice, be it administration, counseling, or teaching. The other motif is the Four Themes – Knowledge, Pedagogy, Diversity, and Professionalism – which constitute the shared knowledge base of reflective practice. Whereas PAR denotes the way in which reflective practitioners ply their craft, the Four Themes describe the requisite knowledge and skills. This foundation for best professional practice includes (1) thorough Knowledge of content, context, and human development, (2) theoretical and practical grounding in Pedagogy, (3) sensitivity and responsiveness to human Diversity, and (4) agreed-upon standards of Professionalism. The four themes are illustrated as follows:

### **THEME 1. KNOWLEDGE**

#### **General Education**

Reflective practitioners possess a broad base of knowledge in the liberal arts, including mastery of oral and written English communication, mathematical and reasoning skills, and technological competence

as well as a global perspective that emphasizes people's interdependence with one another and with nature.

### **Human Learning and Development**

Reflective practitioners have a solid grounding in educational psychology, the branch of psychology that specializes in understanding teaching and learning in educational settings. They know the four pillars of educational psychology: human development, theories of learning and cognition, classroom management, and assessment.

### **Contexts of Schooling**

Reflective practitioners possess a critical understanding of the contexts of schooling: social, political, economic, historical, philosophical, legal, professional, global, and cultural.

### **Area of Specialization**

Reflective practitioners possess a deep, thorough, and, above all, working knowledge of their area(s) of specialization, enabling them to make informed decisions to approach curriculum implementation

## **THEME 2. PEDAGOGY**

### **Theory and Practice of Teaching and Learning**

Reflective practitioners employ a variety of models of teaching and learning. Best practice entails a balance between pedagogical approaches.

### **Instructional Uses of Technology**

Reflective practitioners integrate technology into curricula, instruction, and assessment of students to create high quality learning experiences and instructional opportunities.

### **Assessment as an Aid to Practice**

Assessment is primarily a means for determining the relative success of teaching and counseling interventions for the purpose of improving them in the future. In other words, assessment is used as a tool for reflection and subsequent planning.

## **THEME 3. DIVERSITY**

### **Cultural Diversity and Multicultural Education**

Reflective educators are knowledgeable of both the differences that distinguish individuals and groups and the commonalities that bind them together. They understand and respond to the diverse needs and backgrounds of students, clients, and families and develop strategies for combating prejudice and advancing educational equity, inclusion, and intercultural understanding.

### **Special Needs and Inclusion**

Reflective practitioners are aware of the impact of disability on the teaching-learning process and are responsive to the individual strengths and needs of children and youth with a range of disabilities. They understand the effect that disability has on family functioning, and they can work effectively with parents in program planning. In order to function effectively in an inclusive environment, reflective practitioners must also collaborate with professionals from all disciplines when making educational decisions. They examine their own cultural and family background as it pertains to disability, reflecting on the impact of their beliefs and behavior on the classroom setting, counseling situation, or planning session, making adjustments as necessary. They are prepared not only to be responsive to students' adapted curriculum, instruction, and learning needs but also to make curriculum adaptations and instructional modifications on-the-spot to accommodate students' needs.

## **THEME 4. PROFESSIONALISM**

### **Professional Ethics**

Ethics are principles of conduct used to guide an individual's behavior. Ethical principles guide practitioners as they determine aims and objectives; select content and materials; plan and implement methods and strategies; conduct non-discriminatory evaluations of students, clients, and staff; reflect on their choices and actions; and take responsibility for the consequences. Reflective practitioners accept the professional, social, ethical, and moral responsibilities and reap the personal rewards of being a teacher in a democratic, pluralistic society.

### **Collaboration and Advocacy**

Reflective practitioners recognize that schools, families and communities must work together, and educators must collaborate within schools, to support student and client learning and growth, and to promote democratic values in their own communities and beyond.

### **Professional Development**

Reflective practitioners consciously plan, implement, and reflect upon their own professional growth, as well as that of the profession. Committed professionals actively participate in a wide variety of educational opportunities.

Reflective Practitioners have background knowledge and skills in each of the Four Themes. However, just as the PAR acronym articulates discrete phases of reflective practice which in reality cannot be separated, the Four Themes similarly distinguish domains of knowledge and endeavor which in reality profoundly overlap. Indeed, the overlap is so deep and pervasive that to separate these themes in theory runs the risk of fragmenting the shared knowledge base of professional education practice.

## ***Advanced Competencies***

In spring 2005, faculty members who coordinate advanced programs worked together, with guidance from the dean's office, to develop a common Advanced Programs Assessment System for the unit. The first step was the development of advanced competencies that are linked directly to the unit's Conceptual Framework. Advanced competencies based on the Four Themes of the Conceptual Framework were articulated to guide instruction and assessment. These included Knowledge (General Knowledge, Domain-Specific Knowledge, Technology Knowledge); Practice (Communication and Expression; Reflective Problem-Solving; Professional Practice; Technology Use); Diversity (Systems View of Human Development; Family Centeredness and Engagement; Individuals Differences and Cultural Diversity); Professionalism (Professional Ethics; Collaboration; Leadership; Professional development).

Based on data analyses and suggestions from faculty, the Advanced Programs Coordinators committee revised the unit's advanced competencies in 2008. The goal of this endeavor was to make the Advanced Competencies more meaningful and relevant to the diverse programs at the advanced levels. Ultimately the process resulted in narrowing several existing advanced competency categories, adding clearer language consisting of demonstrable verbs, and re-configuring the topical headings from four to two. Knowledge and Practice are now the larger headings with Diversity and Professionalism infused throughout them, the idea being that what any candidate knows (Knowledge) and can do (Practice) must be in the context of Diversity and Professionalism. The revised Advanced Competencies include Professional Awareness, Information Literacy, Contextual Perspective, and Domain-Specific Knowledge in the category of Knowledge (infused with Diversity of Professionalism) and Evidence-based Decision Making, Technology Use, Diversity of Practice, and Professional Identity Development in the category of Practice (infused with Diversity of Professionalism). The revised Advanced Competencies are illustrated in Table 3.

**Table 3: Advanced Competencies (Revised 2008)**

<b>Knowledge influenced by diversity and professionalism</b> <i>FSEHD advanced candidates demonstrate the requisite knowledge of content and practice to prepare them to be experts of the diverse fields of their disciplines.</i>	<b>Practice informed by diversity and professionalism</b> <i>FSEHD advanced candidates incorporate their domain-specific knowledge into performance with attention to diversity and the standards of their profession.</i>
Knowledge 1.) Domain-Specific Knowledge: candidate demonstrates conceptual mastery of subject matter, literature, theory, and methods in one's chosen field of professional practice.	Practice 1.) Evidence-based Decision Making: candidate defines a problem clearly; collects/analyzes data; uses data to inform decision-making; addresses target population dynamics; and incorporates considerations of other professionals and/or stakeholders while determining a plan of action that: a) contributes to school improvement and/or renewal; and/or b) promotes the well-being of children, family systems, school systems, or communities.
Knowledge 2.) Information Literacy: candidate recognizes when information is needed and has the ability to locate, interpret, and evaluate relevant information.	Practice 2.) Technology Use: candidate selects and uses technology effectively in: a) presentation of information, b) collaborative work environments, c) information collection analysis and management, and d) research based activities
Knowledge 3.) Contextual Perspective: candidate demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of diversity as it relates to field specific content.	Practice 3.) Diversity of Practice: candidate uses knowledge of diversity about self and others to design effective practice.
Knowledge 4.) Professional Awareness: candidate exhibits an understanding of the standards of one's chosen profession, (e.g., confidentiality, ethics)	Practice 4.) Professional Identity Development: candidate examines own emerging, developing or acquired professional knowledge, skills, communication, and dispositions that will result in competent practice, and creates plan to further one's own professional growth.

While Diversity and Professionalism influence all Advanced Competencies, each one has been determined to align most closely with the themes of the Conceptual Framework as follows:

**Table 4. Alignment of Conceptual Framework and Advanced Competencies**

<b>Conceptual Framework</b>	<b>FSEHD Advanced Competencies</b>
Knowledge	Domain Specific Knowledge; Information Literacy
Pedagogy	Evidence-Based Decision Making; Technology Use
Diversity	Contextual Perspective; Diversity of Practice
Professionalism	Professional Awareness; Professional Identity Development

Assessment and evaluation of candidate performance for advanced programs rests within each program with some coordination through the FSEHD Dean's Office. This coordination, after admission, aims to facilitate advanced programs' alignment with the Advanced Competencies<sup>1</sup>, their adherence to national standards of their respective SPAs, and to State of Rhode Island standards for advanced programs.

<sup>1</sup> Note: The Advanced Programs Assessment System is presently being reviewed and is likely to be revised substantially in 2011-2012. For this reason, the existing formative and most summative assessments at the advanced level are still aligned with the "old" Advanced Competencies of Knowledge, Practice, Diversity, and Professionalism, as well as the traditional dispositions. As these assessments were not designed with an eye toward the revised Advanced Competencies or the revised Professional Dispositions that have recently been adopted by the unit and because these existing assessments are likely to be eliminated, the unit has not undertaken efforts to align the existing Formative and Summative Assessments (except for the PIP) to the newly revised Advanced Competencies or revised Professional Dispositions.

## ***Unit Dispositions***

The FSEHD attracts and educates candidates who maintain professional standards reflective of legal and ethical principles and whose professional dispositions make them promising candidates for advanced practice. In 2004, the unit adopted a set of professional dispositions: Self-Reflection, Lifelong Learning, Advocacy for Children and Youth, Respect for Diversity, Collaboration, and Professional Work Characteristics. These dispositions were closely aligned to the Conceptual Framework and the original Advanced Competencies

Based on quantitative data from four years of dispositions assessments plus qualitative feedback from faculty, the Director of Assessment and the Assessment and Program Improvement Committee began working in Spring 2009 to revise the unit's dispositions and design new instruments to measure candidates' dispositions. 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. Based on an iterative process involving multiple rounds of input from FSEHD faculty and cooperating teachers, the unit adopted the following professional dispositions, which are aligned to the unit's Conceptual Framework and the Advanced Competencies:

- **PASSION FOR LEARNING:** Committed to continuous learning; enthusiastic about one's content area(s)/discipline(s); willing to learn new knowledge and skills (Conceptual Framework: Knowledge; Advanced Competencies: Domain Specific Knowledge, Information Literacy )
- **ADAPTABILITY:** Values flexibility and reciprocity; believes that plans must be open to adjustment and revision; values ongoing assessment; committed to refining practice. (Conceptual Framework: Pedagogy; Advanced Competencies: Evidence-Based Decision Making, Technology Use)
- **COMMITMENT TO EQUITY:** Respects constituents as diverse individuals; disposed to use constituent strengths as basis for growth; appreciates multiple perspectives; is fair; believes all constituents can learn/advance (Conceptual Framework: Diversity; Advanced Competencies: Contextual Perspective, Diversity of Practice)
- **CARING NATURE / CONCERN FOR OTHERS:** Concerned about all aspects of constituents' well-being; is willing to consult with others and receive help to promote constituent well-being; respectful of others' privacy and confidentiality (Conceptual Framework: Professionalism; Advanced Competencies: Professional Awareness; Diversity of Practice)
- **WORK ETHIC:** Reliable and trustworthy; takes pride in one's work; responsible for one's actions; has integrity; is willing to take initiative, follow through, and work cooperatively (Conceptual Framework: Professionalism; Advanced Competency: Professional Awareness; Professional Identity Development)

Each disposition is accompanied by a list of attitudinal descriptors. It should be noted that the Commitment to Equity disposition includes NCATE's specification that fairness and the belief that all children can learn be incorporated among unit dispositions.

## ***Culturally Competent Teaching Areas***

In collaboration with other teacher preparation programs in RI and funded under a Teacher Quality Enhancement Partnership (TQE-P) Grant, FSEHD faculty participated in Diversity Objective Group of Project

RITER (Objective 3, Rhode Island Teacher Education Renewal) beginning in 2008. An important product of this work group was the establishment of five culturally competent teaching areas for the unit, plus a listing of samples of observable teaching behaviors related to the area. Each culturally competent teaching area is aligned with the Conceptual Framework, the RIPTS and INTASC standards. The culturally competent teaching areas include:

- Area #1: Planning and Instruction: The culturally competent student teacher should be able to account for, demonstrate awareness of and responsiveness to the sociocultural distinctiveness of his or her students, families and communities when planning for and delivering instruction. [CF: Pedagogy; RIBTS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6; INTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7]
- Area #2: Assessment: The culturally competent student teacher should be able to use a variety of assessment techniques appropriate to diverse learners and accommodate socio-cultural differences that affect learning. [CF: Pedagogy; RIBTS 9; INTASC 8]
- Area #3: Professional Behavior: The culturally competent student teacher is aware of the diverse cultural groups represented in his/her classroom, investigates the sociocultural factors which influence student learning, and is able to integrate this knowledge into his/her teaching. [CF: Diversity; RIBTS 10, 11; INTASC 9]
- Area #4: Collaboration: The culturally competent student teacher involves and works with families and community resources, understanding the differences in families, the important influence of family participation in students' learning, and the benefit of collaborating with the wider school community. [CF: Professionalism; RIBTS 7; INTASC 10]
- Area #5: Communication: The culturally competent student teacher communicates in ways that demonstrate sensitivity to sociocultural and linguistic differences, using a variety of verbal and non-verbal communication techniques that encourage positive social interaction and support learning in their classroom [CF: Professionalism; RIBTS 8; INTASC 6]

While faculty began to incorporate the Culturally Competent Teaching Areas in their curriculum and course assessment as early as 2009, FSEHD formally decided to include them in unit assessment in Fall 2010.

### ***Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards***

In 2007, the Rhode Island Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education officially approved the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS) for Rhode Island educators which outline what teachers should know and be able to do in order to ensure the high levels of achievement expected from each student in Rhode Island. The RIPTS are rooted in highly respected state and national teaching standards. They are an outgrowth of the Rhode Island Beginning Teacher Standards (RIBTS) that were promulgated in 1994. The beginning teacher standards, in turn, were designed to align with the Five Core Propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, as well as the standards developed by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium – both highly regarded statements of quality teaching practice.

FSEHD uses the RIPTS to align its teacher preparation curriculum and designed accompanying assessments to ensure that program graduates have the knowledge and skill required of beginning educators. The Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) approves teacher preparation programs at Rhode Island universities and colleges, in part, by how well their graduates are able to demonstrate competence on these standards:

1. Teachers create learning experiences using a broad base of general knowledge that reflects an understanding of the nature of the communities and world in which we live.
2. Teachers have a deep content knowledge base sufficient to create learning experiences that reflect an understanding of central concepts, vocabulary, structures, and tools of inquiry of the disciplines/content areas they teach.

3. Teachers create instructional opportunities that reflect an understanding of how children learn and develop.
4. Teachers create instructional opportunities that reflect a respect for the diversity of learners and an understanding of how students differ in their approaches to learning.
5. Teachers create instructional opportunities to encourage all students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, performance skills, and literacy across content areas.
6. Teachers create a supportive learning environment that encourages appropriate standards of behavior, positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
7. Teachers work collaboratively with all school personnel, families and the broader community to create a professional learning community and environment that supports the improvement of teaching, learning and student achievement.
8. Teachers use effective communication as the vehicle through which students explore, conjecture, discuss, and investigate new ideas.
9. Teachers use appropriate formal and informal assessment strategies with individuals and groups of students to determine the impact of instruction on learning, to provide feedback, and to plan future instruction.
10. Teachers reflect on their practice and assume responsibility for their own professional development by actively seeking and participating in opportunities to learn and grow as professionals.
11. Teachers maintain professional standards guided by legal and ethical principles.

Together, these varied performance outcomes (Conceptual Framework, Advanced Competencies, Unit Dispositions, Culturally Competent Teaching Areas, and RIPTS) specify the knowledge, dispositions, and skills appropriate for initial and advanced education professionals, as defined by the shared vision of the FSEHD faculty.

## **Assessment System and Unit Evaluation**

### ***Design***

In spring 2005, the faculty, led by the Associate Dean for Graduate Programs and the FSEHD Dean began in earnest to develop a common, coherent, comprehensive assessment system for advanced programs. Based on the clearly identified, agreed-upon learning targets described earlier, and drawing upon assessments already valued within programs (e.g. admission and midpoint interviews with students to assess dispositions and set goals and capstone performances such as comprehensive examinations, masters theses, and portfolios) faculty members worked to develop assessments that are aligned to the competencies and to develop common rubrics for program and unit evidence collection. Since 2008, the entire initial programs assessment system has been revised, as have significant portions of the advanced programs assessment system

The blueprints for the Initial and Advanced Programs Assessment Systems are displayed in Table 5 and Table 6 below.

**Table 5: Initial Programs Assessment System Blueprint**

<b>KEY</b>	<b>Methods</b> SR=selected response/short answer; CR=constructed response; PA=performance assessment; OC=observation/ personal communication	<b>Level</b> I=individual course; P=program; U=unit; SN=state or national	<b>Status</b> E=existing; P=planned
------------	--	---	---

**INITIAL TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS**

Transition Point	Assessment	Method	Level(s)	Status	
Admission	B- or better in FNED 346	SR, CR, PA, OC	I	E	
	2.5 GPA	SR, CR, PA, OC	I	E	
	Completion of RIC Writing and Math requirements	SR, CR, PA, OC	I	E	
	Successful completion of the Reading, Mathematics, and Writing sections of the Pre-Professional Skills Test of the PRAXIS I or SAT or ACT	SR, CR	SN	E	
	Supervisor Reference Form: Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in Field Settings	PA, OC	I, U	E	
	Faculty Reference Form: Assessment of Professional Dispositions in College Classroom	OC	I,U	E	
	Technology competency	SR	U	E	
	B or better in Writing 100	SR, CR, PA, OC	I	E	
	Other, program-specific requirements	SR, CR, PA, OC	P	E	
Preparing to Teach (Formative)	2.5 GPA	SR, CR, PA, OC	I	E	
	Passing scores on PLT, Praxis II, and/or Content tests	SR, CR	SN	E	
	Implemented Lesson Plan	PA, OC	P,U	E	
	Mini Teacher Candidate Work Sample	PA	P,U	E	
	Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in the College Classroom	PA, OC	I, U	E	
	Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in Field Settings (derived from ILP and MTCWS scores)	PA, OC	U	P	
	Assessment of Candidate Cultural Competence (derived from ILP and MTCWS scores)	PA, OC	U	P	
	Community service	OC	U	E	
Exit (Summative)	Teacher Candidate Work Sample	PA	P,U	E	
	Observation and Progress Report	PA, OC	P,U	E	
	Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in Field Settings (derived from OPR and TCWS scores)	PA, OC	U	P	
	Assessment of Candidate Cultural Competence (derived from OPR and TCWS scores)	PA, OC	U	P	
	Other, program-specific requirements	SR, CR, PA, OC	P	E	
	(Used for unit & program assessment, not to evaluate candidate)	Supervisor Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher	PA, OC	U, P	E
		Cooperating Teacher Survey	PA, OC	U, P	E
Teacher Candidate Exit Survey		PA, OC	U, P	E	
Post Graduation	Graduate follow up survey	OC	P,U	E	
	Employer survey	OC	P,U	E	

**Table 6: Advanced Programs Assessment System Blueprint**

<b>KEY</b>	<b>Methods</b> SR=selected response/short answer; CR=constructed response; PA=performance assessment; OC=observation/ personal communication	<b>Level</b> I=individual course; P=program; U=unit; SN=state or national	<b>Status</b> E=existing; P=planned
------------	--	---	---

**ADVANCED PROGRAMS**

Transition Point	Assessment	Method	Level	Status
Admission	GPA	SR, CR, PA, OC	I	E
	Standardized test score	SR	SN	E
	Professional goals essay	CR	U	E
	Performance based evaluation	PA	U	E
	Candidate reference form	OC	U	E
Formative	GPA (minimum B average); assessments tied to standards	SR, CR, PA, OC	I	E
	Work sample	CR, PA	P, U	E
	Self-evaluation	OC	U	E
	Faculty evaluation	OC	U	E
Summative	GPA	SR, CR, PA, OC	I	E
	Comprehensive assessment	CR	P	E
	Professional Impact Project	PA	P, U	E
	Self-evaluation	OC	U	E
	Faculty evaluation	OC	U	E
Post Graduation	Professional Licensure/ Certification Exam (as applicable)	SR, CR	SN	E
	Valid certificate (as applicable)	varies	SN	E
	Graduate follow up survey	OC	U	E
	Employer survey	OC	U	E

As shown in the table above, the assessment systems include four checkpoints at which knowledge, skills and dispositions are assessed: admission, formative (Preparing to Teach for initial program and Formative for advanced programs), summative (Exit for initial programs and Summative for advanced programs), and post-graduation. In addition, the systems are aligned with the Conceptual Framework, RIPTS, Culturally Competent Teaching Areas, and Advanced Competencies, as appropriate. Assessments within the systems occur at multiple levels, and include multiple measures of student achievement. Finally, all but three assessments at the post-graduation transition point have been implemented as of this point.

### ***Guiding Principles***

“...a collection of assessments does not entail a system any more than a pile of bricks constitutes a house. Therefore, the fundamental question for school leaders is: In what sense does their plan constitute a *system* of assessments, rather than a *collection* of assessments?” (Coladarci, 2002, p. 773)

Assessment systems are clearly made up of individual assessments. Yet, a collection of individual assessments is not considered an assessment system unless they are guided by a “coherent plan for assessment” (Coladarci, 2002, p. 773). The following six features distinguish an assessment *system* from a collection of assessments and were used to guide the development of the Advanced Programs Assessment System and the plan for its implementation:

1. The assessments collectively are relevant to announced learning targets.
2. The assessments are conducted at multiple time points (e.g., admission, mid-point (formative), exit, and post-graduation)
3. Each assessment has an announced purpose
4. The system is made up of assessments that are initiated at multiple levels (e.g., classroom, unit, SPA)
5. Candidates are allowed multiple opportunities to demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and skill development
6. The assessments draw on multiple formats—“traditional” and “alternative” alike (Coladarci, 2002, pp. 73-74; Maine Comprehensive Assessment System Technical Advisory Committee, 2000, pp. 3-4)

These six characteristics are evidenced in the FSEHD Initial and Advanced Programs Assessment System. The current status of the six characteristics in terms of design and implementation within the FSEHD Advanced Programs System are described below:

### **The assessments are relevant to announced learning targets.**

The Initial and Advanced Programs Assessment System was specifically designed to provide evidence of student achievement of the learning targets specified earlier in this document: the Conceptual Framework, the Advanced Competencies (linked to the unit’s Conceptual Framework), the Unit Dispositions, the RIPTS, and the Culturally Competent Teaching Areas. The targets of each component of the assessment system are public, and the rubrics/criteria for judging student performance on each learning target are explicit. The learning targets for each assessment are printed on the assessment and the accompanying rubric. Additionally, detailed alignment documents for the ILP, MTCWS, OPR, and TCWS have been developed. Finally, the unit is working toward improving the measurability of the learning targets relevant to each unit assessment. To this end, FSEHD has developed, field tested, and is implementing common rubrics for unit data collection.

### **Each assessment has an announced purpose**

The Advanced Programs Assessment System has been explicitly designed to make clear the purpose each assessment has within the system. Each assessment within the system serves one of the following purposes:

- Admission: Evaluation of candidate qualifications to enroll in an FSEHD advanced programs
- Formative: Evaluation of candidates as they proceed through the programs, identifying weaknesses in candidates and programs so student remediation or program improvements can be offered in a timely fashion. This is implemented prior to student teaching at the initial teacher preparation level. It is typically implemented mid-program or prior to an extended field experience or internship at the advanced level.
- Summative: Evaluation of candidates at the end of an advanced program to ensure that applicants and candidates are qualified to graduate and to identify strengths and weaknesses of the programs and the unit
- Post: Evaluation of candidates for program and unit evaluation

In addition, there are four primary audiences for each assessment. Assessment data can be utilized to address questions and concerns relevant to students, faculty, program coordinators, and unit staff. Examples of questions and concerns pertaining to various audiences over the four transition points include (but are not limited to):

- Candidates: Am I improving over time? Am I succeeding at the level that I should be? What help do I need?

- Faculty: Does this candidate meet the admissions or exit criteria for our program? Which candidates need help? What grades should candidates receive? Are my instructional strategies working?
- Program: Is our program effective? How can it be improved? Which candidates are making adequate progress? Are our candidates ready for the workplace or the next step in learning?
- Unit: Who is applying to our programs? Are programs producing the intended results? How should we strategize to achieve success? Which programs need/deserve more resources? (Stiggins, 2001, pp. 11-12)

## **The assessments are conducted at multiple time points**

The Initial and Advanced Programs Assessment System includes four checkpoints where knowledge, skills and dispositions are assessed: admission, formative (e.g., mid-point), exit, and post-graduation. This allows program and unit staff to monitor candidate progress toward mastery of relevant learning targets. Each program has identified a course of action if assessments indicate that candidates are not yet ready to proceed to the next stages of their programs is being adopted by each program. Possible actions include remediation, re-doing assessments, and denial of advancement. Documentation of these instances is being kept by all programs.

The four transition points are currently in place for all programs. At the initial and advanced levels, the admission transition point occurs at the stage when a candidate applies to a program. The formative assessment transition point for initial teacher preparation programs is just prior to student teaching. The faculty in each advanced program have identified a formative checkpoint that is appropriate to the nature and structure of its particular program. Some timeframes programs have chosen to identify the formative point include: the mid-point in terms of number of credits in the program, after 12 credits of graduate study (application for candidacy), prior to an internship or clinical experience, etc. The summative transition point occurs at the during the student teaching experience for initial teacher preparation candidates. Summative unit assessments are implemented at the end of advanced programs but are sometimes split over the two final semesters.

The post-graduation checkpoint is fully implemented, with the administration of graduate follow up surveys to FSEHD alumni of initial and advanced programs and surveys of graduates' employers. This process was first initiated in 2005/2006 and repeated in 2010/2011. Data have been analyzed, and recommendations for program improvement are available. Additionally, while all advanced program graduates are currently taking required professional licensure or certification exams and obtaining valid certificates for their profession, the assessment system is not yet equipped to collect, analyze, or report on this data.

## **The system is made up of assessments that are initiated at multiple levels**

According to the Standards for Educational Accountability Systems established by the Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing, assessment systems "include data elements that allow for interpretations of student, institution, and administrative performance" (Baker et al., 2002, p. 2). Including assessment data from multiple levels (e.g., classroom, program, unit, etc.) facilitates the process of identifying areas of improvement in each area (American Education Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education, 1999).

Consequently, the assessments in the Initial and Advanced Programs Assessment System are initiated at the individual course (I), program (P), unit (U), and state or national (SN) levels. As displayed in the assessment system blueprints (Table 5 and Table 6), GPA and minimum course grades are derived from course specific assessments (I); however, many courses also include assessments that are common across a particular program (P) or the unit (U). The work sample required at the advanced formative assessment point are program specific (P), yet assessed with a unit wide rubric (U). The TCWS, Mini TCWS, ILP, OPR, and PIP used at the summative point in initial and advanced programs are initiated at the program level (P), yet assessed with a unit wide rubric

(U). On the other hand, candidate self evaluations and faculty evaluation of candidates are initiated at the unit level (U). Furthermore, state or national level professional licensure certification exam results (SN) are utilized to provide additional information regarding the achievement of initial and advanced program graduates. Graduate follow up and employer surveys are initiated at the unit level (U) but are disaggregated at the program level (P). The use of multiple measures allows for the assessment of students, programs, and the unit through multiple lenses and allows for the triangulation of evidence used to make inferences about student achievement and program effectiveness. This, in turn, increases the validity of such inferences.

## **Candidates are allowed multiple opportunities to demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and skill development**

The design of the initial and advanced program assessment systems afford candidates multiple opportunities to demonstrate their growth in the learning targets identified by their programs and the unit. Additionally, the use of common learning targets, criteria, and rubrics as candidates progress through their programs clarifies expectations and enables faculty and candidates to observe candidate growth as they participate in multiple opportunities to demonstrate their knowledge, understanding, and skill development over time. The use of multiple assessments with multiple formats, as opposed to a single, “one-shot” assessment, increases the validity of the inferences subsequently made regarding the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of advanced programs candidates.

## **The assessments draw on multiple formats—“traditional” and “alternative” alike**

There are many methods for assessing learning; yet, no single assessment format is adequate for all purposes. (American Educational Research Association, 2000) Consequently, the advanced program assessment system allows candidates to demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions using a variety of methodologies. The various assessment methodologies used in the Initial and Advanced Programs Assessment System are classified as follows:

- *Selected Response and Short Answers*: Assessments that ask candidates to choose from pre-selected responses, such as multiple choice, true/false, or matching questions. Short answer questions are also included here. These assessments are a good match for evaluating content knowledge and to a lesser extent for the application of knowledge to solve problems.
- *Constructed Response*: Assessments that require substantial responses that candidates construct for themselves on paper. Included here are essays, graphic representations, case studies, and other ways for candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and skills on paper. This method of assessment is often a good match for evaluating content knowledge and the application of knowledge to solve problems.
- *Performance Tasks*: Assessments that require candidates to provide evidence of their knowledge or skills by demonstrating them "in the moment" or by creating artifacts that are similar to those created by professionals in their area of interest. Included here are projects, presentations, and exhibitions. This method is a good match for evaluating candidates' skills as practitioners in their field.
- *Observation and Personal Communication*: Assessments that classroom faculty carry out as part of their daily teaching and assessment repertoire as they observe and communicate with candidates, including formative assessments such as check lists, anecdotal records, conferencing, journal entries, and guided conversations. This method also includes candidate self-evaluation, as candidates reflect on their experience and learning and evaluate their own strengths and weaknesses. This method is a particularly good match for evaluating the dispositions of candidates. (Smith & Miller, p. 17)

As shown in the Initial and Advanced Programs Assessment System blueprints (Table 5 and Table 6), all four assessment formats are utilized throughout the four assessment transition checkpoints. This attempt to “balance” assessment in terms of assessment methods yields multiple forms of diverse and redundant types of evidence that can be used to check the validity and reliability of the judgments and decisions. (Wiggins, 1998)

# Unit Assessments

## Initial Programs

### Admission

The applicant’s academic performance and related experiences are reviewed in the admission process. The application materials submitted by the undergraduate candidate in the Admission Portfolio must provide evidence of the following:

- Successful completion of the Reading, Mathematics, and Writing sections of the Pre-Professional Skills Test of the Praxis I or SAT or ACT, as defined by the RIDE:

**Table 7: Assessment of Basic Skills Requirement for Admission to Teacher Preparation Programs (As Required by the RI State Department of Education)**

<b>Undergraduate – Second Degree – Rhode Island Teacher Education Program (RITE)</b>		
	<b>August 21, 2010 to August 19, 2011</b>	<b>August 20, 2011</b>
SAT*	Critical Reading (Verbal) score of at least 500 and, Math score of at least 500 and, Composite score in these two areas of at least 1100.	Critical Reading (Verbal) score of at least 530 and, Math score of at least 530 and, Composite score in these two areas of at least 1150.
ACT	Reading 22 and, Math 19.	Reading 24 and, Math 20.
Praxis I PPST	Math score of at least 175 and, Reading score of at least 175 and, Writing score of at least 173 or, Composite score of 523 with no test score more than 3 points below the cut.	Math score of at least 179 and, Reading score of at least 179 and, Writing score of at least 177 or, Composite score of 535 with no test score more than 3 points below the cut.
<b>Masters of Arts in Teaching (MAT)</b>		
	<b>August 21, 2010 to August 19, 2011</b>	<b>August 20, 2011</b>
GRE* or	1050 Composite	1100 Composite, Verbal Reasoning score at least 465 and Quantitative Reasoning score of at least 584.
SAT ACT PPST	See above See above See above	See above See above See above

- Admission to Rhode Island College.
- Completion of at least 24 semester hours from a nationally or regionally accredited college or university by the end of the semester in which the candidate applies for admission to a teacher preparation program at Rhode Island College.
- Attainment of a minimum grade point average (GPA) of 2.50 in all college level courses taken prior to admission to a teacher preparation program. Candidates who transfer to Rhode Island College from another school must meet this requirement and provide transcripts from all schools previously attended.
- Completion of Foundations of Education 346: Schooling in a Democratic Society with a minimum grade of B-. The minimum grade requirement applies even if an equivalent course from another institution is transferred to Rhode Island College.
- Completion of the Rhode Island College Writing Requirement and the Rhode Island College Mathematics Requirement.

- Submission of Faculty Reference Form: [Candidate Dispositions in College Classroom](#) form by FNED 346 instructor.
- Submission of Supervisor Reference Form: [Candidate Dispositions in Field Settings](#) form by Service Learning Supervisor.
- Completion of Writing 100 with a grade of B or better
- Completion of the Technology Competency requirement.
- Fulfillment of all additional requirements which a department may have for admission to a particular teacher preparation program/concentration.
- All transfer students must submit an Admission Portfolio as described in the preceding paragraph. If a transfer student submits a course equivalent of FNED 346 the student must also secure two confidential reference forms.

## Preparing to Teach

Across all programs, candidates assemble artifacts of teaching strategies, including a unit plan, at least one implemented lesson, assessments of student learning, and acknowledgement of content preparation. These artifacts are organized to show coherence, to showcase candidate skills and dispositions, and to provide an opportunity for candidates to reflect deeply about their teaching philosophy, pedagogy, and continued learning. Preparing to Teach requirements include the following:

- GPA of 2.5 in all undergraduate coursework
- Passing scores on required PLT, Praxis II and/or Content tests, as specified by RIDE:

**Table 8. Passing Scores on Required PLT, Praxis II and/or Content Tests (As Required by RI Department of Elementary and Secondary Education)**

Certification Area	Required Test	Test Code	Session	Qualifying Score
<b>Early Childhood Education</b>				
Early Childhood – Nursery– Grade 2	Early Childhood: Content Knowledge (PDF)	0022	1	169
	<b>and</b>			
	Education of Young Children (PDF)	0021	2	171
	<b>or</b>			
	Elementary Education: Content Area Exercises	0012	2	148
	<b>and</b>			
	Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (paper-delivered test) (Calculator allowed.)	0014	1	145
<b>or</b>				
	Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (PDF) (computer-delivered) (Calculator allowed.)	5014	n/a	145
<b>Elementary Education</b>				
Elementary Education	Elementary Education: Content Area Exercises	0012	2	148
	<b>and</b>			
	Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (paper-delivered test) (Calculator allowed.)	0014	1	145
	<b>or</b>			
	Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (PDF) (computer-delivered) (Calculator allowed.)	5014	n/a	145
<b>Middle School Education</b>				
Middle School English	Middle School English Language Arts	0049	1	162

Middle School Mathematics	Middle School Mathematics (Calculator allowed.)	0069	2	158
Middle School Science	Middle School Science	0439	1	154
Middle School Social Studies	Citizenship Education: Content Knowledge (PDF)	0087	1	160
<b>Secondary Education</b>				
Secondary Teachers	Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 7–12	0524	2	167
<b>All Grades</b>				
School Nurse Teacher	Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades K–6	0522	2	167
	<b>or</b>			
	Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 7–12	0524	2	167
Special Subjects Teacher	Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades K–6	0522	2	167
	<b>or</b>			
	Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 7–12	0524	2	167
<b>World Languages</b>				
Bilingual Endorsement – Spanish	Spanish: World Language (PDF)	5195	n/a	168
<b>Special Education</b>				
Early Childhood – Special Education	Early Childhood: Content Knowledge (PDF)	0022	1	169
	<b>and</b>			
	Education of Young Children (PDF)	0021	2	171
Elementary–Middle Special Education	Elementary Education: Content Area Exercises	0012	2	148
	<b>and</b>			
	Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (paper-delivered test) (Calculator allowed.)	0014	1	145
	<b>or</b>			
	Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (PDF) (computer-delivered) (Calculator allowed.)	5014	n/a	145
Special Education – Severe/Profound	Fundamental Subjects: Content Knowledge	0511	2	160
	<b>or</b>			
	Elementary Education: Content Area Exercises	0012	2	148
	<b>and</b>			
	Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (paper-delivered test) (Calculator allowed.)	0014	1	145
	<b>or</b>			
	Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (PDF) (computer-delivered) (Calculator allowed.)	5014	n/a	145

- Implemented Lesson Plan. The purpose of this instrument is to provide instructive feedback about the teacher candidate’s teaching performance and to assess the Implemented Lesson Plan during Practicum. Prior to the lesson, the observer reviews the teacher candidate’s lesson plan. During the lesson, the observer evaluates indicators related to Implementation, Content, Classroom Climate, and Classroom Management. Following a post-observation conference with the teacher candidate, the evaluator subsequently assesses him/her on a series of Professional Behavior and Reflection indicators. The ILP is identical to the Observation and Progress Report used for teacher candidates during student teaching. However, as the range of indicators suitable for assessment during Practicum is narrower than during student teaching, several items are marked with an asterisk (\*), indicating that they are optional. While the rating scale used in the ILP is the same as the rating scale for the OPR, it is expected that teacher candidates in Practicum will be at an earlier stage of development on the indicators than student teachers. Consequently, items rated as “developing” are adequate at this stage. As the ILP is being

phased in and until a formal standard setting process is implemented, pass/fail decisions are up to program faculty who evaluate the ILP.

- Mini Teacher Candidate Work Sample. Teacher candidates who are preparing to student teach design a Teacher Candidate Mini Work Sample (TCMWS) centered on an instructional unit that provides evidence of their ability to plan for student learning by setting significant, challenging, varied, and appropriate learning goals and unit objectives; incorporating multiple forms of assessment aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during, and after instruction; and designing instruction for specific unit objectives, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts. The TCMWS contains three of the teaching processes identified by research and best practice as fundamental to improving student learning. (These processes and the TCMWS instrument constitute a sub-set of the full TCWS implemented at Exit.) These three teaching processes fit into the FSEHD Conceptual Framework themes of Knowledge, Pedagogy, Diversity, and Professionalism. Each Teaching Process of the TCMWS is followed by the Task, a Prompt, and a Rubric that defines various levels of performance. The Rubrics are used to evaluate the TCMWS. The prompts/directions/tips support the construction of the TCMWS. The components of the TCMWS include: Learning goals and unit objectives aligned with state or district content standards; An assessment plan designed to assess student learning before, during and after instruction, and; A design for instruction. As the TCMWS is being phased in and until a formal standard setting process is implemented, pass/fail decisions are up to program faculty who evaluate the TCMWS.
- Community Service.
- Submission of Assessment of [Candidate Dispositions in College Classroom](#) form by a faculty member. Scores on this instrument are to be aggregated and reported in terms of FSEHD professional dispositions.
- Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in Field Settings (derived from ILP and MTCWS scores). Demonstration of FSEHD professional dispositions in field settings is calculated based on an aggregate of scores on ILP and MTCWS indicators that have been determined to align with the dispositions.
- Assessment of Candidate Cultural Competence (derived from ILP and MCTWS scores). Demonstration of FSEHD Culturally Competent Teaching Areas is calculated based on an aggregate of scores on ILP and MTCWS indicators that have been determined to align with the Culturally Competent Teaching Areas.
- Other program-specific requirements, as appropriate

## Exit

The purpose of the exit requirements is for the candidate to demonstrate proficiency in reflective practice and to demonstrate knowledge and use proficiency of the educational objectives of the Conceptual Framework and Rhode Island Beginning Teacher Standards. These requirements include completing a full Teacher Candidate Work Sample, being assessed a minimum of six times with the unit's Observation and Progress Report, assessments of candidate's professional dispositions and culturally competent teaching, and other program-specific requirements, as appropriate. By compiling a rich set of artifacts detailing best teaching and learning during the student teaching experience, candidates articulates growth as a reflective practitioner and readiness to assume a position as a beginning teacher. Each unit exit assessment is described below:

- Teacher Candidate Work Sample. During Student Teaching, candidates are required to teach a comprehensive unit for the purpose of the TCWS. The TCWS contains six teaching processes identified by research and best practice as fundamental to improving student learning. These six teaching processes fit into the FSEHD Conceptual Framework themes of Knowledge, Pedagogy, Diversity, and Professionalism and are aligned with the RIPTS. As a reflective practitioner, the TCWS also requires

teacher candidate to plan, act, and reflect to inform practice. Each Teaching Process of the TCWS is followed by the Task, a Prompt, and a six-point analytical Rubric that defines various levels of performance. The Rubrics are used to evaluate the TCWS. The prompts/directions/tips support the construction of the TCWS. The components of the TCWS include: *PLANNING*(Contextual factors related to the community and students to be taught; Learning goals and unit objectives aligned with state or district content standards; An assessment plan designed to assess student learning before, during and after instruction, and; A design for instruction); *ACTING*(Instructional decision-making that facilitates student learning); and *REFLECTING*(Analysis of student learning and evaluation of self as teacher of the unit; A comprehensive reflection on the overall Student Teaching experience and a plan for future professional development).

FSEHD's TCWS draws heavily from the Teacher Work Sample model developed and extensively field tested by 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 Teacher Candidate Work Sample is now a key assessment at the Exit transition point. Requirements for "passing" the TCWS include the following: 1) Candidate does not receive any scores of "1" on any rubric dimension; 2) Candidate's average score for each process must be equal to or greater than "3"; 3) The candidate's total score on the TCWS is 141 points or higher; 4) Candidate is allowed no more than one revision for each process. Using these criteria, performance levels for TCWS performance include the following:

- Fail (Total score of 0-140 points OR the candidate received a score of "1" on at least one rubric dimension OR more than one revision of a TCWS process)
- Pass: Acceptable (Total score of 141-234 points; no scores of "1" on any rubric dimensions; no more than one revision per process)
- Pass: Target (Total score of 235-282 points; no scores of "1" on any rubric dimensions; no more than one revision per process)

The above cut scores were developed based on input from faculty. FSEHD plans to conduct a formal standard setting process for the TCWS in Fall 2011.

- Observation and Progress Report. The purpose of this instrument is to assess and provide instructive feedback about the teacher candidate's teaching performance and other professional behaviors during Student Teaching. The OPR was also designed to capture candidate growth during the student teaching experience. Prior to an observed lesson, the College Supervisor or Cooperating Teacher reviews the teacher candidate's lesson plan. During the lesson, the evaluator evaluates indicators related to Implementation, Content, Classroom Climate, and Classroom Management. The evaluator also assigns a holistic Capsule Rating to the observed lesson. Following a post-observation conference with the teacher candidate, evaluators assess the candidate on his/her Reflection skills and on a series of Professional Behavior and Reflection indicators. They also set goals for the next observed lesson. Additionally Cooperating Teachers assess candidates on ongoing Professional Behavior and Technology Use indicators that they observe on a daily basis and which might not be evident to a College Supervisor during a single observed lesson.

The Teacher Candidate Observation and Progress Report (OPR) is completed by faculty supervisors and cooperating teachers three times each during candidates' student teaching experience using a six-point rating scale. Following the lead of the Special Education program, FSEHD plans to "elaborate" on the rating scale in Fall 2010, when specific performance indicators per indicator for each level of performance will be developed.

- Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in Field Settings (derived from OPR and TCWS scores). Demonstration of FSEHD professional dispositions in field settings is calculated based on an aggregate of scores on OPR and TCWS indicators that have been determined to align with the dispositions.

- Assessment of Candidate Cultural Competence (derived from OPR and TCWS scores). Demonstration of FSEHD Culturally Competent Teaching Areas is calculated based on an aggregate of scores on OPR and TCWS indicators that have been determined to align with the Culturally Competent Teaching Areas.

Three Student Teaching Surveys are also administered during student teaching. The purpose of these assessments is to evaluate the Cooperating Teacher, the College Supervisor, the Student Teaching Site, and the candidate's Teacher Preparation Program. Data from these assessments are not used to decide whether a candidate is prepared to exit a teacher preparation program. The surveys include:

- A 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).
- The Supervisor Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher 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, administered to graduating students, is designed to provide input on teacher candidates' perceptions of their cooperating teacher(s) and student teaching placement(s), as well as their ability to function effectively as future teachers and their satisfaction with their Teacher Education program at FSEHD. 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)

## **SPA Assessments**

Each nationally recognized FSEHD initial teacher preparation program includes six to eight SPA assessments among their program assessments. Many SPA requirements are measured using the same instruments as - and simultaneously with - the unit's assessments. Where SPA assessments differ from unit assessments, programs design and administer SPA assessments themselves, collect and analyze program-level assessment data, and present these data during SPA reviews.

## **Post-Graduation**

The post-graduation checkpoint consists of employer and graduate follow up surveys. Employer surveys are administered electronically to school and district administrators in the state of RI. The employer survey asks respondents to compare the caliber of recent FSEHD graduates to that of graduates from other teacher preparation programs. The survey also asks respondents to assess graduates' master of the RIPTS and their

overall teacher preparation and included opportunities for open-ended feedback regarding their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of teacher preparation at FSEHD. The most recent Employer Survey was administered in November 2010.

Graduate follow up surveys are administered electronically to all FSEHD graduates who have successfully exited a teacher preparation program within the past five years. Graduates are contacted via email. Additionally, links to the survey are posted on relevant RIC sites on Facebook. Follow up surveys of initial program graduates require graduates to rate their mastery of the RIPTS and their overall FSEHD preparation and include opportunities for graduates to provide open-ended feedback regarding the strengths and weaknesses of their programs and their overall experiences at FSEHD. The most recent graduate follow up survey was administered in February 2011.

## ***Advanced Programs***

### **Admissions**

Candidates applying for admission to an advanced program at FSEHD are required to meet the following criteria for acceptance:

- Teaching certificate (for all school related programs except school psychology).
- Official standardized test scores (Graduate Record Examination or the Miller Analogies Test) required for all FSEHD graduate degree plans except CGS in Physical Education.
- Three candidate reference forms completed by former instructors, employees, or other professionals who can assess the candidate's potential to complete graduate study and make a positive influence in the field. Candidates are evaluated on the following dimensions: capacity for insight, clarity of goals, intellectual curiosity, motivation and initiative, rapport with children and youth, rapport with adults, emotional stability, adaptability to change, reliability and dependability, ability to organize ideas or tasks, oral and written communication skills, and overall potential.
- Professional goals essay, essay, including the candidate's reflection on experiences, skills, and lifelong learning; level of preparation, knowledge base, and professional activities; professional goals and their relation to serving all individuals and families; and reasons for choosing the FSEHD advanced program.
- Performance-based evaluation (i.e., a recent teaching or work-performance evaluation).
- Other program specific requirements.

### **Formative**

Each advanced program has identified a formative checkpoint that is appropriate to the nature and structure of the particular program. Some timeframes programs have chosen to identify the formative point include: the mid-point in terms of number of credits in the program, after 12 credits of graduate study (application for candidacy), prior to an internship or clinical experience, etc. To progress past the Formative Transition Point, advanced candidates must demonstrate successful performance on each of the following requirements:

- A minimum Grade Point Average of B or better
- A Performance-Based Work Sample in a key course or practicum. The appropriate work sample for this transition point is determined by the program and is intended to provide evidence of the candidate's growing competency in the Advanced Competency, Practice. In particular, the work sample must display the candidate's skills in Communication and Expression, Reflective Problem-Solving, Professional Practice, and Technology Use. The work sample is evaluated using a four-point, unit wide rubric.

- Self-evaluation: The candidate assesses the extent to which s/he is developing a series of attributes/behaviors related to FSEHD’s Advanced Competencies and the Unit Dispositions since his/her admission into the advanced preparation program. The evaluation instrument consists of a 12-item, four-point Likert-type rating scale.
- Faculty evaluation: A faculty member assesses the extent to which the candidate is developing the same attributes/behaviors as described above. The evaluation instrument contains the same items in the same format as the self-evaluation.

Note: The Advanced Programs Assessment System is presently being reviewed and is likely to be revised substantially in 2011-2012. For this reason, the existing formative assessments are aligned with the “old” Advanced Competencies and dispositions. As they were not designed with an eye toward the revised Advanced Competencies or the revised Professional Disposition and they are likely to be eliminated, the unit has not undertaken efforts to align the existing Formative Assessments to the newly revised Advanced Competencies or the revised Professional Dispositions.

## Summative

To exit their programs, advanced and program candidates must demonstrate successful performance on each of the following requirements:

- A minimum Grade Point Average of B or better
- Successful performance on the program’s Comprehensive Assessment
- Professional Impact Project. FSEHD advanced candidates are required to complete FSEHD Professional Intervention Project (including descriptive rubrics) for Advanced Programs (PIP) to be completed by 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 revised 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 2010. The current status of PIP implementation is displayed in Table 9.

**Table 9: Status of PIP Implementation in Advanced Programs**

Program	Course implemented	When	Material submitted to Assessment
Advanced Studies in Teaching and Learning	SED 555: Literacies across the disciplines.  Teacher research project for the capstone experience.	Spring	This spring, 2011, will be the first time that data will be submitted on the new PIP rubric.
Early Childhood	ELED 510? + ELED 662	Part of the final project, a pilot research study done in ECED 662. The course will next run in Fall 2011.	No, not available yet.
Educational Leadership	LEAD 505 LEAD 505/511	Spring 10 Spring 11	No – beginning Spr 11
Elementary Education	ELED 664 or FNED 547	Fall 2011	No – beginning fall 2011
Health Education	<b>HED 505</b> Program Development	Spring 2011 Complete needs	

		assessment, implementation plan, & evaluation plan	
	<b>HED 562</b> Seminar in Health Education	Fall 2011 Implement program, conduct evaluation, analyze data, write report , submit report	No – beginning fall 11
Mental Health counseling	CEP 683/684	Fall 10/spr 11	No – beginning spr 11
Reading	ELED 663		
School Counseling	CEP 541/542	Fall 10/spr 11	No – beginning Spr 11
School Psychology	CEP 629	Spring 11	No – beginning spr 11
SPED Early Childhood	SPED 648	Fall 10	Yes
SPED Exceptional Learning Needs			
SPED Initial cert			
SPED Severe/Profound			
SPED Urban Multicultural			
Teaching English as Second Language	FNED 547 (ELED 510)	Fall 10 (LB) & spring 2011 (JJ)	C & W

- Self-evaluation: The candidate assesses the extent to which s/he is developing a series of attributes/behaviors related to FSEHD’s Advanced Competencies and the Unit Dispositions since his/her admission into the advanced preparation program. The evaluation instrument consists of a 12-item, four-point Likert-type rating scale.
- Faculty evaluation: A faculty member assesses the extent to which the candidate is developing the same attributes/behaviors as described above. The evaluation instrument contains the same items in the same format as the self-evaluation.

Note: Because the Advanced Programs Assessment System is presently being reviewed and is likely to be revised substantially in 2011-2012, only the newly designed PIP is aligned with the revised Advanced Competencies and revised Professional Dispositions. The other summative assessments are aligned with the “old” Advanced Competencies and dispositions. As they were not designed with an eye toward the revised learning targets and they are likely to be eliminated, the unit has not undertaken efforts to align the existing Summative Assessments to the newly revised Advanced Competencies or the revised Professional Dispositions.

### **SPA Assessments**

Each nationally recognized FSEHD advanced program includes six to eight SPA assessments among their program assessments. Many SPA requirements are measured using the same instruments as - and simultaneously with – the unit’s outcomes assessments. Where SPA assessments differ from unit assessments, programs design and administer SPA assessments themselves, collect and analyze program-level assessment data, and present these data during SPA reviews.

### **Post-Graduation**

The post-graduation checkpoint consists of employer and graduate follow up surveys. Employer surveys are administered electronically to school and district administrators in the state of RI, as well as directors of

community agencies that are likely to employ FSEHD advanced program graduates. The employer survey asks respondents to compare the caliber of recent FSEHD advanced graduates to that of advanced graduates from other advanced preparation programs. The survey also asks respondents to assess graduates' mastery of the Advanced Competencies and their overall advanced program preparation and included opportunities for open-ended feedback regarding their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of advanced preparation at FSEHD. The most recent Employer Survey was administered in November 2010.

Graduate follow up surveys are administered electronically to all FSEHD advanced graduates who have successfully exited an advanced program within the past five years. Graduates are contacted via email. Additionally, links to the survey are posted on relevant RIC sites on Facebook. Follow up surveys of advanced program graduates require graduates to rate their mastery of the Advanced Competencies and their overall FSEHD advanced preparation and include opportunities for graduates to provide open-ended feedback regarding the strengths and weaknesses of their programs and their overall experiences at FSEHD. The most recent graduate follow up survey was administered in February 2011.

## Performance Levels for Acceptable Performance

Minimum thresholds for each assessment, as well as supplementary information that may be used to supersede a threshold that is not attained are listed below:

**Table 10: Minimum Thresholds and Supplementary Information Considered in Initial Programs Unit Assessments**

Transition Point	Assessment	Minimum Threshold	Supplementary Information
Admission	B- or better in FNED 346	B-	
	2.5 GPA	2.5 GPA	
	Completion of RIC Writing and Math requirements	Successful completion	
	Successful completion of the Reading, Mathematics, and Writing sections of the Pre-Professional Skills Test of the PRAXIS I or SAT or ACT	See information in Table 7	
	Supervisor Reference Form: Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in Field Settings	At discretion of program until unit implements formal standard setting process	
	Faculty Reference Form: Assessment of Professional Dispositions in College Classroom	At discretion of program until unit implements formal standard setting process	
	Technology competency	Pass	
	B or better in Writing 100	B	
	Other, program-specific requirements	varies	varies
Preparing to Teach (Formative)	2.5 GPA	2.5 GPA	
	Passing scores on PLT, Praxis II, and/or Content tests	See information in Table 8	
	Implemented Lesson Plan	At discretion of program until unit implements formal standard setting process	
	Mini Teacher Candidate Work Sample	At discretion of program until unit	

Transition Point	Assessment	Minimum Threshold	Supplementary Information	
		implements formal standard setting process		
	Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in the College Classroom	At discretion of program until unit implements formal standard setting process		
	Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in Field Settings (derived from ILP and MTCWS scores)	At discretion of program until unit implements formal standard setting process		
	Assessment of Candidate Cultural Competence (derived from ILP and MTCWS scores)	At discretion of program until unit implements formal standard setting process		
	Community service	Completion of 25 hours		
Exit (Summative)	Teacher Candidate Work Sample	Passing requirements : 1) No scores of "1" on any rubric dimension; 2) Average score for each process must be equal to or greater than "3"; 3) Total score on the TCWS is 141 points or higher; 4) No more than one revision for each process completed		
	Observation and Progress Report	Scores in the 3 to 4 (Acceptable) or 5 to 6 (Target) on all indicators		
	Assessment of Candidate Dispositions in Field Settings (derived from OPR and TCWS scores)	Scores in the 3 to 4 (Acceptable) or 5 to 6 (Target) on all PIP OPR and TCWS indicators		
	Assessment of Candidate Cultural Competence (derived from OPR and TCWS scores)	Scores in the 3 to 4 (Acceptable) or 5 to 6 (Target) on all OPR and TCWS indicators		
	Other, program-specific requirements	varies	varies	
	(Used for unit & program assessment, not to evaluate candidate)	Supervisor Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher	n/a	n/a
		Cooperating Teacher Survey	n/a	n/a
Teacher Candidate Exit Survey		n/a	n/a	

Transition Point	Assessment	Minimum Threshold	Supplementary Information
Post Graduation	Graduate follow up survey	n/a	n/a
	Employer survey	n/a	n/a

**Table 11: Thresholds and Supplementary Information Considered in Advanced Programs Unit Assessments**

Transition Point	Assessment	Minimum Threshold	Supplementary Information
Admission	GPA	Minimum cumulative undergraduate GPA of 3.0 on a 4.0 scale	ii. Last year of study iii. GPA within academic major iv. GPA within graduate courses recently completed
	Standardized test score	i. MAT score minimally within the Average range ii. GRE score minimally within the Average range d. Supplementary	i. Point in time scores ii. Highest scores attained over time
	Professional goals essay	i. Evaluated on a common, four-point scoring rubric by program faculty and rated as 3 (“Acceptable”) or 4 (“Exemplary”)	i. Discussion of essay during a follow-up interview ii. Submission of revised essay iii. Submission of alternative essay; topic determined by advisor or program admission committee
	Performance based evaluation	Submission of recent teaching or work-performance evaluations. Due to the varied nature of these evaluations, reviewers assess these evaluations holistically, on a scale of 1 (questionable) to 4 (strong)	i. Evaluation of a specific work-related activity ii. Letter of recommendation from supervisor or principal addressing applicant’s professional skills iii. Telephone consultation with supervisor or principal by program faculty, with candidate’s permission
	Candidate reference form	Submission of 12-item, four-point Likert-type rating scale completed by two references. Taken together, the two forms are evaluated holistically on a scale of 1 (unsatisfactory) to 4 (commendable), with the expectation that the candidate will receive scores of 3 (above average) or 4 (high level) on the majority of indicators on each of the two forms	i. Discussion of references’ ratings within a follow-up interview ii. Follow-up phone calls of reference authors iii. Review of letters of recommendation requested by program faculty
Formative	GPA (minimum B average); assessments tied to standards	Minimum 3.0 grade point average	
	Work sample	Scores of 2 (Improving), 3 (Adequate), or 4 (Advanced) on all Performance-Based Work Sample criteria.	

<b>Transition Point</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Minimum Threshold</b>	<b>Supplementary Information</b>
	Self-evaluation	Scores of 2 (Inconsistently developing), 3 (Adequately developing), or 4 (Highly developing) on all indicators in the Self-Evaluation.	
	Faculty evaluation	Scores of 2 (Inconsistently developing), 3 (Adequately developing), or 4 (Highly developing) on all indicators in the Faculty Evaluation of the candidate	
Summative	GPA	A minimum Grade Point Average of a 3.0 grade point average or better	
	Comprehensive assessment	A “pass” score on the program’s Comprehensive Exam.	
	Professional Impact Project	Scores in the 3 to 4 (Acceptable) or 5 to 6 (Target) on all PIP indicators	
	Self-evaluation	Scores of 3 (Adequately developing) or 4 (Highly developing) on all indicators in the Self-Evaluation.	
	Faculty evaluation	Scores of 3 (Adequately developing) or 4 (Highly developing) on all indicators in the Faculty Evaluation of the candidate.	
Post Graduation	Professional Licensure/ Certification Exam (as applicable)	varies	varies
	Valid certificate (as applicable)	varies	varies
	Graduate follow up survey	n/a	n/a
	Employer survey	n/a	n/a

Evaluation of a candidate’s suitability for graduate study is conducted within each program. Additionally, the relative weight of each of the above factors in decision making is determined by each program.

## References

- American Education Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: Authors.
- Baker, E. L., Linn, R. L., Herman, J. L., & Koretz, D. (2002). *Standards for educational accountability (Policy Brief 5)*. Los Angeles: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- Center for the Study of Evaluation & National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing. (1999). *CRESST assessment glossary*. Los Angeles, CA: CRESST/UCLA. Available: <http://cresst96.cse.ucla.edu/CRESST/pages/glossary.htm>
- Haessig, C.J. & LaPotin, A.S. (2007). *Lessons Learned in the Assessment School of Hard Knocks*. Irving, CA: Electronic Educational Environment, UCIrvine. Available: <http://eee.uci.edu/news/articles/0507assessment.php>
- Linacre, J.M. (1988). *FACETS*. Chicago: Mesa.
- Linn, R. L., & Gronlund, N. E. (2000). *Measurement and evaluation in teaching* (8th ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Linn, R. L. (1994). Performance assessment: Policy promises and technical measurement standards. *Educational Researcher*, 23 (9), 4-14.
- McLeod, S. (2005). *Data-driven teachers*. Minneapolis: School Technology Leadership Initiative, University of Minnesota. Available at: [www.scottmcleod.net/storage/2005\\_CASTLE\\_Data\\_Driven\\_Teachers.pdf](http://www.scottmcleod.net/storage/2005_CASTLE_Data_Driven_Teachers.pdf)
- Measured measures: Technical considerations for developing a local assessment system*. (2005). Augusta, ME: Maine Department of Education.
- Smith, D. & Miller, L. (2003). *Comprehensive local assessment systems (CLASs) primer: A guide to assessment system design and use*. Gorham, ME: Southern Maine Partnership, University of Southern Maine.
- Stiggins, R.J. (2001). *Leadership for Excellence in Assessment: A Powerful New School District Planning Guide*. Portland, OR: Assessment Training Institute.
- Salvia, J., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (1998). *Assessment* (7th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Webb, N. L. (2005). *Issues related to judging the alignment of curriculum standards and assessments*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.
- Wiggins, G. (1998). *Educative assessment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.