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Introduction

This document, in alignment with the Johns Hopkins University School of Education (SOE) vision, mission, and conceptual framework, presents the SOE Comprehensive Assessment System (CAS). This system was developed through collaboration with faculty, staff, and key stakeholders from the community. It promotes reflective practice, critical thinking, and inquiry-based learning through a robust review of performance-based assessment measures that ultimately drive program and unit level improvements aimed to increase student learning outcomes, satisfaction, and impact on their community. The members of the School of Education (SOE) Assessment Advisory Board review the system and process regularly and offer suggestions to enhance effectiveness of SOE assessment and evaluation practices. The implementation of the system is an iterative process of continuous improvement.

Understanding Assessment

Why Assessment?
The culture of assessment is based on continuous improvement that parallels the SOE’s focus on scholarship and research.

Assessment ensures that students learn
Assessment data provide evidence of the achievement of each individual learner when measured against established acceptable and established benchmarks. Each learner’s performance is measured through targeted assessment and is benchmarked against learning objectives derived from SOE Mission, Vision, Core Values, professional standards, state standards, and program goals. Assessment results and outcomes are analyzed and evaluated in order to monitor student learning attainment and provide indicators that guide and support learning experiences and achievements.

Assessment ensures that courses and programs are effective
The analyses of assessment data indicate course effectiveness and inform course improvement and development as well as feedback for individual learners and programs. Assessments are designed to provide evidence of candidate learning in relation to the objectives and outcomes associated with each course that are drawn from program level objectives and outcomes. Similarly, attainment of learning across all courses in a program provides evidence of program effectiveness in guiding and achieving stated learning outcomes. On a holistic level, evidence of program effectiveness and data collection and analysis from programs across the unit provide and guide unit level improvement and effectiveness.

Assessment ensures that professional standards are met
Assessment results provide evidence that professional standards and discipline-specific standards are effectively addressed and that candidates demonstrate achievement of the standards relative to their learning goals. Assessment to demonstrate accountability and mastery of required standards is an important reason to assess learning accomplishments. Measures of learning assure external constituents (such as potential candidates, trustees, public officials, supporters, and accreditors) that the organization is meeting its goals.

Assessment ensures that the SOE mission, vision, and core values are addressed
Mission, vision, and core values define what the SOE aspire to implement in affecting change and values in the community, and specifically in its own student body. Assessment analyses provide evidence that learning outcomes across programs align with the SOE’s mission, vision, and core values as defined.
What Is Assessment?

Assessment:
   a. identifies the knowledge, skills, and dispositions candidates need to learn,
   b. measures the acquisition of knowledge, skills and dispositions, and
   c. determines the effectiveness in their application.

Assessment is a process of continuous improvement that involves the following steps:

Assessment Steps

Step 1: Establish Candidate Program and Unit Goals
   • Define goals of the program
   • Define intended learning objectives and outcomes
   • Align learning objectives with unit level mission, vision, and core values
   • Align program learning objectives with specific courses

Step 2: Design and Implement Assessments and Metrics
   • Align key assessments with program learning objectives
   • Develop assessment questions
   • Define indicators of success for each assessment question
   • Indicate data sources
   • Indicate methods of data collection
   • Determine timeline for the assessment
   • Indicate how data will be disseminated

Step 3: Analyze Data and Document Results
   • Analyze assessment data
   • Summarize results in a report
   • Indicate course, program, and unit level changes and improvements as a result of data analysis

Step 4: Implement Improvement Strategies
   • Implement changes at the course, program, and unit levels

This process closes the loop by measuring the results of the changes being driven by the data collected.

Assessment Goals
Assessments are designed to ensure continuous improvement at the course, program, and unit levels in order to meet the needs of all learners.

Learners Level
The goals are:
   • to ensure that individual learners meet the learning objectives for a program,
   • for learners to understand criteria and benchmarks for their assessments,
   • to ensure that varied opportunities for learning and assessment exist throughout the program, and
   • to provide effective feedback to individual students to ensure successful attainment of program stated learning objectives.
Course Level
The goals are:
- to ensure that a course meets the needs of the learners in successfully achieving the stated learning objectives,
- to ensure that varied opportunities for learning and assessment exist throughout the course,
- to ensure that assignments and assessments are aggregated across learners and courses, and
- to ensure that focus is on both the learners and the content.

Program Level
The goals are:
- to ensure that learners achieve program level objectives,
- to capture data from key assessments using multiple measures at key points in the program,
- to ensure that assessments consist of, but are not limited to summative and formative assignments, internships, portfolios, capstones and comprehensive exams, and
- to ensure that focus is on both the learners and the program.

Unit Level
The goals are:
- to ensure that learners achieve unit level expectations such as the vision, mission, and core values,
- to capture data from key assessments using multiple measures at key transition points across the programs,
- to ensure that assessments consist of common measures such as entry exams and post-graduation surveys, and
- to ensure that focus is on both the learners and the unit.

Assessment Types
Assessments include measures that are direct and indirect, course embedded and stand-alone, and formative and summative. Direct assessments measure learners’ performance on a specific assignment, standardized tests, and observations. Indirect assessments measure learners’ values, perceptions, attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs through course evaluations, surveys, meeting notes, reflections, and feedback.

Course embedded measures are assessments within required courses that expose learners to systematic learning experiences designed to prepare graduates by providing them with the specific knowledge and abilities to address identified learning outcomes. These include test questions or assignments that are often discipline specific. Stand-alone testing requires candidates to demonstrate certain knowledge or skills as a condition for graduation or at some other specific point in their degree program. These include assessments such as portfolios, comprehensive exams, or standardized tests.

Formative assessments provide feedback and guidance to candidates as they progress in their development toward achievement of mission-based learning. Summative assessments capture performance at key points and are measured against expected levels of progress at each of these points.

Transition point measures are assessments that are required across programs and the unit. These include admission evaluation of potential candidates, evaluation of dispositions, GPA at several points,
admission data such as standardized tests, teacher certification and licensure exams, and evaluations of candidates’ readiness before and after internship.

Interpretation of multiple measures from all candidate level assessments guide candidate support and counseling and inform improvements in courses, programs, and unit operations.

The School of Education Mission, Vision, and Core Values

Johns Hopkins University Mission Statement
The mission of Johns Hopkins University is to educate its students and cultivate their capacity for lifelong learning, to foster independent and original research, and to bring the benefits of discovery to the world.

The School of Education (SOE) addresses this mission through its mission, vision, and core values (Figure 1).

Mission of the School of Education
To support and advance the quality of education and human services for the continuous development of children, youth and adults.

Vision of the School of Education
The Johns Hopkins School of Education will lead the world in attracting the most talented and diverse individuals into the fields of education, counseling, health professions and public safety. We are committed to educational improvement and community well-being by assuring that our students, as well as others in the education profession, have the most innovative tools and effective approaches to challenge the status quo of education in America and to develop the intellectual capacity of every learner.

Core Values of the School of Education
To achieve its mission, School of Education faculty, staff, and students uphold and promote the following core values:

- **Innovation (in discovery, scholarship, leadership, and application):** As members of a university community known preeminently for research and its application, we challenge ourselves to create and test new approaches to the educational needs of our schools and communities, as well as in our own administrative and student support systems.
- **Excellence:** As reflective practitioners, we engage in regular self-assessment and invite external peer reviews to drive the continuous improvement of our academic programs, research activities, and administrative systems.
- **Collaboration and Partnerships:** We believe that multi-disciplinary and inter-institutional teams, including other schools within Johns Hopkins and public school systems, provide the range of perspectives required to address the most challenging issues facing PK-12 schools and communities.
- **Evidence-Based Practice:** Research and its application and evaluation form an iterative cycle that guides informed practice in our program development, policy formulation, and school reform initiatives. So, too, evidence-based decision making shapes our internal activities such as student and financial services.
• **Integrity:** One hundred years of continuous service to our region’s public schools and urban neighborhoods has earned us a reputation as a trustworthy partner in enhancing the quality of life for children, youth, and adults. By continuing to focus our actions and decisions on the students, schools, and communities we serve, we will sustain this primary commitment.

• **Civility and Diversity (in people, thought, and practice):** Civility and diversity are processes that form the warp and weft of our school community, weaving together the multiplicity of perspectives and experiences that enhance all our work.

The Conceptual Framework of the School of Education

![Figure 1. SOE Conceptual Framework](image)

To address its mission, vision, and core values, the SOE developed the following Conceptual Framework proficiencies:

**Content Experts**
- Demonstrate content knowledge at a high conceptual level
- Integrate appropriate program, national, state, and local goals and standards in their work
- Demonstrate the potential to be an innovative leader in their classrooms, organizations, and professional associations

**Reflective Practitioners**
• Modify, differentiate, and analyze effective instruction, intervention, or practice within the context of their organization or school
• Engage in and benefit from research that leads to improved learning and improved student outcomes
• Cultivate a reflective disposition for life-long learning

Diversity Advocates
• Respect differences among learners and colleagues (cultural, ethnic, racial, gender, sexual orientation, ability, socio-economic, etc.)
• Commit to and advocate for the development of students and/or colleagues
• Commit to working in schools and organizations characterized by diversity
• Articulate different learning needs and differentiate instruction appropriately

Evidence-Based Decision Makers
• Describe formal and informal assessments by which progress can be measured at the individual student, classroom, school or organization levels
• Use data and other evidence to plan for instruction, practice, and development
• Utilize an evidence-based approach to practice, teaching, and intervention

Applied Technology Integrators
• Advance instruction and practice through the appropriate integration of technology
• Seek technologies appropriate to their practice or school-based instruction
Components of the Comprehensive Assessment System

The Comprehensive Assessment System (CAS) builds on the mission, vision, and core values to address program goals, professional and national standards, and state standards that are appropriate to each program. In keeping with the SOE mission to generate knowledge to inform policy and practice and educate society to address the most important challenges faced by individuals, schools, and communities, our assessment process (Figure 2) provides evidence to guide decisions about candidates’ performance, program quality, and SOE operations.

Figure 2. Course, Program, and Unit Level Assessment Process

The CAS was developed by and for the entire School of Education. Its assessment cycle reflects an ongoing systematic approach to continuous improvement (Figure 3). It incorporates assessment as a critical driver in addressing the vision and mission for the SOE as stated in its Strategic Plan. It includes key assessments at each of the four transition points: admission, midpoint/pre-clinical experience, post clinical experience, and program completion. It also includes surveys to measure impact of candidates’ in the field post-graduation (1 year), and post-graduation (3 years). The transition points include both internal and external assessments, and address the mission, vision, and core values /dispositions, and the stated outcomes and expectations.
The CAS is reviewed annually at the assessment retreat and biannually by the Assessment Advisory Board. Tk20 is the assessment technology platform for the collection of SOE assessment data. As most systems, the CAS is an iterative work and many of its elements continue to be developed, improved, and implemented.

Formative assessments provide candidates with ongoing feedback from their instructors, advisers, and clinical supervisors. Summative assessments capture candidate performance on key assessments at transition points. The assessment office, in cooperation with program faculty (at the annual assessment retreat) analyze data to improve courses and programs. These results are reported in the Program Improvement Action Plan (PIAP) (Appendix A) and are presented annually to key stakeholders for input.

The SOE faculty and administrators meet to review the PIAP and aggregate data to identify patterns and trends that are important to the continuous improvement of programs and SOE operations. They compile recommendations for immediate implementation and share with appropriate stakeholders.

In addition, each program is aligned with national, state, and professional standards as required. These standards are addressed through assessments for each program. The aim is to demonstrate that SOE graduates are knowledgeable in content, reflective practitioners, committed to diversity, evidence-
based decision makers, and effective integrators of technology as evidenced in their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.

Course-Based Assessment
Course-based assessments are assessments of knowledge, skills, and behaviors in courses within a program. They include SPA key Assessments as well as key assignments designed to assess Program Learning objectives within courses using five point descriptive rubrics. Each program aligns all its Program Learning Objectives with all appropriate standards, including national, professional, and state standards. The SOE core values, ISTE and MTTS standards are aligned with the Program Learning Objectives to ensure accurate and purposeful integration of appropriate educational technology in instruction, candidate projects and work, as well as integration of technology in the P-12 setting by our candidates. Data are collected each semester and distributed to faculty and directors of programs for analysis. All programs are guided by the assessment office to ensure consistency and accuracy of data analysis and implementation of improvements. The assessment office supports programs to complete their PIAP and guides them in identifying changes, improvements, and adjustments to courses and programs using data as evidence. The program faculty create an action plan of changes to include what is to be accomplished, by whom, and offer a specific timeline for completion. Faculty are also assisted in evaluating the implementation of improvements for effectiveness and accuracy. All faculty and program leads come together once a semester during the assessment retreat, to discuss data and analysis needs and recommendations for change. In addition, at the assessment retreat, implications for unit level changes and improvements are discussed. Such changes may include additional policies, changes in program delivery, addition of programs, or termination of others, depending on the data.

Transition Point Assessments
Transition point evaluations are designed to assess candidates’ content knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Admission: Candidates are admitted into a specific program based on a set of criteria that are (1) common across the school and (2) specific to that program. This selection is determined based on the knowledge or skills expected in graduates of their specified program.

Midpoint / Pre-Internship: Candidates are assessed at mid-program or prior to entering an internship to determine the level of their performance and gauge their ability to succeed in their internships and the program.

Post-Internship: Candidates are assessed post internship to determine acquisition of skills and knowledge determined by the clinical experience, as well as to gauge their dispositions.

Program Completion: Candidates are assessed to determine their level of performance in relation to program learning objectives and acquisition of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Post-Graduation: Graduates complete surveys to indicate the impact their preparation has had on their performance. Employers and stakeholders provide information on graduates’ impact. Direct evidence of graduates’ impact on their professional field including but not limited to P-12 student performance, is assessed at determined transition points.
Table 1
Alignment of Dispositions and Core Values to Transition Points and Sample Data Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dispositions Core Values</th>
<th>Transition Points</th>
<th>Sample Data Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable in their respective content area/discipline</td>
<td>Admission</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Internship</td>
<td>Internship evaluations &amp; exit survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Completion</td>
<td>Alumni and employer surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Graduation</td>
<td>Disposition Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective practitioners</td>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Internship</td>
<td>Portfolio &amp; internship evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program completion</td>
<td>Alumni and employer surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-graduation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed to diversity</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Disposition Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Internship</td>
<td>Internship evaluations &amp; exit survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program completion</td>
<td>Alumni and employer surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-graduation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-based decision-makers</td>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Internship</td>
<td>Internship evaluations &amp; exit survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program completion</td>
<td>Alumni and employer surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-graduation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrators of applied technology</td>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Internship</td>
<td>Internship evaluations &amp; exit survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program completion</td>
<td>Alumni and employer surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-graduation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit Operations and Data Collection
The SOE conducts bi-annual reviews of data using criteria such as: number of inquiries by potential candidates, number of applications, admissions, diversity of the applicant pool and enrolled candidates, retention rate, graduation rate, and degree attainment. The SOE also collects data on materials and equipment, grants, enrollments from revenue, cost per student, faculty qualifications and productivity, and audits by external reviewers.

The unit collects surveys, interviews, and focus groups to seek stakeholders (candidates, administration, staff, faculty, employers) perception about operations.

Data analyses and results are used to improve operations, assess resources, and improve practices as they affect candidates, staff, and faculty, and the functioning of the SOE as a whole.
Tools, Resources, and Initiatives

Permissions and Contact Information at Admissions and Graduation
At admission, candidates are informed of the assessment system and are informed that they are required to participate in the process. They are informed that they (1) participate in assessments and understand that their assessment results will be analyzed for the purpose of program improvement and unit improvement, (2) complete assessment related surveys during their tenure as a candidate, at graduation, and for the first three years after graduation; and (3) asked to commit to keeping their contact information and that of their employer current for three years after their graduation, and (4) may give permission to contact their employers both one and three years after graduation. The commitment to stay connected for three years after graduation is reaffirmed through the graduation application process.

Data Collection and Analysis Tools
The SOE utilizes Tk20 to collect and house assessment data. Course-based assessments and field experience assessments are collected through Tk20. Transition points including disposition surveys and portfolio data are also assessed through the same tool. The goal is to collect data and align key assessments with program learning objectives in Tk20. This tool provides the unit the ability to aggregate data across the SOE, programs, and candidates.

The TK20 assessment system, in addition to the assessment team, is supported by a four-member JHU SOE IT team, three members training team, TK20 organization support, and a 24/7 outsourced helpdesk. The SOE assessment system is also integrated into all existing JHU systems and Central JHU IT supports maintenance and upgrades of the integration. SOE also employs a full-time Virtual FTE from central JHU IT (this is a position that amounts to a fulltime employee but pulls from several staff members’ time to ensure the appropriate skills are provided) to support integrations and reports for all systems including TK20. Furthermore, the instructional design team employs five full-time and three part-time instructional designers to support course design and integration of assignments, assessments, surveys, and reports between Blackboard, TK20, and other systems.

Program Improvement Action Plan (PIAPs)
Faculty leads and directors compile an annual report based on a review of the collected assessment data, evaluations, and other data sources by the program faculty and selected members of the professional community.

PIAPs are used to make course and program level changes and improvements. They are discussed at the assessment retreat and are shared with the Assessment Advisory Board. The PIAPs are analyzed as a whole to identify unit level patterns and trends related to strengths and needs to support recommendations for changes at the program and unit levels.

Assessment Retreat
Faculty and administrators meet at regularly scheduled retreats to review and use assessment data for improvement and participate in professional development on assessment. PIAP analysis drives the identification of strengths and weaknesses related to candidate performance, program quality, and SOE operations, including the assessment system. PIAP recommendations are forwarded to the Dean, Vice Dean, and other stakeholders.
Committees and Boards
The SOE created a Teaching and Learning Committee comprised of faculty and community experts. The committee meets twice a year and is charged with discussing program improvements and implementation of innovative teaching practices for all teacher preparation programs. In addition, many programs have program advisory boards that meet regularly to inform curriculum improvements. In fall 2016, the SOE convened an Assessment Advisory Board comprised of faculty leads, program directors, key staff, members of the National Advisory Board, members of the community and accrediting agencies. The Assessment Advisory Board is tasked with overseeing the CAS and ensuring an iterative process of improvement of the system, as well as overseeing and ensuring the integrity and quality of the assessment process at the program and unit levels.

Implementation and Monitoring of the Assessment System
The Vice Dean oversees all academic initiatives. The Associate Dean for Accreditation, Assessment, and Technology reports to the Vice Dean and guides the assessment process. The Assessment Advisory Board supports the development, implementation, and evaluation of the assessment system. All initiatives and changes are reported annually to the office of the Provost. In addition, the SOE assessment team participates in discussions and meetings with the office of the Vice Provost for Education in order to keep abreast of implementation, compliance, and monitoring of assessment and accreditation policies and procedures.

In order to keep faculty, staff, and candidates updated on current assessment components, a professional development team is tasked with regularly training stakeholders on the use of Blackboard, Tk20, assignment submission and evaluation, rubric design and usage, TORSH and media evaluation, just to name a few. Alternate training formats are implemented to support all stakeholders, and include workshops, videos, tutorials, quick guides, and one-on-one support as needed.

The assessment team drives the assessment process by supporting faculty in the implementation of all assessments and regularly monitors the flow of data. In conjunction with the faculty, the team facilitates the process of data analysis as a catalyst for program enhancements.

The SOE employs a Field Experience Coordinator and an Internship School Liaison. The Liaison is tasked with observing candidates and mentors in the field and is also tasked with selecting and training mentors and university supervisors through the teacher mentor office. Training is online through media presentations as well as through workshops and one on one meetings. The mentor office which is guided by a faculty member is also tasked with training adjunct faculty and making sure they are up to date on policy and practices at the SOE.

Annual Assessment Activity Cycle

Application and admission
- Inform students of the assessment process and secure their commitment to the process
- Collect key assessments through the application and admission process
- Use admission criteria and assessments to select candidates to enter the programs

Pre-semester
- Communicate assessment system details to new faculty
- Provide faculty with training on assessment and on the Tk20 data collection system
• Review assessments with each program lead, identify changes, identify data collection timeline, identify and connect with faculty whose courses have key assessments in order to convey required information
• Faculty leads are guided to approve and update syllabi, program objectives, and distribute to all faculty. The process is crucial to ensure the integrity of the programs and the consistency of content across course sections.

**Early semester**
• Send communication to faculty whose courses contain course-based assessments, field experience assessments, and portfolios
• Contact program coordinators to assist in the data collection follow-up
• Send communication to share timing of and directions for data collection

**Mid-semester**
• Collect employer survey or focus groups data (fall)
• Collect alumni survey data – 1 year and 3 years after graduation (spring)
• Conduct alumni focus group and employer focus group as needed
• Assessment Office follows up on missing data

**Late semester**
• Collect course-based assessment and clinical experience data for key assessments at transition points
• Assessment Office follows up on missing data

**Post-semester**
• Generate and distribute data reports to program leads and stakeholders
• Program leads analyze assessment results and contact students who are not demonstrating success at expected level
• At their faculty meetings, program leads will share and analyze data, prepare a Program Improvement Action Plan (PIAP) that reflects student performance and program strengths, needs, and recommendations and bring to the assessment retreat for further analysis and submission
• Implement changes determined in the previous cycle

**Assessment retreat (bi-annually: fall and spring)**
• Faculty and administrators analyze the PIAPs, aggregate data and share additional sources of evidence
• Faculty and administrators review the various PIAPs, identify trends and patterns, and compile a summative report on the overall strengths, needs, and recommendations for the unit.
• The Assessment Advisory Board reviews the reports generated at the retreat prior to disseminating to the Dean, the Vice Dean, and appropriate stakeholders

**Use of data for budgetary considerations of continuous improvement**
• Faculty and administrators are expected to immediately implement approved recommendations for which resources are readily available
• The assessment team will convey to the Dean and Vice Dean any recommendations that require additional resources not readily available for budgetary consideration
**Closing the loop**
- Implement changes
- Collect data on changes made
- Analyze data and share with faculty and administrators
- Determine if the outcomes met expectations or if additional changes are required

**Direct and Indirect Measures**

**Direct Measures**
Direct assessment measures are used to evaluate candidates’ knowledge, skills, and behaviors that reflect achievement of the program stated goals and objectives.

**Candidates Learning Outcomes:**
- Tests, exams, standardized testing, national and state tests
- Review by external and internal examiners
- Oral and Comprehensive exams
- Papers
- Portfolios
- Behavioral observations

**Operational Outcomes**
- Retention rate
- Graduation rate
- Degree attainment
- Materials and equipment
- Cost per student
- Faculty qualifications
- Faculty productivity
- Audits by external evaluator

**Indirect Measures**
Indirect assessment measures are conducted to seek candidates’ perceptions to determine if a goal or objective has been achieved.

**Candidates Learning Outcomes**
- Surveys and focus groups to seek:
  - Candidate perception
  - Alumni perception
  - Employer perception of program impact
- Admission and exit interviews
- Grades in courses
- Candidate records

**Operational Outcomes**
- Surveys, interviews, and focus groups to seek:
  - Stakeholders (candidates, administration, staff, faculty, employers) perception about operations
Data Analysis

Reporting Quantitative Results
Quantitative data will be analyzed to determine means, medium, and standard deviations, as well as percentages of achievement using the five-point rubric scale. Results will inform the achievement of candidates based on learning outcomes and guides changes and improvements as needed.

Reporting Qualitative Data
Qualitative data will be coded for emerging themes, as well as coded on pre-determined set of themes depending on data collected. The themes will be used to improve student experience, learning outcomes, and programs.

Validation of Instruments
In order to validate any and all data collection instruments used for assessment purposes, JHU SOE will develop an evidence-based approach to ensure that each tool functions as expected. This will include multiple sources of evidence to ensure a robust case can be made that the tool is valid. Evidence will be collected to support validity of content and construct, as well as ability to provide meaningful information to improve program requirements (formative), and ultimately future performance (criterion) of an aggregate group.

In the initial stages of the validity assessment, beginning Summer 2017, the focus will be on documenting the development of the data collection instrument and establishing evidence of content and construct validity. Evidence will be drawn by establishing alignment with standards and PLOs, as well as the use of cognitive interviews to establish that respondents understand the items as intended. The additional value of cognitive interviewing is the opportunity to identify any content that could account for cultural variability or bias in responses given the diversity in our body of instructors and candidates.¹ ² This practice will continue with each cycle of improvement.

Data collection instruments will also be reviewed each semester to establish the ability of these data to provide information that is able to inform program improvement. Upon the completion of each semester, data will be provided to each program for analysis and program improvement. Beginning in Spring 2017, these data will be mapped to program improvement, illustrating the formative validity of the data collection instruments. The utility of these data collection instruments will be evaluated annually, by program, to ensure the continued utility and expected function.

Finally, correlational analyses may be conducted to establish if existing measures correlate with other criterion, for instance impact on the field, to evaluate the ability of these assessments to predict future performance.

Reliability of Instruments

The SOE is committed to establishing a process to continuously examining the reliability of instrumentation to ensure consistent, quality data collection and a continuous cycle of improvement. With a focus on quality, the SOE relies on the following approach to establish reliability of the various assessment tools to collect consistent data that can be easily interpreted.

Reliability assessment approaches should depend on the type of assessment and intended use of the data. The SOE will employ a multi-method approach to reliability to estimate the consistency of data used to generalize to a domain of skills expected of an exemplary educator. Data collection instruments utilized in the assessment process include individual candidate tests or assessments of knowledge, self-assessment of disposition, and rater-based assessments.

In order to establish consistent, quality data, the SOE will focus on the reliability of rater-based assessments, the most common within and across programs, by designing an inter-rater reliability design coupled with parallel-forms design when appropriate for field supervision. The SOE will collect data from internal reviewers, in the form of course instructors and or faculty advisers, as well as recruiting external evaluators to score a random sample of candidate work or portfolios. The inter-rater reliability analysis will employ a qualitative examination of the differences in scores or interpretation of the rubric and utilize Cohen’s kappa to test the consistency of pairs of raters on multiple item scores. A parallel-forms approach will be undertaken to establish consistency in the field observation of candidates between their university supervisor and faculty mentor.

In the rare occurrence where an exam or quiz is identified as a key assignment, internal test or assessment consistency will be established by utilizing an average inter-item correlation to ensure that the items on the test/quiz is a reliable instrument. This may also be accomplished through comparing test results over time in certain programs. The challenge to this approach is the inability to establish if change across time is a direct result of low reliability on the instrument or if the construct has changed. This is of particular concern when considering the field experience required in teacher education programs, and the potential confound of that field experience on the continuity of scoring a candidates’ learning and growth across a program.

The reliability analysis will occur each semester and findings will be used for continual improvement of instrumentation and to identify any additional need for training surrounding data collection instruments.

---

SOE Programs

Doctoral Programs
   Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)
   Doctor of Education (EdD)

Bachelor of Science Programs
   BS in Organizational Leadership

Master of Science Programs
   MS in Counseling
      Clinical Mental Health Counseling
      School Counseling
   MS in education in Interdisciplinary Studies
   MS in Organizational Leadership
   MS in Intelligence Analysis

Master of Education Programs
   Master of Education in the Health Professions (MEHP)

Teacher Preparation
   Initial Certification
   MAT:  Elementary Education
         Secondary Education
   MS in Special Education

Advanced Programs
   MS in Reading
   MS in School Administration and Supervision
   MS in Gifted and Talented
   MS in Technology for Educators Now called Digital Age Learning and Educational Technology

Alternative Certification Programs
   MS in Education (TFA partnership)
   MS in Education (TNTP partnership)
   MS in Education (Urban Teachers partnership)

Graduate Certificates
   Clinical Mental Health Counseling
   Counseling (Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study [CAGS])
   Data-Based Decision Making and Organizational Improvement
   Education of Students with Autism and Other Pervasive Developmental Disorders
   Educational Leadership for Independent Schools
   Evidence-Based Teaching in the Health Professions
   Gifted Education
   Leadership in Technology Integration
   Mind, Brain, and Teaching
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT ACTION PLAN

Program Name: ________________________________________________________________

Report Prepared by: ____________________________________________________________

Date of Program Meeting to Develop/Discuss/Approve Plan: _______________________

Data Sets Included in Review: Fall___, Spring___, Summer___, Fall___, Spring___

Data Analysis and Program Improvement Discussion:

Indicate which data from Tk20 and other sources were analyzed in determining strengths and areas for improvement on candidate performance and program improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Goal #1:</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Detailed Implementation</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Goal #2:</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Detailed Implementation</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Goal #3:</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Detailed Implementation</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Goal #4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Detailed Implementation</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Goal #5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Detailed Implementation</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Comments and Evaluation:
APPENDIX B

PROGRAM AND UNIT LEVEL ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES

Program and Unit Level Activities

- Describe the alignment of all appropriate standards to the program goals and objectives and the SOE Conceptual Framework
- Describe the program’s key assessments (those not across the entire school) and include scoring guides (rubrics) and benchmarked outcomes (what percentage of candidates should be at what level to indicate program success?)
- Describe the engagement of the faculty and the professional community in the development of the assessments
- Describe the engagement of the faculty and the professional community in the cyclical evaluation of the capacity and effectiveness of the assessment system
- Describe the program’s annual assessment cycle:
  1. Articulate how you are informing and training faculty
  2. Describe how you are collecting and entering assessment data into Tk20
  3. Describe how you are reviewing the data by program faculty with input from external professionals
  4. Describe the process for the collection and entry of assessment data
  5. Describe how results inform program change
  6. Describe the way in which the assessment process will be reviewed by faculty and the professional community
  7. Identify the assessments held in common with other programs in the SOE

Build an annual assessment cycle calendar to include the following:

- Faculty review of assessment data and other indicators of student learning and program effectiveness in relation to student learning achievement, program effectiveness, and School effectiveness with input from your professional community – summer/early fall
- Completion of the Program Improvement Action Plan based on the discussion of assessment data and other indicators – early fall
- Assessment Retreat for review of PIAPs and development of recommendations for change – mid fall
- Evidence-based recommendations evaluated and implemented when appropriate to change courses, programs, support systems, and/or the assessment system – late fall
- Implementation of updates to assessments – late fall
- Faculty orientation and training on assessment system, timelines, and Tk20 – continuous
• Collection of key assessment data (embedded in courses, admissions data, field work, comprehensive exams, portfolios, etc.) each semester – late fall, late spring, late summer
• Faculty review and analyze assessment data to generate an evidence based report on status of program and recommendations for change – early fall
  o Input from the professional community including alumni and employers when possible
  o External data that indicates impact or effectiveness of graduates

In addition, incorporate a plan to involve the professional community (partner schools, state agencies, professional organizations, alumni, employers, etc.) in the process of evaluating the capacity and the effectiveness of the assessment system.