

SECTION I INTRODUCTION

Overview of Project

Southern Connecticut State University has applied for NCATE accreditation; the Board of Examiners visit is scheduled for October 25-29, 2003. As part of our self-study, we have developed an assessment plan to evaluate candidates as they progress through teacher certification programs; the data will also be aggregated to assess individual program and unit effectiveness. As reflected in our conceptual framework, Southern has adopted the acronym SAILS to express its learner outcomes - Scholarship; Attitudes and Dispositions; Integrity; Learning; Service. INTASC and CCCT standards have been incorporated into our assessment plan and have been aligned with the learner objectives as expressed in SAILS. This represents the model that has guided our Title II project.

The assessment plan consists of four benchmarks or gates: entry to program; midway through course completion; course completion; program completion. Since secondary certification programs are part of the School of Arts and Sciences, School of Education faculty and Arts and Sciences faculty worked collaboratively to develop this assessment plan.

As stated in our initial project proposal and the revised draft (Appendix A), our original plan was to gather data regarding candidate readiness to student teach. This was to be accomplished by focusing on the first two benchmarks of the assessment plan - entry to program and midway through required course completion in each respective program. Our plan was to require the candidate to compile a progress portfolio that would consist of reflections of papers and/or projects from required courses and self-reflections at each benchmark.

As we worked through its development, we realized that a portfolio that reflected only these first two benchmarks would not provide us with sufficient data about a candidate to accurately and fully measure his/her readiness to student teach. As such, we decided to shift our focus to the third benchmark, course completion. At this point, the candidate will have completed all the required courses in his/her certification program, and the next sequence is student teaching. Since a primary component of effective teaching in any subject at any grade level is the ability to plan effective lessons, we felt that an assessment that measures the candidate's ability to do this would be a reliable indicator of his/her readiness to student teach.

We then submitted a third draft of the project proposal that required the candidate to do three things: create a lesson plan, reflect on a paper/project from a previous required course; write a self-reflection (Appendix B). Feedback from the Title II Director (Appendix D) recommended that we do the following: eliminate the two reflections; create an assignment that requires the candidate to (1) reflect on student work taken from scored items from the CMT and CAPT tests, and (2) write a lesson plan based on those reflections. The SCSU workgroup members selected the CAPT sample of student work that would be used in each academic discipline. It was decided to use the student response that had been scored a "2," since a "3" response was a perfect score and the "1" and "0" responses would not provide the candidate with enough information to complete the assignment. Based on additional input from the Director as well as other SDE personnel, the proposal was revised into its final form (Appendix C).

The initial pilot was completed in the spring '03 semester in secondary science, secondary English, and elementary education. Candidates who were in the last course in each program immediately prior to student teaching participated in the pilot. It should be noted that our initial plan was to conduct the pilot in art education and elementary education. Once it was decided to utilize student work from the CAPT tests, and since the CAPT tests do not include art, it was

decided to conduct the pilot in elementary education, secondary English, secondary mathematics, and secondary science. However, due to the time constraints of the project itself and the sequence of courses in its program, it was not possible to include secondary mathematics in the pilot.

Candidates in all three programs were given the same prompt (Appendix E), and a student work sample from the CAPT tests in each respective academic subject (Appendices G, H, I). Six candidate responses (two high, two middle, and two low) from each academic discipline. A rubric based on the linkage/alignment table in the prompt was created, and the responses were scored (Appendices G, H, I).

List of Proposed Deliverables

- Prompt given to all candidates in all subject areas (Appendix E).
- Student work sample from the CAPT tests in each respective academic subject (Appendices G, H, I).
- Candidate responses to the prompt (Appendices G, H, I).
- Scoring of candidate responses using the rubric (Appendices G, H, I).
- Candidate responses to survey (Appendix J).

Members of Workgroup and Institutional Roles

Principal Investigator	Steven A. Greengross, Ed.D. Associate Professor Education Department University NCATE Coordinator School of Education
Asst. Principal Investigator	Susan Cusato, Ph.D. Associate Professor Chairperson - Environmental/Science Education Dept. School of Arts and Sciences
Team Consultants A	Beena Achhpal, Ph.D. Assistant Professor Education Department School of Education
	Christopher Dean, Ph.D. Assistant Professor Coordinator - English Dept. Teacher Certification Program School of Arts and Sciences
	William Diffley, Ph.D. Associate Professor Director - Research and Statistical Measurement Program School of Education

Martin Hartog, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Coordinator - Mathematics Dept. Teacher Certification Program
School of Arts and Sciences

Charles Wieder, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Coordinator - Art Dept. Teacher Certification Program
School of Arts and Sciences

Team Consultants B

James Granfield, Ph.D.
Associate Dean
School of Education

Deborah Hare
English Teacher
Sound School
New Haven, CT

Roxanne Lindgren
Science Teacher
Derby High School
Derby, CT

Terry Santillo
Staff Developer
Interdistrict Magnet School (K-8)
New Haven, CT

Collaboration

Colleagues in the School of Education

Workgroup members from the Education Dept. kept faculty advised of project development.
Workgroup members from the School of Education kept the SOE Quality Council (NCATE Steering Committee) advised of project development.

Colleagues in the School of Arts and Sciences

Workgroup members kept faculty in their respective academic departments advised of project development.
Workgroup members kept the Articulation Committee (consists of teacher education faculty from the School of Education and the School of Arts and Sciences) advised of project development.

PK-12 School Faculty

PK-12 (one each in elementary, English, and science education) participated in the selection of candidates for the pilot, development of the scoring rubric, and scoring of candidates' responses to the prompt.

Milestones

Decision of the workgroup to change the project focus to the course completion benchmark in the assessment plan from the entry to program and midway to course completion benchmarks.

Submission of the third draft of the project proposal requiring the candidate to do three things: create a lesson plan, reflect on a paper/project from a previous required course; write a self-reflection.

Revision of the project proposal to require the candidate to (1) reflect on student work taken from scored items from the CMT and CAPT tests, and (2) write a lesson plan based on those reflections.

Acceptance of proposal incorporating the evaluations of the Title II Director as well as other SDE personnel.

Implementation of the pilot in elementary, secondary English, and secondary Science - all candidates in each program who were in their last course prior to student teaching completed the required assignment.

Evaluations of candidates' responses by SCSU faculty and P-12 personnel.

Selection of two high, two middle, and two low candidate responses from each discipline.

Development of scoring rubric by SCSU faculty and P-12 personnel.

Evaluations of candidates' responses by SCSU faculty and P-12 personnel using scoring rubric.

Assessment of project by SCSU faculty and P-12 personnel.