THE GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
COMPREHENSIVE DESCRIPTION OF THE
EDUCATION PREPARATION PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS
Spring, 2017 Version

Table of Contents

I. Assessment Context [Page 2]
   a. College and EPP Organizational Structures and Unit Programs
   b. EPP's Conceptual Framework and Commitments
   c. Alignment of Conceptual Framework with Georgia PSC, INTASC, NBPTS, and SPA/CAEP Standards

II. Overview of EPP's Quality Assurance System [Page 6]

III. Assessment of Candidate Performance [Page 11]
   a. Alignment of Key Assessment Instruments with Conceptual Framework Commitments and CAEP Competencies (Initial and Advanced)
   b. Procedures for Monitoring Candidates' Progress (Data Collection, Aggregation, Disaggregation, Analysis, Dissemination, and Use) (Initial and Advanced, including Transition Points)

IV. Assessment of EPP Operations (Budget, Personnel, Services) [Page 13]
   a. Alignment of operations indicators with Conceptual Framework Commitments, Georgia Southern Mission, and CAEP Standards
   b. Procedures for Monitoring EPP Operations (Data Collection, Aggregation, Disaggregation, Analysis, Dissemination, and Use)

V. Maintaining and Monitoring the EPP Quality Assurance System [Page 15]
   a. Timeline
   b. Use of Information Technologies
   c. Reliability, Validity, Fairness, Accuracy, Consistency, and Elimination of Bias

VI. Tracking Progress on Assessment: Continuous Improvement [Page 19]

VII. Appendices

   a. The EPP Policy and Procedures on Reliability, Validity, and Fairness in Assessment [Page 22]
   b. EPP Key Assessment Data Collection and Data Quality Procedures and Policies [Page 24]
   c. EPP Assessment Timeline [Page 26]

I. Assessment Context

A. Georgia Southern University

Georgia Southern University is a Carnegie Doctoral-Research university providing the classic residential campus experience. Georgia's largest and most comprehensive center of higher education south of Atlanta, 50 states and 86 nations are represented in the student body. The University's hallmark is student-centered education for undergraduate and graduate students alike.

Georgia Southern University offers degree programs at the baccalaureate, master's, education specialist, and doctoral levels through eight colleges: College of Business Administration (COBA), College of Education (COE), College of Health and Human Sciences (CHHS), Allen E. Paulson College of Engineering and Information Technology (CEIT), College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences (CLASS), College of Science and Mathematics (COSM), Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health (CPH), and the Jack N. Averitt College of Graduate Studies (CGS). The University continues to expand graduate offerings to meet the demands of its region. Georgia Southern is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) and has earned special accreditation from professional and academic associations that set standards in their fields. All academic colleges and nonacademic units participate in ongoing assessment of students and operations, as required by SACSCOC.

Vision. Georgia Southern University's strategic vision is to be recognized as one of the best public doctoral-research universities in the country within the next ten years.
Note. From 2016 - 2017 Undergraduate & Graduate Catalog

Mission Statement. Georgia Southern University is a public, Carnegie Doctoral/Research university devoted to academic distinction in teaching, scholarship and service. The University's hallmark is a culture of engagement that bridges theory with practice, extends the learning environment beyond the classroom, and promotes student growth and life success. Georgia Southern's nationally accredited academic programs in the liberal arts, sciences and professional studies prepare a diverse and select undergraduate and graduate student population for leadership and service as world citizens. Faculty, staff and students embrace core values expressed through integrity, civility, kindness, collaboration and a commitment to lifelong learning, wellness and social responsibility.

Central to the University's mission is the faculty's dedication to excellence in teaching and the development of a fertile learning environment exemplified by a free exchange of ideas, high academic expectations and individual responsibility for academic achievement. Georgia Southern faculty are teacher-scholars whose primary responsibility is the creation of learning experiences of the highest quality, informed by scholarly practice, research and creative activities. The University offers a student-centered environment enhanced by technology, transcultural experiences, private and public partnerships and stewardship of a safe residential campus recognized for its natural beauty.

Georgia Southern is committed to advancing the State of Georgia and the region through the benefits of higher education, offering baccalaureate through doctoral degrees and a variety of outreach programs. The University fosters access to its educational programs, provides a comprehensive and fulfilling University experience, and enhances quality of life in the region through collaborative relationships supporting education, health care and human services, cultural experiences, scientific and technological advancement, athletics and regional development.

Note. From 2016 - 2017 Undergraduate & Graduate Catalog.

B. The College of Education/Education Preparation Provider (EPP)

The COE offers undergraduate and graduate programs developed in collaboration with departments across the campus and with professionals in the field of education. The COE offers a comprehensive set of degree programs including 5 majors for B.S.Ed. degrees, 15 concentrations of an M.A.T. degree, 13 M.Ed. programs, 8 Ed.S. programs, and 2 Ed.D. programs. In addition, 4 endorsement programs are offered. Several graduate programs and endorsements are now offered fully online. A complete list of undergraduate and graduate programs with their associated concentrations are located online and in the Course Catalog.

The College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences offers the BM Music Education program and MA Music Education program.

C. EPP's Mission, Vision, Conceptual Framework and Commitments

The Mission and Vision statements are the foundation of the COE's Conceptual Framework and its theme of "Reflective Practitioners for a Diverse World".

The Vision of the College of Education: We envision a College of Education that continues to grow in its national recognition for excellence and innovation in teaching, scholarship, and outreach; and becomes the choice for novice and experienced professionals desiring a high quality, flexible education to help them meet their individual intellectual and career goals.

The Mission of the College of Education: The mission of the College of Education is to prepare students to teach, lead, counsel, and model life-long learning; engage in scholarship that provides new pathways to meet the needs of a dynamic, diverse society; and facilitate access to learning opportunities that are authentic, student-centered, and technology-rich.

Part I: Beliefs and Commitment

The College of Education assumes leadership for the preparation and continuing development of educators and other professionals in collaboration with other colleges on campus, public schools, and relevant agencies and employers. Further, we believe in the inclusive nature of the term *practitioner* as it refers to candidates in all programs of the College of Education who work in schools or other settings. We understand our work affects both our candidates and the individuals (including students, clients, and colleagues) with whom they work. Toward that end, our conceptual framework extends beyond the traditional boundaries of the College to

form a professional community. The Educator Preparation Committee (EPC), which includes representatives from the College of Education, other colleges on campus, public schools, and relevant agencies and employers, provides a forum for coordinating these efforts.

"Reflective Practitioners for a Diverse World" is the theme of the College of Education's conceptual framework. This theme, as articulated in the *Four Commitments*, clearly reflects the mission of the College and University. The University's focus is on providing a culture of engagement that bridges theory with practice. This focus is reflected in the COE vision "We envision a College of Education that continues to grow in its national recognition for excellence and innovation in teaching, scholarship, and outreach; and becomes the choice for novice and experienced professionals desiring a high quality, flexible education to help them meet their individual intellectual and career goals." To achieve its mission, the College is committed to academic distinction in undergraduate and graduate education, collaboration, diversity, professional development, and regional, statewide, and national service. These College-level commitments are reflected in the *four commitments* we seek to instill in our candidates. Embedding the *four commitments* in our various programs' standards and aligning them with competencies required by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission and Specialized Professional Associations in all initial and advanced programs ensures coherence among curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practice, and assessment across a candidate's program.

Beliefs and Commitments

C.1 Commitment to the Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions of the Profession

We believe that it is of primary importance for our candidates to possess a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of the disciplines in which they plan to work, including a thorough understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of their fields, as delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. These standards provide the framework for the College of Education EPP quality assurance system and for each program's ongoing assessment and revision efforts. We believe that candidates must be knowledgeable about the theories and methodologies of their profession, the application of emerging technologies, and the influence of human growth and development on the people they serve, coupled with a strong knowledge base grounded on a firm ethical foundation. Practitioners must have the ability and the knowledge to create and evaluate personal guidelines for decision making in a professional context. Candidates must understand the expectations of their profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards, and relevant laws and policies. We believe that by presenting a strong research base and linking it with practice we will facilitate the growth of our candidates as informed and reflective practitioners who support the growth and goals of the people they serve. Campus, P-12 schools, agency, employer, and community-based collaborations and partnerships result in richer programs and enhance learning opportunities for all candidates, especially high-quality clinical practice. This represents the wide spectrum of educational activities in the College of Education and recognizes the dynamic nature of the work environments in which our candidates are or will be engaged.

C.2 Commitment to Diversity

We believe in the necessity of a strong historical understanding of one's profession and the willingness to view knowledge as a personal construction affected by one's cultural beliefs. We believe that practitioners must also recognize their responsibilities to, and the rights and needs of, all people particularly underserved or historically marginalized populations, including linguistic minorities, people with exceptionalities, people of color, gender and sexual minorities, and people living in poverty. We believe practitioners must be able to address the needs of the people they serve by accounting for their diverse abilities and learning preferences and taking into account each individual's physical, cognitive, language, emotional, social, and cultural development. We believe that our candidates must understand the interrelatedness of individuals, small groups, and society, both locally and globally. To support the growth and goals of all people, practitioners must be active in working with issues of culture, diversity, and equity; understand the political and humanistic nature of their profession; and have the knowledge and skills to deliver curriculum, instruction, and/or services from multiple perspectives. Practitioners must be cognizant of the ideological, economic, and special interest pressures exerted, from all levels, on the institutions in which they work. We believe practitioners must be able to enhance communication among all stakeholders in their practice, including schools, agencies, employers, communities, homes, and industries. We believe that practitioners must understand how human emotions interact with professional practice, both for practitioners and the people they serve. Practitioners must understand how personal perceptions of self, work, and professional relationships affect the daily decision-making process. Practitioners must be sensitive to prejudice and the effect it has on professional environments. Toward that end, diversity is an integral component of the mission of Georgia Southern University. Our goal is to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations. Our candidates' curriculum, field experiences, clinical practice, and key assessments have been designed to ensure that candidate experiences reflect both the diversity of South Georgia and the larger world.

C.3 Commitment to Technology

We believe candidates must recognize the critical role of technology in all facets of their profession; thus, we provide all candidates with experiences that allow exploration of a broad range of technologies. To that end, all candidates in initial and advanced programs integrate technology and other multimedia resources. Candidates will use technology-based best practices to address their responsibilities, and when their discipline demands, pass along their technological proficiency to the people they serve. The College of Education uses a technology-based quality assurance system that continuously gathers data at the EPP and program levels for formative and summative assessment purposes. Through data analysis, the College of Education's professional community ensures that candidates meet technology-related professional and state standards.

C.4 Commitment to the Practice of Continuous Reflection and Assessment

We believe that reflective practitioners continually engage in data-based assessment; study the history of their profession on a local, state, and national level; and familiarize themselves with the culture of the people they serve by listening to their personal and familial stories. As part of this process, practitioners must continually monitor, assess, and analyze the progress of the people they serve, reflect upon and critique their observations, and make appropriate adjustments to their professional practices and environments based on research and evidence relevant to their profession. We believe that reflective practitioners use multiple sources of data to evaluate and improve their practice in an effort to ensure that the needs of all the people they serve are met. They have the ability to define and frame a problem from multiple perspectives, to consider reasoned courses of action, to act, and, finally, to reflect on the effectiveness of their actions, as demonstrated by a variety of professionally appropriate measures.

Reflective Practitioners for a Diverse World considers all people and represents a vision of professional practice for the entire College of Education professional community. To that end, our conceptual framework demonstrates that we believe all practitioners must acknowledge the multifaceted nature of their work and engage in practice that reflects a commitment to the knowledge and dispositions of their profession, diversity, technology, and the practice of continuous reflection and assessment.

D. Alignment of Conceptual Framework with Georgia PSC, INTASC, NBPTS, and SPA/CAEP Standards

The EPP quality assurance system is grounded at all levels by our Conceptual Framework (CF) Commitments and is responsive to the state and national standards. Likewise, Candidate proficiencies for initial teacher preparation programs are guided by the College of Education's Initial Teacher Education Program (TEP) Standards, INTASC Standards, Georgia Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards, and Georgia Professional Standards Commission/SPA standards, and ISTE Standards. Advanced Teacher Preparation programs are also aligned with our CF Commitments and guided by their SPA and/or NBPTS standards. Graduate non-certification (initial and advanced) programs for Other School Personnel (OSP) are guided by the CF Commitments and SPA standards. For programs with no national or state standards, program faculty developed standards which articulate the faculty's expectations for their candidates' performance. Because each program has designed its curriculum, instruction and assessments around a unique set of PSC/SPA or internally designed standards (always through the lens of the CF Commitments), initial and advanced programs clearly reflect differences in proficiencies. Additionally, the initial teacher preparation programs use INTASC standards with their SPA standards while the advanced teacher preparation programs use NBPTS and INTASC standards, thus allowing differential levels of content, pedagogy, and disposition proficiencies. The COE Curriculum Committee, COE Assessment and Accreditation Committee, and COE Faculty Executive Committee regularly review (and revise when needed) the conceptual framework to ensure it remains current, relevant, and appropriately linked to standards.

II. Overview of EPP's Quality Assurance System

Grounded by our College of Education Conceptual Framework Commitments, our quality assurance system includes a comprehensive and integrated set of evaluation measures that we use to monitor candidate performance and manage and improve EPP operations and programs. At all points of assessment – candidates, programs centers/offices (special services), departments and the EPP – evaluation rubrics are mapped to the Four Commitments. We developed four Frameworks that contain major questions we ask annually regarding (1) candidates/programs, (2) special services, (3) personnel, and (4) resources (including budget). The Frameworks, associated with CAEP standards, are as follows:

For EPP Review of Budget/Resources

- How do we prioritize our budget allocations to effectively support existing programs (including travel, technology, faculty, staff, candidates, P-12 Education/Partnerships, etc.)? **CAEP Evidence of Capacity**
- How are funds and resources being used based on priorities (e.g., end of year, faculty travel, technology, partnerships, field experience support, etc.)?
  CAEP Evidence of Capacity
- How well do facilities (classrooms, labs, offices, technology) meet candidate, program and EPP operations demands? **CAEP Evidence of Capacity**
- How well does the EPP quality assurance system (e.g., data points, data analysis, data reporting, procedures, evaluation, continuous improvement) support EPP review of budget and resources?
  Standard 5 and CAEP Evidence of Capacity

For EPP Review of Personnel

- How do we encourage and maintain the quality of faculty in the areas of teaching, research, and service? **CAEP Evidence of Capacity**
- How do we ensure sufficient faculty/staff to deliver quality programs (full/part-time)? **CAEP Evidence of Capacity**
- How well do we support the professional development of faculty and staff based on EPP needs?
  Standard 2 and CAEP Evidence of Capacity
- What are we doing to support and retain quality faculty and staff (including P-12 Clinical faculty)?
  Standard 2 and CAEP Evidence of Capacity
- How do we attract and maintain a diverse faculty (including P-12 Clinical faculty)?
  CAEP Evidence of Capacity and Diversity Theme
- How well does the current EPP quality assurance system (e.g., data points, data analysis, data reporting, procedures, evaluation) support EPP review of Personnel?
  Standard 5 and CAEP Evidence of Capacity
- How do candidates, clients, and faculty/staff perceive whether needed services are provided?
  CAEP Evidence of Capacity

For EPP Review of Special Services

- How effectively do Offices and Centers support EPP, Department, and Program operations; including field and clinical experiences? **Standard 2 and CAEP Evidence of Capacity**
- How are candidates' complaints handled and resolved? **CAEP Evidence of Capacity**
- What changes are being proposed or implemented to support effectiveness and continuous improvement? **All Standards**

- How well does the current EPP quality assurance system (e.g., data points, data analysis, data reporting, procedures, evaluation) support EPP review of Offices and Centers? **Standard 5 and CAEP Evidence of Capacity**

EPP Review of Candidate/Program Assessment

- How are we encouraging the admission of high quality, diverse candidates? **Standard 3**
- How well do we monitor our candidates' RPG? **Standards 1, 2, 3, and 5**
- How do we ensure that all programs are effectively supporting candidate development of knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn? **Standards 1, 2, 3, and 5**
- How do we ensure that all programs prepare candidates to assess and monitor the effects of educational practices or environments on student learning? **All Standards**
- How well do we implement our COE Policy on Reliability, Validity, and Fairness in Assessment? **Standard 5**
- How do we use key assessments to predict candidate success? **Standard 5**
- How do we involve the P-12 community and other external stakeholders in the assessment of our candidates and programs? **Standards 2, 3, and 5**
- What do we know about the satisfaction of graduates and their employers regarding the preparation they received?
  Standards 4 and 5
- How well do our candidates perform on GACE Program Admission, GACE Content, GACE Ethics, & edTPA certification tests? **Standards 1 and 3**
- What changes are being proposed or implemented to support effectiveness and continuous improvement? **All Standards**
- How well does the current EPP quality assurance system (e.g., data points, data analysis, data reporting, procedures, evaluation) support EPP review of Candidate/Program assessment? **Standard 5**

We then mapped these questions onto a set of EPP Assessment reports and spreadsheets containing common data points to help address all questions posed in our Frameworks. Annual reports written by each department and center represent the analysis, interpretation and use of data in decision making. This set of reports and the EPP-wide spreadsheets is referred to as the **EPP Assessment Toolkit**.

A. EPP Assessment Toolkit Process

The EPP Assessment Toolkit ties together and articulates the connections between the various levels of assessment that lead to the EPP-wide assessment of aggregated data for the improvement of EPP operations. Assessment tools included in the Toolkit have been designed to:

- Provide questions to help guide systematic EPP assessment (Frameworks);
- Capture and aggregate the data from candidates/programs, special services, budget/travel and personnel across all COE departments, centers and offices (Spreadsheets and Key Assessment Aggregate Reports);
- Report annual data aggregated and summarized at program, departments, and center/office levels (Annual Report templates)

- Give structure to the Annual EPP Assessment process that clearly reflects analysis, review and recommendations back to departments and centers/offices, for the improvement of candidates/programs and other EPP operations (Annual EPP Quality Assurance Review and Recommendations).

The Toolkit contains a multidimensional, integrated set of tools that cut across candidates/programs, special services, personnel, and budget/travel to capture an annual comprehensive, aggregate picture of the EPP's candidates, programs, personnel (faculty and staff) and special services. Using this Toolkit, data are collected and monitored annually at program, department, center/office and EPP levels, using *Sharepoint*, *Chalk & Wire*, and *Excel* to store, manage, and generate reports for purposes of analysis. The Administrative Team conducts major EPP Quality Assurance reviews each August and February, using the completed Report Templates, Common Data Points Spreadsheets, and the Annual EPP Quality Review/Recommendations template. Also, a faculty committee, COE Curriculum Committee, reviews the Annual EPP Report in spring semester.

Assessment processes related to our **candidates and programs** are implemented at the program level and evaluated at the program, department, and EPP levels. The Candidate/Program Assessment component of the EPP Quality Assurance System includes a set of six to eight key assessments embedded into every program. These key assessments are each scored using rubrics, entered into the *Chalk & Wire* database then reviewed by both candidate and aggregate formats. Reports are generated from *Chalk & Wire* to focus on key assessment data by rubric element, by overall rubric scores, by semester group, by gender, by ethnicity, by age group, and by instructor. These distinct reports each allow a careful examination of performance from several important perspectives. Programs have identified transition points that serve as milestones for candidate progress or remediation. All programs include multiple forms of assessment including those identified as key assessments.

Transition point data are collected and summarized at the program level, aggregated at the department level, and then taken forward for further review at the EPP level. Other data collected at the program level for key assessments include course-embedded and field-embedded assessments related to the ability of candidates to impact student learning, diversity competencies, and candidates' dispositions. Departmental reports provide departmental evaluation and perspective on these data as part of the EPP level review of the program assessment data.

The assessment processes specifically applied to the **operations** dimension of the EPP involve multiple measures to maintain and improve operations and are primarily addressed within the remaining three Frameworks. These Frameworks guide the annual review of Budget/Resources, Personnel, and Special Services across all departments, offices and centers. The final Guiding Question in each of the Frameworks calls for reflection and analysis of both the assessment process and the Toolkit items involved in the process. This question ensures that the EPP quality assurance system remains functional and responsive to the changing needs and expectations of stakeholders. This Toolkit and the resulting data demonstrate clearly how our process of EPP Assessment includes the complete loop of (1) program, department, and EPP assessment of

candidates and EPP operations, and (2) feedback of data to programs, centers, and offices for improvement in candidate performance, programs, and EPP operations.

The timeframe for program, departmental and EPP evaluation is fall semester through the following summer term of each academic year. Annual faculty/staff/administrator assessments are conducted on a calendar year basis (January 1 through December 31). Beginning with the three academic departments each Department Chair reviews Faculty/Staff Performance Reports and provides summary and evaluative feedback to individual faculty and staff on their progress toward meeting their goals and our Conceptual Framework Goals and Commitments. These individual Faculty/Staff Performance Reports, while they are not submitted with the Department/Center Annual Report, are a crucial part of the Department Chair's Annual Department Report along with the Annual Program Assessment Reports which are summarized and appended to the Department Report. The Department Chair submits the Annual Department Report to the Administrative Team for its annual February assessment retreat review of EPP-wide accomplishments, and for use during the annual August assessment retreat review for annual goal setting.

Similarly, Center staff and Directors engage in ongoing assessment of and reflection on their progress toward annual activity and service goals, through review of annual staff evaluations and annual candidate, faculty/staff surveys. Center goals are derived from each center's mission statement (aligned with the COE Mission and Conceptual Framework Commitments); and staff goals are derived from the corresponding Center's goals. This ongoing assessment and resulting data-based decision-making forms the basis for the Annual Center Activity Reports which are submitted to the Administrative Team for its annual August review.

Each August and February the recommendations resulting from the EPP Assessment Retreats regarding candidate/program and operations feedback into programs, departments, centers and offices through the review/recommendation process resulting from EPP Assessment of all Department, Office and Special Services Center Reports as well as the Toolkit analyses. This process is evident on all reports reviewed at EPP Assessment Retreats. EPP-level goals that result from the data analysis and discussion are presented at each Fall Faculty/Staff meeting. Finally, at the August EPP Assessment Retreat, the COE Administrative Team finalizes the yearly timeline for collection, analysis, review of and recommendations (feedback) regarding assessment data during the academic year.

While the annual EPP assessment review process provides a structure to guide annual evaluation, as issues arise throughout the academic year, any aspect of our EPP's assessment work may be evaluated All policies and procedures related to the systematic collection of data are guided and monitored by the Assessment and Accreditation Committee and the Administrative Team. The ongoing task of utilizing data collection tools to create reports and manage the data is facilitated by the COE Data Manager, the COE Administrative Coordinator, and the Director of Graduate Student Services. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Teacher Education and Accreditation and the Assessment Coordinator provide direct, continuous supervision of these assessment processes.

B. Levels of Analysis

While our final EPP Quality Assurance product is the Annual EPP Report, other levels of assessment, analysis and decision-making form the foundation for that report. Beginning with the day-to-day, systematic, recursive assessment of all COE candidates, programs, faculty, staff, school/community partners, and center services, the following model of data flow is followed on an annual cycle:

Individual

Program faculty/staff members engage in continuous reflection and assessment of their candidates' progress, program effectiveness and their own practice. This ongoing assessment and the resulting data-based programmatic decision-making form the basis for their Annual Faculty/Staff Performance Reports and Annual Program Assessment Reports which faculty, staff, and Program Coordinators submit to their Department Chairs/Directors/Associate Deans in November and December. The following evidence-based data is provided in these reports:

Annual Faculty/Staff Performance Report

1. faculty scholarly accomplishments
2. teaching effectiveness data
3. faculty service activity
4. professional development
5. annual goals, based on Conceptual Framework Goals and Commitments

Tenure Reviews (Pre-tenure, year three of tenure-track; Tenure (year 6), and Post-tenure, 5 years after the most recent promotion or personnel action)

1. Teaching
2. Service (institution or profession)
3. Scholarship
4. Ability to function within the Georgia Southern academic community

Program

Annual Program Assessment Report -- appended to Annual Department Report (Connected to NCATE Standards)

1. key assessment summary data
2. Conceptual Framework Commitments summary data
3. follow-up survey summary data (and other input data collected by program)
4. Input and feedback from P-12 partners and/or other stakeholders
5. program summary analyses of data, including program strengths, weaknesses, decisions, recommendations, and internal/external factors
6. resource requests (training, technology, personnel, etc.)

Department/Center

Annual Department/Center Report (Connected to NCATE Standards)

1. effectiveness toward meeting evaluation period goals
2. summary of strengths, weaknesses, internal/external factors, and needs
3. objectives for following evaluation period
4. faculty/staff accomplishments (teaching/related accomplishments, scholarship,

service, professional development)
5. resource requests and recommendations

COE Assessment Processes

EPP Assessment Toolkit review and evaluation

1. Department/center reports
2. Aggregate data on student performance
3. Aggregate COE services survey data
4. Aggregate resources/budget data
5. Aggregate personnel (faculty/staff) data
6. Resource requests, recommendations
7. Goal setting and strategic planning finalization

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

1. Policy and procedures development
2. Implementation and facilitation of policies and procedures
3. Oversight and revision of college-wide assessment tools
4. Annual review of Conceptual Framework
5. Accreditation documentation review and revision
6. Planning and decision making for future direction

Curriculum Committee

1. Curriculum Decisions
2. Conceptual Framework Review and Revision

Faculty Executive Committee

1. Conceptual Framework Review and Revision

Technology and Instructional Resources Committee

1. Instructional/Assessment Technology Resource Recommendations
2. Instructional/Assessment Technology Planning

Educator Preparation Committee

1. Course, Program, Policy, and Procedures Recommendations
2. Representation from P-12 Stakeholders across the University and Public Schools

III. Assessment of Candidate Performance

A. Alignment of Key Assessment Instruments with Conceptual Framework Commitments and CAEP Competencies (Initial and Advanced)

All undergraduate and graduate programs have developed an assessment planning matrix that shows the crosswalk between key assessments, our Conceptual Framework Commitments (including professional dispositions and diversity competencies), and the SPA/PSC standards for their discipline. The academic and professional expectations within our Conceptual Framework Commitments and their discipline standards are communicated to our candidates

in their course syllabi, in their field experience documents, and at transition points. This matrix becomes the roadmap and the reference point when reviewing the program's effectiveness in preparing candidates to meet the professional standards for their discipline.

B. Procedures for Monitoring Candidates' Progress: Data Collection, Aggregation, Disaggregation, Analysis, Dissemination and Use (Initial and Advanced, including Transition Points)

Candidate performance is assessed at each transition in the program in order to determine whether or not candidates are demonstrating acceptable performance on the assessments that are aligned with the standards. As part of the assessment of candidate performance, each program has in place an intervention plan that is used to support candidates who are not meeting program standards in content, planning, instruction, impact on student learning, and/or dispositions. Faculty who identify these candidates construct an intervention plan that identifies specific weaknesses, a self-improvement plan, and a timeline for improvement. Faculty in the program meet with the candidate to share the plan and establish a process and timeline for monitoring their progress. If initial improvements do not occur, a probation plan is developed that outlines what the candidate needs to demonstrate in order to be successful in the program. These intervention plans are designed to offer guidance for the candidate in meeting each of the program standards. If the candidate does not meet the requirements outlined in the intervention plan, the candidate does not continue in the program. Faculty in undergraduate programs (a) provide an appropriate alternative, including an opportunity to withdraw from the program without penalty and repeat the course or practicum the following semester, or (b) provide further options on selecting a more appropriate career.

At the end of each summer semester, a summary of performance results from the six to eight key assessments is completed. Survey information from teacher candidates, recent graduates, and clinical supervisors from each of the partner school field sites are also collected by the program Coordinator. A meeting is scheduled with P-12 school partners and/or other stakeholders in the fall. At this meeting, members of the task force review, analyze, and interpret performance results, reflect on these results, and establish a plan for program modifications that may be needed in order to improve candidate performance in content, pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions, as well as the impact on student learning. Performance data on the assessments related to content knowledge; professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and impact on students' learning are shared with other university faculty from the various academic departments (where appropriate) who teach content courses in the concentration areas and with other clinical associates and supervising teachers who work with program candidates. A report is prepared annually to present to the Department Chair by mid-September that includes the committee findings, a summary of planned program modifications, and a timeline for planning and implementing any changes.

Program findings and planning are based in part on key assessment data. Collection, aggregation, analysis, and interpretation of this assessment data involve a multi-step process (see Appendix for associated assessment data collection policies and procedures). These general steps are sequenced as follows:

1. Academic program committees develop each of the 6 to 8 key assessments through careful deliberation and linking to standards to help ensure validity, reliability, and fairness in assessment. Program Committees will use the COE Policy on Reliability, Validity and Fairness in Assessment and the COE Procedures on Reliability, Validity, and Fairness in Assessment to guide the assessment development process.

2. As part of the assessment development, academic program committees carefully select or create an assessment instrument such as a rubric or test for each key assessment.

3. The COE Data Manager creates a Program folio for each program within the *Chalk & Wire* electronic quality assurance system and includes the 6 to 8 key assessment rubrics (for assessments that use a rubric) within this folio for online data collection and aggregation.

4. Each semester the COE Data Manager and Administrative Coordinator ensure that each candidate is correctly assigned to the appropriate program in *Chalk & Wire*. Procedures in place help verify that candidates are in the system and linked to the appropriate key assessments (see Appendix).

5. Instructors score candidates on criteria within key assessment rubrics. Scoring is based on performance on assignments or other requirements. These data are digitally entered by either the faculty member by a date indicated on the COE Assessment Timeline.

6. Aggregate data reports are created by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Teacher Education and Accreditation, COE Administrative Coordinator, COE Data Manager, or Assessment GA for each program and its key assessments that use rubrics. These reports are sent to the appropriate program director and saved in *Chalk & Wire*. Reports will be aggregated for each assessment criteria by overall data, by student, by instructor, by age, by gender, and by ethnicity categories. Custom reports can be requested from the COE Administrative Coordinator or developed by faculty and administrators themselves as needed.

7. Key assessment report inventories, candidate verification checks, and initial data accuracy reviews are completed and shared to help ensure data completeness and integrity. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Teacher Education and Accreditation completes the inventories. Program faculty review data summaries for accuracy.

8. Faculty and program committees review aggregate data for completeness and accuracy by the end of August in preparation for September committee review. Data reports will be available for review in mid-August. Missing or erroneous data are reported by faculty to the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Teacher Education and Accreditation for diagnosis and repair.

9. Beginning in early September program committees review aggregate data to look at patterns of findings, then document their analyses and interpretations to support ongoing candidate and program improvement and annual program reporting. Program Committees will use the COE Policy on Reliability, Validity and Fairness in Assessment and the COE Procedures on Reliability, Validity, and Fairness in Assessment to guide interpretations and any decisions. Summaries by demographics categories (age, gender, ethnicity) are

used to help inform assessment fairness reviews. Summaries by instructor are used to inform reviews of reliability.

10. Aggregate data tables are copied or translated from the *Chalk & Wire* digital reports for annual program reporting.

11. Completed annual program reports including action plans are submitted in mid-September to department chairs for initial review, University-review, College-level review, SACS review, and as NCATE/PSC evidence. Action plans within program reports are used by program faculty to support program improvement efforts.

IV. Assessment of EPP Operations (Budget, Personnel, Services)

A. Alignment of operations indicators with Conceptual Framework Commitments, Georgia Southern Mission, and NCATE Standards

The COE EPP Assessment Toolkit indicators address crucial EPP assessment questions centered on the four commitments (knowledge, skills and dispositions of the profession; diversity; technology; practice of continuous reflection and assessment) that are part of the COE Conceptual Framework. The Toolkit indicators also center on the University's mission and the standards provided by CAEP. The alignment of the Toolkit and the overall EPP evaluation evolves with the occasional changes of the Conceptual Framework, the University Mission, and CAEP standards. Review of the Toolkit each year also includes consideration of the match between indicators and their alignment with these guiding documents.

B. Procedures for Monitoring (Data collection, aggregation, disaggregation, analysis, dissemination, and use)

The specific process for collecting, aggregating, analyzing, sharing, and using the EPP level assessment data is finalized by the Administrative Team each year and reflected in the EPP Assessment Timeline, which will be described below. In general, the process includes scheduled assessment activities throughout the year that are coordinated by the Assessment Coordinator and the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Teacher Education and Accreditation. The individuals who are most directly responsible for overseeing this COE EPP centered process are those administrators, faculty, and staff who comprise the Administrative Team of the COE. The Administrative Team includes the Dean, the Center and Office Directors, the Associate Deans, the Department Chairs, and the Assessment Coordinator. Collection of data, analysis and sharing of data summaries, evaluation, documentation, and decision making are the major activities and procedures used for monitoring and modifying the functioning of the COE throughout the year. Toolkit spreadsheets and Annual Reports are focal points of this monitoring.

The procedure for an example Toolkit spreadsheet (e.g., Office and Center Services Survey; Resources/Budget) can be summarized as follows: a) relevant data are collected from a database or survey administration, entered, and aggregated; b) the aggregated spreadsheet is returned to all Administrative Team members; c) findings are reviewed at a scheduled

Administrative Team meeting and/or retreat, d) interpretation and decisions made are documented by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Teacher Education and Accreditation. The procedure for Toolkit Annual Reports differs from that of spreadsheets in that the head of each sub-EPP completes his/her respective annual report form, drawing on both shared data and evaluation narrative that includes plans for continuous improvement. These reports are then reviewed by the Administrative Team and revised if necessary. Decisions, recommendations, and further questions or problems are documented by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Teacher Education and Accreditation, as with Toolkit spreadsheets. The members of the Administration Team then facilitate the sharing of decisions and recommendations across the College as part of the process of closing the assessment loop. Beginning in 2012 an annual College-Wide Progress Report is written and submitted to the University Provost. In this report progress on the COE Strategic Plan action steps is described, as well as accomplishments and action plans for the upcoming year.

Procedures for monitoring assessment at the program level which then influence the broader EPP level Assessment, are determined by program faculty such that they address the college-wide policy and procedures on assessment (described below) and meet the needs for effectively and accurately tracking candidate performance indicated above in Part III. This way EPP wide assessment is based on thoughtfully conceived and developed processes that encourage and support reliability (consistency), validity (accuracy), and fairness (absence of bias) in assessment.

V. Maintaining and Monitoring the Quality Assurance System

A. Timeline

During each spring and summer, the COE's Associate Dean for Undergraduate Teacher Education and Accreditation and the Assessment Coordinator collaborate to draft an assessment timeline for the College (see Appendix for an example timeline). This timeline is finalized and approved by the COE Assessment and Accreditation Committee and Administrative Team in August of each new fall semester, and shared across the College. It specifies the activities, dates, and individuals that are crucial to the assessment requirements throughout the academic year. It also specifies where particular documents and data are to be submitted. It allows a shared understanding of assessment processes from fall to spring to summer, permitting a coordinated effort by all COE faculty and staff. This timeline is made available on the COE website and referred to regularly http://coe.georgiasouthern.edu/accreditation.html . Note that June and July assessment activities are planned one year in advance to permit timeline approval in August for the current year, reducing the likelihood of revisions that follow from the August assessment retreat.

The annual chronology of major representative assessment activities and events can be summarized as follows, with June of each year serving as the starting point for academic assessment:

August
Summer key assessment data due

Assessment Retreat: Review of data & goal setting
EPP Assessment Feedback to Departments/Centers/Offices
Proposed EPP Goals shared with Faculty/Staff
Faculty Review of Prior Year Data Accuracy
Annual data gathering cycle begins with fall semester courses
Initial Program faculty accuracy review of Chalk & Wire aggregate reports for previous year begins
Program Committee and Program Action Team review of data for prior year
KA reports for previous AY completed and submitted to program directors

September

Programs submit new/revised key assessment rubrics for current AY
Annual Program Report completion
Complete and Submit Program Reports to Chairs and University Assessment Director

October

Data manager finalizes rubrics in Chalk & Wire and program directors review

November

Key Assessment Folios Ready for Fall Data Input
Title II interim reporting
Surveys of teacher candidates, university supervisors, and clinical supervisors

December

Fall PPB data collection and analysis for TEP admissions
Fall key assessment data due.

January

Key assessment data report development
Faculty/Staff performance data and goals submitted to Chairs/Directors
PAAR annual reporting/review begins

February

Graduate and Employer Surveys sent
Faculty and Student Services Surveys administered
BOR Reports (Teacher Prep, COUN, EDLD)
Graduate and Employer Surveys analyses & reporting
Faculty and Student Services Survey analyses & reporting
Spring Assessment Retreat – Review of Data, Program Reports, and Resource Needs

March

Annual Faculty/Staff Review begins
Key Assessment Folios Ready for Spring Data Input
PAAR annual reporting due

April

Completion of Annual Faculty/Staff Review Reporting
CAEP Annual Report due
Surveys of teacher candidates, university supervisors, and clinical supervisors

May

Spring PPB data collection/analyses for TEP admissions
Work Begins on Title II Interim Report
Key assessment data for spring due

June
KA data reports developed for spring data
Chalk & Wire report creation and linking of key assessment data for spring semester
Key Assessment Folios Ready for Summer Data Input

July
Chairs/Directors/Deans provide budget data for unit aggregation and review.

B. Use of Information Technologies

The College of Education uses several modern computing systems for the management of assessment data. First, all academic programs within the college make use of the ***Chalk & Wire*** system which serves as a secure database that has communications and portfolio functionality using a World Wide Web interface. This system allows for the efficient entry, storage, aggregation, reporting, and sharing of candidate assessment data. In addition, its database functionality provides a means to develop comparative reports of many kinds, including those dealing with diversity variables, instructors, cohorts, and performance elements. It provides a means of tracking individual student performances as they progress through a program. Beginning at Transition Point One, faculty use *Chalk & Wire* to collect a range of data that quantify candidates' progress toward achievement of our Teacher Education Program Competencies (knowledge, skills and dispositions; also used in a revised fashion for non-TEP programs), our four Conceptual Framework Commitments, and the applicable state/national standards. Faculty and administrators can easily view and make use of all our data throughout the College using this system's web based folio of aggregate reports. Data export capabilities of this system permit the easy use of collected data for further examination of reliability and validity using software programs external to *Chalk & Wire*. The electronic representation of assessment instruments such as rubrics, quizzes, written feedback, and surveys, allows highly secure password protected access for both data input and either raw or aggregate output from anywhere that has an Internet connection and computer. This access provides program faculty a means to rapid self-analysis toward timely program improvements that are informed by accurate data.

Additional computing systems used extensively in support of the COE's quality assurance system include:

- ***Banner*** database for organizing most University-wide student data;
- ***Excel*** spreadsheets for collecting and aggregating EPP Assessment Toolkit data;
- ***Sharepoint*** for archiving and sharing saved data summaries and written reports via the Internet in a secure, password protected location.
- ***Google Forms*** for online surveys of candidates, faculty, and staff.

Although the University system's ***Desire to Learn/Blackboard*** course management system, branded as *Folio*, has been primarily used for instructional delivery and interaction within online

and hybrid courses, this system also served as the initial point of most assessment activity for many courses, and integrates with *Chalk & Wire*. Its Internet-based electronic test, quiz, survey, and rubric features are vital parts of candidate assessment. In addition this system includes a valuable item-analysis feature within tests and quizzes that many instructors make use of for examining the relative performance of both students and assessment items. Item information include difficulty, discrimination, distractor, and reliability statistics

By harnessing all these modern database and analytic technologies effectively within our assessment work, we enable our college wide quality assurance system to support rapidly available data that are also more consistent, accurate, and meaningful than ever before. The College of Education Technology and Instructional Resources Committee plays a crucial role in guiding the planning and use of the many technologies that connect with the EPP Assessment process. Office and laptop computers, classroom technologies, and software are prioritized and purchased through the Technology and Instructional Resources Committee review to allow effective ongoing use of assessment, communication, and instructional systems.

C. Fairness, Accuracy, and Consistency

Among the reasons for using the most contemporary and appropriate technologies as integral parts of our COE quality assurance system is the need to support fairness, accuracy, and consistency with our processes and data use. The technologies described above allow the COE to most effectively implement our ***EPP Policy on Reliability, Validity, and Fairness in Assessment***, as well as our supporting ***EPP Procedures for Reliability, Validity, and Fairness in Assessment*** (see Appendix). These policy and procedures were developed over the course of three years beginning in 2006 by the ad hoc committee on Assessment and the COE Committee on Assessment and Accreditation. While using the broader terminology of *reliability* (encompassing consistency and related issues), and *validity* (encompassing accuracy and related issues), these documents reflect our means of maintaining and continually improving upon our assessment processes in ways that ultimately enhance programs and favorably affect the learning of all our candidates.

Emphasis is placed on this EPP-wide policy and supporting procedures annually through required documentation within the program assessment reporting process and the EPP assessment process. This ensures that we are continually taking advantage of what we know to be effective practices that lead to fair, accurate, and consistent assessment. An ***Assessment and Program Reporting Help Sheet*** and a ***Reliability, Validity, and Fairness Worksheet*** were developed by faculty to support this annual requirement, in addition to supporting the necessary orientation to these issues for new faculty and staff (available at http://coe.georgiasouthern.edu/assessmentandaccreditation.html). Programs are required to report annually on reliability, validity, and fairness evaluation for EPP-wide review to ensure that the EPP-wide policy is upheld. Beginning in 2011, program reporting includes reliability, validity, and fairness reporting across all programs.

Aggregate reports of all key assessment criteria by the rubric performance levels facilitate the faculty, staff, and administrator review of data for evaluations of reliability, validity and fairness in assessments. The further analysis of each key assessment by age, sex, ethnicity, and instructor allows closer comparisons of possible reliability and validity concerns, some of which may affect

fairness in assessment. For example, a program committee and department chair can review overall performances and performance ranges for each criteria of an assessment to identify any mismatches among elements or between performances and outcome expectations. Then, these same data can be examined by the demographic variables and instructors to determine whether differences occur that might reflect a bias that needs to be addressed or a performance weakness that requires instructional modification. Ongoing program committee discussion and training is informed by timely and relevant student data that are made possible by our COE EPP Quality Assurance System.

VI. Tracking Progress on Assessment: Continuous Improvement

Part of the ongoing evaluation of the EPP quality assurance process involves reflecting on changes made as a means of continually examining the short-term and long-term effects of these changes. Tracking improvements made has become an important component of that evaluation.

1. Developed approved, and implemented college-wide assessment policy and procedures for reliability, validity, and fairness.
2. Key assessment rubrics continue to be refined for each program to meet new/revised standards and for improved validity.
3. EPP-wide assessment toolkit data are collected and reviewed each year by the administrative team, to assist with annual planning.
4. EPP-wide assessment toolkit spreadsheets and procedures are refined as needed to meet new/revised standards and new technologies.
5. Initial Teacher Preparation program candidates collect and interpret impact on student learning data and report those within required assignments.
6. The Assessment and Accreditation Committee to support ongoing assessment activities and needs.
7. Positions were created with part of the roles involving assessment support activities. Positions included Administrative Coordinator, Research Specialist, Director of Graduate Academic Services Center, Assessment Coordinator, and Graduate Assistant positions.
8. Assessment retreats are scheduled and carried out each year, currently with one each February, and one each August.
9. Graduate Programs developed a process for tracking and collecting placement data on field experiences.
10. Academic year assessment timelines identify college-wide assessment activities (See Appendix for example timeline)
11. Policies and procedures ensure data collection and data quality throughout each year. (See Appendix).

In addition, the College of Education is focused on several specific improvement areas to build upon the work completed over the last six years. These areas currently being focused upon for improvement include:

1. Further implementation of the assessment policy in a consistent manner across all programs to more clearly show evidence of ongoing work in support of reliability, validity, and fairness.
2. Communication, enforcement, and enhancement of data quality policies and procedures to help maximize data integrity and confidence in data-informed decisions.
3. Revision of the college-wide graduate dispositions assessment process and instrument.
4. Continue to review annual program and departmental reporting processes and templates to ensure the most useful, meaningful information is being used.
5. Build upon candidate impact on student learning and learning environments data and analyses.
6. Evaluate efficacy of all assessment instruments each year and revise as needed using the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments.
7. Further develop the college-wide understanding of new, revised assessment processes and the overall quality assurance system among faculty, staff, and candidates.
8. Develop effective processes for tracking graduates and gathering impact data.
9. Continue to refine recruitment procedures to attract high quality, diverse candidates.

IX. Appendices

The Education Preparation Provider Policy on Reliability, Validity, and Fairness in Assessment

The Education Preparation Provider of Georgia Southern University ensures that its candidate, programs, department, and EPP quality assurance system are reliable, valid, and fair through the implementation of a systematic set of documented procedures that are maintained, shared, and frequently reviewed by the EPP *COE Procedures for Reliability, Validity, and Fairness in Assessment*). The EPP recognizes the interrelatedness and reciprocal nature of elements that make up this set of assessment procedures.

The College of Education is committed to the use of multiple forms of assessment within all of its programs and the ongoing study of its performance data and measures for improvement and the establishment of accuracy, consistency, and fairness. Furthermore, the rights of all candidates completing assessments within EPP programs will be protected by measures taken to ensure that each candidate has an equal opportunity to successfully complete each assessment.

COE Procedures for Reliability, Validity, and Fairness in Assessment

To ensure reliability, validity, and fairness in assessment measures and processes, the following interrelated procedures are implemented within the College of Education and all EPP programs at Georgia Southern University using *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* developed by AERA, APA, and NCME (1999) as a guiding document:

Performance Criteria / Standards
1. Department Chairs will ensure that training (e.g., for faculty, clinical supervisors) in the use of key assessments and rubrics will occur as needed so that assessments are implemented consistently and fairly. Documentation of training must be maintained.

2. Review and analysis of key assessments and rubrics to ensure alignment with appropriate content standards and with critical job-related performances will be completed during program faculty meetings and meetings with P-12 partners and/or other stakeholders. Minutes of meetings and revised key assessments and rubrics will be maintained.

3. Alignment of key assessments with program standards, relevant state and national standards, and course objectives is indicated on the assessment and shared with candidates.

4. Key assessments and rubrics will be developed, reviewed and modified based on data analysis and input from stakeholders (faculty, candidates, program graduates, P-12 partners and/or other community partners).

5. Key assessments will be continuously reviewed to ensure that the language of the assessment is non-biased.

6. Clear criteria regarding evaluation and grading of the assessment will be shared with candidates prior to administration of the assessment.

7. Each candidate will be provided with an opportunity to learn and practice the relevant content.

8. Candidates will receive performance feedback via assessment rubrics as key assessments are completed.

9. Candidates may appeal their assessment results in accord with the University grade appeal process.

Data / Reporting

10. Clear, common procedures and criteria for reporting data will be maintained and reviewed by the EPP and communicated to appropriate stakeholders.

11. Data will be reported across departments and programs using identified performance levels.

12. Inter-instructor consistency across course sections using key assessments will be examined at the program level. Results of the analysis will be included in program reports.

13. EPP Assessment Tool Kit data elements and reports will be maintained electronically using a system that can be accessed by faculty and administrators as needed. Appropriate data security measures will be implemented in consultation with the database provider and university computer/network personnel.

14. Data related to gender, ethnicity, program delivery mode, and other categories appropriate to program or EPP needs will be collected and analyzed at the necessary level (e.g., at the program level for key assessments, at the department or EPP level for standardized tests such as GACE content).

COE Key Assessment Data Collection and Data Quality Procedures and Policies

1. The COE assessment timeline will be the general guide for the sequence of assessment activities. The timeline will be shared by email and at department and office meetings in August, and posted for all COE faculty and staff.

2. COE Program Directors will provide the COE Data Manager with the most current key assessment rubrics prior to the beginning of any academic semester in which that rubric will be used. The Administrative Coordinator will be updated by the Data Manager and GASC Director on any new rubrics to ensure accurate reporting and labeling of those rubrics.

3. The COE Data Manager and Administrative Coordinator will create program folios in *Chalk & Wire* that include the most current assessment rubrics for each academic program. Folios will be ready for data entry or evidence no less than one month prior to the end of any semester in which it is used, specifically according to the COE Assessment Timeline. Key assessment folios will be prepared for each distinct semester.

4. The COE Data Manager and Administrative Coordinator will load all candidates associated with each program to each folio.

5. Data entry into *Chalk & Wire* will occur during the semester itself or within two weeks from the end of the semester. Faculty, staff, or graduate students can enter data, as determined by individual departments and programs.

6. If data cannot be entered for a candidate because that candidate is not showing as associated with the assessment in *Chalk & Wire*, this missing candidate should be reported immediately to the COE Data Manager by the person responsible for entering the data to prevent inaccurate aggregate reporting.

7. Verification of data will be completed using an official listing of enrolled candidates within appropriate course or hour sections. This verification will be overseen by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Teacher Education and Accreditation.

8. Program faculty will review the prior academic year's aggregate reports for accuracy prior by the end of August per the COE Assessment Timeline, and report any inaccuracies to the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Teacher Education for revision to ensure the most accurate data for August/September program review.

9. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Teacher Education and Accreditation, the Associate Dean for Graduate Education and Research, the Assessment Coordinator, and the Department Chairs will ensure necessary training is available for faculty and staff, and will provide supervision for the completion of these policies and procedures. Status of the data collection processes will be reported to the Dean of the College each semester, reviewed at each assessment retreat, reviewed with the Assessment and Accreditation Committee, reviewed with the Assessment Leadership Team, and reviewed with the Administration Team.

Position Title Key for Assessment	2016-2017 Person
Dean	Tom Koballa
Associate Dean for UGTE & Accreditation	Deborah Thomas
Associate Dean for Grad. Ed. & Research	Tracy Linderholm

Dept. Chairs	Beth Durodoye, Kent Rittschof, Bruce Field
Assessment Coordinator	Yasar Bodur
Data Manager	Lisa Akers (Supervisor: Associate Dean for UGTE & Accreditation)
GASC Director	Lydia Cross (Supervisor: Associate Dean for Grad. Ed. & Research)
Administrative Coordinator	Coco Roberts (Supervisor: Associate Dean for UGTE & Accreditation)
SSC Director	Chris Thompson
CATS Coordinator (Info Systems)	Eric Floyd

College of Education
Unit Assessment Timeline
2016-2017

Data Documents/Task	Who is completing it?	When is it due? Reporting Period?	To whom/where is it submitted?
KA Database report for 15/16 to Annual Program Assessment report writers	Assoc. Dean for UTE & Accreditation	Prior to Annual Program Assessment Retreat	Annual Program Assessment Report writers and Dept. Chairs
Final due date for all undergraduate & graduate-key assessment data for Summer 2016	Chairs	August 2, 2016	KA Database
Annual August Unit Assessment Retreat: Review of Data, Strategic Planning & Goal Setting for 2016-2017 (Offices/Centers, Budget, Strategic Plan, SACS, PSC, CAEP)	Admin Team	August 19, 2016 @ Admin Team Assessment Retreat	Annual Unit Assessment Worksheet
Unit Assessment Feedback to Departments/Centers/Offices and make available for access	Chairs/Directors/Deans	Second week in August 2016@ Fall Departmental and Office meetings.	Faculty/Staff/Candidates
Report 2016-2017 Unit Goals to Faculty/Staff and progress on prior year goals.	Dean	Second week in August 2016 @ Fall 2015 COE Faculty/Staff Meeting	Faculty/Staff
Send revised or new KA rubrics for 16/17 to be created in Chalk & Wire	Program Directors/Program faculty teaching a KA course	September 9, 2016	All Programs submit to Research Coordinator (Lisa Akers)
Draft of graduate field experience survey sent to program directors to review/revise.	Administrative Coordinator (Coco Roberts)	September 5, 2016	Program Directors
Program directors make any needed revisions to graduate field experience survey and return to administrative coordinator.	Graduate Program Directors	September 19, 2016	Administrative Coordinator
KA Database departmental reports for 2015-2016 (Fall 15, Spring 16, Summer 16) key assessment data downloaded	Assoc. Dean for UTE & Accreditation, Deborah Thomas	September 26, 2016	Emailed to department chairs
16/17 KA Database rubrics complete. Send email notifying chair, program directors, and faculty teaching a KA course to review for accuracy of rubrics in Chalk & Wire.	Research Coordinator (Lisa Akers)	September 30, 2016	Program Directors/Program faculty teaching a KA course
Program directors and faculty teaching a KA course in 16/17 review rubrics in Chalk & Wire. Report any inaccuracies to Research Coordinator, Lisa Akers.	Program Directors Faculty teaching a KA course	September 30 - October 14, 2016	Research Coordinator (Lisa Akers)

Message to faculty teaching graduate courses with field experiences informing them of the upcoming field experience survey.	Administrative Coordinator	October 10, 2016	Faculty teaching graduate courses with field experiences (except MAT).
Faculty teaching graduate courses with field experiences inform students to complete field experience survey.	Faculty teaching graduate courses with a field experience (except MAT)	October 24 – November 4, 2016	Graduate students enrolled in a course with a field experience (except MAT)
Graduate Field Experiences sent via email to students	Administrative Coordinator	October 31, 2016	Graduate students in a field experience.
Title II Interim Report	Research Coordinator/ Associate Dean for UTE & Accreditation	Due: November 9, 2016	PSC/Electronic submission
KA Database reports for 2015/2016 uploaded to COE repository	Administrative Coordinator, Coco Roberts	Completed by December 1, 2016	COE Sharepoint
Employer Survey Request	Administrative Coordinator	December 1, 2016	USG, Comfort Aflobi
Final due date for all undergraduate & graduate Fall 2015 key assessment data entered in Chalk & Wire (except EDD dissertation assessments)	Faculty teaching a KA course	December 16, 2016	Chalk & Wire
Submit data for EDD dissertation assessments to GASC Director, Lydia Cross	EDD Program Directors	December 2, 2016	GASC Director
Submit data for EDD dissertation assessments to Assoc. Dean for UTE & Accreditation, Deborah Thomas	GASC Director	December 13	Associate Dean for UTE & Accrediation
Graduate Field Experiences data report sent to program directors and chairs	Administrative Coordinator	December 13, 2016	Program directors and chairs
Data Collection for DataMart Completers Report	Research Coordinator	Mid November – Mid January (Due Mid-January)	BOR/Electronic submission
Draft of faculty and student surveys of special surveys sent to appropriate directors of offices/centers	Administrative Coordinator	January 16, 2017	Office/Center Directors
Fall 2016 Semester Key Assessment Data Reports available for review	Associate Dean for UTE & Accreditation, Deborah Thomas	January 13, 2017	Chalk & Wire Program Assessment Work Space
Office/Center directors review/revise survey and submit to administrative coordinator	Office/Center Directors	January 25, 2017	Administrative Coordinator
Department Annual Summary Report Analysis including Review with Admin Team	Dept. Chairs	January 27, 2017 Admin Team preview for Spring Assessment Retreat	COE_key@georgiasouthern.edu, emailed to Admin Team and Dean
Draft of graduate field experience survey sent to program directors to review/revise.	Administrative Coordinator	February 1, 2017	Program Directors
**Completer and Employer Surveys (graduate programs) sent 2015-2016	Administrative Coordinator	February 13, 2017	
**Survey of Graduates – send surveys to completers of graduate programs (2 years out) via email	Administrative Coordinator	March 1, 2017	Graduates of graduate-level programs from previous academic year

Annual Spring Assessment Retreat – Review of 2014-2015 Candidate KA data, 2015 Department Reports, decisions, and likely resource needs for 2016-2017	Admin Team	February TBA, 2017	COE Spring Unit Assessment Review Worksheet
Program directors make any needed revisions to graduate field experience survey and return to Administrative Coordinator.	Graduate Program Directors	February 15, 2017	Administrative Coordinator
**2015-2016 Completer and Employer Surveys (graduate programs) analyses & reporting	Administrative Coordinator	February 27-March 31, 2017	Chairs/Directors/Deans
2015/2016 PAAR Report due to GaPSC	Department Chairs Data Manager Associate Dean for UGTE & Accreditation	March 6, 2017	GaPSC PAAR electronic system
Message to faculty teaching graduate courses with field experiences informing them of the upcoming field experience survey.	Administrative Coordinator	March 13, 2017	Faculty teaching graduate courses with field experiences (except MAT).
Faculty teaching graduate courses with field experiences inform students to complete field experience survey.	Faculty teaching graduate courses with a field experience (except MAT)	March 13 - 17, 2017	Graduate students enrolled in a course with a field experience (except MAT)
Graduate Field Experiences sent via email to students	Administrative Coordinator	March 20, 2017	Graduate students in a field experience.
Annual Faculty/Staff Review for CY2016	All departments/centers/offices	March 23, 2017	Deans/Directors/Chairs
Faculty and Student Services Surveys sent 2015-2016	Administrative Coordinator	March 20 - 31, 2017 Faculty Surveys & Student Surveys	COE undergraduate/ graduate students. COE faculty and staff
CAEP Annual Report (2015-2016)	Associate Dean for UTE & Accreditation	April 2017 (TBA)	AIMS (CAEP online reporting tool)
**Complete analyses of survey of completers and employers, and send via email	Administrative Coordinator	April 10 - 21, 2017	Administrative Team, Department Chairs, and Program Directors
iPEDS/AACTE/NCATE Report	Associate Dean for UTE & Accreditation, Research Coordinator, SSC Director	May 2, 2017	AACTE online
Work Begins on Title II Interim Report	Research Coordinator/ Associate Dean for UTE & Accreditation	Begin work in May 2017 Due: November 2017	PSC/Electronic submission
2015-2016 Faculty and Student Services Survey analyses & reporting	Admin Coordinator and Assoc. Dean for UTE & Accreditation	April 21-May 19, 2017 Sent by June 1, 2017	Chairs/Directors/Deans
Graduate Field Experiences data report sent to program directors and chairs	Administrative Coordinator	May 5, 2017	Program Directors and Chairs
Spring 2017 PPB data collection/analyses for TEP admissions	PPB Coordinator/GA	May 1 – June 1, 2017	Chalk & Wire

Final due date for all undergraduate & graduate-assessment data for Spring 2017.	Chairs	May 19, 2017	Chalk & Wire
Submit data for Ed.D. dissertation KAs to Associate Dean for UTE & Accreditation, Deborah Thomas	EDD Program Directors	May 1, 2017	UTE Associate Dean
Center/Office Annual Summary Report Analysis including Review with Admin Team	Directors	July 21, 2017 Admin Team preview for discussion at Assessment Retreat	COE_key@georgiasouthern.edu, emailed to Admin Team and hard copy to Dean
Budget/Resources (2015-2016) Toolkit Spreadsheet	Template provided to Chairs/Directors/Deans May 30, 2016	Submitted July 21, 2017 Admin Team review at August Assessment Retreat	COE_key@georgiasouthern.edu
SACS Reports on 2016-2017 Program Data	Designated faculty lead report writers	TBA	Chairs and Associate Dean for UTE & Accreditation
Dean's Annual Report 2016-2017	Dean	August 1, 2017	Provost
Send Email to program directors to update rubrics for 2017-2018	Research Coordinator, Lisa Akers	August 1, 2017 (send Email) September 8, 2017 (updates due)	Research Coordinator
Summer Unit Assessment Retreat -- Review of Center/Office data & Goal Setting for 2015-2016	Admin Team	August 4, 2017 @ Admin Team Assessment Retreat	COE Summer Unit Assessment Review Worksheet
Unit Assessment Feedback to Departments/Centers/Offices	Chairs/Directors/Deans	Second week in August 2017 @ Fall Departmental and Office meetings.	Faculty/Staff/Candidates
Report 2014-2015 Unit Goals to Faculty/Staff	Dean	Second week in August 2017 @ Fall 2017 COE Faculty/Staff Meeting	Faculty/Staff

**Assessment/Accreditation Committee convenes at least three meetings each semester to address matters including refinement of key assessment, assessment rubrics, and COE assessment procedures.

Highlighted items indicate Unit Assessment Toolkit

Position Title Key for Timeline	2016-2017 Person
Dean	Tom Koballa; (Jennifer Stocking, Assistant)
Associate Dean for UGTE & Accreditation	Deborah Thomas
Associate Dean for Grad. Ed. & Research	Tracy Linderholm
Dept. Chairs	Beth Durodoye, Kent Rittschof, Bruce Field
Assessment Coordinator	Yasar Bodur
Research Coordinator	Lisa Akers
Administrative Coordinator	Coco Roberts
SSC Director	Chris Thompson

Developed July/August, 2016. Revised October, 2016.

GASC Director	Lydia Cross
CATS Coordinator (Info Systems)	Eric Floyd