Education Unit Assessment System

Unit Assessment Change Process

1. Design new assessments and accompanying rubrics and assignments.

2. Review proposed changes with program faculty and possibly candidates, using Assessment Review as the guide to the process.

3. Discuss Assessment Review process and findings with Department Assessment Chair/Coordinator and sign Assessment Review form when process is complete.

4. Submit coversheet, supporting documents, signed Assessment Review, Alignment Matrix, and SPA Alignment Chart (where appropriate) to Program Council or directly to Program Coordinator who will confirm program approval and participation in design and review of recommended changes and forward to Department Chair.

5. Department Chair will confirm program approval and forward to Director of Assessment and Accreditation.

6. Director of Assessment and Accreditation will either return proposal with suggestions or forward to Assessment Change Sub-Committee comprised of an Assessment Committee Co-chair, a representative from 3 of 4 departments with expertise in assessment and/or measurement and a representative from the remaining department with expertise in assessment, and curriculum and instruction for review and recommendation.

7. Once all have positive recommendations, the Unit Assessment Committee Co-chair will forward the proposal to the Steering Committee via the Dean of Education for its consideration.

8. The Steering Committee then commences upon enacting the Unit Decision Making Process, involving all departments in reviewing, making recommendations, and approving or denying the implementation of the recommended change.
Education Unit Assessment System
Unit Assessment Change Coversheet

Please complete the first section of this form. Be sure to attach, as appropriate, specific changes in standards and/or conceptual framework, assessments, rubrics, and completed/revised Unit Alignment Matrix. Secure signature of Committee Co-chairs, signifying the committee’s support for change. Submit to the Director of Accreditation and Assessment, Linda Amerigo-Piccolo, in PH 100.

1. Description of Proposed Change

Date: ____________________________
Faculty Member Submitting Request: ____________________________

Description of change(s) in standards or conceptual framework, instrument, rubric, and/or process and how program is improved:

Explanation of why this change is necessary/how grounded in research and practice:

Committee Support ____________________________
Signature of Unit Committee Co-Chair ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

Committee Support ____________________________
Signature of Unit Committee Co-Chair ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

Attach: _____ Proposed Standard/Criteria/Outcomes _____ Assessment Review _____ Unit Alignment Matrix

If applicable, attach: _____ Assessments & _____ Related Course Assignments & _____ Rubrics

2. Recommendation/Implementation

Director of Accreditation and Assessment ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

Linda Amerigo-Piccolo

_____ Recommended  _____ Not Recommended

Comments:

Co-Chair of Unit Assessment Committee ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

_____ Recommended  _____ Not Recommended

Comments:
Unit Assessment Review: Fairness, Consistency, Accuracy, and Avoidance of Bias

To ensure fairness, consistency, accuracy, and avoidance of bias throughout its assessment system, the committee presenting a unit-level change has accomplished the following tasks in developing new or revised standards, conceptual framework, and/or assessments:

1. If creating new definitions of the conceptual framework and/or standards, provide specific changes to be made and an explanation for why these are necessary and how they are grounded in research on and practice in teacher education and/or related fields.

2. Where new standards and/or related assessments are created, define the standard in and delineate the criteria to be used to assess candidates’ performance
   a. For purposes of understanding outcomes related to new standards, define the concepts represented in the standard—e.g., the elements and/or multiple dimensions of the standard.
   b. Determine criteria/outcomes for the multiple dimensions of each standard.
      i. Be certain the criteria/outcomes clearly define the multiple dimensions of the standard.
      ii. Simply state criteria/outcomes with no more than one verb and three dimensions.
      iii. Determine whether they are observable and measurable in relation to the performance or product that is to be assessed. For example, three or more faculty members should agree that—given the criteria/outcomes and the performance or product, the criteria/outcomes are easily identifiable and measured.

3. Review and analyze the criteria/outcomes in the examination of candidates’ work or performances. Determine that the stated criteria/outcomes measure the determined standard. Quite simply, ask three or more professionals whether or not they agree that the standard is represented by the criteria/outcomes presented.
   a. Where appropriate and desirable, ask candidates and assessors what the targeted standards and related criteria/outcomes mean to them and whether or not they are clearly, simply stated. Where there is confusion or disagreement, adjust the wording so that candidates and assessors agree upon their meaning and application of the standards, criteria and/or outcomes in assessment.
   b. Where appropriate and desirable, engage several faculty members and candidates in applying the criteria included in rubrics or assessment of assignments to examples of candidate work to see if several individuals using the same assessment on the same product make similar ratings. Make changes in wording of the criteria/outcomes to assure most individuals would similarly rate candidate work when applying the rubric/criteria/outcomes.

Steps following Approval:

1. Programs review the curriculum in light of new unit assessments and rubrics. Determine where the standards are addressed in the learning experiences and formal and informal assessments used in the course where each assessment is used. Be certain each element of the criteria used in each assessment is developed, applied and reviewed within the course and program. Be certain that assessments and rubrics clearly relate to curriculum and instruction.

2. Programs include standards, outcomes and related assessments and assignments and the criteria used for their evaluation in course syllabi.

3. Recommend that programs revise Assessment Handbook for candidates, college faculty, supervisors
and other clinical faculty, and school faculty to establish expectations, roles, and tasks involved in Program Assessment System.

a. Include alignment charts, standards (including conceptual framework, dispositions and standards relative to teaching diverse learners, student learning and dispositions.

b. Detail policies, procedures and timelines to provide consistency of information, establish outcomes-based expectations at start of program, improve candidate, and increase fairness.

c. Describe assessments, rubrics, and the criteria applied to their development and use to establish level of proficiency expected of candidates on specific outcomes.

We have used these guidelines to ensure the fairness, consistency, accuracy, avoidance of bias in developing and implementing new assessments and/or standards, criteria or outcomes submitted for review.

_____________________________________________  ________________  ____________________________________  ______________
Unit Committee Co-Chair  Date  Unit Assessment Committee Co-Chair  Date
## Unit Alignment Matrix

**Quality Urban Educators Assessment System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Standards</th>
<th>NY State Teaching Standards (where applicable)</th>
<th>NCATE/CAEP Standards &amp; Elements</th>
<th>SPA, National Organization, Program Standards and Unit Dispositions*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity</strong></td>
<td>Build inclusive communities that nurture &amp;</td>
<td>Teach Diverse Learners (race,</td>
<td><strong>Dispositions</strong> Equity: Build inclusive communities that nurture &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>challenge all learners</td>
<td>gender, sexual orientation,</td>
<td>challenge all learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Knowledge of Candidates and Student Learning</td>
<td>culture, etc.)</td>
<td>Excellence: Value professionalism, scholarship, efficacy, &amp; evidence-based &amp; reflective practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.2-1.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethics: Value diversity, democracy, &amp; social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Learning Environment</td>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Assessment for Student Learning</td>
<td>Candidates with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics:</strong></td>
<td>Value diversity, democracy, &amp; social justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellence</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrate professionalism, scholarship,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>efficacy, &amp; evidence-based &amp; reflective practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Knowledge of Content &amp; Instructional Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Knowledge of Candidates &amp; Student Learning (1.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Knowledge of Content &amp; Instructional Planning (2.4-2.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Instructional Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Professional Responsibilities &amp; Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Professional Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This column includes standards which may vary by SPA, national organization, and/or program. Programs identify specific professional standards that align with the unit’s 3 Es (Equity, Excellence, and Ethics) and specific New York State and NCATE/CAEP standards.