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I. Introduction

The following constitutes Ohio Northern University’s Center for Teacher Education response to the Board of Examiners’ Report for the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education’s Unit Accreditation Board as submitted following the visit to Ohio Northern University on April 15-20, 2005. Response and documentation as provided in the appendices of this rejoinder clarify the status of Ohio Northern University in each of the areas cited in the BOE report. Section II provides the response to each Area for Improvement as relayed in the BOE report and Section III provides the response to other statements made within the report for which additional clarification may be appropriate. Narrative is provided within the body of the rejoinder and documentation or evidence is provided within the appendices.

II. Response to Areas for Improvement

Standard 1:

Areas for Improvement (p. 27 of the BOE Report)

The Middle Childhood Education licensure program has not received approval by its professional association, the National Middle School Association.

Rationale: The Middle Childhood Education program is in rejoinder with the National Middle School Association.

On April 15, 2004, Ohio Northern University’s Middle Childhood Education program was submitted to the Ohio Department of Education for consideration and review by the National Middle School Association. The program had previously been approved in 1998 using the Ohio/National Middle School Association 1995 Standards. On August 26, 2004, the program was returned with the statement that an external review of the program had been conducted and
the program was not recommended for approval. The rationale for the “not met” decisions in the standards primarily centered around the lack of candidate performance data. Ohio Northern University’s Center for Teacher Education was given one year, or until August 23, 2005, to submit a rejoinder for the Middle Childhood Education program.

This is the only teacher education program offered by Ohio Northern University which was not placed on continued approval when programs were submitted prior to the NCATE BOE visit on April 15-20, 2005. The chart on page 106 of the Institutional Report shows all of the programs and their approval status as of the time of the visit. In fact, other programs had strengths listed such as “Good detail given about dispositions as well as knowledge and skills” (Early Childhood) and, “The evidence presented suggests a strong commitment by ONU to provide candidates with a variety of diverse field experiences, field experiences at many levels, and required professional experiences that make for a strong teacher preparation program. The English content courses appear to be rigorous and comprehensive, and the ELA methods course, in particular, addresses many objectives in the program standards. . . . The reviewers felt that the program performance assessment as described on page 6 of the program report was strong. . . .” (AYA Language Arts). These samples can be found in Appendices pp. A1-A4.

During the 2004-05 academic year, much of the time of the faculty in Ohio Northern University’s Center for Teacher Education, Department of Education, and Teacher Education Advisory Committee was spent in the discussion of Ohio Northern University’s Center for Teacher Education commitments and goals (along with related knowledge, skills, and dispositions), the Assessment Plan, the development of and discussions related to the Institutional Report in preparation for the BOE visit, and other preparations. Since the National Middle School Association’s review of the Middle Childhood Education Program stated that more evidence needed to be given concerning the assessment plan and related data for this program, and these issues were being dealt with on a larger scale within the entire program and unit, it was decided that the full preparation of the rejoinder for the National Middle School Association would wait until these details were discussed more deeply at a broader unit level. Sample minutes of the NCATE Steering Committee, Department, Center, and Teacher Education Advisory Committee (September 2, 2004; October 25, 2004; November 1, 2004; November 4, 2004; January 27, 2005; February 10, 2005; March 23 2005, more) document just some of
meeting time spent in these discussions. Much individual and small group work took place outside of these settings as well (Appendices pp. A5-A17).

Once the BOE visit was completed, preparations of the Middle Childhood Education Program rejoinder began in detail. Meetings were held among primarily three faculty members (two who work closely with the program and one who served as a program writer) to discuss the program, the results of the first submission and comments, and the rejoinder preparation. The program rejoinder was completed and mailed to the Ohio Department of Education on June 17, 2005. The results of the rejoinder have not yet been received. Although it is certainly not the intention to make this document lengthy, it was determined that perusal of this document may be helpful to the UAB when considering this Area for Improvement. Thus, the complete rejoinder submission including the results of the first submission and the accompanying response can be found in the Appendix (pp A18 – A137). It is the belief that this rejoinder adequately addresses the concerns expressed during the first review of the program.

Standard 2:

Areas for Improvement (p. 35 of the BOE Report)

1. The unit has not taken effective steps to examine or eliminate sources of bias in its performance assessments, or has made no effort to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures.

   Rationale: The team did not find evidence of a structured process to ensure that assessments are fair, accurate, consistent, and unbiased.

A summarized, up-to-date version of the assessments required of students is presented by table in the Appendix (p. A139). This table is organized by program commitments (along the top) and transition points (down the side). Although many of these assessments were in place at the time of the BOE visit, some were developed as part of a summer project funded through
Teacher Assessment System Grant Award Title IIA, CFDA #84.367 as awarded through the Ohio Department of Education. This grant was requested in an effort to improve and extend the current assessment system for the unit. Documentation for the receipt of this grant and its intended use was presented to the team at the time of the visit and is found in the Appendix (pp. A140-A146). Only assessments that were in place at the time of the BOE visit, however, will be discussed in this section.

Ohio Northern University’s Center for Teacher Education uses the Praxis I examinations in reading, writing, and mathematics as a requirement before entry into the sophomore level education courses in each program. Candidates must achieve scores of 170 or higher on all three parts before taking the appropriate sophomore courses and before official entry into the program at the end of the sophomore year. In addition, the appropriate Praxis II exams (both Principles of Learning and Teaching exams and content area exams) are used throughout the state of Ohio as a requirement for licensure. The validity of the Praxis test has been well-established. According to ETS, the organization carries out a “comprehensive validation process for this test score use that is consistent with best practices, as recommended by the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing.” This process includes “passing score or standard setting studies by each state or licensing agency during which the job-relatedness of the test content for that state’s entry-level teachers is evaluated.” (ETS website)

During the clinical experience, teacher candidates are rated multiple times by multiple sources to help ensure fairness of assessment. University supervisors visit about six times completing developmental assessments each time. All AYA (Adolescent Young Adult (grades 7-12)) teacher candidates as well as Multi-age (K-12) teacher candidates are also visited at least twice by a content area university faculty member. For example, an AYA Mathematics teacher candidate would be visited and assessed about six times by the university supervisor and visited and assessed at least twice by a university mathematics faculty member. All Early Childhood and Middle Childhood Education teacher candidates are visited about six times by the university supervisor. In addition, every teacher candidate is assessed developmentally by the cooperating teacher throughout the quarter. At the mid-point of the quarter, the university supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the teacher candidate complete a mid-term evaluation form (Appendix
pp. A147-A150) and the same form is completed at the end of the clinical experience. Details concerning this form are described below.

The mid-term and final evaluation forms used to assess candidates during their clinical experience were designed to assess attainment of particular knowledge, skills, and dispositions corresponding to Ohio Northern University’s teacher education program commitments and goals (Institutional Report, pp. 14-24). The clinical experience forms were developed late in the 2003-04 academic year to be consistent with the newly updated ONU commitments/goals, knowledge, skills, and dispositions, and thus consistent with INTASC/Ohio standards and the Praxis III criteria as indicated in the table located in the Appendix pp. A151-A152 and Guidelines for Supervising Teachers pp. A153-A156. These forms were fully implemented in 2004-05.

Clinical experience university supervisors and content area supervisors were involved at some level in the development and/or approval of these forms. (See agendas/minutes in Appendix pp. A157-A160, October, 2003; March 2004; September 2004). This input from both groups helps to insure fairness in development. The fact that all observers use this form which was reviewed for consistency with the unit’s knowledge, skills, and dispositions and approved by multiple groups before implementation helps to assure consistency and fairness of evaluation of candidates.

As indicated in the Institutional Report (p. 59), although the forms had been fully implemented at the time of the BOE visit, there was not enough data available to conduct fairness and consistency studies on candidates’ assessments. The Institutional Report stated that “it is anticipated that this can be done after Spring Quarter 2005.” The relatively small number of student teachers in the fall and winter quarters and the larger number during spring quarter necessitated waiting until Summer 2005 to conduct the overall analysis of the implemented forms. The results of this study and initial reactions are discussed more fully below in Section III, #2 with the data report given in the Appendix pp A291-A297. In consideration of the issues of fairness and consistency, it is particularly helpful to look at the data in the Appendix on p. A291. On the second table, it is apparent that the early childhood education majors consistently receive higher ratings than either the middle childhood or adolescent/young adult/multi-age teacher candidates. However, it is not clear from this data whether this is due to program differences or evaluator differences. The table on pp. A296-A297 shows the mean ratings of the
university supervisors only on each of the items by program levels. Tests were conducted to
determine if there were significant differences in these ratings by program level. Those rows
shaded represent significant differences (p<.05) by program level in the mean ratings given by
the university supervisors. Again, it is unclear whether this is due to program differences or
evaluator differences. This needs to be examined carefully by faculty in the Fall 2005 at the
scheduled data review meeting (October 5, 2005). Christy Cole of the ONU Office of
Institutional Research will attend this meeting to help discuss the data analyses and plan
strategies (studies) to determine the source of the differences. It is interesting to note that the
cooperating teacher ratings and the candidate self-ratings showed far fewer differences in ratings
(see tables pp. A292-A295).

An additional method for insuring fairness and accuracy in the ratings of teacher
candidates on the clinical experience evaluation form can eventually include a comparison
between supervisor and cooperating teacher ratings on this form and the new teacher’s ratings as
received through the Praxis III process implemented in the state of Ohio. Certainly, some
growth should be expected in the candidate between the clinical experience and the rating period
during the first year of teaching. Since the clinical evaluation forms are aligned with the Praxis
domains (Appendix pp. A153-A156), a comparison of the scores received can provide some
information on the consistency of the two ratings. Some of the teacher candidates who were
rated with the new forms during the 2004-05 academic year will undergo the Praxis III review
during their first year of teaching in the 2005-06 academic year. The fact that multiple persons
assess the candidate during clinical experience (including a self-assessment), a review of the
results of the study described above, and eventual comparison with Praxis III ratings will work
together to assure fairness, accuracy, consistency, and lack of bias in this assessment.

During the field experience associated with particular courses in the program,
students are assessed using the designed form (Appendix p. A161) by both university supervisor
(also the instructor of the course associated with the field experience) and the cooperating
teacher. Field experience associated with a particular course is typically supervised by the
instructor of that course assuring that all field experience teacher candidates are assessed
consistently. In addition, each candidate is also assessed by the cooperating teacher using the
required form in order to allow a check between the two observations. This form is newly
designed and was first fully implemented in Fall, 2004. The form is aligned with the Praxis domains which, in turn, makes it aligned with ONU’s commitments/goals, knowledge, skills, and dispositions as indicated in the alignment in the Appendix p. A151-A152. Since these forms are newly designed to assess the unit’s updated knowledge, skills, and dispositions, there was not enough data available at the time of the NCATE visit to formally analyze the fairness, consistency, reliability, and lack of bias of these ratings. This study, like the study of the clinical experience forms, was undertaken after Spring quarter, 2005, with numerous field experience data available from that quarter. The data from this study can be found in the Appendix on pp A312-A324. Standard deviations and variances were computed for each variable rated to examine dispersion around the mean rating. For this data, the variances ranged from .00 to .34 indicating no variation in ratings on at least one item with some variation on others. These numbers need to be examined more closely and discussed at the Fall Quarter data review meeting to determine next steps in bias and fairness evaluation.

For assessments which have been developed on campus, in addition to beginning to assure that these instruments are consistent, fair, reliable, and unbiased as described in the previous paragraphs, every attempt is made to guarantee that data is collected from multiple sources to contribute to the consistency and accuracy of the data collected. The clinical experience mid-term and final evaluations are completed by the university supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the clinical candidate. The three then meet to discuss the ratings. The field experience rating forms are completed by both the university faculty member who teaches the course with which the field experience is associated and the cooperating teacher.

Each quarter, separate meetings are held on campus for classroom teachers who serve as cooperating teachers for field experience and who serve as cooperating teachers for clinical experience teacher candidates. During these meetings, Ohio Northern University’s conceptual framework, model, theme, commitments, and goals (including knowledge, skills, and dispositions) are presented. The forms used for assessment of teacher candidates are then presented as a measure of these and instructions are given concerning completion of the forms. This training session orients the cooperating teachers to Ohio Northern University’s program and the completion of the candidate assessments. Alignments of the knowledge, skills, and
dispositions along with the associated forms with the Praxis and INTASC Standards are also presented.

Prior to admission to the teacher education programs at Ohio Northern University, each candidate must obtain recommendations from faculty within the Center for Teacher Education, outside of the Center for Teacher Education, and others on campus. Although this has been done for some time, the form was recently updated to quantify the ratings given. A sample of the form is given in the Appendix p. A162. The student’s application packet, which includes these recommendation forms, is discussed by the entire Center for Teacher Education before admission approval. This allows any negative recommendations to be discussed and dealt with fairly by the larger group so that one person does not make the admission decision. One year’s worth of data on the new form, which was in use at the time of the BOE visit, has been analyzed with the data located in the Appendix on pp. A304-A308.

In an attempt to address inter-rater reliability on this particular assessment, a subgroup of early childhood and middle childhood education majors who were rated by a core group of Center faculty was selected. Inter-rater coefficients were calculated for six different pairs of the four evaluators. The coefficients for the pairs ranged from .10 (not good) to .89 (significant at p<.01). This suggests that there may inconsistencies among certain pairs of raters while other pairs rate consistently. This needs to be examined by the faculty as a whole in Fall, 2005, with efforts made to determine the areas of inconsistency and remedies.

As other assessments (as described in the updated table in the Appendix p. A139) are further developed and implemented as part of the Center for Teacher Education Assessment Plan and when sufficient data is available, processes similar to those described above will be carried out to further insure fairness, consistency, reliability, and lack of bias of the instruments. A more complete explanation of this timeline will be given later in this document.

2. The unit does not regularly and comprehensively gather, compile, and analyze assessments and evaluation information on the units’ operations, its programs, or candidates.

Rationale: The team did not find evidence that the unit regularly and comprehensively gathers, compiles, and analyzes assessments, and
evaluation information on the units’ operations, programs, or candidates.

The Center for Teacher Education has long been interested in and concerned with its assessment requirements and results at transition points with discussion ongoing and documented. The Praxis I scores and gpa requirements for admission as well as the timeline for the meeting of Praxis II requirements have been of particular interest. Much discussion took place during the 2002-03 academic year about the possibilities of raising the Praxis I requirements, raising the gpa requirements, and changing the timeline for the passage of the Praxis II exams (Initial recommendations found in the Appendix p. A167). Content area faculty as well as professional education faculty thoroughly discussed the positives and negatives of several proposals before decisions were made. Data reviewed and analyzed included candidate gpa records from 1998 to 2002 (Appendix p. A164), the breakdown of Praxis II Content Area Test Results (Appendix pp. A172-A173), and the minimum gpa requirements for program admission at other Ohio institutions (Appendix p. A174). In the end, it was decided to leave the Praxis I requirements and the gpa requirements the same but to require that students meet these requirements before entry into the sophomore level courses rather than before entry into the teacher education program which would typically happen at the end of the sophomore year. This allows for early identification of students who might have difficulty with the program for the purpose of either remediation or career option discussions. (Documentation of these discussions can be found in the minutes in the Appendix pp A163-A176). (These minutes were available to the BOE team at the time of the visit.)

In addition, during these same discussions, changes were made to the timelines for the Praxis II test requirements. Previously, it was not a program requirement to complete either the PLT exam or the Praxis II content exam prior to program completion. A teacher candidate could complete the program and graduate from Ohio Northern University without completing either examination. The passage of the appropriate Praxis exams was simply a requirement before the student could be recommended for licensure in the state of Ohio. After much deliberation, it was decided that the Praxis II content examination should be completed successfully before the student would be allowed to pursue their clinical experience. Again, both content area faculty
and professional education faculty weighed in on the matter, and the decision was made by the Center for Teacher Education as a whole (again, see minutes in the Appendix pp. A175-A176).

During the spring quarter of 2004, the Center for Teacher Education in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Research of Ohio Northern University conducted its Five-Year Follow-up Survey of graduates of the program. This survey has been conducted regularly with this particular survey being at least the third of its kind. The results of this survey were available to the BOE team at the time of their visit and can be found in the Appendix (pp A177-A196). In addition, Ohio Northern University participates in the Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP), a statewide study of teacher preparation and effectiveness. According to the TQP Newsletter, “The Teacher Quality Partnership is a comprehensive, longitudinal study of how the preparation and development of new teachers affect their success in the classroom as measured by the academic performance of their students.” Every clinical experience student at ONU participates in this study by completing a survey at the end of the clinical experience with the surveys being sent to the Teacher Quality Partnership for summary and analysis. Results of the TQP study pertinent to the university are then forwarded to the university for discussion (see Appendix pp. A197-A218). During the 2004-05 academic year, discussion of the Five-Year Follow-Up of Graduates Survey and the Teacher Quality Partnership were discussed at department meetings (see Follow-Up Survey summary of extended narrative comments and minutes Appendix pp A219-A223). Although these minutes do not reflect action, these results were later used to add a course in Classroom Management to the schedule of courses in Fall, 2005, as described below. Praxis score reports from ETS were also discussed.

Paragraphs above demonstrate the unit’s commitment to review and discussion of candidate and unit assessments through documented discussion and review of program requirements at transition points, review of surveys of graduates, and review of data provided through the Teacher Quality Partnership project. In addition, each quarter cooperating teachers for clinical experience students are asked to complete a Cooperating Teachers’ Survey which rates the preparation provided to the teacher candidate by Ohio Northern University’s program. These surveys have been routinely reviewed by the Field Experience Coordinator and the Director of Teacher Education. For some years, this information has been collected and reviewed by the Director of Teacher Education with special note made to teacher negative
comments and concerns which were, for the most part, isolated. After an updating of the form for alignment with the new knowledge, skills, and dispositions (see Appendix p. A224-A225) and for full implementation during the 2004-05 academic year, a process was begun to compile the results of this cooperating teacher survey in an Excel spreadsheet. After the collection of a year’s worth of data, the responses to these forms were analyzed.

The summary of the analysis of 2004-05 Cooperating Teacher Survey data can be found in the Appendix on pp. A298-A300. The first page shows the mean ratings (on a four point scale) received for all student teaching candidates and field experience candidates on the survey items which relate to each of the six unit Commitment/Goals. The same information is then presented by program level. The second page of this data shows mean ratings given on each of the sub-items for each of the six Commitments/Goals by program level for only those candidates involved in clinical experience. Statistical tests were conducted to determine if there were any differences in ratings received for clinical experience candidates by program level on each of the individual items. No significant differences were found. The third page of the data shows mean ratings given on each of the sub-items for each of the six Commitments/Goals by program level for only those candidates involved in pre-clinical field experiences. Again, statistical tests were conducted to determine if there were any differences in ratings received for field experience candidates by program level on each of the individual items. The shading on the table indicates the items where significant differences were found. The two items where significant differences were found (p<.05) when examined by program level were “ability to match teaching strategies, content and assessment to learners’ developmental levels” and “ability to analyze, organize, and coordinate ideas within her/his content”. These results will be discussed in Fall, 2005, as indicated on the schedule in the Appendix p. A226.

A table in the Appendix p. A228-A232 indicates the review process for assessments of unit performance. This table was presented to the BOE team as an appendix item in the unit’s assessment plan. As described above, the Five-Year Follow-Up Study of Graduates was conducted in Spring 2004, reviewed in December, 2004, and is presented in the Appendix pp. A177-A196. The Teacher Quality Partnership data was first collected in Spring, 2004, and discussed in December, 2004 (Appendix pp. A197=A218). The Cooperating Teacher Surveys are reviewed quarterly by the Field Experience Coordinator and the Director of Teacher
Education. The full 2004-05 year’s data analysis is presented in the Appendix pp. A298-A300 and will be discussed at the appropriate time in Fall, 2005. The Student Teaching Evaluation Forms were first fully implemented during the 2004-05 academic year with the analysis of the year’s data presented in the Appendix pp. A291-A297 as to be discussed in Fall, 2005. As indicated above, Praxis I, II, and III scores are discussed and reviewed routinely.

3. **The unit does not use appropriate information technologies to maintain its assessment system.**

   **Rationale:** *The team did not find evidence that the unit uses appropriate information technologies to maintain its assessment system.*

   The unit has used information technologies to maintain its assessment system in limited but multiple ways in the past as described below with plans in place for expanding the unit’s electronic record-keeping system. For some time, support staff personnel have kept an Excel file of all teacher candidates along with a record of their admission status, test scores, etc. (see sample in Appendix p. A233). In addition, Ohio Northern University’s Registrar’s Office maintains all student records using the Banner system. Faculty and students can access course and grade records electronically and this system is used by unit staff to record candidate course grades and requirements in an Excel spreadsheet similar to the one described above. In addition, Excel spreadsheets and SPSS-X were used during the 2004-05 academic year to begin to aggregate the Cooperating Teacher Survey data for both clinical experience and field experience as well as the Student Teaching Evaluation data (see examples in the Appendix pp. A235-A237). The Five-Year Follow-Up Study of Graduates data was entered electronically using Excel and analyzed using SPSS-X. Finally, faculty assessment information as completed through student evaluation of courses is scanned electronically through the Office of Institutional Research with summary information from courses distributed to each individual faculty member and faculty and department summaries distributed to department chairs (see sample in the Appendix p. A238-239).

   As reported to the BOE team, Ohio Northern’s Center for Teacher Education received a summer grant Teacher Assessment System Grant Award Title IIA, CFDA #84.367 to work on
bringing forward the unit’s assessment system. As described briefly above and more completely later in this document, part of this grant is being used to further assessment and rubric development in order to better measure candidate attainment of the six goals of the unit. Another facet of the grant is to pilot the use of an electronic portfolio system during the fall of 2005.

During May, 2005, as reported to the NCATE team, representatives from both Taskstream and Livetext were scheduled to give separate presentations to the faculty in the Department of Education as well as representatives from the Center, the IT department, and administration. On Friday, April 29, 2005, Resa Sackman of Taskstream gave two sessions attended by faculty and administrative representatives to preview the features of the system. This was followed on Monday, May 9, 2005, by presentations on Livetext by Bradley Schulz. After a review of both products, the faculty agreed to pilot the Livetext system during fall quarter, 2005. During the summer of 2005, Nathan Oliver of the Information Technologies office at ONU is participating in the online training for the purpose of beginning to input ONU data into Livetext and to train faculty and students in its use during the fall. Dr. Diana Garver attended the Livetext Users’ Conference in Chicago in July, 2005, and will pilot the system in two courses in the fall (EDUC 310 Integrated Language Arts – 10 students and EDUC 314 Foundations of Reading and Reading Assessments – 20 students). In the meantime, Mr. Oliver and Dr. Garver will work with support staff to enter other assessment data into the system as well. The system use will be evaluated by October 31, 2005 and reported to the Ohio Department of Education as described in the grant application (again see Appendix pp. A140-A146). Based on the results of the fall pilot, the unit will decide how to move forward in this area.

The Center for Teacher Education at Ohio Northern University has used information technologies to keep student data. We believe that the necessary systems exist to improve the data collection, analysis, and reporting practices of the unit and that steps are being taken to move forward quickly in this area.

4. The unit makes limited or no use of data collected, including candidate and graduate performance information to evaluate the efficiency of its courses, programs, and clinical experiences.
Rationale: The team found little evidence that data are examined, discussed, and used to evaluate the efficiency of the units’ courses, programs, and clinical experiences.

The discussion under #2 above discusses this point to some extent. As reported, (again see Appendix p. A228), the unit has a schedule for the review of data as presented in the assessment plan. The schedule in the Appendix (p. A226) shows the data review meeting time set aside for Fall, 2005.

Meeting minutes in the Appendix (p. A219-A220) show that during the 2004-05 academic year, the Five-Year Follow-up of Graduates as well as the results of the Teacher Quality Partnership were discussed. It is acknowledged that the minutes do not completely reflect the substance of the meeting, but time was spent during this meeting discussing the results of these surveys including near-graduates’ and graduates’ perceived needs of more experience in the program in the area of classroom management. The possible delivery and substance of such a course was discussed. During the Fall Quarter, 2005, the course Classroom Management for Young/Late Adolescents (see schedule in the Appendix p. A239) will be offered for the first time. The development of a similar course for teachers of younger students is being planned.

At the same meeting described above, the faculty also discussed the most recent Praxis II data. Because of the small number of candidates represented when these scores are broken down by program area, it was determined that it is hard to use the “percent passing” data on this exam to examine the success of programs when only a small handful in each program are not passing the exam during the completion year. Praxis III results were also discussed during the 2004-05 academic year. One hundred percent of Ohio Northern University graduates who participated in the Praxis III assessment during the previous year had passed as reported to the BOE team. All Praxis data will be studied carefully in upcoming years and particularly if aggregated Praxis II subscore data becomes available.

Another source of information for the unit has been the input of the Teacher Education Advisory Committee. This group met in spring 2004 (see minutes in Appendix p. A242) to discuss the Pathwise Portfolio used as an assessment in EDUC 445 School and Society. Teacher Education Advisory Committee members participated in a mock review of the portfolios at that
time. Input was collected and discussed and it was determined that the current structure of the portfolio and its assessment could be improved. This information and discussion was used to change the structure of the portfolio during the 2004-05 academic year. This discussion was visited again during Summer 2005 as part of the Assessment Grant meetings to further develop this portfolio as a unit assessment (see further details of these meetings below). The Pathwise Introduction to the portfolio will now take place in EDUC 115 Culture and Schooling, the entry course for all education students, and the portfolio subscores will be used as unit assessments (see table in Appendix p. A139 and further explanations below).

The Teacher Education Advisory Committee also spent some time during Fall quarter, 2004, discussing the field experience component of the teacher education programs at Ohio Northern University and provided input through a survey and then gathered for discussion of possible improvements. Sample comments from this survey and the meeting are presented in the Appendix (p. A244). These comments were reviewed particularly by the Standard 3: Field Experience Subcommittee in an effort to provide improved experiences for teacher candidates before the clinical experience. One result which came from these discussions as well as comments from past teacher candidates is the move towards a blocked field experience for Adolescent/Young Adult (AYA) (grades 7-12) teacher candidates. Because of scheduling issues, AYA teacher candidates often had field experiences which, although technically meeting the required hours, did not provide regular or consistent experiences. It was decided to block three AYA courses (Curriculum, Classroom Strategies, and Reading in the Content Area) into one quarter so that the field experiences could be combined. These students will take the three courses in the afternoons during one quarter keeping the mornings free to be in the school classroom providing for a “mini student teaching” prior to the actual clinical experience. This practice will begin in Fall 2005 based on discussions which took place during the 2004-05 academic year (see meeting notes (p. A245-A248, September, 2004; October 2004; January, 2005) and fall schedule (p. A240) in the Appendix.

The quarterly training meetings with cooperating teachers for both field experience and clinical experience were instituted after the Field Experience Discussion meeting with the Teacher Education Advisory Committee as a result of those discussions as well as discussions with cooperating teachers in the past. At these training meetings, the cooperating teachers
receive an overview of Ohio Northern University’s program including the goals/commitments, knowledge, skills, and dispositions as well as the necessary assessment forms and policies. The cooperating teachers hear a careful statement of their responsibilities and they also have the opportunity to with the university supervisor to discuss specific objectives. These cooperating teachers complete a newly instituted form, in addition to the performance assessment forms, which clearly documents hours completed (see Appendix p. A249) as well as the Cooperating Teacher Survey.

Standard 4:

Areas for Improvement

1. The diversity of the student body is limited. Revised: Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with other diverse candidates.

   **Rationale:** Only eight minority candidates (0.02%) are enrolled in unit programs.

   Only 54 minority candidates (0.04%) are enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences.

   According to Karen Condeni, Vice President and Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid, good progress has been made in this area for Fall 2005. As of July 27, 2005, there were deposits for the entering class from 51 diverse students as compared to 33 at the same time the previous year. Part of this increase should impact the College of Arts and Sciences. The Dimension Award (see description below) has been recently implemented which should impact this recruitment area even more in future years. The university now has full-time multicultural support positions in both admissions and student affairs and the admissions strategic plan makes a commitment to move forward with contacts and visits. The Office of Admissions’ newly developed multicultural brochure targets these students.

   According to Jane Blewitt, Institutional Research Analyst, the overall Fall 2005 projected ethnic breakdown of students (whether or not a deposited student), includes twenty-two new African-American/non-Hispanic students with eighteen of these students being enrolled
in the College of Arts and Sciences. Overall, forty-two new minority students are included in
the breakdown with twenty-six of these students expected in the College of Arts and Sciences. At least three of these students have declared the intent to pursue teacher licensure even before their arrival on campus.

As shared with the BOE team and acknowledged in the BOE report, Ohio Northern University set aside $100,000 in 2004-05 to be used for the specific purpose of increasing student diversity. In addition, The Dimension Scholarship awards of $5,000 to $10,000 to minority students based on need were offered for the first time for entering students in Fall 2005. The latest data shows that 63 such scholarships have been offered for the 2005-06 academic year with seventeen accepted for a total of $164,000. Nine offers are still outstanding in a total amount of $90,000. In addition, the unit is working with the Office of Admissions to develop strategies for the recruitment of diverse students to the unit as described to the BOE team and within the BOE report. The university is making every effort to increase student diversity and opportunities for students to interact with others of diverse backgrounds as best as possible within geographic limitations.

III. Response to Other Statements Made Within the Report (not already covered above)

1. p. 10 in BOE Report: “The commitments/goals and knowledge, skills, and dispositions which are aligned with the CF are specifically measured in the methods related field experiences and clinical practice. To further ensure coherence of the CF with the curriculum, instruction, field experience, clinical practice, and assessment, the unit will implement the process of developing a portfolio that begins with the freshman education courses and continues through student teaching.”

One of the major goals of the Summer 2005 grant Teacher Assessment System Grant Award Title IIA, CFDA #84.367 (Appendix p. 140) was to further develop the unit assessment system as shared with the BOE team and reflected in this note in the report. A portfolio assessment system based upon the Praxis/Pathwise domains had already been implemented as part of the EDUC 445 Organization and Administration of Schools course. A review of this
portfolio with the unit’s Teacher Education Advisory Committee in Spring, 2004, as shared previously, indicated that this portfolio assignment needed to be improved and extended.

On July 12-13, 2005, Ohio Northern University education faculty met with Dr. Fran Landers, a nationally trained BOE member, for the purpose of looking at the current assessment system and moving forward in the assessment process (see minutes in the Appendix p. A250-A252). An initial stage to these meetings included looking at the current list of knowledge, skills, and dispositions under the unit’s six commitments/goals and to determine what was already being assessed. The table in the Appendix p. A253-A258 gives this list. It was noted that every skill and disposition associated with any of the six goals is already assessed during the clinical experience. In addition, every skill is currently assessed during the field experiences associated with courses. Thus, all skills are presently assessed numerous times in the field by multiple university faculty members, cooperating teachers, and self-assessments by candidates. A Dispositional Concerns Process already in place allows faculty the opportunity to identify candidates with whom there is a concern and a faculty committee (Student Support Committee) works with that student through a remediation process. Thus the opportunity for disposition assessment takes place already in both the clinical experience and through the dispositional concerns process. The knowledge attainment is certainly measured through multiple sources currently including specific course grades, grade point averages, and Praxis II scores. Thus, after careful examination, it was determined that all knowledge, skills, and dispositions, are already assessed multiple times throughout the program.

It was acknowledged, however, that these knowledge, skills, and dispositions are all currently assessed primarily through standardized tests, field experience and clinical evaluation forms, and course grades and grade point averages. There is a definite lack, as noted by the BOE team, of assessments/rubrics which are related to specific courses for each goal. It was determined that one additional assessment for each of the six commitments/goals of the unit should be added and that each of these assessments should be course-related. It is acknowledged that these course-related assessments were not in place at the time of the BOE visit. However, all knowledge, skills, and dispositions were measured in some way at the time of the visit and the development of these new assessments demonstrates the unit’s good faith response to the team’s note that additional course-related assessments need to be developed.
The table presented in Appendix A139 represents the unit assessment system after the discussions in these meetings. The table presents the unit’s six commitments/goals along the top with the transition points along the side and the assessments that represent each point and commitment in the program. Most of these assessments are already in place. The course-related assessments to be developed and added during Summer 2005 for each of the six commitments are as follows: Commitment 1: Diversity – Diversity Evaluation (completed in course EDUC 115/150 Culture and Schooling Field Experience), Commitment 2: Learner and the Learning Process - Photo Essay w/evidence of individual student learning (completed in EDUC 242 Early Childhood Curriculum and Policies, EDUC 262 Middle Childhood Curriculum and Policies, EDUC 440 Classroom Strategies), Commitment 3: Content and Pedagogy – Unit Plan (to be completed in EDUC 342 Reading in the Content Area), Commitment 4: Reflection – Reflection Assignments (to be completed in both EDUC 150 Five-Day Field Experience and EDUC 470/480 Clinical Experience), Commitment 5: Portfolio Subscore (to be completed in EDUC 445 Organization and Administration of Schools), and Commitment 6: Professionalism – Portfolio Subscore (introduction in EDUC 115 Culture and Schooling, assessment in EDUC 445 Organization and Administration of Schools and EDUC 470/480 Clinical Experience). The faculty spent some of the meeting time talking about the structure of each of the assessments many of which are already in place in slightly different formats or with smaller populations of candidates. Possible rubrics for each assessment were also discussed. Faculty took assignments to continue working in small groups on selected assessments/rubrics with the entire faculty to address each rubric again as a group immediately prior to Fall, 2005. The intent is to solidify the details of the additional assessments and rubrics at that time for pilot implementation in Fall, 2005.

The additional assessment for Commitment/Goal #1: (Diversity) (“The competent teacher demonstrates a commitment to diversity”) will be completed during the five-day field experience (EDUC 150) which is associated with the introductory course EDUC 115 Culture and Schooling. After this experience, the teacher candidate meets with an advisor to review and discuss the experiences in the field. During Spring, 2005, advisors were given a set of questions for the candidate related to diversity that were to be asked during this debriefing session. The advisor was then to rate the candidate on four items related to the Diversity commitment/goal.
and associated with particular knowledge, skills, and dispositions. This was done primarily as an exploration for the assessment development. The questions and rating items used are found in the Appendix, p. A259. A preliminary summary of the ratings can be found in the Appendix on pp. A309.

During the July 12-13, 2005 assessment meetings, it was determined that this assessment could be used as an additional assessment for the Diversity commitment/goal with some revision. It was determined that the assessment should take the form of a writing assignment but still be attached to the courses as described above. An update of the assignment questions and a much more developed rubric can be found in the Appendix p. A260- A262. The faculty will meet again on September 1-2, 2005 (see schedule in the Appendix p. A226) to discuss and share summer assessment work at which time this assignment/assessment/rubric will be finalized for implementation in Fall, 2005. Since those students who enter EDUC 115 in Fall, 2005 will not do the associated five-day field experience until later in the 2005-06 academic year, it will take some phase-in time to get data on this exact assessment. Some real data on this assessment should be available at the end of the 2005-06 academic year. However, since an earlier version of the form was implemented in Spring, 2005, that assessment with similar questions can be continued during the phase-in period with some preliminary data available at the end of Fall, 2005. At that time, summary data can be provided as well as in initial consideration of bias issues.

The additional assessment for Commitment/Goal #2 (Learner) (“The competent teacher candidate is knowledgeable of the learner and the learning process.”) will be the extension of a photo essay assignment already completed by the early childhood students in EDUC 242 Early Curriculum and Policies. The current assignment and rubric can be found in the Appendix pp. A263-A264. The assignment and rubric will be adapted to particularly assess the candidate’s attainment of specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions under Commitment/Goal #2. A similar assignment will be given in EDUC 262 Middle Childhood Curriculum and Policies and EDUC 440 Classroom Strategies (Adolescent/Young Adult/Multi-age candidates) so that each candidate in the program has the opportunity to participate in the assessment. An updated rubric for the assessment as proposed in Summer 2005 is given in the Appendix p. A265. Again, this summer assessment development will be reviewed at the faculty meetings on September 1-2, 2005 for
pilot implementation in Fall, 2005. EDUC 440 Classroom Strategies is offered every quarter so preliminary data should be available as early as the end of Fall, 2005. EDUC 262 Middle Childhood Curriculum and Policies is scheduled to be offered in Winter, 2005-06, and so preliminary data should be available after winter quarter. EDUC 242 Early Childhood Curriculum and Policies is offered only spring quarters so preliminary data would not be available until after spring quarter, 2005-06. However, some initial data for the overall assessment will be available after fall quarter with the EDUC 440 students. Comparison data based on programs will be undertaken as well as a study of bias issues when enough data is available.

The additional assessment for Commitment/Goal #3 (Content/Pedagogy) (“The competent teacher candidate is knowledgeable of the specific content area and the relevant pedagogical tools”) will be a unit plan which all students will complete during EDUC 342 Reading in the Content Area. This unit has been assigned in this course for some time but the rubric designed to assess this commitment/goal will specifically look at the candidate’s progress in the area of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to the content and related pedagogical content knowledge. A sample rubric which will be finalized by the faculty prior to Fall Quarter, 2005, can be found in the Appendix on pp. A310.

The additional assessment(s) for Commitment/Goal #4 (Reflection) (“The competent teacher candidate practices reflective teaching”) is a reflection assignment to be carried out during the second five-day field experience (EDUC 150) and the reflection which takes place as part of the developmental analyses the teacher candidate completes with the supervisor during clinical experience. After the second five-day field experience (EDUC 150), the candidate currently is asked to write a comparison paper which compares and contrasts the experiences in the two five-days (in two different school settings). These comparisons typically center around issues of demographics, student-teacher interactions, instructional strategies, and classroom management. The assignment is being changed to better reflect issues across numerous commitments/goals and the associated rubric will focus on the assessment of knowledge, skills, dispositions related to commitment/goal #4 (Reflection). A draft of the new assignment and rubrics can be found in the Appendix pp A267-A273. Again, these will be finalized at the faculty meetings on September 1-2, 2005 and can be implemented with those candidates who
request placement for the second five-day during Fall, 2005. Since many of these students will not complete the second five-day until winter or spring quarters, only a small amount of preliminary data will be available after winter, 2005-06 with more available at the end of the academic year.

During the clinical experience, developmental observations include goal setting and reflective analysis after the lesson by both the supervisor and the teacher candidate (see form in Appendix p. A274). In addition, the Lesson Plan and Reflection format adopted by the Center for Teacher Education includes a reflection component at every state of the planned lesson (see format in Appendix p. A275-A278. Participation in this time and lesson planning and conferencing with the supervisor during the clinical experience developmental observations will allow the supervisor to rate the candidate in the area of reflection. Assessment will focus on the skills and dispositions of commitment/goal #4 Reflection. A draft of the rubric can be found in the Appendix p. A279. Since the reflection assessment described above will occur relatively early in the program, this second assessment will not only measure reflection skills but growth in this area as well. A rubric will be designed similar to the one designed for the assessment described in the previous paragraph to allow for comparisons. This measure of reflection during clinical experience can begin during Fall, 2005 on a pilot basis although comparative data will not be available as these candidates did not participate in the previous reflection assessment. The study of bias issues will take place when appropriate.

After much discussion during the faculty assessment meetings on July 12-13, 2005, it was determined that attainment of Commitment/Goal #5 (Facilitation) is assessed and documented through the current structure of classroom-based field experience and clinical experience assessments. However, an additional assessment for Commitment/Goal #5 (Facilitation) (“The competent teacher candidates serves as a facilitator of learning”) will be the portfolio subscore for facilitation of classroom learning from the Pathwise/Praxis portfolio which is undertaken during EDUC 445 Organization and Administration of Schools and completed during EDUC 470/480 Clinical Experience. This portfolio assignment has been in place for some time with the assessment reviewed by the Teacher Education Advisory Committee during Spring, 2004, as described above. At that time it was determined that the assignment needed some revision. One problem with the assignment was that it was not introduced until the EDUC
445 course which is taken late in the candidate’s program. The candidate attempted to document progress in the Pathwise domain areas as part of a portfolio based primarily on clinical experience artifacts. It was determined that if the portfolio were introduced earlier in the program, then candidates could collect artifacts throughout their program thus showing growth and development in each of the areas. As determined during the summer 2005 assessment meetings, the Pathwise/Praxis portfolio project will now be introduced during EDUC 115 Culture and Schooling (see Assessment Table in the Appendix p. A139). Candidates will reflect artifacts throughout the program and then complete the portfolio as earlier in EDUC 445 Organization and Administration of Schools and EDUC 470/480 Clinical Experience.

The current form of the Pathwise/Praxis Portfolio assignment is given in the Appendix pp. A282- A283 and current rubrics are found on pp. A284-A286. The table in the Appendix pp. A287-A288 shows that Commitment/Goal #5 (Facilitation) aligns with Praxis Domain Standards B1, B3, B4, B5, C1, C3, and C5. An average subscore of these items on the Pathwise/Praxis Portfolio will be used as a measure of attainment in this area. The updated assignment/rubric will be finalized to begin Fall, 2005. Since the portfolio will first be introduced in the introductory course EDUC 115 Culture and Schooling for the first time this fall, it will take some time for candidates to work completely through to present their portfolio under the new artifact collection system. However, since candidates currently complete the portfolio as formerly assigned, some collection of pilot data can be undertaken during fall and winter quarters, 2005-06.

The additional assessment for Commitment/Goal #6 (Professionalism/Ethics) (“The competent teacher candidate is a professional educator”) will be the gathering of data from the cooperating teacher documentation of hours form (see Appendix p. A289-A290 ) and the associated subscore on the Pathwise/Praxis Portfolio as described above. During each field experience, the cooperating teacher completes an assessment of performance aligned with the Praxis domains (see form in Appendix p A147 ). In addition, the cooperating teacher completes a documentation of hours in the classroom as well as dependability, professional characteristics, etc. (Appendix p. A289-A290). This documentation during field experience measures some aspects of professionalism. In addition, Pathwise/Praxis portfolio items A5, A4, C2, and C3 (Appendix p. A287-A288 ) have been determined to be aligned with knowledge, skills, and
dispositions in this commitment/goal and the average subscore on these items will be used to measure professionalism. Again, the complete newly formulated portfolio assignment will not begin until Fall, 2005, but subscores on the current portfolio assignment can be used as pilot data to be evaluated after fall and winter, 2005-06.

Since the Pathwise/Praxis Portfolio is aligned with the Praxis domains and the Commitments/Goals, knowledge, skills, and dispositions of Ohio Northern University’s Center for Teacher Education are aligned with Praxis domains (again see table in the Appendix p. A287-A288), other portions of the portfolio can be used as additional data for Commitments/Goals #1-4 above even though they were not used as the primary additional course-based assessment as described. This was the original intent as determined in the unit’s assessment plan, but the Teacher Education Advisory Committee had concerns with the implementation of the portfolio as described earlier. The reformulation of the assignment to begin during the entry year will allow candidates to collect artifacts throughout the program thus creating a more complete portfolio by the end of the program and responding to some of the current concerns of the project.

At the July, 2005, assessment meetings, faculty also considered possible assessments for how the teacher candidates at Ohio Northern University impact student learning. It was determined that one such assessment should take place earlier in the program with an additional assessment taking place during clinical experience. This will be addressed initially as part of the photo essay assignment described above under Commitment/Goal #2 (Learner). A similar assignment will take place during the clinical experience with the draft assignment and rubric found in the Appendix p. A280-A281.

Again, all knowledge, skills, and dispositions of the Ohio Northern University’s Center for Teacher Education are assessed currently multiple times using multiple sources. Most of this assessment comes through field experience ratings, clinical experience ratings, and standardized tests. Nevertheless, some of the assessments described above are course-related assessments, mostly adapted forms of assessments already in place, which will provide more data throughout the program to solidify the measures from the field- and test- related assessments. Preliminary data will be available for many of these measures at the end of fall or winter quarter, 2005-06.
2. p. 12 in BOE Report: “Data are being collected at this time on a number of new versions of assessment instruments. Performance data are relatively scarce in coursework however; standard forms are being used throughout field experiences and student teaching classroom observations. Data collection is in its initial phase consequently data aggregation analysis, summary and dissemination are not yet implemented in a systematic manner for all assessments.”

Refer to the previous section, (Section III, #1) for a discussion of the development of assessments to be implemented during coursework with the associated rubrics.

Since the redevelopment of the unit’s Commitments/Goals and knowledge, skills, and dispositions, new forms aligned with these were created to assess both field work and clinical experience. Some forms were piloted in Spring, 2004, but the forms were first fully implemented during the 2004-05 academic year. Some fall term data was available at the time of the BOE visit, but a deeper study was planned including data aggregation, summary, and dissemination for the end of the 2004-05 academic year as shared with the BOE team.

A summary of the clinical experience rating mid-term and final evaluation form (Appendix p. A147) data for the 2004-05 academic year can be found in the Appendix on pp. A291-A297. Data was available for sixty-three teacher candidates including twenty-three early childhood majors, sixteen middle childhood majors, and twenty-four adolescent/young adult/multi-age teacher candidates. Rating sheets were completed by the university supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the teacher candidates. The top table on p. A291 shows the mean composite ratings by Commitment/Goal and Evaluator. The second table on the same page breaks the data apart by program level. On the next three pages of tables, the data reported separately for the cooperating teacher ratings (pp. A292-A293), candidate self-ratings (p. A294-A295) and university supervisor ratings (p. A296-A297). Assessment items are organized on the left side according to the Goal/Commitment with which they are aligned. Mean ratings and rating standard deviations for each question are given with totals given by program level and question number. Ratings appear to be high in all program levels and on all items in all Commitments/Goals. However, there were some significant differences (p<.05) in ratings across program levels on certain items and for certain evaluators. Those questions appearing in the
shading represent items on which the significant differences appeared. However, it is unclear whether the differences appear based upon the teacher candidate performance by program level or the particular assessors of each candidates. (See discussion of fairness and consistency earlier in this document under Standard 2, #1.) This will need to be discussed by faculty and examined more deeply. These results will be discussed and analyzed by the faculty during the data review meeting scheduled for October 5, 2005 (see schedule in Appendix pp. A226). In addition, ratings were summarized according to scaled score determinations as found in the Appendix pp. A300-A301 with 100% of these 2004-05 candidates achieving scaled scores of 3 (mean ratings on subscore items for each Commitment/Goal > 2.50, Expectations Exceeded).

A summary of the field experience evaluation rating form data for Spring Quarter 2005, is found in the Appendix on pp. A312. Again, this recently implemented form (p. A161) was in place at the time of the BOE visit but results were not yet compiled for a large number of students. The first page of this summary shows mean ratings received by the students on form items as aligned with the unit’s six Commitments/Goals (across the top). The information is presented by program level and by evaluator (university supervisor or site supervisor). A first glance of this data shows that ratings are consistently high by both supervisors on and off campus. The remaining six pages of this summary more specifically split the data according to the particular course in which the candidate was participating at the time of the field experience with one commitment/goal per page. Again, ratings appear to be high with a few exceptions. These will need to be examined closely by faculty at the data review meeting scheduled for October, 2005.

A summary of the responses on the recommendation forms for candidates applying for admission to the Teacher Education Program can be found in the Appendix on pp. A304. These forms are completed by selected education faculty, content faculty, and others on campus and rate each applicant in areas such as academic ability, work ethic, oral/written communication skills, and others. A sample of the form can be found on page A162. These forms have been in existence for some time but were recently changed to allow for quantification of recommendations. The summary data shows each candidate’s mean ratings in each area as well as the mean ratings for all applicants in each area. It is interesting to note that the lowest mean
rating appeared in the category “oral/written communication ability”. This data will be reviewed at the faculty data review meeting in October, 2005 as described earlier.

In addition, complete Cooperating Teacher Survey data was compiled at the end of the 2004-05 academic year as explained in the IR and to the BOE team and was summarized in the previous section under Standard 2, #2.

Performance related to the commitments/goals, knowledge, skills, and dispositions within coursework will be measured on the new assessments described in the previous section with the data analysis timeline as given.

3. p. 55 of the BOE Report: “While all syllabi indicated a point system for determining the weight of a single assignment to the final course grade, a limited number also included rubrics or guidelines for evaluating an individual assignment. Interviews with unit faculty indicated that while some individual faculty are experimenting with the construction and use of rubrics this has not been systematized across the unit; The Director of Teacher Education indicated that this should be a future priority.”

Faculty worked together with rubric construction during the July 12-13 assessment meetings with work continuing over the summer. The rubrics to be piloted for the unit assessments described in note #1 above will be finalized before the start of fall quarter for immediate implementation.

4. p. 57 of the BOE Report: “The Office of Institutional Research maintains a university-wide aggregate data of student evaluations. A summary of ratings from 2000 to 2004 indicates consistently high levels. For 14 items, aggregated data indicate mean scores from 4.00 to 4.66 on a five point scale. One item asking students to rate the value of the textbook produced mean scores of 3.88 to 3.97.”

Data is also routinely aggregated for the education faculty as a whole. A sample in the Appendix p. A238 shows an aggregation of that data.