Policy 7.0

The links below will allow you to jump directly to a section of Policy 7.0

Policy Area: SYSTEMATIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION   **Number: 07**
Subject Area: Guidelines   **Number: 07. 1**
Specific Subject: **Number:**
Subject Component: **Number:**
Effective Date: Spring 1989
Revised Date: Spring 2001

Reviewed Date: Spring 2008

1. Assessment procedures should be both formative and summative. Procedures should be designed to improve both program and student learning.

2. Evaluation plans should be future oriented and continuous. Assessment procedures should be systematic and (ultimately) comprehensive. All elements of assessment plan do not have to occur simultaneously or even annually. In some instances, it is not necessary to assess every student if sampling is appropriately conducted.

3. Expected outcomes to be assessed should be those that reflect extent to which program is achieving its stated purpose. Outcomes should be stated as standards of excellence according to state and national professional standards, as well as minimum outcomes and competencies.

4. Quantitative and qualitative means for evaluation should be employed as appropriate. Measures of student perceptions are acceptable. For example, instead of just asking students to assess content stressed in course, ask if content was stressed and how confident they are in degree to which they have learned specified content.

5. While some important goals and educational results or outcomes are not readily "measurable," this limitation should not necessarily preclude assessment of extent to which most have been accomplished. For example, improvement in student's disposition or attitude may not be directly assessed but such improvement can often be observed.

6. Copies of evaluative reports should be filed in a central location deemed appropriate for each program.

7. Comparative information is critical to evaluation. Knowing how findings relate to other programs or departments of other institutions may be significant.

8. Assessment of student learning should be approached as an exploration of curriculum and beginning process associated with it.

9. Assessment program should be consistent with mission of college and university.

10. Assessment program should reflect diversity of programs and specific characteristics of students' career objectives.

11. Primary responsibility for determining appropriateness of measuring instruments should reside with faculty in each program. Department may cooperate with testing organizations and university resource persons or programs in developing such instruments. Two exceptions to this guideline are possible.

a. While department should not use norm-referenced instruments in assessment program; this restriction does not preclude use, as a supplement to broader assessment process, of information derived from student performance on certification and licensing examinations. Analyzing sub-areas may provide important information. Passing rate on such examinations should not be identified as an assessment of program.

b. Program should not require taking of post-baccalaureate admissions test, such as Graduate Record Examination, as part of assessment program. However, if students enter graduate school, information derived from analysis of content sub-areas of such tests may be used as a supplement to broader assessment program.

12. Assessment strategies adopted by faculty should be based upon clear specification of learning objectives for each course and careful selection or design of valid and reliable assessment instruments.

a. Assessment within major should stress development of skills related "Conceptual Framework" specified for College of Education, as well as all other program competencies.

b. Each course in curriculum should have well-defined instructional objectives, including a specification of student behavior or performances sufficient to satisfy objectives.

c. Paper and pencil tests are limited measures of abilities individuals need to succeed in their discipline. Such examinations, if used, should be comprehensive with multiple-choice, true and false, and matching examinations combined with additional assessment tools or approaches (e.g., essay, oral, behavioral exercises, self-assessments, interviews, video taping, logs). A pre- and post-test for each course (including clinical and field experiences) should be developed and

administered. Assessment procedures should help students realize that success in a program does not depend on ability to reproduce course content on tests, but, rather, on ability to solve work related problems. Faculty should define kinds of problems students will solve in his/her course and what solutions will be accepted – developing a rationale for including course in preparation program.

13. Different methods of assessment may be appropriate for different programs. It is recommended that method of assessment for each program be selected from among such alternatives as following.

a. Programs in which students are required to take examinations for certification or entry into a program may use test performances through content sub-area analysis of scores. Passing scores, however, may not be used exclusively as measures of program effectiveness. In addition, as proposed in recommendation 11a, above, these programs will be expected to use faculty-developed assessment instruments to expand and enrich assessment process for particular program.

b. Program assessment may utilize faculty-developed, criterion-referenced, end-of-program measurement instruments (e.g., portfolios, case studies, and action research). Such instruments should provide for comprehensive and integrative indicators of array of student competencies developed during participation in program. Several approaches to an end-of-program assessment may be appropriate including tests, performances, interviews, self-assessments, and portfolio evaluations. Student performances on assessment measures may not, however, serve as a gate to prevent graduation.

c. Faculty should take advantage of field based faculty activities. Supervisors of interns, practicum students, and others involved with in-service activities provide opportunities to collect follow-up evaluation data through interviewing and observing.

14. The assessment process should be designed to make students aware of their own growth, strengths, and weaknesses.

15. Program evaluation procedures should focus on assessment of student progress in "Conceptual Framework" and specific program requirements.

16. All faculty members are expected to teach elements of "Conceptual Framework" and to assess student progress or attainment of common requirements in each course as specified by college.

17. Course-by-course tracking of individual student progress toward exit-level expectations will assist faculty to individualize work with students and study and modify curriculum content and design of programs.

18. Program continuous assessment is the responsibility of chairperson and each program will present annual report of program change based on student feedback and other appropriate data.

Policy Area: SYSTEMATIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION	**Number: 07**
Subject Area: Program Evaluation by Program Coordinator	**Number: 07. 2**
Specific Subject:	**Number:**
Subject Component:	**Number:**
Effective Date: Spring 1989	
Revised Date: Spring 2001	

Reviewed Date: Spring 2008

Programs may be assigned a Program Coordinator whose duties, among others, will be to evaluate program. (See listing of duties and responsibilities of Program coordinator in Section 01. 11.)

Accountable/Reports to**:** Chairperson of Department

Policy Area: SYSTEMATIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION	**Number: 07**
Subject Area: Evaluation of Kentucky Teacher Standards	**Number: 07. 3**
Specific Subject:	**Number:**
Subject Component:	**Number:**
Effective Date: Spring 1989	
Revised Date: Spring 2001; Spring 2008	

1. Each department or program will monitor their role in teaching and evaluation of Kentucky Teacher Standards, and other appropriate state and national professional standards. Each department will maintain a matrix indicating courses in which such content is taught and maintain a system for evaluation of attainment of specified outcomes.

2. A variety of assessment and evaluation strategies will be developed with faculty input and implemented in a systematic fashion.

3. Evaluation data related to state and national standards shall be compiled for each program and submitted to dean's office to be included in College of Education strategic plan.

Policy Area: SYSTEMATIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION	**Number: 07**
Subject Area: Evaluation of Conceptual Framework	**Number: 07. 4**

Specific Subject: **Number:**
Subject Component: **Number:**
Effective Date: Spring 1989
Revised Date: Spring 2001

Reviewed Date: Spring 2008

1. Dean will appoint a committee or an individual to conduct and monitor the evaluation of Conceptual Framework. This committee or individual is charged to establish and maintain a system for assessing knowledge, skills, disposition, and attitudes related to Conceptual Framework.

2. A variety of assessment and evaluation strategies will be developed with faculty input and implemented on a regular basis at key points and at exit from program.

3. Evaluation data related to Conceptual Framework shall be kept in a central location.

Policy Area: SYSTEMATIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION   **Number: 07**
Subject Area: Student Participation in Program Evaluation and Review   **Number: 07. 5**
Specific Subject: **Number:**
Subject Component: **Number:**
Effective Date: Spring 1989
Revised Date: Spring 2001

Reviewed Date: Spring 2008

Each department or program shall make provisions for student input in decision-making phases related to design, approval, evaluation, and modification of programs.

Policy Area: SYSTEMATIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION   **Number: 07**
Subject Area: Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (KTIP)   **Number: 07. 6**
Specific Subject: **Number:**
Subject Component: **Number:**
Effective Date: Spring 1989
Revised Date: Spring 2001

Reviewed Date: Spring 2008

Coordinating and evaluation of KTIP are assigned to Teacher Education Services.

Policy Area: SYSTEMATIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION   **Number: 07**

Subject Area: Evaluation of Practica   **Number: 07. 7**

Specific Subject: **Number:**

Subject Component: **Number:**

Effective Date: Spring 1989

Revised Date: Spring 2001; Spring 2008

Each department or program, with partnership with the coordinator for field experiences, shall develop procedures for evaluating and shall evaluate practica sites, cooperating professionals, and university faculty who participate in practica.

Policy Area: SYSTEMATIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION   **Number: 07**

Subject Area: Evaluation of Student Teaching Experience   **Number: 07. 8**

Specific Subject: **Number:**

Subject Component: **Number:**

Effective Date: Spring 1989

Revised Date: Spring 2001; Spring 2008

Teacher Education Services shall maintain and implement a system for securing evaluation of sites, supervising teachers, and university coordinators. Aggregate data will be provided to faculty on an annual basis.

Policy Area: SYSTEMATIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION   **Number: 07**

Subject Area: Evaluation of Programs by Students   **Number: 07. 9**

Specific Subject: **Number:**

Subject Component: **Number:**

Effective Date: Spring 1989

Revised Date: Spring 2001

Reviewed Date: Spring 2008

Each department or program will ask both undergraduate and graduate students, who are preparing to graduate, to evaluate various aspects of their training program. Evaluation coordinator of each department or program should conduct evaluation.

Policy Area: SYSTEMATIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION   **Number: 07**

Subject Area: Follow-up Evaluation of Programs   **Number: 07. 10**

Specific Subject: **Number:**

Subject Component: **Number:**

Effective Date: Spring 1989

Revised Date: Spring 2001

Reviewed Date: Spring 2008

1   Program coordinators will form and meet with a program advisory council at least once a year. Advisory councils will provide pertinent perspectives and input regarding program evaluation.

2. Former students shall be asked to respond to specific program structure and operation items to rate their perceived ability to demonstrate specific competencies.

3. Employers of former students will be contacted after former students have been employed one year. Employers should be asked to respond to items related to knowledge, skills, and abilities of former students they have hired.