

# **SUNY Teacher Education Program Assessment (TEPA) Project**

U.S. Department of Education  
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE)  
PR/Award #P116B030099 from October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2006

## **Abstract**

The fifteen colleges and universities in the State University of New York (SUNY) that prepare new teachers will collaborate with SUNY System Institutional Research to develop, implement, and enhance their campus assessment systems to improve teacher education programs and beginning teacher competency. SUNY prepares 6,000 new teachers/year in New York, about 25% of the total recommended for certification, so the impact of this project on P-12 student learning will be substantial.

The project is guided by an innovative and robust model of program assessment goals that applies to the full range of teacher preparation institutions in SUNY and across the country. The project design provides for (1) collaboration among campuses through professional development symposia each semester that are designed to support (2) campus-level implementation of validated assessment and data management strategies by faculty and administrative assessment leaders.

The measurable project outcomes include:

- ⊕ Increased quality of teacher education programs and their associated assessment systems;
- ⊕ Reallocation of institutional resources for program assessment;
- ⊕ Assessment of important candidate characteristics that are difficult to measure, such as professional dispositions and impact on K-12 learning;
- ⊕ Teacher certification exam analyses that support content area program improvements;
- ⊕ System and campus databases for managing teacher assessment data;
- ⊕ Increased collaboration among SUNY teacher education campuses to support assessment; and
- ⊕ Access to NYSED data on SUNY inservice teacher graduates.

Three of the SUNY symposia will be held in conjunction with statewide meetings of teacher educators, thus disseminating project results to faculty at an additional 45 institutions in the state. Project results will also be disseminated by presentations at national meetings of teacher educators and through peer-reviewed publications based on the project evaluation study.

## **Project Need**

While a heated national debate rages about what constitutes teacher quality (Darling-Hammond, 2002; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996, 2003; U.S. Department of Education, 2002; Walsh, 2001; Wilson, Floden & Ferrini-Mundy, 2001), the fifteen schools of education and system administrators within the State University of New York (SUNY) have quietly accepted the challenge of demonstrating that the new teachers that graduate from SUNY

know their content and can help diverse K-12 students learn (State University of New York, 2000, 2001).

SUNY teacher education institutions are committed to meeting high standards for preparing teachers, emanating from three sources with quite different views of what constitutes teacher quality:

- ⌚ In the *No Child Left Behind Act*, “Congress has made it clear that it considers content knowledge to be of paramount importance” in preparing new teachers (U.S Department of Education, 2002, p. 6).
- ⌚ Revised state teacher certification regulations (New York State Education Department [NYSED] Commissioner’s Regulations, 1999) require new teachers to meet high standards of preparation and pass rigorous state certification examinations in three areas: general education, content area, and pedagogy.

- ☉ NYSED (1999) also requires that all teacher education institutions achieve national accreditation by 2006. Twelve SUNY institutions are or will be accredited by the National Council for Teacher Accreditation (NCATE); three are seeking accreditation from the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC; see Table 1). Both accreditation bodies require institutions to document the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of the new teachers they prepare; NCATE explicitly and TEAC implicitly require institutions to document the positive impact of their graduates on K-12 student learning (NCATE, 2002; TEAC, undated).

The process of meeting all these standards has provided a rich opportunity for individual campuses to review and improve the programs we provide for candidates. However, meeting all these candidate performance standards simultaneously for the first time by 2006 is a formidable task even for SUNY, a university system with an excellent national reputation in teacher education. Higher education programs historically have not been organized to document student performance in the aggregate. Faculty do an excellent job of providing timely and accurate feedback to individual candidates as they move through our programs. However, reorganizing faculty and administrative activities to accommodate this new demand for programmatic public accountability is complex, time-consuming, and expensive, especially for state institutions that produce many new teachers with limited resources.

Public institutions generally lack the discretionary resources to cover the initial costs of reorganizing to support ongoing assessment activities. The initial start up costs in time and money are considerable. Knowledgeable faculty assessment leaders must be identified and their workloads adjusted; all faculty need continued professional development on promising assessment strategies; consensus among faculty on the selection of course-specific measurement strategies and instruments, rating scales, data collection procedures and analysis must be achieved; productive relationships among faculty assessment coordinators and institutional research offices must be forged to validate new instruments and procedures and merge data sets; and electronic data management systems must be developed and maintained. Once all of this is in place, an effective assessment system can be maintained with a much smaller commitment of steady-state staffing and institutionalized funding.

This project will create a sustainable assessment system to document beginning teacher performance and provide feedback for program improvement in each of the fifteen institutions that prepare teachers in the State University of New York (SUNY) system. SUNY is the largest system of higher education in the nation, preparing about 6,000 new teachers annually, about 25% of the teachers recommended for certification by colleges and universities in the state each year. The Universities at Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo and Stony Brook and the Colleges at Brockport, Buffalo, Cortland, Fredonia, Geneseo, New Paltz, Old Westbury, Oneonta, Oswego, Plattsburgh, and Potsdam represent a diverse range of size and internal organization; number of teacher education programs and graduates per year; faculty approaches to teacher preparation; and accreditation strategies (Table 1). However, all are linked by their relationship to the SUNY System Administration, which has the capacity to provide a structure for high-quality, cost-effective, coordinated, and collaborative action.

Table 1. Summary of Campus and System Assessment Leadership and Goals.

SUNY Unit U = University C = Center Comprehensive College Accrediting Agency	Approximate Number of Program Completions Per Year	Key Education Faculty & Administrative Leadership Personnel Involved in the Project	Goal 1 Implement/enhance campus assessment system	Goal 2 Institutionalize assessment role of faculty	Goal 3 Professional development about assessment	Goal 4 Develop technological resources for assessment	Goal 5 Integrate campus and system research expertise	Goal 6 Institutionalize assessment funding
SUNY System Institutional Research	NA	Associate provost	X	X	X	X	X	
Albany (U) TEAC	300 grad	Asst dean (faculty member), director of initial teacher prep programs	X	X	X	X	X	
Binghamton (U) TEAC	75 grad	Faculty member & accreditation coord	X	X	X	X	X	
Brockport (C) NCATE	320 grad & undergrad	Accreditation coord (faculty member)	X	X	X	X	X	
Buffalo (U) TEAC	180 grad	Asst dean (accreditation coord)	X	X	X	X	X	
Buffalo State (C) NCATE	790 grad & undergrad	Asst dean (accred coord)	X	X	X	X	X	
Cortland (C) NCATE	665 grad & undergrad	Director of institutional research & dean of education	X	X	X	X	X	
Fredonia (C) NCATE	415 grad & undergrad	Director of education (accreditation coord) & faculty member	X	X	X	X	X	

Geneseo (C) NCATE	435 grad & undergrad	Director of education (accreditation coord)	X	X	X	X
New Paltz (C) NCATE	365 grad & undergrad	Asst dean (assessment coord)	X	X	X	X
Old Westbury (C) NCATE	95 undergrad	Accreditation coord (faculty member)	X	X	X	X
Oneonta (C) NCATE	350 grad & undergrad	Asst dean (accreditation coord)	X	X	X	X
Oswego (C) NCATE	405 grad & undergrad	Assoc dean (accreditation coord)	X	X	X	X
Plattsburgh (C) NCATE	410 grad & undergrad	Accreditation coord	X	X	X	X
Potsdam (C) NCATE	165 grad & undergrad	Assessment coord (faculty member)	X	X	X	X
Stony Brook (U) NCATE	160 grad	Director of education (accreditation coord)	X	X	X	X

## Project Design

At their semi-annual meetings in June and October 2002, the SUNY Education Deans & Directors\* prioritized the assessment needs on individual campuses, creating a list of 58 system-wide activities that fall into six broad categories common to all campuses (Figure 1). This robust framework proved to be a useful roadmap for documenting the performance of pre-service and beginning teachers in a wide variety of institutions. By sharing information and expertise, and providing collaborative professional development across all the SUNY campuses, this framework will be used to initiate and enhance sustainable, high-quality program assessment systems on each of our unique campuses in the next three years.

### 1. IMPLEMENT & MAINTAIN CAMPUS ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS

- Organize faculty to select or create appropriate assessment instruments at common checkpoints
- Develop and implement a system for regular collection, aggregation, analysis, and reporting assessment data
- Validate local assessment instruments
- Use assessment results to improve programs and increase beginning teacher competency

## **2. INSTITUTIONALIZE ROLE OF FACULTY IN ASSESSMENT**

- Reorganize faculty workload to include ongoing candidate and program assessment effort
- Provide clerical and/or GA support for data collection, analysis, reports

## **3. PROVIDE INFORMATION & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ABOUT VALID ASSESSMENT**

- Identify and share practical, valid teacher education assessment strategies (e.g., teacher work samples, electronic portfolios, standardized tests) at standard program checkpoints (admission, pre-student teaching, graduation, post-graduation)
- Provide collaborative professional development to support implementation of valid assessments and use of technological resources (see below)

## **4. DEVELOP TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

- Create teacher education program assessment database framework(s) that link dept, campus, system, and state assessment information
- Electronically collect and store candidate and K-12 assessment artifacts

## **5. INTEGRATE CAMPUS AND SYSTEM RESEARCH EXPERTISE**

- Create procedures to use campus- and system-level institutional research expertise to support program-level assessment efforts
- Create common analytical reports for SUNY system and state assessment data (e.g., detailed state teacher certification exam analyses)

## **6. INSTITUTIONALIZE ASSESSMENT FUNDING**

- Reallocate resources and increase funding over time to institutionalize effective candidate and program assessment

\*The group consists of deans, directors, and assessment/accreditation coordinators from all fifteen SUNY institutions that meets semi-annually with SUNY System administrators, NYSED staff and other invited guests to discuss education policy and other issues of common concern.

Goal 1 – developing, implementing, and maintaining campus assessment systems to improve programs and beginning teacher competency – will be the principal campus outcome of the 3-year FIPSE project. Goals 2-5 – which address the role of faculty in assessment; professional development activities; and technological and institutional research support – support Goal 1 and will be implemented through a series of collaborative academic year symposia and individual consultation across campuses that support specific campus activities in these areas over the 3-year project. Goal 6 – institutionalizing increased funding for sustained program assessment – supports Goals 1-5 on long-term basis and is a project outcome for the campuses and SUNY System Administration.

In order to create an assessment system to document and improve the performance of beginning teachers (Goal 1), individual campuses must have the funding, manpower, knowledge and training, technology, and institutional support (Goals 2-6) to complete the endeavor. Each of the fifteen campuses has begun this job, building on resources already in place and working to fill the gaps. Since all the campuses have

similar implementation challenges (see Table 2), collaborative effort across campuses – supported by a combination of FIPSE and sustainable SUNY System Administration and campus funds – offers a significant and innovative opportunity to achieve economies of scale while custom building a high quality assessment system on each campus.

Figure 2 summarizes the project design. The primary direct participants in this project are the faculty and administrators in assessment leadership positions at each campus (white box in Figure 2). This group includes assessment and/or accreditation coordinators (usually the same person); faculty program coordinators or department chairs; and faculty assessment leaders who serve on assessment committees and teach professional education courses where performance data are generated. These individuals will serve as the conduits for information and collaborative decisions between SUNY System Administration and the faculty at individual campuses working to implement and maintain campus-based assessment systems. The primary face-to-face opportunities for collaboration are the symposia (shaded box in Figure 2; and Table 2) to be held twice per year for the duration of the project.

Table 2. Proposed SUNY Assessment Symposia & Work Sessions

Time/Topic/Goal	Description of Collaborative Event
<p>Fall 2003                      Analysis of Teacher Certification Test Scores                      AND                      Beyond the Tests: Documenting Complex Teaching Performance                      Goals 1, 3 &amp; 5</p>	<p>⌚ Part 1 will focus on creating a new SUNY database and common format for reporting state certification test scores to campuses by program, discipline, and candidate characteristics (Figure 1). Careful analysis of test content relative to requirements in teacher education programs across SUNY will support program improvements and accreditation reviews.</p> <p>⌚ Part 2 will feature a presentation/workshop by Emerson Elliott, Coordinator of NCATE's Assessment Examples Project, which identified a variety of best-practice strategies and instruments for assessing complex teacher skills and dispositions, as well as content.</p>
<p>Spring 2004 Documenting Candidate Impact on K-12 Student Learning Using TWS Methodology (with NYACTE/NYSATE)                      Goals 1&amp; 3</p>	<p>⌚ Roger Pankratz and/or other representatives from the Department of Education's Renaissance Project have agreed to make presentations and facilitate workshops over a two day period to help faculty at SUNY and other colleges implement the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) methodology for documenting K-12 student learning.</p> <p>⌚ TWS is a validated method to evaluate a candidate's ability to deliver a context-specific instructional unit and to document K-12 student learning by analyzing pre/post assessments related to appropriate learning standards.</p>
<p>Fall 2004                      Technology &amp; Teacher Education Assessment (Database Storage &amp; Retrieval Systems and Electronic Portfolios)                      Goals 1-4</p>	<p>⌚ Managing data from multiple assessment checkpoints in teacher education programs (admission, mid-point, student teaching, post-graduation) will require electronic storage of candidate artifacts, and the development of user-friendly technologies to collect, store, analyze, and report performance data.</p> <p>⌚ Possible presenters include a representative from the FIPSE-supported Galileo Program at the University of California at Riverside; the Renaissance Project; and/or SUNY Cortland,</p>

	<p>which has expertise in this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⌚ Strategies for implementing various kinds of electronic portfolio assessments will also be featured, with possible presenters from SUNY Oswego and other institutions with expertise in this area.</li> </ul>
<p>Spring 2005 Assessing Preservice Teacher Dispositions (with NYACTE/ NYSATE) Goals 1&amp; 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⌚ Evaluating developing professional attitudes and dispositions of preservice teachers is a challenging task because there are few validated instruments or procedures. This symposium will feature promising practices, including those under development at SUNY Brockport.</li> <li>⌚ This symposium will also focus on using dispositional evaluations to provide enhanced feedback to candidates about their performance; and to make earlier and more accurate decisions on retention or termination of candidates based on professional performance standards.</li> </ul>
<p>Fall 2005 Integrating Inservice Teacher Data into Assessment Systems Goals 1, 3 &amp; 5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⌚ This symposium will focus on the challenges of gathering post-graduate data from program completers, their school employers, and NYSED.</li> <li>⌚ Early in the project, representatives from the SUNY Institutional Research and the Education Deans &amp; Directors (especially SUNY Geneseo) will meet with NYSED representatives to explore sharing quality indicator data on SUNY graduates who become teachers (e.g., certification application rates, tenure status, retention in teaching, additional certifications), as is done in other states.</li> </ul>
<p>Spring 2006 Lessons Learned: Exemplary Teacher Assessment Systems (with NYACTE/ NYSATE) Goals 1, 2 &amp; 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⌚ The final symposium will feature presentations by faculty at SUNY and other state institutions to share exemplary teacher performance instruments and procedures.</li> <li>⌚ The SUNY System Institutional Research will</li> </ul>

	present information about the SUNY database and standardized analysis format for reporting state certification test scores.
--	---

In general, each SUNY campus has identified at least one person who has assigned time (25% effort or more) to coordinate teacher education assessment activities across the education unit. Generally, campus-based teacher education assessment coordinators are or have been faculty members, usually with long experience at the institution; they have a professional interest in assessment, excellent organizational skills, and collaborative leadership capabilities. Few are deans or directors (both jobs are very demanding). Many are full-time associate or assistant deans, or accreditation coordinators, while others split their time between assessment coordination, teaching and/or research (see Qualifications of Key Personnel in the Appendix for details).

All campuses have one or more assessment committees consisting of key faculty from within and/or across education programs (e.g., childhood, literacy, music, vocational education) who work closely with the assessment/accreditation coordinator (top of Figure 2). The assessment group(s) are charged with organizing the rest of the faculty who teach professional courses and/or supervise candidates in field placements to come to consensus on an assessment plan and implement it. The scale of this organizational structure at Binghamton, which has graduate-only programs and about 75 program completers/year, is quite different from that at Buffalo State, which graduates over 750 candidates/year from its undergraduate and graduate programs (Table 1). However, the underlying organizational structure for implementing assessment activities at both institutions is similar. Exploiting the proven collaborative and organizational abilities of the assessment/accreditation coordinators and faculty leaders involved in program assessment at every campus is the key to success for this project.

The collaborative work of the project will be organized as follows:

- ⊕ **The major practical implementation challenges** faced by all the SUNY institutions – and their relationship to project goals (Figure 1) – have been identified and are listed in the left-hand column of Table 2. Each topic is one for which professional development for faculty and collaborative interactions across institutions can provide a substantial and cost-effective contribution to improving the performance of beginning teachers graduating from SUNY programs. The significance of these assessment challenges is confirmed by a national study conducted this year by NCATE (2003).
- ⊕ **Two-day collaborative symposia** are based on these major assessment challenges. They will be held twice a year over the course of the project (Table 2). They will offer teacher education faculty and assessment coordinators information on practical assessment solutions; provide significant opportunities for interaction among faculty and assessment coordinators from various campuses; and form the basis for implementation activities on each campus. Since many campuses have started and will continue to develop faculty expertise in particular assessment areas (e.g., assessment in science education, data management systems, electronic portfolios), we anticipate (and will document) that campus-to-campus sharing between symposia will occur on a much broader scale than is presently the case.
- ⊕ **Specific campus-level implementation activities** are necessarily unique to each SUNY institution, and are detailed in the campus budget justifications in the Appendix. Each campus is committed to developing a complete teacher education program assessment system that

addresses all six project goals. However, they differ in the extent to which various goals are already started or partially accomplished and thus differ in their immediate goals for this project (Table 1).

The project budget is designed to support participation in the symposia for minimum of 2-4 persons from each campus, usually the assessment coordinator (see Table 1) and 1-3 additional faculty assessment leaders. The symposia will be held in Albany and Syracuse on an alternating basis to minimize travel costs for all. Activities and workshops at the symposia will be specifically designed to make it easy for participating assessment/accreditation coordinators and faculty assessment leaders to share information with faculty at the home campus. Presentation graphics files and photocopy masters of all handouts will

7 SUNY Teacher Education Program Assessment Project

be available to download from a “SUNY Teacher Education Program Assessment Project” web page that will be maintained on the SUNY System Administration web site ([www.suny.edu](http://www.suny.edu)). A listserv including all symposium participants will facilitate direct campus-to-campus sharing over the grant period and beyond.

### *Project Outcomes & Evaluation*

Persuasive teacher education program evaluation (Goal 1) will be the major outcome of this project at the campus level. Each campus will systematically report and analyze aggregated teacher performance data, and use the results to guide program changes designed to improve candidate performance at major checkpoints (admission, candidacy for student teaching, graduation, and post-graduation in the schools). To reach this goal, campuses and SUNY System Administration must simultaneously reallocate faculty, administrative, and technological expenditures of time and money (Goal 6) in order to institutionalize the role of faculty in assessment (Goal 2); continue to provide necessary professional development on assessment (Goal 3); and develop the technological resources and integrated institutional expertise to make the assessment system efficient (Goals 4 and 5).

The major outcome of this project at the system level will be the creation of a database to support individual program assessment by the fifteen SUNY campuses offering teacher education programs (Goals 4 and 5). The database will combine teacher certification examination results with other data available to SUNY System Administration (e.g., student academic indices, demographics, social economic group, academic program), and will potentially include data on inservice teachers from the New York State Education Department (NYSED), which keeps records on more than 200,000 teachers, including those who have graduated from SUNY teacher preparation programs (see Table 3, Outcome H). The database will relate teacher certification test scores to various measures of performance during preparation, and eventually to NYSED teacher inservice performance data, to create a holistic resource for assessing program effectiveness. The outcome will be a replicable, systematic approach to teacher program assessment based on standard, reliable data.

Table 3 summarizes the measurable outcomes associated with each of these goals and what will be accomplished over the 3-year period of FIPSE support for start-up activities. Most are long term propositions, to be pursued and enhanced by all the SUNY institutions long after FIPSE funding has ended.

We will use a "value-added" approach to project evaluation:

- ⌚ Each campus has, to various degrees of completeness, the following elements of a program assessment system that has been or will be evaluated by a national accreditation agency between 2001-06:
  - ⌚ a program assessment system description or plan (Outcomes A and B in Table 3);
  - ⌚ assessment reports based on various instruments and strategies to measure a wide array of beginning and master teacher performance outcomes (Outcomes C and E);
  - ⌚ a system for storing and retrieving program assessment data (Outcomes D and F); and
  - ⌚ records of program improvements based on assessment results (Outcome A).
- ⌚ We will survey each campus for this information (as well as the level of collaboration among institutions for Outcome G) as part of the registration process for the first and last collaborative symposia. Survey information will be followed up by interviews to fill information gaps. We will obtain the qualitative and quantitative assessment documentation available from each

institution resulting from NCATE and TEAC accreditation reviews that will have occurred by June 2004.

- ⊕ We will categorize and summarize the "before" and "after" state on Outcomes A-G in the fifteen participating institutions. (Progress on Outcome H will be described in the project evaluation report as

## 8 SUNY Teacher Education Program Assessment Project

well.) The confidentiality of specific program evaluation results will be preserved in accordance with SUNY program assessment policy (SUNY, 2000). Particular attention will be paid to describing:

- ⌚ strategies that had positive impacts on preservice teachers and could be expected to result in improved K-12 student learning;
  - ⌚ cost-effective strategies across many kinds of programs and institutions; and
  - ⌚ the manner and extent to which Outcomes A-G have been institutionalized and will continue after funding (a FIPSE evaluation priority).
- ⌚ Data on the extent to which elements of this project are being replicated at other institutions during the 3-year project period (another FIPSE evaluation priority) will come primarily from follow-up surveys and telephone interviews with the faculty and administrators from non-SUNY institutions who attend the SUNY symposia in conjunction with NYACTE/NYSATE (Table 2). NYACTE/NYSATE has members from the nine City University of New York (CUNY) institutions, and the majority of the other 80 private teacher education institutions in the state.

The completed evaluation report will document the impact of the FIPSE-supported collaborative work we complete relative to the six project goals (Figure 1). We expect the results to form the basis of dissemination presentations at state and national conferences, and significant peer-reviewed publications as well.

Table 3. Measurable Project Outcomes

Outcome and Associated Goal	Description & Evaluation Timeline
<p>A. Increased Quality of Teacher Education Assessment Systems and Program Improvements Goal 1</p>	<p>Campus assessment systems will include systematic and comprehensive analyses of multiple validated measures of teacher performance at defined checkpoints that are supported by appropriate technology and used to make program improvements. Year 1 – Survey and description of current practice at each campus and system. Year 3 – Survey and description of post-project practice at each campus and system.</p>
<p>B. Reallocation of Resources for Program Assessment Goals 2 &amp; 6</p>	<p>System and campuses will shift resources of time and money to institutionalize program assessment as part of faculty and administrative workload Year 1 – Survey and description of current practice at each campus and system. Year 3 – Survey and description of post-project practice at each campus and system.</p>

<p>C. Implementing Assessment of Candidate Impact on K-12 Learning, Dispositions, and Electronic Portfolios Goals 1 &amp; 3</p>	<p>Faculty at campuses will adopt exemplary new course-based assessment strategies and use them as the basis of enhanced individual and program assessment at key checkpoints. Year 1 – Survey and description of current practice at each campus and system. Year 3 – Survey and description of post-project practice at each campus and system.</p>
<p>D. System-Wide Database for Managing Teacher Assessment Data Goals 4 &amp; 5</p>	<p>SUNY System Institutional Research (IR) will create a teacher education database linking candidate characteristics (e.g., admission SATs, demographics) and college performance (program, GPA, time to graduation) to NYSTCE test scores (LAST general education, ATS-W pedagogy, CST content area). Year 1 – Database design and initial programming completed. Year 2 – Database populated and draft queries, reports, forms produced. Year 3 – Draft reports reviewed by campuses and finalized.</p>
<p>E. Teacher Certification Exam Reports That Support Content Area Program Improvements Goals 1 &amp; 5</p>	<p>SUNY System IR will work with campus representatives (faculty and IR staff) to produce annual charts and graphs summarizing candidate performance on the NYSTCE, by campus and compared to “similar colleges.” Colleges will use these reports to insure that courses support candidate content area competency. Year 1 – Faculty needs assessment completed. Year 2 – Draft report format created and tested. Year 3 – Draft reports reviewed by campuses and finalized.</p>
<p>F. Campus Databases for Managing Teacher Assessment Data Goal 4</p>	<p>SUNY System IR will begin to work with the 9 campuses that use Banner data systems to initiate a system-wide project to develop a common data management system for teacher education. Year 2 – Begin discussions with the SUNY Banner User Support Group. Year 3 – Begin design work with interested campus IR staff.</p>

Table 3. Measurable Project Outcomes (Continued)

Outcome and Associated Goal	Description & Evaluation Timeline
<p>G. Increased Collaboration Among SUNY Teacher Education Campuses Goal 3</p>	<p>Use of program assessment and data management expertise of faculty and staff from other SUNY campuses is expected to increase dramatically over the grant period as a result of the collaborative symposia. Year 1 – Survey and description of current practice at each campus and system.</p>

	Year 3 – Survey and description of post-project practice at each campus and system
H. Access to NYSED Data on SUNY Inservice Teacher Graduates Goals 1 & 3	Teacher education institutions will begin to access NYSED data on inservice teacher graduates and incorporate findings into their program assessment systems. Year 1 – Exploratory discussions with NYSED (SUNY Geneseo interest) Year 2 & 3 – Obtain legal authority and begin to make data available to campuses through SUNY System IR

**Project Dissemination**

Dissemination of project results across the SUNY system and to other New York State public and private institutions will occur as a result of the collaborative symposia held in years 1-3 in conjunction with NYACTE/NYSATE. Broader dissemination to higher education systems in other states will occur as a result of the publication of evaluation results, and presentations at national meetings of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) and the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE), using the successful dissemination model of the DOE’s Renaissance Project.

**Project Significance**

This project will result in the system-wide, sustainable implementation of validated assessments. It will produce significant new knowledge about the effectiveness of teacher education for over 6,000 new teachers recommended for certification each year by the fifteen SUNY institutions with teacher preparation programs. Teacher education program improvements generated by these assessments will, in turn, improve the likelihood that these 6,000 new SUNY teachers will have a positive impact on the achievement of hundreds of thousands of K-12 students in their classrooms.

The utilization of teacher work sample methodology across many SUNY institutions will also eventually produce significant new information about teacher education strategies that are effective in improving K-12 student learning (Pankratz et al, 2003). The importance of such information in guiding program revisions and improvements at all state teacher education institutions cannot be underestimated.

Some of the project outcomes listed in Table 3 will be system- and campus-specific, but others such as the analytical model to be developed for reporting the New York State Teacher Certification Examination (NYSTCE) scores (Fall 2003 symposium, Table 2; Outcome E, Table 3), may be easily replicated at the other 90 teacher education institutions in New York State.

Finally, the great potential replicability of this project is based on the innovative nature and robustness of the teacher education assessment goals model summarized in Figure 1 and the process by which we propose to implement it (Figure 2). The goals model is itself a result of a creative needs assessment conducted by knowledgeable representatives from all fifteen diverse SUNY institutions. It has already proven its efficacy in persuading all these very different, independent-minded institutions to agree upon (and commit significant resources to) the collaborative strategies for program assessment improvements described in this FIPSE proposal. The goals model builds upon and enhances the work that these colleges

are already struggling with alone, and provides a process of supportive collaboration in those areas where such interaction will have maximum impact.

The process that we will use to implement the goals of the model (described in Figure 2) is also innovative and robust. It relies on scaling-up proven assessment strategies (e.g., disaggregation of state certification test score data, teacher work samples, electronic portfolios) and uses the economies of scale available to any state system of higher education (e.g., the professional development symposia proposed here will impact 6,000 new teacher graduates/year for a very small cost per graduate). The model used by the FIPSE-supported Galileo Project at the University of California at Riverside was informative, but its specific statewide context made it difficult to apply in New York. In contrast, the innovative and generalizable goals and implementation model of the SUNY Teacher Education Program Assessment Project has powerful potential for replication on a national scale.

### **Project Management Plan and Quality of Project Personnel**

The project will be managed by Dr. Suzanne Weber, Associate Dean of Education at SUNY Oswego, and Dr. John Porter, Associate Provost for Institutional Research at SUNY System Administration. Weber has been a research biologist, a middle school science teacher, a teacher education faculty member, and is now responsible for assessment and accreditation of the teacher education programs at SUNY Oswego. Porter directs all the institutional research programs and activities in the largest system of higher education in the nation. Together, they offer a synergistic combination of knowledge about good practice in teacher education assessment systems and large-scale data management systems; both have demonstrated skills and successful experience in managing many complex projects. The qualifications of both are detailed in the Appendix, along with that of the nineteen campus-based faculty and/or administrators who will coordinate implementation activities at the fifteen participating SUNY institutions.

Weber will be responsible for:

- ⌚ Organizing the collaborative symposia described in Table 2 (with the assistance of Ms. Jerusalem Rivera-Wilson, University at Albany, who will serve as liaison to NYACTE/NYSATE);
- ⌚ Facilitating the campus teacher education program assessment implementation activities at SUNY Oswego and the other 14 participating campuses; and
- ⌚ Timely completion of evaluation activities associated with campus-based teacher education program assessment outcomes (Outcomes A-C and G in Table 3).

Porter will be responsible for:

- ⌚ Creating a database to support individual program assessment by the fifteen SUNY campuses offering teacher education programs (Goals 1, 4 and 5); and
- ⌚ Timely completion of the evaluation of the project's system-level data management outcomes (Outcomes D-F and H in Table 3), which will include working with NYSED on protocols to share data on inservice teachers who have graduated from SUNY institutions.

Each of the fifteen participating SUNY teacher education institutions has designated one or two faculty or administrators in assessment leadership positions who will serve as campus-based project assessment leaders (see Table 1 and the Qualifications of Key Personnel in the Appendix). These assessment/accreditation coordinators have also agreed to serve as a

project advisory group to Weber and Porter, the project co-principal investigators. The group will meet twice a year at the SUNY symposia, but also continue to interact by email in a collaborative decision-making capacity, as they have throughout the development of this grant proposal. This group of campus assessment/accreditation leaders has many members who also attend the SUNY Education Deans & Directors semi-annual meetings in their roles of assistant/associate dean or accreditation coordinator. The SUNY Education

Deans & Directors initiated this project, and their continuing support is crucial to institutionalizing funding and the role of faculty in program assessment.

The project evaluation will be carried out by Drs. James Wyckoff, Donald Boyd and Hamilton Lankford of the University of Albany (SUNY). Wyckoff is Associate Professor of Public Administration, Public Policy and Economics. He is a nationally known scholar examining K-12 educational policy. With Boyd and Lankford, Wyckoff has experience with large-scale databases to examine issues of policy and the link between teacher preparation and teacher and student outcomes. Boyd is Deputy Director of the Center for Policy Research at the University of Albany (SUNY), and the Director of Fiscal Studies at the State University of New York's Rockefeller Institute of Government. Boyd has conducted research for SUNY on teacher preparation in its institutions and on the career paths of SUNY-educated teachers. Lankford, the third member of the external evaluation team, is Professor of Economics and Public Policy at the University of Albany (SUNY) where he has served as Chair of the Economics Department. Lankford's research, focusing on economic and policy issues pertaining to K-12 education, has included work regarding the education workforce, the changing structure of educational expenditures and school choice. (A full description of the qualifications of Wyckoff, Boyd, and Lankford is in the Qualifications of Key Personnel in the Appendix.) Although their faculty appointments are at the University at Albany (SUNY), they are in the College of Public Policy and not involved in SUNY teacher preparation programs in any way. They can be expected to perform the project evaluation independently, objectively, and professionally.

Wyckoff, Lankford and Boyd will perform the evaluation of the proposed project as a team. They have already been consulted about the general outline of the evaluation process as described above. Their project role will begin with designing specific instruments to gather quantitative and qualitative data from the fifteen participating SUNY institutions to assess: (1) the existing status of program assessment systems, (2) existing campus commitment of resources to teacher education assessment, and (3) specific progress on difficult assessment issues, such as the impact of preservice teachers on K-12 learning and documenting professional dispositions. Also, the team will consult at the initiation of the project to determine an appropriate pre-post quantitative and qualitative evaluation framework for describing the development of a system-wide database for managing data; on integrating data from the State Education Department on inservice teachers into SUNY teacher education assessment systems; and on analysis and reporting of teacher certification examinations. During the second year of the project the team will coordinate with project directors to assure that outcome measurement procedures are on track. During the concluding year of the project the team will evaluate the effectiveness of the project in: improving program assessment systems; changing campus commitment of resources to teacher education assessment; and progress in assessing such specific areas as the impact of preservice teachers on K-12 learning and documenting professional dispositions. In addition, the team will provide an evaluation of the system-wide database developed for managing data and the methods developed to analyze teacher certification examinations.

### **Adequacy of Resources**

When planning began in earnest for this project at the end of March 2003, participating campuses were allocated a budget for campus implementation activities that roughly reflected the size and complexity of their programs, as reflected in the number of program completers reported in 2000-01 to NYSED under Title II of the Higher Education Act. Small program campuses with fewer than 200 program completers (Binghamton, University at Buffalo, Old Westbury, Potsdam, Stony Brook,) were budgeted at \$8,100/yr for a total of \$24,300; medium program campuses with 300-450 program completers (Albany, Brockport, Fredonia,

Geneseo, New Paltz, Oneonta, , Oswego, Plattsburgh) were budgeted at \$10,800/yr for a total of \$32,400; the two large program campuses with 650-800 program completers (Cortland, Buffalo State) were budgeted at \$15,120/yr for a total of \$45,360.

Each campus agreed to create an assessment implementation plan that addressed the goals we had already determined encompassed our needs and desired outcomes (Figure 1); name an assessment/accreditation project coordinator to help write the proposal and agree to serve on an project advisory group if funded; and create a budget that insured the participation of assessment/accreditation leaders in implementing the funded campus activities and in attending the collaborative symposia (by funding travel for at least 2 persons per event).

Based on this model, campuses will receive about 70% of the requested FIPSE funding of \$680,177, for a mixture of collaborative work directed outward toward one another and SUNY System Administration, and inward toward faculty teaching in professional education programs (see Figure 2). The other 30% will be used to organize the collaborative symposia and create the teacher education database at SUNY System Administration. Adding symposia travel to the conference (included in campus funding) raises the balance of system-level collaborative work to about 40% of the total requested from FIPSE.

The total cost share of about \$985,000 is impressive. It reflects the commitment of the SUNY institutions to demonstrate through performance assessments that the new teachers that graduate from SUNY know their content and can help diverse K-12 students learn. Over the next 3-5 years, this one-time strategic infusion of funds from FIPSE will multiply the efforts of these under-resourced public institutions to initiate and institutionalize high-quality performance assessments, in a very cost-effective manner.

### **Budget Summary and Detailed Budgets**

The Appendix contains detailed budgets and budget justifications for SUNY Oswego (lead campus), SUNY System Administration, and the other fourteen SUNY colleges and universities that are participating in this project. Each budget gives a detailed breakdown of institutional support for the project.

### **References**

Darling-Hammond, L. (2002, September 6). Research and rhetoric on teacher certification: A response to "Teacher Certification Reconsidered," *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 10(36). Retrieved on December 12, 2002 from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n36.html>

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: Teacher's College.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2003). *No dream denied: A pledge to America's children*. Washington, DC: Author.

National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2002). *Professional standards for the accreditation of schools, colleges, and departments of education* (2002 ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2003). *Assessing education candidate performance: An early look at changing practice*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved on April 30, 2003 from [http://www.ncate.org/resources/papers/assessment\\_examples\\_aactevers.pdf](http://www.ncate.org/resources/papers/assessment_examples_aactevers.pdf)

New York State Department of Education Commissioner's Regulations, Part 52.21, Registration of curricula in teacher education (1999). Retrieved on April 28, 2003 from [http://www.highered.nysed.gov/ocue/title\\_8\\_chapter\\_ii\\_regulations\\_o.htm#%2052.1%20Registration%20of%20postsecondary%20curricula](http://www.highered.nysed.gov/ocue/title_8_chapter_ii_regulations_o.htm#%2052.1%20Registration%20of%20postsecondary%20curricula)

Pankratz, R, Evans, S., Whitfield, P., Bonner, G., & Brown, T. (2003, January). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher

Education (AACTE). *Structures and processes essential in the development of a performance assessment accountability system*, New Orleans, LA. Retrieved on May 3, 2003 from [http://fp.uni.edu/itq/Powerpoint/PowerPoint\(ppt\)/feb03\\_PPT/StructuresandProcessesEssentialtotheDevelopmentofaPerformanceAssessmentandUnitAccountabilitySystem.doc](http://fp.uni.edu/itq/Powerpoint/PowerPoint(ppt)/feb03_PPT/StructuresandProcessesEssentialtotheDevelopmentofaPerformanceAssessmentandUnitAccountabilitySystem.doc)

State University of New York. (2000, November 28). *Report of the provost's advisory task force on the assessment of student learning outcomes*. Albany NY: Author. Retrieved on April 29, 2003 from <http://www.sysadm.suny.edu/Provost/asmtfinalreport.pdf>

State University of New York. (2001, May/June). *A new vision in teacher education*. Albany NY: Author. Retrieved on January 12, 2003 from <http://www.sysadm.suny.edu/Provost/NewVision.pdf>

Teacher Education Accreditation Council. (Undated). *TEAC accreditation process: Summary outline of the TEAC accreditation framework*. Retrieved on April 29, 2003 from <http://www.teac.org/accreditation/summaryoutline.asp>

U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *Meeting the highly qualified teachers challenge: The Secretary's annual report on teacher quality*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, Office of Policy Planning and Innovation.

Walsh, K. (2001). *Teacher certification reconsidered: Stumbling for quality*. Baltimore, MD: Abell Foundation.

Wilson, S., Floden, R., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2001, February). *Teacher preparation research: Current knowledge, gaps, and recommendations* (Document R-01-3). University of Washington: Center for the Study of Teaching.