SUNY CORTLAND ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

Prepared by: State University of New York College at Cortland

Chief Executive Officer: Erik J. Bitterbaum

INTRODUCTION

Assessment is not a narrow nor exclusive kind of activity in which only exotic specialists indulge. From birth to death all people and all systems are active or passive parties to assessment, which directly or indirectly affects every decision made. The implementation of assessment at SUNY Cortland reflects this basic conception. Assessment at SUNY Cortland involves both "top down" and "bottom up" approaches in keeping with the notion that the job of each member of the campus community includes assessment. Many aspects of the system are mandated (top down) from (1) federal, (2) New York state, (3) SUNY system (4) SUNY Cortland, and (5) accrediting bodies (e.g., NCATE and Middle States). At the same time, assessment begins with faculty and staff members assessing students and the university on a daily basis, and develops into program, department, school, unit, and university assessment systems. From this perspective assessment is a bottom up generated system. At each level the system is exemplified by way of the fundamental elements of assessment: (1) establishing goals, (2) setting policy, (3) choosing and generating learning outcome measures, (4) analyzing data, (5) making changes based on analysis, and (6) sharing results at all levels. This assessment plan is intended to address Middle States Standards 7 and 14.

ASSESSMENT AT SUNY CORTLAND

The following tables and descriptions are presented to help explain the SUNY Cortland assessment system. The first table lists the main components of our assessment system, including the overall plan, philosophy, goals, policies, measures, and methods of data retrieval and analysis. The second table presents the schedule of assessment activities, categorized by level of assessment (e.g., New York State, SUNY system). This table also includes links to the results from the assessment activities listed. A third table, below under "Assessment Reports" focuses on three reports contained in table two: Annual Reports, Program Reviews, and Program Accreditation Reports. These reports are sorted into three separate categories based on the extent to which they demonstrate ongoing data collection, analysis of data, and use of that data to improve the program, department or office in question.

Assessment System Elements

Table 1 presents the primary components of SUNY Cortland's assessment system. These policies, goals, measures and procedures make up the structure that direct our assessment activities and ultimately determine the kinds of data available and the extent to which that data will allow us to critically examine and improve the college.

Table 1. Functional Elements of the SUNY Cortland Assessment System

Assessment Element.	Listing/Sample/Reference/Description
Overall Assessment Plan	Plan

Assessment Philosophy	Statement
Student Learning Outcomes (Goals)	Goals
Assessment Policies	Policies
Student Learning Outcome Measures (Direct)	Measures
Student Learning Outcome Measures (Indirect)	Measures
Student Learning Outcome Measure Usage (Direct and Indirect)	Measures - Usage
Banner, Database Retrieval	CAPP_example
Online Interface, Retrieval/Analysis	Tutorial
Online Surveys	Surveys
College Assessment Committee Grants to Improve Assessment	Grants Listing

The following is a brief description of each of these elements and what to expect from the links provided:

Element 1: Overall Assessment Plan – The *Overall Assessment Plan* is this very document. The document is intended to provide a comprehensive overview of the assessment system at SUNY Cortland and to demonstrate how this system aligns with Middle States' standards for assessment. The document provides information about the various components of our assessment system, including policies, philosophies, development and implementation, assessment data, and ways in which data has been and/or will be utilized to improve the school.

Element 2: Assessment Philosophy – The *Assessment Philosophy* is taken from the 2010-2011 Undergraduate Catalog, a document in accordance with the policies set forth by the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York (SUNY). This statement conceives of assessment as an ongoing commitment that is supported and undertaken by the administration, faculty, staff, and students alike. By continually evaluating programs and services, faculty and staff will be better able to address the needs of their departments and students, and students will experience their education with greater depth. A dynamic assessment system enables the College to fulfill definite goals and identify areas in need of improvement.

Element 3: Student Learning Outcomes (Goals) – The link provided for *Student Learning Outcomes (Goals)* provides a thorough list of the various goals towards which all academic and service units aim to fulfill and all assessment activities aim to assess (i.e., realize or find to be

deficient). The following is an example of how assessment of General Education (GE) at SUNY Cortland involves establishing stated goals/objectives, using instruments specific to measuring those goals/objectives, and using rubrics that corresponds with the overall SUNY rubric for assessing GE. This particular example looks at the assessment of GE Category 9: Foreign Language.

SUNY CATEGORY	GOALS ASSUMPTIONS, &/OR OBJECTIVES					
SUNY GE9 FOREIGN LANGUAGE	Students will demonstrate: (1) basic proficiency in the understanding and use of a foreign language; and (2) knowledge of the distinctive features of culture(s) associated with the language they are studying.					
	QUESTIONS/INSTRUMENTS					
	1. Please write or communicate in the target language a description of yourself, your friends and family, and your routine activities.					
	AND					
	2. Please write an essay in your native language summarizing the unique features of the culture(s) associated with the language that you are studying					
CORTLAND RUBRIC ALIGNED WITH REPORTING CATEGORIES						
SUNY Rubric	Not Meeting Standard	Approaching Standard		Meeting Standard	Exceeding Standard	
Points	1	2	3	4	5	6
Cortland Definition	Provides minimal or no evidence of understanding; makes no connections between Goals, Assumptions, & Objectives of the GE Category; and makes unclear or unwarranted connections to the assigned task.	Conveys a confused or inaccurate understanding of the course material; alludes to the Goals, Assumptions, & Objectives of the GE Category but makes unclear or unwarranted connections to the assigned task.	Conveys a basic understanding of the course material; makes few or superficial connections between the Goals, Assumptions, & Objectives of the GE Category and the assigned task	Conveys a basic understanding of the course material; makes implicit connections between the Goals, Assumptions, & Objectives of the GE Category and the assigned task.	Conveys a thorough understanding of the course material; makes clear and explicit connections between the Goals, Assumptions, & Objectives of the GE Category and the assigned task	Reveals an in-depth analysis of the course material; makes insightful connections between the Goals, Assumptions, & Objectives of the GE Category and the assigned task.

Element 4: Assessment Policies – *Assessment Policies* provides a list of policies that guide SUNY Cortland's overall assessment system. This list categorizes the policies by the

administration or institution that develops and enforces them. For instance, the New York State Education Department (NYSED) requires fulfillment of various evaluation and assessment activities of schools and colleges in New York State. Thus, those policies developed and enforced by NYSED are categorized under the New York State level.

Element 5: [Student Learning Outcome Measures (Direct)](#) – *Student Learning Outcome Measures (Direct)* lists those measures that serve to provide direct evidence of the level of student learning. An example measure from this list is the Student Teacher Evaluation ([STE](#)) instrument completed by a college supervisor, cooperating teacher, and the student him or herself. Because a college supervisor and cooperating teacher are proficient in the knowledge required of a student teacher at various stages in his or her learning development, and in direct contact with that student during such, this rating instrument serves to provide explicit and meaningful evidence of that student teacher's learning.

Element 6: [Student Learning Outcome Measures (Indirect)](#) – By contrast to Element 5, *Student Learning Outcome Measures (Indirect)* lists those measures that supply the assessor with indications of student learning without making clear connections between the assessment results and student learning. An example of a Student Learning Outcome Measure (Indirect) used at SUNY Cortland is the Graduate Survey which elicits graduates' perceptions about their experiences at the college. By measuring such outcomes as perception and satisfaction, this instrument provides clues about student learning but lacks definitive evidence of such.

Element 7: [Measures Usage](#) – The *Measures - Usage* link that corresponds with *Student Learning Outcome Usage (Direct and Indirect)* directs one to an extensive list of past and current annual reports from academic departments and schools at SUNY Cortland. The leftmost column lists these annual reports and the top row a list of the direct and indirect measures used to assess these departments and schools. By following along the row where a particular annual report resides, one will see linked Xs which direct a user to the particular place in that annual report where the Xed assessment measure is utilized. For ease of use, the annual reports are listed alphabetically by department/school, which are themselves ordered chronologically by year. For example, after locating the Recreation, Parks and Leisure Studies Department 2010-2011 annual report on page three, one will see an X in the column designating Certification data, meaning that in 2010-2011 this department utilized this direct assessment measure of student learning and provided the data as evidence.

Element 8: Banner Database Retrieval – The *Banner, Database Retrieval* is an essential component of SUNY Cortland's assessment system. For one, the database itself stores and organizes all student data, including the Curriculum Advising and Program Planning ([CAPP](#)) Report, a tool that allows students and faculty to monitor students' academic progress with their coursework and academic requirements. Insofar as the coursework and requirements reflect federal, state and institutional desired learning outcomes, this database system facilitates direct and transparent data on student learning.

Element 9: Online Interface, Retrieval Analysis – *Online Interface, Retrieval/Analysis* refers to an internal system used by the Institutional Research and Assessment Office to organize and manipulate Banner data in a more customized manner. Administrators, faculty and staff frequently make complex requests for institutional data which cannot be fulfilled by the limited mechanisms of the Banner reporting system. By contrast, the Online Interface allows users and recipients to view SUNY Cortland's body of data more critically.

Element 10: Online Surveys – Dozens of surveys are administered at SUNY Cortland, which serve the purpose of gaining information that informs decisions made regarding the campus, student learning, and the overall experience of all members of campus. These surveys differ from those included in Element 5 and Element 6 (Direct and Indirect Measures of Student Learning Outcomes) in that they do not specifically assess student learning but rather other aspects of the Cortland experience that affect the whole campus community.

Element 11: College Assessment Committee Grants to Improve Assessment – SUNY Cortland strongly encourages faculty to conduct thorough and ongoing assessment of their departments and programs. One way in which the college incentivizes this process is through awarding grants geared specifically towards working on and improving assessment. The provided link, *Grants Listing*, leads to a list of the many such grants awarded to faculty at SUNY Cortland.

Levels of Assessment at SUNY Cortland

Table 2 illustrates the various levels of assessment that exist at SUNY Cortland, the components of which comprise the institution's overall Assessment Plan. These levels categorize assessment activities by institution or organization that mandates them.

Table 2. Levels of Assessment at SUNY Cortland

Level*	Assessment	Data Collection/ Reporting	Reference/Policy	Outcome
1	Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System	Ongoing/Jan, Apr	SUNY Cortland Profile	IPEDS Reports
	National Survey of Student Engagement	Spring (3-yr cycle)	NSSE Policy	NSSE Results
	Student Opinion Survey	Spring (3-yr cycle)	SOS Policy	SOS Results
	Collegiate Learning Assessment	Oct (Freshmen) Mar (Seniors)	CLA Instrument	CLA Results
	New York State Education Department	Ongoing	NYSED Website	NYSED Reports

2	NYS Teacher Certification Examinations	Feb, Apr, May, Jun, Aug, Oct, Dec	Manual Policy	NYSTCE Scores
3	General Education	Spring/Fall	GE Requirements	Assessment Results
	Program Review	Fall/Spring/5-year cycle	PR Policy	Program Reviews
4	Course Teacher Evaluations	Dec, May/ongoing	CTE requirement	CTE Results
	IRA Data for Annual Reports	Ongoing/Spring	Request by IRA	Data for ARs
	Annual Reports (depts and schools)	Ongoing/June	AR Request Memo	Annual Reports
	Annual Reports (service units)	Ongoing/June	N/A	Annual Reports
	Faculty Workload Analysis	Fall/Jan, Feb	Request by IRA	Faculty Workload
	Enrollment/Degrees Granted	Fall/Jan, Feb	Request by IRA	Enroll/Degree Report
	Student Teacher Evaluation	Monthly, Fall-Spring/Jun	STE Instrument	STE Results
	Graduate Survey (Career Services)	Mar-May/Nov	Survey Instrument	Survey Results
	College Assessment Committee Grants	Spring/Fall	N/A	Grants Listing
5	Middle States	Ongoing/10-yr cycle	MS Accreditation	Self Study
	National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education	Ongoing/7-yr cycle	NCATE Accreditation	Institutional Report
	Specialized Program Associations	Ongoing/7-yr cycle	SPA and Program Accreditations	SPA reports

*Level: 1 = Federal/National; 2 = New York State; 3 = State University of New York (SUNY); 4 = SUNY Cortland; 5 = External Accreditation

Federal

At the federal or national level, SUNY Cortland must report to the Integrated Postsecondary Education System (IPEDS). SUNY Cortland also chooses to administer the national surveys listed in the table above, which serve as indirect measures of student learning by eliciting student opinions and perceptions about their college experience.

State

At the state level, examinations such as the New York State Teacher Certification Examinations (NYSTCE) are taken by students to assess their preparedness to enter the teaching profession. The NYSTCE program addresses New York State Education Law and the Commissioner's Regulations, which require prospective New York State educators to pass designated examinations as a requirement for receiving certification. Because approximately fifty percent of students at SUNY Cortland are in the Teacher Education program, this assessment is relevant when assessing student learning and preparation school-wide. The New York State Education Department (NYSED) also requires periodic reports with up-to-date data about the institution.

State University of New York (SUNY)

The State University of New York (SUNY) also requires certain assessment activities by the college. In particular, the SUNY Faculty Senate has developed the Guide for the Evaluation of Undergraduate Academic Programs to promote improvement through a self-study process of planning, implementing, and evaluating. This process is achieved by way of a five-to-seven-year cycle program review, during which data is collected, analyzed and used continuously. In order to create a comprehensive guide, the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Committee has considered guidelines of such bodies as the Middle States Association of the Commission on Higher Education, the New York State Education Department, and specialized accrediting associations.

SUNY also sent out a memorandum in 2010 that provides guidance on implementing the State University's Board of Trustees Resolution 2010-039, *Streamlining the State University Board of Trustees Policy on Assessment*. This resolution updates the University's policy on assessment and underscores the necessity of campuses to regularly assess institutional effectiveness, academic programs and general education, in order to meet or exceed the standards set by the New York State Department of Education, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, and programmatic accreditation bodies.

SUNY Cortland

SUNY Cortland reports and analyzes a variety of process variables in order to review college-wide and departmental operations, including the professional education unit and programs. These include resources (fiscal, faculty, space, and support services), productivity (faculty and program), and faculty performance. Professional education unit and program assessment operates as a subset of college-wide assessment. For example, faculty workload analyses incorporate all departments, programs, and faculty at the College, including Teacher Education. Data are provided annually to each department for their annual review. The annual Career Services

[Graduate Survey](#) provides data disaggregated at the program level for both Teacher Education and non-education-related programs. Also integral to SUNY Cortland's assessment system is the cycle of GE assessment. This assessment [plan](#) was developed by the Cortland GE Committee and the Institutional Research and Assessment Office and is approved by the SUNY Faculty Senate.

At the local college level, data is collected, maintained, analyzed and accessed in the Banner system. Directly connected to this system is the college's Curriculum Advising and Program Planning (CAPP) Report which tracks students' academic progress while at Cortland. This tool is useful in that it lists such information as students' personal and demographic data, completed coursework and pending coursework necessary for [graduation](#). The Institutional Research and Assessment office utilizes data both directly from Banner, as well as indirectly via an [online query](#) system that accesses the stored data in order to answer a variety of questions requested by faculty and staff at SUNY Cortland. This system allows the office to quickly organize and analyze existing data in a manner that is often impossible or too time consuming when using university databases or standard software [packages](#).

Formal assessment of Cortland's academic and service departments and faculty and staff is also embedded within the college's [policy](#). Presidential and administrative mandates require assessment to be implemented and utilized by faculty, staff, and academic and service departments. In particular, the President distributes a memorandum regarding annual reports that requests each department to include use of assessment and how assessment findings have informed the work of the department.

Moreover, the College Handbook [stipulates](#) there be a comprehensive teaching evaluation system consisting of two components: (a) the administration of a Course Teacher Evaluation (CTE) form, and (b) materials and information submitted by the teacher. SUNY Cortland also administers a variety of surveys intended to assess student learning, student opinion, and student engagement, to name a few. Specifically, there are three assessment devices that are administered to students on a rotating basis. They are: (1) the [Student Opinion Survey](#) (SOS), (2) the [National Survey of Student Engagement](#) (NSSE), and (3) the [Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)](#) (already mentioned). All three are nationally established assessment instruments that have been checked for reliability, validity, fairness and free of bias. The SOS has be administered continuously (every 3 years) since the 1980s. The spring 2011 will be the second administration of the NSSE. Another survey administered by the college is the Student Teacher Evaluation ([STE](#)) form along with [validity](#).

Assessment Reports
This section describes various reports referred to above that are required of departments and services at SUNY Cortland. While each report differs in purpose, content, and body/institution to which the report is submitted, each is useful in showcasing the assessment activities that occur at

all levels on this campus. The following table briefly demonstrates what paragraphs that follow describe in more detail.

Report	Annual Reports (Academic)	Annual Reports (Service/Support)	SPA/Program Accreditation Reports	Program Reviews
Assessment Components	Direct and Indirect Measures of Student Learning	At least one of the following: 1. Assessment 2. Data 3. Goals 4. Outcome 5. GPA	1. Relationship of Program to Conceptual Framework 2. Program Assessments 3. Assessments Used 4. Relationship of Assessment to Standards 5. Evidence for Meeting SPA 6. Use of Assessment to Improve Program	Fundamental Elements for Middle States Standard 14
Evidence	Checklist that shows which direct and indirect measures were used by each academic department, up to four years back	Annual Reports (Service/Support) with Bookmarks leading to above five components (when applicable)	SPA reports with Bookmarks leading to the above six components	Program Reviews with Bookmarks leading to Element and sub element(s)

Annual Reports (Academic)
The following **link** focuses attention on the Annual Reports listed in the above Table 2. Annual reports function well in highlighting the many assessment activities undertaken by academic departments. Because these reports are submitted each year, they refer to specific assessment activities in greater detail than do reports submitted less frequently (e.g., Program Reviews). The above link leads to a checklist that separates assessment measures into the direct and indirect learning outcome measures described above in Element 5 and Element 6 of Table 1. Course grades are identified as direct measures rather than indirect measures as supported by a recently

completed [study](). One may simply scan the checklist to gain a general scope of assessment effected by each department as far back as 2006-2007. This superficial viewing provides information regarding the number of direct versus indirect assessment measures used by each department in a given year, how one department varies from year to year, and how different departments compare to one another with respect to their assessment activities. By looking at the snapshot below, one can see that the Biological Sciences Department 2009-2010 Annual Report contains data related to teacher certification (Certification data), as well as reference to and/or data regarding tests/exams specific to the Biological Sciences major (Major Tests).

	Grades from capstone courses	Banner CAPP data	Certification data	Culminating experience	Faculty Created Tests (not gpa)	General Education Data	Course Grade Data	Major Tests	Portfolio da	Rubri
Africana Studies Department 2007-2008						X				
Africana Studies Department 2008-2009										
Africana Studies Department 2009-2010										
Africana Studies Department 2010-2011										
Art and Art History Department 2007-2008					X	X		X		
Art and Art History Department 2008-2009	X			X	X	X		X		
Biological Sciences Department 2007-2008				X			X			
Biological Sciences Department 2008-2009								X		
Biological Sciences Department 2009-2010			X					X		
Biological Sciences Department 2010-2011			X	X						

One can go further by clicking one of the hundreds of linked Xs, which will lead to the exact section of a particular Annual Report where that Xed measure is discussed. To continue with the above example (Biological Sciences Department 2009-2010 Annual Report), one may click on the X corresponding to Certification data (highlighted in yellow) and arrive at the page within that Annual Report that contains the snapshot below. In this case, the paragraph reports student scores and pass-rates on Teacher Certification exams.

2. B.5. External Assessments of student learning
We had seven students send their GRE scores to us this year. The average percentiles for these students on the General GRE exams were Verbal = 43, Quantitative = 51, and Analytical = 50. These are reasonable but not outstanding scores in comparison to other seniors pursuing graduate study.
As part of our departmental assessment, we also administered the ETS Major Field Test in Biology to 3 randomly chosen students in May 2010. Their total scores were 171, 169, and 158; scores of 168 -171 rank in the 85th percentile and scores of 158-159 rank in the 60th percentile. These test scores are right in line with the dozens of scores (median 168) we've collected over the past 9 years.
We had a 100% pass rate for our students on Teacher Certification exams.

Annual Reports (Service Units)
Another important set of reports that reflect work that supports student learning and well-being is the Service Unit Annual Reports. These reports vary greatly in length, scope and content, but all describe how these departments, programs, units contribute to student learning. The following link directs to a list of these reports. By opening a report or two, one will notice that each of these reports has one or all of the following bookmarks: Goals (e.g. plans, future activities), Outcomes (e.g., assessment findings, goals achieved, accomplishments), Assessment (i.e., activities to evaluate the department/unit), Data (i.e., numerical information regarding the work or accomplishments of the department/unit), and GPAs of students. These bookmarks are intended to broadly demonstrate the types of assessment and evaluation that takes place in each department, program, unit, etc.

Specialized Program Association (SPA) Reports
Specialized Program Association Reports present data collection and analysis and the use of such to make programmatic improvements in a format that is clear and consistent across all reports. The following link leads to a list of SPA reports which can be navigated by the bookmarks found on the left hand side of the document. These bookmarks are: (1) Relationship of Program to Conceptual Framework (i.e., How the program adheres to the Conceptual Framework of SUNY Cortland's Teacher Education Unit, go here for more details on the Conceptual Framework); (2) Unique Program Assessments (i.e., Assessment undertaken that is specific to the program that complements overall Teacher Education Unit assessment); (3) Assessments Used (i.e., Measures or methods used to assess the program); (4) Relationship of Assessment to SPA Standards, 5) Evidence for Meeting SPA Standards (i.e., How each program meets the particular standards of the SPA to which it reports; (6) Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program.

Program Reviews
In general, Program Reviews provide a more comprehensive examination of academic programs than do Annual Reports or SPA reports because of their 5-year cycle of data/information collection and submission. Because of this, Program Reviews more fully demonstrate how an academic program demonstrates evidence of the Middle States Fundamental Elements for Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning. The following are links to a few Program

Reviews that are navigable according to the Standard 14 Fundamental Elements by using the bookmarks on the left hand side of each document:

[Speech Pathology and Audiology Program Review 2006](#)

[Economics Program Review 2009](#)

[Mathematics Program Review 2005](#)

ASSESSMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Another important assessment system within Cortland's overall assessment plan is the Teacher Education Candidate Assessment System (TECAS). Although this system applies only to assessment of the teacher education program, it is relevant when assessing SUNY Cortland at large because roughly fifty percent of students are part of the unit.

The unit assessment system incorporates the assessment of both unit operations and candidate performance. The system consists of four sources for accessing the data: (1) BANNER, (2) the SUNY Cortland Teacher Education Candidate Assessment System (TECAS), (3) the Curriculum Advising and Program Planning (CAPP) report, (4) requesting summary data from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Each component maintains its own identity even though data from these related systems can be integrated, aggregated and summarized.

Assessment of unit operations

Assessment of unit operations includes assessment of faculty performance, resources, and productivity. Faculty performance is assessed in part by way of annual reports, course and teacher evaluations, an advisement survey, and candidate complaints which can take the form of both informal and formal processes to address student grievances. Fiscal and faculty resources are assessed by way of an annual review by the unit. Assessment of productivity is achieved when the unit assessment system annually evaluates faculty (workload, faculty hiring with the intent to increase diversity, contributions to the institution via external grant funding and scholarly activity) and the teacher education program. The latter involves annual assessment by departments and the Teacher Education Council. Departmental assessments produce data on candidate performance in the major, assessment of the General Education program, and candidate performance on statewide teacher certification examinations. A committee will analyze the data and make recommendations for improvements.

Assessment of candidate performance

All candidates in the teacher education program must demonstrate knowledge, skills and dispositions to teach effectively. Candidates are assessed at each checkpoint by program/department faculty and staff and/or Field Placement Office staff. Annual reporting of candidate performance in coursework, in student teaching and on New York State Teacher

Certification Examinations (NYSTCE), as well as candidate exit surveys, assist the Unit in adjusting and improving the curriculum.

Teacher candidates are assessed at the following checkpoints in the program:

The Teacher Education Candidate Assessment System (TECAS)		
Check Point	Assessment Data Indicator	Learning Outcomes
Admission to Program	Teacher Education Application-1	2010 LEARNING OUTCOMES SEQUENCE KNOWLEDGE BASE- Candidates will: 1. Demonstrate a solid foundation in the arts and sciences; 2. Possess in-depth knowledge of the subject area to be taught; 3. Understand how students learn and develop; 4. Manage classrooms structured in a variety of ways to promote a safe learning environment; 5. Know and apply various disciplinary models to manage student behavior. PROFESSIONAL COMMITMENTS-Candidates will: 6. Collaborate with other staff, the community, higher education, other agencies, and cultural institutions, as well as parents and other caregivers, for the benefit of students; 7. Continue to develop professionally as ethical and reflective practitioners who are committed to ongoing scholarly inquiry; STANDARDS- Candidates will: 8. Know state and national Standards, integrate curriculum Across all disciplines, and balance historical and contemporary research, theory, and practice; 9. Demonstrate appropriate Professional dispositions to Help all students learn; DIVERSITY- Candidates will: 10. Apply a variety of teaching strategies to develop a positive teaching-learning environment where all students are encouraged to achieve their highest potential; 11. Foster understanding of and respect for individuals' abilities, disabilities and diversity of variations of ethnicity, culture, language, gender, class, and sexual orientation. ASSESSMENT- Candidates will: 12. Use multiple and authentic forms of assessment to analyze teaching and student learning and to plan curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of individual students. TECHNOLOGY- Candidates will: 13. Demonstrate sufficient technology skills and the ability to integrate technology into classroom teaching/learning.
	GPA Overall (Varies by Program)	
	Judicial Screening	
	Academic Requirements Completed	
Field Experience	Field Experience-diversity	
	a) ELL	
	b) SWD	
	c) Tech	
	d) Range of developmental Levels	
	e) Socio-economically disadvantaged	
	f) Interaction with Parents & Caregivers	
Entry to Clinical Practice - Student Teaching	Student Teacher Application-2	
	Judicial Screening	
	NYS PD Workshops	
	a) CAR	
	b) SAVE	
	GPA by program requirement	
	Academic Requirements Completed	
Student Teaching (During and Exit)	STE	
	a) dispositions	

	b) impact on P-12 Student Learning	
	c) diversity (also high needs)	
	d) planning	
	e) reflection	
	f) subject matter knowledge	
	g) collaboration	
	h) assessment	
	i) communication	
Program Completion	Academic Requirements Completed	
Post Graduation	Teacher Cert Exams	
	a) ATSW	
	b) LAST	
	c) CST	
	Graduate Employer Survey	
	Alumni Survey	

After graduation the candidates are recommended for a NYSED professional certificate. The quality of the program is assessed through follow up surveys with employers and graduates.

The major portion of the present TECAS was formulated at the time of the last NCATE accreditation visit. That plan has been modified and expanded to include overall student, staff and system assessments in keeping with updated policies. All data gathering has been implemented. The feedback process has been modified as described below. The plan, originally as described in 2003 with modifications is as follows.

Much of the system is online and summary data and reports are available upon request to the Institutional Research & Assessment office. Access to individual student records is controlled through Banner Web Access so that a student can access only their own records but faculty members can have access to appropriate multiple student records (e.g., advisees). The TECAS is designed to complement the Curriculum Advising and Program Planning (CAPP) report that

shows all requirements for a student's major and the student's progress in meeting those requirements. That report can be viewed (tutorial here) on the computer screen or can be printed.

The data for assessing candidate progress comes from several different sources. Most of the data is available through online databases with information about the particular student. For example, several of the indicators come from the online Student Teaching Evaluation Form that is completed during the student teaching experience. This is an online form that is completed independently four times during student teaching by the candidate, the student teacher supervisor, and the cooperating teacher. Other data comes from sources such as the field experience assessment system and the Registrar's Office records.

The TECAS is built around the 13 SUNY Cortland Learning Outcomes. These outcomes are described in detail in the SUNY Cortland Conceptual Framework. The learning outcomes are assessed at six checkpoints including: a) application to the Teacher Education Program, b) completion of 100 hours of field work, c) eligibility to student teach, d) during the student teaching experience, e) completion of the program, and f) post-graduation. Within each outcome there are multiple indicators. The original matrix from 2003 can be found here in the Institutional Report.

CLOSING THE LOOP

Consideration of assessment data at SUNY Cortland continually results in significant changes intended to improve teaching and learning. What follows are examples of recent changes in programs, courses or assessment.

The 2010 Childhood Education Annual Report (Annual Report-Childhood Education-2010) shows that their review of the Student Teacher Evaluations (STE) revealed that candidate ratings were relatively lowest in the two STE categories of "Diverse Learners" (only 39-48% at Target) and "Assessment" (40-54% at Target). As a result, the department developed new assessments focused specifically on helping candidates to better assess student learning. They also began working on activities to help improve student teachers' understanding and use of differentiated instruction.

The 2010 Associate Provost for Academic Affairs Office Annual Report cited initiation of the following changes for 2010 based on analysis of multiyear feedback (2006-2009) from participants and presenters at Orientation: Shifted Campus Information Fair to the morning of the second day of program; Provided a "Taking Care of Business" opportunity for students and parents to talk with representatives from Financial Aid and Student Accounts during check in; Added a city of Cortland bus tour with a stop at the Alumni House for parents and guests.

The 2010 Geography Department Program Review lists numerous findings that emerged from the review process. As a result of these findings, Geography faculty changed the B.S. Major in Geography with a Concentration in GIS to a B.S. Major in GIS. Another change involved the continuing development and expansion of the GIS lab: purchasing state-of-the-art computers and

printers, acquiring a server, the GIS lab as an ESRI Authorized Learning Center, and acquiring ESRI instructor certifications by two faculty members, among others. Additionally, the department expanded internship opportunities for majors. The department also developed the TechFirst! Learning community program for first-year pre-majors (those who have not declared majors) which involves a core of integrated courses centered around computer skills, and has resulted in a number of majors joining the department early in their college careers.

As documented in their SPA Report, (SPA report-CEC-2010), The Inclusive Special Education program, after reviewing their program assessments, in alignment with their CEC standards, determined that they needed to create a new assessment focusing on collaboration. Seven other key assessments were revised, some significantly. Rubrics were designed or revised for each assessment. An electronic portfolio system, involving assessments from all courses in the program, was created using TaskStream so that candidates and faculty are able to review and assess a candidate's experience throughout and across the program.

The SPA Report (SPA report-NSTA-MAT-Earth Science-2010) for the graduate program in Adolescence Education: Earth Science shows that although 100% of their students were passing the Content Specialty Test (CST), a closer look at the sub-scores on the exam indicate that some program completers exhibited areas of weakness even after completing their degree. Instances of low sub-scores were not associated with any particular subtest and may be a result of deficiencies in candidates' requirements that may include 1) requiring the CST as a condition of admission such that areas of weakness may be identified early on and addressed through prescribing particular coursework; 2) only accepting undergraduate content coursework passed with a grade of "C" or better; and 3) targeting graduate content coursework to fill candidate deficiencies as noted by transcript review.

The English as a Second Language program SPA report (SPA report-TESOL-2010) paid particular attention to results from three assessments: 1) their Content Specialty Test; 2) Course assessment of content knowledge in English as a second language; and 3) lesson, unit, and assessment plans. These three together indicated that, while their candidates have satisfactory knowledge of language as a system and a good understanding of concepts, theories, research, and practice of second language acquisition and development, assessment #3 also revealed one area in which their knowledge and performance needed further improvement: the ability to explain English language structures for pedagogical purposes. To address this weakness, they have developed a new course, English Grammar for TESOL, which was offered starting in spring 2010 as an elective, and will become a requirement in spring 2011

The following example shows change at the institutional level. A campus-wide committee was charged with refining the mission statement and identifying strategic priorities for the campus. The committee used several phases of data collection including two surveys, 10 open meetings and a presidential retreat lead by a consultant. The campus was asked for feedback on the existing statement and subsequent revisions through surveys. Appreciative inquiry was used to

ask about campus strengths, priorities, and future. Survey responses, open meetings, and other feedback was coded through content analysis and emergent themes lead to the construction of a revised mission statement; vision; core values; and four campus priorities with goals. These were shared with the campus and subsequently endorsed by the Faculty Senate.

More reports like these can be founded embedded in annual reports, program reviews, and SPA reports. Click here and select a report.