



## New Program Assessment Rubric

**Program Reviewed:**  
**Reviewer:**  
**Date:**

**A note to institutions:** In order for reviewers to find information with ease, please be sure to clearly label each standard and indicator. Bookmarking the PDF or providing a table of contents is helpful in keeping the document organized. Please ensure that the information outlined on the rubric is available under the standard listed. Please submit each syllabus as a separate file in a zipped folder. When you are complete, please submit your proposal to [sbogan@doe.in.gov](mailto:sbogan@doe.in.gov).

Guidelines have been provided for each standard with expected page limits. While these are simply guidelines, we anticipate submissions to average around 15-20 pages, not inclusive of course syllabi and content standards matrix.

### Standard 1: Rationale

**Guidelines:** Please limit this section to ***no more than two pages.***

	Evidence	For Approval	Inadequate	Not Approved	Approved	Comments
1.1	<b>Program Description</b>	Proposal identifies content area, licensure level and delivery model of the program.  Program is innovative and designed to meet needs of 21 <sup>st</sup> century candidates for this content area. Program may include promising “out of the box” approaches to teacher preparation.	Program does not appear to meet the needs of the 21 <sup>st</sup> C candidate for this content area. Program does not appear to incorporate current best practice.			

1.2	<b>Needs Assessment Data</b>	Data clearly identifies need for licensure program and has established LEA relations or defined state needs in order to ensure local and/or state needs will be fulfilled.	Data does not adequately support need for new program.			
-----	--------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

## Standard 2: Curriculum

**Guidelines:** Please submit each syllabus as a separate file in a zipped folder. Include matrix as part of main submission.

	Evidence	For Approval	Inadequate	Not Approved	Approved	Comments
2.1	<b>Matrix aligning program to appropriate educator standards</b>	<p>Program aligns to state approved standards and provides candidates with knowledge specifically relevant to 21<sup>st</sup> century candidates. <b>Matrix documents standards coverage at the micro or indicator level.</b> General education, professional education and content preparation must be included for initial programs.</p> <p>For an example click <a href="#">here</a>.</p>	<p>Program does not ensure all essential state pedagogy and content standards are adequately addressed and assessed. Matrix documents coverage of standards at the macro level. Excessive coursework may be required.</p>			
2.2	<b>Syllabi for required courses</b>	<p>A syllabus is submitted for each required course.</p> <p>Required courses are streamlined, progressive and model innovative pedagogy. Course materials and assignments are strategic, rigorous and target skills required of 21<sup>st</sup> C teachers. Syllabi include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course objectives and goals</li> <li>• List of required texts with citations</li> <li>• Outline of class schedule</li> <li>• Description of required assignments</li> <li>• Sample of 2-3 assessments</li> </ul> <p><i>Please include a table that highlights in which specific courses program candidates are instructed and assessed on the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Assessment,</i></li> <li>• <i>Use of Technology to Impact P-12 Student Learning,</i></li> <li>• <i>Cultural Competency,</i></li> <li>• <i>Scientifically Based Reading Instruction (SBRI).</i></li> </ul> <p>For an example click <a href="#">here</a>.</p>	<p>Syllabi do not reflect all required components or not all are included.</p> <p>Courses may not model effective pedagogy. Materials and assignments may be outdated. Delivery method may not match assignments/assessments appropriately.</p> <p>List highlighting courses focusing on Assessment, Technology, Cultural Competency, and SBRI is incomplete.</p>			

**Standard 3 Clinical and Field Based Experiences** – *In Indiana, supervised clinical field experience (CFE) is defined as a university employed adjunct or faculty member assigned or contracted with to provide feedback to candidates based on observation of a candidate’s performance in a school setting. School based partners for initial programs (commonly referred to as cooperating teachers) do not count as supervisors of clinical experiences for this section. For non-IHE programs, supervised clinical experience is defined as non-IHE employed personnel who have teaching expertise that is contracted with to provide feedback to candidates based on observation of a candidate’s performance in a school setting.*

**Guidelines:** Please keep submissions to 3-6 pages for this standard including any sample assignments or rubrics.

	Evidence	For Approval	Inadequate	Not Approved	Approved	Comments
3.1	<b>Location and learner contact</b>	CFE provides minimum requirements of 10 weeks of full time student teaching with experienced teacher.	The evidence and narrative do not clearly describe the location of the program’s CFE and/or amount of learner contact, or show a location and amount of learner contact that do not meet state expectations. CFE relies primarily on candidate observation and minimal expectations for actual responsibility for teaching.			
3.2	<b>Supervision</b>	<p>CFE Supervisor is a university employed adjunct or faculty member knowledgeable in candidate’s anticipated educational role and capable of providing multiple forms of feedback. Supervision provides systematic formative candidate feedback based on actual observation of candidate’s performance.</p> <p>Cooperating teacher is rated effective or highly effective. Innovative and collaborative student teaching models are used.</p>	<p>The evidence and narrative do not clearly describe the qualifications of the CFE Supervisor, or the CFE Supervisor is not a university employed adjunct or faculty member.</p> <p>Supervision of candidate’s performance relies predominately on cooperating teacher. Program relies heavily on review of lesson plans rather than actual observation to provide candidate feedback. Minimum requirements for cooperating teacher are not stated or are inadequate to ensure proper supervision.</p>			

3.3	<b>Candidate impact on student learning</b>	CFE includes opportunities to assess student learning outcomes in a variety of ways using formative and summative measures, develops candidate’s ability to enhance learning by analyzing assessment results, and allows candidate to practice developing, delivering and analyzing results of commonly used assessments in the state and schools most appropriate for expected educational role.	The evidence and narrative do not clearly describe the student learning outcome assessments included in the CFE, or the student learning outcome assessments do not meet state expectations. Program relies heavily on candidate reflection on lessons rather than on P-12 student learning data to determine effectiveness.			
3.4	<b>Diversity and Grade Level Coverage</b>	<p>Proposal clearly describes tracking system to ensure diversity in field placements as well as appropriate grade level coverage.</p> <p>CFE provides opportunities for candidate to participate with students of diversity<sup>1</sup> in a variety of ways, including that of the candidate’s expected educational role, as well as opportunities to work with a variety of parents, administrators, and school staff.</p>	<p>Systematic tracking of experiences to ensure all candidates have opportunities to work with diverse students in an appropriate variety of grade levels is not ensured.</p> <p>The evidence and narrative do not clearly describe the diversity experiences or grade level coverage within the CFE, or the diversity and grade level experiences within the CFE do not adequately prepare the candidate to help all students<sup>1</sup> learn.</p>			

<sup>1</sup> “All Students” and “All Learners” refer to diversity created through differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area per the NCATE definition.

## Standard 4 Evaluation:

### Program Evaluation

1. The Unit Assessment System clearly denotes how the program and program participants will be assessed. Specific attention should be paid to addressing how the new program assessment fits within the current UAS and how data will be disaggregated for program assessment and improvement.
2. There are provisions for continuing evaluation of the program based on performance criteria to be met by those graduates completing the program.

### Candidate Evaluation

1. The program has systematic procedures for monitoring candidate admission, progress and completion of the program.
2. The proposal includes a description of assessment procedures and timelines that reference the approved Unit Assessment System and specifies:
  - a. products and performances to be assessed, and
  - b. standards of performance required to advance in the program.
3. The proposal should include plans/assessments to address, candidate content knowledge (min of 2 assessments for this area), pedagogical knowledge, student impact/P-12 student outcomes, SBRR reading, use of technology for effective teaching and cultural competency.
4. Systematic approaches are used to assist candidates who are making unsatisfactory progress in their programs.
5. Candidate evaluation includes all required testing requirements for licensure.

**Guidelines:** Not inclusive of student teaching evaluation rubrics, please limit documentation for this standard to 3-4 pages.

	Evidence	For Approval	Inadequate	Not Approved	Approved	Comments
4.1	<b>Unit Assessment System (UAS) program evaluation</b>	<p>Includes a summary of UAS. Unit regularly examines validity and utility of program data produced and makes modifications to keep abreast of changes in assessment technology and in professional standards. Unit regularly evaluates the capacity and effectiveness of the UAS with internal and external stakeholders. Effective steps have been taken to eliminate bias in assessments and to establish fairness, accuracy and consistency. Data is systematically used for program improvement. Provisions are in place to collect follow-up data.</p> <p>Description includes a flowchart and timeline for collection and analysis of data.</p>	<p>UAS is limited in data collection including candidate and graduate performance information which can then be used to improve program. UAS does not regularly and comprehensively gather, aggregate, summarize and analyze assessment information on its programs. UAS does not use appropriate information technologies to maintain its assessment system. Bias in its assessments has not been examined. Efforts to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency are not apparent. Data collection system has not been demonstrated to be consistent and successful</p>			

4.2	<b>Evaluation of student teaching</b>	<p>Student teacher evaluation tools or rubrics are well designed, reliable, valid assessment instruments.</p> <p>When rubrics are used descriptions of indicators are given at all levels.</p>	<p>Student teacher evaluation tools or rubrics may not meet state expectations for rigor. Rubrics may not appear to be reliable or valid. Rubrics may not be designed to be an effective measurement tool.</p>			
-----	---------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

## Standard 5: Governance

**Guidelines:** Please limit this section to *no more than two pages*.

	Evidence	For Approval	Inadequate	Not Approved	Approved	Comments
5.1	<b>Governance</b>	<p>Brief descriptions of program leadership roles and responsibilities are provided.</p> <p>Leadership for program ensures effective coordination of systems needed. Governance process manages curriculum, instruction and resources needed to support high quality program.</p>	<p>Leadership does not ensure effective coordination of all systems needed to ensure high quality program.</p>			

## Standard 6: Schedule

**Guidelines:** Documentation for this standard may be as short as a paragraph, but please limit this section to *no more than two pages*.

	Evidence	For Approval	Inadequate	Not Approved	Approved	Comments
6.1	<b>Projected Implementation</b>	<p>Plan for communication, implementation, graduation, and anticipated census are included in proposal.</p>	<p>Inadequate plans have been made for program implementation.</p>			

### *Approval*

1. Programs must be fully approved by the Indiana Department of Education **prior** to being offered.
2. Programs are required to submit reports as requested by the IDOE. All approved programs are subject to Title II low performing criteria.
3. In the event that the program is discontinued, the institution must notify the IDOE.