

September 22, 2004

TO: Peter Spear, Provost

FROM: Mike Subkoviak, Associate Dean

RE: 2003-04 Reports on Program Review and on Program Assessment Activities

The following information is provided in response to your request of August 23<sup>rd</sup> for summaries of program reviews and assessment activities that have taken place over the last year in the School of Education.

### PROGRAM REVIEW

Attachment D has been revised to indicate the review status of the academic majors in the School of Education. The school completed reviews of the following five departments / programs during the last year: Art Department, Kinesiology (undergraduate program), Secondary Social Studies, Special Education (graduate program), and the Foreign Language Education Program. The Elementary Education and Continuing Vocational Education Programs, which were also scheduled for review last year were deferred until this year. None of the four departments included in this summary have had a chance to respond formally to the reviews yet, so the following summaries only reflect the external committees' perspectives. Attachment D has also been revised to reflect the current information on accreditation reviews.

#### Program Review Summaries:

*Art Department* – The Art Department was reviewed by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASD) in Spring 2004 as part of its reaccreditation process. The external review team consisted of Jerry L. Draper of Florida State University and Lois Greene of the University of Kansas.

Overall, the review was very positive. The team noted an improvement in faculty morale since the last review and commented on the strong support that the department receives from the Graduate School and the School of Education Dean's Office. They were impressed that despite budget constraints the department maintains excellent studios and labs. The team also recognized the important contributions that Tandem Press and the Kohler Art Library (which are both part of the Art Department) make to community outreach efforts.

The team had some concerns, primarily over space and funding. They felt that the current arrangement, which has the department spread physically throughout the campus (and, in some instances, off campus) is inefficient. They also worried that some of the

older labs lack proper lighting and ventilation, but noted that these problems would go away with the construction of a new Art Building. In terms of funding, they were concerned that not enough graduate students receive support, which makes the department less competitive nationally. They also suggested that more money was needed to hire support staff to supervise students in the labs. A third set of concerns involved the curricular requirements for the Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA) degree, which they felt were hard to distinguish from the requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree.

The Art Department is in the process of responding to NASD's review, and the board will vote on their reaccreditation this October.

*Kinesiology Undergraduate Program* – The Kinesiology undergraduate program was reviewed in Spring 2004 by an external committee consisting of Pricilla M. Clarkson of the University of Massachusetts, Howard Zelaznik, of Purdue university, and Mary O'Sullivan, of Ohio State University.

The team reported that the program has a very high caliber of faculty, staff, and students and is equipped with excellent facilities. They were impressed with the rigor of the program and especially applauded the Adapted Physical Education concentration, which they felt not only offered excellent hands-on experience with special needs adults, but would be an excellent program to highlight with donors.

The team noted that parts of the program's mission were unclear and that students have reported problems with the advising staff in the School of Education, some of whom feel don't have an adequate understanding of the program. Combined, these two factors have led to some confusion for students. The team also remarked that staffing is limited and that academic staff are not included in decision-making processes. They suggested making curricular changes that would allow them to navigate the program more smoothly and would help to make them more marketable upon completion. They also recommended establishing a recognition / appreciation system for staff.

*Secondary Social Studies Program* – The review team for this program consisted of Keith C. Barton of the University of Cincinnati, Patricia G. Avery of the University of Minnesota, and Jeannette B. Burda of James Madison Memorial High School.

The team was impressed with the quality of this program. In particular, they praised the high level of preparation that students received both in the curriculum and in their field experiences. They also approved of the fact that students move through the program with a cohort of students from other secondary fields, which provides both camaraderie and an interdisciplinary perspective.

While the team felt that field placements were generally of high quality, they pointed out that some students had complained about a lack of choice of cooperating teachers. They also expressed concern that there may be a lack of communication between the university and cooperating teachers regarding expectations for students' experiences during field

placements. Finally, they suggested that the current admissions procedures, which focus on GPAs and written essays, do not necessarily give a holistic view of students. They suggested that this practice might limit diversity in the program and unfairly favor certain students.

*Department of Rehabilitation Psychology and Special Education – Special Education Graduate Program* – The review team for this program consisted of Janis Chadsey of the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Susan Hupp of the University of Minnesota, and Ken Kavale of the University of Iowa.

The team reported that the program is dynamic and offers varied experiences in teaching, research, and service. They felt that the faculty is of high caliber and that there are sufficient resources, both within the department and across the university, giving students many opportunities for research and collaboration.

Some concerns included the fact that doctoral student research experience is uneven, with some students receiving more opportunities than others. There is little interaction between students during the first year, which prevents them from forming a strong cohort of peers. The noncertification master's program is small and unstructured, leading to a significant overlap between requirements for undergraduate and master's students. Finally, the review team felt that the doctoral students tended to have all of their experiences (research, mentoring, teaching assistantships) with their major advisor, which narrows their perspectives.

*Foreign Language and Education Program* – The review committee for this program consisted of Teresa Calderón, Madison Metropolitan School District; Jean Hindon, University of Wisconsin – La Crosse; Aleidine Moeller, University of Nebraska; Paul Sanrock, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction; and Leslie Schrier, University of Iowa.

The review team praised the high quality of the program's faculty. They noted that students in the program have access to a wide range of field placement and study abroad experiences. There is a good relationship between the program and cooperating teachers in the school district. Also, the program cooperates in the cross-program cohort activities described above, so students foster a group of peers outside their own program and gain an interdisciplinary perspective.

The review team's biggest concern is that the program be brought into full compliance with new certification requirements outlined in Chapter PI 34 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code. Beginning in August 2004, all students seeking certification in only one language must complete a major in that language and be prepared to teach at all levels from early childhood through high school. In addition, the review team would like to see the program fill a vacant Spanish position and hone the program's mission statement to distinguish it from other foreign language programs.

## ASSESSMENT

In 2003-2004, the School of Education used assessment funds to hire a project assistant who worked as a portfolio integration specialist. She worked with Ken Zeichner and other faculty and staff to integrate the electronic teaching portfolio into our teacher education programs and the Master of Science in Professional Education Program (MSPE). A performance-based assessment system and portfolios are required by PI34, the new teacher licensing law in Wisconsin. For the last several years, we have converted all of our teacher education programs and other certification programs to a performance-assessment model. This included aligning the curriculum (including hundreds of L&S courses) with state teacher and content standards and developing rubrics for the assessments in School of Education courses. The e-portfolio system is used to document that our certification students have met these standards which are required for an initial license to teach in Wisconsin. Following are examples of the kind of specific activities performed by the School of Education:

- Assisted in developing materials to aid teacher education students in understanding the concepts involved in constructing a teaching portfolio, such as what it means to meet a standard and to be analytic in reflecting upon artifacts. The materials developed have been incorporated into our training and support system for the e-portfolio.
- Developed a model for integrating standards based portfolio assessment in CURRIC 506, a key course in our elementary and secondary teacher education programs. This model is being used to improve the level of integration in other courses. We hold a workshop each semester with teacher education faculty and staff to share successful practices in performance-based assessment, and this material has been included in the packet that is distributed at these meetings.
- Developed a model that shows different ways in which teacher education students can demonstrate that they can integrate technology into their instruction. This is one of our teaching standards where students have had difficulties in documenting their competence. The model developed has been made available to teacher education students in our training and support program.
- Integrated the e-portfolio system into the MSPE program structure. The first cohort to use the results of this work began the program last summer.

Although a lot has been accomplished this past year, we still have much work to do both with the performance-based assessment system as a whole and with the e-portfolio component. This has been a massive change in our programs that has required a substantial shift in the thinking of the faculty. Our goal is to have the performance-assessment and portfolios integrated in a seamless fashion into the School of Education coursework rather than being seen as an unwanted add-on. We have been moving closer to this goal. We now have 848 active e-portfolios in our teacher education programs that are used to document the completion of the state teaching and content standards. We also have initiated a portfolio exhibition process where student teachers talk in a public setting about their accomplishments during their programs.

In addition to the performance-based assessment requirement in PI34 that we have addressed in our previous assessment projects, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction requires us as part of the program approval process to get feedback from the graduates of our teacher education programs and to demonstrate that we make use of these data to improve our programs. In our current approach to meeting this requirement, we ask teacher education graduates three years out from graduation to complete a survey in which they tell us how well they feel they have been prepared in a number of specific areas (e.g., teaching English language learners) and generally how they think that their teacher education program has prepared them for their work. These data are shared with individual faculty program coordinators, with the School of Education Coordinating Council on Teacher Education and with several school-based advisory groups. Changes are made in our programs to improve them on the basis of these discussions.

As useful as these data are, we would like to go beyond these self-report surveys and look more deeply at the character and quality of the teaching that is provided by our graduates to the public schools of Wisconsin. We want to add a survey of the principals of our graduates and to conduct interviews with and observations of a sample of our graduates to get a more detailed and valid picture of their teaching performance. It is particularly important at this time for us to be able to go beyond graduates' self-reports about the value of their preparation for teaching at UW-Madison to compile data from the employers of these teachers and from our observations. The university role in preparing teachers for our nation's public schools is under attack currently and alternatives to genuine preparation programs are expanding at a rapid rate, often to the detriment of students who can least afford to be taught by under-qualified teachers. Given the current context of accountability, eventually it will be important for us to be able to demonstrate the value of our programs in terms of the learning of the pupils who are taught by our teacher education graduates. What is being proposed for 2004-2005 is a step toward this point. Adding systematic employer evaluations of the performance of our graduates and evaluations based on direct observation is an important next step for us.