

## **COE Dispositions Assessment Policies and Procedures**

Approved by College Council, 5-07-10

Amended & Approved by Provost's Office & COE Academic Council, 6-30-10 & 7-19-10

Amended in Response to Feedback from University Legal Counsel, 8-10-11

Approved by COE Academic Council, 8-12-10

The Roosevelt University College of Education prepares teacher, counselor, and school leader candidates to cultivate democratic learning in schools and communities and to develop robust professional identities. Consistent with this mission, the faculty have outlined in the COE conceptual framework a list of professional dispositions that they consider vital to the cultivation of democratic learning and professional teacher, counselor, and school leader identities.

This document outlines the policies and procedures related to the evaluation of these dispositions. These policies and procedures have emerged as a result of several months of meetings, discussion, feedback, and revision involving multiple stakeholders in the unit. In part, these policies and procedures are intended to provide the unit and programs with data to inform decision-making about admission, advising, retention, and graduation policies and procedures. However, they also are intended to increase awareness of the core dispositions that professional organizations and the College of Education value, and the importance of enacting these dispositions at all times regardless of one's status or role in the unit.

#### Section 1: The Assessment Rubric

1. It is the responsibility of the Continuous Improvement Committee<sup>1</sup> to develop, review, and update an assessment rubric, consisting of core dispositions and common criteria to be assessed by all instructors and academic programs in the college, as well as this policy. It shall do so in consultation with academic programs and with the approval of the College Council and other required entities in the university.

2. With the approval of the Continuous Improvement Committee and the Academic Council, academic programs may develop their own additional, program-specific

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Continuous Improvement Committee is a standing committee within the College Council focused on issues of assessment and curriculum. Approximately 6-8 faculty are appointed to this committee every two years by the Dean of the college using the criteria of expertise in assessment and curriculum and representation across departments and programs. The Associate Dean is an ex-officio member of the committee.

- dispositions and criteria to add to the COE dispositions assessment rubric, or to assess separately.
- 3. The Continuous Improvement Committee shall undertake its initial review of the COE dispositions assessment rubric and policy during the Spring 2011 semester, after seeking input from faculty, candidates, and community partners. Thereafter, reviews shall be conducted at least every two years, with the same kind of input.
- 4. It is the responsibility of the college administration and the faculty to share the COE dispositions assessment rubric and all associated policies and procedures with all candidates electronically and/or in print, as a required link on all course syllabi and advising templates, and other venues deemed appropriate by programs, faculty, and administrators in the college (e.g., orientations, student and faculty handbooks, initial advising, COE website, etc...).
- 5. It is the responsibility of faculty in the college to inform candidates about the assessment rubric and its purposes and rationale at the time of initial advising; the same is required at the beginning of all courses.
- 6. It is the responsibility of the administration of the college to provide ongoing professional development for faculty in the evaluation of dispositions.

#### Section 2: Implementation

- 1. The programmatic use of the COE dispositions assessment rubric shall begin with the start of classes in Fall 2010.
- 2. At any point during the Fall 2010 semester, and in any semester thereafter, faculty may use the dispositions assessment rubric as a formative tool to help candidates become aware of core professional dispositions valued by the college.
- 3. At the end of every semester, at a point no later than the university deadline for the submission of grades, all COE instructors in all academic programs (including EDUC) shall use the COE Assessment of Professional Dispositions rubric to summatively evaluate in writing all teacher, counselor, and school leader candidates currently enrolled in COE courses. The assessment rubric shall be located in Taskstream or another electronic system approved by the COE Academic Council. Candidates shall have access to the rubric on Taskstream and their assessments completed by instructors.
- 4. Assessment data related to summative assessments completed by instructors shall be collected, analyzed, and reported back to academic programs no later than the mid-point of the fall and spring semesters by the Assistant Dean for Continuous Improvement. Academic programs and the COE Continuous Improvement Committee shall review the data and reports at least annually and use them to inform decisions regarding any changes to existing admission, retention, advising, and/or graduation policies.
- 5. The College may initiate a Student Performance Review to address issues related to unsatisfactory or unacceptable dispositions if candidates: (a) receive a rating of "Unacceptable" on any item included on the assessment rubric; (b) receive a rating of "weak" on an early Verification of Hours or Evaluation of Student

Performance Form; or (c) are dismissed from clinical experiences or rejected by at least three schools or clinical sites due to concerns about academic performance and/or performance in an interview context. The procedures for the Student Performance Reviews are published on the College of Education website and in student and faculty handbooks, and are attached to this policy.

### Section 3: Appeal Process

If a student wishes to appeal an Assessment of Professional Dispositions completed by an instructor, the student shall use the following procedures (which are, in large part, the same as the general Procedures For Handling Student Concerns Other Than Final Grade Appeals outlined in the Roosevelt University Student Handbook). Where a Student Performance Review has been initiated addressing the results of an Assessment of Professional Dispositions, however, the appeal process to be followed shall be the appeal process set forth at the conclusion of the College of Education's Policy and Procedures -- Student Performance Reviews (SPRs).

A student wishing to appeal an Assessment shall first communicate the concern to the instructor (or to the department chair responsible for the program, in the event that the student is not comfortable speaking with the instructor directly). For clarity of communication, it is preferable that students submit these concerns in writing. In many cases, the simple communication of such a concern will promote a constructive dialogue, lead to an improved understanding between the faculty member and the student, and result in an immediate adjustment of expectations on one part or the other. Faculty members or department chairs receiving and discussing such concerns will summarize the resolution of the concern in writing and provide a copy of that Resolution to the student. Students may initiate communications regarding a concern up to (30) calendar days after the conclusion of the course that is the subject of the concern. After thirty (30) calendar days, the concern cannot be reviewed.

If the student is not satisfied with the initial resolution of the instructor or department chair to such a concern, the student may then, within ten (10) calendar days after receipt of the initial written resolution described above, communicate his or her continuing concern in writing to the department chair (or to the associate dean of the College of Education, in the event the department chair has served as the first level of review). The student will be informed that the department chair or associate dean will speak with the faculty member to hear his/her point of view before a decision is made about how the issue should be resolved. The department chair or associate dean will present the concern to the faculty member to verify the facts, hear the faculty member's point of view, and seek a resolution. If a student brings a concern about a faculty member to a University official other than the department chair or associate dean, the official will encourage the student to speak to the faculty member with whom he/she has the concern. If the student is not comfortable doing so, the official will direct the student to the department chair or associate dean and provide the student with the necessary contact information. This second level of review, like the initial review described above,

shall conclude with the department chair's or associate dean's written summary of the Resolution, with a copy provided to the student.

If the student is not satisfied with this Second Resolution by the department chair or associate dean, the student may then, within ten (10) days after receipt of the Second Resolution, appeal the matter in writing to the College of Education Dean, who will review the matter with the department chair or associate dean and decide whether to uphold the Second Resolution or to offer a different result. The decision of the dean, which shall be summarized in writing with a copy provided to the student, is final.

At the discretion of the Dean of the College of Education, the above time limitations and appeal process may be modified for good cause, with any such modification to be explained in writing to the student and affected faculty member or other college officials.

# Section 4: Approval Process

- 1. Initial approval of this policy shall be obtained from the College Council and the Provost's Office prior to the initial implementation during the 2010-11 academic year, inclusive of a review by university lawyers.
- 2. The same approvals above shall apply to subsequent iterations of this policy. However, the decision about whether or not to have university lawyers review subsequent policies will be made by the Provost's Office.