

Education Department Assessment Retreat

August 22, 2012

NCATE

At the request of the Assessment Committee, newly revised Field Evaluation forms for Step Two and Three (fall) were distributed with Standards 7 and 8 added. Discussion then followed regarding the ratings. It was decided that current wording isn't compatible with the Teacher Candidate rubric. It was decided that the language should be compatible, so the language will be changed to Beginning, Developing, Proficient, and Outstanding.

Kitty reported on the upcoming NCATE visit. The Institutional Report was submitted on August 2. The NCATE leadership team (Carol, Patricia, MaryAnn, Kitty, Jessica, & Daniel) decided to opt for the in person pre-visit by BOE Chair, Dr. Carrie Robinson. It is scheduled for September 10. The purpose of the pre-visit is to iron out details of the focused visit October 7-9. Dr. Robinson shared in a conference call with Kitty and MaryAnn that she expected the State representative to be in attendance at the pre-visit, but this contradicted a letter MaryAnn had received during the summer. Kitty called the State person listed on the NCATE site, but heard back from still another person who indicated that the State would only participate by telephone. Dr. Robinson told Kitty and MaryAnn that she didn't need to talk with faculty during the Pre-visit.

[Action points in bold.]

As NCATE Coordinator, Kitty explained that this was our opportunity to review and discuss reports summarizing and analyzing results of last spring's assessments. While the faculty had received hard copies of everything we would be discussing last week, Kitty used the website to acquaint everyone with the site and go through our data. The site can be accessed by going to the College site, then to Academics, then to Departments and Programs, then to Education, then to the menu on the left side of the page to NCATE Accreditation and Assessment. Kitty indicated that there is a narrative that explains what is in that section, then a list of hot links that goes right to the supporting information. The first section is an overview of the entire site. We will need to keep the website updated every semester to keep our information current.

The second section explains the unit organization, provides faculty CVs, course syllabi, and department agendas and minutes. It was pointed out that a number of course syllabi aren't on the site. Kitty will add those. She will also add Terri's CV.

The third section explains and lists all the assessment tools we use. Results of using these tools are in the Data section. The tools should be used at key decision points in the programs, so the tools appear in three steps and post graduate. The tools represent both internal and external assessments.

The fourth section holds the conceptual framework and a table that shows how each element of the framework is assessed. The conceptual framework has not changed since

the 2002 visit, though it has been refreshed with updated references. We still believe that the teacher should be a reflective decision-maker. We still abide by the importance of Scholarship, Mission, and Competence.

The fifth section is the 2010 NCATE Visit. It contains the IR. Kitty made sure all the Track Changes were off. This section also contains the BOE report and the Rejoinder.

The sixth section is the 2012 Focused Visit. It contains the Institutional Report. It will have the agenda as soon as it is finalized.

The seventh section is called Accreditation Letters. It contains the official letter from NCATE, the letter from IDOE, and Dean Fleming's letter to IDOE.

The final section is the Data section. Kitty posed the question of the day: How can we use this information to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations?

Kitty took us through the data reports by Step. There were several reports that essentially apply to all Steps—Cumulative GPA, both Elementary Ed. and Secondary Ed. This is what is stored in our databases in Banner. We discussed the current 2.5 needed for entrance to the department. Is that sufficient? We reviewed the rules about grades in an Education department course, etc. It was also noted that 2.5 is pretty standard. Both the El.Ed. and Secondary Ed. cumulative GPAs are above 3.0, so we are satisfied the GPAs are acceptable now. We will continue to monitor them.

We looked at Praxis I Scores for 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014. The average Elementary Ed. score is 540 across the years (one is 539) and the Secondary average is 545. It was noted that more students in the classes of 2013 and 2014 are using ACT and SAT scores. The average for Praxis I takers is lower for those classes.

Step One – 2012 Field Evaluation Summary Somehow we separated Development and Diversity into separate scores. They should be combined. We also decided that the ratings do not match the Teacher Candidate Rubric. **We will change the Field Evaluation to the rubric terminology.**

Step Two - 2012 Field Summary The same discussion occurred regarding terminology. **We will change the form.**

Step 2 Disposition Survey Some candidates rated themselves as 5s. There seems to be a difference between “I believe” responses and those implying action. The report indicates that Elementary candidates are not as willing to receive constructive criticism.

Field Evaluation Summary Ratings indicate candidates are receiving high scores from the beginning. How comfortable are we with our assessments if the students are all receiving 4 and 5 from the beginning? Are the tools really working? **We will monitor the validity of the evaluations.**

Step 2 Critical Reflection on Teacher Standards Secondary candidates did better on the oral presentation than the Elementary candidates. Secondary candidates unpacked the standards in an EDUC 346 class, but there hasn't been this in depth explanation for Elementary candidates. Where could such an unpacking take place for Elementary candidates? **We will prepare the Elementary candidates better.**

Generally, the oral presentations were consistently better than a year ago. We believe this is because after the 2011 presentations we restructured the rubric to include more specific criteria. We believe this actually has taught the candidates more about doing effective oral presentations, in line with the College's Learning Outcome 2. We required visuals for this year and that considerably improved the presentations.

Step 3 Field Evaluation – The same discussion occurred regarding terminology. **We will change the form.**

Oral presentations on Standard 3 – We have mixed results on inter-rater reliability. **We will go through the rubric ahead of time to make sure we are interpreting items in the same way.**

Oral Presentation of the Education Portfolio inter-rater reliability is consistent. **We want to create a more detailed rubric to give them more exact information.**

Praxis II only gives an institutional report if there are more than five students.

Exit Survey – Generally, candidates feel well prepared. Lengthy discussion followed about the timing of the survey because by the time they get to this at the end of the retreat, they're too tired to give much in the way of commentary. **We might want to do this as a survey monkey.**

Formative/Summative- Change It was noted that there were typos that need correcting.

Mild Intervention Data – **Will be added to the web site.**

Disposition Survey - Disposition responses start high and end higher between Step Two and Step Three for many items. This seems to indicate that field experience does not negatively impact candidate attitudes. **We will continue to monitor dispositional changes.**

From the surveys of Step 2 and Step 3 in both Elementary and Secondary, candidates rank themselves lower in “engaging in research-based practices.” We haven't done a good enough job of telling them the methods they are learning are research-based. **We will point this out more clearly.**

Cooperating Teacher Survey – Cooperating Teachers have generally reported our candidates are well prepared. This is the first time we have surveyed the cooperating

teachers, but we will continue to monitor this area, especially as RISE teacher evaluation occurs. **We need to teach our candidates how to assess where students are and how to set learning objectives.**

Alumnae Survey – This was the first time we have captured alumnae information. Generally, we are pleased with the results. Literacy for Secondary Ed. really showed the changes in EDUC 346, with 2011 scores substantially different than 2007.

We are continuing to pay attention to inter-rater reliability and there will be a meeting before Standard 3 presentation to review the rubric and make sure it is appropriate.

In a discussion with members of the Cooperative Council regarding documentation of our students having experience with ESL students and students with IEPs, it was suggested that we include a place on the field evaluation cards for teachers to indicate the number of ESL students and students with IEPs in their classes. It was decided that the information could be charted each semester. Karen Van Meter, Director of Student Teaching/Field Study is currently doing that.

Another possibility regarding these experiences was also discussed. Students could complete and document field hours with ESL students and students with IEPs independently. Reference was made to previous independent field requirements.

It was decided that we would review the data collected from the field at the end of the year before moving forward with an additional requirement.