

Dewar College of Education Assessment Committee

### **Minutes of the October 23, Meeting**

Present: S. Sanderson, J. Reffel, L. Hilgert, J. Hummel, L. Brockmeier, G. Doepker, H. Brasell, S. Lahr, L. Corbin, J.D. Thomerson, G. Langford, L. Minor, M. Roberts, F. Polkinghorne, B. Suber, M. Westherington, B. Brown, J. Kinney, R. Seiple, S.A. Christie, Guests, Dean Gunter

1. Report from previous meeting – S. Sanderson

Chair Sanderson reviewed activities of the past academic year. The committee reviewed the data calendar for the unit, proposed a 5999 course similar to 2999 for graduate data collection, analyzed the disposition data for initial candidates, decided the RSCH 7100 would complete the Advanced Literature Review Assessment for all programs to ensure consistency, adopted a form created by the ACED department on Impact on P-12 Learning document for the consistent calculates the effect size; looked at “can all students learn” disposition instrument; reworded question and removed “neutral from the survey; saw some improvements in question #11 on disposition survey; added response boxes to advanced disposition survey.

2. Approval of minutes – S. Sanderson

L. Minor moved approval of the minutes from the April 14, 2008 meeting of the Dewar College of Education Assessment Committee. H. Brasell seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion carried and the minutes were approved.

3. Attendance – S. Sanderson

Chair Sanderson welcomed the members of the committee.

4. Introduction of members – S. Sanderson

Introductions were made of members.

5. Charge from Dr. Gunter

Dr. Phil Gunter thanked the committee for its work last year and emphasized its importance as assessment guides the work of the Dewar College of Education. Dean Gunter shared Part C of the NCATE report that is submitted annually (attached in files). He specifically focused on the two areas of improvement:

***Some programs lack evidence for the effective preparation of candidates in the area of P-12 student assessment.***

***The unit does not have a systematic procedure to ensure that all programs use data for program improvement.***

Dean Gunter emphasized that the purpose of assessment is to determine that our candidates are doing a good job in their work with P-12 students. He presented data from his SPEC 3020 Applied Behavior Analysis course on how students impact P-12 learning. He then charged the committee with the following:

**How are we evaluating the impact of our candidates on P-12 learning in advanced programs?**

**Look again at the dispositions of our candidates. What are they? How do we assess them?**

**Are our candidates prepared to address Response to Intervention in the area of formative assessment?**

6. Impact on the P-12 learner document and examples shown from Dr. Sanderson (Advanced and Initial)

Dr. Sanderson shared her work with advanced candidates using the effect size document that the committee prepared last year. She shared that it is very user friendly and seems to really help the candidates and the programs see the effect on P-12 learning.

7. Any other discussions

P-12 partners shared some areas in which our candidates need to be prepared for their schools. These areas include: Georgia Alternative Assessment, Response to Intervention, Learning Focus Strategies. Gunter asked about the use of DIBLS, Positive Behavior Support / School Wide Information Systems (SWIS), and the Keys Assessment of teachers. Also mentioned as professional development needs of teachers are the areas of Differentiated Instruction, ESOL and Reading / Language Arts (like the MSP program).

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4:00 pm, room 255, Dewar College of Education.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia M. Reffel