

## **Assessment Committee Meeting**

**January 14, 2008**

**4:00pm**

**Room 255**

1. Welcome: Dr. Phil Gunter and Dr. Julie Lee
2. Introduction of Members
3. Attendance
4. Report from previous meeting
5. Approval of minutes
6. Dr. Gunter will speak about the Impact on the P-12 learner information.
7. Dr. Lee will speak about our unit dispositions and the outcomes from data collection in Dec. 2007.
8. Group discussions on both of the above matters.
9. Thank you to all members for attending. We appreciate all P-12 members and other members of the committee outside of the COE department!
10. Next meeting time
11. Adjournment

## **Assessment Committee**

Minutes of the January 14, 2008, Meeting

**Chair Sanderson welcomed the members of the committee. Introductions were made of members.**

**Present: S. Sanderson, J. Reffel, L. Schmertzinger, H. Hummel, H. Brasell, S. Lahr, L. Corbin, G. Langford, L. Minor, S. Andrews, C. Myers-Jennings, J. D.**

**Thomerson, B. Suber, J. Nienow, J. Ernest, M. Wetherington, B. Brown, C. Dowler, R. Seiple and guests: Dr. Phil Gunter and Dr. Julie Lee**

**The minutes of the November 26, 2007 meeting were approved.**

**Chair Sanderson reviewed activities of the previous meeting.**

**Dr. Phil Gunter presented information regarding the standard related to “impact on p-12 student learning.” The COE Executive Committee has discussed this and is soliciting input from this committee regarding how VSU can implement strategies and collect data on candidates’ effectiveness. There is a great deal of information from administrators that say VSU candidates are “great,” and the students are “satisfied” with their preparation. This is evidence but is not sufficient to satisfy PSC and SACS. Candidates need to document measurable change, i.e., quantifying the outcomes. Aggregated data is acceptable but APA has stipulated that data must include effect size to be considered valid research. Each program needs to develop an instrument or mechanism to allow aggregated data across the program and ultimately the unit that measures impact on learning. Dr. Gunter then explained his current project related to this aspect.**

**Lorraine Schmertzling suggested a rubric concept that could be used after the program projects to generate data for effect size analysis.**

**Dr. Gunter explained that effect size is based on standard deviations and brings data into a common language that can accommodate a variety of statistics. He urged programs to be sure to have activities that generate numbers like his current project. Drs. Sanderson and Reffel will look at the program projects related to this and bring this information back to the committee at the next meeting.**

**Dr. Lee presented information re exit disposition data for fall 2007. The new survey included an additional question that utilized the new language developed by the committee: “I believe that a teacher’s skill in teaching has greater impact on student achievement than the impact of a student’s family background.” The data continues to reflect a large percentage of “neutral” responses and the level of agreement remains at 50% across all programs. Statement 11, the original, is still low. A discussion ensued about whether or not the faculty and the teachers believed this – a suggestion was made to survey “us” to determine our dispositions in this area. Subtle messages may be being communicated to encourage the “undesirable” dispositions. The next iteration of the survey will remove “neutral” as a possible response, forcing agreement or disagreement. There will also be a space for the initial candidates to provide clarification for their response like there is for advanced candidates. The advanced candidates’**

responses will be presented at the next meeting. Dr. Lee says that there is improvement from entry to exit, but it is still not where we want it to be.

**Action steps:**

1. These statements will be added to the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year teacher surveys to determine if they feel differently having been on the job.
2. There will be a response box for initial candidates to explain and clarify their answer to questions 11 and 13.
3. The responses for advanced candidates for questions 11 and 13 will be presented at the next meeting.
4. The survey will be administered at the end of student teaching rather than at the beginning as is the current practice.
5. "Neutral" will be removed as an answer option on the survey.

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

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Lynn A. Corbin**

November 26

COE Assessment Committee

The following 4 items are what we discussed that needs some attention before our next meeting on January 14th at 4:00 in room 255.

1. Please look at number 22 (statement 11) on the initial disposition form and send me suggestions on how you would like to see the statement worded. If you break down the statement into two different statements please indicate in some way that you are sending me two different statements from the one original statement. I am going to put all suggestions on one sheet and email those to everyone before our next meeting. Then we will be able to vote on which statement best represents what we need to ask.

2. Please look at number 23 (statement 12) and make sure you feel this statement reads how you feel it should read. If you have suggestions on how to change this statement, please send me your suggestions.

3. A question was posed whether we should pass student teachers if they can not show an impact on student learning during student teaching. Please let me know how you feel about this statement and if we can justify a pass/fail on the impact of student learning.

4. Please review the Advanced Impact on P-12 Learning Assessment and see if we can create an Initial Impact on P-12 Learning Assessment. Please come with suggestions for the January 14th meeting.