

COE Assessment Committee Meeting March 3, 2008

Present: S. Sanderson, J. Reffel, L. Hilgert, J. Hummel, L. Schmertzing, L. Brockmeier, S. Andrews, H. Braswell, L. Corbin, G. Langford, L. Minor, J. Lee.

## MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting were presented and approved.

Julia Reffel presented information on the “effect size” requirement for impact on student learning data. She reviewed Gunter’s Boys’ and Girls’ club data. She will start with ECE in beginning the process for determining impact on student learning data re effect size using 2006-07 data that has been extracted and compiled. She emphasized that in order to run effect size analysis, percentages must be used. She urged program coordinators to be sure to have the data reported in a consistent format using 1) Excel tables, 2) percentages, and 3) a pre-test post-test design.

Gathering data for this standard for advanced impact of professional development on p-12 learning for non-teachers is difficult. The new NCATE standards have a new focus on this aspect. Reffel suggested using Excel tables instead of Word tables to simplify data entry and analysis.

Reffel reviewed programs’ source of data. Some are numbers already; some need to figure out how to do this. Discussion continued around whether to provide aggregate for the candidate or for all students, a class average? Standard deviations are needed for each Candidate. The projects were determined to be acceptable, but Reffel needs to know where the data is.

Reffel stated that she would develop an Excel spread sheet for all to use to simplify this process.

Discussion arose about the reliability and validity of the data and assessments. Should each program prescribe a unified project? Do candidates have sufficient knowledge of research design to expect clean designs for tests and projects? The assessment for each project should be evaluated to assure validity. Should this be a course or in a course, and is so, which one? Each program will monitor and assure this aspect. It’s too late to develop this for spring – the new form will be used next year.

Larry Hilgert shared a rubric that might be a good model.

Julia Lee presented SP 07, SU 07, FA007 exit data and the advanced candidate answer narratives about questions 11 and 13 on the disposition survey. The comments were deemed valuable and revealing. The variables motivation and background were separated in the survey. The “neutral” option for a response was deleted. The survey will be administered at the end of student teaching rather than the beginning. The “comments” option will now be available for initial candidates. Lee reported that NCATE has stipulated that we must provide data re “observed” dispositions in the classroom. The survey will no longer be sufficient. Discussion about the possibility of using the existing COE Observation instrument occurred but only one item on this was deemed adequate. Another suggestion was to

analyze the responses in the Teacher Work Sample re factors re the project. Fairness needs to be defined: do we “meet needs” or “treat all the same”?

More suggestions were offered

Have open ended questions, interviews, focus groups in student teaching.

Look at the framework and observations and others’ work to develop ideas on measuring dispositions

Need to think about how to measure; revisit conceptual framework?

Julie reported on the reworded survey and will be sending the data use for program improvement forms.

Members are asked to come with their impact on student learning data.

The next meeting was set for April 14 at 2:00. Since the p-12 partners are not attending, it was decided to have the meeting earlier to accommodate Chair Sanderson’s schedule more efficiently.

Respectfully submitted.

Lynn Corbin