

COE Assessment Committee

Minutes for the meeting held April 30th, 2009

Present: Sonya Sanderson, Julie Reffel, Maggie Roberts, John Hummel, Lynn Corbin, Steven Lahr, Lynn Minor, Lantry Brockmeier, Larry Hilgert, Lorraine Schmertzinger, Gina Doepker, James Nienow, George Langford, James Ernest, and Mimi Wetherington.

Sonya volunteered to take minutes.

Sonya gave a brief overview of the previous meeting.

Sonya asked for approval of the February 26th 2009 minutes.

1. Julie discussed disposition **data for our undergraduate candidates and our graduate candidates for summer 08- spring 2009. As a committee, we decided to change number 1 and 11 while adding a new number 13. We also wanted the removal of the “neutral” comment for those questions.**

We were wanting to see if there was a difference in students dispositions from entry to exit. Steven wanted to know why we were trying to look at the data this way, since we were looking at apples to oranges, since we were looking at one data set (entry) to a different data set (exit), they were not the same group of students.

James Ernest also wanted for us to define “performance verses achievement” verses the ability to learn.

It was discussed that numbers 1 and 11 has more than 1 variable and needed to only have one. This could be causing the confusion in how to answer the question.

Can we find a way to look at gain scores instead of learning vs. achievement was discussed.

Some members stated that research does show that family backgrounds do have an effect on student learning, which is contradictory to how we want students to answer question 11 on the disposition form.

Lorraine brought up the fact that NCATE looks at student learning verses achievement (going back to the disposition questionnaire and how we ask questions 11 and 13).

John discussed that students may view the questionnaires as “my quality of teaching” verses the “quantity of motivation” verses the “quality of teacher

research”, which then confuses students more with how they may reply to questions 11 and 13.

James stated that we needed to use Evidence Based Practices when asking questions about the impact of student learning to possibly minimize confusion.

Steven believes that we should just ask the questions straight forward.

As a committee, we continued to believe that statement 1 and 13 remained confusing, but we could not come to a definite conclusion on how to reword the statements.

Sonya agreed to send the disposition questions to all committee members again to see if we could come to a consensus on how we want statements 1, 11, and 13 worded.

2. Lynn Minor discussed the Teacher Observation Instrument. She proposed a change in the instrument.

She asked the committees feelings on changing section III G. Communication to 2 parts (a and b). Her reasons for the change are that the section III G. asks about spoken verbal communication and about effective questions skills. She believed we were asking two different things here, so the area should be broken into 2 parts for evaluating student teachers.

The committee agreed that the section III G. communication should be written in an a and b part.

As a committee, we also looked at V. F. Resources and Technology and how it was hard for student teachers to use technology for every lesson. The proposed change was to remove technology from the section header to adding it to the evidence/comments area.

Meeting was adjourned.