

## 1. Welcome

## 2. Commend- Middle Grades Faculty -AMLE and CEC-CAEP SPA recognition

- The Middle Grades faculty **and** Special Education team were commended for their strong work and national recognition.
- Recognition is connected to professional affiliations, including:
- Association for Middle Level Education (AMLE)
- Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP SPA)
- It was noted that not all programs have access to similar affiliation opportunities.

## 3. Impact Check (Program Coordinators) -Updates from each Program

### a) Report on the program's progress.

- Programs were asked to submit impact checks this month.
- These updates reflect: Assessment results from the fall, semester progress toward goals, challenges and opportunities identified; updates should reflect growth from the August assessment day through the fall semester to the present.

### b) Any Changes to the programs recommended based on the data?

#### Middle Grades (MAT) Program Report

##### Data Concerns

- The MAT program reports data concerns requiring long-term revisions rather than quick fixes.
- Key issue: **GACE certification exam scores.**
  - **GACE Score Challenges**
- Scores appear low in some areas (e.g., physical science), but breakdown data is unclear.
- Many students take the GACE before entering or early in the program.
- Current reporting includes pre-program test attempts, which may inaccurately reflect program effectiveness.
- Students often take the GACE multiple times before passing, lowering reported averages.

- MAT students must pass the GACE for provisional certification prior to employment, often before completing key coursework.
- The program does not directly teach content-specific coursework (e.g., math, science), making it difficult to attribute low content exam scores to program quality.
- Concern was expressed that external reviewers may misinterpret this data without context.
- When reporting accreditation data (e.g., CEC file), clarification was provided that some GACE scores were invalid indicators of program impact, and that explanation was accepted.
- **The GACE score issue remains ongoing.**

#### **4. Updates on accreditation review preparation- Various Levels-Unit prep/standard prep/Program and degree level preparation?**

- A recent SPA report identified a **weakness in meeting one standard**.
- The program is implementing a **new assessment** to better align with its philosophy and concepts.
- They are piloting an **AML-aligned observation instrument** to demonstrate stronger field connections.
- A **new key assessment** is being tested to align with AML standards and sub standards, since the traditional observation form does not meet AML alignment requirements.
- They conduct **interview reliability checks**, though it is difficult due to differing opinions on ambiguous samples.
- Internal reliability studies are emphasized as important for meeting **CAPE and PSC requirements**.
- Faculty are asked to **review and document the status of their key assessments**, including validity and reliability evidence.

#### **5. Validity/Reliability – Key assessment and PL for all faculty- Timeline**

- Substantive curriculum changes must be made **this semester** before the review portal opens.
- After substantive changes, at least **one semester of data collection** is required.
- Minor updates are allowed; changes to course sequencing may require formal review.
- Deadline for substantive changes needs clarification.
- Continuous improvement is encouraged within the review of the portal framework.
- Rubric and instructional revisions are allowed; **key assessments** are tightly regulated.
- Clarification is needed on what officially counts as a substantive change (follow up with Melissa).
- Planned revisions are believed to qualify as substantive; key assessments expected to remain the same.

#### **Assessment Cycles & Data Expectations**

- Two assessment cycles:

- **Fall:** Initial cycle (early, expected low scores).
- **End of Spring:** Second cycle (growth should be evident).
- Early scores (mostly 1s, some 2s) are expected due to limited time in program.
- Higher scores (3s) are unrealistic early.
- Some variation in scoring is appropriate.
- Growth should be clear by the end of spring cycle.

### **Leadership & Next Steps**

- Leadership transition (retired faculty); reorganization underway.
- Focus areas moving forward:
  - **Validity and reliability of key assessments**
  - **Professional learning (PL) for all faculty**
  - **Clear implementation timeline**

### **Final thoughts/additional items?**

#### **Program Adjustments**

- The current cohort is receiving **more focused writing instruction**, emphasizing clarity and concise responses to prepare for the written exam.
- These adjustments require **changes to course content**.
- A new faculty member has been helpful in supporting these changes.

#### **Funding Opportunity**

- The Provost's Office announced **small grants (\$500–\$2000)** to support student initiatives.
- Funds could potentially be used for **practice tests or exam preparation resources**.
- Multiple proposals can be submitted (e.g., for teacher leadership, literacy).
- The timeline is **tight**, and proposals must go through the dean.

**\*\*\*\* Next Assessment committee meeting is March 13<sup>th</sup> at 10:00am \*\*\*\***