College of Education Assessment Committee Meeting Agenda  
Friday, February 8, 2019  
11:00 am-12:15pm, Glass Room

11:00-11:05 – Welcome and Sign In
11:05-11:40 – Subcommittee Group Updates
   o Completer Perception Survey (Initial and Advanced) – Cheryl Reynolds, Olha Osobov, Marcia Peck
   o Initial Teacher Candidate Performance Assessment – Betta Vice, Carol Christy, Tina Holmes-Davis, Steve Wills
     ▪ Candidate Assessment on Performance Standards (CAPS)
     ▪ Lesson Observation Form
   o Initial Teacher Candidate Professionalism Dispositions Rubric/Advanced Dispositions Survey – Nancy Mizelle, JW Good, Kevin Hunt, Diane Gregg
     ▪ Professional Behaviors and Dispositions Assessment (PBDA) for Initial Teaching
     ▪ Advanced Dispositions

11:40 -11:50 – PAAR Questions/Concerns
   ▪ Due March 8\textsuperscript{th} for review to be finalized by March 15\textsuperscript{th}
   ▪ Semesters included Fall 2017, Spring 2018, and Summer 2018
   ▪ Resources: Glossary, Manual, Faculty Master List

11:50-12:15 – Assessment Discussions/Updates

Reminders

Assessment Goals for AY 2018-2019

Standard 1
   • Consistently collect and analyze data from EPP Assessments and document changes
   • Consistently collect program data – all faculty are responsible (Part-time, Limited Term, Tenured) – SMART, PSC, SPA
   • Initial Teaching Programs
     – Review effectiveness of Initial Teacher Candidate Field Experience Performance Assessment (data available, add student completion, continuous improvement)
     – Review effectiveness of Initial Teacher Candidate Professionalism Rubric (add student completion of rubric in LT; response to dispositional issues, needs improvement)
     – Obtain Content Validity and Inter-rater Reliability on both
     – Ensure alignment of current program data points with InTASC Domains – 6 program assessments
   • Service and Leadership Programs
     – Choose 3 of the 6 competencies to be measured in each program.
     – Implement Completer Perception Survey for all Service Programs
     – Create and Implement Completer Perception Survey for Leadership Programs

Other areas:
   • Technology Cross Cutting Theme – Initial and Service/Leadership
   • Diversity Cross Cutting Theme – Initial and Service/Leadership
   • Develop CAEP Team
   • Meet regularly as an Assessment Committee- meetings set for Academic Year 18/19
   • Communicate regularly at COE Meetings
## COE Assessment Committee Sign In Sheet

**DATE:** 2/8/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carol Christy</td>
<td>Reading/Literacy</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olha Osobov</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>Olha O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Mizelle</td>
<td>Middle Grades</td>
<td>Nancy M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rui Kang</td>
<td>Secondary MAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Wills</td>
<td>Special Education – Graduate Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Gregg</td>
<td>IT/Media Specialist</td>
<td>D. G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Reynolds</td>
<td>Tier I Educational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JW Good</td>
<td>Tier II Educational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcie Peck</td>
<td>Teacher Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Hunt</td>
<td>PE MAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Holmes-Davis</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desha Williams</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Bradley</td>
<td>Professional Learning and Innovation</td>
<td>Linda B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Griffin</td>
<td>Assessment Office</td>
<td>R. G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holley Roberts</td>
<td>COE Assessment and Accreditation</td>
<td>Holly R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole DeClouette</td>
<td>Special Education BS</td>
<td>Nicole D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Peters</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Hinson</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>Jane H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justina Jenkins</td>
<td>Middle Grades MAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Roquemore</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11:00-11:05 – Welcome and Sign In
   commitment and work being done – thank you
   each group at different places in their committees – sharing out

11:05-11:40 – Subcommittee Group Updates
   o Completer Perception Survey (Initial and Advanced) – Cheryl Reynolds, Olha Osobov, Marcia Peck
     ▪ Reviewed the standards across the programs
     ▪ Thinking of continuing the current completer perception survey for everyone
     ▪ Major tweak on the teacher leadership and ed leadership programs
       • Focus of both programs students working with adults rather than children
     ▪ The focus for ed leadership and teacher leadership – preparing for working with adults - equip with skills to work with adults
     ▪ Best information from the completer perception survey
     ▪ Barbara shared about the work she is doing and will share with Marcia, Cheryl, and Olha
   o Initial Teacher Candidate Performance Assessment – Betta Vice, Carol Christy, Tina Holmes-Davis, Steve Wills
     ▪ Candidate Assessment on Performance Standards (CAPS)
     ▪ Lesson Observation Form
       • The committee is currently reviewing the observation instrument to make sure it aligns with the CAPS.
       • Holley – contacted a colleague whose EPP currently uses CAPS to find out how and when they assess candidates using the instrument.
         o Undergrads- use it as a summative assessment and also formatively throughout the program.
         o Ex. Senior year – fall teacher candidate meets with university supervisor and mentor leader. The three talk about all items on the CAPS and the university supervisor enters the data - meant to measure outcome – formatively, at midpoint and the final – what they report out is the outcome of how the teacher candidates score on it – for MAT commit to doing it in their program 4 times
         o It does demonstrate growth for the candidate all along the way – but the EPP data set is an outcome
           ▪ In our current Initial Teacher Candidate Performance Assessment, we look at how does it look pre and post. At the unit level were not looking at it per student. – are programs?
         o We have a hard time getting assessments through to the partner teachers
       • Inter-rated reliability will have to be established.
         o Document cannot be used for SPAs unless it is coded or an addendum is added specifically relating to the SPA standards.
• Desha and Claire – working on Partner Teacher professional develop to support teacher candidates and completion of all assessments
• Adjuncts and part time instructors – we are currently working on training to support this group
• Dr. Carol Christy has volunteered to work on the Standard 1 team
• This document (CAPS) gives the student many opportunities with content and ways to show what was done
• More discussion on when the CAPS is administered and how it’s administered – however, like programs should administer it at the same time
  o Will need a report back for monitoring
  o Initial Teacher Candidate Professionalism Dispositions Rubric/Advanced Dispositions
  Survey – Nancy Mizelle, JW Good, Kevin Hunt, Diane Gregg
    ▪ Professional Behaviors and Dispositions Assessment (PBDA) for Initial Teaching
      • Met twice Jan 24th decision – yes we need two separate dispositions assessments
        o One for initial teacher and one for advanced programs
      • Met Feb 7th – yes what we want to use for initial teacher and how we wanted to proceed with advanced
  • Initial Teaching
    o Recommendation: Our initial teaching programs adopt the PBDA instrument. The sub-committee reviewed the current dispositions assessment utilized in all initial teaching programs and looked over it carefully and compared it to the PBDA. The subcommittee decided that the PBDA suits our needs. We have looked at the guidelines. We would like to recommend that we accept the instrument and follow the guidelines with the understanding that programs should look into this including “like programs” where we need to talk among ourselves as a program – doing things similarly across the college – similar but understanding differences with as much similarity as possible. We also understand each program needs to discuss this. If we moved on this as a committee we could start this in the summer.
    o How many administrations of this per student?
      ▪ 3 in the guidelines were recommended
      ▪ Right now we are doing 2
      ▪ The recommendation for administration for the undergrad programs would be first semester – right now end of first placement and then end of junior year and then second semester of senior year.
    o Who fills it out?
      ▪ Page 3 – PBDA 3 times by multiple assessors
      ▪ Important for the candidate to understand the assessment – partner teachers, and university supervisors.
    o Introducing to students so that expectations are understood
      ▪ First time used – talk about with students and go through it – introduction – used as first check point
    o Pushing out to programs – how they are going to do it and when they are going to do it. Continuously point back to these instruments – integration in programs
o Growth or outcomes? It depends on how we choose to do it.
  ▪ As long as you know when and where they are going to be used – centrally located classes that you know they are going to be used in
  ▪ Assessment handbook – specific place for you to go look – student handbook – place to put it electronically – insert into handbook for teacher candidates and partner teachers
  ▪ Useful document and a plan to put something into play if there is a problem with a candidate’s development of dispositions
  ▪ Introduce with pre-ed classes
  ▪ Arrangement of the rubric – ranges from does not meet to exceeds
    • Encouraged to start with exceeds and to move across to does not meet
    • Reasons to do both ways
    • Flip it?
    • One of the arguments for leaving it – think more in terms of development rather than to just mark the exceeds column
    • Change everything if we flip it
    • Steve – we start with the lower end
    • Be consistent across all areas
    • Consistent in the delivery – if this is going to be an instructional instrument
    • Meet with partner teachers – introduce to this and discuss the different assessment to talk about development
    • We cannot switch around the CAPS
    • Follow CAPS over the next few years
    • Suggestion from committee is to flip the rubric
    • When talking about the advanced, we flipped it
  o Weakness in the way that we have previously been doing it – secret from students – transparency – involve students – this change will address this weakness
  ▪ Advanced Dispositions Assessment
    • Decided to create something brand new but taking the lead from Purdue online university and a dispositions assessment
      o Seeking approval from them and understanding to take that as a jumping off point as our own
    o We are beginning – in progress

11:40 -11:50 – PAAR Questions/Concerns
  ▪ Due March 8th for review to be finalized by March 15th
  ▪ Semesters included Fall 2017, Spring 2018, and Summer 2018
  ▪ Resources: Glossary, Manual, Faculty Master List
    o Less hours than most
    o All resources in the top
- When you put the number in make sure to pay attention to that
- Problems with taking too long online

11:50-12:15 - Assessment Discussions/Updates
- PAAR- kids that completed course work but have not completed ESOL thing – run back up to Angie about completion
- Be ready for College of Ed meeting for 30 minutes
- Flip before COE meeting and tell people

Reminders

Assessment Goals for AY 2018-2019

Standard 1
- Consistently collect and analyze data from EPP Assessments and document changes
- Consistently collect program data – all faculty are responsible (Part-time, Limited Term, Tenured) – SMART, PSC, SPA
- Initial Teaching Programs
  - Review effectiveness of Initial Teacher Candidate Field Experience Performance Assessment (data available, add student completion, continuous improvement)
  - Review effectiveness of Initial Teacher Candidate Professionalism Rubric (add student completion of rubric in L.T.; response to dispositional issues, needs improvement)
  - Obtain Content Validity and Inter-rater Reliability on both
  - Ensure alignment of current program data points with InTASC Domains – 6 program assessments
- Service and Leadership Programs
  - Choose 3 of the 6 competencies to be measured in each program.
  - Implement Completer Perception Survey for all Service Programs
  - Create and Implement Completer Perception Survey for Leadership Programs

Other areas:
- Technology Cross Cutting Theme – Initial and Service/Leadership
- Diversity Cross Cutting Theme – Initial and Service/Leadership
- Develop CAEP Team
- Meet regularly as an Assessment Committee- meetings set for Academic Year 18/19
- Communicate regularly at COE Meetings
### Continuous Improvement Documentation/Minutes
#### PROGRAM/EPP: EPP Assessment Committee
**Meeting Date:** 2/8/19

**Members Present:** Carol Christy, Olha Osobov, Nancy Mizelle, Rui Kang, Steve Wills, Diane Gregg, Cheryl Reynolds, JW Good, Marcia Peck, Desha Williams, Linda Bradley, Holley Roberts, Nicole DeClouette, Jane Hinson, Barbara Roquemore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment/Objective</th>
<th>Data/Data Analysis</th>
<th>Changes Recommended</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Progress Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Teacher Candidate Professionalism Dispositions Rubric</td>
<td>Data is not being used effectively to address dispositional weaknesses or current development of dispositions. The current EPP created assessment does not meet the CAEP criteria for assessment.</td>
<td>Professional Behaviors and Dispositions Assessment (PBDA) is recommended to be used as an EPP assessment for all initial teaching programs. The recommendations for implementation will be followed. The only modification that will be made is changing the order of the performance indicators.</td>
<td>The Assessment Committee makes the recommendation to adopt the PBDA as the EPP Dispositions assessment at the COE meeting, February 22, 2019.</td>
<td>If the assessment is approved, Dr. Roberts will follow up with Dr. Williams and the program coordinators to finalize the process of implementing the PBDA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Teacher Candidate Performance Assessment</td>
<td>Data is not useful in demonstrating progress of candidates. The current EPP created assessment does not meet the CAEP criteria for assessment.</td>
<td>Candidate Assessment on Performance Standards (CAPS) is recommended as the EPP assessment.</td>
<td>The Assessment Committee makes the recommendation to adopt the Candidate Assessment on Performance Standards (CAPS) as the EPP assessment to</td>
<td>If the assessment is approved, Dr. Roberts will follow up with Dr. Williams and the program coordinators to finalize the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Assessment is a survey and does not provide substantive indicators for candidates to use in their development. The current assessment does not satisfy the Mother Rule requirement of supporting candidates in understanding the state teacher evaluation instrument.</td>
<td>Advanced Dispositions Assessment</td>
<td>The subcommittee will continue work on the Advanced Dispositions Rubric.</td>
<td>The subcommittee will report their progress at the next COE Assessment Committee Meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>