



CAEP Steering Committee Luncheon Meeting
May 9, 2016 11:15 - 1:00 pm

Committee Members Attending

Dr. Erinn Bentley, Assistant Chair
Dr. Jennifer Brown, Program Coordinator for Accomplished Teaching
Dr. Toni Franklin, Assistant Professor Special Education
Dr. Dawn Frazier, Associate Professor for Counseling, Foundations, and Leadership
Dr. Deirdre Greer, Dean, College of Education and Health Professions
Mr. Roger Hatcher, Director, Center for Quality Teaching and Learning
Dr. Ellen Martin, Program Coordinator for Health and Physical Education
Dr. Sallie Miller, Associate Dean for Assessment and Accreditation
Dr. Deniz Peker, Program Coordinator for Science Education
Dr. Margie Yates, CAEP Coordinator
Ms. Jackie Adamczyk, Council Secretary

Dr. Margie Yates welcomed everyone to the CAEP Steering Committee Meeting and called the meeting to order at 11:15a.m.

Approval of Minutes

Dr. Margie Yates called for a motion to approve the minutes from the February 4, 2016 CAEP Steering Committee Meeting. The meeting minutes were approved without revisions.

Discussions

Dr. Margie Yates stated that in July 2016, the Dean (Dr. Deirdre Greer) will be voting on a new partnership agreement with CAEP.

The GaPSC will begin Program Reviews on a 5-year cycle. Our next CAEP site visit was changed from 2020 to no earlier than Spring 2021.

Group I Report –See Appendix A

Models of Appropriate Practice (MAP)

Dr. Ellen Martin and Mr. Roger Hatcher discussed their findings on the MAP assessment.

Dr. Martin stated that it needs a lot of work and also suggested that MAP language be revised using more simplified, less misleading text.

Dr. Greer agreed that the language should be very clear, easily understood; e.g., “quality training” can mean one thing for a person but have an entirely different meaning for someone else. Dr. Greer reiterated that we need to be very clear with our MAP assessment. Dr. Burcham has established a sub-committee to help with the MAP revision.

Mr. Hatcher then distributed a “Model of Appropriate Practice” for Columbus State University Educator Preparation Programs. The document has four (4) levels for which teachers are evaluated.

Suggestion: Divide MAP into categories for small groups to work on. For example, what are the guidelines for “meet expectations” and “adequate”? Intent: To develop a more User-Friendly MAP.

Group II Report –See Appendix B

Dispositions

Dr. Brown and Dr. Bentley discussed the importance of Dispositions Evaluations.

Dr. Brown stated that the Graduate Dispositions Assessment is out of date and needs to be addressed – we need to add reflection components so that it can also be used for the undergraduate programs.

State Dispositions Project

Dr. Miller shared a project overview (PowerPoint) of the Georgia Assessment Directors’ Association Dispositions Assessment –Phase I. The intent of the project is to develop a valid and reliable dispositions assessment to help universities meet CAEP Standard 1.1. The assessment will be made available for voluntary statewide use with the possibility of interstate use. No university shall be required to use this assessment.

The research group contacted each Georgia School District and requested reference forms to identify desired professional attitudes and behaviors. Response rate: 13.8% (Dr. Miller will present research paper during the next CAEP Steering Committee Meeting)

Next, a frequency analysis or Q-Sort was conducted to determine the most frequently used criteria by the school districts. The same analysis was conducted for EPP's. The committee members deliberated on the LEA's and the EPP's different dispositions – in order of importance.

(The frequency counts were not based on raking of importance)

Group III Report –See Appendix C

Rubric

Mr. Roger Hatcher recently returned from a meeting in Washington and shared information about Rubrics he received. He provided Dr. Yates with a rubric handout (used by CAEP and InTASC) to share with the CAEP Steering Committee.

Employer and Alumni Surveys

Dr. Frazier and Dr. Franklin, survey reviewers, discussed the low response rate of the employer/alumni surveys (14% Response Rate).

Notes from Survey Reviewers *(Frazier and Franklin)*

- 1) More information (documentation) on how the data should be used
- 2) Survey language and items seem ambiguous on the expected behaviors and practices
- 3) Feedback received is difficult to understand

Question posed: How do we get more principals and teachers to complete the surveys? Dr. Frazier suggested a cash incentive. She just completed a survey and was paid \$30.00. Dr. Martin suggested that maybe we could put the respondents' names who participated in the survey in a pool to win a prize.

Dr. Brown stated that on the first week of school the student candidates fill out the Qualtrics' Surveys regarding review and timing. Dr. Brown also wanted to know who to send the alumni survey to...who are the recipients?

Post Meeting Notes: Dr. Miller advised that the 2016 Alumni and Employer Surveys will be distributed to 1st and 3rd year teachers / graduates. The database is complete (Source: GaPSC, Human Resource Directors) and the Qualtrics surveys are uploaded. Graduates and employers should receive the surveys via Qualtrics by the end of this week. Survey copies and cover email letters are attached to this document.

Other Meeting Notes

Dr. Miller included information (PowerPoint) on "Establishing Content Validity". Dr. Miller explained the *Q-sort and Quantifying Consensus* as "researcher friendly" and advocated for its use for the current state-driven dispositions project.

Dr. Yates and Dr. Peker shared a PowerPoint on "Demystifying Assessment Validity and Reliability". The PowerPoint identified critical dimensions of assessment validity and reliability and strategies for collecting key validity and reliability evidence. Committee members were reminded to keep issues of validity and reliability in mind while revising COEHP instruments and key assessments. A validity and reliability study plan worksheet was shared with members of the committee.

Dr. Yates reviewed the COEHP CAEP Task List and Timeline. Dr. Burcham has assigned additional teacher education faculty to assist with the revision of the initial program key assessment instruments based on the CAEP Steering Committee's evaluations. Work will continue throughout the summer and pilots are scheduled to take place fall 2016 or spring 2017.

Ms. Adamczyk presented the revised *Educator Preparation Assessment Handbook Section I of XII*. A motion to accept the revised document, seconded, and accepted with one revision: Add the Honors College into the Organization of the University.

Post Meeting Notes: Section II of XII review and suggested revisions are due by September 9, 2016. Please email to Jackie Adamczyk at adamczyk_jackie@columbusstate.edu.

Meeting adjourned at 1:00pm

Respectfully submitted by Jackie Adamczyk

Appendix A

MAP Evaluation Using the CAEP ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

Item Category	B*	S*	A*	Comments
1. ADMINISTRATION AND PURPOSE: Point when instrument is administered in the program, its purpose, and standards addressed (informs relevance). Evaluation categories or assessment tasks are tagged to CAEP, InTASC or state standards.		x		Each program has generated a list of courses where the MAP assessment is administered.
	x			No evidence to suggest that the purpose of the MAP assessment and its use in candidate monitoring or decisions on progression ARE specified and appropriate
		x		Each program has created a matrix where evaluation categories or assessment tasks are tagged to CAEP, InTASC or state standard.
2. INFORMING RESPONDENTS: Information given to respondent before and at the administration of the instrument (informs fairness and reliability); basis for judging candidate performance is explicit	x			No evidence to suggest that candidates are given a description of the MAP’s purpose.
	x			Questions remain as to where and when instructions are provided to candidates about what they are expected to do are informative and unambiguous
	x			The criterion for success is not made clear to candidates. Item descriptors are not made explicit to candidates – some items use ambiguous language (scoring rubric at top of instrument is confusing).
3. CONTENT OF ASSESSMENT: Evaluation categories explicitly linked with standards, reflect degree of difficulty in standards, and unambiguously describe proficiencies to be evaluated; when standards include higher level functioning, the evaluation categories explicitly require higher levels of intellectual behavior; most evaluation categories require judgment of <u>consequential</u> candidate proficiencies (informs relevancy).		x		Evaluation categories or tasks are explicitly aligned with CAEP, InTASC or state standards
	x			Examine if evaluation categories or tasks reflect the degree of difficulty or level of effort described in the standards
	x			Evidence of ambiguity in some evaluation categories or tasks
				Need to examine categories that inform higher level functioning when evaluation categories or tasks require higher intellectual behavior
	x			What items are considered <u>consequential</u> and are those consistent throughout all programs? What is consequential? There isn’t a total score on the MAP so how do we determine if most evaluation categories or tasks (or at least those comprising 80% of total score) require

Item Category	B*	S*	A*	Comments
				observers to judge <u>consequential</u> attributes of candidate proficiencies in the standards?
<p>4. SCORING: Basis for judging candidate work is well defined; each proficiency level is qualitatively defined by criteria aligned with the category; proficiency descriptions represent a developmental sequence from level to level and are defined in actionable, performance-based or observable behavior terms; feedback for candidates is actionable (informs reliability and actionability).</p>		x		Rubrics for the basis for judging candidate work are defined.
	x			Each proficiency level is qualitatively defined <u>but NOT by specific</u> criteria aligned with the category (or indicator) or with the assigned task.
	x			It is not clear if the proficiency level descriptions represent a developmental sequence from level to level (to provide raters with <u>explicit guidelines</u> for evaluating candidate performance and candidates with <u>explicit feedback</u> on their performance.
		x		Feedback to candidates is actionable and can be found in LiveText.
	x			Proficiency level attributes are vague or not defined and may just repeat from the standard or component – This is what our MAP does
<p>5A. DATA VALIDITY: EPP provides a description of plan that details steps to ensure validity of the assessment and its use; assessment was piloted prior to administration; EPP details process or plans for analyzing and interpreting results.</p>	x			<p>The instrument was investigated and shown to have both content and construct validity (Confirmatory factor analysis) after removing the following variables:</p> <p><u>Domain 1</u> Demonstrates knowledge of students and their learning / Demonstrates knowledge of resources / Assesses student learning for planning</p> <p><u>Domain 2</u> Managing student behaviors</p> <p><u>Domain 4</u> Communicating with families / Contributing to the school / Keep accurate records</p> <p>These variables should be removed or revised.</p>
		x		<p>The instrument was investigated and shown to have internal consistency (Cronbach Alpha)Not sure if a plan is in place but the instrument was investigated and the types of validity have been examined (e.g., construct, content) and how they were established. A new plan</p>

Item Category	B*	S*	A*	Comments
				should be developed to revise or remove the variables mentioned above.
				May need to show a timeline of revisions and testing to the MAP instrument to demonstrate if it was piloted prior to administration
				The EPP details its current process or plans for analyzing and interpreting results from the assessment.
5B. DATA RELIABILITY: EPP provides a description or plan that details steps to ensure reliability of the assessment; training of scorers and checking inter-rater agreement and reliability are documented.	x			While there has been an investigation of the MAP instrument, <u>a description or plan has not been provided</u> that details the type of reliability that is being investigated or has been established (e.g., test-retest, parallel forms, inter-rater, internal consistency, etc.) and the steps the EPP took to ensure the reliability of the data from the assessment.
	x			No evidence, or limited evidence, is provided that scorers are trained and their inter-rater agreement is documented. Inter rater reliability hasn't been established. Do multiple administrations of the instrument over time affect reliability? Between and within programs?
				The described steps meet accepted research standards for establishing reliability.

B= Below Sufficient

S= Sufficient

A=Above Sufficient

Appendix B

Tuesday, March 29, 2016 from 1:30 until 2:30 PM

Jennifer Brown and Mary Beth Hendricks met in the JH 305 Conference Room to review the Graduate Dispositions Assessment. The following issues were found the current Graduate Dispositions Assessment based on the CAEP Evaluation Tool for EPP-Created Assessments Used n Accreditation.

- The points of assessment are not stated.
- The purpose of the assessment is not stated.
- The directions for completing the assessment are not included.
- This assessment tends to be a self-assessment for graduate students.
- 70% of the items were deemed observable.
- The assessment has an odd number of levels for each criteria.
- The use of data is not explained.
- Suggestion: The above missing items could be included in the Graduate Studies handbook and individual program handbooks.

Monday, April 4, 2016 from 10 AM until 11 AM

Jennifer Brown, Pam Wetherington, and Erinn Bentley met in the JH 305 Conference Room to review the Undergraduate Dispositions Assessment for Teacher Candidates. The following issues were found the current Undergraduate Dispositions Assessment based on the CAEP Evaluation Tool for EPP-Created Assessments Used n Accreditation.

- The points of assessment are not stated.
- The purpose of the assessment is not stated.
- The directions for completing the assessment are not included.
- 65% of the items were deemed observable.
- Training is needed for all evaluators.
- Suggestion: The above missing items could be included in the Teacher Education handbook along with a formula similar to the MAP formula. The formula should convey the continuum of expectations after admission to Teacher Education through admission to Student Teaching/Internship. Two evaluations prior to admission to Student Teaching/Internship are expected. State in the handbook that an action plan will be developed if below proficient depending on the continuum.
- Other: Ad hoc committee was created in the spring of 2013. It was piloted during the fall 2013 semester, and it was revised and re-piloted during spring 2014 semester. It was implemented during the fall 2014 semester.

Appendix C

MAP Evaluation Using the CAEP ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

Item Category	B*	S*	A*	Comments
1. ADMINISTRATION AND PURPOSE: → Point when instrument is administered in the program, → its purpose, and standards addressed (informs relevance). → Evaluation categories or assessment tasks are tagged to CAEP, InTASC or state standards.		X		
	X			Purpose does not explain how the data is being used (what they are monitoring, how decisions will be made)
	X			Assessment is not tagged to any standards as part of the description of the tool
2. INFORMING RESPONDENTS: → Information given to respondent before and at the administration of the instrument (informs fairness and reliability); → basis for judging candidate performance is explicit		X		
		X		
				N/A
6a. SURVEY CONTENT: → Survey items explicitly aligned with EPP mission and CAEP, InTASC or state standards; → questions have a single subject, use unambiguous language; → leading questions are avoided; → items stated as behaviors or practices rather than opinions.		X		
	X			Questions are not single subject; the language of the items is ambiguous
		X		
	X			The items often ask about opinions, not behavior or practices
	X			Item structure makes it hard to understand how programs can adjust to address stated weaknesses in graduates.
6b. DATA QUALITY: → Even Number or scale choices prevents neural responses; → scaled choices are qualitatively defined using	X			The likert scale is odd-numbered
				N/A - We are not sure how appropriate this particular item is. The likert options do not provide other info other than how much one agrees with the question stem.

Item Category	B *	S*	A*	Comments
criteria aligned with key attributes identified in the item; → feedback provided to the EPP is actionable;	X			Items were assessed for face validity and potential content validity. But further testing of content validity and construct validity not provided
→ questions are piloted to ensure intended interpretation;		X		
→ interpretations or results appropriate for items and data.	X			Comparisons are not conducted to assess reliability of the instrument.

B= Below Sufficient

S= Sufficient

A=Above Sufficient