

CAEP Unit Assessment Committee Meeting

January, 2016

Members present:

Dr. Lesa Beverly, Dr. Deborah Buswell, Dr. Cala Coats, Dr. Tracey Hasbun, Dr. Frank Mullins, Dr. Jannah Nerren, Dr. Heather Olson-Beal, Dr. Barbara Qualls, Dr. Pauline Sampson, Dr. Josephine Taylor, Dr. Liz Vaughan, Dr. Carol Wright

Members absent: Dr. Jared Barnes, Dr. Marc Guidry, Dr. Chris Sams, Dr. Nancy Shepherd, Dr. Kathy Sherriff, Dr. Christina Sinclair, Dr. Mark Turner

Update on T-TESS Training

Dr. Nerren provided a brief recap of the last meeting for those who were not able to attend the December meeting. Dr. Nerren discussed that someone has been assigned the special training module for T-TESS. Dr. Mize will be working with Dr. Nerren on this.

Dr. Nerren also provided a SFASU Unit Assessments Review Schedule Timeline for the remainder of the AY 15-16.

Dr. Nerren will check the timelines with Haley and see if we are not too late for spring to collect Dispositions by Faculty and Initial Dispositions which would be in all programs.

There was discussion about having separate sub-committee meetings to look at graduate assessment and undergraduate assessments but also meeting together. For our next meeting, we will come together as one group and split into groups.

Dr. Sampson asked her to send a list of all programs that are advanced so we can make contact with the correct contact person.

Timeline for the Remainder of AY 15-16 and Examples of Remaining Unit Assessments Currently in Use

Dr. Nerren wanted to know if it was ambitious to tackle the Program Completer Survey and the Program Evaluation by the Cooperating Teacher as she believes they will not need as much work. Then, she suggested addressing the Work Sample as it will need a greater focus. (All in the spring).

The goal is to get through this year refining what we currently have. Then, we can see where the gaps are in regards to CAEP standards. Everyone present was in agreement with the timeline.

Program Evaluation by Cooperating Teacher and Program Completer Survey

This Program Evaluation by the Cooperating Teacher is completed at the end of the Student Teaching semester by the classroom teacher. The cooperation rate has not been great. Dr. Nerren's goal is to strengthen those relationships for many reasons, one that is to collect better data. There will be an overall award for the Outstanding Cooperating Teacher and a celebration on campus with certificates for those that were nominated.

There are a not a lot of items on the evaluation that is completed in LiveText. The committee looked at the existing items and discussed if any changes need to be made.

Dr. Vaughan asked should this be aligned to T-TESS/ InTASC/CAEP? Dr. Olson-Beal suggested that it should match all the

things we are doing, in regards to who is completing the forms (Cooperating Teacher's, Field Supervisor's, and the Student's form should be similar in order to triangulate data). Dr. Nerren said what we currently have does match.

Dr. Vaughan thinks it should be aligned to the 10 InTASC Standards. CAEP also says we have to address those standards.

Dr. Sampson stated that the Program Evaluation by the Cooperating Mentor and the Program Completer Survey must be different for the advanced standards than for the initial standards.

There was discussion about the cooperating teacher evaluating the program rather than what they see the student do. There was discussion about changing the wording and the title of the Program Evaluation by the Cooperating Teacher survey.

The suggestion was made to take the InTASC "stub" and place in front of the items for the Program Evaluation by the Cooperating Teacher. Ex. How well did the candidate....Plan and deliver appropriate instruction? How well did the candidate....Establish a positive environment?

Dr. Qualls suggested taking out the word "program" and "plan" out of the Program Evaluation by Cooperating Teacher.

After discussion about the Program Evaluation Cooperating Teacher, it was determined that it would be more suitable to title this assessment to Candidate Performance Evaluation by Cooperating Teacher

There was discussion about moving from Excellent, Acceptable, or Unacceptable (A, C, and F) to other indicators on the Program Evaluation by the Cooperating Teacher. Dr. Sampson noted that NCATE required three levels and that you had to explain what the difference is between the three.

Conclusion

Dr. Nerren will send out draft Program Evaluation by Completer and Candidate Performance Evaluation by Cooperating Teacher to the committee for feedback by email. When we get to something we can agree upon on these two documents, then she will send out all of the Work Samples for us to review before the next meeting.

Dr. Nerren will send out a scheduling poll for the next meeting.