

CAEP Unit Assessment Committee Meeting

May 10, 2016

Members present:

Dr. Jannah Nerren, Dr. Barbara Qualls, Dr. Pauline Sampson, Dr. Josephine Taylor, Dr. Liz Vaughan, Dr. Deborah Buswell, Dr. Kathy Sheriff, Dr. Heather Olson-Beal, Dr. Christina Sinclair, Dr. Carol Wright, and Dr. Tracey Hasbun,

Members absent: Dr. Jared Barnes, Dr. Lesa Beverly, Dr. Cala Coats, Dr. Marc Guidry, Dr. Frank Mullins, Dr. Chris Sams, Dr. Nancy Shepherd, Dr. Mark Turner

Discussion and Edits to the Unit Candidate Work Sample Rubric 2016:

Small edits were made to the Unit Candidate Work Sample Rubric 2016. (Mechanical errors.)

Impact on PK-12 Learning

It was discussed how to identify Exemplary vs. Acceptable in Impact on PK-12 Learning. It was suggested to include the words “**Multiple**, excellent examples.....” for the Exemplary column. It was also suggested to include the words “**absent or ineffective** lists, charts,....” to the Unacceptable column.

Future Plans

It was suggested to include the sentence “The plan adequately matches the targeted objective” to the Adequate column.

Other Discussion:

Members were reminded that this is for initial candidates only and will be piloted in the fall.

Dr. Sampson noted that the elements that elements such as Pre-Assessment, Implementation of Plan, and Post-Assessment worked for the Superintendent Program but not the other elements. She wants it to match her program better than it has in the past.

It is important that the students know what Exemplary, Acceptable, and Unacceptable looks like but it is equally important that the faculty have a clear understanding. For example, it was suggested to have faculty to discuss examples of Exemplary, Acceptable, Unacceptable elements of the Unit Work Sample. (Being trained how to use the rubric; both the students and the faculty.)

Dr. Olson-Beal voiced concern regarding the differences with the work sample rubric and grading rubrics not matching. There was extensive discussion about this. Dr. Nerren noted that it is important for faculty to not equate course grades with unit assessments. Dr. Buswell made a point regarding the difference between teaching and grading (geared toward the individual students) and unit assessment

(geared toward evaluating our programs for improvement). It was discussed to remove the assessment score visibility off the LiveText rubric for unit assessments so that students only see the Exemplary, Acceptable, or Unacceptable categories/scores and do not worry or misunderstand that the unit assessment score affects their course grades.

It was discussed that preparation to use the new unit assessments should be made available to faculty at a one-time, open forum meeting for those that would be involved in this. This meeting should be documented as evidence that the unit equips faculty to effectively use the rubrics in order to obtain meaningful data. Discussion should include explanation as to how all unit assessments were created as well as including some examples of products from the past to serve as exemplars.

The Candidate Work Sample Rubric will be piloted in fall 2016 with revisions (if necessary) prior to implementation in the spring 2017 semester.

There was extensive discussion about the need for a connection between the academic content areas and Secondary Education. The disconnect that some content area programs feel with the SED program underscores why it would be helpful to have some exemplars to show at the forum.

Conclusion

The committee was ready to move forward with piloting the Candidate Work Sample Rubric once Dr. Nerren makes the changes noted today. It will be piloted in the fall 2016 with initial teacher preparation programs, after which the committee will solicit feedback from programs to make any necessary revisions.