

A-State EPP Initial Programs Assessment Committee
Minutes, November 4, 2016

Present: Voting members: S Whiteland, M Gao
Ex Officio: A Bowser, ME Spence, J Grymes
Also attending: MJ Bradley, L Bryant

Dr. Bradley began the meeting by reviewing the purpose of the committee and its charge:

1. Review and analyze unit assessment artifacts at the initial level
2. Review/evaluate the assessment system as it applies to initial programs
3. Using InTASC as a state framework, devise an implementation plan
4. Create an Initial Programs Procedures Sheet
5. Complete a unit assessment report and send to the Head of the Unit by May 31, 2017. The report will include areas of strength and/or areas of improvement.

Dr. Bradley stated that both Programs and Unit (EPP) assessment will coordinate with the A-State Assessment Office. She shared a chart used at the last NCATE visit which provided the checkpoints for programs and identified their assessments.

Review of Data

Internship Summative

- Should the data be represented by 8 weeks or reported just once per intern
- What is needed for this data to be more meaningful; would inclusion of the rubric data from the formative provide more informative data
- The Summative data as provided does not provide much detailed information
- What patterns evolve from the data

Analysis

- While there is overall very little difference among the means of the different domains, Classroom Management tends to be the lowest and Professional Responsibility tends to be the highest. Is it possible that the documentation required for scoring Professional Responsibility supports the higher score in that domain?
- Discussion occurred about breaking the EPP data down by campuses. The Committee consensus was that programs should report back to the unit a review of data based on campus differences, but unit data would not be addressed as such. Grymes will provide a copy of the data and analysis sent forward for the HLC report earlier this semester.

Praxis II Content

- Looking across the EPP, programs with some concerning results would be Mid Level, Languages, Mathematics, English.
- Programs need to provide this committee (And CAEP Standard 1) with interventions implemented to improve Praxis scores and the results of those interventions
- What unit recommendations might this committee make about Praxis II scores across programs?

Committee members were reminded they represent either departments (EICSE, HPESS, TE) or programs (secondary/K12). They are responsible for sharing information with their constituents.

Mary Elizabeth will conduct a doodle poll to determine a time for the next meeting.