College of Education and Allied Professions - Assessment Committee
September 28, 2009, 1:30pm in Killian 218

Present:

Renée Corbin, Chair; David Byrd, student; Dan Grube, Interim Associate Dean; Justin Menickelli, faculty; Sarah Meltzer, faculty; Jamel A. Ruff, faculty; Krista Scronce, student; Michael Shallock, faculty; Adam Zimmer, faculty; Linda Raxter, Recording.

Handouts – on file:

- Agenda
- February 26, 2009 minutes
- TaskStream Summary of Performance for Authors in DRF: 2008 Teacher Education Candidacy
- TaskStream Summary of Performance for Authors in DRF: 2008 Pre-Internship
- TaskStream Summary of Performance for Authors in DRF: 2008 Program Completion

Welcome:
Renée welcomed everyone. February 2009 minutes were approved without changes.

Ultimate Survey and Qualtrics:
The university has stopped using Ultimate Survey and switched to Qualtrics. Renée has put in an application for training and account approval through the IRB office, however she is concerned that this may not happen in time to conduct the program evaluation survey for the undergrads at the end of the semester. She requested ideas for a plan B in case the Qualtrics survey cannot be implemented this semester. Suggestions included using WebCat or using a paper and pencil scantron evaluation in class. Sarah Meltzer did recognize the difficulty in making this a forced assignment on WebCat.

Justin asked if a similar survey is being conducted among the graduate students. At this time the Graduate students are not included, though this certainly may be an option in the future.

BETA Test of M5-336 personality questionnaire and Educators Personal Beliefs about Diversity inventory:
Admission to the Teacher Education Program previously required an interview and autobiography to evaluate student dispositions. However, with increasing numbers of students this became too labor intensive. Last semester a pilot program was conducted to replace these measures with the M5-336 Personality Questionnaire and the Educators administered via TaskStream.

Sarah Meltzer recounted student response to these proposed Candidate evaluation tools. Students liked having in class since many had questions about how to use TaskStream. This is the first experience most of these students have had with TaskStream. The students did feel that the 336 questions were too much and that many were redundant. The primary downside was that
the evaluations took the entire class period. Andrew did mention that there are shorter versions of the M5 available. Dan suggested that may be an option in the future but at this early stage we want to be more comprehensive as this is one of the few tools available to measure dispositions. Renée also mentioned that these dispositions data are needed for accreditation.

Students who miss the class for the evaluations will still need to complete the surveys on their own for acceptance into the Teacher Education program. Renée explained that students will not be disqualified based on the questionnaires, though those falling outside of a certain standard deviation will be invited to discuss their results.

**TaskStream Costs:**
Renée reported on efforts to use student technology fee money to pay for TaskStream subscriptions instead of making students purchase a personal subscription in addition to these University fees. However with the tight budget situation these funds were used to maintain ITS staff.

**Review of 2008-2009 TaskStream Portfolio Results:**
Renée reviewed the TaskStream data for 2008-2009. Evaluations show how student performance matches the goals of the conceptual framework. The majority of our students were rated at or above standard. Dan asked if this information was available by program. Renée said that it was and had already been sent to the programs. Data are also evaluated along the lines of race, gender and comparing main campus students with distance students as these three comparisons will be required for our next accreditation visit.

There is also a student evaluation of the host teachers. Our students consistently report that they were treated well in the classroom.

**Assessment Plan Review and Discussion:**
The university requires all colleges and programs to have an assessment plan. Renée has noticed that these tend not to change from year to year and asked for ideas about how she can support the process to make the plans a little more substantial. Renée does send out data reports to the various programs, but these are usually a year old at the May 15 deadline. Renée asked if requesting two smaller reports during the year might be better. However Justin felt that one report with all the available data would be better, though he had not seen assessment plans for other programs. Dan suggested that Renée find a few good examples and share these. Jamel did mention the importance of these plans for accreditation and suggested that faculty need to be more aware of this. Dan did mention that with revisioning the new exit criteria will be on a pass/fail basis so the College will need to develop additional tools for more specific assessment.

**College Alumni Survey Process 2010:**
Renée wanted committee members to start thinking about the Alumni Survey that is conducted every five years. The next survey will be next year. She will be sending out copies of the last survey to department heads for review.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 PM.