**Assessment Committee Meeting
Monday, October 20, 2014**

*Members Attended: David Scales, Lee Nickles, Patricia Bricker, Bridget Ryan, Kelsey K. Marie-Line Germain, and Renee Corbin*

*Members Absent: Kim Winter,*

*Visitors: Carrie Rogers, Kelly Kelley, Catherine Carter*

Renee welcomed the new members to the committee and reviewed Assessment Committee By-laws for the new members and visitors to understand the responsibilities of the Assessment Committee.

***Catherine Carter*** *-* ***Use of the Praxis II for the EE2 in Secondary Education Programs***
Last Spring 2014, the program decided to use Praxis II scores (which does require constructive response writing) to satisfy the state’s EE2 Depth of Content Knowledge criteria. The program is indifferent since they are not certain if the state is requiring students to complete the Praxis II during their last year in school or their first year of teaching. The program currently has only 3 intern II’s in English and they have already taken and passed the Praxis II.

***Kelly Kelley - Service Learning (handout provided)***Inclusion Education program requires 50 hours of active services learning from one or more organizations. “Active” service learning includes hands-on service with people with/without disabilities. I In working with Center for Service Learning, they have assisted in networking and helping find locations for students to complete service learning. There are three designated services learning courses which spreads out the requirement over their course load instead of cramming it all in during the last semester. The completion of service learning hours accumulates into points. If students receive 100 points and have a 3.25 GPA they can apply for the Lilly Community Engagement Award. The monitoring of service learning hours, including the reflections and signature forms will be housed in TaskStream within the undergraduate program folder. The service learning platform is still a work in progress and suggestions/comments are welcomed.

***Carry Rogers - Individual Growth Plan (IGP)***The IGP is an assignment for students to complete during seminar for students to identify two areas of professional growth, one technology, and the other an area of the candidate’s choosing based on the North Carolina’s Teaching Standards. Currently, Carrie reported that it does not provide reliable information. Elementary Education is proposing changes in order to assess the actual implementation of their Individual Growth Plan. Carrie made a motion at a program meeting to modify the IGP and the program members would like to think about creating something better. Renee reported that she went back through the Leadership Council minutes to determine the origin of the IGP. The IGP was initiated in 2007 to replace the technology portfolio and prepare students for professional development in public schools. CAEP doesn’t want to see technology separated but they want to see all standards integrated with technology. As part of the continuous improvement process, professors are recognizing that the IGP is inefficient and want to create it an effective assessment for student achievement in planning for professional growth. Currently, how the IGP is being implemented is creating some redundancy with the established formal assessments and other EE’s throughout the internship process. Before deleting this requirement, we need to find out who uses this for a form of assessment. Renee will contact the secondary programs to see if there is anyone using this information.

The meeting concluded at 5:00 PM.

**Follow Up from Renee on 10/27/14**

As promised, I checked with the secondary program coordinators to determine how or if they use the IGP to provide the committee with more information.  I have only heard from Art, Math, English, and Social Sciences and none of them currently use the IGP data.  I also decided to send out an email to Fall 2013 graduates to determine if they have used their WCU IGP in professional development at their school during their first year of teaching.  We really don’t know if it is being used so I wanted to find out if anyone would share.  So far, I have only received three responses. One used the IGP word for word in their first year of teaching professional development document, while the other two candidates did not. Those candidates had to use the designated SIT goals for their school systems.

We can’t really base our decisions on three responses since we don’t know if this is a representative sample, but it is interesting to know.  I think the next step is to take the information that we have and submit to the PEC next week.  Barb has added the IGP to the agenda for discussion.