

## **Notes on Meeting of Advanced Programs at June 4<sup>th</sup> Retreat**

Present:

Peter Griswold	M.Ed. in Special Education, Learning Disabilities
Hilary Wilder	M.Ed. in Curriculum and Learning, Learning Technologies
Rochelle Kaplan	M.Ed. in Curriculum and Learning
Heejung An	M.Ed. in Curriculum and Learning, Learning Technologies

We brought sample aggregated data on several assessments to the meeting and discussed assessments in terms of what class scores told us.

The following is a summary of our discussion and conclusions.

### **1) Assessment 1 and Assessment 5, M.Ed. in Curriculum and Learning**

Rochelle shared these assessment results.

These assessments are common to all concentrations as measures of comprehensive content and pedagogical knowledge (Assessment 1 – Literature Review and Problem Statement chapters from master’s thesis) and of impact of candidate on performance of P-12 students (Assessment 5 – Methods, Results, and Discussion chapters of master’s thesis).

Assessment 1 covers research and applied knowledge in the candidates’ areas of specialization and takes the place of a standardized test which is not available for any of the concentrations.

While each concentration may have additional assessments that would work for Assessment 5, the fact that the thesis is common to all concentrations is an advantage in terms of program integrity and common outcomes.

Heejung made the following observations:

While this is a valid measurement and in the current situation it might be the best option, it is possible that these chapters may not always be a valid measure for “Impact on student or client learning.” This is because most likely our students tend to measure their students learning outcomes with only single short-term treatment effects, with a very small number of students; However, by conducting their own study and writing this entire thesis (chapters 3-5), I think that students are more likely to think about and understand "how they teach" which would impact their future teaching. In this sense, I think this thesis assignment is really valuable as a source of information about candidates impact on P-12 students.

### **What we learned:**

It was decided that while the rubrics need a bit of refinement to be more sensitive to specific standards related to each assessment, they both reflected reasonable methods for collecting data. Specifically it was recommended that the rubric elements be fine-tuned to better measure (be more closely aligned) with the specific competencies we believe are related to Impact on Student or Client Learning/Development.

It was also observed that assessments of target, acceptable, and unacceptable on rubric elements was inconsistent across raters.

Plan for Action: In the fall, the concentration coordinators should work on the rubrics for both of these assessments to operationalize outcomes and align them more closely to COE Advanced program outcomes and to SPA standards for impact on P-12 students. Reliability measures of scoring also need to be obtained.

### **3) Assessment 6 – M.Ed. in Education, Learning Technologies concentration**

Hilary and Heejung shared their process for refining this assessment.

We discussed a rubric for Assessment 6 for the LT program which is administered in CIEE 605. Hilary had created the rubric to look at how well our candidates can model and facilitate appropriate social, ethical, legal, health, etc. behaviors when using technology. Unfortunately, in the fall 2007 semester, the assignment we were hoping would show this turned out to need work. Heejung was able to revise the assignment to better get at what we wanted to see in our candidates for this semester and so instead of all candidates getting "U", we now have the majority getting "A" with one or two getting "T" and I think one getting "U." So, we were able to revise the assignment to better get at what we wanted to see in our candidates.

Before the Spring, 08, Heejung had students pose questions pertaining to the topic that was assigned. The problem was that most students tended to pose questions that could not really lead to "helping other teachers (modeling)," or sometimes their questions could not get their classmates thinking about the implications of their assigned topic, as it related to education.

Since Hilary created the rubric for this specific discussion session this past winter with "targets" (regardless of the topic) that were associated with helping other teachers, in addition to understanding the social, ethical, legal issues, I prompted my students in that way to develop better questions. That's why many students got an A or T.

#### What we learned:

- As instructors, we first have to clearly know what we want our students to learn and achieve, which needs to be closely derived from the standards. Likewise, this should be clearly reflected in the rubric. We should also guide students to achieve those targets in the rubric.

- Secondly, during the spring, 08, the reason why some of my students only got an A or U (instead of a T) was because some of the questions posed by their classmates didn't lead them to answer in the way in which they could get a "target." This result has led me to think that maybe I should review the posed questions before other students post their responses on the Blackboard discussion forum.

#### Plan for Action

Continued review of the rubric and candidates' responses in relation to expected assignment outcomes and how the course attempts to meet those outcomes.

**3) Assessment from Special Education, M.Ed.**

Peter shared one candidate's scores from an assessment used in the LD program. We talked about how he could use a similar rubric model as was developed for the LT Assessment 6 and incorporate some of the outcomes that appeared in Assessment 5 for the M.Ed. in Education.

**What was Learned:**

NCATE expects to see improvements in areas where candidates earned U and A

**Plan for Action**

He concluded that the LD masters program needs to improve candidates' abilities to make recommendation based upon standardized tests, informal surveys, and prescriptive teaching.

**4) Six Outcomes for Advanced Programs**

In the fall, the Advanced Programs committee will need to work on operationalizing its 6 performance outcomes, particularly those related to diversity and dispositions.