May 2012 Data Conference Report
Fall 2011-Spring 2012 Data

Name(s):____Marva Solomon, Chris Purkiss, Sandra Maxedon, Charlene Bustos, Linda Lucksinger, Ann Bullion-Mears, Donna Gee, Marilyn Eisenwine

Program/course:__EC-6, SPED Educator Preparation Program

Program data:

1. After reviewing your Fall 11-Spring 12 data, what changes will you make toward program improvement for Fall 2012?

We analyzed our students' test data and decided that it was most important to target Domain 3 on the PPR test. We examined the competencies in Domain 3 to learn that much of the focus of the domain is on implementing assessment and feedback. For program improvement we plan to add a field component to RDG 3335 that will give EC-6 and SPED students more opportunities to have practice-based opportunities for lessons, assessment and feedback.

We also noted the scenario type questions on the tests and decided to add test-taking "warm-ups to ED 3303 and ED 3332.

Due to recent college restructuring, EC-6 and SPED students will have access to PPR training sessions offered by professors in the C&I department. These sessions will be voluntary for ASU teacher candidates.

Other program improvements that are newly implemented or upcoming are as follows:

- We continue to lobby for disaggregated testing data so we know exactly which competencies within domains are problematic for our students.

- We are changing our Assessment 2 to an ACEI standards-based rubric for scoring content area lessons rather than Block I course grades. This should be a better picture of our students' content knowledge. The new rubric will be in place by Fall 2012.

- We have added our Assessment 3, lesson series planning, to Taskstream for the first time this spring.

- We collected Case Study Data for Assessment 6 on Taskstream for the first time this spring.

- We collected Student Teaching Data from the University Supervisors in Taskstream for the first time this school year (2011-2012.)

- We used Taskstream to launch an email survey to collect confidential teacher data for the first time this school year (2011-2012.)

Disposition data:

1. Please review the 2011-2012 Disposition Data for your program/courses taught. What discrepancies do you notice between self and supervisor/professor assessments? To what do you attribute this discrepancy (if any)?

We noticed that at the beginning courses level, students tended to rate themselves higher than their professors/supervisors. We thought that the use of N/A as a scoring choice was confusing and it is being changed to "rarely" to clear up some of the misconceptions. We plan to talk at August 2012 faculty meetings about the rating scales so that all professors/university supervisors can be on the same page in regards to what each rating point means.

Also, beginning candidates are probably unaware of "what they don't know they don't know." Since a lot of the dispositions are targeted toward teaching behaviors, most candidates in early courses are only able to respond accurately to areas like "timeliness." Even dressing appropriately can be misjudged by newer students since the standards for dressing for going to college classes and those for going to work at a school is can be different.

As of right now, Taskstream cannot disaggregate data by demographics such as whether the responder is EC-6, 4-8, or SPED, so it is hard to target the programs that need the most help with improving dispositions. We hope to have this ability in the Fall of 2012.

2. Please list areas in which candidates performed exceptionally well. Why do you think this happened?

University Supervisors report that our candidates do well in the area of Professional Practice. We think this happened because our candidates, by the time they are student teachers, are used to being in schools, used to expectations that they are on time, and dressed professionally. We also emphasize a collegial demeanor in the Block I courses.

3. Please list areas in which candidates performed in the lower range. What is the possible cause? What changes might be necessary in your program/course to improve this result?

Our candidates performed the lowest concerning involvement with families. Our Block 1 courses and Student Teaching courses lack opportunities to interact with families due to polices of the local school district. We thought that the expectation that candidates act "on behalf of students" was particularly problematic for our students in terms of the lack of opportunity to advocate for students.

We believe that we can improve programs/courses by clarifying and standardizing meanings and scoring across all the professors and to do a better job of emphasizing the importance of dispositions with candidates.

4. Overall summary of Disposition findings:

Overall, we concluded that:

- We need to discuss Dispositions in all of our classes, throughout our program. We still find a percentage of candidates who are unfamiliar with the dispositions and how they should be implemented within the actions of a teacher candidate in both the college and public school classrooms.

- We need wider implementation of Incident Reports. Candidates throughout the program need to be more familiar with consequences for tardiness, absences, inappropriate dress, etc. In an August 2012 faculty meeting, we will review Incidence Report implementation.

- Our faculty will look at dispositions once again in Fall of 2012, as well as review dispositions scores and definitions. We will discover how each professor is interpreting the descriptions and come to a consensus so we can more standardize our results. Also, we will determine what the dispositions should look like in early classes, and how they might look different in later courses and student teaching.