

Partnering to Develop State-wide Key Assessments

CAEP Conference
St. Louis, Missouri
March 23, 2017

Outcomes of Session

Participants will learn how to

- ▶ develop state-wide key assessments collaboratively with other EPPs
- ▶ increase stakeholder and partner involvement in the development of key assessments
- ▶ implement strategies to develop an employer and completer survey aligned with InTASC standards
- ▶ apply the Lawshe method for content validity

Alabama State-wide Partnership

- Alabama Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (ALACTE)/(AACTE Chapter)

<https://alacte.com/about-us>



- Presenters

- Diana Cheshire, Ph.D. Samford University
- David Crowe, Ph.D. Auburn University
- Rhonda Morton, Ph.D. Auburn University, Montgomery
- Lou Ann Worthington, Ph.D., University of Alabama, Birmingham

Brief History and Timeline

July 2015

Following the release of the CAEP standards, CAEP Coordinators met to discuss their progress on the new CAEP requirements.

Discussions and Concerns:

- What does CAEP require?
- What are we doing to meet these requirements?
- How can we collaborate?

EPPs were then asked to share:

Alumni, Employer, and Exit Surveys
Field/Clinical Evaluations
Professional Dispositions Evaluations
Impact on Student Learning Assessments

Brief History and Timeline

August 2015

- As a result of the July 2015 meeting, we agreed to meet for a full day to focus on CAEP requirements.

Discussion and Concerns:

- Reviewing the eight annual reporting measures
- Discussion of CAEP Standard 4
- Psychometric Requirements for Instruments

October 2015

- EPPs Agreed to work on developing statewide employer and alumni surveys.

November 2015

- EPPs Agreed to work on developing statewide employer and alumni surveys based upon the 21 InTASC Learning Progressions.

Discussion and Concerns:

- Originally progressions were put into rubric form, but we had some concerns about the length and complexity of the rubric
- Sub-group of the committee/taskforce was created to draft an instrument and then solicit feedback from all CAEP Coordinators.

History and Timeline

Spring 2016

- The CAEP Committee met physically and virtually several times to develop a draft of the surveys.
- Draft copies of the employer and alumni surveys were presented to CAEP Coordinators.
- This draft featured a rating scale instead of a rubric format.
- There was general agreement by CAEP Coordinators to move forward with this format.

Spring/ Summer 2016

- Pilot of the instrument conducted

Findings:

- ▶ Survey length appropriate
- ▶ Survey content/terminology clear and understandable (InTASC)
- ▶ Survey responses informative (primarily CAEP Standards 1 and 2)

Meeting with Stakeholders Administrators, DOE, and Others

August 2016

State-wide Stakeholder meeting with:

- ALACTE Representatives from 7 IHEs
- ALSDE Representatives
- School Superintendent's of Alabama Representative
- CLAS Representative
- AACTE Representative - Mark Lacelle-Peterson

Outcomes of this meeting included:

- refinement of survey format
- determination that the ALSDE would disseminate the survey via Survey Monkey
- development of a process for content validation of the surveys

Rich discussion of the surveys and processes took place

Meeting with Superintendents State-wide

August 24, 2016

- ▶ Approximately 25+ superintendents and the former Interim Superintendent of the State Department were in attendance .
- ▶ Background, purpose and description of surveys were discussed with the ultimate goal to use information from surveys to improve teacher preparation programs.
- ▶ Superintendents assured that no identifying information for teachers or principals would be reported and an annual Executive Summary would be provided of the results.
- ▶ Concerns from Superintendents were expressed.
- ▶ Comments from several Board Members were in favor of this kind of data being collected and was very supportive of our efforts.
- ▶ Superintendents were thanked for their time and informed that 7 institutions would pilot the survey this Fall and we would go from there.

Survey Final Development

- ▶ Following the 2-day retreat, Alabama's DOE took the Employer Survey and the In-service Survey back to the State Department and surveys were created using Survey Monkey.
 - ▶ Employer Survey
 - ▶ *ALACTE Survey for Employers of New Teachers*
 - ▶ What other demographic data might be helpful?
 - ▶ In-service Survey
 - ▶ *ALACTE Survey for In-service Teacher*
- ▶ Once the State Department has been given the "OK," the surveys will be published.

Determining Content Validity

- ▶ 1. Establish Content Validity on Items using Lawshe's (1975) Content Validity Ratio (CVR).
- ▶ 2. Reorder questions relative to the CVR.
 - ▶ Subject-Matter Experts rate each of the instrument's items on a 3-point scale
 - ▶ Essential
 - ▶ Useful, but not essential
 - ▶ Not necessary
 - ▶ $CVR = \frac{ne - (N / 2)}{(N / 2)}$
 - ▶ ne - the number of SMEs indicating that the item is "essential"
 - ▶ N - the total number of SMEs in the panel

Demographics Collected

Employer Survey (N=20)

- ▶ Grade Level
 - ▶ Elementary K-5 - 12
 - ▶ Middle 6-8 - 5
 - ▶ High 9-12 - 5
- ▶ Years of Experience
 - ▶ 0-5 Years - 0
 - ▶ 6-10 Years - 4
 - ▶ 11-15 Years - 4
 - ▶ 16-20 Years - 3
 - ▶ 20+ Years - 4
- ▶ Highest Degree
 - ▶ Master's - 7
 - ▶ Ed.S. - 4
 - ▶ Doctorate - 4

In-Service Teacher (Alumni)

- ▶ School Demographics
 - ▶ Rural - 2
 - ▶ Suburban - 2
 - ▶ Urban - 1
- ▶ Years of Experience
 - ▶ 0-5 Years - 2
 - ▶ 6-10 Years - 2
 - ▶ 11-15 Years - 1
 - ▶ 16-20 Years - 0
 - ▶ 20+ Years - 0
- ▶ Highest Degree
 - ▶ Bachelor's - 3
 - ▶ Master's - 0
 - ▶ Ed.S. - 2

Simplified Table of $CVR_{critical}$ including the Number of Experts Required to Agree an Item is Essential (Ayre & Scally, 2014)

Panel Size	$N_{critical}$	Proportion Agreeing Essential	$CVR_{critical}$
10	9	0.900	0.800
15	12	0.800	0.600
20	15	0.750	0.500
23	16	0.696	0.391

Item	N	n _e	CVR _{critical}	CVR _{critical} needed
Learner Development 1.1 - Appropriate and Challenging learning experiences	20	19	0.900	0.500
Learning Differences 2.1 - Design Inclusive learning experiences	20	17	0.700	0.500
Learning Environments 3.1 - Collaborates to build a positive learning climate	20	20	1.000	0.500
Learning Environment 3.2 - Manages the learning environment to engage learners actively.	20	19	0.900	0.500

Item	N	n_e	$CVR_{critical}$	$CVR_{critical}$ needed
State initiatives and programs	20	14	0.400	0.500
Alabama's state assessment system	20	14	0.400	0.500
Communicates with students, parents and public about AL assessment system and initiatives	20	13	0.300	0.500
Integrates programs and initiatives into the curriculum	20	14	0.400	0.500
Alabama Code of Ethics, NASDTEC Model Code of Ethics for Educators	20	18	0.800	0.500

Next Steps

- ▶ Access
- ▶ Timeline
- ▶ Implementation Date
- ▶ Other Surveys and Common Statewide Instruments
- ▶ Committees to Impact Engagement and Innovation

Thanks for the Tireless Work of all Participants including:

- Alabama Association of Colleges for Teachers Education (ALACTE)
- Alabama CAEP Coordinators
- Alabama CAEP Committee
- Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE)
- Alabama K-12 Superintendents and Administrators
- AACTE

Special thanks to:

- Dr. Anna McEwan, Dr. Anna Kozlowski, Dr. Tim Lewis, Dr. Thatcher, Karen Bost, Samford University, UAB, Auburn University, and Auburn University Montgomery, and Montevallo



Questions?

- ▶ Contacts:
- ▶ Dr. Diana Cheshire dcheshir@samford.edu
- ▶ Dr. David Crowe kimbraw@auburn.edu
- ▶ Dr. Rhonda Morton rmoton@aum.edu
- ▶ Dr. Lou Ann Worthington lworth@uab.edu