Programa de Preparación de Maestros de Escuela Secundaria

Universidad de Puerto Rico
Recinto Universitario de Mayagüez
Decanato de Asuntos Académicos
PROGRAMA DE PREPARACIÓN DE MAESTROS DE ESCUELA SECUNDARIA

HOJA DE ASISTENCIA

Reunión: **3ra reunión comité timón CAEP**
Fecha: **Viernes, 18 de marzo de 2016**
Lugar: **C 206**

Recurso: **Dra. Carmen Bellido**

Hora: **2:30 pm**

Nombre	Firma
1. Carmen M. Bellido	[firma]
2. David Padilla	[firma]
3. Diana Rodríguez	
4. Grisel Rivera	Excusada
5. Iris Figueroa	[firma]
6. Janette Ferrer	[firma]
7. José A. Figueroa	Excusado
8. José E. Pérez	[firma]
9. José Ferrer	
10. Keith Wayland	[firma]
11. María C. Figueroa	Excusada
12. Rebeca Orama	Rebeca Orama
13. Silvestre Colón	[firma]
14. Rosa Román	

TAREA: Instrumentos para someter a revisión de CAEP
Early Evaluation Instruments

Ver CAEP Accreditation Manual - pg 27

Favor seguir las instrucciones y preguntas establecidas en la siguiente Tabla 2: Early Evaluation of Instruments y marcar en la lista de Evaluation of Assessments by BOE Team. Luego llenar el fomulario de **Evaluation of Instruments UPRM EPP for Submission to CAEP review**

I.

Table 2: Early Evaluation of Instruments

Provider submits	CAEP reviews

Three years in advance of an accreditation site visit, the provider submits its assessment and survey instruments that are used across all discipline-specific content areas to CAEP for review.
 	
The provider:
• Requests "shells" or report templates for submission to AIMS, indicating semester and year of the self-study report submission
• Submits assessments, scoring guides, and surveys in the appropriate AIMS shell
• Includes the following items in the submission:
  ○ Instruments created by the provider (such as student teaching observation protocols used during clinical experiences, survey data, teacher work samples, portfolios, candidate exit surveys, employer surveys, and other common measures of candidate competency)
  ○ A chart that identifies proprietary assessments
  ○ Scoring guides for these instruments
  ○ A table that identifies which items on assessments or surveys provide evidence for individual CAEP standards, and, in those states making the feedback program review option available, indicates the alignment with state standards
  ○ Responses for each assessment and survey to these three questions:
    ▪ How was the assessment developed?
    ▪ How will the quality of the assessment/ evidence be determined?
    ▪ What criteria of success have been established or measured for scoring guides and survey data?
• Completes the submission for the fall semester by October 1; spring submissions by April 1
	CAEP provides appropriate AIMS reporting shells, depending on the separate program review options available under the CAEP-State agreement that is effective where the provider is located.
	
	CAEP trains reviewers for this task, following the assessment, survey, and scoring guides included in the *CAEP Evidence Guide* (January 2015 edition).
	
	CAEP returns an evaluation to the provider. When the review is fully phased in and reviews are conducted three years prior to completion of the self-study report, there will be sufficient time for providers to revise instruments and collect one or more years of data.

II. **Quien va a someter cuales instrumentos:**

Instrumento	A cargo de:
Assessments & Scoring Guides Instrumento de Observación de Practica Rubrica de Planes	Canny y Keith Rebeca, José P
Surveys End of Program Alumni Directors Cooperative Teachers	Rebeca y José P
Rubrica de Filosofía Educativa	Grisel, Rebeca, José Fe

Para trabajar con estos instrumentos deben evaluarlos primero con el CAEP INSTRUMENT RUBRIC que se provee para hacerle los cambios pertinentes antes de someterlos. Cada instrumento tiene que tener claramente la alineación a los estándares de INTASC y los estándares profesionales del DEPR.

Evaluation of assessments by BOE Team

1. HOW THE ASSESSMENTS ARE USED

- Is the point in the curriculum at which the assessment is administered clear (e.g. first year, last year, etc.)

☐ At entry, exit, mid-point, etc.?
☐ While the emphasis should be on exit, are there examples of assessments or assignments at other points?
☐ Are the curricular points an identified part of a clear developmental sequence?

NOTE: This information would be part of the documentation that the assessments are relevant.

2. HOW THE INSTRUMENTS ARE CONSTRUCTED

- Are assessments aligned with CAEP Standards and not treated as a substitute for Standards? If so, then:

☐ the same or consistent categories of content appear in the assessment that are in the Standards;
☐ the assessments are congruent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skill requirements described in the Standards; and that
☐ the level of respondent effort required, or the difficulty or degree of challenge of the assessments, is consistent with Standards and reasonable for candidates who are ready to teach or to take on other professional educator responsibilities.

NOTE: Information on these aspects of assessments can be used by the provider to demonstrate construct or content validity and relevance.

3. HOW THE INSTRUMENTS ARE SCORED

- Is there a clear basis for judging the adequacy of candidate work?

☐ A rubric or scoring guide is supplied.
☐ Multiple raters or scorers are used.
☐ There is evidence that the assignment measures what it purports to measure *(NOTE: this information would be part of the evidence for construct validity or content validity and relevance) and that results are consistent across raters and over time (NOTE: this would be evidence of reliability).*
☐ If good performance on one attribute can make up for poor performance on another, the EPP self-study explains the implications in terms of readiness to teach.
☐ If weights are used, they are explained or justified. What do the performance levels represent?
☐ There are three, four or five distinct levels, and they are clearly distinguishable from one another.
☐ Levels are constructed in parallel with one another in terms of the attributes and descriptors used.
☐ For each level of performance, attributes are described that are related to actual classroom performance; attributes are not simply mechanical counts of particular attributes.
☐ Levels represent a developmental sequence in which each successive level is qualitatively different from the prior level.
☐ Headings clearly describe which levels are acceptable and which are not acceptable.
☐ It is clear which level represents exit proficiency (ready to practice).
☐ A "no data" or "unobserved" category is included.

NOTE: Information in this category would help documents that the evidence is actionable—it is in forms directly related to the preparation program and can be used for program improvement and for feedback to the candidate.

- Are the levels described in language that is readily understandable?

☐ The levels should communicate to broad audiences including educators, stakeholders, and school partners.

☐ Any special terms used are clearly defined. Is there evidence of efforts to achieve consistency in scoring?
☐ Multiple scorers are used.
☐ Consistent training of reviewers is present.
☐ Evidence of consistency such as inter-rater reliability is supplied.

NOTE: This information can be used by the provider to document reliability of the assessment.

4. HOW THE DATA ARE REPORTED (Esta parte no es necesaria para el Early Evaluation Instrument Task)

- Are data reported?

☐ Data are needed to show that the assessment is actually in use.
☐ Data distributions (e.g. a cross rubric levels, disaggregated by area of specialty / licensure preparation and by demographic groups) are reported and interpreted.
☐ The EPP uses the data and its interpretation to suggest changes in the preparation program.
☐ All candidates who completed the assessment are included or the cases included constitute a representative sample.

NOTE: this information would be appropriate for the providers to use in demonstrating that the data are representative.

- How are results aggregated for reporting?

☐ Scores are reported in terms of a percentage distribution of candidates scoring at each level or a mean with a range and not just a single central tendency (e.g. mean).
☐ Are there comparisons?

b) Surveys

Surveys allow EPPs to gather information to use for program improvement and can provide valuable insights on candidate preparation from a broad spectrum of individuals. EPPs often use surveys to gather evidence on candidate, graduate, and employer satisfaction as well as the perceptions of clinical faculty of candidates' preparedness for teaching.

The quality of the evidence provided by surveys is directly linked to the quality of the survey with an emphasis on the accuracy, reliability and validity of the results. To this end, surveys should be carefully designed, systematically collect data related to the topic of the survey, measure the property the survey is claimed to measure, and produce data that are clear and usable. If ratings are based primarily on a candidate self-report, they should wherever possible be triangulated or supported by other evidence. The box below contains a list of guideline questions that Visitor Teams and the CAEP three-year-out reviews will follow.

☐ The EPP explains how it determines that an answer is "good enough".
☐ Comparisons should be criterion based.
☐ The EPP describes other kinds of comparisons that are used (e.g. fixed standard or target, normative, improvement over time, comparison with peers in a state or region or nationally).

NOTE: The information from reporting is linked with the actionability principle since it determines how closely the information aligns with particular preparation programs or experiences and with groups of candidates.

5. INFORMING THE TEST TAKERS

- Is there a mechanism for supplying feedback?

☐ To candidates.
☐ To the EPP for purposes of continuous improvement.

☐ Are candidates given information about the bases on which they will be scored/ judged?

NOTE: This information can be used by the provider as part of their documentation that assessments are fair.

1. HOW THE SURVEYS ARE USED

Are the purpose and intended use of the survey clear and unambiguous?

Is the point in the curriculum at which the survey is administered clear (e.g., first year, last year, etc.)? ○ At mid-point, exit, pre-service, in-service, etc.?

☐ Are surveys being used at different points so comparisons can be made? (For example, are candidates surveyed at the completion of the program as well as one or two years after completion?)

NOTE: This information would be part of the documentation that surveys are relevant.

2. HOW THE SURVEYS ARE CONSTRUCTED

☐ Documentation should include evidence that prior research was used to develop the content and format of the survey questions.
☐ The survey was pilot tested or other wise tried out in advance. Are the individual items or questions in the survey constructed in a manner consistent with sound survey research practice?
☐ Questions should be simple and direct; lengthy questions should be avoided.
☐ Questions should have a single subject and not combine two or more attributes.
☐ Vague language or language that can be interpreted in more than one way should be avoided; if frequency questions (e.g. "occasionally") are included, they should be defined in numerical terms (e.g. "3-5 times").
☐ Questions should be stated positively.
☐ Questions should maintain a parallel structure throughout the survey.
☐ Leading questions should be avoided.
☐ Response choices should be mutually exclusive and exhaustive.
NOTE: Information of this type would be a part of the documentation that surveys are valid in terms of construct or fact validity and they are relevant.

3. HOW RESULTS ARE SCORED AND REPORTED

☐ What efforts were made to ensure an acceptable return rate for surveys? Has a benchmark been established? (NOTE: This information can be used by the EPP to document representativeness)
☐ What conclusions can or cannot be determined by the data based on return rate? Is there a comparison of respondent characteristics with the full population or sample of intended respondents?
☐ How are qualitative data being evaluated?
☐ How are results summarized and reported? Are the conclusions unbiased?
☐ Is there consistency across the data and are there comparisons with other data?
NOTE: This information can be used by the EPP, in part, to document reliability.

4. SPECIAL NOTE ON SURVEYS OF DISPOSITIONS

☐ If surveys that address professional dispositions are included, does the EPP provide an explanation/justification of why they are included and how they are related to effective teaching and impact on P-12 student learning?

☐ Judgments of dispositions are anchored in actual performance and are demonstrably related to teaching practice.

NOTE: This information would be related to actionability.

☐ Language describing dispositions is conceptually framed well enough to be reliably inferred from an observation of performance.

5. INFORMING SURVEY RESPONDENTS

• Is the intent of the survey clear to respondents and reviewers?

☐ A cover letter or preamble explains what respondents are being asked to do and why.
☐ The sequence of questions makes sense and is presented in a logical order.
☐ Individual items or questions are grouped under appropriate headings and sub headings.

c) Case Studies

The CAEP Commission's final report includes an appendix with 79 illustrative examples of evidence across the five Standards and annual reporting recommendations24. A quarter of those illustrative examples describe exhibits such as case studies, documentation of particular program features, or demonstrations of the consequences of practice. Among them are examples in which the EPP would develop and evaluate new measures, such as these:

- Assess the effects of a change in admissions that define criteria for "grit," persistence and leadership abilities, as an "innovation"– *for Standard 3 on candidate quality and Standard 5 on continuous improvement/quality assurance*;

- Pilot a new assessment constructed to show developing candidate proficiencies for use of an assessment to enhance learning during clinical experiences–*for demonstration of one InTASC standard in CAEP Standard 1 on content and pedagogical knowledge*; or

- Conduct a case study of completers that demonstrates the impacts of preparation on P-12 student learning and development–*for part of the evidence under Standard 4.* Evidence of this kind is generally most useful in generating hypotheses or ideas, and is less useful or applicable in confirmatory analysis. In assembling such evidence, moreover, the standards that apply to research for peer review and publication cannot be implemented rigidly or in all situations.

• Are clear and consistent instructions provided to respondents so they know how to answer each section?

☐ Instructions are provided where needed as the respondent progresses through the survey.
☐ Instructions are written in simple, easy-to-understand language.
☐ Clear references document the time frame or context that the respondent should consider (e.g. "over the last year" or "in all my classes").

NOTE: This information could be a part of a self-study documentation that the survey is fair

Evaluation of Instruments UPRM EPP for Submission to CAEP review

Submited by (name of professor/s):
Date:

Instrument Tittle:

Type of document evaluated:
- ☐ Assessment instrument
- ☐ Scoring Guide
- ☐ Survey

Instrument type:
- ☐ Student teaching observation protocols
- ☐ Rubric Plans
- ☐ E-portfolios
- ☐ Teacher Work Sample
- ☐ Candidate End of Program (Exit) Survey
- ☐ Employer (director) Survey
- ☐ Cooperative Teacher Survey
- ☐ Educational Philosophy Rubric

How was the assessment developed?

How will the quality of the assessment/ evidence be determined?

What criteria of success have been established or measured for scoring guides and survey data?