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5.5 The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved {in a meaningful way} in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.
What Do We Do With Data?

- Give meaning
- Interpret
- Act on that data
- Use it to improve
- Determine the effectiveness of our improvement plan
What Do We Need To Do To Achieve Our Mission?
Considerations

• How do you meet the requirement for data sharing and/or data analysis?
• What is your process of acting on these?
• What do you do to engage ALL stakeholders?
Our Journey Began in 2004 With NCATE Standard 2

- The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.
  - System is regularly evaluated by professional community.
  - Candidate assessment data are systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, & analyzed.

We are using a similar format with the transition to CAEP
Our Philosophy

We had a choice

- Top Down
- or Bottom up?
Process

Assessment Committee

• The Assessment Committee identifies concerns
• The committee organizes the day and the data according to the Shared Values and Beliefs
• The Data Retreat is a “day of directed questions”
Process of the Day

Agenda

• Review of Progress from the Last Retreat
• Focused Review of Data Instruments and the Assessment System
• Focused Review of Data
• Interpretation of Data
• Report Out
• Threads and Trends
• Reports to Assessment Committee
FHSU Educator Preparation Provider (EPP)
2014 Data Retreat – 10am-2pm

Agenda

- Welcome
- CAEP Update
  - CAEP-O
  - Emphasis on Shared Values and Beliefs
  - Timeline to the CAEP Visit
- EPP and Program Data
  - What is the Difference?
  - EPP Data Collection Points
  - Tk20 Update
  - 5 Criteria for Evaluating the Quality of Evidence
- Data Analysis (Breakout Groups)
  - Exit Survey
  - Praxis II Scores
  - Entrance and Disposition Data
  - FPA Data
  - Student Teaching Evaluations
- Group Summary Presentations
- Final Retreat Summary
Each “group” designates someone to take notes and someone to report for their group on recommendations.

Steps:

1. Examine and analyze the data “assigned” to their group.
2. Examine existing plans and recommendations from the past year’s data retreat.
3. Discuss data patterns you observe. Develop hypotheses from observations.
4. Use the Goal Setting Matrix to help determine group priorities from the data.
Critical Questions

• **Question 1**: Is the current data sufficient? Does additional or replacement data need to be added or does some data need to be deleted?

• **Question 2**: Which of the data points your group examined appear to be the “strongest” to inform the Unit? What are the trends? Note data points and a brief explanation.

• **Question 3**: Are we developing a professional educator as defined by the Conceptual Framework element discussed in your group? Support your answers with evidence from the data.

• **Question 4**: Based on your interpretation of available data, what actions should the unit should consider to improve attainment of the CAEP components in the next year?
Initial Programs Retreat

Advanced Programs Retreat

Assessment Committee

Action Steps

Dean’s Office Allocates Resources
Process

- The Assessment Committee then collects all information and summaries to create Action Steps
  - Short Term
  - Long Term
## Next Step

### EPP Improvement Actions Stemming from Data Retreat

#### Unit Improvement Actions from the FHSU Annual Data Retreat – October 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level +</th>
<th>Data Supporting Improvement</th>
<th>Assessment Committee Recommendation November 4, 2004</th>
<th>Accreditation Steering Committee Action*</th>
<th>Council on Preparation of Teachers and School Personnel*</th>
<th>Dean of the College of Education and Technology*</th>
<th>Responsible Party and Written Report Date Due to Dean</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAEP Standard 5

5.5 The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.
Questions?

Fort Hays State University
Dr. Paul Adams       peadams@fhsu.edu
Dr. Janet Stramel    jkstramel@fhsu.edu
Tk20 offers comprehensive solutions for planning, assessment, and accreditation reporting that can be tailored to meet the needs of your teacher preparation program.

What’s more, data collection can be streamlined and integrated with your LMS to seamlessly generate reports for analysis of student learning, field experiences, and program performance.
Fort Hays State University
College of Education & Technology
Data Retreat
November 9, 2007

Small Group Discussion Process

Purpose: To engage in reflective collaboration about patterns we observe from the data and develop hypotheses and recommendations for unit improvement.

Directions: From the data and your discussion today, each group will develop a report that contains recommendations for unit improvement. Include in your report answers to the following questions:

1. Is the current data sufficient? Do the instruments in use tell us enough? Does data need to be added or deleted?

2. Which of the data points your group examined appear to be the “strongest” to inform the Unit about our candidates? What are the trends? Please note the data points and have a brief explanation.

3. Are we developing a professional educator as defined by the Conceptual Framework element discussed in your group? Support your answers with evidence from the data.

4. Based on your interpretation of available data, what recommended actions should the unit consider to improve attainment of your Conceptual Framework element in the next year?

   - Each group will give a short (5-minute) presentation for all participants. Your report should include information and recommendations from the four (4) questions above.
   - Note: Please designate someone from each group to take notes and someone to act as “reporter.”

Thank you all for your time and involvement today!
## Unit Improvement Actions from the FHSU Annual Data Retreat – October 2006
### 2006-2007 Initial Programs Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Data Supporting Improvement</th>
<th>Assessment Committee Recommendation November 4, 2004</th>
<th>Accreditation Steering Committee Action*</th>
<th>Council on Preparation of Teachers and School Personnel*</th>
<th>Dean of the College of Education and Technology*</th>
<th>Responsible Party and Written Report Date Due to Dean</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. B</td>
<td>The KSDE/NCATE Assessment Committee, after three years of data review that the assessment instruments in use need to greater resolution for continued unit improvement. SEE ALSO 2 &amp; 4 from OCT 2005 – NOT COMPLETED. ALSO REVIEW 9 &amp; 12 from OCT 2006 in this Document</td>
<td>Operational definitions should be developed for the CF elements. These will be used to modify/improve/replace current unit measurements for improved unit assessment (e.g. academic knowledge, FPA, Directed Teaching Evaluation, Post Grad Survey) by working groups established by the Dean of COET INDICATOR: Developed set of operational definitions by June 2007. Phase in modified instruments beginning in Spring 2008. IMPACT: Improved Fort Hays State University Quality Assurance System with targeted measures.</td>
<td>4/18/07</td>
<td>4/19/07</td>
<td>4/23/07</td>
<td>Conceptual Framework Committee Ad Hoc Tech. Committee Diversity Committee Pull all operational definitions together—Conceptual Framework Committee</td>
<td>Complete Spring 07 &amp; being refined by the 07-08 committee. Will go the approval process in Nov.-Dec. 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I</td>
<td>There are a range of scores on the FPA when comparisons are made between elementary and secondary programs.</td>
<td>Formalize a training schedule on FPA on a semester basis for secondary and elementary faculty and secondary student. As data become available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Spring 07 the training schedule was set into the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **As a unit measure, there is still a lack of an external comparison of the FPA to the KPA.** | correlate FPA and KPA scores as an external validation of the FPA unit-assessment.  
INDICATOR: Published and distributed training schedule for faculty and students.  
IMPACT: Improved reliability and validity of the FPA. |   | directed teaching calendar as a ongoing training. |
|   |   |   |   |
| **3. I** The KSDE/NCATE Assessment Committee, as a result of discussions during the retreat, determined that the focus group interviews provided limited information and may duplicate some of the EBI items. | Remove the Focus Group instrument from unit measures. Examination of the questions should be done to determine if additional questions should be added to the EBI to capture “essential” items that were covered in the Focus Group (i.e. academic discipline preparation).  
IMPACT: Refinement of data used during the data retreat. | 1 individual | Complete Spring 07  
The Focus Group was officially eliminated. |
|   |   |   |   |
| **4. B** The KSDE/NCATE Committee noted that during discussions of the data there was | A committee should be appointed to determine the groups that should be “tagged” for possible | 5 individuals | In Progress Fall 07 |
|   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>concern about any program differences for partnership students (e.g. para programs, transition-to-teaching) and students receiving coursework through virtual and off-campus venues.</th>
<th>disaggregating for future data retreats and studies.</th>
<th>INDICATOR: Subgroups should be identified by Spring 2007. Data system will be changed to reflect subgroups during Summer 2007. KSDE/NCATE Assessment Committee will select subgroups for Fall 2007 retreat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT: Refinement of data used during the data retreat and improved resolution for program improvement.</td>
<td>5. I PLT Scoring analysis indicates initial candidates are not performing up to state average on written case-study portion of the PLT, especially in the area of professionalism. CONTINUATION FROM OCT 2005</td>
<td>CONTINUATION FROM ITEM 1, Oct 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A faculty workshop for educational psychology and methods instructors (elementary, SPED/ESOL, and secondary) should be offered on how to develop, assess, and integrate into the curriculum, “case studies” of classroom scenarios of the type initial candidates encounter on the PLT and similar types of exams.</td>
<td>INDICATOR: 100% of the methods faculty and educational psychology faculty would be expected to attend.</td>
<td>2 individuals In Progress Fall 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A sample scenario is provided to the unit by each faculty member illustrating the use in the program curriculum by Spring '07. <strong>Impact:</strong> Improvement in PLT scores on written items following the Spring 2008 test-taking period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I</td>
<td>Pre-FPA Data is not being consistently collected from all initial programs.</td>
<td>Representatives from the Assessment Committee and the Standard 1 Committee be formed to determine if the Pre-FPA data is a) necessary, b) if necessary how to expedite collection, and c) representation and correlation of the data for unit evaluation purposes. <strong>INDICATOR:</strong> Formation of committee and report by the Data Retreat Fall 2007. Implemented plans by Spring 2008. <strong>IMPACT:</strong> Improved data set for interpretation and data set for unit improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I</td>
<td>As part of a continuing trend, it is noted that the knowledge of assessment in the classroom is not as strong (e.g. PLT, survey)</td>
<td>Formation of an Ad Hoc Committee to determine what: a) candidates should know about assessment; b) performance-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOT MET</td>
<td>The Diversity Committee is charged with operationally defining the Diversity element of the Conceptual Framework in order to identify critical measures both at the initial and advanced level. Based on the review and operational definitions, the Committee is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity Committee Complete w/ refinement in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>charged to review/suggest/improve/replace current instruments, processes and procedures for ascertaining attainment of the expectations of the Diversity element in the Conceptual Framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requirements: Report by May '06 New measures in place by Fall '06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact: Improved interpretation and measures for reporting diversity by Fall '07.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**11. I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A current measure, Test 2 of the Foundations of Education may no longer be a valid measure for Reflection.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard 1 Committee should consider and recommend the impact of replacing Test 2 of Foundations of Education with the reflection from Teach-In #2 or other measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMPACT: Improved measurement of reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|   | Complete Fall 2007 w/ implementation considerations in progress. Curriculum map being developed. |

**12. I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Continuation of 4 from October 2005. The retreat committee was unable to interpret collected data in a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation of 4 from October 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An Ad Hoc Committee should be formed and charged with operationally defining the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee appointed and operational issues being defined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
meaningful manner as the committee was unsure what the data meant in the context of the conceptual framework element of technology.

CONTINUATION

Technology element of the Conceptual Framework in order to identify critical measures both at the initial and advanced level. Based on the review and operational definitions, the Committee is charged to review/suggest/improve/replace current instruments, processes and procedures for ascertaining attainment of the expectations of the Technology element in the Conceptual Framework.

Requirements:
A preliminary report should be reported to the Unit in May 2006. A final action report is to be completed by Spring 2007, with implementation by Fall 2008.

CF = Conceptual Framework
PLT= Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching
FPA= Fort Hays Performance Assessment
Checkpoint 1= Occurs at Transition Point 1 and includes the following measures: Disposition Assessment, Reflective Essay, and Program Review Report on Content Knowledge
Checkpoint 2= Occurs at Transition Point 2 and includes the following measures: Disposition Assessment, Program Review Report on Content Knowledge, and Program Review Report on Pedagogical Knowledge
+Advanced (A), Initial (I), Both (B)
*A - Approve recommendation with minor or no changes
AM - Approve recommendation with major changes; NCATE Steering Committee Rewrites
NA – recommendation is informational and not an action statement, or is deemed to not merit further consideration