

Members Present: Dean Vivian Fueyo; Drs. Bonnie Braun, Alejandro Brice, Malcolm Butler, Olivia Hodges, Cynthia Leung, Terry Rose, Zafer Unal; Ms. Jennefer Khattabi and Ms. Rebecca Rhoden Ogletree

Welcome and Announcements

Rebecca Ogletree called the meeting to order and introduced the agenda for approval. She announced that Dean Fueyo had excused George Roy from his duties on the Assessment Committee due to his commitment on the Quality Enhancement Plan committee for SACS.

Minutes

Minutes from the September committee meeting were approved as revised.

Annual Schedule for Reporting to the Assessment Committee: Changes to the Format

In order to engage the committee members in more meaningful dialogue regarding quality assessment and how the results impact what we do to meet the needs of our candidates, Dean Fueyo explained that updates on previous items will be presented in written format on the final meeting agenda. Dr. Butler asked about monthly reports and was told that these are still due as per the annual schedule, but the reports will be submitted electronically to Ms. Ogletree. Ms. Ogletree will send reminders of the monthly reports per the annual schedule for reporting to the assessment committee. Dean Fueyo and Ms. Ogletree will be meeting with faculty members when reports are due to the assessment committee.

Dean Fueyo announced that summary data reports will now be made available to the college. Donna Knudsen, Director of Graduate Studies, has agreed to provide data each semester on new admissions as well as continuing students.

ACTION ITEM – Ms. Ogletree will send reminders of monthly reports per the annual schedule for reporting to the assessment committee.

Other Business

AP 5 Rubric Discussion

Dean Fueyo reintroduced the topic of revising the AP 5 rubric. She asked the committee to consider how to reword the elements of the rubric to reflect more than just acceptance of a culture. How do we get candidates to appreciate the cultural contributions the students and families bring to the learning experience? The committee examined the prompts to see how each can be revised to help students understand the college's intent.

The discussion moved into sharing what is happening in various classrooms regarding conflict resolution, behavior change projects, mediation, etc. It seems that when responding to the rubric prompts, the candidates often deal with issues only if they arise in the classroom. Dr. Rose said he sees the same in candidate responses to AP 6 regarding classroom safety...if it occurs in the classroom, candidates gain experience but it's not necessarily developed otherwise.

Dr. Leung suggested there may be a semantic issue in that candidates may not have an in-depth understanding of the language regarding diversity. She shared the idea of teaching tolerance to our candidates and helping them to develop the vocabulary as well as the

understanding of diversity. Dr. Leung went on to state we could provide or have candidates create a reference list of articles and resources to use as teaching tools...help candidates create a database they can use in class.

Dr. Rose suggested looking at openness, inquiry, and support as listed in the rubric's introductory statement. He suggested we begin our revisions by coming up with a clear idea of what we want to see in the classrooms—start with the end in mind.

The dean discussed various strategies candidates include in their CDN reflections for AP 5, and she said the third element of the rubric is where the biggest problems occur: identify, design, and implement strategies that foster acceptance and conflict resolution.

Dr. Butler observed we have three candidate learning outcomes and three items in the rubric. Each strand, he stated, seems to address a learning outcome except for the outcome of social justice and advocacy.

Dr. Braun shared the concern that candidates often have no choice, or very little choice, in curriculum during their internships. They must take advantage of transition times to use curricular resources. The following questions then arose:

- What kind of purposeful decisions can candidates make to impact how they interact with their students and how students interact with one another?
- What would you like to see? Perhaps there is an issue in the classroom...how do you deal with it?
- What if none of the resources in the classroom reflect a student's culture? What artifact would you want to see?

It was suggested the committee may begin with:

5.E.3 - Identify curricular, community, and instructional resources to teach about advocacy of social justice.

It was agreed the committee will return to this discussion at the next assessment meeting. Dr. Butler reminded us that if we want to build on Dr. Rose's idea of what we want candidates to do, we need to get a clear picture of what we believe; we need to continue the discussion among ourselves. Dr. Brice then reminded the committee that the purpose is to get candidates to embrace diversity, not simply accept it. Therefore, committee members need to be talking about what we want candidates to be doing in the classroom.

The decision was made to bring this discussion to the faculty meeting on October 22 to allow more input and to gather from a larger pool of experience.

ACTION ITEM – During the October faculty meeting, present the rationale for changing the AP5 rubric and engage the faculty in efforts to enhance the rubric.

Plans for NCATE's Continuous Improvement

Dean Fueyo shared the options for continuing visits:

- Transformation Initiative (TI) visits are for colleges that have been working with improvement for numerous years. Institutions participating in TI are primarily the larger, land-grant colleges with a deeply embedded culture of student and faculty research in the schools.
- Continuous Improvement (CI) allows institutions to engage in continuous improvement between on-site visits. Colleges select an NCATE standard to move from "Acceptable" to "Target." The college describes the work undertaken to move to the target level and discusses plans for continuing improvements. For other standards, the college provides a summary of the most significant changes and subsequent improvements related to the standard.

It was agreed upon that the college will follow the CI option for NCATE reaccreditation.

The dean shared the comparison for the target/acceptance rubric on Diversity (COMPARISON of “ACCEPTABLE” and “TARGET” RUBRICS of the 2008 NCATE STANDARDS by Dr. Marilyn Feldmann, Coastal Carolina University, Conway, SC) and explained that she will address this at the next faculty meeting. Dean Fueyo explained that it’s not the data collected but rather how the data is used to improve what we do and what we offer our candidates. How is it consistent with our values? For example, there is a greater representation of Hispanics in COE than in the university; there are fewer African-American students than in the university, but we’re increasing this percentage. As a recruitment incentive, the college provides the Florida scholarship for minority students.

ACTION ITEM – Following our October faculty meeting, the dean will send Dr. Feldmann’s “Acceptable/Target” comparison document to the entire faculty. Together, the faculty will select the standard to move toward target.

Assessment Committee Meeting Dates for the Semester

November 22, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

December 10, 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.