

MEMORANDUM

Date: 8 May 2002

To: Khaula Murtadha, Chris Leland, Beth Berghoff,
Pat Rogan and Linda Houser

From: Barbara Wilcox

Re: Reports from Benchmarks I and II

Last Thursday, May 2, we conducted the first “to scale” pilot of Benchmarks I and II in our unit assessment system. Faculty teams reviewed all the students completing Block I this spring semester (approximately 100) using Benchmark I, and scored nearly 120 Benchmark II tasks (with nearly 90 of those tasks scored by two readers).

Please appreciate that these reports are not perfect. They did not execute as planned.

Benchmark I Report. I believe that some of the review teams did generate approximations to an “action plan” for problem candidates. By selecting Reports/Benchmark I Reports/Individual from the database menu, you can call up what prescriptions might have been generated; of course, you will also see what dimensions of the rubric were the source(s) of the candidate’s difficulties. Both should assist the faculty who meet with the candidates about expectations for change/remediation/improvement.

Benchmark II Report. We did not begin to approach the development of “action plans” for the candidates submitting the

Benchmark II task. We did figure out that, in the future, Benchmark II should be conducted in several distinct steps. In the meantime, by selecting Reports/Benchmark II Reports/Individual (and then selecting those individuals on "the list") you can print out the elements of the task that were deemed problematic for him/her. I think the consensus was that the BII candidates with "negative indicators" should be referred back to the relevant faculty or teaching team to generate a prescription since those faculty would be more knowledgeable about the candidates. This is a process decision, of course, and the first time we have had to implement the process with a large group of candidates.

Michaels, Rae and I have done a reasonably thorough debriefing that has identified both issues related to the capacity or functioning of the database and issues related to our organization or staging of the assessment tasks. Some of the issues are small and easily remedied internally while others are more complex and will, of necessity, involve Steve Raymond. We three plan to meet in June to review our progress, and we plan a later meeting that will involve Steve. I have included a copy of our notes so that you have a sense of what the issues are.

Negative Indicator Student List

Assesment Term - 12

Thursday, May 02, 2002

Student	Knowledge Negative Indicators	Written Negative Indicators	Interaction Negative Indicators	Disposition Negative Indicators
[REDACTED]	None	None	1	3; 4; 5
[REDACTED]	None	None	3	None
[REDACTED]	None	None	None	8; 9
[REDACTED]	None	None	None	8; 9
[REDACTED]	1	1	3	None
[REDACTED]	None	None	None	8
[REDACTED]	None	None	None	3
[REDACTED]	1; 3; 7	1	None	None
[REDACTED]	1; 3; 6	1	1; 3	8
[REDACTED]	1	None	1	3
[REDACTED]	None	1	None	None
[REDACTED]	3	None	None	4
[REDACTED]	3; 4; 5; 7	None	None	None
[REDACTED]	None	1; 2	None	None
[REDACTED]	None	None	None	3
[REDACTED]	None	1	None	None
[REDACTED]	None	None	None	7; 8; 9
[REDACTED]	None	1	None	None
[REDACTED]	3	None	None	None

Student	Knowledge Negative Indicators	Written Negative Indicators	Interaction Negative Indicators	Disposition Negative Indicators
[REDACTED]	6	None	None	7; 8; 9
[REDACTED]	None	None	None	7; 8; 9

Debriefing from May 2 live test of the UAS

Issues/Recommendations re: Benchmark I

Reduce the number of comment boxes eliminating the ones associated with each "dimension" and leaving only the "overall summary" box that prints out with the individual student report. DEVELOPERS THINK THAT IT WILL PROVE IMPORTANT TO HAVE A "COMMENT BOX" ASSOCIATED WITH EACH DIMENSION THAT IS BEING RATED. RATHER THAN MAKE THIS CHANGE, WE WILL EDIT THE DOCUMENTATION TO EXPLAIN THAT (A) COMMENT BOXES ARE USED TO "TAKE NOTES" ABOUT PROBLEMS SO THAT THERE IS A SOMEWHAT DETAILED RECORD THAT CAN BE CALLED UP IN ANY FUTURE REVIEWS AND (B) IF THERE ARE NO PROBLEMS, THE BOXES REMAIN EMPTY.

There is no need to convene a separate meeting to complete Benchmark I. Teaching teams can simply complete the task when they meet to reconcile grades at the close of the semester. If they all gather in one office with access to the database, it will be a piece of cake.

- Will have to establish a deadline by which the assessments must be completed.
- Will want some mechanism to monitor which instructor fail to participate in the task.

Issues orienting faculty

- To ensure their familiarity with the rubric
- to "dispositions" focus and to stress this is separate from course grades
- to the "go/no go" decision that the benchmark invites

Populate the "evaluators field" automatically with the instructors assigned to relevant Block/Option choices. This can be imported from Rae's database.

Benchmark II Issues

Must be able to

- identify candidates as Elementary, Secondary, or All Grades and
- import the content major of all Secondary and All Grades candidates.

Have to get Benchmark II reports to work!

Problems populating the "Evaluators" pull-down will all potential raters. Group does extend beyond the Block II teaching teams for both the Elem & Sec groups.

Need clear instructions to students re: deadlines for submission (and mechanism to get feedback to instructor about whether all papers were received if Benchmark was introduced as a "must do" item for a course). May be able to send e-mail reminder to candidates in relevant Block/Options.

Needs to be conceptualized as a multi-stage-task: (1) training & rating the submissions; (2) entering the data; (3) generating prescriptions/"Action Plans."

Need to ensure that Sec papers are read by at least 1 reader in the content area.

General Issues

Most fundamental issue is developing a logical taxonomy of "programs" [tantamount to redesigning the upper right side of the Student Information page]. BW HAS DRAFTED ONE POSSIBLE SCHEME AND WILL REVIEW WITH BB ON MAY 8. THIS IS IMPORTANT BECAUSE IT WILL NECESSITATE CHANGES IN RAE'S DATA BASE AND SET A LOGIC THAT WILL BE REFLECTED IN THE SOE WEB MATERIALS, THEIR REPORT OF PROGRAM OFFERINGS TO IPSB, ETC. WE SHOULD COME TO INTERNAL AGREEMENT BEFORE ENGAGING STEVE RAYMOND IN THE CONVERSATION.

Need to describe or map out the overall process for each benchmark (e.g., the development of Action Plans for candidates with identified concerns and the designation of a faculty member responsible for following up on the plan). PART OF THIS "PROCESS DESCRIPTION" WILL INCLUDE INSTRUCTIONS ABOUT WHICH REPORTS TO RUN WHEN AND HOW TO DISTRIBUTE THEM.

Need to describe the larger context for decision-making re: individual students (e.g. reviewing GPA, alerts [now "comments"], performance on BI).
Develop pull down menus for action plans.

Keeping track issues: can we have a report that lists candidates for whom NO rating was entered. Such a "no assessment entered" report would enable a check to see that no target candidates had been missed/that all candidates had submitted the required materials.

Problem of students with the same last name. Add text to documentation remind raters of the importance of including first name on rating sheet.

Lots of format improvements on reports, including

- Making the report menu and the report titles match
- Making tab labels on the "Student Screen" match the title areas (e.g., Student Teaching" rather than "Clinical Experience"

Re-organize student e-mail list to enable selection

- By program [see first bullet above]
- By block/Option
- By "negative indicators" reports for
 - Benchmark I
 - Benchmark II

Change buttons to say "close" not "cancel."

Troubleshoot so that Praxis I data from Rae's database transfers automatically to UAS. Praxis II scores will have to be entered manually by <designate individual>.