

Data Use Report Form
Teacher Education Unit, Eastern Mennonite University
 COVER SHEET

Group Reviewing the Data (Check one):

- ☐ Department
☐ Program Faculty
☒ **Committee on Teacher Education (COTE)**
☐ Assessment Committee

Date of Meeting: **November 16, 2010**

Name of Person Submitting Report: **Don Steiner**

- ☐ UG Department Chair
☐ Program Coordinator
☐ COTE Co-chair
☒ **Director of MA Education**
☐ Unit Assessment Coordinator

Data Set/ Date Assessment was administered: **MA 1st (2008-09) & 5th year (2004-05) Alumni Survey/ data set from Spring 2010**
 (Example: Final Student Teaching Evaluations/Spring 2009)

Instructions: Data are reviewed in the unit to make three types of decisions: (1) to make changes in the unit/department/individually in order to increase effectiveness; (2) to continue with something that is working; and (3) to monitor over a longer period of time. This form is completed by one of the following leaders of data-driven decision-making: program coordinator, department chair, MA Director, assessment coordinator, or co-chair of the COTE.

1. Please complete the form.
2. Save an electronic copy or pdf to the appropriate Data Use Report Form folder under UAS on the network.
3. Insert paper copy into appropriate Minutes binder.
4. Send an e-copy or pdf to the Assessment Coordinator.

Schedule of Data Review

Reviewer Codes:

U=Unit (typically COTE) D=Department (UG or MA) P=Program faculty

Data Set: CIRCLE ONE	Schedule of Review (Reviewer): CIRCLE ONE	
Unit Operations Survey	Sept/Oct (D)	Nov by COTE (U)
1st/5th Year Alumni Surveys	Oct (D)	Nov by COTE (U)
SPA/Endorsement area data*	May (P)	August/Sept (D or U for curriculum change decisions)
Field Experience: Profiles of Performance, Part E	May (P)	August/Sept (D or U for curriculum change decisions)
Final Student Teaching Evals*	May (P)	February (D of all programs)
Key Assessment Data (MA)	Sept (P)	Sept (D-MA or CORP for curriculum change decisions)

*Data will be reviewed every year; decisions will be made every other year to ensure that the

sample size of data is large enough to be considering change.

Guidelines for Data Interpretation and Use:

1. Assess the quality and adequacy of the data. Considerations include:
 - a. *Sampling methods, representativeness of sample, and sample size.* Is this a large, random and representative sample from the appropriate population? If not, what biases, outliers, or other limitations have impacted the inferences drawn from these data?
 - b. *Reliability and validity.* Is there evidence of reliability (e.g., stability over time, internal consistency, inter-rater reliability)? Are the inferences drawn from these data supported by other evidence?
 - c. *Purpose of the data collection.* Is the decision congruent with the intended use of these data?
2. Maintain the anonymity and confidentiality of individuals; do not use names or other data that will reveal identity in this report.
3. Interpret data objectively, without regard to personal experience and knowledge of individuals, programs or the unit.
4. Consider alternative interpretations and solutions before proceeding with a course of action.

Data Use Report Form
REPORT SHEET

1. Based on the data reviewed today, what evidence or trends appear to indicate strengths of the program, department, or unit?

- Strengths?

MAED Alumni and administrators continue to report high rates of satisfaction with EMU's Master of Arts in Education program. Graduates report in the *Alumni Survey* and in *Exit Interviews* that they demonstrate a strong commitment to apply ideas gained in their studies to their educational settings.

- Describe the data that demonstrate these strengths.

Quantitative data from 2010 Graduate Teacher Education annual survey for '08-09 indicated on Item 36 (*Overall Program Effectiveness for '08-09*) a score of 4.5 on 5.0 scale which suggests a strong affirmation that the Master of Arts in Education program is meeting their expectations and needs. In addition, the goals of the conceptual framework produced the following mean scores based on a 5.0 scale. Scholarship 4.0; Inquiry 4.4; Professional Knowledge 4.3; Communication 3.9; Caring 4.5; Leadership 4.9. A premium is placed on achievement of the leadership goal. The 4.9 score indicates that candidates are emerging from the program with more confidence in their abilities to provide leadership among colleagues in their respective educational settings.

Qualitative data from 2010 Graduate Teacher Education annual survey for '08-09 and from the Exit Interview process indicated strong satisfaction with emphasis on reflective practice and practical skills application with a strong knowledge base preparation. They stated professors were accommodating, professional and knowledgeable in their subject matter, and strong in their leadership preparation. They indicated the action research process was challenging and provided a basis for ongoing decision making in the classroom (See p. 14 of annual survey).

- Do any other data sets confirm or dispute these strengths? Explain.

Overall data sets confirm strengths as identified above. All the items listed as strengths remained strengths from previous cohorts. One area for further review and monitoring is some ambiguous data regarding candidates use of inquiry and critical thinking to inform decision-making which impacts the leadership goal that is considered especially important within program.

2. Based on the data reviewed today, what evidence or trends appear to indicate that improvements are needed in the program, department, or unit?

- Improvements needed?

Three specific areas emerged as potential weaknesses in the 2010 Graduate Teacher Education annual survey for '08-09. These are as follows:

- (1) Lack of integration of principles of action research**
- (2) Use of constructivist frame to create learning environments**
- (3) Empowerment of students and their families through collaboration and appropriate communication with others.**

- Describe the data that demonstrate the need for improvement.

Selected data from items 14-16 Inquiry; items 17-21 Professional Knowledge (See pp. 10 & 11 of the 2010 Graduate Teacher Education annual survey for '08-09) suggest that not all candidates integrate principles of action research into their classrooms, use constructivist

frames or feel the program prepares them to empower students and their families. Several responses appear to be outliers.

- Do any other data sets confirm or dispute this need for improvement? Explain.

Data sets present some ambiguity in regard to whether items 1-3 as identified above need further review. However, anything that hints of as an area of improvement should be addressed. These items will be highlighted as goal areas for further monitoring and emphasis.

3. What type of decision is made, based upon this review? *Check one box and explain the decision and rationale.*

☐ No change is needed: data indicate that program/department/unit is effective.

☒ **The following change is needed. . . because. . . (Describe the change and the data that support this decision.)**

As a result of feedback from 2010 Graduate Teacher Education Annual Survey for '08-09 core class syllabi will be reviewed to for how candidates might integrate action research principles into their respective classroom. A review of the Exit Interview questions to further assess the integration of action research principles theme will also be conducted. EDCC 501 Constructivist Environments/Cultures of Change will be reviewed in terms of meeting current MAED goals and EDCC 531 will be reviewed for how the theme of *work with school, family, and community connections in more explicit ways* might be incorporated more extensively.

☒ **The data will be monitored until 2012 Graduate Teacher Education Annual Survey results are available.** Data from the Candidate Exit Interview will also be reviewed at that point in time to further measure any indication of weakness.

☐ **Need for more information.** Additional data, information, or re-analysis that you need for decision-making: **None at this time.**

4. Describe a prospective process for change, including timelines (if appropriate), and progress indicators.

A review of the Exit Interview items will be conducted by CORP spring 2010 to include more items regarding how AR is incorporated into candidates' teaching.

Syllabi from EDCC 531 Social and Ethical Issue will be evaluated spring 2011 for incorporation and emphasis on content material and assessments regarding *empowerment of students and their families through collaboration and appropriate communication with others.*

EDCC 501 Creating Cultures of Change will be reviewed by fall 2011 by CORP and instructors teaching the course.

5. Date that I saved this file/pdf to the *G-drive: UAS/Decision Doc Charts/year/your* folder:
January 10, 2010

6. Date that I sent an e-copy/pdf of this report to the Assessment coordinator: **January 10, 2010**

Electronic or scanned SIGNATURE of REPORT WRITER: **Don Steiner, Director of the Master of Arts in Education Program**

Date of this Report: **January 10, 2010**