1. **Welcome and Introductions:** Dana Edward welcomed the group including new members Tim Fitzpatrick (Music) and Pam Hardman (English). All members introduced themselves.

2. **Review of Minutes, Meeting of February 29, 2008:** Minutes of the meeting of February 29, 2008 were reviewed. It was moved by Timothy Fitzpatrick and seconded by Bruce Larson to approve the minutes; motion passed with one abstention.

3. **Items from Commission Members:** LeaAnn Martin asked members about the timing of senior evaluations and indicated the PEHR department wants them to be completed before internship. An evaluation is done by the teacher certification office to determine if candidates will have all their education and endorsement program coursework completed before the internship. Susan Cahill further explained that a plan of study signed by the academic department earlier in the program can be used by the teacher certification office to verify completion of the endorsement program. However, if a substitution or deviation from the plan of study has occurred the candidate is directed back to the department for a final signed evaluation form. The teacher certification office does not verify degree major requirements so this could continue to be an issue for the degree application. It was agreed that efforts should be made to direct candidates to apply for the degree and complete the senior evaluation before they start internship even if the degree application deadline is later.
4. **AY 2008-09 Charge: Key Assessment of Pedagogical Competencies and Data Collection:**

Dean Salzman joined the meeting and explained that the state’s revised residency teacher program approval standard (Standard V. Knowledge and Skills) adds the requirement for institutions to provide evidence of K-12 student performance. Woodring is collecting data on student performance and candidate performance within each teacher preparation program.

The state has also adopted a process for the assessment of endorsement programs. Content knowledge is assessed by the WEST-E test but there needs to be at least one piece of evidence specific to the content area and tied to an assessment that is pedagogical. Dana Edward added that departments should look to key assessments that are reflective of the endorsement’s core competencies in content pedagogy. The method for grading the assessment is flexible but it must be the same for all candidates in the program. The assessment should be within a content methods course and all the instructors for that course will need to use the same grading method for the selected assessment. Departments need to choose at least one assessment and stick with it for awhile. We are required to have three years of data by the next accreditation visit in 2012.

Tim Fitzpatrick pointed out that picking an assessment too early in a candidate’s program wouldn’t account for improvement later. An assessment in a music practicum later in the program might be more appropriate. It was noted that departments may choose multiple assessments that demonstrate progress over time. Dana Edward offered to help departments identify an assessment(s). The remainder of the meeting was devoted to two examples of content pedagogy assessment and a review of the data collection process.

5. **Social Studies Endorsement Assessment and Data Collection:** Bruce Larson and Kimberly McDaniel shared some assessments that are already in place for the Secondary Education Social Studies methods course. Bruce explained that he chose assessments at various decision points within the course. This way he could look at performance and chart progress. He has found this especially insightful when problems come up later. One key factor that has been identified from this process is the importance of the unit that focuses on long-range planning. Candidates who struggle with this unit also tend to be the candidates who struggle with internship.

Bruce assesses a series of four lesson plans within the Social Studies methods course that are later revised by the candidate and compiled in a long-range unit plan. The lessons are graded on a simple “did not meet standard/met standard/exceeds standard” rubric but the instructor’s anecdotal notes are also entered in the system and have provided the best feedback.

A handout was provided on Standard V elements and criteria. On the back of the handout is a listing of core competencies for social studies instructional methodology. Bruce noted that knowing where these competencies are addressed helped him to determine when and where in the program it was appropriate to collect data. Several of the competencies are evidenced within the internship and information is already being collected on these via the pedagogy assessment. Bruce identified others that are within the methods course and used this knowledge to assigned data collection points. The assessment doesn’t need to be the most important test or project that the candidates do but it should be indicative that the candidate
met the standard. How the results are recorded should reflect this also. However even a very complex assessment can be “boiled down” to met standard or did not meet standard.

Kimberly McDaniel can show departments how to input the information and help them decide on a grading method. The input method is through Web4U. She provided a handout outlining the five information points that need to be defined to set up an assessment within a course and make it available in Web4U. Departments need to identify a minimum of one assessment but they can do more.

Kimberly showed the group some data that is already on Web4U. Faculty would sign into Faculty Services/Assessment then choose the course and CRN. A list of candidates who are registered in the course is displayed with an entry block across from the candidate’s name.

Results can be collected over time if more than one assessment is input. Progressive data can be compiled and sorted by course and/or candidate and/or year. The same assessment can be given at different points in the program and results analyzed for program improvement.

Currently reports would need to be ordered from Kimberly, future enhancements to the system would enable departments to run their own reports. Information can be reported cumulatively, summarized or disaggregated.

6. **Health and Fitness Endorsement Assessment Presentation**: LeaAnn Martin and Derrick Mears presented an extensive overview of the Health and Fitness program assessments via PowerPoint presentation. The Health and Fitness program is focused on learning objectives, followed by teaching opportunities, feedback and analysis of a candidate performance. Learning objectives are incorporated into unit plans that are then taught by the candidates to other candidates or to younger students within a practicum setting. Feedback and analysis are based on instructor observation, student critiques and candidates assessment of their own presentations that are recorded on video or handheld audio devices. In practicum they also get feedback from the cooperating teacher.

During their first year in the program candidates build upon skills learned in each block and end the year working with Elementary age students. In year two candidates develop much longer and more advanced unit plans and work with middle and high school students. As a final project each candidate is given a different activity unit which they develop, teach, get feedback on, analysis, revise, etc. These units are then copied and shared with other candidates so everyone leaves the program with a binder of unit plans covering various activities.

The detailed PEHR Student Outcomes Assessment Plan including assessments and resulting data may be viewed through the following link: http://www.wwu.edu/pehr/Physical_Education/PE_ProgramOutcomesAssessment.pdf

7. **Distribution of New WEST-E Test Summary and Framework**: Tabled to the next meeting.

8. Meeting was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.