OSWEGO
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Instrument Quality Study – Highlights Include Partner Feedback

The School of Education created assessments within the quality assurance system were analyzed to ensure the validity and reliability of the assessments and associated rubrics. The study involved examining each assessment with the "CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessment." Criteria from the framework were addressed according to the assessment categorization (i.e., surveys will address content and quality but not validity).

Common assessments across the School of Education included in this documentation are:

- Disposition Assessment
- Student Teaching Evaluation

Consistent with the "CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments," each assessment included an analysis of 1) Administration and Purpose, 2) Content of Assessment, 3) Scoring, 6) Survey Content, and 7) Survey Data Quality. Dr. Sandy Bargainnier, Professor, Health Promotion and Wellness, conducted this analysis. Important to note that Dr. Bargainnier was not involved in the development of these assessments; her analysis was sought due to this and her extensive experience with assessment.

For assessments not categorized as a survey detailed analysis of 4) reliability and 5) Validity was completed. Dr. Michael LeBlanc, Chair of the Counseling and Psychological Services department, conducted this analysis. As Chair of the School of Education Assessment Committee, Dr. LeBlanc participation in developing the disposition assessment and the Alumni, Employer, and Exit Survey. His expertise in statistics was sought to judge the validity and reliability of EPP common assessments.

The following pages contain details relating to data validity, where the School of Education sought feedback from our partners. The entire instrument study was submitted with the CAEP self-study report as supporting evidence.

Disposition Assessment

5. Data Validity

The disposition assessment is used throughout all programs in the EPP (i.e., Initial and Advanced) and is completed as a self-assessment by candidates and by faculty, cooperating teachers, or other site staff during clinical experiences.   The study was completed over the fall 2019 and spring 2020 semesters, starting with revising the instrument based on our conceptual framework and InTASC standards. Once the instrument was revised, an invitation to provide feedback was sent to 15 participants, including all five department chairs within the EPP, three program coordinators (School Psychology, School Counseling, and Educational Leadership), three student teaching supervisors, one practicum faculty, and three cooperating teachers. The feedback was organized and lead to discussions with the Associate Dean for Assessment and Accreditation, Chair of the Assessment Committee, and Curriculum and Instruction Student Teaching Coordinator. Changes based on this feedback included more inclusive language to include all of the EPP's programs. For example, "Demonstrates an Asset-Based View of Learners" was changed to "Demonstrates Strengths-Based View of Learners."

Following revisions based on feedback, a survey was sent to a panel of professionals in the field to determine if each criterion was essential. The panel consisted of 36 professionals, including School District Leaders, School Building Leaders, Certified Classroom Teachers, School Counselor, School Psychologists, Occupational/Physical Therapists, and Speech-Language Pathologists. Panelists reported employment as a teacher or other school professional at 1-5 years (11%), 6-10 years (13%), and over ten years (76%). Additionally, certified teachers in the panel reported the level and subject of their classroom. The level spanned Elementary through High school, and the subject's reports included Math, Physics, and Science.

In the survey, panelists were asked to rate each criterion as "essential," "useful, but not essential," and "not necessary." Results from the survey were analyzed using the Lawshe Content Validity Ratio (CVR) equation: CVR- (ne-n/2) / (n/2), with ne as the number of panelists indicating the criteria was essential. The minimum or critical value established by the Lawshe method is based on the number of the panelist, for 35 panelists, the minimum ratio would be .31. Results from the analysis are found in Table A: Content Validity Ration for Disposition Assessment. For each of the criteria, the CVR is well above the minimum or critical value.

Table A: Content Validity Ratio for the Disposition Assessment

Criteria	# Essential	CVR
1. Demonstrates Commitment to Ethical Practice	35	.94
2. Demonstrates a Strengths-Based View of Learners	33	.83
3. Demonstrates High Expectations for All Learners	36	1.00
4. Demonstrates Commitment to Developing Supportive Learning Environment	35	.94
5. Demonstrates Commitment to Authentic Learning	33	.83
6. Demonstrates Commitment to Identifying and Addressing Bias in Resources	32	.78
7.Demonstrates Commitment to Reflective Practice	32	.78
8. Demonstrates Commitment to Examination of Personal Biases	34	.89
9. Demonstrates Commitment to Professional Learning and Growth	36	1.00
10. Demonstrates Commitment to Collaboration	35	.94
11. Demonstrates Respect for Diverse Families	36	1.00
12. Demonstrates Commitment to Advocating or Learners	33	.83

Student Teaching Evaluation

5. Data Validity

The revised student teaching evaluation is used throughout all initial programs in the EPP (i.e., undergraduate and graduate) and is completed by faculty supervisors and cooperating teachers. The study was started in spring 2019 with the identification of the need for a standard student teaching evaluation across the unit. Within the EPP, each program had a content-specific student teaching evaluation mapped to the professional standards of their field. Nine content-specific student teaching evaluations had question sets ranging from 5 to 45 and rating scales ranging from a 3-point scale to a 5-point scale; data from these nine evaluations are useful at the program level but led to questions of the ability to aggregating data at the unit level. Faculty members decided to create a standard student teaching evaluation grouping similar items across all programs into a standard unit-wide student teaching evaluation. Content-specific criteria will continue to be assessed with an addendum that includes measures mapped to program-specific professional standards.

The revised student teaching evaluation is based on InTASC standards and is organized into four major categories: Planning, Instruction, Assessment, and Professionalism. The revised student teaching evaluation was deployed in fall 2019 for the first quarter of student teaching. The faculty supervisors were given the revised student teaching evaluation during orientation and asked to share with cooperating teachers to provide feedback. Feedback was positive and mostly focused around the increased clarity of criteria and descriptors. However, faculty supervisors indicated that the point value associated with the rating scale (0-2) caused some discomfort for themselves and cooperating teaching, and at their recommendation, the point value was changed to 1-3.

Following revisions based on feedback, a survey was sent to a panel of professionals in the field to determine if each criterion was essential. The panel consisted of 29 professionals, including Certified Classroom Teachers, School Counselors, School Psychologists, and Speech-Language Pathologists. Panelists reported employment as a teacher or other school professional at 1-5 years (17%), 6-10 years (28%), and over ten years (55%). Additionally, certified teachers in the panel reported the level and subject of their classroom. The level spanned Elementary through High school, and subject's reports included Family and Consumer Sciences, Spanish, Music, STEM, English, Math, and Science.

In the survey, panelists were asked to rate each criterion as "essential," "useful, but not essential," and "not necessary." Results from the survey were analyzed using the Lawshe Content Validity Ratio (CVR) equation: CVR- $(n_e - n/2) / (n/2)$, with n_e as the number of panelists indicating the criteria was essential. The minimum or critical value established by the Lawshe method is based on the number of the panelist; for 25 panelists, the minimum ratio would be .37.

Results from the analysis are found in Table C: Content Validity Ration for Student Teaching Evaluation. Three criteria were below the minimum or critical value: Plans with Prior Assessment Outcomes in Mind, Plans for Technology Integration, and Participates in Professional Learning Opportunities. Faculty members will discuss these criteria and expectations for candidates.

Table C: Content Validity Ratio for Student Teaching Evaluation

Criteria	# Panelist	# Essential	CVR
Plans with Learners' Development in Mind	28	28	1.00
Plans with Learners' Strengths, Interests, and Needs in Mind	28	25	.79
Plans Inclusive Learning Environment	28	27	.93
Plans for Learners' Language Development	28	24	.71
Plans Individualized Support for Learners with Identified Needs	28	27	.93
Plans Using Content Standards and Curriculum	27	27	1.00
Plans with Prior Assessment Outcomes in Mind	27	18	.33
Plans Aligned, Sequenced, and Varied Learning Experiences	27	26	.93
Plans for Technology Integration	27	13	-0.04
Plans for Assessment of Learning	27	25	.85
Facilitates a Positive Learning Environment	26	26	1.00
Facilitates a Safe Learning Environment	26	26	1.00
Engages Learners Meaningfully and Equitably	26	24	.85
Communicates with Clarity, Using Multiple Representation, and Academic Language	27	20	.48
Makes Connections between Prior and Current Concepts of Study	28	24	.71
Promotes Critical Thinking	27	25	.85
Attends to Literacy Development	26	24	.85
Monitors Learning and Adjusts Instruction	26	26	1.00
Assesses Learning in Varied Ways and throughout Instruction	26	25	.92
Provides Feedback on Performances	26	24	.85
Analyzes and Interprets Assessment Data	27	25	.85
Participates in Professional Learning Opportunities	26	17	.31
Reflects on Teaching and Learning	26	23	.77
Collaborates within the School Setting	27	21	.56
Communicates with Families	27	20	.48