

MEEES Content Validity and Training Update

MABEP
Spring 2019

MEES Teacher Candidate Assessment

- ❖ Modeled after the state tool used to evaluate practicing teachers: Missouri Educator Evaluation System
- ❖ Implemented as the performance assessment for teacher candidates in the Fall of 2018
- ❖ The cut score of a 24 was set for the 2018-2019 year
- ❖ A component of the Educator Preparation APR
- ❖ Consistent training materials were available to all preparation programs

Fall Process 2018

- ❖ Revised MEES Rubric and Triad Training Implemented

Feedback Gathered:

- Triad Training Survey completed by EPP representative
 - Content Validity Survey completed by seven pedagogy experts per institution
 - Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor Survey completed by Fall18 CTs & USs
- ❖ Presentations to MACTE, MOTEP, MACCE, MABEP

Spring Process 2019

- ❖ January 28 - 29 Data Review
 - Reviewed all data sources in teams by standard
 - Teams made suggested revisions to rubric language
 - Whole group reviewed suggested revisions
- ❖ February - Video Collection
- ❖ March - Revised draft shared at MACTE

Overarching changes to the document

- ❖ More positive language, observed evidence rather than assumptions about candidate knowledge
 - “makes mistakes” was changed to “shares correct information”
 - “changed “is unaware” to “provides no evidence of”
- ❖ **Stronger verbs, more concise language**
 - changed verbs to demonstrates, affirms, integrates

Overarching changes to the document

- ❖ Language that lacked clarity was changed
 - “Reciprocal higher order questioning” was changed to “uses questioning techniques that result in students providing answers reflecting critical thinking”.
- ❖ Eliminated some rows if data indicated unclear/unimportant/redundant information
- ❖ Revisions to format to include rows for clarity of strands across levels
- ❖ Overall feedback very positive

Response Rate from Content Validity Survey

	External Faculty	Internal Faculty	Practitioner	TOTAL REVIEWERS	# Responses	Response Rate
Standard 1	3	11	9	23	13	57%
Standard 2	3	11	9	23	15	65%
Standard 3	2	12	9	23	14	61%
Standard 4	2	12	9	23	20	87%
Standard 5	2	12	9	23	18	78%
Standard 6	3	11	9	23	18	78%
Standard 7	2	12	9	23	11	48%
Standard 8	2	11	10	23	11	48%
Standard 9	2	11	10	23	13	57%
TOTAL	21	103	83	207	133	64%

Review Teams

Team	Name	Role
Team 1 Standards 1,3	Kim Nuetzmann	F
	Ron Banfield	F
	Alicia Murillo	A
	Ximena Uribe-Zarain	A
Team 2 Standards 4,6	Tammy Mann	A
	Beth Kania-Gosche	A
Team 3 Standards 2,5	Joy Voss	F
	DJ Kaiser	A
	Daryl Fridley	A
Team 4 Standards 7,8,9	Bill Runyan	F
	Karen Engler	F
	Matt Beaver	A

Method

Based on agreement score on alignment, importance, clarity, and distinction (80%)

	Strand	Indicator is aligned	Indicator is essential to assess Standard	Indicator is clear	Levels are distinct (0 vs 1)	Levels are distinct (1 vs 2)	Levels are distinct (2 vs 3)
Standard 7	7.1	82%	82%	82%	82%	82%	73%
	7.2	91%	91%	82%	91%	91%	91%
	7.3	73%	91%	73%	91%	91%	91%
Standard 8	8.1	82%	73%	91%	82%	82%	82%
	8.2	100%	100%	100%	91%	100%	91%
	8.3	91%	91%	82%	100%	100%	91%
	8.4	100%	91%	91%	91%	91%	73%
Standard 9	9.1	54%	38%	77%	54%	69%	62%
	9.2	85%	85%	69%	62%	69%	69%
	9.3	77%	92%	69%	85%	85%	77%
	9.4	85%	85%	85%	92%	77%	85%

Review (Example)

Standard 9

Standard 9: Professional Collaboration. The teacher candidate has effective working relationships with students, families, school colleagues, and community members.			
0	1	2	3
Resists participation in school-wide functions.	Recognizes the importance of participating in school-wide functions, but does not attend.	Recognizes the importance of participating in school-wide functions and attends sporadically.	Participates in school-wide functions to enhance student learning.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resists. No evidence of understanding of the importance of professional collaboration with colleagues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognizes the importance of professional collaboration with colleagues, but does not fully participate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participates in collaborative meetings, professional collaborations with colleagues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepares for and fully engages in collaborative meetings, professional collaboration with colleagues to enhance student learning.
Avoids communication with students, staff, and families.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognizes the importance of communication to support student success, but does not implement communication strategies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communicates with students, staff, and families to support student success in alignment with expectations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purposefully engages in positive, effective, and ongoing communication with students, staff, and families to support student success.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to build rapport with students, staff, and families; including the cooperating teacher. No evidence of understanding of importance of building relationships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintains limited. Recognizes the importance of building relationships with students, staff, colleagues, and families, but does not do so. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintains. Builds and maintains appropriate relationships with a limited number of students, staff, colleagues, and families. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Builds, maintains, and seeks out positive, appropriate relationships with students, staff, colleagues, and families.

Representative Indicator: 9.3 Cooperative Partnerships in Support of Student Learning

Review (Example)

Standard 9

Standard 9: Professional Collaboration. The teacher candidate has effective working relationships with students, families, school colleagues, and community members.

0	1	2	3
Resists participation in school-wide functions.	Recognizes the importance of participating in school-wide functions, but does not attend.	Recognizes the importance of participating in school-wide functions and attends sporadically.	Participates in school-wide functions to enhance student learning.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resists. No evidence of understanding of the importance of professional collaboration with colleagues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognizes the importance of professional collaboration with colleagues, but does not fully participate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participates in collaborative meetings. professional collaborations with colleagues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepares for and fully engages in collaborative meetings professional collaboration with colleagues to enhance student learning.
Avoids communication with students, staff, and families.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognizes the importance of communication to support student success, but does not implement communication strategies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communicates with students, staff, and families to support student success in alignment with expectations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purposefully engages in positive, effective, and ongoing communication with students, staff, and families to support student success.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to build rapport with students, staff, and families; including the cooperating teacher. No evidence of understanding of importance of building relationships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintains limited Recognizes the importance of building relationships with students, staff colleagues, and families. but does not do so. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintains Builds and maintains appropriate relationships with a limited number of students, staff colleagues, and families. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Builds, maintains, and seeks out positive, appropriate relationships with students, staff colleagues, and families.

Importance:
38%

Clarity: 69%

Clarity: 69%
Alignment: 77%

Distinction (1 vs 2):
77%

Review (Example)

Based on agreement score on alignment, importance, clarity, and distinction (80%)

	Strand	Indicator is aligned	Indicator is essential to assess Standard	Indicator is clear	Levels are distinct (0 vs 1)	Levels are distinct (1 vs 2)	Levels are distinct (2 vs 3)
Standard 4	4.1	55%	75%	50%	65%	60%	60%
	4.2	85%	90%	80%	75%	60%	65%
	4.3	75%	90%	80%	60%	50%	40%
	4.4	75%	80%	70%	80%	55%	65%
	4.5	90%	85%	80%	80%	75%	60%

Review (Example)

Standard 4

Standard 4: Critical Thinking. The teacher candidate uses a variety of instructional strategies and resources to encourage students' critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

0	1	2	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses only one strategy that was largely ineffective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains strategies to engage students to engage in self-monitoring, self-reflection, and/or self-directed learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitates limited opportunities for students to engage in self-monitoring, self-reflection, and/or self-directed learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitates opportunities in which majority of students actively engage in self-monitoring, self-reflection, and/or self-directed learning.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides no opportunities for <u>No evidence of knowledge of importance</u> of students to share <u>sharing</u> ideas and generate <u>generating</u> possible solutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is knowledgeable about strategies to facilitate opportunities for students to share ideas and generate possible solutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides <u>limited opportunities</u> <u>one strategy</u> for to students to share ideas and generate possible solutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides opportunities <u>Uses multiple strategies</u> in which all students convey their ideas and/or solutions through product and/or process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitates no opportunities for <u>No evidence of knowledge of importance</u> of student to analyze <u>analysis</u> and discuss <u>discussion</u> of problems and possible solutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains <u>and plans</u> strategies for analyzing and discussing problems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitates <u>limited opportunities</u> <u>one opportunity</u> for students to analyze and discuss problems and possible solutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitates <u>multiple</u> opportunities in which students analyze and discuss problems and possible solutions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students are not encouraged to respond to or ask <u>No evidence of knowledge of</u> questions. <u>that promote critical thinking</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes questions that promote critical thinking in <u>lesson plans</u>. <u>planning</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses questioning techniques that prompt students to provide <u>answers</u> reflecting critical thinking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitates <u>reciprocal higher-order</u> questioning. Uses questioning techniques that <u>results in students providing answers</u> reflecting critical thinking.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitates <u>No evidence of</u> instruction <u>lacking</u> in rigor and relevance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains strategies to <u>incorporate</u> <u>Plans for</u> rigor and relevance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses <u>limited strategies</u> <u>one strategy</u> to incorporate rigor and relevance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses various <u>Consistently uses multiple</u> evidence-based instructional strategies to promote rigor and relevance.

Importance: 75%
Alignment: 55%
Clarity: 50%

Distinction
(All): < 80%

Distinction
(All): < 80%

Clarity: 70%
Alignment: 75%

Distinction
(All): < 80%

Additions to Standard 2 and Standard 6

- ❖ Added Indicator 2.6: Sensitive to students' family, language, culture, and community
- ❖ Added 6.2: Communications sensitive to student diversity

Artifacts for Standards 7, 8, 9

- ❖ Additional artifacts to support scoring accuracy
- ❖ Documentation of artifacts collected, including reflective dialogue

Calibration Training and EPP Orientation

Two Training Components:

- ❖ MEES Calibration Training - Statewide materials and training available
- ❖ Institution- Specific Orientation Required

Calibration Training

- ❖ New, improved version for online calibration training
- ❖ **Multiple choice questions to review protocol**
- ❖ New videos embedded in the training with immediate feedback
- ❖ **Train the trainer sessions available in June**

Spring Process 2019

- ❖ April 22 - 23 Final Review and Training Revision
 - MEES/APR Group will review revised MEES Rubric one final time
 - New Video collection will be used for calibration
 - Face to Face Training and online training revised
- ❖ May
 - Finalize training materials; Revise technical manual; Revisit cut score
- ❖ June
 - Train the trainer sessions

Thank You