

CAEP STANDARDS WORKSHOP

Strengths	Weaknesses
<p>Meaningful assessment are identified Master syllabi process Hallmark assignments Developed Rubrics Aligned assessment to Danielson and InTASC Core faculty support Great partnerships Large amount of raw data Effective administration and faculty buy-in Existing meeting and administrative structure Have a director of accreditation Dedicated staff for support Excellent Faculty Establishing a culture of assessment Review data frequently Small faculty – quick changes Great school partnerships Support for faculty Good administrative support Alignment of rubrics Faculty is committed Standards established Team approach Acceptance of feedback Diversity within the team Willingness to improve Previous experience Seeking and using feedback Department of Education support Assessment in isolation Faculty participation State support Faculty acceptance and buy-in Common assessments are used Consistent data collection system Curriculum aligned to InTASC and SPAs Ongoing collaboration Common mission and efforts New processes Continuous improvement is understood Common time for accreditation have been established. MDE partnership Invested faculty Lots of data to choose from Rich discussions Effective advisory groups Focus on continuous growth Collaboration with multiple constituencies Growing specificity regarding expectations Dedicated faculty</p>	<p>Large amount of raw data Difficult shift from IB to SI First time in accreditation process Too much change for faculty, students Accessibility to data Too many systems that do not talk with each. Ability to track standards within the system External perceptions Personal stereotype Leadership in many ways Time (big issues) Humility of the professions Systems do not talk well with each other Hitting a moving target Some limited faculty community Lack of processes to move assessment forward Establishing quality control checks Technology and data storage Limited time Limited personnel Internal process is unclear Students lack commitment Weak support for faculty professional development Data silos create large issues Limited communication across departments Revamping assessments creates problems Establishing reliability Establishing validity Addressing small N values Lack of capacity for data collection Lack of capacity for data analysis Need for clarity from CAEP Uneven participation Process for CAEP is unclear Too many silos of dat Accessing the data is difficult Establishing reliability Establishing validity Assessment system is too complex Too many assessment Clarity is needed Great need for a process Need to establish validity Need to establish reliability Validity Reliability Need to have an identified process Need to have a common understanding for assignments Failure by many to see relevance of the dat</p>

<p>Innovative secondary curriculum Great students Good staff Faculty and staff collaboration Creativity Administrative support Diversity of perspective Data management Flexible Review data frequently Small faculty – quick changes Great school partnerships Good administrative support Alignment of rubrics Faculty is committed Standards established Team approach Acceptance of feedback Diversity within the team Willingness to improve Previous experience Technology to aggregate data Technology to disaggregate data Seeking and using feedback Department of Education support Assessment in isolation Alignment with MDE/State Faculty participation State support Faculty acceptance and buy-in Common assessments are used Consistent data collection system Curriculum aligned to InTASC and SPAs Ongoing collaboration</p>	<p>process Silos of data Need process Need for a database for records Need for consistency within program Need for common language for assessment Resources Need to leverage resouces Lack of data from some content areas Not enough information shared Focus too much on reports without meaningful discussion Lack of faculty participation Lots of miscommunication Organization – who does what Desire for collaboration Lack of clarity of responsibility Limited time Limited personnel Internal process is unclear Students lack commitment Weak support for faculty professional development Data silos create large issues Limited communication across departments Revamping assessments creates problems Establishing reliability Establishing validity Addressing small N values Lack of capacity for data collection Lack of capacity for data analysis Need for clarity from CAEP Uneven participation Process for CAEP is unclear Too many silos of dat Accessing the data is difficult Establishing reliability Establishing validity Assessment system is too complex Too many assessment Clarity is needed Great need for a process</p>
---	---