

TEAC Dispositions Claim Committee

6th Meeting of 2009-2010 Academic Year

September 30, 2009 (8:30 to 9:45 a.m. in 322 EHS)

I will see what I can find on data analysis information and bring to the meeting

Committee Members Preparation for Meeting:

\*Your Notes from 9/23 meeting

\*9/23 follow-up Items Disseminated by Laura

Agenda – Clarifying Paula’s Information

1. Faculty Survey Data Analysis: Clarifying what Paula told us – Future ideas

\* 2009 Professional Dispositions Faculty

\*Frequencies handout

\* 2009 Professional Dispositions Faculty Survey – Crosstabs

2. Paula’s Faculty Dispositions Survey Report – Clarifying

3. Faculty Student Survey Data – Getting started on writing out the data – ideas

4. Dialogue on Discussion with other EHS Depts. – Laura’s query after Professional Education meeting

5. July 2009 Dispositions Report on TEPD Dispositions Data (Paula’s report) – Read and Discuss

\*\*\* See Laura’s review notes on pages 2+ of this agenda

October 7: Best use of our time?? Meeting with new assessment coordinator?? Determining next level of data analysis for faculty survey?? Completing unfinished conversation from 10/1??

FYI: The EHS Assessment website is: <http://www.ehs.cmich.edu/css/assessment>

Data Analysis On Deck:

\*Student Dispositions Survey Data Analysis (then review and write-up)

\* Faculty Dispositions Survey Data Review – Determine Significant by Department and additional analysis

\*Compare Student Dispositions Survey data to Faculty Survey data and decide comparison analysis

\* Begin review of data to this point on Disposition Related Questions in: MDE Exit Survey (07, 08); Supervisor’s Survey (07, 08); Alumni Survey (07,08,09); Employers Survey (08, 09)

\* Begin review of Special Education Unit Survey Dispositions data (pre-post on each): SPE 322 (Spring 09, Fall 09); SPE 578 (Spring 09, Summer 09); SPE 579 (Summer 09, Fall 09)

\* Begin review of Special Education Unit Student and Clinical Teacher Exit Survey data: Fall 2008 (4 surveys); Spring 2009 (4 surveys) and to be repeated Fall 2009.

Dispositions Committee – Here are my notes from our meeting with Paula.

I. 2009 Professional Dispositions Faculty (front page Chi-Square test, Lamda – measure of strength of association)

\* Pages 1-2: What back through this briefly to see that we understand. This data indicates that there is no relationship between items 10-15 and Program Teaching Focus or Specialty Program area. This data also indicates that there is no relationship between items 10-15 and Years at CMU or Faculty Rank, except for item #11 and Faculty rank.

Laura's notes: On these two pages we look at the Significant column after Chi-Square and after Lambda. A relationship is significant if it is  $<0.05$ , The Chi-Square data reports the strength of the relationship. The Lambda data reports/indicates the predictive value of the relationship. Paula indicated that we are looking for "significant" data in each. If the strength of the relationship is significant and the predictive value is significant, then we should then we want to follow-up and discuss this in our report.

Program Teaching Focus and Items 10-15: Item #10: Does your program have a statement of specific professional dispositions?

This item was significant for "Program Teaching Focus", meaning that there was a relationship between the program teaching focus and knowledge/awareness of the program having a statement of specific professional dispositions. However, this relationship was not significant for predictive value. Therefore, there is no consistent ability to predict this relationship in the future.

There were no other items in the Faculty Dispositions Survey that demonstrated a significant relationship to Program Teaching Focus.

Special Program Area and Items 10-15: There were no items in the Faculty Dispositions Survey that demonstrated a significant relationship to special program area in teaching.

Years at CMU and Items 10-15: There were no items in the Faculty Dispositions Survey that demonstrated a significant relationship to years at CMU for faculty who responded.

Faculty Rank and Items 10-15: Item 11: Does your program have a process to TEACH professional dispositions?

This item was significant for "Faculty Rank", meaning that there was a relationship between the rank of the faculty and the response to this item. In addition to significant Chi-Square, the data indicates that there is a significant Lambda. This means that there is a predictive value of this relationship. Now, we do not know the predictive value until we go back and review the frequency data to know the direction of the predictive value. Paula reported that the Chi-Square is positive, so it is likely that as faculty rank increases, the relationship of knowing about the program process to teach professional dispositions increases.

Paula reported that this significant and predictive relationship was good to have.

Our To-Do: Review the Frequency Data on this item.

There were no other items in the Faculty Dispositions Survey that demonstrated a significant relationship to faculty rank.

\* Pages 1-2: Your Additional Notes/Comments

## I. 2009 Professional Dispositions Faculty (front page Chi-Square test, Lamda – measure of strength of association)

\*Pages 3-11: First we are interested in the importance of the large crosstab table on each of these pages. If it is important, we need help understanding the set-up and data interpretation. Second, we want to review the small Spearman Correlation data table in the lower third of each page. We want to review the data and our interpretation of the relationship so we understand.

### \*Our To-Do from Pages 3-11: Discuss Awareness, Importance, Application interpretation from data for our clarification

Laura's Notes: First, the crosstab tables may be of interest to us. The tables show the pattern of the responses. Paula showed us how to look at trends by looking at showing us an example on page 3. Take this crosstab table across the top find the 100% column under question #13. Put your right forefinger on this column. Then go to the 100% cell under question #7 and place your left forefinger on this cell. Then go down with your right finger and across to the right with your left finger until they meet at the cell where there is an n=38. This "38" means that out of 95 responses, 38 answered 100% to each question.

Now, stay with this to look at trends. Go straight up in the same "38" column and the numbers (n) get smaller. Go straight to the left in the row and the numbers (n) get smaller. Go diagonal from the 38 to "6" and the numbers get smaller. This is a trend. In going back up, as one number gets smaller so do the others. Then in coming back down the table as one number gets larger, so do the others. Again, these tables show trends. Paula said that all of our crosstab tables in this set show the same trend and that is, as one increases so does the other.

Next, I am going to place the Spearman Correlation data for each of the crosstabs on pages 3-11. Paula told us that we will need to find out what the actual literature reports for what is considered a high, moderate, and low relationship. She would send us what she has. I (Laura) will also see what I have. In the small tables at the bottom of pages 3-11 we are interested in the first number (value) and the last (Approx. Sig.). We only need the Spearman Correlation data. Paula used Spearman correlation because we have ordinal by ordinal data.

Page 3-5: Crosstabs: 13 Facilitates development of PDs in students (page 3: To what degree does increased awareness also correlate to awareness? Page 4: To what degree does increased importance also correlate to awareness? Page 5: To what degree does increased application also correlate to awareness?)

#7: To what degree are you aware that teacher preparation students are involved in a process that exposes them to and evaluates them on a set of professional dispositions (Awareness)

Crosstab

with #13: To what degree do you facilitate the development of professional dispositions in your students through your role as a teacher educator? (Awareness)

Data analysis:	Value	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal Spearman Correl.	.537 (moderate relationship)	.000 (significant)

Item #7 to Item #13: There is a positive correlation.

#8: To what degree do you believe the acquisition of professional dispositions is important in the preparation of future educators? (Importance)

Crosstab

with #13: To what degree do you facilitate the development of professional dispositions in your students through your role as a teacher educator? (Awareness)

Data analysis:	Value	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal Spearman Correl.	.418 (moderate relationship)	.000 (significant)

Items #8 to Item #13: There is a positive correlation.

#9: To what degree do you believe that teacher preparation students are applying professional dispositions in your courses? (Application)

Crosstab

with #13: To what degree do you facilitate the development of professional dispositions in your students through your role as a teacher educator? (Awareness)

Data analysis:	Value	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal Spearman Correl.	.459 (moderate relationship)	.000 (significant relationship)

Item #9 to Item #13: There is a correlation.

Page 6-8: Crosstabs: 14 Belief that own PDs influence teaching quality (page 6: To what degree does increased awareness also correlate to the importance? Page 7: To what degree does increased importance also correlate with ability to importance? Page 5: To what degree does increased application also correlate to ability to importance?)

#7: To what degree are you aware that teacher preparation students are involved in a process that exposes them to and evaluates them on a set of professional dispositions (Awareness)

Crosstab

with #14: To what degree do you believe that your own professional dispositions influence the quality of your overall teaching performance? (Importance)

Data analysis:	Value	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal Spearman Correl.	.392 (low relationship)	.000 (significant)

Item #7 to Item #14: The correlation is inconclusive.

#8: To what degree do you believe the acquisition of professional dispositions is important in the preparation of future educators? (Importance)

Crosstab

with #14: To what degree do you believe that your own professional dispositions influence the quality of your overall teaching performance? (Importance)

Data analysis:	Value	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal Spearman Correl.	.421 (moderate relationship)	.000 (significant)

Item #8 to Item #14: There is a correlation.

#9: To what degree do you believe that teacher preparation students are applying professional dispositions in your courses? (Application)

Crosstab

with #14: To what degree do you believe that your own professional dispositions influence the quality of your overall teaching performance? (Importance)

Data analysis:	Value	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal Spearman Correl.	.425 (moderate relationship)	.000 (significant)

Item #9 to Item #14: There is a correlation.

Page 9-11: Crosstabs: 15 Degree practice own PDs in class (page : To what degree does increased application also correlate to application? Page 10: To what degree does increased importance also correlate to application? Page 11: To what degree does increased application also correlate to application?)

#7: To what degree are you aware that teacher preparation students are involved in a process that exposes them to and evaluates them on a set of professional dispositions (Awareness)

Crosstab

with #15: To what degree do you practice (live) your own professional dispositions in your teacher education courses? (Application)

Data analysis:	Value	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal Spearman Correl.	.317 (low relationship)	.000 (significant)

Item #7 to Item #15: The correlation is inconclusive.

#8: To what degree do you believe the acquisition of professional dispositions is important in the preparation of future educators? (Importance)

Crosstab

with #15: To what degree do you practice (live) your own professional dispositions in your teacher education courses? (Application)

Data analysis:	Value	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal Spearman Correl.	.357 (low relationship)	.000 (significant)

Item #7 to Item #15: The correlation is inconclusive.

#9: To what degree do you believe that teacher preparation students are applying professional dispositions in your courses? (Application)

Crosstab

with #15: To what degree do you practice (live) your own professional dispositions in your teacher education courses? (Application)

Data analysis:	Value	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal Spearman Correl.	.369 (low relationship)	.000 (significant)

Item #9 to Item #15: The correlation is inconclusive.

## 2. 2009 Professional Dispositions Faculty Survey – Crosstabs

C:\CMU\Surveys\Faculty\Dispositions\2009ProfDispFacsvy.sav

\* Descriptive Statistics on the bottom of page 3 to top of page 4.

Laura's Notes: We will work with the 105 respondents. Paula provided clarification on the meaning of Standard Deviation in the column on bottom of page 3 and top of page 4. Basically, Standard Deviation is how much did the group response deviate from the mean. We want a smaller Standard Deviation. A smaller Standard Deviation is a closer cluster to the mean. When we have a Standard Deviation over 1.00, it indicates that participants did not answer in a similar way. This leads to asking, "Why are the deviating so much?" With the data handout that reports the Frequency, we will focus on the Mean and compare this to the Frequency. We had four items in #7-16 where there was a Standard Deviation above 1.00

Our To-Do: Go Back and Look at Mean and Frequency Data – Pull this out into a separate table.

### 3.Support document handout (Faculty Surveys – Data Analysis Ideas)

\* Laura’s Notes: Paula told us that TEAC requires data to be disaggregated by department. For this data handout on department, the responses included are those who answered “yes” to the department question. Right now, this is not analyzed by the individual departments that the respondents represented.

We went through this data packet and looked at each page. There are two levels of data reporting on pages 1-10. The top table is the Chi-Square table and this reports the level of relationship. The lower table is the Lambda and reports the predictive value of the relationship. We look at each of these questions and if the Pearson Chi-Square is significant, this indicates a relationship. This is important enough to have further analysis for individual department data. The following is our review of each item in the Faculty Dispositions Survey by department:

Item	Significant Relationship	Significant Predictive Value of Relationship
#10	Yes	Yes (strong)
#11	No	No
#12	Yes	Yes
#7	Yes	Yes
#8	Yes	Yes
#9	Yes	Yes
#13	Yes	Yes
#14	No	No
#15	No	No

Our To-Do: Conduct another level of data analysis. Have Items 10,12,7,8,9,13 analyzed by department.

In addition, we may want to take the department data from TEPD and compare to CSE. From what we know right now, these are the only 2 departments actively working on dispositions. We may want to compare these 2 departments to one another on the Yes, items. We can then also take TEPD, CSE, and compare to all other departments as a 3<sup>rd</sup> group. We could also combine TEPD and CSE as one group and compare to all other departments. In this, we can compare significance as in TEPD to CSE, as in TEPD and CSE combined to all other departments. Then we can see what the difference is by individual item analysis.

Additional Notes from our Discussion:

Paula said that what we have is all a big baseline. So, we ask ourselves, “What do we want to improve?” and “What do we want to do?” Paula posed to us: What/Why did we survey? We stated to find out how the faculty and students were experiencing dispositions within: Awareness, Importance, and Application.

Paula suggested that we write down the questions we are seeking to answer and review our data in that structure. We should review the faculty data before we look at the student data. Then review the student data. When we see what is significant from the student data the compare that to what is significant from the faculty data. The crossover of what is significant is a good place to conduct our comparison data analysis.

In a future round of self-study if we want to bridge this and connect/bridge faculty to student then we want to survey faculty and their actual students to make the connection.

Renee Papillion is expanding the TEPD Dispositions Survey to more departments. Our committee will want to collect data only consistent with the current student population, similar to the 2008-2009 student data population. This can be justified as a pilot. We will end our TEPD dispositions data collection in December 2009. This data will need to be analyzed in January so we can have it ready for our report. The new assessment coordinator will be notified of this (Laura and she will also discuss with Larry).

