

March 2, 2007

To: T&L Faculty  
From: Office of Advising and Admissions  
Re: Admission Application Review

Thank you to those of you who attended the inter-rater reliability workshops. We will continue to hold these around fall and spring application time until all faculty have had an opportunity to attend at least one session. We will then hold them every 3 years.

Here are a few reminders to guide you as you review candidates' materials.

- Review all materials and enter a score (1, 2, or 3) for each category. Even if they will be denied based upon criteria in only one category, we need the scores in each, so that we can disaggregate the data;
- *Each application must be reviewed by at least two different faculty members; where scores differ (1&3, or 1&2) a third faculty member should review the application.*
- Candidates must receive scores in “meets” or “exceeds” categories to be admitted;
- For each score in the “does not meet” or “exceeds” categories, please include explanatory information in the comments section;
- The **only** reason a candidate may receive a “pending” is if dispositions have not yet been received **and** the candidate is currently enrolled in Intro. to Ed courses;
- The composite score for the Praxis I is 518; students may fail to meet the cut score in 1 of 3 areas (by not more than 2 points) and still be considered passing as long as the total score is 518;
- The inter-rater reliability workshop centered on the scoring of the letter of application. To guide your thinking as you complete Parts A and B, I have listed the qualitative descriptors faculty offered. The number in parentheses indicates what score faculty thought might be given related to the descriptor:
  - For Part A
    - Grammar and/or usage is distracting and gets in the way of the message (1);
    - Wanders; lacks coherency (1);
    - Organization clear (2);
    - Flows from one paragraph to the next (2);
    - Well developed ideas (2/3);
    - Few usage/mechanical errors (2);
    - Sense of working to communicate in an engaging way (2);
    - Clear sense of audience (2).
  - For Part B
    - Persistence is evident but without added reflection--“I’m going to be a teacher despite what others have said about me.” (1);

- Non-constructive approach to statements relating criticism from others (1);
- Generalities and platitudes without elaboration—"In schools today, we need teachers who have patience." (1);
- Experiences with children are merely listed (1);
- Sense that teaching the subject matter is more important than teaching students (1);
- Focus on the self to the exclusion of what he/she might contribute to the profession (1);
- Indicates merely a "love" of kids and that teaching is "fun"(1);
- May indicate a focus on wanting to coach without connecting coaching to teaching (1);
- Relates a variety of experiences that applicant actively sought out (2/3);
- Relates experiences, what they meant to the applicant, and how they lead to the development of teacher-like characteristics (2/3);
- Recognizes the needs of children (2);
- Larger sense of self—realistic vs. narcissistic (2/3);
- Goes beyond childhood stories of playing teacher to reveal the impact that event had on their choosing the teaching profession (2);
- Contains multiple references to people who influenced the applicant with descriptive information (3).

Thank you for your continued commitment to admitting quality candidates to the Teacher Education Program.