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A Quality Assurance review was conducted for the interview process in the Fall of 2018 for students who wanted to enter the education programs at PNW. This was the first attempt at implementing a new procedure for entering the School of Education and Counseling programs. Applicants were asked to prepare a short presentation, complete a writing sample, and answer several questions in an interview format (Appendix A).

The purpose of this EPP Student Interview was to develop a more formal process for entering the program and to help increase quality of applicants. It is also designed to provide students with another experience that will help them grow professionally. This report will be used to further refine the assessment process and to better understand the quality of the students entering the program and how we can assist in their successful transition into and throughout the various programs.

The review consisted of assessing several components of the Interview process including:

* Analysis of results (number of candidates applying/ accepted) and reasons for not being accepted.
* Results of all three components of interview process (writing, presenting, interview).
* Interrater reliability of reviewers
* Review of Process by analyzing Student Feedback through a follow-up survey
* Analysis of Faculty Survey to gather feedback about the process

## Overall conclusions:

1. Of 80 students applying to the interview, 64 qualified, and 49 were interviewed.
2. 48 out of 49 (98%) entered a program following the interviews. 27 of them did so provisionally due mainly to CASA needing to be passed.
3. The average score for the interview was 29.7/36.0.
4. Scores were highest for the interview portion (3.3/4.0) and lowest for the writing component (3.1/4.0)
5. Inter-rater reliability showed a 56% agreement between scores from 2 faculty interviewing the same person. 97% agreement within one rubric point.
6. A majority of students (77%) and all faculty agreed the interview was a valuable process.
7. Student participants felt the environment, organization and timing were appropriate for the activities related to all aspects of the interview process.
8. The lowest scoring area for student survey was the “criteria being clear” with 17/26 (or 65%) agreeing.
9. Students provided suggestions that more information, more notice and more feedback could have been provided.

## Students Applying, Qualifying and Admitted

Out of the 80 students that applied 64, qualified to participate in the interview. 16 who did not qualify were either too early in the program (10) or had to retake courses due to low GPA (6). Out of the 64 who qualified to interview only 49 were interviewed. A total of 15 did not participate primarily due to not showing up (7), 3 were already determined to be in the program, 3 had to reschedule for another time and 2 declined the interview.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total** | **Westville** | **Hammond** |
| Students Applying | 80 | 36 | 44 |
| Students Qualifying | 64 | 28 | 36 |
| Total Interviewed | 49 | 23 | 26 |

Of the 49 students who were interviewed, Elementary Education-Reading was represented the most with 16 students (33%). Elementary Sp-Ed was represented second with 14 or 29%. The table below represents the number of students and associated programs.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| ELED-Reading | 16 | 33% |
| ELED – Special Ed | 14 | 29% |
| Early Childhood | 7 | 14% |
| Sec- ENG | 1 | 2% |
| Unknown | 11 | 22% |
| **Total** | **49** | **100%** |

## Results of Interview Process

The number of students admitted to the education program was 48/49 (98%) following the interview. 21 Admitted, 27 Provisional Admit (need CASA or low GPA), and 1 Denied due to a low Interview Score (22/36).

Students were assessed based on three categories (writing, presentation and interview). They were scored using a rubric (Appendix B) on a scale of: Unsatisfactory= 1; Developing =2; Proficient = 3; Exemplary =4. The total amount of points possible for the entire interview was 36. The range of scores from either 2 or 3 reviewers was a low of 22.7 to a high of 35.0 out of 36. The mean was 29.7/36.0.

Overall, students averaged a 3.3/4.0 on all components of the interview process by all interviewers. Based on the rubric scores, students were most successful in the interview questions (3.5/4.0).Lowest scores were for the writing (3.1/4.0) and the presentation averaged 3.3/4.0. The table below presents a summary of the category, specific topic and score averages from each interviewer.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Specific Topic (Rubric Element)** | **Int-1** | **Int- 2** | **Int- 3\*** | **Ave** |
| **Writing** | **Organization** | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.1 | **3.1** |
| **Development** | 2.9 | 3.1 | 2.9 | **3.0** |
| **Grammar and Mechanics** | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.0 | **3.1** |
| **Presentation** | **5 Required Areas** | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.6 | **3.5** |
| **Poise and Confidence** | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.3 | **3.2** |
| **Organization** | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.4 | **3.4** |
| **Interview** | **Listening** | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.7 | **3.6** |
| **Professional Dress** | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.5 | **3.5** |
| **Body Language** | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.5 | **3.4** |
|  | **Total** | **3.2** | **3.4** | **3.3** | **3.3** |

*\*13/49 interviewed students had only 2 interview scores calculated in their average*

## Inter-rater Reliability Study

An informal study was conducted to determine the inter-rater reliability between scorers who did not consult with each other on judging the same candidate. Only scorer 1 and 2 were compared. A total of 56% of the scores from 49 students on 9 assessments were identical. 41% of the scores only differed by one point. And 3% differed by more than 1.

Most direct agreement was in scoring the organization of the writing (65%) and professional dress (63%) and Body Language (61%) during the interview. The lowest direct agreement came from the category of 5 required areas of the presentation (45%).

The Table below indicates the level of agreement or reliability of scores between scorer 1 and scorer 2 on each of the topics for all 49 students.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Specific Topic (Rubric Element)** | **SAME** | **DIFFER +/-1** | **DIFF +/- 2 or more** |
| **Writing** | **Organization** | 65% | 33% | 2% |
| **Development** | 55% | 41% | 4% |
| **Grammar and Mechanics** | 57% | 39% | 4% |
| **Presentation** | **5 Required Areas** | 45% | 53% | 2% |
| **Poise and Confidence** | 55% | 45% | 0% |
| **Organization** | 51% | 43% | 6% |
| **Interview** | **Listening** | 53% | 45% | 2% |
| **Professional Dress** | 63% | 33% | 4% |
| **Body Language** | 61% | 37% | 2% |
|  | **Total** | **56%** | **41%** | **3%** |

## Survey of Student Experience

Participants of the Interview process were asked to respond to a short online survey following their experience to provide feedback to the EPP about the quality of their experience. All participants were emailed a link to the survey (~60). A total of 26 completed surveys were completed.

Six questions were asked to give feedback on a forced response scale of (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neutral, (4) Agree and (5) Strongly Agree.

The table below represents the mean score of the feedback for each of the prompts as well as the percentage of participants who Agreed or Strongly Agreed with the statement.

## Summary of Feedback provided by Participants in the INTERVIEW PROCESS

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question Prompt** | **Mean** | **% Agree/ Strongly Agree** |
| I was adequately prepared for what was expected in this interview process | 4.2 | 88% |
| The interview process was well organized | 4.5 | 92% |
| The environment for the interview was appropriate | 4.6 | 100% |
| The timing of each portion of the interview was appropriate. | 4.5 | 100% |
| The criteria for how I was going to be assessed was made clear. | 3.8 | 65% |
| Overall, I believe this was a valuable process | 4.0 | 77% |

*Open-Ended Items*

20 out of 26 students responded to the prompt: What aspect of this process do you believe was the most beneficial? Over half of the students responded that the interview was the most beneficial component. Students particularly enjoyed being able to ask questions at the end. Four students mentioned the presentation. No students mentioned the writing sample. Two comments were related to building relationship with faculty.

* “I think sitting down and actually talking with faculty and staff members in the department was beneficial. Establishing those relationships early on can help in the long run.”
* “I found most beneficial being able to communicate my reasons for wanting to be a teacher and having personally a meeting with professors I'm going to have in the future.”

15 participants in the survey answered the question: “What ideas do you have for improving the interview?” The majority of the comments were related to procedural issues involving wanting more information, more notice and more feedback. The following chart indicates the major themes and associated quotes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Theme** | **Quote** |
| **More information** | * Having a clearer list of what needed to be prepared * Maybe give a little more information concerning the writing sample, because I was a bit confused about it from the email. * If anything I would just let the students know the schedule of events. For example, the writing will take 20 minutes, the presentation will take 10, and the interview will take 10 minutes. I knew what was expected of me as far as content goes but giving students a set schedule of events can help clear up any confusion and relieve some stress. |
| **More notice** | * Give more of a notice before the interviews. Provide a clear explanation of what is going to be assessed. * I believe a longer period of time from the time the interview emails are sent out until the interviews actually are should be a longer period of time, because many students work and it’s hard to get a day off in a short notice. |
| **More feedback** | * I wish I could have gotten more feedback. I don't know how I did, if there was things I did wrong, what skills I can improve on etc. I also think if the same people Interviewed everyone it would make it easier on the students. But I understand that there was a lot to do in a short time. I feel like this was overall a great experience. I would just like to know what I need to improve on in the future. |

## Faculty Feedback

Nine faculty directly involved with the interviews took part in submitting feedback about the assessment process. The same questions were asked of the faculty with the following responses.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question Prompt** | **Mean** | **% Agree/ Strongly Agree** |
| I was adequately prepared for what was expected in this interview process | 3.9 | 78% |
| The interview process was well organized | 4.6 | 100% |
| The environment for the interview was appropriate | 3.9 | 78% |
| The timing of each portion of the interview was appropriate | 4.0 | 78% |
| The criteria that I was using for the assessments was clear. | 4.2 | 100% |
| Overall, I believe this was a valuable process | 4.4 | 100% |

*Open-Ended Responses*

When asked about what was beneficial to the Interview Assessment, faculty mentioned comments regarding the theme of: getting to know the students personally or better. Additionally, the fact that it provided a professionalism skill they needed to succeed in the field. Suggestions faculty made were varied and included the following:

|  |
| --- |
| * Have tissues and small water bottles available for the potential teacher candidates. |
| * I think perhaps having different focused questions for each part so there is less repetition. Share the criteria with the students ahead of time. |
| * Typically, students answers the questions for the interview in their presentation, making the interview somewhat redundant. The questions should either be very different from the presentation or the presentation be made much shorter (5 minutes) to only ask them about their goals and intentions for becoming a teacher. That allows us to then ask follow-up questions about strengths and weaknesses for 10 minutes. Also, with students coming in back to back, it was not always easy to ensure that the last person's rubrics were complete before the next one walked in. I am also not sure if a timed writing does not serve to make students even more nervous. Some were dreadfully frightened of the process and I wonder if the 20 minutes of timed writing wasn't part of getting their nerves up. Could their essays (no more than a page or whatever the requirements are determined to be) be something that is sent in with their confirmation of their scheduled date and time? |
| * Besides dress, adding other factors to the rubric that indicate professionalism I.e. introduction, shaking hands, early arrival etc.  I anticipated the process to be an information-gathering process for us; however, my group offered advice to students when appropriate. Including that in the preparation would have been helpful. |
| * I'm wondering that if a student was denied, is there a policy in place to allow for another interview? |
| * Arrange for classroom/interview spaces that have tables (such a minor thing!) |
| * Providing a rubric for the presentations to candidates would be helpful. |

# Appendix A: Education Interview Protocol

 Eligible candidates are contacted for an interview. In this email, they are apprised of the format of the interview process and that they are to prepare the following items for the interview:

* Resume
* Presentation with an outline

*This information is to be submitted the Monday prior to their interview.*

**Interview Format**

Interviews will occur in three parts:

* Writing sample
* Presentation
* Interview

At the end of each interview, the committee will score candidates using the “Professional Interview Scoring Rubric.”

**Writing Sample (20 mins.)**

Candidates complete an informal writing task.  They are presented with three prompts.  They select one prompt and write their response.

***Writing Prompts***

1. What are the most important things we should know about you, your life, your experiences? Tell us a bit more so that we know *who* you really are.
2. If your greatest supporter was in the room with us today, what five words would he or she use to describe you as a person, a future educator, or a colleague?
3. Who has most influenced you to become an educator, and how did they influence you?
4. In 100 words or fewer, what is your philosophy of teaching?

At the end of the interview, the committee will score the writing sample holistically, noting on the bottom of the interview scoring rubric if the writing reflects a serious concern.

**Presentation (10 mins.)**

Candidates are asked to prepare a presentation describing their reasons for wanting to become an educator.  They submit their presentation outline prior to their interview.  Specifically, candidates are to respond to these questions:

* Why do you want to teach?
* What goals should a good educator attempt to accomplish with students?
* What are your areas of strength?
* What are your areas of need?
* What are your future and professional goals?

**Interview (10 mins.)**

Following their presentation, the interview committee may ask a series of follow up questions to learn more about the candidate.  Some sample questions are:

1. When did you decide to become an educator, and why did you choose this field?
2. What do you know about our program?
3. List five adjectives to describe yourself?
4. What do you like most about teaching as a career?
5. What personal strengths do you find especially helpful in your teaching?
6. In what ways have your previous experiences prepared you to be an educator?
7. What do you believe your greatest challenge will be?
8. Describe your greatest accomplishment.
9. You mentioned \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ in your presentation is an area of need. How are you working to improve it?
10. Tell me about your experience in this field.  What was challenging? What was your contribution?

**Appendix B: Education Interview Scoring Guide**

**Candidate’s Name** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Program of Study:** Early Childhood-Reading Elementary-Reading

Elementary-Special Education Secondary-English

Secondary-Math Secondary- Social Studies

Secondary- Physics Secondary- Biology

Secondary- Foreign Language Secondary- Chemistry

**Rating Summary** **Interviewer** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Convert ratings into points and write the number of points in the blank beside the item number(s) listed within each application areas. Unsatisfactory= 1; Developing =2; Proficient = 3; Exemplary =4. Then add the points to get an overall score total. The maximum score is 36 points.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Interview Area** | **Points** | **Decision: Admit Provisional Admit Deny** |
| ***Writing*** | |
| Organization |  |
| Development |  |
| Grammar & Mechanics |  |
| ***Presentation*** | |
| 5 Required Areas |  |
| Poise and Confidence |  |
| Organization |  |
| ***Interview*** | |
| Listening |  |
| Professional Dress |  |
| Body Language |  |
| ***Overall Score Total*** |  |

**Directions:** This interview contains a total of nine items, including a summary statement, with rubrics for each that are used to rate a candidate’s responses. Immediately after the applicant has responded, score the response by checking the box next to the term that best describes the quality of the candidate’s response. At the conclusion of the interview, enter the ratings in the summary box above. Then, based on your professional judgment, determine if the candidate’s responses were strong enough to merit his or her consideration for admission to the educator preparation program.

***Writing***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Distinguished**  **4** | **Proficient**  **3** | **Emerging**  **2** | **Underdeveloped**  **1** |
| **Organization**  *Did the candidate create an internal structure in his/her writing sample?* | Writing shows high degree of attention to logic and reasoning of points. Unity clearly leads the reader to the conclusion and stirs thought regarding the topic. | Writing is coherent and logically organized with transitions used between ideas and paragraphs to create coherence. Overall unity of ideas is present. | Writing is coherent and logically organized. Some points remain misplaced and stray from the topic. Transitions evident but not used throughout essay. | Writing lacks logical organization. It shows some coherence but ideas lack unity. Serious errors. |
| **Development**  *Did the candidate communicate a message in his/her writing sample?* | Main points well developed with high quality and quantity support. Reveals high degree of critical thinking. | Main points well developed with quality supporting details and quantity. Critical thinking is weaved into points. | Main points are present with limited detail and development. Some critical thinking is present. | Main points lack detailed development. Ideas are vague with little evidence of critical thinking. |
| **Grammar & Mechanics**  *How mechanically correct is the candidate’s writing sample?* | Sample is free of distracting spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors; absent of fragments, comma splices, and run-ons. | Sample has few spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors allowing reader to follow ideas clearly. Very few fragments or run-ons. | Most spelling, punctuation, and grammar correct allowing reader to progress through essay. Some errors remain. | Spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors create distraction, making reading difficult; fragments, comma splices, run-ons evident. Errors are frequent. |
| ***Summary:*** | | | | |

***Presentation***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Distinguished**  **4** | **Proficient**  **3** | **Emerging**  **2** | **Underdeveloped**  **1** |
| **5 Required Areas**  *In the candidate’s outline and presentation, do they respond to the five required questions:*   * *Why* * *Goals of educator* * *Strengths* * *Needs* * *Future goals* | Presents information and supporting evidence clearly, concisely, and logically; audience can easily follow the line of reasoning. Clearly and completely addresses the five required questions. | Presents relevant, well-chosen descriptions, facts, details, and examples to support claims. Selects information, develops ideas and uses a style that is successful for communicating ideas. Addresses the five required questions. | Presents information and supporting evidence in a way that is not always clear, concise, and logical; line of reasoning is sometimes hard to follow. Attempts to address the five required questions. | Does not present information in a logical manner; audience cannot follow the line of reasoning. Selects information, develops ideas and uses a style that is inappropriate to the purpose and audience. |
| **Poise/Confidence**  *What was the candidate’s level of confidence?* | Displays a confident demeanor while presenting; actively engaging the audience by making and maintaining eye contact and using movement (facial expressions, posture, gestures) to focus attention and interest. Speaks using the appropriate volume and with clarity. Uses appropriate grammar of vocabulary. | Displays a somewhat confident demeanor while presenting; usually engaging the audience by making and maintaining eye contact and using movement (facial expressions, posture, gestures) to focus attention and interest. Speaks using an appropriate volume. Uses mostly appropriate grammar and vocabulary. | Displays some hesitance while presenting; occasionally engages the audience by making and maintaining eye contact and using movement (facial expressions, posture, gestures) to focus attention and interests. Speaks too loudly or too softly. Makes some errors in grammar or vocabulary. | Hesitant in presenting; neglects to engage the audience because rarely makes and maintains eye contact of uses movement (facial expressions, posture, gestures) to focus attention and interest. Difficult to hear. Makes many grammatical mistakes while presenting. |
| **Organization**  *Did the candidate organize and execute his/her presentation in logical, coherent manner?* | The logical progression of the presentation is demonstrated and there is an easy flow from topic to topic. Information is coherent and well organized coherently; candidate presents effectively. | The presentation is logically organized; stays on the topic and there is a flow to the presentation. Most information is organized and presented and executed effectively. | The presentation is somewhat logical and presented with adequate competence. Generally, the information is organized information, though the candidate occasionally strays from the topic. | The presentation is not logical nor executed well. Information is poorly organized and candidate often strayed from the topic. |
| ***Summary:*** | | | | |

***Interview***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Distinguished**  **4** | **Proficient**  **3** | **Emerging**  **2** | **Underdeveloped**  **1** |
| **Listening**  *Did the candidate answer the question(s) that was presented?* | Answer(s) reflect a thorough understanding of the question(s). Candidate included details and examples to support their statements. | Answer(s) reflect a general understanding of the question(s). Candidate may have missed a detail and/or did not include examples to support statements. | Answer(s) reflected a partial understanding of the question(s) | Answer did not reflect an understanding of the question ***or*** answered an unasked question. |
| **Professional Dress and Conduct**  *Did the candidate dress in a professional manner for an interview?* | Dressed in a professional attire. Respectful to audience. Speaks, interacts, and provides meaningful input. Asks questions. Well-prepared for the interview. | Dressed in a professional manner (skirt/blouse, dress pants/blouse, shirt and tie). Generally neat and well-groomed. Speaks and interacts. Prepared for the interview. | Dressed in a casual, but not necessarily professional manner (revealing blouse, open collar); fairly neat. Limited interaction with audience beyond the questions asked by the panel. Somewhat prepared for the interview. | Dress was inappropriate and/or unkempt. No interaction beyond the questions asked by the panel. Appears unprepared for the interview. |
| **Body Language** | Body language conveyed interest in responding. Used natural gestures and movements. manner. Clearly conveyed interest in the topic and listener. Showed level of confidence in interacting with listener. | Body language conveyed interest in responding. Sat in an upright manner. Seemed fairly natural most of the time. Generally conveyed interest in the topic and listener. Showed generally good levels of confidence in interacting with listener. | Body language was difficult to interpret (too nervous and/or too casual). Sat upright at times, but slouch at others. Extraneous movements detracted from response. Conveyed non-interest in the topic and/or listener. Did not seem confident of interactions with the listener. | Body language conveyed disinterest and/or extreme nervousness. Slouched or moved nervously throughout the interview. Seemed disengaged with topic and/or listener. |
| ***Summary:*** | | | | |