

797 Article Review - Kimberlie Fair

Score Sheet

Title: Exploring the Reliability and Validity of a Preservice Teacher Assessment
for CAEP Accreditation

Manuscript ID: JPA-15-0207

Recommendation: Revise and Resubmit

Confidential Comments to the Editor:

Form Development:

The CAEP requirement to measure candidates knowledge, skills, and dispositions appears to have been the reasoning behind the decision to divide the measure of preservice teacher performance into the sub-constructs of Pedagogy and Disposition, though this not explicitly stated. The Form Development section only discusses the pedagogic frameworks that were referenced

Framework for Validity and Reliability

After a thorough discussion of the need for examining measurement invariance across groups, the article explains that due to constraints in sample size measurement invariance could not be examined. This is an important omission in an assessment that is to be used statewide.

Longitudinal invariance was considered, but the justification for the use of the measure in the absence of the assessment of measurement invariance is not established.

Methods

An explanation for why items 1-8 of the Dispositions subscale were dichotomous is needed to provide context for the emergence of the ceiling effect and subsequent removal of these items.

Marvin Powell: additional analysis, maybe. Maybe they wanted to show that time didn't matter

Marvin Powell: i agree.

Even though the subconstructs of Pedagogy and Disposition were supported by the CFA, an examination of the factor loading patterns produced by the EFA would have provided a richer analysis of the items and allowed for further refinement of the instrument.

Inter-rater reliability assessment using independent ratings of the same preservice teacher but different observations is problematic.

Findings:


The low scores for content validity for item D3 is not addressed.

The article (Kuzborska, 2001) that supports teachers' beliefs impact on students does not explain the correlation of pedagogy and disposition. This appears to be a different construct, unless beliefs are a part of disposition which has not been established in this article.

Discussion:

Authors state that EFA suggests a two-factor solution which is a contradiction of their previous statement that factor loading patterns were not consulted.

Comments to the Author:

The need for a valid and reliable instrument that aligns with state teaching and accreditation standards to be used in addition to already available national assessments is well established. Support for the development of an observation-based performance assessment is also supported. A review of the literature that informed development of the Disposition items into the subconstructs of Pedagogy and Disposition would strengthen the article. 

Literature addressing how beliefs are related to Pedagog and Disposition would clarify how beliefs function in your findings.

Marvin Powell: what about a clear definition of the factors?

An expansion of the discussion of the development of Disposition items 1-8 would explain why they were dichotomous and would further support the removal of the items.

The addition of a discussion of Limitations would allow you to address the need to further study invariance across groups in a larger sample.



Marvin Powell: it would be helpful to provide citations for your suggestions.
Overall a good review