

Standard 4 Discussion Notes in Yellow

PEUC Agenda

Wednesday, September 21th, 2016

Welcome Returning and New PEUC Members

Karen Adams, Math

Jared Androzzi, P.E.

Elvira Allison, DOE Chair

Helen Baker, Field Placement

Scott Beard, Graduate Dean

Denis Berenschot, Spanish

Dawn Burke, DOE

Tauna Cole, DOE

Ruth Conley, Science

Kathy Corpus, FACS

Theresa Fontana, DOE

David Gonzol, Music

lynne hannah, DOE

Dori Hargrove, Elementary

Virginia Hicks, SOEPS Dean

Rhonda Hovatter, Health

Maggie James, Student

LeAnn Johnson, DTE

Doug Kennard, DOE

Becky Mercado, Early Ed

B.B. Mitchell, Special Ed

David Modler, Art

Page Moore, BRCTC

Paige Palmer, Student

Linda Sell, DAA

Peggy Swisher, Cert. Analyst

Georgiann Toole, Grad & SS

J.B. Tuttle, English

Michael Funkhouser, EWVCTC

Members in bold were in attendance at this meeting.

Approval of Minutes from September 7, 2016

MAT Retention I – *PEUC members have 1 week to email LeAnn with any concerns.*

CAEP Work -- Linda Sell

Accreditation Pathway: Clinical Partnerships Report Back on Data

TC exceed required 125 field placement hours prior to student teaching:

Early Ed: $(150=8) + (200=10) + (320=20) + (304=30) + (315L=10) + (334L=50) + (335L=50) = 178$ field hours

Elementary: $(150=8) + (200=10) + (320=20) + (PED1 50 to 66) + (Ped2 70 to 90) = 158-194$ field hours

Secondary (not music): $(150=8) + (200=10) + (320=20) + (370=30 \text{ but changing to } 37) + 443 = 50) = 125$

PE: + ?? extra hours

Art Methods +20 extra hours

Music: $(100=8) + (200=10) + (320=20) + (322=15) + (325=15) + (326=15) + (443=50) = 137$ field hours

Placement of students in diverse settings:

This information has been stored in the filemaker pro data base. Doug checked, and information is incomplete. Helen is pulling information from paper records to reconstruct the missing data for student teachers teaching this semester and last year to give us complete records for three cycles of data. She has updated school diversity designations as she has done this.

Work between faculty and teachers to develop TC impact P-12 learning

Cooperating Teacher Surveys: Helen has compiled these and they are posted on the PEUC Sakai site.

Unit Plans – Need TK20 data by specialty area from content methods courses:

Georgiann retrieved data from TK20 as follows:

Math 420: S16	English 421: F 15	SS 422 S15 and S 16
Science 423: No data since F 14	Spanish 423: No data	Art 427: No data
PHED 431: No Data	HLTH 432: No data since F12	

Reports have been uploaded to PEUC Sakai Site

Lengthy discussion focused on Unit Plans. Lynne indicated that the unit plan was originally tied to EDUC 443. LeAnn indicated that when she began teaching 443 four years ago, that there was a unit plan in 443 but that it focuses on embedding literacy instruction in content area instruction and that the rubric does not address content specific expectations. It is untenable for the 443 instructor to use multiple rubrics that require content specific expertise to rate this unit. Likewise, it was determined that it is untenable for students to upload a unit done in a different course to 443 in TK20 and then have specialty area coordinators grade them. It was decided that the 443 unit plan could be used as a program level key assessment for secondary programs, but that the unit plans done in the various content methods courses would serve as specialty area assessments. Strong opinions were voiced over the fact that many of these courses are taught by adjuncts being paid minimal amounts due to low enrollment who have not been properly oriented to expectations regarding key assessments embedded in those courses. All concurred that more thorough training for these adjuncts is needed.

TWS Data – Need TWS-R by specialty area 1 semester: Georgiann sent reports to content coordinators.

Need edTPA and PPAT data by specialty area 2 semesters: LeAnn is compiling it ST-11 data from student teaching by specialty area TK 20 with addendums: Georgiann will post on Sakai.

SPA Specific Key Assessment data: Specialization Coordinators have been asked to provide it.

Establishment of Reliability and validity of instruments

TPA Work – LeAnn

ST-11 Observation and Summative Forms developed by Becky with Companion Tools Worked on by lynne, 3 supervisors and 3 classroom teachers are uploaded in the CAEP folder of the PEUC website

On-line resources for cooperating teachers—Helen

ST-11 Scoring video put together by Becky

Cooperating teacher link on Education Webpage

Professional Development School Establishment in Berkeley County

Meetings BB and Helen had with Public Schools to determine content of on-line resources

Standards Teams Reports

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Ruth Conley reviewed the assessments that are being done across programs. Discussion ensued about assessments that were program wide versus specialty specific. (ST-11, TPA, Pro 05, Portfolio, Unit Plans, Praxis exams). Information from this group's work is posted on Sakai. Questions were raised for Linda regarding what assessments and what data from those assessments will be needed for the CAEP report due in January and the review for next fall.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

Jared Androzzi quickly reviewed the files he had. These file are now uploaded on the PEUC Sakai Site for further review.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

Due to resignations, this group is down to two individuals, lynne Hannah and Denise Berenschot. Not much was done and no information is available.

Standard 4: Program Impact

LeAnn Johnson and Rhonda Hovatter reported that Shepherd has done no work towards meeting this standard. Linda Sell indicated that all universities are struggling with determining how to meet this standard and expectations from CAEP are still being clarified. Hopefully more information will received at the CAEP conference scheduled for next week. This group's report is posted on the Sakai site.

Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

Linda indicated that Donna left notes indicating that she was going to work on this. No information regarding what she was going to do has been found yet. The completer survey update information indicated below will be one piece towards meeting this standard.

Completer Survey Update *LeAnn reviewed the following information sent from the state.*

10 Universities have signed on so far for the 3 NDSU/Qualtrics surveys

Links to the surveys will be embedded into the WVDE evaluation system for

Teacher survey (transition to teaching survey)

Supervisor satisfaction survey

A list of our graduates will need to be provided with teaching license numbers each year to insure that the correct survey link is embedded into the right evaluations

A SU person will need to be trained in Qualtrics to implement the surveys and work with the state in getting data from NDSU

Questions were raised as to whether this would be someone at the university level or would need to be someone related to teacher education. Elivra Allison said she would follow up.

PRAXIS 2 Content test requirement update:

Related SU Policy Change Discussion – Review Letter

LeAnn indicated that she met with Alan Purdue, Scott Beard, and Virginia Hicks yesterday regarding the legal implications of a change in graduation requirements resulting from the state policy change and that the drafted letter to be sent to students after formal SU policy regarding Content testing is voted on.

Discussion revolved around potential for law suits from students who are prevented from graduating, the fact that some content areas and some universities require the content tests prior to student teaching and that language exists in the Shepherd Catalog that covers the university for having to make mid program changes to requirements in order to stay in compliance with state policy.

LeAnn read notes provided by Scott Beard indicating that concern was expressed among the Chief Academic Affairs Officer meeting attended in Charleston and that he will follow up with Dr. Dennison, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

A motion was crafted as follows “All education students must have passing Content Praxis II scores as a requirement for student teaching.”

This motion was tabled for further discussion and a final vote in the next PEUC meeting to insure that everyone has a chance to fully consider all implications.

Faculty were reminded of the Electronic Portfolio workshop being held immediately after PEUC by the physical education department.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40

Future Reports/Considerations:

- SU Policy Recommendations regarding GPA and ACT/SAT from 5100 Review ad hoc committee: Elvira, Scott, David M., Doug, Georgiann
- Practicum Manual Revision— Helen, Lynne, Dawn, Peggy, LeAnn
- Catalog Listing Location for Endorsements –Move to include under education rather than in respective departments?
- University Wide Tracking of Completers – Scott Beard

PEUC Minutes

Wednesday, December 7, 2016, 3:10 – 5:00

“It’s the entire campus that gets accredited not just the department of education.”

Food for Thought from the CAEP Conference

The people in bold were in attendance at least part of the time.

1 - Karen Adams, Math
3 - Jared Androzzi, P.E.
4 - Elvira Allison, DOE Chair
2 - Helen Baker, Field Placement
5 - Scott Beard, Graduate Dean
1 - Denis Berenschot, Spanish
4 - Dawn Burke, DOE
2 - Tauna Cole, DOE
1 - Ruth Conley, Science
1 - Kathy Corpus, FACS
2 - Teresa Fontana, DOE

1 -David Gonzol, Music
1 - lynne hannah, DOE
2 - Dori Hargrove, Elementary
5 -Chris Ames, SOEPS Acting Dean
4 - Rhonda Hovatter, Health
Maggie James, Student
3 - LeAnn Johnson, DTE
1 - Doug Kennard, DOE
5 - Becky Mercado, Early Ed
3 - B.B. Mitchell, Special Ed
1 - David Modler, Art

3 - Page Moore, BRCTC
Paige Palmer, Student
Group Support - Linda Sell, DAA
5 - Peggy Swisher, Cert. Analyst
4 - Georgiann Toole, Grad & SS
5 - J.B. Tuttle, English
3 - Michael Funkhouser, EWWCTC
2 -Paulette Lashley, Erly Lrng Center

Karen James

Minutes from November 16, 2016 approved

Names of Students for Juncture were presented. LeAnn asked people to contact her within the week if there were any concerns.

LeAnn welcomed Dr. Ames to group 5.

Everyone was told to watch for an email at the end of the day on January 6 with names of students that we anticipated receiving juncture paperwork for over the holiday.

An ad hoc committee was formed to consider a Student Petition for Readmission to Teacher Education: Denise Berenschot and Elvira Allison will work with Tauna Cole who will chair the committee. It was recognized that this committee's work may not take place until the new semester starts. LeAnn indicated that due to the late submission of the petition, the student was told he would have an answer before midterms for Spring semester, 2017.

March 8 was selected for the Cooperating Teacher Appreciation Event. LeAnn will contact the student center to verify the reservation of the ballroom. Dawne, Tauna, Linda, and Elvira agreed to work with LeAnn on the committee. Others who are interested may let LeAnn know.

LeAnn provided minutes from the EPPAC Meeting from last week. Those who were in attendance indicated that they got valuable information and that there was good discussion of pertinent topics.

LeAnn indicated that CAEP: D-Day is Here! Groups were to have all their documents and narrative points for Linda to work with posted by today.

A ST-11 Inter-Rater Reliability session was held yesterday. Minutes from that session were provided to the group which summarize many important points that were made regarding this evaluation. A follow up meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 6, 2-5 in Knutti. This will not conflict with any faculty expectations related to the new student convocation, advising and registration being held that morning. All who can make it are encouraged to attend.

LeAnn indicated that standard 3 focuses on recruitment of students, especially for STEM fields. Currently the university catalog houses information related to the early education endorsement with the other teaching fields, but has placed the information related to the Math and Social

Studies endorsements with the Math and History Majors respectively. These endorsements cannot be earned without getting an elementary or secondary education degree so students who are math or history majors are not eligible to earn the endorsement. Additionally, unless a student knows that the endorsement exists, it is unlikely that they would run across it in their reference to the catalog. LeAnn suggested that it would make sense to have the links for these endorsements appear beside the education degrees to which they would have to accompany. She spoke with the registrar's office about placing them in both locations and was told that software required that they be in one place or the other and could not be in both places and had been placed according to the courses involved.

LeAnn asked if everyone agreed that we should ask Math and History if they would allow the endorsement information to be moved to accompany the information on the early education endorsements, thus making it easy for the students eligible for them were most likely to see and explore them. This would raise the awareness of the potential for becoming certified in math or social studies and hopefully lead to more students adding these endorsements to their program of study.

The motion to have LeAnn follow up on this was passed.

LeAnn turned the time over to Linda who summarized the aims of the work needed this semester and recognized the progress made in the past 3 months but also recognized that a lot of work was still not done.

She provided a Standard Work Group Review sheet that included

Review the work/evidence you have gathered for the various components within your standard.

The following information needs to be included with the evidence/item upload:

- What is the item of evidence?
- How was the quality of evidence determined or assured?
- What criteria of success has been established on the measure? How was it established? If criteria have not been established, what is the plan/proposal for establishment?
- What does this evidence mean?
- How is this evidence used? Or, if not systematically used now, how could it/will it be used moving forward?

CAEP Work Groups were given a few minutes to confer before reporting out.

- Standard 1 Group Report and Future Considerations—time did not allow for this group to present.
- Standard 2 Group Report and Future Considerations—Dori Hargrove reviewed the work this group has done and indicated that one concern that they had was that they were making decisions regarding things that they did not have an in depth knowledge of.
- Standard 3 Group Report and Future Considerations—
LeAnn summarized the following:
Data was extracted from federal government documents to show teacher shortages in the certification areas that Shepherd provides, special education, and ELL for last year across all 50 states. Of those states, West Virginia indicated

shortages in all areas. Furthermore, all 55 counties have indicated teacher shortages county wide for the past 7 of the last 10 years. Data regarding hiring in the three adjacent counties (Washington County, MD, Berkeley County, WV, and Jefferson County, WV) show significant numbers of teachers being hired each year. While Washington was able to fill all its openings, unfilled openings remained last year and this year in several areas.

Data from census records in the three adjacent counties was compared to institutional data. The table with this data indicates that Shepherd University recruits heavily for ethnic diversity but that the ethnic diversity of the group diminishes until it closely matches the surrounding community by the time prospects finally become enrolled students. It is thought that this is because to get more ethnic diversity it is necessary to recruit more heavily in counties closer to Washington DC which means that these students would be paying out of state tuition making Shepherd a less viable option compared to colleges where they can commute and pay instate tuition.

The recruitment plan developed was reviewed in the last PEUC meeting so LeAnn did not review it but asked whether CAEP would want our goals to be process or product oriented. It was decided that process goals made more sense given our current situation and that the product of these processes would be best stated as an effort to halt 20% decrease in enrollment of education students that the university reported recently.

Tables showing that we have met the GPA and Test Score requirements of CAEP were presented

Challenges in pulling data regarding the Pro05 disposition assessment were discussed and the plan to report the Results of the EDUC 200 courses and supplement them with two case studies of students who were given low Pro05 ratings, went through the readmit process, worked with their advisor and ultimately returned to the program successfully will be used to supplement this data with indications that the initial steps towards developing a disposition assessment were taken at the EPPAC meeting last week and will continue. It is anticipated that a year will be needed to achieve a disposition assessment that will meet CAEP requirements.

Regarding program progression, this group will summarize the juncture 1, 2, and 3 process, but a weakness was identified in our tracking of students between EDUC 150 and juncture 1. The group felt that tracking the number of semesters it took students to reach juncture 1 would be a good measure of adequate progress, however, LeAnn highlighted what has been learned about the design of data bases when it comes to obtaining necessary reports and indicated that a great deal of work needed to be done as part of this process in order to identify all the reports necessary for review and that this could become the foundation for working with individuals at TK20 and in information systems to organize TK20 to meet these needs.

Doug reviewed that it might be possible to get some information through the File Maker Pro data base which shows the date each student file was accessed. Dr. Ames indicated that it might also be possible to get information from the main university system. These potential sources of information will be explored further next semester.

Data regarding content knowledge and positive impacts on P-12 learning will be taken from the TPAs and Praxis 2. Praxis 2 data following the testing changes that took place in 2013 is not yet available. LeAnn recognized the work Doug did to create the File Maker Pro data base and the work he did this semester to create the new fields so that this test data could be entered. Karen James has been working on this, but it has not yet been completed. Once the information is in, reports will be generated for further analysis.

In regards to documenting expectations of the profession, LeAnn indicated that the student teaching task checklist instituted this semester documents student teacher activities showing completion of these expectations. This information is just now coming in from student teachers and will be analyzed at the beginning of next semester. To promote the analysis next semester, Helen Baker has placed the checklist into the student teaching binders on TK20.

- **Standard 4 Group Report and Future Considerations**

Elvira indicated that this is a very difficult standard and that she was encouraged when she found that some data may be available by teacher at the EPPAC system. LeAnn cautioned her to follow up on the information shared to make sure that it was indeed possible.

Dawne summarized research done regarding what employers are looking for in teachers with leadership being number 1. She indicated that many of the top characteristics are encompassed by our current Pro05 disposition form and that we were going to need a survey. LeAnn reminded everyone that the surveys from NDSU had been adopted last April and reviewed that the first complete surveys had been made available to our graduates last week, that the MOUs were in place although she wasn't sure if the payment between the university and the shared account with other universities had been routed yet. She reviewed information provided previously regarding how these surveys would be embedded in the state's reporting system so that principals and teachers would automatically fill them out as part of their yearly reports, that the state would then separate out the data for our graduates which would be sent to us. This was good news for this group because development of an EPP survey would not be necessary, however, it was stressed that data from the current surveys, while not meeting CAEP standards, should be analyzed and included in the SSR.

- **Standard 5 Group Report and Future Considerations**

Scott left notes for his group, but time was short and no one from the group was available to present further.

Linda indicated that a CAEP Documents and Data Review Meeting would take place Friday, December 9, 10:00 – 3:00 She requested that at least 1 representative from each standards group to review, discuss, question, and clarify the information in the working folders that she will have to work with over the break as she drafts the self-study report

Linda then reviewed the 2017 CAEP Timeline presented on the back of the agenda as included below

The meeting adjourned at 5:00

CAEP Accreditation Timeline for Spring 2017

- January 6 – follow up ST-11 meeting – 2:00 – 5:00
- By January 13 - PEUC members receive draft Self Study Report Narrative to review prior to January 18 PEUC meeting
- January 18 – PEUC meeting – Standard Work Group collaborative review of SSR draft, whole group discussion of status, identification of gap areas, prioritizing work to be done in focus groups
- Week of January 23 – voluntary focus work groups to meet (working with Dr. Ames to determine parameters of supplemental pay for these sessions)
 - Proposed times (Linda and LeAnn to participate in all – others, as available for any or all)
 - Tuesday, January 24 - 1:30 – 4:30
 - Wednesday, January 25 – 1:30 – 4:30
 - Thursday, January 26 – 1:30 – 4:30 and/or 4:30 – 7:30
- February 1 – PEUC meeting –
 - Self - Improvement Plan (based on findings of SSR) discussion
 - Further SSR discussion/review as necessary based on working group progress
- Week of February 6 – 10 – SIP working group + Standards work groups as needed
 - Proposed times (Linda and LeAnn to participate in all – others, as available for any or all)
 - Tuesday, February 7 - 1:30 – 4:30
 - Wednesday, February 8 – 1:30 – 4:30
 - Thursday, February 9 – 1:30 – 4:30 and/or 4:30 – 7:30
- February 15 – PEUC meeting –
 - “Final” version of SSR for review prior to submission to Dr. Hendrix
 - Draft SIP for review and comment
- February 21 – EPPAC at 6:30
- March 1 – PEUC meeting
 - Share feedback received from Dr. Hendrix, address any remaining concerns
 - Present SIP for final review
 - Calendar work identified in SIP for remaining PEUC meetings this semester
- March 2 – Education Fair – All Day – details forthcoming
- March 2 – 3
 - Any final revisions, additions, tweaks to SSR/SIP take place as needed
- Week of March 6 – 10
 - ALL documents and narrative uploaded to CAEP by March 10 submission deadline
- Week of March 13 – 17 – SPRING BREAK☺☺☺
- April 5 PEUC meeting – focus on action items identified in SIP
- April 19 PEUC meeting – focus on action items identified in SIP

Other Important Spring Semester Dates

April 1 – KDP Little House Literacy Carnival – details forthcoming Saturday

Saturday April 8 Literacy Leaders Conference: Workshop Proposals now being accepted at www.jcwvreads.org

Join the Education Relay for Life Team

http://main.acsevents.org/site/TR/RelayForLife/RFLCY17SA?pg=entry&fr_id=83527

Direct Questions to Team Captain Nicole Kees nkees01@rams.shepherd.edu

Professional Education Unit Council Minutes

Wednesday, February 1, 2017, 3:10 – 5:00

Those attending are in bold

1 - Karen Adams, Math

1 - Denis Berenschot, Spanish

1 - Ruth Conley, Science

1 - Kathy Corpus, FACS

1 - David Gonzol, Music

1 - Lynne Hannah, DOE

1 - Maggie James, Student

1 - Doug Kennard, DOE

1 - David Modler, Art

2 - Helen Baker, Field Placement

2 - Tauna Cole, DOE

2 - Teresa Fontana, DOE

2 - Dori Hargrove, Elementary

2 - Paulette Lashley, Erly Lrng Center

2 - Paige Palmer, Student

3 - Jared Androzzi, P.E.

3 - LeAnn Johnson, DTE

3 - B.B. Mitchell, Special Ed

3 - Page Moore, BRCTC

3 - Molly Edelen, EWVCTC

4 - Elvira Allison, DOE Chair

4 - Dawn Burke, DOE

4 - Rhonda Hovatter, Health

4 - Georgiann Toole, Grad & SS

5 - Scott Beard, Graduate Dean

5 - Chris Ames, SOEPS Acting Dean

5 - Peggy Swisher, Cert. Analyst

5 - J.B. Tuttle, English (sabbatical)

Group Support - Linda Sell, DAA

Dr. Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MSA/U: Approval of minutes from January 18, 2017

Cooperating Teacher Appreciation Event Update:

Dr. Johnson thanked Dr. Ames for providing a budget of \$1000 for the Teacher Appreciation Reception. Unlike previous years when this event was a formal sit down dinner limited to teachers who supported full-time student teachers, this year's event will be a reception from 4:30 to 6:30 on March 8th that all facilitating/cooperating teachers will be invited to attend. A question was raised as to whether this would include teachers who only hosted one-day job shadows. After some discussion, the consensus was that we would do our best to see that these teachers were also invited recognizing that it may be that the invitation would be extended to the principal of participating schools who would have to then pass it on to the teachers s/he assigned for the job shadow. **Instructors of courses that involve a field placement were asked to send a list of the teachers they have had students placed with for either the fall or spring semester, 2015-16 to LeAnn with the teacher's email addresses.** Teachers will be sent an electronic invitation. A printed invitation will be provided to hand deliver. **Those who plan to be in a public school before March 8 are asked to let LeAnn know what schools they will be in.** Invitations to place in teacher's boxes will be provided.

Education Fair Update:

LeAnn provided copies of the flyers that will be distributed to high schools in Berkeley and Jefferson County and to the two geographically closest high schools in Washington County (South High and Boonsboro) later this week as soon as the

liability release form is received from Alan Purdue's office. LeAnn thanked Dawne Burke, Tauna Cole and BB Mitchell for being willing to open their classes to visiting high school students. LeAnn indicated that the goal was to bring 20 high school students on campus. She also indicated that if we got a significantly higher response, the plan would be to split these classes into two groups and run two classrooms simultaneously doing the same instruction. If this becomes needful, a request for other faculty members will be extended to find volunteers willing to implement instruction in the second classroom of students. Once we start getting registrations, we will be better able to judge whether this will be needed. Registrations will also ask high school students to indicate a specialization of interest. Specialization coordinators for those areas of interest will be asked to join current teacher candidates in those specializations for an informational session about the specialization program in the afternoon if at all possible. KDP students (Katelyn Butscher, Thomas Kozak, and Maggie James as leaders) have been instrumental in helping set up this event and will be leading some sessions, helping facilitate class participation, and will act as escorts between sessions throughout the day. Thanks was extended to Virginia Hicks' office for providing a budget of \$75 to cover some breakfast foods during the morning sign in and providing snacks in the game zone at the end of the day when high school students will have an opportunity to mingle informally with teacher candidates.

Faculty was reminded that evidence of any recruitment related contacts need to be uploaded to the PEUC Sakai Folder.

SU students taking BR EDUC Program Courses: LeAnn presented a situation that had just been identified; two early education majors from Shepherd had enrolled in an EDUC course at Blue Ridge instead of enrolling in it at Shepherd. Clarification was sought as to the original intent of the Blue Ridge Collaborative Agreement.

Both Doug Kennard and Georgiann Toole, who were involved with the negotiation of this agreement, indicated that EDUC courses approved for delivery at Blue Ridge were to be limited to those students who were part of the collaborative agreement. They felt that this intent had been spelled out in the agreement and that credit for these courses as part of the SU teacher education program was limited to those students who completed the entire program and junctured in their final semester at Blue Ridge. Both indicated that when the agreement was developed, that the Registrar's office indicated that credit for program specific EDUC courses would only transfer as program to program articulation, not as individually articulated courses.

Lynne pointed out that to do otherwise created difficulties for accreditation reports that require us to separate and analyze data for students coming into the program from associated programs. If students take classes in both programs, how would this data be analyzed? LeAnn indicated that the administrative issues for record keeping would be problematic even if guidelines for how to address cross program courses were addressed and would also create issues for tracking the practicum profile.

If the intent of the agreement was reinforced, another issue involved whether students in the BR program who completed all coursework, but did not meet juncture requirements (GPA or test scores) and changed majors to general studies in order to graduate with an AA, still have program credit for taking EDUC courses? After clarifying that these students knew that they would have to meet juncture requirements as Shepherd students to move forward in the program, it was determined that yes the courses taken at BR should count since it would not make sense for them to be required to retake courses they had already completed at BR that were deemed equivalent to the same course taught at SU.

For the current students, the question arose as to whether they had received appropriate preapproval (green form signed by advisor and chair) to enroll in the courses at BR. It was unclear whether these two students had followed this process. Their new advisor, Terresa Fontana indicated that there was no evidence in their advising files to indicate that the previous advisor had signed these approval forms.

LeAnn asked Terresa Fontana (current advisor) and Page Moore (Blue Ridge Program Coordinator) to work with Elvira Allison (DOE chair) to determine if these forms has been signed. Additional research would be done regarding the Blue Ridge Collaborative Agreement

Standard 4 Report:

Georgiann Toole summarized the requirements for CAEP Standard 4.1 indicating that this was something completely new and that no previous data or protocols exist for meeting this required standard. She indicated that the state would not be able to provide classroom level data (despite an assistant superintendent in a county who said this was possible under the old evaluation system) and that trying to follow up with all the school principals our students will end up working under would take an incredible amount of time. She indicated that they had looked at what two other universities were proposing. One had set up a mentorship program for new teachers using retired volunteer teachers and alumni fundraising that would allow the unit to support the program. Another had described an action research project.

The standard 4 Group indicated that they would be able to put together a plan for something like the action research project, but that the implementation of it was not something that could be done casually in a faculty members 'spare time.' The group's question was 'Who is going to actually DO it?' She indicated that at present the university infrastructure to make any plan happen is not currently present and stated that the standard 4 group has been silent for these reasons.

Group discussion brought up and/or clarified the following points.

- We are not required to follow all completers, only 10% that would be 8-12 per year.
- The first year would include the first group with another 10 or so completers being added until we had a group of about 30 completers at which time the completers beginning their fourth year of teaching would be replaced with teachers from the newly graduated class making the total number of completers we would be working with at any time approximately 30.
- We do not need to follow students who end up teaching long distances from the university. Since a significant number end up with jobs in the neighboring counties it would be appropriate to focus on completers who work locally.
- Developing an agreement with participating completers could include sharing data from that teacher's end of year tests, however, not all subject areas are tested.
- Data would have to be separated from PK-12 student grades. For example, many WV administrators have told physical education teachers; they are only allowed to grade students on participation, not progress on physical education skill and knowledge standards.
- While we can find out how other WV universities intend to meet this standard, we need to use TEAC to request the state to address PK-12 data collection. Linda indicated that CAEP has directed that we can't wait on the state to respond to such requests that have already been made, but that we need to move forward with a good faith plan as to what we would like to do.
- At present, CAEP is only requiring a plan, but there is a chance that requirements may be modified in the future as more and more universities come up for review and the limitations associated with such plans become more apparent.
- Our plan needs to thoughtfully address questions that we have about whether or not our program is producing teachers who impact student learning.
- We cannot just list ideas for a plan; we have to actually submit a plan even if we end up adjusting it in the future.
- Scott mentioned that a plan that could take advantage of current university resources such as the Social Media Platform available through the Center for Regional Innovation would allow us to meet completers on line. Such a way of following up would be innovative and not incur added expenses for mileage... LeAnn mentioned that if such platform was in place, the teleconference with completers could be scheduled as part of a regular PEUC meeting. It was also mentioned that to prepare for such a teleconference, completers could be given a set of questions to answer ahead of time that differ from those that would be embedded in their yearly evaluation as part of the NDSU surveys.
- It might be possible for a follow up study to be used as a recruiting tool for bringing our graduates back for the MACI program.

- Georgiann brought the discussion back to the initial question—who will do it? She reiterated that ‘this group cannot do it’ with reference to heavy teaching and advising loads. Elvira backed this up with the comment that this task is too complex and too essential and too important and that there is a need for additional infrastructure to do it and that it is not collegial to expect faculty to add the implementation of this plan to already heavy loads.

Scott indicated that accreditation is a moving target and that we need to find ways where we can use current resources to do it. He emphasized that this is a job for the education team and that it should not all fall on one person. Being involved in this process may end up being very beneficial to all.

Elvira said that President Hendrix wanted SU to be a desirable place to work and that it was untenable to try to motivate faculty into extra work but not be compensated for doing it. She emphasized the need to hire a full time DAA as a tangible way for implementing our goals, that ethically it is not right to persuade faculty to do it because it is not sustainable. She added that she has been involved in the accreditation process before at other institutions and that it is important for the institution to develop appropriate infrastructure to support that process.

Linda indicated that we all agree that this has been a lot of work and that she understands faculty frustration over the fact that we have had to do so much in such a short period of time. She indicated that she had agreed to stay on even though she had been hired with the expectation that she would be required to do a much less in far fewer hours. She said that while she had been misled, she had made the decision to stay on as an adult and was living with it knowing that her being here on a short-term part time contract was only a small band-aid for a large amount of needed triage. In the tug of war between empathizing with faculty feelings and knowing that the job needed to be done, she said that we need to move forward so that we can submit a report.

LeAnn indicated that one of her motivations for working hard to support Linda in the work needed to prepare the CAEP report, was to try to move us from a point where we were very likely to be given probation to a point where we would only have to deal with conditions and stipulations. She emphasized the negative impact that being placed on probation would have on our students and that she did not want that to happen for their sake.

Linda said that while the way the DAA position was currently structured and funded was unsustainable and the reality is that the work still has to go on and that March 10th is a reality. While a full-time faculty member would be nice, it isn’t going to happen in the next few weeks. She indicated that she and LeAnn had been keeping a list of things encountered in the work this year for inclusion in the Self-Improvement Plan and that one of those things was to systematically calendar data review so that things don’t have to be this overwhelming in the future.

Dawne reiterated the need for establishing protocols and calendar cycles for data/program review. She said that she was not trying to be recalcitrant, but that she can’t do it with her current load and that being too distracted with so many different tasks had a negative impact on her students. She challenged the institution to restructure now so that we can have a good program with the proper supports in place to avoid having 11th hour crises happen again and again.

Linda indicated that while she understood the current situation, that it was important for us to document the good work of the program, that we need to represent our program in the best possible light and so she is motivated to keep moving forward. She asked the rhetorical question, “why do we need to look at data as a group?” and answered it, so that this group can make decisions.

Concern was expressed that by applying band-aids so that we pass, the administration will come to the conclusion that we don’t need the help and the underlying problems would continue. Linda and LeAnn indicated that no matter how much work is done, there are many things that we simply can’t provide and so we can expect feedback from the CAEP review. LeAnn indicated that with the recent changes in our administration coming at the same time

we would be getting this feedback, that she honestly believed that the institution will make changes in the organizational structure that will allow this work to be more fully supported in the future.

Scott emphasized that probation is a big problem and that it is detrimental to our students. He emphasized the need to look at data which has not been examined in recent years and to make decisions based on it. He said that the specialty coordinators have been looking at this data for their individual programs and making these kinds of decisions but that the Department of Education faculty as a whole has not had to do this. The CAEP report is essentially a SPA for the unit and that while very difficult, the process helps everybody. He indicated that things are moving in terms of institutional restructuring even though we do not yet know what that restructuring will look like.

Elvira asked if for the time being we can get tangible resources for the DAA now?

Scott indicated that he has talked to Dr. Ames and that there is already a half time faculty release for this position but that they were looking at adding more resources to keep Linda on past May 15.

Elvira indicated that the ideal is not necessarily a faculty member but a full time person with a specific skill set and that the problem is with the fact that the DAA is only a half time load for faculty and that when positions rotate, there is no sustainability.

Doug indicated that the administration needs to look at why the previous DAAs left their position. He indicated that he wanted the minutes to record that at no time did the administration ask him why he stepped down from being the DTE. He said that he worked very closely with Dr. Porter, the last faculty member to hold the position as DAA, and that he saw her struggles as she tried to move forward but instead of getting more support was given more and more tasks until it was not possible to do the work. He asked if any administrator asked why she left Shepherd to assume the same position at WVU? He said he would like to hear the administration one time ask the questions that would show that they were trying to understand.

Tauna indicated that the administration needs to carefully consider workloads and salaries when they find that no faculty member is willing to take on these responsibilities.

LeAnn wrapped up the discussion indicating that the minutes will show the concerns expressed, that the frustration and need for more resources has been noted. She asked that in the interest of moving forward with the report if faculty would agree to spend the final 25 minutes of the meeting reviewing one of the data sets Linda brought to the PEUC for analysis.

Analysis of WVTPA Pilot Data

Linda passed out a table of the first attempt scores of the WVTPA data along with a page of prompt questions, those remaining were asked to provide written responses as a result of small group discussion to the following:

What does the assessment look at? Planned intention (validity)? Lived intention (reliability)? What does the data tell you? What can you surmise about students and their learning and understanding?

What steps can we take in response to this data? What should we continue doing? What do we need to change? What can we add to make improvements?

Are there questions we would like to answer by analyzing this data set that we can't answer as the data is organized and reported currently?

Does the organizational structure of the data table facilitate data analysis? Is anything missing? Could anything be done to make it more usable/readable?

Additional comments.

Groups worked for about 20 minutes.

Assessment Data Analysis sheets were collected and the meeting was adjourned at 4:55

The following represents the comments of groups in relationship to the WVTPA data

What does the assessment look at...

Students overall struggle with context.

We need reference data from other institutions and from multiple raters in terms of reliability

Low experience/short preparation or practice time might contribute to lower performance.

Students may focus heavily on tasks to complete rather than the process of teaching effectively

The data seems to indicate in each program the specific areas that might be weaknesses that need to be addressed.

Range from high to low. As a task being done in a special education class, the class scored the lowest in tasks related to special education that supports the need for a second special education methods class before student teaching.

What steps can we take in response?

Continue?

More content area input on completing TPAs.

Collegiality

Change?

Add descriptions of the tasks and subtasks for those who are less familiar with the assessment

Address SPA requirements (align with SPAs)

Remove 0s unless student scored poorly. If they didn't submit, they should be scored n/a or null

Improve

Add overall mean

Student appear weak in assessment

Improve infrastructure and administration of programs to allow for integrating assessments needs within and across programs.

Questions to answer?

No responses

Structure of Table

An overall mean might be more helpful than means for individual content areas

Try a box, notch and whiskers PLOT for entire cohort & cohort subtests showing inner quartiles of the data to provide a data range. Add a 95% confidence interval or mean and median to such a chart and then do a test to look for any significant difference within the program or between institutions

Include data/information on completer numbers.

We need overall mean not individual scores.

Minutes Submitted by: Dr. LeAnn Johnson

