

PEUC minutes regarding Pro 05/Disposition Assessment in GREEN

Professional Education Unit Council Minutes Wednesday, October 5, 2016

Voting Members Present: J. Androzzi, S. Beard, D. Berenschot D. Burke, R. Conley, T. Fontana, D. Gonzol, c. hannah, D. Hargrove, R. Hovatter, L. Johnson (Chair), D. Kennard, P. Lashley, R. Mercado, B. Mitchell, D. Modler, P. Moore, L. Sell, G. Toole, J. Tuttle, P. Palmer, Elementary SESA Rep.

Voting Members Absent: K. Adams, E. Allison, H. Baker, T. Cole, K. Corpus, Maggie James, Secondary SESA Rep.

Visiting: V. Hicks,

Dr. Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:12 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MSA/U: Approval of September 21, 2016 minutes.

JUNCTURE REVIEW

Members received the candidates for Juncture 1, Juncture 2, and Retention 2 dated October 5, 2016. Members have one week to notify Dr. Johnson, in writing, with concerns or objections of juncture candidates. If nothing is forthcoming, a letter will be sent to the students awarding the status as indicated.

MATH COURSE CHANGES

Dr. Hargrove requested a change for EDUC 341 be added as a co-requisite or permission of instructor for EDUC 351 and EDUC 352 that will allow for better understanding of teaching mathematics in the elementary school and use what they are learning while completing their fieldwork. (Changes were presented previously but approved before they had been approved by other bodies.)

MSA/U to waive the second reading.

MSA/U to list EDUC 341 as a co-requisite or permission of instructor for EDUC 351 and EDUC 352.

ELECTRONIC PORTFOLIOS

The physical education department provided portfolio training and is moving forward with electronic portfolios. Dr. Johnson presented reasons why we need to move to electronic portfolios and why TK20 would be able to provide us with a way to collect and analyze data regarding portfolios. Dr. Mercado, serving as chair with Dr. Tuttle and Page Moore, were charged with identifying those elements that would be required for all programs and developing a rubric for rating those requirements. They will present their conclusions to the entire PEUC for further discussion.

DISPOSITION ASSESSMENT

Dr. Johnson indicated that the Pro 05 does not meet CAEP requirements and that we need to research disposition assessments that would be acceptable. Drs. Hovatter and Androzzi will bring recommendations to the PEUC for further discussion and adoption.

MOU FOR ART STUDENT TEACHING IN ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY

David Modler indicated an Art Education student has run into a problem with her student teaching; therefore, Mr. Modler has requested that we allow her to do an extra week of student teaching.

MSA/U to allow the student to student teach an extra week.

STUDENT RE-ADMIT PETITION

A student has requested re-admission to student teaching. An Ad Hoc committee has been formed with Dr. Georgian Toole, serving as Chair, with Drs. Mitchell and Dr. Tuttle.

Begin with the End in Mind—What will the CAEP site visit involve and what will your role be?

Dr. Sell reported on the CAEP 2016 conference attended by herself, Drs. Johnson and Allison and indicated that following the conference, they met for more than five hours.

Dr. Sell explained the difference between NCATE and CAEP and the paradigm shift needed using the analogy of getting a job on just a resume and interview and getting a university job that involved demonstrated teaching and likened CAEP reviewers to a university supervisor who looks at a lesson plan but then goes beyond to see if the student can actually teach it and then reflect on it and follow up with changes based on those reflections.

CAEP is looking for more than evidence, they want to see how we have used it.

CAEP will spell out what they want to see for further evidence. When CAEP arrives on campus, we will have the information ready for them. If we say it, we must show it. They do not want to see course syllabi but they want to see where we list the evidence in the course syllabi. If handbooks speak to core professional objectives, they want to see that section.

Some things will be stored in the evidence room. When we submit the Self Study, we are allowed 90 uploads only.

All the materials that are dropped into Google.doc will be put into one piece of evidence.

Dr. Beard indicated we should provide a cohesive cover sheet that shows where each piece of evidence is located.

The big piece of the report writing is pulling it all together in one place. We must prove our case and tag the evidence.

The timeline used last year was handed out and the point was made that we are not where we should be. The CAEP standards came out in 2013 and the process should have started in 2014. Reports have been written and some work has been done. In order to get our self-study report submitted, we will have to make this a project with a December 7 deadline.

LeAnn indicated that the final PEUC meeting of the semester will be held December 7 and that group work will require that we maximize our PEUC time.

On December 7, Dr. Sell will take what has been given to her from the standards work groups and will write the report over break and present the written report at the first PEUC meeting in January for final approval before submission.

To maximize work, the standards work groups have been reconstituted and Google doc folders have been set up for each group. These folders should be used for each group's work. Dr. Sell will be monitoring them and answering questions as needed.

The final report will be submitted electronically in January. We will receive feedback in July with an opportunity to submit additional data and information. During the spring semester, faculty will need to work on creating evidence on the areas that are weak so that it is ready for resubmission.

Approximately two months before the visit, which is tentatively scheduled for November, Shepherd will get a final report spelling out what CAEP wants to see when they arrive for their campus visit. They will also tell us whom they want to talk to when they arrive. We need to be well versed on our

own programs and processes. The site visitors will only want to see specific evidence. We won't give them the 50-page handbook; instead we will give them the segment that is relevant.

Our supporting documents will be kept in the evidence room (Sakai). The Report will be submitted electronically as pdfs with specific evidence tagged so that the reviewers can find it easily. Linda likened the process to building a court case with the goal of making our case easy enough to understand for a jury.

Each group will be interviewed by their particular standards; they must be an expert on their particular standard. All standards must be addressed.

There was talk of requesting an extension. It was investigated and was strongly encouraged by the state not to request an extension. If the site visit is in Fall 2017, we only have to write a Self Study and show work for initial standards. If the visit were extended, which would only be by one semester, the advanced programs would have to be included in the report and visit.

Dr. Beard shared that this process is very similar to the institutional review he completed recently and invited us to look at the files put together for that process as a model. Everyone moved into standards groups and Dr. Sell reviewed the following documents with everyone and showed the Google docs site where the work will take place.

CAEP Standards overview

Preparing the Selected Improvement Self Study Report – Steps

Themes of Technology and Diversity

CAEP Standards for Initial Programs: Evidence Sufficiency Criteria, and Key Evidence Sufficiency Criteria

Linda stressed that while some standards are required, all must be addressed.

Each group was to identify a group leader who would be responsible for communications with Linda

Each group was tasked with taking stock of where they are

Identifying Action Steps

Setting up a timeline for those steps

Assigning tasks

CAEP Standards Groups - 45-Minute Work Session

Check out <http://www.caepnet.org/about/2016-fall-caepcon> for presentations from the conference

Each team was asked to take minutes of their session.

PRAXIS II Content test requirement was passed unanimously with a minor adjustment

To be eligible to student teach, teacher candidates must have passing scores at the required state level on their designated Praxis II content exam(s).

GPA Policy Change Recommendation from 5100 Review ad hoc committee: Elvira, Scott, David M., Georgiann

GPA Juncture 1 Requirements (First Read)

- Teacher candidates with a GPA of 3.0 are eligible for full status at Juncture 1.
- Teacher candidates with an overall GPA between 2.5 and 3.0 with a Pro Ed GPA greater than 3.0 are eligible to apply for juncture 1, but will have provisional status.
- Teacher candidates with provisional status may register for and continue in post juncture courses as long as their post juncture semester G.P.A is 3.0 or higher.
- Provisionally admitted teacher candidates will be given full status when their overall G.P. A. increases to 3.0 or higher.

- Provisionally admitted students who earn less than a 3.0 semester G.P.A. have the option of repeating their courses 1 time to achieve the semester G.P.A. of 3.0 before being withdrawn from the teacher education program.

Lynne, Doug and BB submitted arguments opposing this proposal on discussion

- Lynn indicated that the proposed policy was confusing, that the language “provisional” currently has a different meaning in our policy as would “probation”, that such a change would amount to taking the money of students who could never pass Juncture 2 because they may not be able to get to the required 2.75 in two semesters, that it would allow for students who have demonstrated lack of academic excellence to enter a program they were not able to succeed in, and that lowering the individual GPA to 2.5 is lowering our standards overall. She said that we are currently meeting the required cohort GPA of 3.0 and that she could not foresee a time when we do not have enough students with high enough GPAs to keep the cohort average above the required 3.0. She indicated that any change in policy would have to be submitted to the state for program approval.
- Doug indicated concern about not addressing the need for an overall GPA of 3.0 by Juncture 2 and asked if the calculations had been done to determine the quality points required to move from a 2.5 to a 3.0 in two semesters. He questioned which cohort students admitted without full status would belong to.
- BB indicated that a straight change to 3.0 overall GPA should be passed.
- LeAnn indicated that the committee making this recommendation (LeAnn, Georgiann, Scott, and Elvira) had carefully considered wording of policy 5100 and CAEP before making this recommendation and that all felt that it not only met the letter of the law (minimum individual overall GPA of 2.5) but also the spirit of the law by defining core classes as the required EDUC courses and requiring students to maintain a semester GPA of 3.0 after passing Juncture 1. She cited the fact that CAEP was encouraging the cohort language to allow for promising students who individually did not meet the 3.0 to still move forward in teacher education without compromising overall quality. Social justice would indicate that these students be able to have an alternative path to demonstrating excellence. She indicated we have several nontraditional students now in the program, and anticipate more in the future, who come to us with a bad record from a previous time in their lives and must then take semesters of courses that do not contribute to their progression as teachers just to bring their GPA up, but who have maintained a high GPA since arriving at Shepherd. The new policy would allow them to move forward while holding them to a high academic standard. She agreed that appropriate language would have to be identified to designate students who passed Juncture 1 with less than full status and that an addition to the proposal would have to be made to indicate that these students who maintain their semester GPA of at least a 3.0 between Juncture 1 and Juncture 2 would be eligible to pass Juncture 2 and complete the program.

At this point the discussion was tabled until the next PEUC meeting due to time.

The final item on the agenda was tabled for the time being and the meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Test Score Juncture 1 Requirements: More research and discussion is needed to address the top 50% Policy 5100 requirement. We are however allowed to base this on ACT, SAT, GRE, CORE (at a higher level than passing cut offs). If we are willing to engage in long term studies to show that teacher candidates admitted with other scores or assessments of excellence are

as effective as students meeting the standardized test requirements, we could potentially use AP Tests, PARC, Smarter Balance, a rigorous end of course project in EDUC 320 or 360, interview, or other evidence of leadership.

Future Reports/Considerations:

- 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

Professional Education Unit Council Minutes
Wednesday, October 19, 2016

Voting Members Present: E. Allison, D. Berenschot H. Baker, D. Burke, T. Cole, T. Fontana, D. Gonzol, c. hannah, D. Hargrove, L. Johnson (Chair), D. Kennard, R. Mercado, D. Modler, P. Moore, L. Sell, G. Toole, J. Tuttle, P. Palmer, Elementary SESA Rep.

Voting Members Absent: K. Adams, J. Androzzi, S. Beard, R. Conley, K. Corpus, R. Hovatter, P. Lashley, B. Mitchell, Maggie James, Secondary SESA Rep.

Visiting: V. Hicks

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MSA/U: Approval of October 5, 2016 minutes.

JUNCTURE REVIEW

Members received the candidates for Juncture 1, Juncture 2, and Retention 2 dated October 19, 2016. Members have one week to notify Dr. Johnson, in writing, with concerns or objections of juncture candidates. If nothing is forthcoming, a letter will be sent to the students awarding the status as indicated.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Blue Ridge Collaborative Program is adding Physical Education, Health and Early Education to Shepherd University's agreements with BRCTC and SU. The amended agreement will be signed by the two institutions in the near future.

Distribution of PRAXIS II Content Test Policy Change Letters by Advisors (Posted on PEUC Website). Hard copies of these letters were distributed and a file with an electronic copy has been saved in the PEUC Sakai Site Resources folder for making additional copies or transmitting to advisees

electronically. Advisors were asked to distribute a copy of the letter to their students when they are advised and to bring a list of advisees who received the letter to the next PEUC meeting.

CAEP: 49 Days left to gather information and make any required changes for the self-study report

Validity is expected for EPP created assessments such as observation instruments, program rubrics, and other tools used to assess/evaluate candidate performance. CAEP expects at least Content Validity. Expert judgment is the primary method used to determine content validity.

CAEP recommends we start with Q-Sort and end with Lawshe. All Stakeholders (faculty, P-12 administrators and teachers, and students) should be included in process

Review Webinar Slides on Validity from Stevie Chepko.

Dr. Johnson presented the information in this slide show regarding content validity to the PEUC using the slides previously provided by Stevie Chepko. Dr. Johnson stressed that Q-sort was a way to get all stakeholders involved in defining independent constructs within an instrument and once those elements were identified and defined, that the Lawshe process could be used to document the level of agreement as to their importance to the purpose of the assessment. The magnitude of what needed to be done spurred council wide conversation regarding faculty load and time for addressing these procedures.

Dr. hannah reviewed the process used for developing the ST-11 and its companion tool indicating that because it was required by the state, we would not need to undergo the validity process outlined. LeAnn indicated that if that is true, we would still need to establish training for use and inter-rater reliability.

In regards to stakeholder input, Dr. Johnson suggested that work groups who needed that input may want to take advantage of the EPPAC meeting in December to do a Q-Sort and Lawshe at that time. Dr. hannah suggested that the EPPAC meeting would be a good place to recruit stakeholders for that work and Dr. Allison suggested that the RESA 8 meetings would also be a good place for recruiting stakeholders to participate. However, both stressed with others concurring that the time required to do it right would probably best be done during a working meeting or retreat for a half to whole day and involve food and other expenses and that the university would need to provide funding to support such a meeting.

Discussion regarding which instruments would need to undergo this process for unit level assessment focused on the Pro05 and unit plan. Dr. hannah commented on the consistency of the rubric for the unit plan across programs and it was suggested that she directly email the PED instructors, EDUC 443 instructor, and EDUC 334 instructor for their current rubrics to determine how they aligned with each other.

Disposition Assessment

Regarding the Pro05, Dr. Johnson indicated that Drs. Androzzi and Hovatter were at a conference but were planning to bring their recommendations to PEUC in November. They are currently looking at proprietary instruments as well as soliciting instruments from other universities to provide us with different ideas regarding the best way to do this. A comment was made as to the expense for purchasing a proprietary instrument or pay for developing it.

Dr. Toole made a comment that while CAEP is expecting this of us for unit level assessments; the individual program assessments used for the various SPAS were also going to be expecting this level of development in the future. Dr. Allison asked who would be paid to do this kind of work, that she was concerned about overloaded faculty taking on more responsibility and indicated that at most universities this work is done by a full time staff member, associate dean, who has the specific set of

skills required which faculty are not trained to do. She questioned whether the university would support the infrastructure for it.

Dean Hicks indicated that it wasn't too hard which Dr. Burke refuted and added that it was inappropriate to expect it given the current loads.

Dean Hicks suggested that we could possibly put off the visit if we needed more time. The reasoning for not doing this was again presented as in previous PEUC meetings. She then said she could meet with Dr. Johnson and Dr. Allison and the provost to come up with a plan for supporting such a position. Dr. Allison reiterated that this would be good because it is an indispensable position that is not appropriate for part time work or a partial faculty release.

Dr. hannah supported this by stressing the fact that while the establishment of validity was a one-time thing for each instrument, the training and inter-rater reliability was a constant process and that a full time DAA would be needed to keep it up and running. Dr. Allison agreed stressing the need for consistency and continuity if we were to be successful in having the type of program that we owe our students. Dean Hicks agreed and the PEU faculty indicated they also agreed.

Dr. Tuttle said that this is a key question that the unit needs to have addressed. "We all work too hard to do all we can. None of us can read about this (Lawshe and Q-Sort) and feel confident in doing it. Infrastructure is needed for the long term and the current status is unacceptable."

Dean Hicks indicated she came from a university that had an associate dean who did this work and that when she came to Shepherd, Dr. Kennard did it all. She said that the position he held was broken into two positions, the DAA and the DTE. She said that we now have a placement coordinator and that the university was willing to hire a new external chair. She stated "We need it, but I'm in between. They have helped us out but the department needs more."

Dr. hannah indicated that the turnover in leadership positions was the direct result of the unsustainability of the expectations and that hiring part time people is what has put us in the position we are now in. Dr. Burke asked how we could be expected to be accredited when the part time person hired to be the DAA has a contract that ends in May. This means the DAA will not be employed with Shepherd during the summer when a response to the report will be needed and will not be here in the fall when the visit takes place or beyond when we will have to be working on the conditions that we most certainly are going to be cited.

Dean Hicks said that we can't go back but that we must go forward and that we need to work together.

Dr. Johnson summed up the discussion by summarizing that many valid concerns had been expressed. That Dean Hicks has promised to set up a meeting with Provost Ames, Dr. Allison, and herself to discuss the need for a full time long-term position. That it was now time to get with the CAEP work groups. Given the short time left, group work time would be reduced to 15 minutes to give each group an opportunity to determine what to report on their status reports.

15 Minute CAEP Standards Work Session

Standard 5 Group Progress Report

Dean Hicks indicated that her group met last Wednesday and that Dr. Mercado had been able to participate from out of town. She said that Google docs worked well as they came up with information for 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 She cited Title 2 report, Teacher Work Sample, SPAs, the Assessment report with the Center for Teaching and Learning, Program Review Process and the Annual quality assessments done on faculty for meeting these standards.

Standard 4 Group Progress Report

Dr. Allison said her group had met today and had reviewed the requirements for CAEP. She indicated that we have surveys of principals and cooperating teachers we could use but that the return rate was low and we would need to do something to get it up to 20%. She said that we could use student course evaluations and they would work with the institutional research office. She also indicated that they would be working closely with RESA 8 for field experiences and employment. She indicated we need to collect informal anecdotal evidence from satisfied completers and principals regarding satisfaction with the program. Dr. Sell indicated that we should post emails, etc., to this effect to the Google drive and that people can take notes to document phone calls. That this is considered tangible evidence.

Dr. Mercado asked if TK20 could be used to report back post graduation. She suggested that we can start with EDUC 150 in setting candidate expectations that their preparation as teachers goes beyond graduation and that while we can't require them, we can encourage them strongly to respond to post graduation assessments posted to TK20 with requests emailed to them. She also indicated that it would be a good idea to teach our students a little bit about what accreditation is, what the 5 standards are, and what their role in it will be. We need to remember that candidates will be interviewed by CAEP and that it would be good for them to understand what it is all about.

Standard 3 Group Progress Report

Dr. Johnson indicated that her group had developed an extensive task list in Google drive and had established a document laying out ideas for a recruitment plan. Big pieces of this standard are going to rest on dealing with the 3.0 GPA, top 50% test score, and disposition instrument so there will be a lot more in future PEUC meetings on these issues.

Standard 2 Group Progress Report

Dr. Fontana indicated that this group had reviewed the work done by the initial Standard 2 group and that they agreed with the evidence provided by them but that they had lots of questions about 2.2 which involves recruiting quality cooperating teachers and would be in touch with Linda about them.

Standard 1 Group Progress Report

Dr. Kennard indicated that their leader was not there but that they had given out assignments and had collected data that would be worked on for the coming weeks. Dr. Berenschot added that the secondary specialization coordinators on the team were able to talk about their specializations but were having difficulty drawing back to see the big picture and find the commonalities. The group said they were basically looking at 4 instruments. Dr. Sell concurred that it is a big challenge to back out of the individual SPA mindset to see the global picture. She then indicated that she was happy to see that the group had gone into more detail to identify a specific part of an assessment that applies to a specific part of the CAEP expectation. She reiterated that because we are in the transition phase of CAEP, we would be able to come up with a plan whereas to delay a plan wouldn't do us any good because they would be looking for data and the masters programs would be added to it. Dr. Berenschot asked if we could use things from NCATE to assist but everyone said that it was a different process, it was 7 years ago and that the ST11 hadn't been used at that time.

CAEP Related Discussions

Electronic Portfolios: Becky Mercado

Dr. Mercado presented the handout of the recommendation that the Ad Hoc committee had put together. She explained the processes of the group, the research they had done regarding program needs for tracking students from 150 to juncture rather than simply at juncture which resulted in 100% passage since students either dropped out or waited in a holding pattern until they met juncture requirements. She also indicated that TK20 is the most logical place to house a unit wide portfolio that could be tied to streamlining juncture processes. She indicated that if we were to design it right, it could result in giving us the ability to show how and why the 750 students that are declared education majors when they enter EDUC 150 shrinks substantially by the time they juncture. It could also be used to revise the current ST11 and take off the elements of standards 4

and 5 and move them into the portfolio—something that might be more appropriate than with the summative ST11. She highlighted the fact that it would provide consistency that is important for CAEP (Dr. Allison and Dr. Burke strongly agreed) and that individual specializations could add specific elements to it as needed by their SPAS. She said that if everyone concurred that a portfolio of this nature was desired, the Ad Hoc committee would begin work on specific recommendations for content and scoring rubrics.

Dr. Mercado asked that everyone please email her with questions and comments or to address any of the items bulleted on the handout over the next week and that we could then vote on whether to proceed with development of a unit wide portfolio in TK20 at the next PEUC meeting.

Dr. Gonzol indicated that this would be a big departure from how he currently uses the portfolio in music.

- New Federal Regulations Article: Linda Sell – Not discussed due to time

Ad hoc committee Reports

- Contract Modification: Dori Hargrove –
Dr. Toole summarized the original work done by the Ad hoc committee and asked Dr. Johnson to comment further on it. A motion was made by Dr. Hargrove to modify the contract and proceed with the new recommendation that the EDUC 390 experience be turned into a student teaching experience for the remainder of the semester.
MSA/U: Approval for contract modification
- Student Readmit Petition: Georgiann Toole
It was decided to table this discussion until the next PEUC meeting so that appropriate time could be devoted to fair deliberation.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55

Future Reports/Considerations:

- Modified Language for GPA Policy Change Recommendation on Hold
- Disposition Assessment Recommendation: Rhonda and Jared
- 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

Minutes provided by Dr. LeAnn Johnson

Professional Education Unit Council Minutes Wednesday, November 16, 2016

Voting Members Present: E. Allison, J. Androzzi, H. Baker, D. Berenschot, D. Burke, T. Cole, R. Conley, K. Corpus, T. Fontana, D. Gonzol, c. hannah, D. Hargrove, R. Hovatter, L. Johnson (Chair), D. Kennard, P. Lashley, R. Mercado, L. Sell, G. Toole, J. Tuttle, P. Palmer, Elementary SESA Rep.

Voting Members Absent: K. Adams, C. Ames, S. Beard, M. Funkhouser, EWCTC, B. Mitchell, D. Modler, P. Moore, Maggie James, Secondary SESA Rep. P. Swisher

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

JUNCTURE REVIEW

Members received the candidates for Juncture 1 dated November 16, 2016. Members have one week to notify Dr. Johnson, in writing, with concerns or objections of juncture candidates. If nothing is forthcoming, a letter will be sent to the students awarding the status as indicated.

CAEP: 21 Days left to gather information and make any required changes for the self-study report Recent CAEP

CAEP Related Policy Discussions

Electronic Portfolios: Becky Mercado

Dr. Mercado reviewed what had been covered two meetings ago. It was clarified that we first had to decide whether a portfolio with common elements should be adopted as a program wide unit assessment. A motion was made and seconded to “set up a committee to develop a unit wide portfolio.” This committee will solicit feedback from PEUC members and determine what pieces should be included as those common to all programs and will be the foundation upon which individual programs may add specific requirements.

Moved and seconded to set up a committee to develop a unit wide portfolio. The motion passed with a vote of 12 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstained.

Dr. hannah noted that, as an assessment, the development of a portfolio will need to follow the procedures outlined by CAEP to establish validity and reliability. All recognized this as accurate.

Disposition Assessment Recommendation: Rhonda Hovatter

Dr. Hovatter indicated that she had contacted several institutions to see what they were using as a disposition assessment. All of the institutions had developed instruments under NCATE and have not gone through the CAEP Standards development. She said that all involved the same types of elements as our Pro05 but they had indicators for each rather than an arbitrary rating with no descriptors. She has been unable to locate any proprietary disposition assessments that we could simply adopt.

Dr. Johnson commented that the Pro05 will not meet CAEP standards so we will have to begin the process of developing a disposition assessment following the CAEP guidelines.

Dr. Hovatter said she would upload the instruments used by other institutions to the PEUC Sakai site so that we could examine them in starting this process.

Three Point Recruitment Plan: LeAnn Johnson

Dr. Johnson reviewed a document prepared by Standards group 3

Recruitment Plan

3.1 The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a **broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations** to accomplish their mission. The **admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America's P-12 students**. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently, STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.

3 Point Plan

1. Local High School Visits: (Berkeley=4, Jefferson=2, Washington=7)
 - a. 1 Time Per Academic Year
 - b. PEUC Members join an admissions counselor and do a high school visitOr
Set up a Visit at Their Own Convenience (Admissions is willing to loan materials)

Goal: Increase visibility of the education programs especially for STEM fields
Dr. Johnson invited comments related to this first proposal.

Dr. Conley commented that the science department has already discussed a similar proposal and that they felt there was too much for faculty to do already. Dr. Burke concurred. Faculty feel that they are being “piled on” and that faculty load needs to be distributed differently if we are expected to do any more than we are already doing.

Dr. Conley suggested that, alternatively, a team of faculty members could skype into a high school to talk to interested students and indicated that faculty already have significant connections with P-12 students through science fair judging and such. Dr. hannah commented that this is the job of admissions and that expecting the department to do more is untenable. She indicated that it is more than just a couple of hours. That it takes time to set up the venue with the school in addition to the time actually spent at the school. She also indicated that we are “already out there” and that our students are great role models to their P-12 students. She cited a middle school principal as indicating that this was one of the reasons why they liked having our students placed in their school and that Ranson Elementary School had commented that “they know us” and rather than asking for more, that we document what we are already doing. Dr. Tuttle said that he does a lot in the schools but has never had a vehicle for being able to formally document it.

It was suggested that we work with our teacher candidates to have them talk student-to-student. That it could become a program requirement.

Linda Sell commented that most high schools have college fairs and perhaps we could have some of our students join us in attending them.

Dr. Cole mentioned that when Martinsburg High School had their Harlem Renaissance Fair, faculty and candidates had participated with very positive results.

Dr. Hovatter mentioned that in her previous institution, participating in a career day was part of the methods field hours completed by her students.

Dr. Johnson invited Paige Palmer, as our student representative, to respond to the idea of promoting more student-to-student interactions as part of a recruitment plan. Paige said that she felt that it would mean more to high school students to talk to teacher candidates, but that we need to be aware that not all of our college students have had the same positive experiences with Shepherd and that there is potential for the opposite to happen.

Dr. Johnson asked if in asking students to do more, that this would be asking too much for our students who are already extremely busy with many holding down jobs in addition to classes and field hours. Dr. Kennard strongly concurred.

Dr. Mercado said that if we have ready-made brochures to use, it would be helpful and Dr. Johnson reminded everyone that the Chairs had been told that admissions was in the process of developing such flyers that we could use.

Dr. Johnson wrapped up this topic by indicating that the Standard 3 group would revise this part of the recruitment plan accordingly and that a system would be set up for faculty to document their recruitment related contacts with P-12 students.

Dr. Johnson introduced the second point of the proposed recruitment plan.

2. SU Education Fair

- a. Bring High School Students to Shepherd for a Day (Pilot March 2, 2017)
- b. Pair up with a Teacher Candidate to attend morning classes
- c. Campus tour
- d. Series of hands-on workshops on educational topics
- e. Candidate/Student/Faculty social activity late afternoon

Goal: Form personal connections with high school students so they are more likely to choose a Shepherd University education program.

It was suggested that we tie into events already going on across campus such as Shep-O-Treat or the Eagle School 5th grade campus tours. Dr. Johnson commented that recruitment of high quality diverse individuals into teacher education is different than generic community good will and that it is a pretty big jump to try to support a 5th grade field trip as a teacher education recruitment tool.

Dr. Androzzi contributed the idea that having a special activity to bring potential teacher education students to Shepherd can also apply to transfer students and cited the Physical Education Department's PE Central All-Day workshop that brought in 10 students from Montgomery College.

Several suggestions included having high school students 'sit in' on classes or shadow a teacher education student throughout the day. Dr. Johnson indicated it would be part of the planned activity.

It was also mentioned that it would be good for the visiting students to be able to stay in the dorms with their mentor teacher candidate. LeAnn commented that group 3 had checked into this but there were concerns from Residence Life about underage students in the dorms and university liability and so they had dropped the idea of staying overnight and focused on a daytime activity. In the beginning, we would want to pilot a small number of high school students before opening future education fairs to larger numbers.

Dr. Hargrove said that if we were to go with the March 2 date that had been suggested by KDP students who would be involved, it would interfere with the PED students being in the field that week. Timing is something that would need to be worked on to insure that a maximum number of teacher candidates are on campus the day that high school students would attend.

Concerns were raised about money needed for food and liability if we were to do this. Linda Sell commented that we might be able to have someone from the high school on campus to mitigate potential liability issues.

Dr. Conley mentioned that we shouldn't forget that people coming to the university with intent to go into other fields, shouldn't be overlooked because, if well advised, they may be able to get a double major in that field with added teaching certification as was proposed in the Noyce Grant. Dr. Johnson indicated that they recognize this possible source of high quality candidates and that the education fair could potentially include them but that the focus for the first pilot would be on high school students who have indicated an interest in teaching.

Dr. Johnson summed up the conversation by concluding that we would pursue the development of a pilot SU Education day next semester and that careful attention would be paid to liability issues and to insure that it was a well-planned positive experience for high school students who attend.

Dr. Johnson introduced the third point of the recruitment plan.

3. Establish/Update Advising Pathways from Community Colleges that SU is Targeting (25% tuition discount) (HCC, FCC, Montgomery, Northern Virginia, Lord Fairfax)
 - a. Different from formal agreements with Blue Ridge and Eastern
 - b. Example, PSC = 13 new courses articulated since June, EDUC 150 being offered as a hybrid so transfer students can take it concurrently with their 2 year college classes.
 - c. PE has started working with Montgomery College

Goal: To make us a viable option for potential transfer students

Montgomery and Northern Virginia are much more diverse than SU which will show attempts to "recruit students from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations"

Fall 2015 Cohort=35 Students (33 White, 1 Hispanic, 1 2 or more races)

Spring 2016 Cohort = 36 Students (35 White, 1 Asian)

Fall 2016 Cohort= 26 Students (25 White, 1 Black/AA)

Dr. Johnson explained the university's focus on the five colleges listed in the plan and that we felt that by updating or creating advising pathways with them, as has been done since May for Potomac State College, will encourage students to consider Shepherd for transfer. It should be noted that Montgomery College and Northern Virginia have much more diverse student bodies than our local area and recruitment for transfer students on these campuses would likely result in more diversity in our current teacher education population. Dr. Androzzi described the work done by physical education with Montgomery County along these lines . Dr. Cole noted that she thought that of the three points, this would be the most successful at increasing the diversity of our cohorts which as noted in the plan, are quite low even though they are representative of the surrounding community. Dr. Johnson turned to a PEUC policy that could potentially negate students transferring from another university and the committee's recommendation for eliminating it.

Stumbling Block to Transfer Students: **PEUC Policy: 24 Credits before being allowed to Juncture.** We would propose to reduce this to 12 credits that would allow students to Juncture after completing one semester at SU.

Due to concern about dispositions cited previously as reason for this, we suggest adding a caveat to the Juncture disposition requirement that students who do not have Pro-05's from EDUC 150 and EDUC 200 need three letters of recommendation from a previous course instructor, college advisor, and field faculty/cooperating teacher).

Dr. hannah indicated that the committee must have an old copy of the PEUC Policy and Procedures Handbook, that this policy had been changed many years previously and that students only had to complete nine (9) credits before being allowed to juncture. Several other PEUC members concurred that this was indeed the case.

Because the currently agreed upon policy is more friendly to potential transfer students than the committee's recommendation, the recommendation with its attendant caveat to require letters of recommendation to make up for fewer experiences was dropped.

At this point, the order of the agenda was modified to insure that other business was voted on.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MSA/U: Approval of November 2, 2016 minutes.

Student Petition:

Dr. Johnson outlined the background of a petitioning FACS student who had joined the Blue Ridge Collaborative Program that did not include FACS and thus prevented

her from applying for juncture at Blue Ridge before transferring to Shepherd University. Upon transferring, she found that a poor academic record from 1988 gave her an institutional GPA too low to juncture despite an overall GPA of 3.18. Normally such a student would be advised to retake the classes previously failed to bring up his or her GPA, however, the student had already retaken most of the courses at Blue Ridge which meant that the Academic Forgiveness policy would not apply. After much discussion and support from Dr. Corpus, her advisor, a motion was made to allow substitution of courses retaken at Blue Ridge for computation of an institutional GPA for juncture purposes. This motion passed with 10 in favor, 3 abstentions and 1 opposed.

It was noted that even with this motion, the student would have to receive 16 credits of A's and 9 credits of B's between this semester and next semester to obtain the required GPA for full status when her juncture application will be reviewed next semester.

CAEP Work Groups were given about 15 minutes to get reports organized:

CAEP Work Group Reports

Standard 1 Group Progress Report

Dr. hannah reported that Standard 1 group has gone through the ST-11 and the EDUC 380 unit plan and identified those pieces that would be pulled for analysis for the self study report.

Clarification regarding SPAs was sought. It is our understanding that the Site review team will have access to the SPA's and that approved SPA's reflect content specific knowledge. The fact that the SPA's are in and approved is an implicit "OK" for CAEP. It was also noted that while some SPAs such as Health used data from the ST-11, others such as P.E. and Social Studies did not.

Dr. hannah indicated that group 1 has not yet looked at the TPAs or grades. She asked Dr. Johnson to send her copies of the rubrics for the edTPA and PPAT which she agreed to do.

Standard 2 Group Progress Report

Group 2 reported that they are making good progress.

Standard 3 Group Progress Report

Group 3 deferred further reporting in light of the time since most of the meetings discussion had been to make determinations as to a significant portion of Group 3's tasks.

Standard 4 Group Progress Report

It was stressed that Group 4 is the only standard in which ALL elements must be met and that it required a workable PLAN.

Linda Sell encouraged groups to watch the CAEP webinars that were sent to everyone for additional clarification as to CAEP expectations

Dr. Burke indicated that, as a group, they still had a great deal of questions about the surveys.

Dr. Johnson summarized that employer satisfaction surveys could be sent to all three states, that there are no restrictions on where our students get jobs, but that we need at least 20% back. She indicated that the NDSU surveys will be available very soon, hopefully, in time to catch this semester's completers for follow up over the next three years.

Linda stressed that whatever group 4 says we are going to do in March, must result in an action plan. On November 4, we will be expected to show proof that we are taking action towards fulfilling the plan.

Dr. Allison indicated that 4.1 is very difficult and that 100% of the data must be supplied by schools and that FERPA is a potential problem. She wanted to know what we are planning to do to get it from the schools.

Linda concurred that while it is a good idea in theory, it is not easy to do in practice. However, it is being used as the way we know that we have a good program. She also indicated that we can't wait for the state to give us the data, we must come up with a plan for showing that our graduating teachers can actually impact student learning.

Standard 5 Group Progress Report

Dr. Beard handed out a progress report for this team that included the following points:

5.1 narrative created outlining institutional processes and that various data sets were added to demonstrate how we measure quality and performance

5.5 Narrative created outlining use of data to determine how we qualify faculty and improve faculty and other stakeholders in quality improvements and revision of the curriculum.

It also outlined the times the team had met and plans to meet before the end of the semester to discuss the remaining points and that they had added more evidence to the SAKAI folders.

Announcements :

- PEUC/CAEP Work Group Meeting Wednesday, November 30, 3-5 p.m.
- Sign up for Education Relay for Life Team by going to http://main.acsevents.org/site/TR/RelayForLife/RFLCY17SA?pg=entry&fr_id=83527
click on “Join this Relay” Create an Account Join Kappa Delta Pi Future Educators (Team Name Will be Changing—watch for the name voting on the Knutti Bulletin Board coming soon)
And make a \$10 donation

Future Reports/Considerations:

- Practicum Manual Revision— Helen Baker, lynne hannah, Dawn Burke, Peg Swisher, LeAnn Johnson
- Catalog Listing Location for Endorsements –Move to include under education rather than in respective departments?
- University Wide Tracking of Completers – Scott Beard

Submitted by LeAnn Johnson