

Data Analysis via PEUC meetings

PRAXIS Content and PLT

TPA

ST-11

Pro 05

PEUC Minutes

Wednesday, January 18, 2017, 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

Attending members are in bold

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 - Christopher Ames, SOEPS Acting
Dean

4 - Rhonda Hovatter, Health

Maggie James, Student

3 - LeAnn Johnson, DTE

1 - Doug Kennard, DOE

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 - Molly Edelen, EWWCTC

2 - Paulette Lashley, Erly Lrng Center

Dr. Gansz – Dean's

Representative

Meeting was called to order at 3:10

Minutes from December 7, 2016 Approved

Cooperating Teacher Appreciation Event: March 8 LeAnn invited anyone else who would like to help on this committee to join.

Data Evaluation

Linda thanked everyone who had helped pull data together for analysis. She emphasized that the need for data analysis was not just for CAEP but for the ongoing work of the PEUC in making informed decisions to improve our program. She indicated that there was a need to establish a culture of data analysis and decision making and that once we had completed an initial analysis of the data from our unit wide key assessments, that we would need to set up a schedule for regular review of assessment data going into the future.

LeAnn clarified that because we are not a cohort driven program, students have many advantages in moving through the program at different rates. However, this posed a challenge for determining how to group students for cohort analysis. After a lot of thought, it was decided that it made most sense to look at data by student teaching group for the Praxis exams, TPA and ST-11. Consequently, these data tables have slightly different groups of students than the

groups defined at juncture 1 when students were first admitted to the program that were presented to the PEUC previously as part of the standard 3 working groups reports on GPA and Tests of Excellence.

PRAXIS PLT

Copies of tables containing the PRAXIS PLT data for the past three semesters of student teachers were distributed along with a handout of guiding questions to frame the analysis. Tables included scores achieved, whether each score was passing or not, the date each attempt was made, and the total number of attempts required for passage.

It was noted that not all students in these cohorts had PLT scores. Current policy does not require passing scores for graduation but does require them for certification in WV. Because we have a significant number of students from MD, VA, and PA, we may never get scores on some because they will not apply for WV certification. PEUC members questioned whether students who had opted not to take the PLT or had not yet taken the PLT should be eliminated from the tables since technically, they were not 'completers' in the sense that they were certified WV teachers that we would be following post graduation as part of standard 4. LeAnn and Linda indicated that it was their understanding that CAEP was interested in our analysis of all students moving through the program and that removing students with incomplete data so that only those students that were completely successful remained for analysis would not provide us with the insights we would hope to get about the effectiveness of our program.

LeAnn pointed out that Early Education and Elementary Education took the same PLT. Each student's scores were placed in separate tables reflecting their specialty area. Because early education is a new program, this meant that only one student thus far shows up on the early education table. She asked the PEUC if they felt that this was the correct way to look at scores or if since these two specialty areas took the same test, they should be combined into the same table.

Lynne indicated that she felt that we should keep them separated out because the different coursework and classroom experiences will shape how students view teaching and learning. The PEUC concurred and scores from these programs will continue to be separated out going into the future.

LeAnn pointed out that on the secondary tables, students receiving k-adult certification had the choice of taking the PLT for elementary or the PLT for 7-12 grade. Since nearly all students had taken the secondary PLT, scores were provided for it with an asterisk showing those few who had taken the elementary version.

It was noted that all but two students across all secondary specializations, elementary, and early education programs passed the PLT on the first attempt. The instructors of EDUC 320 were praised for the good foundation they were providing students that enabled so many of them to succeed. Lynne indicated that students continued to learn what was needed beyond 320 as they entered their various pedagogy classes and experienced not just the principles of learning but also the principles of teaching.

The guiding questions provided spurred an in-depth discussion of what kind of information we hoped to achieve in the analysis of this data. It was noted that the PLT examines how much

knowledge a student has about learning and teaching and is meant to assess candidate knowledge of how people learn. However, it was pointed out that simply looking at total passage rates did not provide an in-depth understanding of what those scores meant. It was suggested that future analysis include tables with data regarding performance on each subtest within the assessment so that we can see which subtest areas our students are strongest and weakest.

Concern was expressed over how to do this type of analysis at a group level since students take the exam at many different times and we have no information regarding the version that they get. It was pointed out that the ETS data reports include the raw scores and that each subtest has a different number of items. While they provide the range depicting the middle 50% of raw scores achieved by all students across the country on that administration, this variability creates difficulty in determining how to analyze a group of students who all took the test at different times with different ranges for comparison. It was suggested that a scatterplot might be able to do this and that perhaps ETS could provide us with this type of analysis so that we are better able to look for consistent patterns that could lead to not just within class adjustments, but also lead to teasing out program weaknesses.

Linda indicated that we would look into these ideas going into the future.

Shepherd University as a Testing Center

Discussion of the Praxis tests brought up the comment that offering tests at Shepherd would be a great service to our students. Scott Beard referred everyone to President Hendricks' recent letter indicating that they were exploring that option. Doug provided past history for everyone indicating that before tests became computerized, Shepherd was a testing center but that it was decided that it was cost prohibitive to provide the necessary computer center for testing at that time. Three years ago when the Blue Ridge Collaborative was being developed, it was again looked at and rejected as costing too much but that Blue Ridge had decided to set up a testing center. Page confirmed that this has since been done and that students can now take the ETS tests at Blue Ridge. Scott indicated that at the president's direction, he is already meeting with IT to see if we can do it and that it might now provide a revenue stream because other tests needed by Shepherd students in other programs would also use it to take required assessments.

PRAXIS 2 Content Exams

Tables with data for the Praxis content exams were distributed and small groups were asked to look at them in light of the guiding questions. Small groups then shared out with the larger group.

The same desire for analysis of subscores as was discussed for the PLT was expressed. Secondary education coordinators indicated that they look at these subscores as part of their SPA reports and that they have used this analysis for making course and program changes since the specialty studies courses are under the control of their respective departments.

It was pointed out that elementary students take 5 content tests and that learning the required content comes not just from specialty courses but relies heavily on courses that are part of the core. Because they have options as to which courses to take for fulfilling core requirements, they may end up not taking a course that would provide them with the content knowledge needed for passing a content test. This emphasizes the importance of advising in recommending

those courses for core requirements that would have the biggest impact on content covered by the content exams.

It was suggested that we start looking at program changes that would narrow the options students were allowed to select from to meet core requirements. However, it was pointed out that the more restricted the options, the more difficult transfer to Shepherd would be for students starting elsewhere. Ruth commented that the new WV 70% rule required us to provide a substitution for transferred classes if only 70% of the content was the same.

It was mentioned that Maryland has 100% articulation between all of the county community colleges and the seven state universities for core requirements. If students from these community colleges found that many of their coursework would only be counted as electives, it would be unlikely that they would consider Shepherd as a viable alternative when deciding where to transfer to especially if all coursework would meet requirements at an in-state (for them) university. LeAnn pointed out that we have a direct conflict of interest between standard 1's need for strong content knowledge as expressed by the WV state required Praxis exams and standard 3's aim for recruiting high quality candidates, which for us means bringing students across state lines.

LeAnn asked where the line was between our responsibility for "delivering" all content to students versus students' taking responsibility for augmenting their current knowledge through self-study in preparation for content tests. There was no answer to this question. However, it was suggested that we find a way to 'tag' transfer students in the data so that we can determine if there are differences in performance between students who took all their core and specialty studies courses at Shepherd compared to those who took a number of them elsewhere.

One last note regarding Content Exams related to small numbers in some programs. It was suggested that in addition to looking at students by cohort that we also collapse the three cohorts by specialty area so that program analysis is more apparent.

WVTPA – Fall 2017

LeAnn quickly reviewed the recent history of the TWS, edTPA, PPAT, TWS-R and current WVTPA. She indicated that data for all previous performance assessments had been brought to the PEUC over the past two years for analysis so it would not be relooked at today. Because Shepherd has followed the recommendation of Stevie Chepko from CAEP to work with other WV EPPs, we are part of the consortium of 13 universities developing the WV TPA which was piloted this past semester and that a revised version is being used this semester.

Linda passed out a table showing the TPA data from fall. It quickly became apparent that the data did not represent student's first independent attempt, but rather their final attempt showing passage. In the interest of time, the correct table will be brought to the next PEUC meeting.

It was noted that scale is an issue for SU. The consortium pushed to use the same scale as is used for practicing teachers with 'emerging' being considered acceptable for first year teachers. This creates a scale in which growth up to an acceptable level of performance is not captured and the things required to score at the highest levels are close to impossible to demonstrate in 7 weeks of student teaching.

LeAnn indicated that she agreed and had argued against this scale at the state meetings held over the past 9 months as the WVTPA was being developed. However, she was outvoted. Lynne indicated that a similar problem had occurred in the development of the ST-11.

The remaining data analysis will continue at our next PEUC meeting.

LeAnn reviewed the following events that are coming up this semester, asked everyone to encourage their students to attend the Professional Development day and invited all to submit proposals for the Literacy Conference.

Other Important Spring Semester Dates

Monday, February 20—KDP Professional Development Day – Please encourage your students to attend.

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

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

David Gonzal announced that the Music Department had just received accreditation for the next 10 years.

Rhonda Hovatter encouraged everyone to pay attention to the flyers posted about the upcoming health fair and indicated that tables were available.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45.

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?

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

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

PEUC Minutes

Wednesday, February 15, 2017, 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

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, EWWCTC

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

Group Support - Linda Sell, DAA

Minutes from February 1, 2017 Approved

Update on CAEP Self Study Report Progress:

Linda Sell thanked the Standard 4 group and indicated that the plan for obtaining pk-12 student impact data is being put together reflecting the previous PEUC meeting conversation and would involve recruiting candidates for follow up as completers. Scott indicated that the faculty member overseeing the follow up would be granted released time to do so.

Qualtrix Data on NeXT Completer Survey for Fall 16 that just became available to us was disseminated and time was provided for PEUC members to review the graph and read comments provided by the students who responded. The group expressed satisfaction that we now had this data. The point was made that the link for the survey was provided to students the day after they completed student teaching and that this represented a 70% response rate for all student teachers (33 student teachers, 29 responded; 3/6 MAT, 22 undergrads). Data could not be separated out by program—something we can perhaps get for the future? In the future, the link will be provided before student teaching ends as part of the exit to EDUC 400/527. This should result in near 100% response rates.

It was noted that the data and comments raised some red flags for program consideration and that we should look for consistent patterns that might show up between this initial response and the additional data that will be collected from completers in the coming semesters.

LeAnn indicated that full results of the survey would be posted on Sakai for PEUC members to study in more length.

Length of Student Teaching was mentioned: The fact that some states have students complete a one year internship instead of a short one semester student teaching experiences was mentioned. Others indicated that while salary for an internship was small, teacher candidates did get paid and that they were paired with a mentor teacher for the full year.

LeAnn indicated that the Quality Task Force meeting she attended last week was putting together a white paper that would guide future policy decisions. One of the points in this white paper explored at length last week was moving to a full year student teaching experience but that questions were raised as to whether this experience would consist of the entire senior year or extend six months beyond a four year program, how it would impact programs such as ours that do not have a cohort system with all student teachers arriving at student teaching in the same semester, and that it was unclear how this would work for students not ready to begin student teaching in the fall and thus would need to return in the fall for another half year.

Page Moore was thanked for her research into New Teacher Evaluations done since the last PEUC meeting and that this information would help in the completion of the standard 4.1 plan. The goal for this plan was to utilize evidence of student learning that new teachers would already have to provide with a system for sharing it with us rather than to add to their task load during their already difficult first year of teaching.

In WV, currently, the same Evaluation (as outlined here) is used for all teachers, but New Teachers are Observed More Frequently

Self-reflection and Evidence = 80%

2 Student Learning Goals = 15%

School-wide Growth in Reading and Math 5%

PEUC members were invited to watch the video at <http://wvde.state.wv.us/evalwv/>

For more information about the teacher assessment process, LeAnn noted that, at the next EPPAC meeting, area school systems have been asked to share more details about teacher assessment so that we can insure that our plan can take advantage of these elements.

In the interest of time, PEUC members split into four groups with two groups assigned to look at each of the remaining two data sets that had not been previously analyzed. Analysis from each group was captured on a written form and then used to lead group discussion of each data set representing the previous three semesters and encompassing students in all specializations.

ST-11 Data Recorded on Forms:

- The ST-11 is used as the final student teaching evaluation.
- It captures the sum of Student Teaching Performance.
- Validity is based on state mandates
- It doesn't show growth or progress. It only shows the final evaluation
- Suggestion was made to compare the First ST-11 from the university supervisor to the fifth or final ST-11 from the university supervisor.
- The question was raised: How does "N/A" factor into calculations RE: Standards 4 and 5 which are generally scored at the end of the semester
- Data indicates that Student teachers are doing good
- It was suggested that it would be a good idea to also have the n and mean for each program (Elementary Ed/Secondary Ed) and that a standard deviation would be helpful to understand the spread of scores.

- It was suggested that Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor Scores be compared to see how closely they match, agreement scores would indicate if we need training to use the ST-11 effectively.

Sharing and conversation regarding the ST-11 resulted in the following conclusions:

We do not have a validity issue for CAEP because the ST-11 is based on state mandates regarding the four point scale and WVPTS format. LeAnn asked if we had documentation supporting the state mandate. It was suggested that we ask the state to provide this information. LeAnn indicated that she would inquire about this with the WVBOE. There may also be old minutes from 2010 that document this.

The table needs to include the n and standard deviation for each program specialization. The standard deviation will allow us to identify those areas where we may need to relook at the descriptors for each rating to tighten them up.

Data for secondary programs need to be collapsed so that a comparison can be made between early, elementary and secondary programs.

Including standard 5 on an observation form led to mixed opinions.

Most of these functions are rated as 'yes aware' making any numerical analysis of data meaningless. The Student Teaching Task List was praised for helping student teachers think of the things they could do to demonstrate those functions and document their actions for their supervisor. LeAnn indicated that these functions may be able to be moved into the common portfolio which will be developed in the future so that they become a program expectation rather than an expectation on individual rating forms. Because the ST-11 is used to document these functions for several program area SPAs, she was cautioned against this because much of the required language is specific to student teaching. LeAnn indicated that no change would be made without careful analysis of potential impact on each SPA was considered with the various specialization coordinators. LeAnn did note that concerns had been noted by other universities in TEAC meetings about including standard 5 in an observation form.

Many SPA writers indicated that their SPA would not accept the ST-11; that a 3-point scale was recommended by reviewers and that strict adherence to the WVPTS structure created difficulties aligning it with SPA language.

It was noted that a 3-point scale would most likely result in better reliability. LeAnn reviewed the training conducted fall and spring semester regarding use of the ST-11 and indicated that even with the four point scale, we were above 80% reliability in scoring. Lynne indicated that the companion tool was based directly on the state evaluation and descriptors used for teachers that was required by the state.

LeAnn was asked to inquire of the state how much flexibility we have in modifying the ST-11 to make it more useful for SPA reviews. She noted that if we were given flexibility, any subsequent changes would have to follow the CAEP process for developing an EPP designed assessment.

Pro 05—Data represents only EDUC 200 which is the only prejuncture course that all students have completed at the time they apply for juncture 1. The fact that the same professor teaches all sections makes reliability of scoring between classes a moot factor. Groups recorded the following:

- The Pro-05 measures professional dispositions and personal dispositions
- Rating scale is not a rubric—it is arbitrary—graduated/gradated rubric?
- Both validity and reliability are questionable.
- 6 point scale is too much, recommend (yes/no/meets); collapse to three categories
- There may be multiple interpretations of some terms (i.e., personal integrity is this actually observed?)
- "Integrity" continued use is in question

- It would be helpful to have a larger N. This only represents an n of 40 out of a N of +/-500 this sample does not include MAT students.
- Looking at growth requires use of the Pro05s from EDUC 150 to 400
- Data needs to be identified by program area
- Color coded graphs may make it easier to read
- Total is incorrect
- In the future we will need to develop a new instrument with content validity that meets Lawshe's critical values and includes all stakeholders in the process.
- Get Dawne Burke's data sets from 320 for Pro-05, student's describe overt behavioral indicators for these characteristics.
- Need one singular centralized database for ALL data collections.
- Should not use a 0 for N/A—should not be figured into the mean. The way it is set up in TK20 creates a zero which skews the mean
- The table does not include the final question about whether the rater thinks the person should be a teacher (yes/no/unsure)

Follow up discussion of shared information included the following conclusions

- There is concern about many of the characteristics included. While each characteristic is defined on a separate page, definitions are not measurable making any rating extremely subjective (i.e., capacity is very subjective, how do you judge integrity?)
- 6 Levels are too much (too many shades of gray to differentiate reliably) leading to arbitrary ratings. Need to be collapsed to 3 levels (no, yes, outstanding) with documentation of why a student should be moved down to a no or up to an outstanding.
- A behavioral description needs to accompany each 'level' for each characteristic
- On TK20 display,
 - The student's name needs to remain on the screen when the instrument is brought up.
 - Each item needs to include the descriptors for each rating next to the rating—this would be of assistance to both rater and student.
- LeAnn indicated that the same disposition assessment used to rate students on campus needs to also be used in the field so data is available for review in the juncture process.

Health Education Program Change: Rhonda Hovatter indicated that she had HYPERS and SOEPS approval for a course change in the health methods course. She presented the following. Currently students with a health endorsement take two health education courses, HLTH 203 and HLTH 204. The two classes have identical course catalogue descriptions and a significant amount of overlapping content. These two classes would be merged into a single class. This would leave an opportunity in the program to add a new Health 350 Research methods course that would become a new requirement in the health endorsement specialization.

A motion was made to waive the second read. MSA/U to waive the second read.

Discussion of the proposed change clarified that if the change could be taken through C&I before the end of the semester, the change would go into effect in the fall 2017 semester. The department would work with students currently in the program to modify their course of study so that they would not be penalized for the change. It was pointed out that the Health endorsement consists of 24 credit hours of courses and that the SPA judges those courses against full health B.A. programs. It was felt that this change would be in keeping with SPA requirements and strengthen the program by providing students with some elementary statistics and a better understanding of assessment that would help with TPA performance where candidates have to assess and analyze student learning.

MSA/U to remove HLTH 204 and add HLTH 350

Education Minor Change: Tauna Cole indicated that the education minor needed to be updated since it currently contained courses that had not been offered for a number of years. She indicated that research had been done

regarding other minors offered at Shepherd as well as a close look at education minors offered by other institutions. The revised minor course requirements and options were distributed to the PEUC for review.

MSA/U to waive the second read

MSA/U to accept the Education Minor changes

A change in the catalog to clarify the pre and co requisite courses related to EDUC 564 and 556, that are special education endorsement classes in the MACI program, was proposed by Scott Beard

MSA/U to waive the second read

MSA/U to accept the pre and co requisite change.

LeAnn presented information from the English Department regarding Core Curriculum English Education Courses ENGL 208 and 209. The name of these courses are being changed from "Survey of World Literature and "Survey of World Literature II" to "Introduction to World Literature. Because the courses are options in the core curriculum for English Education Majors, the English Department wanted to receive PEUC approval. It was determined that an official vote was not needed but the PEUC had no objections to it other than noting that this name change would necessitate updating any forms containing course names.

LeAnn Presented the following Updates to upcoming events

Cooperating Teacher Appreciation Event, March 8, 4:30 to 6:30

Evites have been sent to all potential participants, healthy response so far

SU Catering will be doing the food

Elvira is working on a short program 5:30 to 6:00, includes an open mike for candidate/teacher stories

Candidates have been asked to send a picture of themselves with their teacher for a slide show

P.R. for post event sharing and preparation of teacher favors are underway

Education Fair Update: March 2

14 High Schoolers Registered as of last night (SS, ELA, Lots of EI Ed and Early Ed)

Changes in the Pinning Ceremony which is held at 9 a.m. in the Frank Center will be necessary this year because SU is going to hold a separate graduation ceremony for graduate students which will be held in the Frank Center at 11 a.m. To facilitate the switch from one program to the other, instead of a post ceremony reception, there will be a Pre-ceremony breakfast on the plaza in front of the Frank Center for Pinning Ceremony Participants. Graduate studies will pay for this reception for us.

LeAnn reminded everyone that evidence of any recruitment related contacts needs to be uploaded to the PEUC Sakai Folder.

LeAnn announced that the BRCTC Agreement and Course Concerns expressed in the previous PEUC meeting were being followed up on with Dr. Ames

The meeting adjourned at 4:40

Submitted by LeAnn Johnson