

**Minutes PDS- CAEP Workday
March 1, 2019**

Attendees:

| | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| Teresa Inman | Dr. William Williams |
| Dr. Ernie Adkins | Lethea Smith |
| Dr. Kathy Hawks | Erick Burgess |
| Dr. Terry Mullins | Tom Adkins |
| Kathy Blankenship | Tom Chaffins |
| Rebecca Curry | Ann Cline |
| Dr. Nancy Burton | Dr. Kathy Tucker |
| Dr. Anita Reynolds | Dr. Rick Druggish |
| Kelly Druggish | Dr. Michael Bean |
| Dr. Andrea Campbell | |

The CAEP work day was held on March 1, 2019 in Room 100.

Morning Session:

Dr. Michael Bean welcomed the group and expressed appreciation for their participation. The group introduced themselves by playing “Bean Ball” as an ice breaker.

Immediately following the introduction Dr. Rick Druggish discussed the importance of data analysis for our program. He reviewed the purpose of four key assessments required by all teacher candidates. He shared how the data was to be analyzed and how it would be used to support changes in our program and instruction. The PDS partners and CU faculty collectively disaggregated and analyzed data from the following assessments:

- Praxis Core
- PLT
- TPA
- Student Teaching final

Participants were seated at four different tables with five or six individuals at a table. Each table was assigned a different assessment to review. Data notebooks for each of the assessments had been created and were distributed to the tables. Participants at each table individually and corporately disaggregated the data, analyzed the results, and recorded their findings on a data analysis activity sheet. The activity sheet asked three questions:

1. What does the data indicate are strengths?
2. What does the data indicate are weaknesses?
3. What are three suggestions for moving forward?

The results were as follows:

| | WV Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) | PLT | Praxis Core | Student Teaching Final |
|--------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Strengths | Elementary progress is stronger | MAT scores strong Strong scores on professional development, leadership and community | Elementary reading strong Strong pass rate for first attempts. | Student learning goals 6.1 Professional conduct |
| Weaknesses | Health and PE significantly lower Overall, secondary pedagogical weakness is lesson planning | Elementary and PE have lower pass rates Students need work on ability to analyze case studies that deal with instructional strategies. | Writing and math weak across the board. | Standard 5 Standard 2.2 |
| Suggestions | Correlation between block and higher scores so move forward with secondary block Preparation for health and PE majors improved | More requirements for EDUC 210 in field placement, i.e., analyze instruction. Have students analyze case studies across program. Students should have more opportunities to evaluate lessons. | Continue Praxis prep courses in math and writing. Increase writing requirements within all education courses. Compare ACT/SAT scores with Praxis core scores. | Have students sign off on reading school handbook. Yearlong residents required to be involved in parental activities, outside school activities, and beginning of school year activities. |

After all the groups completed their work, each group shared their findings and discussed possible trends and concerns as evidenced by the data. Suggestions were brought to the table and the pros and cons of the suggestions were considered.

Lunch provided by CU in the conference room.

Afternoon Session:

Dr. Rick Druggish began the afternoon session by explaining the Student Teacher Observation Tool (STOT). The STOT was piloted during spring 2019, with a select group of student teachers and university supervisors. Anecdotal data and interviews with university supervisors indicated a strong satisfaction with the STOT as compared to the previous instrument. It was indicated by university supervisors that it was a more effective tool and more appropriate for evaluating student teachers; and, it was noted that it was aligned to the INTASC Standards. University supervisors especially liked the half-point scale for scoring. Dr. Druggish announced that plans for full implementation of the STOT in fall 2019 were in progress.

The afternoon session continued with the task of co-constructing rubrics for early field placements and the block. Due to changes in the program over the past few semesters, the current rubrics do not adequately assess the goals of the field placements.

The participants were divided into the following groups and assigned the mission of constructing a rubric for each of the following course field placements. Information about the requirements for each field placement was distributed.

| EDUC 210 | EDUC 305 | EDUC 306 | Block |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Willy Thea Tom C Tom A. | Anita Terry Rebecca Erick B | Andrea Nancy Ernie Teresa | Kathy H. Kathy T. Kayla Kelly |

Two components were the driving force for the development of the rubrics:

- INTASC Standards
- Student Teacher Observation Tool (STOT).

During the co-constructing process, each group selected the INTASC Standards which they determined appropriate for, and which should be demonstrated by candidates in each course depending on the responsibility affiliated with the field placement. Discussions were held and questions were addressed.

The results were:

| Course and Field Hours | Responsibility | INTASC Standards |
|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| EDUC 210- 25 hours | Observe and assist | 1, 2, 3, 9 |
| EDUC 305- 25 hours | Observe, assist, and teach two lessons | 2, 4, 6, 7 |
| EDUC 306- 25 hours | Observe, assist, and teach two lessons | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|------|
| Yearlong residency- Block- Current schedule for elementary 3 weeks CU campus 4 weeks public school 3 weeks CU campus 4 weeks public school 3 weeks CU campus | All responsibilities and co-teaching | 1-10 |
|--|--------------------------------------|------|

A conversation took place about the summations extracted from the chart. The idea of possibly using the STOT as the foundation for creating the rubrics for all field placements was discussed. After an informed and productive dialogue, it was decided that since the STOT identifies the skills by which all candidates are ultimately held accountable, is a valid and reliable evaluation tool, and is aligned with INTASC Standards, it would be the instrument which would be the basis for all field placement rubrics and evaluations.

Dr. Kathy Hawks informed participants that a survey would be emailed to them regarding the workday. She encouraged them to complete it and return it as soon as possible. She shared her indebtedness to the group and thanked them for their part in making CU's EPP effective and strong.

Dr. Andrea Campbell spoke briefly conveying her appreciation and gratitude to the group for their insights and hard work. She thanked them for being a vital part of our team and assured them that by working together education for all students would be more effective.

Meeting was adjourned.