

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

C-PAC, C- TEC, and PDS 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.

PDS Minutes (May 8, 2019)
Principal's Appreciation Breakfast

Attendees:

Dr. Deborah Akers (superintendent)	Kim Miller	Steve Hayes
Rick Ball	Rhonda Rogers	Shellie Simpson
Todd Browning	Mary Terry	Russell Lippencott
Dawn Staten	Mike Morgan	Brent Murphy
Stephanie Kopp	Dina Smith	Angela Damon
Thomas Adkins	Rosemary Mitchell	Dr. Michael Bean
Dr. Ernie Adkins	Brittany Keys	Michael Jones
Courtney Gracon	Becki Perry	Edith Bennett
Sarah Grose	Jason Underwood	
Craig Havens	Shannon Noble	
Kelli Stanley	Mark Godfrey	
LaCosta Hodges	Josh Riffe	
Shelly Weiss	Krissy Zickafoose	
Lynn Bayle	Melissa Boothe	
Dr. Kristal Filipek	Ashley Smith	
Angela Groseclose	Emily Huddle	
Michael Collins	Dr. Kathy Hawks	

- Dr. Kathy Hawks opened the meeting by welcoming everyone to the annual appreciation breakfast. She expressed the gratitude of the education faculty for their support.
- Appreciation was expressed to the superintendent for her support and dedication by Dr. Michael Bean.
- A brief update was provided by Kathy Hawks on:
 - Importance of collaboration
 - Our goal for producing effective educators
 - Appreciation of their dedication and support for CU
- A summary of PDS events was made available
- Breakfast was served
- PDS portion of the meeting was adjourned
- Mercer County principal's monthly meeting was called to order with Dr. Akers, Mercer County superintendent, hosting the remainder of the meeting.