Tentative Meeting Agenda

Attending: Sara, Dixie, Daniel, Lance, Scott, Irina

February 8, 2019

Called to order: 1:05 PM

Sara moved to close, Dixie seconded: 2:35 PM

Location: Educational Leadership 216

* Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes – Postponed (limited knowledge by voting members in attendance)
* Updates from sub-committees
  + Dispositions
  + Impact on student learning
  + Technology – No change in Tech Plan
    1. Discussed University tech survey
       1. Concern over lack of support for Google
  + Collaboration and alignment
    1. Overview of minutes from last meeting
       1. Feeling of reaching the heart of the matter
       2. Secondary feeling that edTPA vote was not aligned with the decision in collab meeting
       3. No data supporting start of edTPA
       4. Concern over logistical issues for edTPA
          1. Who pays?
          2. Do students have to do both PLT and edTPA
       5. Discussion of recommendation for paid support for curriculum development toward edTPA
       6. Sara begrudging believes that the edTPA has been helpful (vocab and connections to prior learning)
       7. Concern for deadline for putting change to edTPA in bulletin
       8. Discussed no back up plan if no edTPA
       9. Cooperating teachers don’t like having to giving up 3-5 lessons during concert assessment and marching band season (Sara)
       10. Survey of completing students to ask what is more important: cost, assessment of competency, taking more than one test
       11. What is being done to notify incoming freshman to take the writing portion of the ACT before they leave high school?
       12. Aired longtime concerns
       13. Discussed hours and requirements of courses
       14. How do we shape conversations for courses that are general to multiple majors?
       15. Sara has received emails from prof ed faculty to align assessments for her students
       16. Placement could be supported through communication with each department due to content area knowledge of educators in the field.
       17. Sara has put a course prior to intro that teaches same content as intro with music slant to try and help her students make connections
       18. Irina believes that Ed Psych will be one of the most difficult to align due to make up of majors in the course
       19. Suggestion: create separate sections of educational psychology: “educational psychology for the K12 teacher”
           1. Should set a prerequisite to require only education majors to be able to take the course (the idea was met with approval by other members of the committee)
           2. Discussed support due to need of ed psych connections needed in edTPA
       20. Classroom management discussed in last meeting
           1. Need for more field time
           2. Looks different in each area
           3. Need to experience to learn it
* PRAXIS II Report (Dr. Labovitz & Dr. Whiteland)
  + Small “n”
  + Susan praxis PLT: 100% success rate
  + Sarah Content: Not 100%, not sure of reason, Content will still need to be taken with edTPA
    1. Content prep is area specific
    2. Content are an issue
    3. Content are placed in a range of grade levels that may cover content that may not be covered in curriculum
    4. Suggestion of exploring content gaps and providing information to students for prep
* EDA
  + Small “n” – 38
  + Self-assessment
    1. 5 believed that they had nothing to work on
    2. 3 noted 1 area for need of improvement
    3. 11 stated 2 areas of need for improvement
  + Assessment does not break down the 9 components
  + Suggestion that there should be other assessments in addition to a self-assessment
  + The tool is a 3-point Likert scale and calculated numerically.
    1. Concern was noted that 4-point is stronger than 3-point
    2. Concern was noted that the scale should be analyzed as categorical
  + Supposed to have faculty assess students later in teacher candidate career
  + Belief that we are taking bad data and no decisions are to be made based on the data.
  + Currently departments are not sure how the tool is expected to be used.
    1. Some secondary have students complete the tool and bring it to screening. If it’s complete the screeners check a box. This was noted by others to not be the correct procedure.
  + Recommendations:
    1. Training and requirements for the EDA tool needs to be provided
    2. Interrater reliability needs to be conducted
    3. Naming of the tool throughout portal needs to be aligned. Currently is noted to be named differently in various areas.
    4. Vocabulary and procedures of the tool were noted as a concern
* New Business
  + P20 initiative
    - Chancellor wants a push for ASTATE to be involved
    - Kick off showcase/expo (May 2)
    - Ruth Owens contact
  + Superintendents meeting
    - Thoughts from departments invited
* Proposed business (postponed to next meeting):
  + Background Checks
  + Admission Checkpoints 1 and 2

**Next Meeting:** Friday, February 22nd at 1:00 pm