College of Education and Behavioral Science

Initial Programs Assessment Committee (IPAC) Meeting Minutes

September 11, 2019

3:30-5:00 pm

ELS 207

Members present: Dixie Keyes, Nicole Covey, Prathima Appaji, Audrey Bowser, Kimberley Davis, Mary Jane Bradley, Jacques Singleton, Lance Bryant, Scott Doig, Sarah Labovitz, Susan Whiteland, Heloisa CursiCampos (via Zoom) present

* Approval of previous meeting minutes
* Election of Recorder
  + Nicole elected recorder
* Recommendations for Initial Programs CAEP Team:
  + Need chairs for each standard—some members volunteered:
    - Standard 1—Nicole Covey, Scott Doig, co-chairs
    - Standard 2—Audrey Bowser, chair; Sarah Labovitz, committee member
    - Standard 3—Heloisa Campos, committee member
    - Standard 4—Dixie Keyes, Susan Whiteland, committee members
    - Standard 5—Kimberley Davis and Lance Bryant, co-chairs
  + Discussion:
    - On our most recent CAEP visit in fall 2017, some advanced program faculty chaired committees for initial programs. They may now need to chair for APAC, so we should focus recruiting other initial programs faculty to chair. We have our visit in fall 2023 so committees need to begin meeting once a semester. We were rushed before so we feel like we have more time now to work through it. We feel we will be in much better shape this time around.
    - Audrey offered recommendations: Cindy Nichols for working with capstones, Michele Johnson for working with intern 1, Natalie Johnson-Leslie for secondary representation, Amanda Lambertus is involved in field experience, Rusty Young to assist for standard 2; all of these recommended for standard 2.
    - Committees will need both advanced and initial reps per standard.
    - Clarified that these committees will be for our 2023 visit.
    - Reps can come from either APAC or IPAC.
    - We don’t have to decide today. We can take it back with us and get reps for each.
    - We want to encourage our secondary folks to be active on these –Amanda Lambertus recommended for 3, Kellie Buford for 1, or Kellie on 3 and Amanda on 1; Scott Doig could fill in a gap.
    - People should think about where you will be most beneficial to provide assistance –which particular standard.
    - On standard 3 we need to have a focus on diversity recruitment.
    - Others who deal with EDA and admission will help with standard 3.
    - Diana Wiiliams can help with standard 1, Tonja Fillippino can help with standard 3, Minghui Gao can help with standard 3, Jacques Singleton can help with standard 3, Blair Dean can help with standard 2.
    - These are merely suggestions for committee appointments/assignments and therefore not set in stone.
* Develop an action plan to address goals for 2019-2020
  + Item 5--Develop Sub-Committee to develop EPP wide lesson plan and redesign EPP wide evaluation instrument
    - We use the ELED lesson plan, we can adapt it to fit all programs
  + Item 3—Recommend partners for EPAC (Educator Preparation Advisory Council)
    - CAEP suggested we work with school partners to get feedback on how we are preparing our candidates. This group will look at the data and will make recommendations for improvement. Wayne ran stats for us last time. We want the focus to be on completers and employers and their satisfaction with our program preparation. We once hired a consultant from 1998-2003 to gather the information from our completers to acquire and compile information in an unbiased manner. This is for continuous improvement so will meet regularly. Not just for CAEP. Send nominations of completers or school partners names to Kimberley so she can start forming teams. We had a summer meeting that went very well, and we want to continue the progress. We have talked and talked and talked about these issues and it’s time to deal with these concerns and address them to move forward. The curriculum and alignment sub-committee came up with some wonderful ways to address these recurring issues with our completers.
  + Item 7--Curriculum and Alignment sub-committee tasks and meetings
    - We want to continue looking at ways to align course content and curriculum. Dixie says people want to actually move forward, begin the work, to implement actions we have designed to improve our alignment. We need to find out what’s been happening and communicate to others what we have found.
  + Item 4--Diversity Recruitment and Retention Plan
  + We can talk about some ideas with the existing plan and see how we are addressing this at the EPP level and to satisfy CAEP. It should be embedded across all courses in the EPP. CAEP now says technology and diversity will be stand-alone components that will have a heavy focus when they visit.
  + Item 1—Employ research-based strategies to measure p-12 student progress
    - We have to collect data on our completers and their students they teach and how they are positively impacting student achievement in our schools. We can use collected test data or student surveys. We would have to get the schools on board with providing data and distributing surveys.
    - Since some programs do not have p-12 assessments that collect data, how will we collect common data? We could gather select data per program, like Sarah (Performing Arts degree program) collecting data from schools who participate in band competitions to measure student achievement.
    - Dixie read aloud the standard to the group.
    - Arkansas does not currently provide a state database of student achievement. Scott asked if the state doesn’t provide the data to support your completers, then what do you do? Dixie stated literacy and math is covered with collected state data but what about other areas? As being part of the EPP we could possibly collect data from individual programs. This program specific data could help support the data we do have available, so programs collecting data independently could help. However, at the initial level, we have to be cautious about individual programs collecting their own data which could be problematic since we are evaluated as a unit. So then how do we collect data for programs that do not have standardized assessments? It will need to be more general for everybody. The question that needs to be answered is are you able to teach students, period, and a measure that assesses that. They want data like the edTPA, which could be us going out and rating our students as completers on a universal rating scale. An outside consultant would be more consistent and unbiased which would help with the data reliability.
    - With the shortages hitting some areas, our completers are getting jobs in the first three years. We have look at our completers in their own field of licensure and not for those teaching out of area. State says they will have a database of English-language arts, math, and science available to us in the near future. We all agree that following them for three years can prove problematic.
  + Items 2 (Review EDA data for candidates) and 6 (Develop a plan to address classroom management deficiencies among candidates) will be tabled until our next planned meeting.
* Review EPP Assessment Plan
  + Kimberley will email out assessment plan, look over and bring feedback to next meeting.
* New business not on the agenda
  + Dr. Bradley shared with us that our students scores did not meet the identified Praxis 2 state score standards. She wants this committee to start looking at this issue. She has shared scores with Dr. Utter and explained that we did not meet the 88% threshold and he will want us to develop and submit strategies to address this. One area identified was our middle level program. Secondary faculty who did not meet the 88% have been contacted by Dr. Bradley. Any program with scores below 88.15% the threshold will need a plan. We need to look for patterns in the data, particularly in the sub-areas defined on the reports. Art did a bootcamp last year to see if it would impact student data. They gave a pretest, used Quizlet, etc., then did a different pre-test followed by a post-test after the bootcamp and saw a definite positive increase in test scores. We are going to have to focus on particular areas to see improvements. The 88.15% cut score was set by a state board subcommittee. Those institutions that require students to pass Praxis 2 to intern or graduate will have higher percentages. We need to look at when we suggest students take the exams. We were 87.4%.
  + Discussion is tabled. This discussion will continue at the next planned meeting.
* Dixie moved to adjourn, Sarah seconded the motion, Meeting adjourned at 5:08 pm.