

Additional Selectivity Factors Documentation

Specific portfolio requirements vary from program to program and among advisors. The following is an example of the Portfolio requirements for physical education which shows that factors other than academic ability must be demonstrated to move through the three juncture points in the education program.

Juncture & PETE Electronic Portfolio (PEP)

Review Guidelines & Checklist

Teacher Candidate (TC) assessment occurs at several transition points in the teacher education program at Shepherd University. Assessments of the TC through the transition/juncture points provide evidence of the candidate's growth and development. Each transition point uses various formative and summative assessments that provide data to determine the professional and pedagogical content knowledge of candidates. In the Physical Education Teacher Education program candidates will create & maintain an electronic portfolio that will serve as evidence across the various transition points in the program.

The following lists several key guidelines to remember as you prepare for the Juncture Review process:

1. It is the TC's responsibility to schedule a juncture review meeting with his/her advisor.
 - The request for a meeting should be made well in advance of ***Juncture I (admission to teacher education program)*** & ***Juncture II (admission to student teaching)*** application deadlines (as established by the EDUC dept.).
 - This will allow you time to make any necessary revisions prior to the application deadline.
 - TC's will need to bring a completed Juncture I & II Forms (obtained in Knutti) to their Juncture Review meetings.
2. ***Juncture III Review (recommendation for licensure)*** occurs during Student Teaching.
 - The TC must schedule a final review meeting with his/her advisor (once the TWS has been completed at an "acceptable" level).
 - During the Juncture III meeting, the advisor will review the PEP (specifically, Standard 5) to make the final decision regarding recommendation for licensure.
 - All other requirements should have been met & reviewed in previous juncture reviews.
3. **The Juncture Review Checklist** will be used to evaluate the completion of the PETE Electronic Portfolio at each Juncture of the PETE program.
 - In the checklist, each component of the portfolio is identified, along with the specific evidence that must be provided for each component, & the juncture point at which it is required to be completed.
 - TCs must share their PEP with their advisor (using Google Sites) prior to any

juncture review meetings. Failure to do so will require the TC to reschedule their juncture review meeting.

SP16

Juncture Review Checklist

Teacher Candidate (TC) Name: Advisor/Reviewer:

Date: Juncture I

Juncture II

Juncture III

Component	Evidence Required	Juncture Completed		
		I	II	III
My SU PETE-portfolio	Includes brief, but interesting bio that describes the TC; has uploaded a picture	X		
Computer Competencies	COMPLETED Computer Competence form	X		
Health Education Coursework	CPR-First Aid Certification	X		
	HLTH 203 key assignment	X	X	
	HLTH 432 – min. two lesson plans, or one-unit plan.		X	
Philosophy	PHED 104 – statement of philosophy paper	X		
Professional Growth	Completed Conference attendance form		X	X
	Documentation of out-of-class requirements		X	X
Professional Websites	Identified "live links" Websites listed include a brief description of the site Must include links to SHAPE America, WVAHPERD, & PlaySportsTV		X	X
	Identifies 2 educational resource sites		X	
Standard 1	A copy of your PE program advisement card (with completed courses & grades)	X		
	A copy of ACT, SAT &/or Praxis I Scores	X		
	A copy of Praxis II (Content Knowledge & PLT)			X

Standard 2	Scores from PHED 246, 315, 325, & 326	X	X	
Standard 3	2 Unit Plan Projects in PHED 310 & 431 (Elementary & Secondary Methods)		X	
Standard 4	Two field evaluations completed by a university supervisor (one in PHED 301 & one in PHED 431)		X	
Standard 5	Occurs during Student Teaching (once TWS is completed); Copies of each section of the completed TWS should be uploaded to the portfolio			X
Standard 6	Pro05s completed in PHED 104, 301, & 431	X	X	

After much discussion, the formation of an ad hoc committee, and a review of their recommendation, the PEUC has determined that a unit-wide electronic portfolio which will include factors in addition to academic ability will be developed. See the following PEUC Meeting Minutes (Portfolio passages highlighted in yellow, Pro05 information highlighted in green) excerpts and ad hoc committee meeting minutes.

Professional Education Unit Council Minutes
Wednesday, October 5, 2016

Voting Members Present: J. Androzzi, S. Beard, D. Berenschot D. Burke, R. Conley, T. Fontana, D. Gonzol, c. hannah, D. Hargrove, R. Hovatter, L. Johnson (Chair), D. Kennard, P. Lashley, R. Mercado, B. Mitchell, D. Modler, P. Moore, L. Sell, G. Toole, J. Tuttle, P. Palmer, Elementary SESA Rep.

Voting Members Absent: K. Adams, E. Allison, H. Baker, T. Cole, K. Corpus, Maggie James, Secondary SESA Rep.

Visiting: V. Hicks,

Dr. Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:12 p.m.

ELECTRONIC PORTFOLIOS

The physical education department provided portfolio training and is moving forward with electronic portfolios. Dr. Johnson presented reasons why we need to move to electronic portfolios and why TK20 would be able to provide us with a way to collect and analyze data regarding portfolios. Dr. Mercado, serving as chair with Dr. Tuttle and Page Moore, were charged with identifying those elements that would be required for all programs and developing a rubric for rating those requirements. They will present their conclusions to the entire PEUC for further discussion.

DISPOSITION ASSESSMENT

Dr. Johnson indicated that the Pro 05 does not meet CAEP requirements and that we need to research disposition assessments that would be acceptable. Drs. Hovatter and Androzzi will bring recommendations to the PEUC for further discussion and adoption.

PEUC ad hoc Committee Meeting Notes

10/17/16 2-3 PM Knutti Hall 104

Present: JB Tuttle, Page Moore, LeAnn Johnson, Becky Mercado

LeAnn reviewed relevant excerpt from DOE meeting minutes:

Elvira: ask committee to develop a simple survey that can be used to develop a possible rationale for the portfolio by asking PEUC members

What do you feel is the purpose of the portfolio for the education program (independent of SPAs)?

Should we continue to require a portfolio?

If yes, how should we use it?

If the answers come back no, then for the self study report, we need to document how it was used in the juncture process and the process by which we decided to discontinue it.

The Committee's response to DOE suggestion:

We are presenting the information we have gathered, including a proposal to the PEUC membership along with an opportunity for individuals to ask questions, comment, suggest, or express concerns in particular areas.

What we did:

The PEUC ad hoc Committee on Portfolios reviewed the history and current use of portfolios in individual programs as well as across the entire unit. We also discussed CAEP expectations for a unit-wide assessment to track all candidates' progress toward demonstrating the teaching standards.

What we know:

- Currently, only the advisor or specialization coordinator reviews the portfolio
- Although some specialization programs gather data and use the portfolio as a SPA assessment, no data are gathered from portfolios at the unit-wide level with results aggregated for all programs at Shepherd
- Although the current portfolio is a unit-wide juncture requirement, it is not used as a unit-wide assessment to determine program areas that need improvement or to track candidates
- The current portfolio has different purposes depending on the program, and in some cases, depending on the advisor within a program
- The current portfolio, in some specialization areas (but not all), is aligned to WVPT Standards, on which our current Student Teaching Assessment (ST-11) is based
- Current Juncture procedures include candidates completing paper forms with GPAs and course grades, which then must be checked manually by the Certification Analyst, verified by advisors, and confirmed by specialization coordinators
- Presently, we do not have a systematic mechanism by which to determine how many education majors across all programs never go through juncture and why nor how many candidates spend extra semesters to improve GPA or to pass PRAXIS I exams
- We currently have students purchasing TK-20, which has the capacity to provide an efficient platform for creating and housing the unit-wide and program-specific assessment measures,

- reports, and monitoring systems we need for accreditation reports
- TK-20, which we already have available, provides one central platform within which all unit-wide assessments and data for monitoring can be housed. While other online platforms could be used successfully for the portfolio, reports would have to be generated manually.
 - TK-20 has the capacity to directly upload candidates' grades in courses needed for verification without manual data input by candidates or staff
 - CAEP requires a unit-wide assessment that monitors candidates' progress toward demonstrating teaching standards
 - CAEP requires unit-wide assessments that monitor candidates from the time they declare an education program as their major (EDUC 150) through Junctures 1, 2, and 3
 - CAEP seeks evidence that EPPs are including points of differentiated instruction for candidates as they progress through a program.

Committee's Conclusions:

- A portfolio, housed in TK-20, is the most efficient and effective way to monitor candidates beginning in EDUC 150 throughout their time in an education program, including the Juncture processes, and advisors and students would have access to the candidate's progress, simplifying the determination of readiness for each Juncture point
- Recognizing that some specializations will wish to use portfolio data in SPA reports, those elements may be added to the unit-wide requirements; however, all requirements within a specialization area must be consistent throughout that program and have inter-rater reliability established among all assessors.

Committee's Recommendation to PEUC:

- Revise current portfolio requirements at the unit-level based on WVPT Standards, including, among others, the evidence needed in Standards 4 and 5 that are now included on the ST-11 but are not relevant to a performance assessment
- Develop the unit-level portfolio within the TK-20 platform with the capability of adding additional requirements to satisfy individual SPA requirements
- Begin developing scoring rubrics and new Juncture procedures

PEUC Members are encouraged to submit questions, comments, suggestions, or concerns about the following areas:

- Required artifacts vs. candidate chosen artifacts
- Advisor scoring vs. individual artifacts scored by instructor as part of a course key assessment
- Nature and scope of narratives required; how candidates identify standards/functions that correspond to their artifacts
- Portfolios for transfer students
- Rubrics for aligning artifacts to standards
- Requirements for Juncture I and Juncture II
- Ways to develop inter-rater reliability across the entire unit
- Other considerations

If and when the PEUC approves this recommendation, we will begin working on the details to present for approval.

Respectfully submitted,
Becky Mercado

PEUC Agenda

Wednesday, November 16, 2016, 3:10 – 5:00

“Where CAEP goes the university goes.”

“It’s the entire campus that gets accredited not just the department of education.”

Food for Thought from the CAEP Conference

CAEP Related Policy Discussions

- **Electronic Portfolios: Becky Mercado**

Becky reviewed what had been covered two meetings ago. It was clarified that we first had to decide whether a portfolio with common elements should be adopted as a program wide unit assessment. A motion was made seconded to “Set up a committee to develop a unit wide portfolio. This committee will solicit feedback from PEUC members and determine what pieces should be included as common to all programs and will be the foundation upon which individual programs may add specific requirements.” The motion passed with a Vote of 12 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstained.

Lynne noted that as an assessment, the development of a portfolio will need to follow the procedures outlined by CAEP to establish validity and reliability. All recognized this as accurate.

- **Disposition Assessment Recommendation: Rhonda**

Rhonda indicated that she had contacted several institutions to see what they were using as a disposition assessment. All had developed instruments under NCATE so had not gone through the CAEP Standards development. She said that all involved the same types of elements that our Pro05 has but that they had indicators for each rather than an arbitrary rating with no descriptors. She had been unable to locate any proprietary disposition assessments that we could simply adopt.

LeAnn commented that the Pro05 will not meet CAEP standards and so we will have to begin the process of developing a disposition assessment following the CAEP guidelines.

Rhonda said she would upload the instruments used by other institutions to the PEUC sakai site so that we could examine them in starting this process.

The Pro 05 Dispositional Assessment

The Pro05 is a disposition assessment constructed in 2005. Originally it was filled out in paper form but has since been placed in the TK20 data management system. It is filled out by the instructor of all education courses. Candidates are expected to include Pro05 evaluations from all courses in their portfolio and the Pro05s are reviewed by their advisors as they progresses through the program at each

juncture. Advisors can also access the Pro05s directly through TK20 in preparation for advising sessions each semester.

Pro 05 Disposition Assessment completed by the instructor for each EDUC Course

Instructor's Qualitative Evaluation of Teacher Education Student

A. Personal Characteristics

	Excellent(6)	Excellent Good (5)	Good(4)	Good Fair (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Cannot Judge
1. Personal integrity							
2. Seriousness of intent							
3. Interpersonal skills							
4. Acceptance of responsibility							
5. Appropriate role model							
6. Intellectual curiosity							
7. Communications skills							

B. Professional Characteristic

	Excellent(6)	Excellent Good (5)	Good (4)	Good Fair (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Cannot Judge
8. Willingness to commit to professional development							
9. Capacity for professional development							
10. Appreciates diversity and dignity of individuals							
11. Engages in critical discourse							
12. Commits to action, interpretation, critical reflection cycle							

C. Do you believe this student belongs in teacher education? Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

Definition of Qualitative Review Criteria

1. Personal integrity: Represents only own work as own work, is truthful about absences and late work, accepts consequences of own behavior, etc.
2. Seriousness of intent: Diligent in course work, progresses through program requirements, shows respect for teaching and profession, etc.
3. Interpersonal skills: Hears and listens to spoken and unspoken messages, accepted by peers, shows genuine interest in other people, etc.
4. Acceptance of responsibility: Regular in attendance, punctual with assignments, open to constructive criticism, extracts maximum benefit from TEP experiences, etc.
5. Appropriate role model: Evidences appropriate personal hygiene, uses appropriate language, practices appropriate behavior, etc.
6. Intellectual curiosity: Desires to learn and know, willing to ask questions, etc.
7. Communication skills: Able to produce clear and accurate verbal and written language; able to receive and interpret verbal and non-verbal communication, etc.
8. Willingness to commit to professional development: Integrates new knowledge into a growing professional perspective, examines preconceptions about teaching, demonstrates the willingness to seek out and experience growth possibilities, etc.
9. Capacity for professional development: Demonstrates ability to grow and change; absorbs, integrates and uses knowledge; tolerates ambiguity, etc.
10. Appreciates diversity and dignity of individuals: Respects the dignity and worth of all individuals. Demonstrates a broad appreciation of diversity in school and community through speech, writings, and interactions, etc.
11. Engages in critical discourse: Demonstrates the willingness and capacity to engage in critical discourse about education issues. Fosters and participates in critical discussions through challenging the thinking of self and others, exploring ambiguity in teaching and learning, and taking risks to strengthen understanding of theory and practice, etc.
12. Commits to the action, interpretation, critical reflection cycle: Actively seeks to learn from teaching/learning experiences. In critical reflections, balances rationales for teaching and learning by exploring intersections of field experiences and pedagogical knowledge, etc.

When ratings by instructors indicate concerns, the advisor conferences with the candidate to articulate concerns, help the student identify and take responsibility for behaviors that result in the ratings, and form a plan for improving in the personal and professional characteristics where improvement is needed.

Candidates have a minimum of 3 pro05s by the time they are admitted to the program (EDUC 150, 200 and 320). Most also have a Pro05 rating in 360 and some have Pro 05 ratings in EDUC 333, and some of the pre-juncture early education courses. The ratings and comments on each are discussed with the candidate and considered by the advisor when recommending the candidate for juncture. When a student with questionable ratings and instructor comments is brought before the department of education, the advisor makes Pro05 concerns known and faculty members who have interacted with the students are given an opportunity to comment further.

At times an advisor may recommend juncture but ask that a concern be recorded as is noted on the Juncture notification letter sent to a student fall semester, 2016. As was done in the example below.

Excerpt from September 28, 2016 DOE Minutes

Dr. Allison asked for motions for the juncture candidates. Dr. Hannah made a motion to approve juncture 1 candidates and Dr. Hargrove seconded the motion. Discussion followed the motions. Dr. Hannah noted that there are 18 elementary education students on the juncture list. She suggested that advisors let students know that they will have to wait if their juncture form is not in at this point. Dr. Hannah said the department will have to review and choose the most qualified candidates. Peg Swisher added that there are also 5 Blue Ridge students that went directly to PEUC for juncture. There is only one spot left at this point. Dr. Mercado said that many students have trouble passing Praxis. She suggested that advisors counsel these students to take content courses rather than taking easier courses to bring up their GPA. Peg Swisher said there are 13 students currently for 1 section of 370. Dr. Johnson suggested since any future juncture applicants have missed the deadline, we are not obligated to open another section. Dr. Tuttle said the deadline shows us how many sections to plan. With no further discussion, the juncture 1 candidates were approved with all in favor.

Dr. Hannah made a motion to approve juncture 2 candidates. Dr. Tuttle seconded the motion. Dr. Mercado mentioned that one of her advisees in PED 2 has been having trouble in the past with dispositional characteristics but has made a substantial turn around, but she did put an additional condition on his juncture form. The condition was acceptable PRO-05s in EDUC 353 and 354. With no further discussion, the juncture 2 candidates were approved with all in favor.

Shepherd University does not have a cohort system, consequently candidates do not take pre-juncture courses as a group. Because of the way the data management program is set up, it is possible to pull data reports by class but not by cohorts. Attempts to analyze this data revealed a shortcoming in the

organization of the database which is something that will need to be redesigned for better analysis in the future.

EDUC 150 is only a 1 credit course offering the least interaction between instructor and candidates. Additionally music students take an alternative course, MUSC 100. Pro05s are not completed in EDUC 320 at the time most candidates apply for juncture and are given provisional status pending successful completion of 320 and the Pro05 when they would move to full status. Consequently, the only class that all candidates in all specializations have in common with Pro05's available for initial consideration at juncture is EDUC 200. Therefore, data has been provided as part of the CAEP Standard 1 narrative and supporting documents for the past three semesters (Fall 2015, Spring 2016, Fall 2016) for students taking EDUC 200. It should be noted that the same instructor taught all students in all sections of these courses for these three semesters so there is consistency in the rater.

Data analysis that took place in the February 15, 2017 PEUC Meeting. The following is an excerpt from that meetings minutes.

Pro 05—Data represents only EDUC 200 which 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 (ie 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 stake holders in the process.
- Get Dawne Burk’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 measureable making any rating extremely subjective (ie 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.

Due to the noted difficulties with how TK20 produces tables and graphs for analysis, the focus of this analysis shifted from programmatic conclusions to feedback that will be used to inform the need for developing a new dispositional assessment and restructuring of the data base as is indicated in the Self Improvement Plan.

Consequently, to build a more detailed picture of how the Pro05 is used to help advisors identify patterns in dispositions, the Pro 05's from all courses from the first education course to the completion of coursework leading to student teaching is provided for two students. Students in the same specialization, Social Studies, who have the same advisor are presented for the sake of consistency.

Pro05's for Candidate A -Social Studies Specialization

Semester	EDUC 150	EDUC 200	EDUC 360	EDUC 320	EDUC 370	EDUC 422	EDUC 380	EDUC 443	EDUC 443
Personal Characteristics	Fall 1	Fall 12	Spring 13	Spring 13	Spring 14	Spring 14	Fall 14	Fall 14	Spring 15
Personal Integrity	4	5	3	4	5	6	5	3	6
Seriousness of Intent	2	5	3	2	4	6	3	1	2
Interpersonal Skills	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	2	3
Acceptance of Responsibility	2	5	3	3	4	5	4	2	6
Appropriate Role Model	3	5	3	3	4	6	4	4	6
Intellectual Curiosity	2	4	3	3	4	4	1	1	3
Communication Skills	3	4	3	3	4	4	2	1	3
Professional Characteristics									
Willingness to Commit to Professional Development	2	5	3	3	4	6	2	1	4
Capacity for Professional Development	3	5	3	3	4	5	3	3	6
Appreciates Diversity and Dignity of Individuals	4	5	3	3	4	6	5	6	6
Engages in Critical Discourse	2	4	3	2	4	4	1	2	6
Commits to Action, Interpretation, Critical Reflection Cycle	2	4	3	3	4	4	1	2	6
Total	32	55	36	35	49	59	34	28	57
Recommended for Teaching	Not Sure	Yes	Not Sure	No	Yes	Not Sure	Not Sure	Not Sure	Yes

Instructor Comments

150 A would benefit from holding himself to higher standards as a student in preparation for being a teacher. He did not take advantage of quiz retakes and failed to submit one major class assignment.

200 Puts forth effort in his coursework. Shared thoughts on how to teach meaningful and engaging history. Always prompt to class.

EDUC 360 A was very quiet in class...his lack of participation made it very difficult to judge his dispositions.

320 A did not actively participate in the course. He prepared himself better for the class discussions at the end of the semester than he did throughout the semester, but he did not pay attention to course requirements and rarely participated in class discussions. His actions in class did not demonstrate an interest in the program or the profession.

370 A struggled with some writing lesson plans and assessing his teaching episodes, but his work improved over the semester, his final exam showed strong skills in identifying areas for continued improvement, and he progressed in practicing skills for teaching.

422 Interest in the content areas of Social Studies is unquestionable. Has creative ideas for lessons that with further development will be solid for classroom use. Expanding dialogue with fellow students on educational issues will greatly assist in development as a potential educator. Attended Comm on Core training by Education Department.

380 Poor class participation. Little affect for course content. Projects displayed limited creativity and connection to course content.

443 First Attempt A was diligent in putting in hours in the field and attending class. However, he is very quiet. He rarely contributes to class discussion unless directly called upon. He seemed 'tired' all semester with little energy to put into his learning or his interactions with students. I was very concerned that he would have the dedication required to meet the demands of student teaching especially since his instructional skills were fairly weak. I strongly counseled him to not attempt it until he was willing to give it a full effort and to do an independent study experience in the meantime. However he felt that he could be successful. It was not until I computed final grades that I realized how many assignments he had not turned in over the course of the semester because there were several online components to the course while he was in his field placement.

443 Second Attempt A has great potential as a social studies teacher. However, he has difficulty maintaining his focus and multi-tasking. His grade reflects non participation in online components of the class that were required while he was in the field. He has, however, done a nice job with his students. He has diligently incorporated feedback from his cooperating teacher and myself into his teaching and made a lot of progress in connecting with the students while providing quality instruction. I believe A has the ability to succeed in student teaching but he will need to stay on top of the many tasks associated with his field requirements, the

Pro05's for B -Social Studies Specialization

Semester	EDUC 150	EDUC 200	EDUC 360	EDUC 320	EDUC 370	EDUC 422	EDUC 443	EDUC 380
Personal Characteristics	Fall 11	Fall 12	Fall 12	*	Fall 13	Spring 14	Spring 14	Fall 14
Personal Integrity	6	6	5		6	6	6	6
Seriousness of Intent	6	6	5		5	6	6	6
Interpersonal Skills	6	5	5		5	6	3	6
Acceptance of Responsibility	6	6	5		6	6	6	6
Appropriate Role Model	6	6	5		5	6	6	6
Intellectual Curiosity	6	5	5		5	6	6	6
Communication Skills	6	6	5		5	6	3	6
Professional Characteristics	42	40	35		37	42	36	42
Willingness to Commit to Professional Development	6	6	5		5	6	6	6
Capacity for Professional Development	6	6	5		5	6	6	6
Appreciates Diversity and Dignity of Individuals	6	6	5		5	6	6	6
Engages in Critical Discourse	6	6	5		5	6	6	6
Commits to Action, Interpretation, Critical Reflection Cycle	6	6	5		5	6	6	6
Total	30	30	25		25	30	30	30
Recommended for Teaching	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

*Data missing from TK20

Instructor Comments

360 B will make a excellent teacher. Her written work is excellent and she participates in class discussion often. She seems 100% dedicated to her goal of becoming a teacher.

370 B performed at high levels in all areas of the course

443 B is a very bright student who is determined to succeed at everything she does. She is a hard worker and is willing to put forth a great deal of effort in order to succeed. There are two things that will prevent her from succeeding in the classroom. #1 She MUST slow down. Because her own thinking processes are so quick, she moves through content extremely fast and tends to jump from topic to topic without explicit connections that students need in order to understand relationships between concepts. #2 She needs to become more aware of the subtle body language of others that she is interacting with. This ranges from peers who feel like they are in her shadow to students who are sending signals that they are having difficulty following the content. She is aware of these two areas and has shown some improvement in both this semester. Once she has these two areas in hand, her enthusiasm for history will lead her to become an outstanding teacher

For candidate A, with two exceptions, EDUC 200 and EDUC 370, a clear pattern of unengagement and personal affect emerges from this data and specific concerns are highlighted regarding lack of initiative, lack of participation, and attention to the details of course requirements. His advisor met with him repeatedly and at the time of application specific goals were set in order to allow him to juncture. He responded to this process as is evidenced in 370. However, he was unable to maintain it and slid back into the previous pattern when he moved on to 443 which resulted in failing the class. A formal contract was put in place with the 443 instructor clearly identifying those behaviors that needed to be observed. Additionally he met regularly with his advisor and instructor to monitor those behaviors. A significant change was noted and he was allowed to move through Juncture 2 and ultimately student taught

successfully.

For candidate B, a clear pattern of strong personal and professional disposition emerges across all course instructors and semesters. No concerns were raised at either juncture 1 or juncture 2 and the candidate moved directly into student teaching where she excelled and was asked to interview for a midyear opening by the principal of the school where she student taught.

It should be noted that student A passed his content praxis on the first attempt but required 2 attempts to pass the PLT. Student B passed both on the first try with high scores. This indicates that the Pro05 does not just capture academic ability but does indeed address characteristics beyond achievement.

While the Pro05 has the ability to show dispositional patterns and trends across courses, it does not meet CAEP standards for an EPP developed instrument (See 2016 10-5 PEUC Minutes above).

An ad hoc committee was set up to explore possible dispositional assessments that had been developed elsewhere that could be adopted by SU. The results of this exploration was presented to the PEUC on November 16, 2016 (see pink highlights from PEUC minutes extracts above). Because an instrument was not found that would meet CAEP standards, it was decided that SU would begin the process of developing a new dispositional assessment to take the place of the Pro 05.

The first step of this process took place at the December 1, 2016 EPPAC meeting and involved 4 SU faculty, 1 faculty member from our Community College Partner, 4 SU teacher candidates, and 7 representatives sent by 5 of the counties we have clinical partnerships with individually identifying professional and personal characteristics, categorizing them as critical, important, and optional and then ranking them in small groups.

Shepherd University Educator Preparation Program Advisory Council

December 1, 2016



Attending:

Sharon Shrum, Elementary Supervisor Frederick County Virginia Schools;
Margaret Kursey, Assistant Superintendent Berkeley County Schools;
Page Moore, Education Program Coordinator Blue Ridge Community and Technical College;
Tara Mahoney, Coordinator of Elementary Schools, 3-5, Jefferson County Schools;
Patrick Blanc, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction Jefferson County Schools;
Claire Houseknect, Human Resources Coordinator Washington County Schools;
Lindsey Darr, Certification Specialist Washington County Schools,
Asia Jones, Director of Secondary, Loudon County Schools;
Garrett O'Connell, Secondary Student Shepherd University;
Theresa Lang, Early Education Student Shepherd University;
Madeline Witte, Elementary Education Student Shepherd University;
Jordyn Marion, Student Teacher, Shepherd University;
Elivra Allison, Department of Education Chair Shepherd University;

Scott Beard, Dean of Graduate Studies and Associate Provost Shepherd University
Chris Ames, Acting Dean School of Education and Professional Studies and Provost Shepherd University
LeAnn Johnson, Director of Teacher Education Shepherd University

The meeting commenced with dinner at 6:30

LeAnn welcomed everyone, had each person introduce themselves and then introduced the new Shepherd Educator Preparation Leadership

Acting Dean and Provost: Chris Ames	comes@shepherd.edu
Associate Provost: Scott Beard	sbeard@shepherd.edu
Department of Education Chair: Elvira Sanatullova-Allison	eallison@shepherd.edu
Director of Assessment & Accountability: Linda Sell	lsell@shepherd.edu
Director of Teacher Education: LeAnn Johnson	ljohnson@shepherd.edu

A handout prepared by Linda Bragg from WVBOE with updates from Policy 5100 highlighted. Everyone was encouraged to review the full document, but LeAnn pointed out the importance of commenting on suggested policy during open comment periods and potential implications of the following information found on the first page:

Change in language about top 50 Percent distribution on a Nationally normed assessment (Shepherd is currently meeting this, but change in language allows potentially strong candidates to be considered even if they have a less than stellar high school test performance score)

The state's unexpected decision to let us pick or develop our own teacher performance assessment (reviewed involvement in pilot of the edTPA/PPAT) and Shepherd's decision to avoid the high stakes expense of the commercial assessment to work, at least for the time being, with other universities in developing the WVTPA.

Choice in development of a disposition assessment

The potential impact of requiring content PRAXIS cores BEFORE student teaching. (Some discussion ensued regarding importance of demonstrating content knowledge, test anxiety, expense, and impact on number of completers due to change in policy.)

LeAnn provided a handout of the 5 CAEP standards and used the attached Powerpoint to review the following key highlights related to new CAEP accreditation

Validity and Reliability of Assessments – Stakeholder Involvement

Clinical Partner “Co-Selection” for Program Entry

Each individual was provided a stack of sticky notes and asked to identify personal and professional characteristics independent of content and pedagogical knowledge, writing 1 per page. They then rated each characteristic as Critical, Important, or Optional. In small groups, the identified characteristics from group members were then ranked from most important to least important. This work will form the first step in the development of a new disposition assessment that meets CAEP standards.

Recruitment of Diverse Highly Qualified Candidates

LeAnn questioned the counties as to whether they are doing anything to identify highly academically able students who are interested in becoming teachers.

Washington County has a teacher academy at North and South High that gives students experience working with elementary age groups. Two of their recently hired teachers went through this program. This is different than the child care completer program done for students interested in working in day care settings. It was clarified that Maryland elementary certification is for 1-6 grade and WV students from Shepherd who do not have the early education endorsement lose certification for kindergarten when they get a MD teaching license.

The question was asked as to why we as a society are not pushing our best students to be teachers.

Washington County is working on a program called Middle College in collaboration with HCC and they are sponsoring a diversity recruitment day with an emphasis on trying to get not just ethnic diversity but gender diversity in among teachers.

Jefferson County has a Teacher Cadet program at Washington High that includes an apprenticeship in elementary classrooms.

Loudoun County also has a Teacher Cadet program at the middle and high school level. There are a large number of students in this program and historically many of them graduate from high school get teaching certification from area institutions and return to the county to teach. They also have an Educators Rising Club for students not in the cadet program—again they are trying to encourage both gender and ethnic diversity.

Frederick County Virginia has links on their webpage to news clips featuring their teacher programs for high schoolers through their FACS program.

Berkeley County also has a teacher cadet program. In addition they are getting ready to kick off a jump start program called Grow Your Own that is being done at Blue Ridge. This program will allow qualified students in high school to spend part of their school day at Blue Ridge. These students can complete 21 credits by the end of high school including EDUC 150 and 200.

LeAnn noted that the Blue Ridge collaborative is in the process of adding early education and physical education to the collaborative agreement which should help pull additional students from high school into this program. She noted that because of the age of the students, most of these programs focused on recruiting students for elementary and early education rather than secondary education and asked how we could encourage high schoolers to consider teaching secondary subjects.

It was noted that recruitment towards secondary education specializations had to start with teachers who loved their content area and shared that love with students more so than starting with students who love children and encouraging them to teach. LeAnn shared an example of this happening in science at Boonsboro high school and Lindsey Darr noted that her love of mathematics is what led her to teaching.

It was noted that recruitment for teachers must start in the middle schools, that by the time a student is a freshman in high school it is too late. Chris noted that Virginia Hicks from Shepherd University was going to be setting up programs for middle school student involvement on campus and that we might tie into this opportunity.

LeAnn also noted that an Education Fair was going to be planned for March 2 and that more information would be forthcoming about an opportunity for high school students who were interested in education would be able to come to campus, be paired with a host student and take part in classes and special events for the day.

It was noted that there is an ongoing need for math, science, Spanish, ELL, and special education teachers. Berkeley County noted that for the first time they had had difficulty filling elementary positions and Frederick, Loudoun and Washington Counties all indicated that they currently had new positions being posted mid year in a variety of content areas that needed to be filled. LeAnn indicated that data on hiring in the local counties for the past two years substantiated these needs and that RESA 8 still had 2 positions for PreK that they had been unable to fill for more than a year.

Program Success Measured by Impact on P-12 Student Learning – New Paradigm

Elvira commented on the challenges of this standard. Margaret indicated that they roster achievement information by teacher and that they can share this information. Lindsey said that in Maryland teachers set achievement goals using the Danielson framework and that data was kept to see if those goals were accomplished. Elvira thanked them for this information as she is leading the standards group working on a plan for meeting this standard.

Evidence-Based Quality Assurance Systems

Scott briefly reviewed the systems that Shepherd has in place for monitoring quality of both university faculty and teacher candidates as they move through the educator preparation program.

No additional Stakeholder Reports/Comments/Questions were added.

The next EPPAC meeting was announced for Tuesday, February 21, 6:30 Byrd Center for Legislative Studies Multi-Purpose Room

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Small Group Ratings of Individually Identified Dispositional Characteristics

Characteristics

Rank	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
1	Moral Character (integrity, honest, trustworthy)	Collaborative	Coachable	Ethical
2	Strong Interpersonal Skills (cooperative, team player, personable, emotionally stable, patient, good communicator)	Dedication/Hard Working	Punctual, consistent, reliable	Reliable
3	Positive	Knowledgeable/Learning	Culturally Competent	Collaborative
4	Problem Solver	Flexible, Open minded, responsive, inclusive	Perseverant	Self-Motivated/Reflective
5	Enjoys Kids	Creative	Dedicated	Creative
6	Motivated (eager to learn) growth mind-set, committed	Ethical, Integrity	Able to Prioritize	
7	organized	Communication	Analytical.	
8	reliable	Self-Aware, Reflective	Flexible/Open Minded	
9			Collaborative	
10			Level-Headed	
11			Organized	
12			Positive	
13			Leader	
14			Forward Thinking	

Results of EPPAC Meeting Disposition Activity

In addition to the Pro05s done in university courses, dispositional expectations are outlined in the Shepherd University Code of Conduct for Teacher Candidates in the field (See SU Code of Conduct). Students sign a statement before beginning each field placement verifying that they have read, understand and will abide by the code of conduct. A process for addressing dispositional concerns in the field is outlined in section IV of the code. (See Below)

Violation of Shepherd University Code of Conduct for Teacher Candidates in the Field

Any instance in which the TC has not abided by the Shepherd University Code of Conduct for Teacher Candidates in the Field is a violation of such. In situations in which the TC has not abided by any of the criteria in the Shepherd University Code of Conduct for Teacher Candidates in the Field, the course professor may use discretion as to how any violations will be addressed. Possible outcomes, including but not limited to the following, might be: (1) verbal counselling, which may be documented, in a meeting of the professor and the TC, which may include the cooperating teacher or others as deemed appropriate by the professor, to discuss the violation and what steps must be taken by the TC to improve professionalism; (2) the development of a contractual agreement of remediation between the course professor and student in which the professor sets forth criteria that would serve as evidence of improvement; (3) suspension from field placement until completion of a contractual agreement of remediation that shows evidence that the TC is prepared to re[enter field placement; (4) involuntary withdrawal from practicum; or (5) expulsion from the teacher education program.

4

Letter of Agreement

By signing this "Letter of Agreement" I am confirming that I have read, wholly understand, and will abide by the Shepherd University Code of Conduct for Teacher Candidates in the Field. If I commit any infraction upon the Shepherd University Code of Conduct I understand that such may be reviewed by Shepherd University personnel who will address the matter accordingly in a timely, professional, and objective method. Possible repercussions that may result of any infringement or infringements could include but are not limited to meeting with the Shepherd University personnel to undergo a remedial plan prior to re[entering the field placement or expulsion from the respective course and/or teacher education program.

Name (printed):

Name (signed): Date: / /

5

Request for Modification of the Shepherd University Code of Conduct for Teacher Candidates in the Field

This request must be submitted no less than two weeks prior to field placement to the Request for Modification subcommittee of the Professional Education Unit Council. Accommodations associated with a special need will be coordinated through the Office of Disability Support Services and Request for Modification Subcommittee of the Professional Education Unit Council. Please check any and all justifications you are seeking for any modification of the Shepherd University Code of Conduct for Teacher Candidates in the Field:

- Religious beliefs
- Special needs
- Other

Provide a brief, written rationale as to why you are making the request.

By signing this "Request for Modification of the Shepherd University Code of Conduct for Teacher Candidates in the Field" document, I am confirming that I have read, wholly understand, and will abide by the Shepherd University Code of Conduct for Teacher Candidates in the Field regardless as to whether or not my request is approved or denied. I am also confirming that I wholly understand that the right to deny this request is reserved by the respective Shepherd University personnel that review my request.

Please sign and date:

Name (printed):

Name (signed): Date: //

This section is to be completed by the Request for Modification Subcommittee of the Professional Education Unit Council.

Request for Modification: (circle one) Granted Denied

Provide a brief written rationale as to why this request has been granted or denied.

Course Instructor's Signature: _ Date: //

One case in point, Student C, is provided to illustrate. After multiple warnings about being late and unprepared, the lack of a professional disposition culminated when Student C's supervisor came to the school for an observation and found that he had not come to school that day leaving the teacher to teach without warning. Following a pattern of lack of communication and unexcused and uncommunicated absences, C was given the option of withdrawing voluntarily or being withdrawn involuntarily. C was later readmitted with conditions following review of the situation and Pro05's from previous semesters by an ad hoc committee. The behavior that led to his withdrawal from the practicum was resolved and feedback from the course instructor indicates that he will have a very strong Pro05

Pro05's for C - Social Studies Specialization

Semester	EDUC 150	EDUC 200	EDUC 360	EDUC 320	EDUC 370	EDUC 422	EDUC 380	EDUC 443	EDUC 443
Personal Characteristics	Fall 12	*	Spring 14	Fall 14	Fall 15	Spring 16	Spring 16	Spring 2016	Fall 16
Personal Integrity	5		2	6	5	5	0	4	
Seriousness of Intent	3		2	6	4	5	0	1	
Interpersonal Skills	5		2	6	4	6	0	1	
Acceptance of Responsibility	3		2	6	4	4	0	1	
Appropriate Role Model	5		2	5	4	6	0	4	
Intellectual Curiosity	5		2	6	6	6	0	1	
Communication Skills	5		2	5	4	5	0	3	
Professional Characteristics									
Willingness to Commit to Professional Development	3		2	6	4	5	0	1	
Capacity for Professional Development	6		2	6	6	6	0	5	
Appreciates Diversity and Dignity of Individuals	6		2	6	5	6	0	0	
Engages in Critical Discourse	4		2	5	4	6	0	1	
Commits to Action, Interpretation, Critical Reflection Cycle	4		2	6	4	5	0	3	
Total									
Recommended for Teaching	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not Sure	Not Sure	

*Data not recorded in TK 20

Instructor Comments

- 150** I believe that C has the potential to be an effective teacher. His comments and ideas, especially those expressed later in the course, showed increased maturity and insight over earlier work. I hope he will continue this
- 200** Data is missing from the TK20 database
- 360** C was absent more than 3 class periods and did not participate a lot in class. I didn't really get a chance to know him
- 320** C made great contributions to this class and demonstrated growth from the beginning of the class. He had an enlightening field experience in an interesting social studies class. Mike contributed to discussions. He has a great sense of humor and he has the potential to be an excellent teacher.
- 370** At times C was unprepared, but usually he made carefully-considered valuable contributions to class discussions. C's teaching experiences were successful, and his content knowledge is excellent.
- 422** Awesome and creative lessons (especially NEARPOD). Late on some posted assignment time tables/class times, but provide solid and thoughtful work once completed.
- 443** First Attempt C was consistently late for class and had difficulty being prepared and showing initiative as needed for coordinating his field work. These same characteristics carried over into his work with his cooperating teacher and led to his withdrawal from the field placement. I believe that he has the capacity to be a good teacher, but he needs to resolve the personal issues that have impacted his ability to succeed in this class. I believe that once he has some coping mechanisms in place, he has the actual knowledge and capacity to learn to teach that could enable him to be a good teacher. However, he will have to show that he is engaged in class with content and expectations, and show that he is willing to give 100% effort if he attempts EDUC 443 a second time

443 Second Attempt: Informal conversation with instructor indicates excellent dispositions in both class and field.

Addendum: At the time of CAEP report submission, this student was excelling in his student teaching placement and no additional dispositional issues have been noted.