Cross-Campus Education Committee Meeting

Time: November 28, 2012, 11:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m.

Place: PUB 206

Contact: Kevin Decker of Jackie Coomes

In attendance: Kevin Decker, Chris Valeo, Charlie Potter, Mariann Donley, Sharon Keattch, Sean Agriss, Kathleen Huttenmaier, Jackie Coomes, Sheila Sherwood and David Neilson.

Key Points:

- Program and standards alignment.
- The potential introduction of a canvass site which will allow faculty and staff to share documents and ideas.
- Questions for a survey for members of the Cross-Campus Education Committee.
- What assessments could be developed by each program? for multiple programs?

1. **Alignment of our own program/course goals and out assessments.**

Chris Valeo: Each program should evaluate how the courses they offer align with the evaluation standards by which candidates will be judged. Faculty are already having these discussions frequently, however, their efforts go undocumented; the committee should find ways to track and document these discussions to show the full scope of faculty and staff efforts.

The various programs may look to revising their SLOs (Student Learning Objectives) to improve the overall function of the program as well. This is related to the evaluation of programs and should be documented.

Students should be aware of how they are being evaluated. Some students may not be aware that they are expected to summate knowledge gained from multiple classes for various tests, for example.

Charlie Potter: The state is mostly concerned that faculty and staff are having these conversations and creating an environment where everyone is advised. The regularity of the conversation and the creation of a proactive community is as important as the data itself.

Sharon Keattch: An issue which has arisen is that not all students will have declared a major while taking classes. It is then necessary to later review their transcripts to find the grade they received, which suffices yet limits the knowledge of the student’s performance in a particular class to their grades. It would be helpful to develop a constant so that all programs can self-evaluate while also being sure to track student development.
Kevin Decker: At this current juncture, the standards are the constant; each program may have a unique approach; it ultimately depends on the needs of the program.

A canvas sharing-site could be developed. The canvas site would allow for multiple people to have access to other programs' information.

Jackie Coomes: We should also consider how to address learning style. We can look to students for guidance, utilizing student voice.

We can ask students for a personal philosophy statement. This will not only allow us to evaluate students, but the report will indicate how a student interprets the program.

Sean Agriss: We should consider moving up assessment so that students have time to reevaluate and correct an issue.

2. Professional expectations/dispositions of our teacher candidates

Mariann Donley: Disposition is especially important. If there is a concern regarding a student, Mariann Donley can be contacted. At times, mentors do not openly speak of problems. Initiative, dependability and punctuality are the most commonly occurring issues. However, it is important to remember when evaluating students they are going through a learning process; student teaching is the study of teaching.

Sean Agriss: It would be beneficial to incorporate disposition into the English department and other departments, rather than limiting the information to Education Department. The cooperating teachers have a variety of styles. For example, one teacher may feel threatened if a student takes initiative whereas another teacher may expect the student teacher to be very active. Understanding the teacher and matching dispositions is key to candidate success.

Jackie Coomes: We can adapt the aspects of the disposition evaluation to each program.

Chris Valeo: When we revise, we should consider keeping TPEP in mind. We also need to make distinctions such as a rating of three being based upon the performance of a first year teacher rather than a more experienced teacher.

3. Accreditation

Charlie Potter: Each department meeting, a different aspect of standard 3 is discussed. The first goal is to ensure that standards are met. This process will allow for great growth in the Education Department and other departments as well.
Chris Valeo: If students could serve on committees and help guide education program, it would help to develop a body of knowledge pertaining to standards as well as evaluation. Optimally, a student from each program would take part.

Committee members can also begin thinking of ways to bring more faculty members into the know.

Sean Agriss: It would be beneficial to choose a student who is early on in the program so that the student could serve on the committee for an extended period of time.

4. SurveyMonkey

Kevin Decker: This survey is intended to enable all members of the committee to have input. Please email any questions you would like to include in the survey to Kevin at kdecker@ewu.edu.

Some examples of questions which would be beneficial to include are: Do you have access to the information you need regarding accreditation? How could this information be more readily available?

Sean Agriss: There is an opportunity for the committee to reach out to the university and publicize the changing standards. We could ask how the committee could best share this information. In addition, we should ask what issues have arisen while advising a student. How can committee have an influence within the university to publicize changes.

5. Field Experience Updates

Chris Valeo: At the last Education Department meeting, faculty and staff discussed Standard 3.2c. This standard concerns establishing an adequate number of supervisors and support personnel. How do we adequately support the field experience unit? We can perhaps have additional faculty help to fulfill this role.

The Education Department is looking to bring in seven more lecturers to fulfill the roles of field supervisors. This task can rotate every three years, providing all faculty members a chance to participate without having to overload their schedules. The lecturers will be included in the meetings so that they are better aware are the standards to which students will be upheld.

As of January 2013, a new employee will act in the role of supervisor.

Mariann Donley: The Education Department works to maintain continuity so that students can remain with the same faculty member(s). However, faculty may take time off for one reason or another. Maintaining consistency becomes an issue. There has been discussion regarding a reduction in the time commitment of field supervisors, but it is beneficial to have that weekly involvement. Another solution such as hiring additional faculty is by far a better option. In addition, establishing a liaison between EWU
and a local school will aid in matching dispositions of candidates and teachers, as well as enabling teachers to approach someone who is affiliated with the university to arrange a student teacher.

Chris Valeo: A liaison could oversee perhaps 4 or 5 candidates. Students are going to enroll in the student teaching course along with their supervisor, allowing faculty to step in and oversee. Even though there may not be continuity, students will be supervised by teachers they already know and faculty will be able to see the knowledge their students have gained (not only will faculty be able to help their students, they will be able to reflect upon areas which can be improved in the program).

Sean Agriss: An issue of concern is that a student may finish their degree without having a full-time tenure track lecturer to guide them along the way. Could this position be adapted so that it is their job, rather than their turn to oversee students. The committee should begin working together to develop a job description.

6. Fall 2012 edTPA scoring updates

Chris Valeo: In fall 2013, the edTPA scores will become consequential. As of right now, they are not, which enables faculty members to discuss how they would like to format student evaluations. Furthermore, programs will have several months to make any desired programmatic changes inspired by the new accreditation standards.

Jackie Coomes: It is important to consider how the evaluations will be interpreted and the implications of student scores. If a student were to have two areas in which they scored ones, but have an average of three, a faculty member should at least discuss any issues with the student. Depending on which strengths and weaknesses the candidate portrays, a conversation may suffice or perhaps it would be necessary to repeat a class. Perhaps faculty could discuss different levels of approaches.

Conclusion:

- Committee members should continue thinking of ways to align programs with evaluation.
- Should a canvass sharing-site be introduced and what information should be shared?
- What can we learn from student feedback and how should we incorporate student voice in programmatic changes?
- What questions would you like to have included in the survey?
- The next Cross-Campus Education Committee meeting will be held on January 30, 2013.