

Educational Personnel Preparation Advisory Committee (EPPAC)

Thursday October 27, 2016 @ 5:30
Memorial Student Center, Shawkey Room

ATTENDEES

**Teresa Eagle, Kandice Rowe, Sara Smith, Allison Carey, Amanda Preece
Mindy Backus, Stacey Murphy, Lynn Ferguson, Paula Lucas, Jan O'Hanlon, Edna Miesel,
Sandra Stroebel, Sara Stapleton, Jennifer Bowling, Tammy Stowers, Sissy Isaacs,
Annalisse, Samantha**

AGENDA

I. Welcome and Introductions - Dr. Teresa Eagle, Dean, College of Education and Professional Development

II. Old Business

Approval of minutes of the previous meeting

Motion: Paula Lucas

Second: Mindy Backus

Vote: Unanimous

III. New Business

A. West Virginia Department of Education

Ms. Linda Bragg, WVDE Liaison – refer to handout

B. The Education Preparation Provider (EPP) submits the following issues for approval and/or discussion by the EPPAC:

Approval Items

1. UPCC Items– Dr. Paula Lucas

- MI – Multicategorical (see handout)
- Praxis II change (see handout)

2. GPC Items – Dr. Sandra Stroebel

- ATE – Adult Continuing Education (see handout)
- LS and EDF changing alpha designators (see handout)
- Research changes (see handout)
- Broadening courses
- Restructuring
- Counseling catalog changes for CACREP accreditation
- Motion: Amanda Preece
- Second: Stacey Murphy
- Vote: Unanimous

Fall 2016 WVDE Updates & Guidance
Office of Educator Effectiveness & Licensure

Policy 5100: Revisions WVBE-approved effective July 11, 2016 – Below are some highlights, but are not inclusive of all revisions. A recommendation: Anytime policy revisions are adopted after the 30-day comment period, we recommend that EPPs read the sections that were open in order to stay informed of all adopted policy revisions. Also, during the comment period, an “underline and strike-through” version of the policy is always on the WVBE web page to make it easy to find the proposed revisions. Also on the WVBE web page during the comment period are instructions for making comments to the open sections of the policy.

§126.114-6. Professional Educator Preparation Program Requirements: Teacher

- Admission criteria (in alignment with CAEP changes)
 - However, 6.2.b.1 is scheduled to propose revision when policy is reopened to accept the WVBE-approved cut score of the Praxis CASE and remove the language regarding the top 50 percent distribution on a nationally-normed assessment such as ACT;
- EPP support/remediation to candidates for Praxis preparation after two unsuccessful attempts to pass;
- replace conceptual framework with CAEP-required mission statement focused on continuous improvement;
- requirements of and flexibility with choosing a performance assessment and disposition screening assessment of teacher candidates;
- clarifying language regarding clinical experience;
- 6.3.i revisions regarding special education programs—removed requirements for subject area/core content requirements and added a focus on reading instruction

§126.114-9. Professional Educator Preparation Program Requirements: Student Support and Administration:

- Guiding language for performance assessment
- Clarifying amount and programmatic levels for clinical and field experience.

§126.114-10. Additional Program Requirements.

- Removing the requirement of the core content endorsement for Special Education Programs --per the federal *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA) including removing requirements for additional endorsement with a gifted endorsement.
- Clarifying language regarding validity of test scores--removing outdated language requiring tests that are too old.
- Adding the requirement of passing scores on content tests as part of program completion.
- Adding the requirement of passing scores on content tests before candidates are placed in their clinical experience.

§126.114-12. Educator Preparation Program Approval Process.

- Updating terminology. Adding description of the requirements for review of programs of study, determination of approval status and timelines. Clarifying the Educator Preparation Program Review Board (EPPRB) process for review and re-approval of a revised program of study.

§126.114-14. Annual Report and Performance.

- Adding language regarding EPP annual reporting. Adding criteria that identifies low performing and at-risk EPP status (also scheduled to propose revision for clarification)

§126.114-Appendix A-8. West Virginia Elementary Mathematics Specialist Standards (Master’s Degree Programs).

Program Review Regarding Low Enrollment or Suspended Admission of Candidates (Dormancy)--

West Virginia requires submission to the Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) even for programs with low enrollment so that all aspects of the program can be reviewed by the SPA. We often hear that CAEP associates have suggested that EPPs request a waiver from the state or CAEP says that the SPA “will not review.” WV’s position is to submit to SPA unless the EPP receives an official communication from the SPA stating that the SPA will not review it.

SPA reports will not only reveal conditions caused by low enrollment, but also report about other program circumstances as well. The dilemma arises when low enrollment remains an issue, and the conditions cannot be met because enrollment is too low to produce the necessary data. Because the state is also interested in SPA *conclusions and revelations* about other aspects of the programs, the following guidance is offered: If the reported conditions are only about low enrollment and no other areas of the program of study are identified with conditions, then the educator preparation provider (EPP) may resubmit via the Program Review with Feedback process because the conditions cannot be met.

****Please note--**SPA reports that reflect conditions in areas other than lack of data must be resubmitted to the SPA regardless of enrollment. Also, if a program of study has a CAEP-accepted national organization that reviews, the same state position is taken.

Further guidance for your consideration: If program(s) are not currently enrolling candidates and currently have no candidates in the pipeline for completion of those particular programs, then a SPA submission will not be required. Instead, because those programs are listed as part of the EPP, the EPP will be required to submit through the Review with Feedback process. When the institution decides to open the programs for enrollment once again, a SPA report must be submitted immediately after the data collection of the first implementation of the assessments.

Decision to Eliminate the Program:

If the educator preparation provider (EPP) decides to eliminate programs that are no longer admitting candidates and there are no candidates in the pipeline for completion, SPA submissions are not required. If elimination is decided, the Office of Educator Effectiveness and Licensure will need official correspondence from the EPP stating the decision to eliminate the program(s). If the EPP, at a later time, decides to offer the program of study again, it must resubmit a program proposal to the West Virginia Educator Preparation Program Review Board (EPPRB) for review and seeking approval. Upon EPPRB and West Virginia Board of Education approval, the EPP will follow CAEP’s direction in submitting a SPA report as appropriate.

SPA Program Review Cycle

Spring Cycle	Fall Cycle
Due March 15	Due September 15
Reviewers assigned by April 15 and review completed by June 1	Reviewers assigned by October 15 and review completed by November 15
CEC audit team reviews reports by July 1	CEC audit team reviews reports by January 4
CAEP staff tech edits reports and returns the recognition reports to the institution by August 1	CAEP staff tech edits reports and returns the recognition reports to the institution by February 1

UPCC MEETING
Friday, September 9, 2016
1:00 pm
JH 219
MINUTES

Member Present: Paula Lucas, Debbie Lockwood, Kathy Seelinger, George Watson, Janet Dozier, Sissy Isaacs

- *Paula Lucas was elected as chair for the 2016-2017 year.*
- *Debbie Lockwood was elected as secretary for the 2016-2017 year.*

I. Special Education changes – Debbie Lockwood

- Program name change
 - *Mentally Impaired K-6 to Multi-Categorical K-6*
The name change is to reflect the terminology used in the Special Education field. Motion to approve was made by Janet Dozier; seconded by Kathy Seelinger; all voted in favor and vote carried.
- CISP 438 – Course addition
This course is being added; it is related to the characteristics and behavior of students in the classroom, positive behavior support, etc. Motion to approve was made by George Watson; seconded by Debbie Lockwood; all voted in favor and vote carried.
- CISP 440 – Course change (new title)
Title is the only change – from ID to multicategorical. It will change student teaching from two-five week placements in special education, to an eight week placement in multicategorical. Motion to approve was made by George Watson; seconded by Kathy Seelinger; all voted in favor and vote carried.
- CISP 453 – Course change (new title and catalog description)
Change in course based on the necessity to expand course from focus on intellectual disabilities to multicategorical which will ensure our candidates are better prepared to teach this population of students. Motion to approve was made by George Watson; seconded by Janet Dozier; all voted in favor and vote carried.

II. Program Changes (ECE, Elem, and Sec) – Paula Lucas

Praxis II must be passed prior to graduation for those admitted to the program after Jan. 1, 2017 According to Policy 5100, all new admits to Teacher Education must pass Praxis II prior to graduation. This will affect program requirements for ECE, Elementary Education, and Secondary Education. Motion to approve was made by George Watson; seconded by Janet Dozier; all voted in favor and vote carried.

III. Adjourn

Graduate Program Committee Meeting Items

Fall 2016

ATE to ACE –alpha designator changes

Alpha-designator changes from LS (leadership studies) to EDF (educational foundations) are being made to research courses that are shared by Doctor of Education candidates in both Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Leadership. These include LS 719 to EDF 719, LS 703 to EDF 703, and LS 776 to EDF 776. Course number changes from 500 level to 600 level and from 600 level to 700 level are being requested to establish the beginning quantitative (EDF 517 to EDF 676) and qualitative (EDF 625) courses required in the doctoral program at the 600 level and to equalize the advanced quantitative (LS 776 to EDF 776) and qualitative (EDF 626 to 725) options at the 700 level.

Course Change from EDF 517 Statistical Methods to EDF 676 Statistical Research This course is taken by doctoral candidates (Ed.D.) and the content has been updated to better prepare these candidates. Increasing the level will also create better overall alignment of our research requirements. With this change Ed.D. students will be required to have a 600 level qualitative research course and a 600 level statistical research course. Then, with other changes we are proposing, students will select one 700 level quantitative or qualitative course depending on their research focus.

Course Change EDF 626 Advanced Qualitative Research in Education to EDF 725 Advanced Qualitative Research in Education- Since 626 is an advanced course for the doctoral program, we would like to offer it at the 700 level. This would also better align with the advanced, 700 level quantitative course option.

Course Change LS 703 Research Design to EDF 703 Research Design- We want to change the alpha-designator from LS (leadership studies) to EDF (educational foundations) since it is a foundational course for both groups of students, not just those completing the leadership specialization.

Course Change LS 719 Introduction to Doctoral Studies to EDF 719 Introduction to Doctoral Studies- We want to change the alpha-designator from LS (leadership studies) to EDF (educational foundations) since it is a foundational course for both groups of students, not just those completing the leadership specialization.

Course Change LS 776 Computer Analysis in Doctoral Research to EDF 776 Computer Analysis in Doctoral Research- We want to change the alpha-designator from LS (leadership studies) to EDF (educational foundations) since it is a foundational course for both groups of students, not just those completing the leadership specialization.

Course Change LS 720 Public School Finance to Financial Models in Education - Course is being expanded to accommodate issues across education levels (i.e., public school, community and technical college, and higher education).

Course Change LS 740 Higher Education Law to Legal Issues in Education- Course is being expanded to accommodate issues across education levels (i.e., public school, community and technical college, and higher education).

Course Deletion LS 725 Higher Education Finance- The major concentrations in the LS curriculum of the EdD program (i.e., public school, community and technical college, and higher education) were discontinued effective summer 2016 due to small enrollment figures in the public school and CTC majors. All students admitted to the LS EdD major are now admitted as simply LS students (major code GEJO). There is thus no longer a need for separate finance courses for higher education and public school majors, hence the request to delete the LS 725 course.

Course Deletion LS 745 Higher Education Law- The major concentrations in the LS curriculum of the EdD program (i.e., public school, community and technical college, and higher education) were discontinued effective summer 2016 due to small enrollment figures in the public school and CTC majors. All students admitted to the LS EdD major are now admitted as simply LS students (major code GEJO). There is thus no longer a need for separate law courses for higher education and public school majors, hence the request to delete the LS 745 course.

Counseling Changes to catalog- Upon completion of the self-study process this last spring, it was noted that there were some changes that the faculty had made in the program structure that needed to be reflected in the catalog language so that current and prospective students would not be confused by the differences in practice and the information put into the catalog last fall. In addition to that, the Dean of the Graduate College asked earlier this summer that we all clarify the language regarding conditional and provisional admission and be certain that this language was also changed in our catalog entries. The language in the changes below reflects that clarification as well.

Praxis II (5235) Biology 9-Adult WV Passing Score = 152			
	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
# of test takers	-	4	7
Highest score	-	174	179
Lowest score	-	168	153
Median score	-	171	173
Pass rate	-	4/4 passed 100%	4/4 passed 100%

Praxis II (5245) Chemistry 9-Adult WV Passing Score = 157			
	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
# of test takers	-	1	5
Highest score	-	159	187
Lowest score	-	-	138
Median score	-	-	172
Pass rate	-	1/1 100%	4/5 passed 80%

Praxis II (5265) Physics 9-Adult WV Passing Score = 126			
	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
# of test takers	-	1	1
Highest score	-	142	146
Lowest score	-	-	-
Median score	-	-	-
Pass rate	-	1/1 passed 100%	1/1 passed 100%

Praxis II (5435) General Science 5-Adult WV Passing Score = 153			
	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
# of test takers	2	9	9
Highest score	186	179	188
Lowest score	181	142	137
Median score	184	162	172
Pass rate	2/2 passed 100%	7/9 passed 78%	6/9 passed 66%

Praxis II (5440) General Science 5-9 WV Passing Score = 150			
	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
# of test takers	-	-	11
Highest score	-	-	186
Lowest score	-	-	132
Median score	-	-	156
Pass rate	-	-	9/11 passed 81%

Praxis II (5113) Music PreK-Adult WV Passing Score = 155			
	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
# of test takers	2	16	16
Highest score	174	173	182
Lowest score	152	149	150
Median score	163	161	166
Pass rate	1/2 passed 50%	11/16 passed 69%	13/16 passed 81%

Praxis II (5134) Art PreK-Adult WV Passing Score = 158			
	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
# of test takers	2	2	4
Highest score	168	162	167
Lowest score	166	158	153
Median score	167	160	157
Pass rate	2/2 passed 100%	2/2 passed 100%	2/4 50%

Praxis II (5195) Spanish 5-Adult WV Passing Score = 163			
	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
# of test takers	3	5	1
Highest score	156	181	152
Lowest score	131	126	-
Median score	149	155	-
Pass rate	0/3 passed 0%	1/5 passed 20%	0/1 passed 0%

Marshall University COEPD Praxis II Pass Rates for Elementary Education

Most Recent Academic Year September 2015 through August 2016.

Praxis subtests for Elementary Education	WV Passing Score	Number of Test Takers	Pass Rate	Highest Score	Lowest Score	Median Score
Praxis II (5002) Reading Language Arts	157	109	98/109 passed 90%	192	141	169
Praxis II (5003) Mathematics	157	126	109/126 passed 86%	200	127	172
Praxis II (5004) Social Studies	155	115	85/115 passed 74%	190	121	160
Praxis II (5005) Science	159	107	84/107 passed 79%	200	132	166
Praxis II (5203) Teaching Reading	162	98	89/98 passed 91%	193	148	171

Marshall University COEPD - EPPAC Website

Our college of education is constructing a website for communication and information to share with our EPPAC community. Please describe the type of information and features you feel would be beneficial to include on this website.

You can write your suggestions tonight and hand this in to Edna Meisel. Or you can submit your suggestions to Edna Meisel through this email address:

meisele@marshall.edu

Thank you!
Edna

An Ad-Hoc Committee was created at the beginning of the Spring 2016 semester to discuss the admission process in the teacher education program at Marshall University. The committee consists of COEPD students, COEPD staff, and faculty both in and out of the college. After several formal meetings the committee wishes to propose the following changes:

The admission process for teacher education has not been updated or changed for several semesters.

According to CAEP Standard 3: The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program.

By increasing the importance of entrance into the teacher education program, COEPD can demonstrate continuous candidate improvement.

There are several recommendations for consideration:

- Implementing Application Deadlines
- Completion of Student Self-Assessment
- Recommendation(s) for Admission (3)
- Writing Sample (One Page)

APPLICATION DEADLINES

Currently, COEPD candidates can apply for admission into the teacher education program at any time during any semester. This proposal states that changing the admission to three times a year will increase the importance of being admitted in a timely manner.

Here are the proposed admission dates for upcoming semesters:

Application Deadlines			
Incomplete applications will not be accepted.			
Spring 2017	Summer 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
If you are anticipating taking ADMI 4 courses in the Summer 2017 or Fall 2017 semester you must be admitted by the following deadline date:	If you are anticipating taking ADMI 4 courses in the Summer 2017 or Fall 2017 semester you must be admitted by the following deadline date:	If you are anticipating taking ADMI 4 courses in the Spring 2018 semester you must be admitted by the following deadline date:	If you are anticipating taking ADMI 4 courses in the Summer 2018 or Fall 2018 semester you must be admitted by the following deadline date:
March 17, 2017	March 31, 2017	October 27, 2017	March 16, 2018

COMPLETION OF CANDIDATE SELF-ASSESSMENT

The self-assessment will help the teacher candidate become more familiar with and understand the dispositions. All assessments will be completed through LiveText.

Example:

Instructions:

This self-assessment must be completed and included with your ADMI 4 application. Teacher candidates will rate how much they understand a variety of education standards and concepts. Because some have not had exposure to the concepts in coursework yet, it is not unusual for a teacher candidate to rate his or her understanding as a "1". This does not count against the teacher candidate. Please answer each question honestly.

TEACHER CANDIDATE DISPOSITIONS	Score
APPEARANCE: Neat, well-groomed, and dressed professionally.	
TIME AND GOAL MANAGEMENT: Prompt and regular in attendance; sets realistic goals	
SELF-CONTROL: Maintains poise in unexpected/difficult situations; is positive and supportive.	
ADAPTABILITY: Makes adjustments in teaching strategies based on student learning and behavior.	
INTEGRITY: Maintains confidentiality concerning all student information.	
SELF-EFFICACY: Believes in one's ability to succeed.	
CRITICAL THINKING: Uses questioning techniques to stimulate higher level thinking skills that promote meaningful interactions; demonstrates multiple solutions to problems.	
POLICY AND PROCEDURE: Adheres to state, district, school, and University policies and procedures for clinicals/field experiences	
RESPECT: Interacts professionally with students, parents/guardians, colleagues and community	
SCHEDULE: Adheres to school work schedule	
COMMITMENT TO STUDENTS: Treats students equitably in a positive learning environment.	
COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY: Values and respects student differences.	
COMMITMENT TO TECHNOLOGY: Uses technology to enhance the educational experience.	
COMMITMENT TO PROFESSION: Works cooperatively with all school personnel.	

4 = I demonstrate competency with the standard beyond the majority of students.

3 = I demonstrate competency with the standard

2 = I can show I have made progress towards demonstrating competency with the standard

1 = I have had little to no experience toward meeting the standard

Signature _____

Date _____

RECOMMENDATION FOR ADMISSION

After researching the admission process for several other teacher preparation programs, the committee feels the recommendation piece is a significant piece to consider. All recommendations must be loaded into LiveText by the student.

Example:

Recommendations should come from the following sources:

REQUIRED

- Marshall University Instructor with whom you have had a class **AND**

Choose two of the five listed below:

- Former teacher
- Former guidance counselor
- Former school administrator
- Former or present employer
- Any individual who has supervised you in an activity involving children and/or youth

The following is to be completed by the person writing the reference:

Please Check	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	N/A
Clear and Effective Communication Skills					
Critical Thinking					
Ability to engage children and/or youth					
Personal appearance					
Social/Personal Reliability					
Cooperation/Collaboration					
Initiative					
Leadership Skills					

Comments: Please use the space below to add any additional comments. Use additional sheets of paper if needed. Please put your name and applicant's name on all additional sheets. This will become a part of the student's file; it is not necessary to seal this recommendation.

WRITING SAMPLE

A written statement of no more than 500 words. The written statement needs to be typed with one inch margins on all sides, 12 point font, and double-spaced. The writing sample must be loaded into LiveText. Students will choose one of the following topics below:

- **Belief Statement** – Provide a brief statement describing your current beliefs about education and explain how you see the purposes of school and the roles and relationships of teachers and learners.
- **Experience Statement** – Provide a brief reflection on an experience from your life and discuss how that experience might influence your work with diverse populations of learners.
- **Current Topic in Education** – Identify a topic on education in the news in the last year that you believe may have a significant impact on public education.

Ad-Hoc Committee Members: Sissy Isaacs, Paula Lucas, Janet Dozier, Kandice Napier, Rob Wray (Music Dept.), Sarah Stapleton (Wayne County), Sarah Willis (student), Erin Casper (student)

Writing Sample Rubric

CONTENT			
Critical and Original Thought	Abundance of evidence of critical, careful thought and analysis and/or insight concerning the field of education	Discussion concerning the field of education; however, statements lack support by analysis and/or insight.	Superficial, rambling statements that lack relevance to the field of education.
Relevance to Teaching and Learning	Evidence and examples are vivid and specific, while focus remains on the field of education, including detailed description of the context and valuable, personal insight.	Evidence and examples are relevant and connected to teaching and learning.	Lacks description, experiences may be irrelevant, confusing, incomplete, and/or vague.
WRITTEN EXPRESSION			
Organization	Evidence of a sophisticated writing style that includes a clearly developed and cogent introduction, body, and conclusion. Provides a smooth progression of ideas by using transitional devices throughout the writing.	Includes an introduction, body, and conclusion. Provides a logical progression of ideas throughout the writing. The introduction and conclusion provide a summary of the key points in the body of the paper.	Attempts an introduction, body, and conclusion; however, one or more of these components could be absent or confusing. Presents information in a random or illogical order throughout the writing.
Conventions	Demonstrates a consistent and strong command of sentence structure, grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling. Does not contain errors.	Demonstrates an adequate command of sentence structure, grammar, capitalization, punctuation and spelling. May contain 1-2 minor errors that do not interfere with readability.	Lacks an adequate command of sentence structure, grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and/or spelling. Contains errors that interfere with readability.
Professional Language	Demonstrates exemplary use of professional language with advanced vocabulary, precise word choice, and sophisticated sentence structure that engages the audience.	Utilizes appropriate professional language that demonstrates knowledge of the prompt, a precise vocabulary, and an awareness of audience.	Lacks professional language exhibited by simplistic language repetitive phrasing, slang, informal tone, colloquialisms, and limited vocabulary.

