In attendance: Dave Pratt, Hadassah Moore, Patrick Keegan, Sheila Stephenson, Maya Blackwell, Gary Sutton, Mary Jane Eisenhauer, Shannon Wood, Jen Jones, Staci Trekles, Rita Brusca-Vega, Denise Frazier, Rich Pearson, Kerry Meyer, Jackie Skaggs, Shirley Coons, Julie Remschneider, Deb Pratt, Trish Tompkins, and Amanda Timm

**MINUTES**

| **Agenda Items** | **Discussion** | **Feedback** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Training1. Dispositions
 | Looking at overall trends for entire school, not program specificAll of these assessments are relatively new to usTook existing instruments, CAEP doesn’t want us using our own* Niagra Dispositions
* Looks at relationships and critical thinking
* 18 items total, 6 in each theme
* 5 point scale, default score of 3
* Must provide evidence if it’s a score other than 3
* Done in most field placements
* For early and mid, done at end of semester only
* Student teachers evaluated at midterm and end of semester
* Be as specific as possible in evidence
* If “strongly disagree” is selected, an email is automatically sent to the field coordinator, and student affairs for a dispositional intervention plan (DIP)
 |  |
| 1. STOT
 | * Used by the entire state of North Dakota
* Based on INTASC standards
* Early -11 items evaluated, early secondary -15 items evaluated, mid -29, mid secondary-31, student teaching-34
* Introduce better progression, too many at mid
* 4 levels of performance
* ½ points allow for movement
* Sharing completed evaluations mid-way can help identify strengths and areas for growth
* Internal and external influences can affect scoring
* Be aware of biases, leniency, or severity
* Halo or horns effect (all good, all bad)
* Personal bias often yield inaccuracies
* Prevent bias by reading rubrics closely, don’t give benefit of the doubt,
* Prevent leniency and severity by grading through lense of the rubric
* Be specific as possible if it’s not a 3, especially for student teachers who may not work on needed parts if only given limited feedback
 | * There is a lot to assess
* There is a choice of not observed if you don’t always see something
* Assess what candidates are prepared to demonstrate
* No time for collaborative conversation
 |
| 1. edTPA
 | * Teaching portfolio sent to outside reviewer
* Create a measurement of teaching
* Developed by professors and Pearson facilitators
* Establish accountability, credibility, transferability and required in many states, not yet Indiana
* Cycle of planning, instruction, and assessment
* Candidates have issues with language and terminology
* 1-5 scale, aim for a 3
* 15 rubrics
* Recommended pass score is 37-42, average is a 38
* PNW passing score is 39 for AY 19-20
* Special consideration if needed
* 68% of our candidates did not feel prepared and did not feel faculty did not include edTPA in their course
* Candidates struggled with commentary and going deeper; justifying why you’re doing things
 | * Provide templates/scaffolding for commentary
* Use commentary terms throughout program to help students
* Have lesson plan template that mirrors edTPA template
 |
| Review of Assessments1. Program Effectiveness
 | * New law in IN-show attrition, retention, and completion rates
* 97% of PNW grads are effective/highly effective for first 3 years
* 96% of principals satisfied
* 92% of teachers rated preparation as good/excellent

Feedback from graduates:* More experience on how to handle classroom management and differentiation
* Sprinkle assessment and management throughout courses
* Do a good job with professionalism
* Work with families/parents more
 |  |
| 1. Student Teacher and Complete Feedback
 | * Change to 5 point scale, hard to differentiation
* Each individual had to rate from 1-10 how important the questions were-sheets were collected for data
 |  |
| 1. edTPA Data Review
 | * Pearson provides state and national averages
* PNW at state average, a little lower than national
* Improve planning scores, rubrics 2 and 4
* Giving feedback was higher than expected as our candidates struggle with that
* Candidates don’t always see feedback modeled
* Confusion with Rubric 14’s meaning-relates back to Rubric 4
* edTPA Glossary handout for reference
 | * If we don’t understand what the rubrics mean, we can’t help candidates
 |
| 1. STOT Data Review
 | * Issues with interrater reliability
* Create activity where supervisor has conference with the students
* Students struggle knowing what to plan for future weeks
* Have university supervisor and cooperating teacher both score and compare
 | * Issues with coop. teachers understanding STOT and field guide
* Teachers back out because they’re overwhelmed
* Coop. Teacher training on STOT and field guide, receive PGP points for attending
* Have university supervisor and cooperating teacher both score and compare scores and provide them, don’t just combine
* Issues with how scores are calculated-how they do it v. how they think it should be done
 |
| 1. Test Results
 | * Westville students take CASA a lot
* Some of the low score issues are a reflection of high school preparation, not us
 |  |
| Next Data Dialogue Day: April 3, 2020 9am-Noon |  |  |