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 Training   1. Dispositions | Looking at overall trends for entire school, not program specific  All of these assessments are relatively new to us  Took 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 Assessments   1. 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 |  |  |