



Missouri State[™]

U N I V E R S I T Y

EPP BSED Committee Meeting Minutes January 20, 2017

I. Call to order

Andrew Homburg called to order the regular meeting of the Bachelor of Science in Education Committee at 1:34 p.m. on January 31, 2017 in PSU 313.

Present: Tamara Arthaud, Fatih Benzer, Kim Dubree, Karen Engler, Andrew Homburg, Jennifer Jensen, Kurt Killion, Danielle Lillge, Carol Maples, Travis Marler, Holly Metcalf, Gay Ragan, Gayle Runke, Gigi Saunders, Kim Stormer, Tonia Tinsley.

II. Approval of minutes from last meeting

Remove “e” from Carole for those listed as Present.

Motion to approve minutes as amended from December 9, 2016 meeting. Minutes stand.

III. Updates

1. EPPC:

- a. Requested low program numbers be removed for reporting. They may be low enrollment numbers or low graduation numbers. It cannot be differentiated according to James Sottile. The document is marked as draft. Is there a final document? What information will be provided? How useful is the information other than providing low numbers.

2. Director of Secondary Education: Karen Engler

- a. At the end of December 2016 an EDC 150 review by program was emailed to Program Coordinators with a request to respond confirming accuracy. Only two responses were received. As of now, program EDC 150 specifics will be assumed as correct until further notice from the Program Coordinator.
- b. It was communicated with Travis Marler that there is a Counseling Out form that is part of Taskstream. This will be sent to Program Coordinators with the form and directions on how to locate it in Taskstream. It does not require input from the student. All coordinators and advisors should have access to the form. If there are advisors that are not coordinators; Travis will need their names so he can set them up for access.
- c. Any communications having to do with Secondary Education that need to go to certification or any other department in COE must go to Karen Engler first. This is new protocol that Chris Craig is in favor of so we can know what types of requests are being made from all programs. A suggestion was made that this should be in writing and sent via email. Discussion. Secondary will track what types of issues arise and determine better ways to resolve them. Also, all phone calls must go through Secondary Education office before routing to appropriate department. If the certification office is called, the call will be referred to Karen Engler. Questions:
 - Why is this new protocol?
 - Does Karen Engler need to be apprised of conversations regarding Secondary issues?
 - Who initiated the new protocol?

EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROVIDER

901 South National Avenue, Springfield, MO 65897 • Phone: 417-836-6204 • Fax: 417-836-5008

www.missouristate.edu/epp • epp@missouristate.edu

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action/Minority/Female/Veterans/Disability/Sexual Orientation/Gender Identity Employer and Institution

IV. New Business

1. Middle School Coordinator: Kimberly Stormer
 - a. Middle School is collecting only four assessments. MID 400 has a lesson plan. Crossover concerns if student takes in two different programs. Data would not be affected because all programs set their parameters. There is a template for unit plans, non-observed and observed. It was suggested that Kimberly have a meeting with all instructors teaching methods courses.
 - It was recommended that all instructors learn the templates. Kimberly will send an email.
 - Discussion regarding EDC 150 and dispositions. Clearance issues are not being communicated to Program Coordinators. It is important for the Program Coordinator to be informed so relationship with school can be maintained. Middle school teacher candidates that are flagged go to Cathy Pearman. Kimberly will be more than happy to share with the Program Coordinator/ Instructor/Advisor but not sure how that will work until we cross that bridge.
 - Sidebar: Secondary protocol for a hit on a student is that John Reinert notifies Chris Craig and Chris Craig notifies Karen Engler. There is a process and there are limitations. Karen can notify Program Coordinators of hit but cannot give details.
2. April Advisory Committee is approaching. We need to think about who will be invited and how it will work.

V. Old Business

1. The Ad Hoc Committee for candidate impact on student learning met. A handout was distributed (see attached). The committee is moving forward to address the need a common assessment that is unit-wide to test the candidate's ability to influence student learning. We cannot use MoPTA Task 2 according to CAEP. The draft is designed so programs can decide in Transition Point 3 if they want to use it and where to embed. There is no requirement for the candidate to write anything. They can meet with the instructor or a faculty member to discuss their understanding and how their instruction influenced and how to modify that instruction for improvement. The data can be collected and compared. A one-on-one meeting with the instructor would give the candidates meaningful help in drafting for Task 2. Committee is creating a pre-assessment but it has not yet been designated where that would go. This could be left up to the program. The program could synthesize in graphic representation and analyze the results and data. Not sure if this needs to be done in Transition Point 2 or 3.
 - Questions for Jamaine Abidogun as to where this should go. This issue is timing because there is not enough time to reflect for Task 2. For Secondary it would be during student teaching.
 - Motion to take unit-wide assessment before the next EPP meeting for approval. Second. Discussion. Motion carried.
2. The PPT introduction to Teacher Education will be discussed at the February 2017 meeting.
3. Gigi Saunders spoke with Sue McRory regarding testing times and they are willing to talk about rescheduling. However, because of budget cuts and hiring freeze, they will have to cut back on testing hours. Discussion.
4. BSED chair elect is still needed.
5. Discussion regarding using Task 1 as data point. It is happening in some programs and COE. Faculty scores in Taskstream and we could use that data. Discussion. Need clarification from the institution as to how much goes to ETS and we would prefer to keep it in house. Discussion. It would be nice to see this in a template. There may be legal and proprietary issues. Task 1 is due February 8 and our next meeting is February 10.

VI. Adjournment

Andrew Homburg adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:23 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by: Vicki Kramer