COPE

January 25, 2019

1 – 2:30 pm

Minutes

Present:

Lance Bryant, Audrey Bowser, Nicole Covey, Kimberley Davis, Joanna Grymes, Joan Henley, Kevin Humphrey, Annette Hux, Amanda Lambertus, Julie Lamb Milligan, Alicia Shaw, Susan Whiteland

Proxies: Lance Bryan to Scott Doig; Joanna Grymes for LaToshia Woods; Susan Whiteland for Sarah Labovitz

Visitor: Lisa Rice

Approval of Minutes from January 15th Meeting will be moved to an email vote meeting because the attendance was left off the minutes.

Dr. Bowser would like clarification of PEP Office’s responsibility for professional development described in the Technology Plan that was stated in those minutes.

**Old Business**

No old business is on the agenda.

**New Business**

Nicole Covey brought forth the motion from IPAC with reference to the edTPA.

The IPA motion was:

IPAC recommends full EPP implementation and submission of edTPA starting fall 2019. Results will be non-consequential for students. Amount of submissions of TC completed edTPA materials would be decided on by individual programs.

Nicole stated that some programs had asked about a start date.

Julie asked if there were other programs that were not involved or responsive to the discussions about edTPA. There do seem to be secondary/k12 programs that have not been responsive.

Kim Davis stated that it does matter when we start. It important to start by Fall 2019 to have the data for CAEP. We were supposed to pilot this past fall and this spring.

Kevin stated that the pilot was to be volunteer to provide information back from the pilot to inform the decision. Kim stated that we do not have the data back yet. At this time there are no other options on the table for consideration. The timing to make another decision at this point is limited.

Kim stated that CAEP has the expectation we are moving forward with an assessment.

Amanda asked about a meeting in Fall in which secondary/k12 programs were told that we would review data, and yet now we are stating we do not have a

The only alternative we had found PPAT. The committee had moved forward with edTPA over PPAT based on issues related to the PPAT and its connection to LiveText.

Susan shared information from the secondary and K12 program directors/faculty. The questions were related to how did the pilot essentially get lost in terms of sharing the data from pilot. They would like more information about how teacher interns responded to edTPA and consideration of the data.

Amanda stated calling it a pilot is a misnomer. Nicole responded we piloted F18 and Sp19; beginning in F 19 the EPP would be using the edTPA. Beginning in F19 it becomes the basis for EPP data; it is not consequential for students in terms of licensure. Alicia used an analogy of new tests in a public school and the understanding it will start low and provide opportunity for growth.

Julie asked about how Nicole’s students responded. Nicole shared how Elementary Education used the edTPA tasks to replace what had been in the internship portfolio. Nicole responded the students were more positive than the faculty.

Audrey shared that perhaps the secondary/K12 faculty may not have enough training to support implementation of edTPA in their programs. Secondary/K12 are also concerned about their SPAs. Her question about full implementation asks about how many will be submitted in Fall 19/Sp 20.

Audrey believes it is likely edTPA will be adopted by ADE in the future.

There needs to be some time for secondary/K12 leading the programs to plan for implementation, including the instructors in the Measurement and Performance Based courses.

Amanda wanted to add to the statement about concerns. Most programs only have one individual, and this is a large undertaking. Balancing the content aspects of their positions within their colleges with the EPP expectations is difficult to manage with one or maybe two faculty members.

During the alignment meeting secondary programs had, Susan had made a recommendation, that there wasn’t a place to add training for edTPA and do all the artifacts. The suggestions was to do a case study – take on the observation for the performance based also doing an observation and zoom seminar with the students to support implementation. It didn’t seem fair to ask students to commit to the time and not get anything from it. This would be switching the 5-hour performance based and moving the 2 hour observation piece.

Julie suggested we were at the point to either table or make a motion.

Joan stated that we need to vote on it; should it pass next step would be to determine if the motion passes.

Joan put forward the IPAC motion; Annette seconded. After discussion the final motion was:

For this time, the official results from SCALE edTPA assessment (pass/fail) is not consequential with relation to licensure or graduation. Programs will determine how candidates are evaluated for their internship and use what candidate submit for captstone portfolios. COPE recommends that full EPP implementation and submission of edTPA start Fall 2019. The number of submission of teacher candidates’ completed edTPA materials would be decided by individual programs.

Nicole stated that programs can submit for approval through ADE to use edTPA and PLT so students could have an option to best meet their own strengths.

Vote: Yes 9; No 4; 1 abstain

This motion will come to the EPP meeting Feb 14.

Next meeting is Friday Feb 1.

ELSE will have bulletin changes to present.

Annette/Alicia moved to adjourn. Meeting adjourned 2:19.