**TPALs Agenda**

**April 21, 2016, 1:45-3:15\* p.m. COED 166\* (time and room change)**

**\*Please note time and room change due to first floor flooding repairs.**

**Agenda / Minutes**

**Attendees:**  Laura Hart, Melba Spooner, Joyce Frazier, Bill Anderson, Shawnee Wakeman, Amy Good, Erik Byker, Drew Polly, Tom Fisher, Rex Mangiaracina, Jamie Brown, Mitch Eisner, Mary Jo Anderson, Tesh Ramey, Mayreese Koraly, Deana Murphy, Hilary Dack, Joyce Brigman, Wendy Wood, Anna Athanasopoulou, Teresa Petty, and David Gall.

* *Minutes from the February 16 meeting (posted on website) were approved. Tom Fisher motioned for approval, Mitch Eisner was the second.*

Information Items (10 minutes)

1. Official Scores received back to UNC Charlotte: April 21 (today): *4 students from spring still have not submitted; next submission date is April 28. These students will receive Incompletes until score reports are received.*
2. Reconsidering when edTPA becomes required for licensure (see page 3 for information – more on this in the discussion items.). *As the State Board of Education is under legislative mandate to develop policy around a nationally normed pedagogy assessment (aka “edTPA”), it seems prudent policy to wait on SBE recommendations before setting our own policy on edTPA and licensure. However, some faculty have suggested that some students aren’t taking edTPA seriously yet because it is not required for licensure. We may wish to increase the percentage that edTPA counts in the student teaching grade. Discussion under #4 below.*
3. Working on edTPA comprehensive COED report: *Laura’s office is currently working on a comprehensive report on UNC Charlotte’s edTPA results to do. This report will compare outcomes from UNC Charlotte candidates with state and national scores. A breakdown of scores by handbook, candidate ethnicity, and gender will also be included.*

Discussion items

1. Consider increasing the percentage that edTPA counts in the student teaching grade to 20 or 25% *- if we opt to do this, OFE will need to look at this over the summer.* (10 minutes)

*Some faculty have suggested increasing the percentage that edTPA counts in the student teaching grade. There have been some suggestions that students don’t take it seriously because it’s not required for licensure; it’s a big project to count “so little.” All the key points on page 2 were discussed and shared (see below). Faculty in attendance discussed the possibility of increasing the final student teaching project (edTPA) grade to 25% of overall student teaching grade. Some faculty felt that this was too high, and recommended 20%. In either event, it was also pointed out that when edTPA becomes required for state licensure, then we can potentially make edTPA less of (or not part of) the student teaching grade. Until them, consensus was that it does need to be higher than 15%.*

*The final decision was to increase the percentage that edTPA counts to at least 20% and not more than 25%. The large group agreed to allow a small committee (led by OFE) to work on a resolution to the problem. Several faculty asked to be on the committee. They will work on this over the summer of 2016 so that OFE can share the new percentage with student teachers in August 2016.*

1. Tentative submission dates for 2016-17 – early vs later? (5 minutes)

*Deadline dates for 2016-17 are not posted yet, but based on feedback the earlier date works better for everyone… earlier in fall if possible is a suggestion. Once the deadlines are posted, Laura will work with edTPA Faculty Liaisons to establish common due dates for 2016-17.*

1. Discussion of edTPA Practice Pieces used in coursework. (50 minutes)

*Laura shared some context for this agenda item. When we began our edTPA work in the college, the focus was on* ***implementation****. Now that we are “up and running,” it feels like we need to refocus our efforts on another common goal. The group agreed that* ***formative experiences*** *to developmentally scaffold edTPA knowledge and skills into coursework prior to student teaching should be our next focus.*

* 1. Guiding Questions: *Reviewed at the beginning of the conversation:*
     1. What is the purpose of the practice pieces?
     2. How can we best use the data generated by the practice pieces?
  2. *Amy Good and Erik Byker presented an abbreviated version of their national conference presentation for the group:*  Using edTPA Practice pieces in Elementary Ed (25 minutes)
  3. Generating guidelines for faculty – using practice pieces in coursework (25 minutes). *Laura offered the following suggestions as a starting point for consideration in the discussion:*
     1. Suggestions for guidelines
        1. Scoring – how will faculty score practice pieces (e.g., too lenient, too hard) – developing common understanding around this
        2. Using rubrics “as is” or modifying to allow for candidate development
        3. Consistent data collection – final version vs working draft
        4. Clear purposes of the practice tasks – how much feedback is required?
        5. Who is teaching these pieces?
        6. Embedding skills and knowledge across all courses where appropriate

*Feedback from faculty was collected and shared. Key points included:*

* *Consistency among the faculty should be established on what is evaluated (which pieces get the most emphasis?)*
* *Need to be sure that faculty understand rubrics. (“Local” rubrics vs official rubrics.)*
* *Attitude of edTPA (formative) on student teaching: How we (faculty) talk about edTPA with our students is critical. We need a purposeful message about the connections of edTPA and effective teaching. “Effective Teaching” vs. “edTPA”*
* *Faculty should separate rubric feedback on edTPA from “grade” –students should be allowed to get credit with lower scores. It is expected that students in the pipeline would get lower scores on formative pieces.*
* *Faculty can work on developing a “progression” of edTPA: what do we expect from juniors, seniors, student teachers?*
* *We need to make deliberate connections (between and across courses & actual edTPA pieces – T1, T2, T3)*
* *Faculty need regular program-level PD – deliberate edTPA conversations*
* *Is a 1 hour seminar during YLI a possibility?*
* *COED Leadership message needs to be clear: this is a priority. This must be a commitment from all the teacher ed prep faculty.*

*Moving forward for 2016-17, our TPALs and program level work will focus on these points. Next steps: Laura will draft some general guidelines for COED faculty based on these comments. These will be reviewed at the next TPALs meeting in September.*

2016-17 TPALs meetings - *note change in time- some faculty requested that some of the meetings be in morning:*

Thursday September 15 – 10:00 a.m. (time change)  
Monday November 14 – 1:00 p.m.   
Wednesday February 15, 2017 – 10:00 a.m. (time change)  
Tuesday April 18, 2017 – 2:00 p.m.

**Reconsidering when edTPA becomes required for licensure -- Setting Cut Scores for edTPA**

**This will be our first discussion item on our TPALs agenda in the fall 2016 semester.**

1. The State Board of Education is currently considering proposals for establishing policy around edTPA/other portfolio assessments. This puts us in “limbo.”
2. Our current policy:
   * 1. edTPA is required for completion of student teaching. Failure to submit results in highest student teaching grade to be a “C.” (“A” or “B” is required for licensure recommendation).
     2. edTPA scores are currently calculated as 15% of student teaching grade.
     3. Pros: students don’t have to pay for resubmit; not part of licensure requirements yet so our requirement doesn’t supersede the state requirements; bad edTPA score doesn’t mean failure in student teaching course (“one small piece of the bigger puzzle”).
     4. Cons: some supervisors report that students don’t take it seriously because it’s not required for licensure; it’s a big project to count “so little.”
3. Previous suggestions:
   * 1. Going forward with setting a required cut score at UNC Charlotte. Anyone who doesn’t meet required minimum cut score who have to resubmit.
        1. Resubmits could be locally scored until the state makes a decision on official scores. This would require faculty assistance (current pass rate is around 80%).
        2. Resubmits could be scored official at student expense ($100 per task resubmit).
     2. Increasing the percentage that edTPA counts in the student teaching grade to 20 or 25%. – *(we will look at this one today)*