

Teacher Education Advisory Council Meeting Agenda

5-17-21; 05:00 p.m.- 06:30 p.m.

Zoom link:

Members:

Travis Klatka (Chair)	<i>School principal</i>		
Catherine Scott (Vice-chair)	<i>SCOE faculty</i>		
Amanda Brian	<i>CCU partner</i>	Kristy Floyd	<i>School teacher</i>
Amanda Scogin	<i>School teacher</i>	Leslie Huggins	<i>School principal</i>
Amanda Wilmoth	<i>SCOE student</i>	Matthew Doherty	<i>SCOE student</i>
Betsey Costner	<i>SCOE staff</i>	Rebecca Schroyer	<i>School principal</i>
Breanna Hicks	<i>School teacher</i>	Ronald Radcliffe	<i>Community partner</i>
Emma Savage-Davis	<i>SCOE faculty</i>	Teresa Burn	<i>CCU partner</i>
Hsing-Wen Hu	<i>SCOE administrator</i>		
Jamia Richmond	<i>SCOE faculty</i>		
Jerome Christia	<i>CCU partner</i>		

Business:

1. A speaker shares study on a current, timely topic in education (Dr. Tiffany Hollis)
 - Topic: Creating a culturally inclusive and social just classroom.
2. Review and revise TEAC bylaw. (See Appendix 1)
 - Motion made by Jamia Richmond to revise the bylaw after the college structure in place; Hsing-Wen Hu seconded the motion. The Council unanimously move the motion.
3. Review SCOE data and provide feedback. (See Appendix 2)
 - 1) Review MAP scores.
 - 2) What other ways can show CCU Education Major completers impact on P-12 learning and development?
 - 3) Discussion notes:
 - Reading scores between CCU completers and their district counterparts are fairly equal.
 - There is a large gap between math scores for the students of CCU completers and their counterparts.
 - A CCU partner asked why the scores were so low
 - Principals Klatka and Huggins explained the use of MAP testing and why low scores may not be a concern; the goal with MAP is growth.
 - There is additional concern in measuring growth given this time period, due to school closures and other abnormalities due to COVID.
 - The CCU partner asked if there was a way to compare by completer, school, or grade level.

- Cathy Scott explained the data collection process, and the limited abilities to disaggregate data in such a way due to district requirements.
 - Samples of less than 5 are not reported, to maintain anonymity.
 - Data for some graduates cannot be obtained, as they are in roles (SPED, intervention) where they are not assigned a homeroom.
- Cathy asked for input from the district partners as to ways to collect data that account for these concerns.
 - CCU Partner asked about the state dashboard
 - Cathy Scott noted that there is no state dashboard, so this is an issue for all colleges in SC, not just CCU.
 - CCU Partner asked about getting self-reported data from graduates
 - Principal recommended getting self-reported SCTS 4.0 data, to see how candidates are performing holistically, rather than using just end of grade data.
 - Dr. Hu asked how they could start a case study to get the data
 - The principals said it has to go through the district level
- Cathy asked about hiring timelines
 - Middle of June tends to be later, per the principals – April to May is more likely
 - In Horry, school populations are growing, so more teachers are needed due to growth, not turn over
 - In Georgetown, fewer teachers are needed because numbers are down.

4. Others

Appendix 1-Teacher Education Advisory Council bylaw

The Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) provides a forum to communicate and discuss ideas, needs, and proposed changes regarding the educator preparation programs. The College views the preparation of pre-service and in-service teachers as a collaborative university and community responsibility. The twenty members of the Council include PK-12 school district principals and teachers, Board of Visitor members who represent varied areas of community interests, teacher candidates from initial and advanced programs, program coordinators of the academic areas in the College, and one representative from each of the university's other colleges. The Council meets when there are issues, ideas, or proposed changes to be shared and discussed by stakeholders.

The Chair of the Council will be elected from the voting membership during the spring semester prior to the expiration of the current Chair's term to serve a two-year term. The members of the Council shall serve staggered two-year terms except student members who shall serve a one-year term with the option to renew. Votes shall be used to determine consensus recommendations for the Leadership Team, Associate Dean, and the Dean in SCOE, as appropriate.

Appendix 2: CCU Education Major Completers Impact on P-12 Learning and Development

The Horry County School District (HCSD) provided student achievement data for the Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) testing for the fall 2019 and spring 2020 testing cycles. Included in this analysis are 2018-2019 completers who were hired by the HCSD and employed during the 2019-2020 academic year.

The data are disaggregated by grade level and subject area (Math and Reading). There are two measures of MAP growth reported in Table 1. In the fall, growth projections are created for students based on their current grades and score on the MAP test. In the spring, it is determined by South Carolina Department of Education if students met their growth projections, which is shown in Table 1. The EPP's sample of teachers (EPP completers) excludes teachers in specialty areas or those working in a schoolwide position. P-12 students in the "CCU Sample" were excluded from the "District" growth calculation.

In terms of the comparison between students aligned with CCU completers and the district population, there was one area where there was a statistically significant difference. For Elementary Math (grade 2 to 5), the CCU completers, the percentage of their students achieving positive growth was 39.00%, and for the district's population was 46.02%. There is a difference of 7.02 percentage points. For Elementary Reading (grade K-5), for the CCU completers, the percentage of students achieving positive growth was 48.55%, and for the district's population was 48.52%. There is a difference of 0.03 percentage points (See Table 1)

Table 1. Comparing MAP scores for all students

MAP Assessment	Grade Level	Years	CCU Sample (Completers' students)				HCSD Sample (excluding CCU sample)			
			N (All Students with two growth measure -s)	N met growth target (#)	Met growth Determi- ed (%)	Average Condi- tional growth index (SD)	N (All Student -s)	Positive Growth Determi- ned (#)	Positive Growth Determi- ned (%)	Average Condi- tional growth index (SD)
Math	Elementary (2-5)	19-20	200	78	39%	-.40 (1.22)	6073	2795	46.02%	-.189 (1.17)
Reading	Elementary (k-5)	19-20	346	168	48.55%	-.122 (1.27)	12027	5836	48.52%	-.113 (1.19)

Table 2: Year 2019-2020 MAP-Conditional Growth Index-Grades 2-5 Mathematics (ANOVA)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	8.621	1	8.621	6.331	.012
Within Groups	9024.586	6627	1.362		
Total	9033.207	6628			

There is also a conditional growth index score given to each student that indicates the strength of the growth. A positive score means that students exceeded their growth target and a negative score means that the student did not meet their growth target. There is a significant difference between the MATH conditional growth indexes of students taught by first-year CCU graduates compared to all other

students that $F(1,6627) = 6.331$, $p=.012$. See Table 2. In other words, compared to other teachers in HCSD, CCU completers' impact on students is less than other teachers. There is no significant difference between the READING conditional growth indexes of students in these two groups, decided by $F(1, 12371) = .019$, $p=.891$. See Table 3. That means CCU completers have the same impact on students as the other teachers do.

Table 3. Year 2019-20 MAP-Conditional Growth Index-Grades K-5 Reading (ANOVA)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.027	1	.027	.019	.891
Within Groups	17653.319	12371	1.427		
Total	17653.346	12372			