

EPSB Concerns for all programs

1. How does the program ensure that partners are involved to develop and ensure mutually beneficial P-12 school experiences?

Morehead State University has long-standing relationships with the surrounding school districts and the districts in our service region. The region consists of 30 school districts in 22 counties serving a population of approximately 73,000 students in Eastern Kentucky (See MSU Service Region Demographics). While these long-standing relationships have typically followed one directional models of EPP to PreK-12 schools, MSU has worked for several years to make the transition with the districts in the service region and with preparation programs across the campus to an open forum for a shared responsibility model. The EPP has, at times, had a dedicated faculty or staff member dedicated to building and maintaining P-16 relations, and this responsibility currently resides with program coordinators and program faculty.

Morehead State University established a Teacher Education Council with committee members representing local districts and representatives from each College in order to gain input and shared decision-making across the EPP and with P-12 schools. This Council has continuously operated since prior to 1988 (See Teacher Education Council Minutes).

The Director of the Teacher Education Services Unit works with school administrators to appropriately place candidates for clinical practice and has established Memorandums of Agreements (MOAs) with schools and districts within the service region plus school districts in Louisville, Central and Northern Kentucky with whom we partner for Clinical Practice. MOAs describe EPP/partners' shared responsibility to provide clinical practice experiences that allow candidates to link theory to practice. MOAs are evidence that the EPP has worked with and have mutual agreements regarding expectations of teacher candidates and cooperating teachers (Collaborative Partnership MOAs). New MOAs are being proposed for the 2018-19 Academic Year that will focus on mutual planning and responsibility for candidate preparation through the full range of clinical experiences.

The Dean and a Department Chair (rotating chairs/faculty members have participated) have conducted "focus group" visits to school districts in our service region and additional surveys have been sent to all districts in order to get feedback on specific areas of our teacher preparation program, in recent months (Focus Group Results). MSU faculty and administrators also attend and participate in regional education Cooperatives (these "Co-ops" - Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (KEDC), Kentucky Valley Educational Cooperative (KVEC), and Central Kentucky Educational Cooperative (CKEC)) which serve regional districts with assistance and expertise for the benefit of the member school districts, including cooperative purchasing and comprehensive educational programming within our state and establish cooperation between districts, Co-ops, and Universities (See KY Education Cooperatives).

The EPP has established mechanisms for the review of teacher candidate academic performance and dispositions during courses and field experience in the teacher education programs. Each program receives a report each semester which identifies candidates with low GPAs, low grades in TEP restricted courses, and dispositional issues. The programs are responsible for discussing the issues noted with the candidate and implementing remediation, sanctions, or exit counseling. In addition, EPP and clinical faculty members work together during clinical experiences when problems arise (See Teacher Education Program Handbook, Academic and Professional Standards Committee).

The MSUEDNET Continuum of Collaboration (See Continuum of Collaboration Model) was the model that provided the framework for school-university partnerships in the EPP. The Partnerships developed along the continuum from cooperatives towards a fully collaborative Professional Development School (PDS) model. To meet the needs of candidates for full engagement in collaborative partnerships, the EPP has realized that this model no longer meets the needs of the EPP and has begun to make some important changes.

The EPP has established mutually beneficial partnerships with clinical faculty and PreK-12 partners with districts in the immediate area and is moving toward more collaborative reciprocal partnerships with school districts over the last few and upcoming years. The EPP and PreK-12 partners make shared decisions on clinical experiences, preparation, and performance expectations. In 2007, MSU developed and implemented the Professional Partnership Network (PPN) with Rowan County Schools (Professional Partnership Network White Paper) and has in recent years (2014-current) expanded that model to other P-12 partner schools (Carter County and Fleming County) for Elementary and Special Education program candidates. The partnerships have been developed with these specific schools within districts by individual faculty members with the collaborative and shared-responsibility for teacher candidates in mind as the end goal (Building New Partnerships). These districts are consulted for coherence across clinical and academic components of candidate preparation; they offer suggestions for improvement of candidate preparation (PDS Advisory Board Minutes). The development and pilot of the PPN demonstrates partner participation in planning and implementing training beneficial to all stakeholders (See Clinical Experience Mentor Training). Candidates graduating from the PPN have a 90% hire rate and a 92% hire and graduate school rate. Focus group feedback included many positive comments about the strength of the PPN student graduates (See PPN Success).

Because productive, mutually beneficial partnerships are an inherent part of quality candidate preparation, developing more authentic partnerships and professional development schools is a focal point of the EPP's Plan for Improvement. One aspect of this plan is to move toward a consistent model to be used across the EPP for partnership planning, meetings, MOUs, and implementation in ways that allow for adjustment of plans to fit the needs of the various content area programs and each individual district. This kind of approach would allow the EPP to set up a model/mechanism in order to establish consistency in the approach to partnerships across the teacher education program.

2. It is not clear how the Director of Student Teaching determines the quality and effectiveness of the University Supervisors.

The Department Chairs hire each University Supervisor by approved university protocol. Along with new faculty training received at the beginning of the year, the Director of Teacher Education Services provides individual training for new University Supervisor (US). This includes modeling conferences and school visits by accompanying the US to the school. Additionally, the Director meets with the US for work sessions throughout the semester.

Student surveys are completed each semester. Additionally, faculty peer observation occurs each year. The US turns in a portfolio to the department chair each year according to the faculty evaluation plan.

Evidence of this can be located in the following sources: Individual University Supervisor Portfolio, Student Surveys, Faculty Peer Observation, University Supervisor Work Sessions with Director of Teacher Education Services.