

VSBPE

Date: March 12, 2020

Item: Castleton 2-Year Report on Postbac Program

ITEM: Shall the VSBPE approve Castleton's Two-Year Report on its Postbac program and grant full approval to the program?

AGENCY RECOMMENDED ACTION:

That the VSBPE does not approve Castleton's Two-Year Report on its Postbac program and authorizes the Office to convene a team of three to conduct a follow-up visit to Castleton in the fall of 2020.

BACKGROUND:

From 2016 motion for VSBPE:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

In July of 2015 a ROPA team visited then Castleton State College to approve two new programs. Their leadership program was approved but their post baccalaureate program was not approved until they addressed four stipulations. Ric Reardon has submitted a document outlining how he has addressed these concerns. There were concerns about the second stipulation but Ric recently made a concerted effort to address the concerns. The team has looked over Ric's revisions and has agreed that he has addressed the ROPA concerns. **There will be a two-year visit scheduled where progress on the concerns and stipulations will be reviewed.**

RATIONALE: The Two-Year Report submitted contains more narrative than actual evidence of having met the stipulations and conditions that were in the original ROPA Report.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

[Castleton's Two-Year Report](#)

AOE Feedback on Two-Year Report

Stipulation 1: *Castleton University will need to provide evidence that ensures that the elementary and secondary candidate will have the required content knowledge in all endorsement areas.*

CU submitted portfolios and a narrative about their process. This is not evidence that applies to this stipulation. We should be able to see transcript review forms for each candidate.

Stipulation 2: *Castleton University will need to provide evidence that ensures that the elementary and secondary candidates will have the required knowledge of pedagogy in all endorsement areas- math, social studies, and science methods- for elementary education students.*

Evidence submitted is the following courses that pertain to pedagogy:

[EDU 5090: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment](#) (Summer)

[EDU 6090: Pedagogical Content Knowledge](#) (Fall)

[EDU 5270: Models of Secondary Teaching and EDU 6420 Models of Elementary Teaching](#) (Fall)

[EDU 5050: Developing Literacy: Reading-Writing Classroom](#) (Fall)

[EDU 5090: Reading Writing Across the Curriculum: Disciplinary Literacy](#) (Fall)

Participant sample submitted from EDU 6090 is about Special Education and not relevant to this stipulation. Other evidence from that class is student work and a narrative about the 80 hours of field experience. I did not see anything specific to pedagogy instruction for math, social studies, and science for elementary educators. For EDU 5270/6420, the course description is about general pedagogy- again, nothing specific about pedagogy in the specific content areas. Evidence could be specifics in the syllabi, as well as data from portfolio entries and follow-up surveys of completers once they are teaching elementary education.

Stipulation 3: *Need to create a comprehensive, systematic assessment plan that delineates continuous measure of candidate progress towards licensure and that includes a timeline of assessments linked to relevant standards.*

Castleton states that they have not yet addressed this stipulation and are currently looking at resources to help them do it.

Stipulation 4: *Need to have a handbook that includes candidate, cooperating teacher, and supervisor guidelines for all fieldwork prior to student teaching, to include clear evaluations methods for candidate performance in the field. Course syllabi need to more clearly articulate the fieldwork requirements attached to them. Syllabi are needed for EDU 6851 & 6852: Student Teaching.*

Handbook submitted as evidence that has all of the above needed components. Syllabus provided for Student Teaching Seminar (EDU 5740) but not for 6851/6852. Other syllabi not provided so I could not tell if they contain information about the field placements required.

From the Two-Year Report re: addressing concerns, below. I do not see sufficient evidence that these concerns have been met.

Concerns:

Standard 1

The PCK course appears to be too broad and therefore can't adequately cover or assess all the content and pedagogy related to all proposed endorsement areas.

PCK has been redesigned with a new instructor. The new course design is described [here](#).

Technology needs to be embedded in multiple courses or evident in a stand-alone course. If embedded, technology standards and instruction need to be documented in the course syllabi, and there needs to be evidence of clear linkage to the ISTE standards or other technology standards. If technology is addressed in a stand-alone course, a syllabus and course description need to be provided.

Technology is embedded throughout the courses. See new descriptions by instructors above in Stipulation 2. Licensure portfolios are technology rich, including a variety of multimedia. Sarah Chambers, media specialist, visits classrooms to demonstrate appropriate iPad applications for elementary, secondary, and special education candidates.

The assumption should be that post baccalaureate students come into this program with no educational background. There should be clear evidence of how transcripts are assessed upon admission to ensure that candidates receive appropriate coursework in content and pedagogy relevant to their specific endorsement area. Course requirements should be clear to applicants/candidates so that there are no 'hidden' requirements for additional pedagogy courses.

The process for transcript review has recently (December 2019) been modified to address these concerns. A formal application of the procedures outlined in Stipulation 1 above.

The learning goals of Models of Secondary Teaching and the PCK course appear to be very similar, as are the assignments. The syllabi need to be revised to represent clearer and more distinct expectations.

These two courses were previously taught by the same instructor. This concern has been addressed by redesign of the courses and by two different faculty teaching each course.

Instruction regarding teaching diverse students should be embedded throughout coursework. This should include a focus on teaching ELL students, as there are Core Teaching Standards directly related to ELLs.

Meeting the needs of diverse students is one of our core philosophical principles. However, this still needs to be more prominently addressed throughout syllabi.

Student teaching components are missing in this standard. Additional documentation should include course syllabi for student teaching internships, as well as a handbook for student teaching.

A handbook has been developed and is available [here](#).

Standard 2

All of the concerns relative to this standard have been addressed in the stipulations.

Standard 3

Documentation of evaluation of student teachers is limited. Collaboration and supervision systems need to be more formalized.

Need a handbook to make expectations for sequence of fieldwork experiences clear.

Stipulation 4 addresses this concern including evidence of the use of google docs for student teaching evaluation in a formalized system.

Standard 4

There should be evidence that programmatic leadership includes both secondary and elementary expertise.

Our department faculty have experience and scholarship across K-16.