

S-1071 Meeting Minutes May 2019

Attendees:

Jessica Blythe, West Virginia University, jmblythe@mail.wvu.edu

Kevin Curry, Penn State, Kevincurry@psu.edu

Tyson Sorensen, Utah State, Tyson.sorensen@usu.edu

Jonathon Ulmer, Kansas State, julmer@ksu.edu

Kasee Smith, University of Idaho, klsmith@uidhaho.edu

Kate Shoulders, University of Arkansas, cshoulde@urk.edu

Aaron McKim, Michigan State, amckim@msu.edu

Catherine DiBenedetto, Clemson, cdibene@clemson.edu

Andrew Thoron, University of Florida, athoron@ufl.edu

Katie Stofer, University of Florida, stofer@ufl.edu

Monday, May 20

During a working dinner members in attendance discussed business including the election of officers and project logistics (how to join, annual individual reporting, etc.). Members were asked to consider serving in a leadership role and to be prepared to make nominations the following day.

Tuesday, May 21

Project structure and leadership:

Current Chair Jessica led the group in a discussion of how the project is currently structured and the duties of the project leaders. Following some additional discussion, the decision was made to revert to a 3-year term for the leadership team. The following officers were selected for 2019—22:

Chair: Catherine DiBenedetto, Clemson University

Vice-Chair: Aaron McKim, Michigan State University

Objective 1 Coordinator: Andrew Thoron, University of Florida

Objective 2 Coordinator: Kasee Smith, University of Idaho

Objective 3 Coordinator: Kevin Curry of Penn State

It was suggested by the administrative advisor that the entire group or the objective subgroups maintain communication through quarterly conference calls.

Objective 1: Next Generation Science Standards Disciplinary Core Ideas papers have been published (Integrating Disciplinary Core Ideas, the Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources Career Pathways and Next Generation Science Standards. 2018. Career and Technical Education Research 43(1):41-56. DOI:10.5328/cter43.1.41.) Waiting to coordinate the distribution of the papers with Objective 2 & 3.

Objective 3: The innovation configuration map was completed previously and underwent an extension review process. S-1071 participants were involved in some of the teams that reviewed the process of determining what are the best resources and how should they be utilized. Kevin reported that the document is waiting on final edits and approval. The group shared thoughts on dissemination of the map and ideas included waiting until items from Objective 1 & 2 can be shared simultaneously.

Objective 2: Discussion for this objective started with identifying the challenges which have hindered forward progress; lack of funding, definitions of exemplary teachers, consistency in data collection which will allow for more successful publication acceptance, etc.

Identifying exemplary teachers has been one of the biggest challenges to this objective. When discussing what is an exemplary teacher's ideas included using Cooperative teachers, NAAE award winners, state-based evaluations, student program completion data, Create an evaluation to sample, utilize other teacher programs guidelines for exemplary teachers.

To make progress more successful there is a need to have to separate constructs within this objective:

1. What makes a teacher exemplary? How do we determine the characteristics which make a teacher exemplary?
 - a. Create survey for identifying Exemplary teaching.
 - i. Include question about identifying exemplary teaching peers.
 - b. State based choices for qualitative follow-ups.
 - c. Pseudo-Snowball sampling method within states– Ask key groups (teacher ed, state advisors, teachers, ffa area specialists, etc.) and select based on overlap in responses.
2. What methods, materials and techniques do exemplary teachers use?
 - a. How are we going to capture the methods, materials, and techniques for teaching?
 - b. Creating data collection protocol so different states can assist in data collection

Final discussion centered around a strategy to attract external funding to support teacher observations and participation costs. Primary needs are for incentives for the teachers, travel and students to do the observations.

We decided to utilize the remaining time to complete the data collection plan and methods needed for Objective 2 so that it could be implemented immediately upon our return home following the conference.

- Construct 1 – Jon Ulmer, Kasee Smith, Jessica Blythe, Kate Shoulders.
- Construct 2 – Aaron McKim, Tyson Sorenson, Kevin Curry, Cathy DiBenedetto, Andrew Thoron

Having a common self-assessment survey based on the 12 practices identified in Objective 3. Using a National Random Sample Survey and State Census. Have teachers rate themselves on a Practice (To what extent do you use this practice) then ask to identify who they recommend who does it best. Included demographics about teaching awards, Cooperating teacher, etc. Then there is the potential to link it back to awards.

Potentially include an open ended-question about methods, materials, and techniques. We may need to have this separate.

Project Updates: Attendees went around the room or shared via email to update the group regarding their activities and current issues their state may be facing in ag education as well as the objectives to which they felt they could contribute.

Kasee Smith (Idaho)- disseminated work related to the impacts of cognitive sequencing and STEM integration in agricultural education. Working toward identifying sites for STEM research in the upcoming school year.

Catherine DiBenedetto (South Carolina) - designed a three-day STEM focused professional development conference for a national group of agriscience teachers related to the goals and objectives from a small grant from the American Floral Endowment (AFE). The topics within the professional development are intended to provide teachers with an opportunity to experience inquiry-based instruction through modeling. The content of the PD is related to microgreens plant propagation and harvesting, distribution, and storage of cut flowers in the floriculture industry, and greenhouse sensors and controls. The PD conference will be held at Clemson University in June of 2019. Colleague, Andrew Thoron and graduate

student, Natalie Ferand from the University of Florida will assist with the curriculum development and delivery of the seminars at the conference.

Katie Stofer (Florida) - continues to share the NGSS Disciplinary Core ideas cross-listing to (primarily science) teachers in workshops on invasive species and emerging pathogens. Also worked on a game-based activity and assessment for public audiences based on cross-links between agriculture and STEM, mentoring an undergraduate and graduate student (then Postdoc once he graduated).

S1071 Summer Meeting - Thursday Aug. 8 from 12:00- 1:00 EST via Zoom conference call

Attendees:

Catherine DiBenedetto
Aaron McKim
Tyson Sorenson
Kevin Curry
Jessica Blythe
Kasee Smith
Jon Ulmer

AGENDA:

1. Review of Instrument (Aaron)

Started needs assessment/survey design at AAAE – Drafted and sent out for feedback.

Feedback utilized to improve instrument. Final survey screen view shared today. Already included in IRB at some institutions.

If we run through separate IRB at our institutions, may need to complete block one language in survey individually

Data set on one link or per institution? – keep survey consistent – no deletion or addition of questions

Aaron can share copy of survey; each institution adds IRB language if needed and then we all share data.

2. Update on IRB proposal (Kasee)

How many institutions have communicated with University of Idaho?

Housing at U of I

Clemson University
West Virginia
Kansas State
University of Florida
Penn State (both)
University of Utah (both)

On own

Michigan
Penn State

University of Utah

Kasee will follow up and should have full IRB approval by next week from University of Idaho

Need to reach out to others for assistance with survey distribution in other states:

Rebekah Epps (Kentucky) - Kasee will contact

Laura Haselquest (South Dakota), Kate Shoulders (Arkansas) – Jessica will contact

*****Who is our contact for Iowa?? *****

- 3. Outline plan for pilot testing instrument – At AAAE we proposed August**
Need minimum of 30 for pilot test

Test and retest for reliability with matching respondents

Possible population = graduate students with teaching experience– we can reach out to colleagues at all institutions if we use graduate students

Also discussed using West Virginia AGED teachers – low response rate and timing concern
Discussion determined that AGED teachers from other states, in addition to WV would be better option for pilot test

Jon Ulmer and Jessica Blythe will work together to take lead on pilot test
Target states for pilot test include West Virginia, Texas, Missouri and Nebraska

Aaron will send link to the instrument to Jon and Jessica

Proposed plan to begin pilot test by the end of next week

4. Determine timeline for data collection –

At AAAE we proposed pre notice September 9, then start data collection on Sept 16, with followup notices on Sept. 23, 30 and close Oct 4.

Now dependent upon administration and completion timeframe of pilot test
Discussion determined it will be best to finish pilot and then set dates for data

collection Jon and Jessica will communicate back to group when pilot test is completed

States we plan to target for data collection (based on NAAE regions)
Idaho, Utah, Kansas, Arkansas, South Dakota, Iowa, Michigan, Kentucky, South Carolina, Florida, Pennsylvania, Connecticut

5. Update on any possible grant collaboration

Jon mentioned – 2020 March for some deadlines – SPECA
We will all keep looking and report back again at next meeting

6. Other items for discussion???

Thanks to all for collaborative efforts!!

Next meeting determined by pilot test completion