CITEP Meeting
April 22, 2016
Wardlaw 029
1:00 – 3:00

Minutes

Members Present: Donna Watson, Stephanie Milling, Paul Malovhr, Christine Lotter, Susi Long, Cookie Winburn, Nate Carnes, Beth White, Tommy Hodges, Lauren Brown, Regina Wragg, Ashley Holt, Christine Christle, Lisa Peterson, Cindy Van Buren, David Virtue, Wendy Valerio, Rob Dedmon

1. Welcome and Introductions – Chair: David Virtue

   David Virtue called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.

2. Approval of minutes from March meeting – David Virtue

   Stephanie Milling motioned to approve the minutes. Christine Lotter seconded the motion. The minutes were subsequently approved.

3. Conceptual Framework – Revisit – David Virtue

   - David Virtue: We are striving to develop collaborative educational leaders and advocates. As we prepare for our CAEP report, there are aspects we need to address. Is this the conceptual framework that guides the work we do? Do we first have a motion to affirm that this diagram is our conceptual framework? Christine Lotter motioned to approve this motion, and Nate Carnes seconded the motion.
   - Christine Lotter: How will this be affected by our new NIET rubric? David Virtue: Cindy Van Buren shared a crosswalk that will show how these are all related. In 1989 our first conceptual framework was designed.
   - Cindy Van Buren: The NIET rubric is aligned to ADEPT. NCATE assessed the unit on their conceptual framework and CAEP doesn't do that. CAEP says that it is okay if you have one, but you don't have to. Rachel Harvey (SCDE representative) went to a site visit recently that did have a conceptual framework and it framed a lot of the work they presented. Irma VanScoy gave the Office of Assessment & Accreditation a history of the conceptual framework and Cindy's question is: do we still live by this? Is this who we are? If it's not who we are, what do we want to do about that and how do we present this in report?
   - Regina Wragg: If the surveys (exit, employer, intern, supervisor) and everything else that we are currently using is aligned with this, this establishes some of the content validity. Irma VanScoy said that the surveys were designed and aligned to the conceptual framework.
   - Christine Lotter: Interns know what all of these terms mean and it is more meaningful because our dispositions document is aligned to this framework. Beth

White also added that these are the terms that she uses as well with interns in Elementary programs.

- Cindy Van Buren: Hasn't the professional domain of ADEPT always been different than the USC dispositions? You have all aligned dispositions with the professionalism domain with ADEPT?
    - Cookie Winburn: Aligns dispositions with any APS of ADEPT.
    - Chris Christle: APS 10 and candidate dispositions are a little bit different…there is some overlap though.
- David Virtue: Is there anything about this that would give you reservations on saying that this is not actually our conceptual framework?
    - Chris Christle: I think it has been working and we definitely evaluate our interns on it.
    - Susi Long: It may be a time to revisit it because the time has come, but I don't think now is the time before our CAEP visit.
    - David Virtue: If we decide today that we want to create focus groups to revisit it and realign it.
    - Nate Carnes: During the first three years of Les Sternberg, it went through a lot of editing. There are some overlaps, but not so much such as social justice which is not in ADEPT.
- David Virtue: All in favor of affirming the conceptual framework? *All agreed…no oppositions.*

4. Dispositions – Revisit – Cindy Van Buren
    - Cindy Van Buren: Based on CAEP Steering Committee's views on what we should be doing with dispositions, I would like for us to look over this proposal. (List 4 proposals)
        - I. Reaffirm or revise the dispositions adopted by the COE in 2001 and updated in 2006; ask faculty to assist with making links to research for each of the disposition items.
        - II. Approve or revise the current dispositions rubric and submit it to the CAEP assessment shell for EPP created assessments.
        - III. Begin to measure dispositions across time in addition to the internship dispositions assessment
            - Disposition self-assessment in an early class (perhaps 201 and others) and at admission to the professional program
            - Disposition assessment connected to all or most field experiences
            - Disposition assessment at admission to the internship
        - IV. Institute a disposition concerns form/procedures as a coaching mechanism for students who are exhibiting behaviors that are in conflict with the COE Dispositions.
    - Tommy Hodges: Is there any way to make it so that it is not completing a self-assessment? Maybe analyze a clip of someone else teaching? This will show whether they have a level of knowledge of the dispositions themselves.
    - Cookie Winburn: All of the dispositions are personal. What are you personally doing in the classroom and with kids?

- Beth White: If you want to see growth, 201 is a great place to see growth. The professionalism hasn't always kicked in while they are in that class. 201 has an early practicum experience of 10 hours.
- Cindy Van Buren: We have a lot going on in different program areas, but we must have unit-wide assessments. Afraid that one thing that CAEP will tell us is that we do not have any unit-wide assessments, so we are looking for easy ways to integrate unit-wide assessments. The assessment may be given in different courses, but could be the same assessment. It should be at a similar point in their progression, but does not have to be the same year.
- Chris Christle: Would like if we did the dispositions at admission to professional program and twice during internship.
- Stephanie Milling: Feels a level of limitation because she will not really be in the classroom with them during early internships.
- Paul Malovhr: Shares the same concerns as Stephanie. They have had instances where students were not acting professional during internship and it should have been assessed at an earlier time.
- Cindy Van Buren: The early assessment can be done by the student, teacher, or even demonstrating that they understand the dispositions and somehow apply this to themselves. We do not have a formal way to address a student that has an issue with dispositions. What most institutions have in place is some formal mechanism for addressing that disposition area early on. It is a coaching tool…a dispositions committee could also be formed. If the problem does not get coached away or resolved, you then know you have an issue with a candidate.
- Stephanie Milling: Is there a way that the action plan form could be adapted? Christine Lotter: The action plan is not necessarily a coaching tool. Cookie Winburn: Are there examples?
- Cindy Van Buren: If we want to go in this direction, we could have graduate assistants see what forms are out there in other institutions and we can then put work groups together to create/revise forms and CAEP will see that we have a plan in place. We [OAA] will look at our rubric this summer/compare to CAEP, and then submit if we feel it will meet the requirements. Do we like this proposal for moving forward?
- David Virtue then put forward a motion to move forward with Cindy's proposal. *All agreed…no oppositions.*

5. Roll out of new Internship Evaluation – Cookie Winburn

- Cookie Winburn: Roll out for Fall 2015 (August) for everyone in final internship. We will be using this new rubric for evaluation. We have 110-120 students that will be evaluated with the new rubric starting in August. We will be holding a training with SDE. SDE has approved an 8 member team. Maggie, Margo, Cindy, and Cookie will be part of the training. We also pulled in Christine Lotter, Beth White, Bridget Miller, and George Roy. We are not leaving anyone out…Art, PE, Special Education, Music, and Foreign Languages also have fall final internships. With this, who needs to be trained? Any supervisor that will be working with a final internship intern. It is a 3-day training. Train the trainer model will be June

1-3, and we will then train everyone else that needs to be trained. They at first told us that all of our coaching teachers would need to go through a 3 day training, but now we know they will only have to go through 1 day of training. Spoke with some administrators yesterday and they liked the idea of having multiple trainings throughout the summer. We may also have to have a Saturday training in August. Faculty will also need training.

- Cindy Van Buren: One question that we do not know the answer to yet is if a faculty member teachers but does not supervise, do they need 3 full days of training? We believe the answer will be that you can decide.
- Paul Malovhr: Will you be contacting supervisors?
- Cookie Winburn: We will be in contact with you or you can email Cookie with these names. We will be offering three 3-day trainings for supervisors (June, July, & August). We will email supervisors and give them the registration link. We hope to have the location set next week, will pay $300 stipend for attending, and feed them. We also can pay faculty that attend this summer. June 28-30, July 12-14, August 1-3 are these dates. Coaching Teachers: June 29, July 13, and an additional date in August..we will be sending out additional dates.
- Cindy Van Buren: The only people that absolutely have to go this summer are those that are supervising final interns this fall. Tria Grant at SCDE said that June 1-3 training will only be for IHEs, so we are not clear if the 8 from USC will be able to train districts.
- Susi Long: For faculty that are not supervising but have undergraduates that they teach, could this training be integrated into our faculty meetings? Possibly have Bridget come to these meetings to train?
- Cindy Van Buren: One thing we will need to determine is how much a faculty member teaching a methods course will need to know about the NIET rubric. Teacher candidate training for most institutions is 2-3 hours.
- Wendy Valerio: Afraid that a lot of supervisors will already have plans for the summer and would like for this information to come from Cindy and/or Cookie.
- Cindy and Cookie will be sending out additional information to everyone regarding the training dates and details.

6. University Supervisor/Coaching Teacher Evaluations – Regina Wragg

- Regina Wragg: Early Childhood and Special Education are the only two programs that have had conversations with us regarding the supervisor/coaching teacher/intern evaluations. Regina then showed sample data summaries to everyone.
- Would this feedback on each supervisor/coaching teacher in comparison to others be helpful? *Yes, all agreed that this would be helpful.*
- Is this current evaluation asking what you need to know? Per the question category, Regina made comments for each. We need to get this evaluation out next week, but it does not have to change for this semester. Regina will send these out to program coordinators, get feedback, and then what we send out in the fall will be improved. OAA will get feedback after these evaluations are sent out to

program coordinators and then you can make revisions and submit to Regina so that we can update before sending out again in the fall.

- David Virtue: One of the first meetings of CITEP in the fall we can decide who can meet to create these new evaluations with the feedback.
- Several members then decided that we should take out the intern portion of the evaluation since supervisors have already evaluated their interns several times throughout the semester. Regina noted this, and OAA will take this out prior to next semester.
- Summary: OAA will not send out the teaching intern page in the future, we will continue with the survey as it stands this semester. Feedback will be given to program coordinators, they will look at and then make a decision from there on what changes should be made. Will be revisited at our first fall meeting.

7. Recruitment Plan – Rob Dedmon

- At CAEP steering Committee and evaluation of the CAEP standards, it has been determined that we need a recruitment plan. Given his knowledge, Rob has agreed to work on this. He has worked with a few people within the college to see what we do at COE. Rob will be reaching out to all program areas. One thing we will need to address is diversity and how do we recruit diverse students? More information to come.

8. Technology Integration Discussion – David Virtue

- Christine Lotter: On college-wide survey, about 45 people responded to this technology question and about 20 people said overall improve technology in Wardlaw…offices, classrooms, etc.. and software for research on computers. Only 10 people said access to training on K-12 software. Better IT support (proactive vs. reactive) & IT services. The Strategic Planning Committee will share this information at the All College Meeting and with the new dean to move forward with plans.
- Rob Dedmon: There are programs across the unit that we need to ensure are included in that.

9. Status Update on Teacher Induction Model – Tommy Hodges

- At our last CITEP meeting, shared proposal for Teacher Induction Model (very general, non-specific). With Cindy & CAEP Steering Committee' support, we will flesh out a much more detailed version of that. Goals: 1) responsive to induction teacher needs 2) receive data necessary for CAEP. This work will take place in early summer and will be shared in the fall. Hopefully this can serve as a model for other institutions across the state.

10. New Business

- Inviting P-12 partners to join CITEP – Cindy Van Buren

- Cindy Van Buren: Some of us attended the PDS national conference in Orlando. Standard 2: CAEP expects that our P-12 partners are helping us make decisions by our programs. A suggestion was that we invite P-12 partners be on our decision making committees. We have partners on QCom, but do not have any on CITEP. Cindy wanted to propose the idea to have P-12 partners join. Her idea was to invite 1 PDS representative, an induction coordinator of a district we work with often, and invite someone with an esteemed position in a Midlands district.
- Cookie Winburn: If we could not get a teacher, we could get an administrator. David Virtue: Could make this part of our MOU with PDS schools. Several of the members loved this idea. We would have to amend our governing documents to include P-12 partners. David called a motion to move forward. *None opposed. We will move ahead with this idea.*

- Internship Application/Professional Program Application – Cindy Van Buren/Rob Dedmon
  - Rob Dedmon: Last meeting we discussed SLED/TB check process that we need to put into place. We created guidelines/policy on that. It is somewhat simplified from what we had before. We changed PK-12 school to experience with children. We also extended this to include all program areas, not just initial certification areas. Rob Dedmon showed the new website with all these areas listed. Students will upload their SLED & TB Test to their Chalk & Wire accounts. We checked with Chalk & Wire and you can set it up with enhanced security for that type of file. Will be sending an email out next week to COE students, and will give email to those that are not in COE so that you can forward to your students. Email will include explicit instructions. For those that have already submitted hard copies to Beth Looney's office, we will let students know they do not have to turn this in again. For those that are going into full internship next year, they will have already gone through the SLED check and submitted certification application materials.
  - Lauren Brown: What would be helpful, especially for those that are outside of the college, is a list of who is moving forward in internship.
  - Rob Dedmon: There are certain issues that this policy does not resolve, but we will work on those as well. Go on the website and double check to make sure all of your courses with practicums are listed (url on form)
  - Cindy: We also want to do an online application for admission to internship. Hopefully also with Rob and Donna Watson's approval admission to professional program. Cindy will send a mock-up to everyone soon over email and ask for feedback. Would like to do away with paper internship application ASAP. One undergraduate, one MT, and one MAT application instead of so many different applications.
  - Chris Christle: In addition to that, all of the paperwork at the end? Cookie Winburn: We are working on that. Chalk & Wire will help us with that too.
- Assessment Plans – Regina Wragg

    - Regina Wragg: In order for you to complete program changes, you need to have data. Program changes are due to provost office June 17th. We want to give you data summary reports. The program changes document will be sent to you and we want these returned to our office by May 13th. We will send these out ASAP.
- Summer Communication – David Virtue
    - Cindy Van Buren: There will be a lot going on this summer because OAA has to draft our CAEP self-study over the summer and we will need input on some things. If there is a way you would prefer that we contact you besides university email, please let us know. Also let us know if your program coordinator is changing.

11. Adjournment

Cindy Van Buren adjourned the meeting at 3:05 pm.