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?
  - o Cookie Winburn: Aligns dispositions with any APS of ADEPT.
  - o 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?
  - o Chris Christle: I think it has been working and we definitely evaluate our interns on it.
  - o 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.
  - o David Virtue: If we decide today that we want to create focus groups to revisit it and realign it.
  - o 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)
     - o 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.
     - o II. Approve or revise the current dispositions rubric and submit it to the CAEP assessment shell for EPP created assessments.
     - o 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
     - o 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

- o 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.
  - o 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
  - o 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.
  - o 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.
  - o 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)
  - o 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.
  - o 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

- o 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
  - o 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.

Minutes

Members Present: Ognian Trifonov, Regina Wragg, Susi Long, George Roy, Cookie Winburn, Rob Dedmon, Beth White, David Virtue, Lynda Nilges, Donna Watson, Cindy Van Buren, Chris Christle, Stephanie Milling, Tommy Hodges, Lisa Peterson, Thomas Hebert, William Morris, Daniella Cook, Ed Dickey, Christine Lotter, Wendy Valerio, Peter Duffy, Beth Looney, Ashley Holt, George Roy

CAEP Steering Committee Members Present (P-12 Representatives): Roy Blakeney, Margaret Hicks

I. **Welcome and Introductions – Chairs: David Virtue and Lynda Nilges**

Lynda Nilges called the meeting to order at 11:30 AM.

II. **Approval of Minutes from February Meeting – Lynda Nilges**

Regina Wragg motioned to approve the minutes. The minutes were subsequently approved.

III. **NIET Rubric Follow up and Vote – Cindy Van Buren**

- Cindy Van Buren: Dennis Dotterer (SCDE Director of SCTAP) provided us with information sessions on the NIET rubric last week. Dennis has been using the NIET rubric for 5 years and is writing his dissertation regarding data on this rubric. Representatives from OAA, OCE, PDS, Secondary SS, Secondary English, Science, PE, Theatre, Dance, and Undergraduate Affairs were present for at least one of these meetings. We need to establish a training plan if the state does not announce the chosen rubric. There is a 3 day training available…if SCDE announces their decision in time, they will provide the training. The state will then implement a "Train the Trainer" model…we would then train our own people at USC. Margo Jackson has started working on a training plan in the eventuality that we vote yes today. Cookie Winburn, Margo Jackson, Beth Looney, Maggie Frick, and Cindy have set aside half a day Monday (3/21) in case you vote yes to start working on deciding the questions that need to be answered and decisions that need to be made. If the vote is favorable today, you are invited to the meeting. If it is voted no, we will go back to the drawing board and figure out what to do from there. Two decisions: how do we roll this out? Internship IIB

in Fall or roll out with everyone in the Fall? What is passing? SCDE is still requiring that we turn in Met/Not Met.

- Questions/Comments/Discussion:
    - o Lynda Nilges: PE faculty personally endorse it. Any kind of system has some limitations, but we have a very specific PE assessment that we will continue to use. This does not have a huge impact on our program. For us though, adding a Component 5 that is PE specific would be beneficial.
    - o Chris Christle: Special Ed looked at it and, prefacing, we have already had a rubric specifically for ADEPT. With this new rubric, it is not specific to the SPED areas and with the notion that we can't change/modify it in any way, it will be difficult. We will go with what the college goes with.
    - o Lynda: one thing that came up in CAEP steering, we don't want to put ourselves in a position where we are doing assessment after assessment to cover our bases.
    - o Daniella Cook: Secondary SS believes the rubric is fine but we need a sound plan for how we are going to train these coaching teachers. (PR Plan for coaching teachers and supervisors because they are going to be alarmed).This is a tight timeline, so we need to take that into consideration.
    - o Lynda: How do we train and get everyone trained? We will have to be aware of this.
    - o Cindy: Margo Jackson represented us at an IHE collaboration meeting and SCDE showed a timeline for rolling out the new rubric statewide. First year teachers would begin using in 2017-18 in school districts. IHEs need to be one year ahead of that so that we are graduating students that are already familiar with the rubric. How late it too late for training? SCDE must announce before June 1st for other colleges to implement. USC is different because we have to change our rubric for CAEP and we are the first up for accreditation.
    - o Susi Long: Speaking for ECE Faculty, one of their concerns is that we are behind, and we need to go ahead with this. We want to use what SCDE is using, but don't want to go into the time to be trained if we do not know for sure. If we have to commit 3 days in the summer for training…how do we compensate?
    - o Stephanie Milling: Music is in favor, but they were not available to meet.
    - o Cindy: University faculty have to go through a 3 day training and be certified. Coaching teachers may not have to go through the 3 day training and be certified, but we must seek clarification on this. If we are training coaching teachers, we would need to do so during the school year and provide substitutes.
    - o Margaret Hicks: Don't we want our coaching teachers trained during the summer prior to the school year? At the beginning of the school year, many teachers will not want to leave their classroom.
    - o Chris Christle: Taking them out of the classroom is not a good idea because there are so many other meetings they must attend, especially with Special Education.

- Cindy: If this is the rubric that SCDE is choosing, then all of these teachers will have to be trained either way, and this will be less teachers the district will have to train.
- Chris: It is getting harder and harder to get coaching teachers, because what is in it for them? There are a lot of teachers turning this down.
- David: As an incentive, build that into the way they are evaluated as professionals. If you are expected to engage in collaborative learning with others as part of evaluation, this could be an incentive.
- Cookie: The plaque from USC is actually very important to a lot of teachers.
- Chris: We should ask in coaching teacher surveys what an incentive would be for them. (OAA will look to add this to the survey.)
- Daniella: We must consider the needs of our USC interns. Once we start to tie that expectation to our interns successfully completing our programs, we will potentially impact who completes our programs.
- Peter Duffy: I tell students all the time that this is the one place to take chances and fail big and have support. Does not feel this rubric supports this.
- Daniella: The community also want their students to come out of classrooms and be prepared and successful, and this should be considered.
- Susi: I think that what happens is when students get out in schools, they do find these evaluation systems and we need to show them how to use this system as development and a coaching tool.
- Stephanie: Agrees with Peter…there are so many indicators in each criterion and to even say that all of us could do all of this in a semester is overwhelming. Maybe there are ways to take aspects of it.
- Lynda: When the rubric was presented, Dennis Dotterer really talked about the fact that our teachers coming out are not going to be at that top level and very few are at that top level. This is a shift in our thinking because our students are going to want to be above and beyond. Dennis encouraged us to think about that as a pass/not pass.
- Stephanie: Having worked in a system where the top score was an A and you weren't allowed to give students an A, it is very unfair. Dennis encouraged us to think about what our point of success is and it will not be a level 4 all the way around. We would have the opportunity to decide.
- Margaret Hicks: 6th grade students are being assessed on an 8 level rubric, but 4 is considered an A and 4 is where they want 6th graders to be. We can look at this at the college level. The next step will be how to tease this out if we decide to adopt this.
- Beth White: Just recently had a conference with an intern whose supervisor was giving her a 2 and she was upset because her peers were given a 4.
- Cindy: The TAP schools use 5 levels, state will be adopting a 4 level NIET rubric. We have to have something in the fall that is more than met/not met because what we have right now is not a rubric, it is a checklist. It is not acceptable for CAEP. If we create one ourselves and do

not choose NIET, we will have to adopt our own and have it approved by CAEP. SCDE and CAEP do not care what rubric we use as long as it meets the requirements. Many colleges will continue to use the rubric they have been using and developed. One benefit that we would have is if SCDE adopts this rubric, our candidates will be trained once they start teaching. Another state institution is changing the rubric and they will now have to go through a validity study with CAEP, so we do not want to be in this same situation. It may not fit into your program, everyone said the same about ADEPT and we found ways to make it work. SCDE will bring in NIET twice for 3 days in June…there will be a Train the Trainer model. Whoever goes this summer will become our trainers and we would need your help in deciding that. University supervisors, coaching teachers, and faculty that teach methods courses would need training. We could pay NIET $7500 to train 75 people prior to June 1st if we decided to do this.

- After a lengthy discussion, Lynda then called a motion to vote: Motion on the floor is that we vote to approve the NIET rubric. 9 have voted to approve. Opposed: 1 Abstaining: 2. The NIET rubric will be adopted.
- Cindy: In 274-N on Monday (3/21) Cindy and OCE will meet with Dennis Dotterer and we will answer questions, think through the process, and determine changes/decisions that need to be made before engaging in training. Emails can be sent to Cindy in advance to ask on Monday.

IV. CAEP Annual Report Narrative – Cindy Van Buren
- Current Narrative:
  o We have selected Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge. We are instituting a systematic approach to ensure that our candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their disciplines, and are able to use discipline specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college and career readiness standards. Our Committee for Initial Teacher Education Programs (CITEP) is carefully monitoring the development and adoption of new state standards for PK-12 schools. Select faculty have participated in the preparation of those standards. Part of that involvement has focused on the development of a state document describing the portrait of a South Carolina graduate. That knowledge has become a core component of candidate preparation. CITEP has also begun an emphasis on the role of InTASC standards in the preparation of candidates with focus on the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

  In particular we are actively collaborating with the State Department of Education to identify and obtain data that support completer's performance in areas 1.2 - 1.5. We have submitted SPA reports in 28 program areas that support our claims that completer's apply content and pedagogical knowledge as evidenced by outcome assessments. We are also continuing

to focus on the abilities of candidates to model and apply technology standards.

- Cindy: Every year we do a CAEP annual report and she looked back and read the two that we submitted in the past and is not sure if CITEP was a part of this. Prior to two years ago, it was a NCATE report. Narrative section: You all selected Standard 1 to be your area of continuous improvement (narrative is above). Cindy asks if CITEP can help to write this narrative for this year since she does not feel the above is adequate.
- Daniella: Could we by program area submit info to Cindy?
- Cindy: Think about anything from your program area that has happened in the past year or two that shows us as very strong in Standard 1. What have you done in terms of continuous improvement in CAEP Standard 1? Any ideas for your program area that what we have done to improve this area. Send by April 1st to Cindy. The final report is due April 15th.

V.   SLED/Background Check for Early Field Experiences – Rob Dedmon
- Including after school programs and summer programs – if you are doing any type of work with PK-12 students, you would need to complete an online background check before entering that school and COE will need to keep this background check on file. We have not previously been doing this, and it is important that we begin this process in the fall. We can begin storing this information in Chalk & Wire (C&W). Students can upload their background check along with their TB Test indicating negative results. There will be directions on our website on how to upload these results to C&W. (See Rob's handout for additional information on the steps which may be revised.)
- Daniella Cook: Does it meet HIPPA's requirements?
- William Morris: This has been used by multiple schools and this has not been an issue for other institutions.
- Rob: Students will have a folder in C&W for this specifically. Any student in a teacher preparation program has to have a C&W account…there are courses where students are taking a course and are not in the program. We will have to determine what we will need to do with these students. Either way, we have to at least start doing something. We need to index all courses in all programs that require students to step foot in a classroom. Rob has a chart that all program areas will need to complete. Rob will be sending an Excel sheet to your program and you will write yes/no if they go to a school for any of the courses.

VI.   Teacher Induction Model – Tommy Hodges
- At the last CAEP Steering Committee Meeting, one of the standards involved accumulation of student achievement data as an indication of intern effectiveness in P-12 schools. SC is not a value added state and SCDE is not giving us this data, so it will be up to us to determine how to obtain this data to determine our effectiveness. Partnered with this is a personal belief of Tommy that it is our responsibility of teacher educators is to support them after they finish. In order to marry these obligations, we looked at a model and teased out some preliminary ideas on how to

support induction teachers. With SLOs, they are completing action research and assessing at the end to determine effectiveness. This is just an idea to put out there where the university plays a mentor role in the students' SLO process…we are gathering data that we need along with providing support to the candidates.

- Chris Christle: We were looking to do this with e-mentoring in our program…if we could somehow have some support with our graduates electronically. We always have teachers come back and they talk about how their induction program is worthless, and if we become involved, this could make their induction much more valuable. Tommy agreed that much of this may be done at a distance.
- Lynda: If this was program specific support if possible, it would also provide additional support.
- Tommy: The only way for this to be a robust program is to have content area expertise.
- William Morris: It would be valuable if there is a central place where you would go for specific information and first year teachers are then more likely to use this resource. There is something that could be institutionalized.
- Tommy: There may be graduate credits that could be offered, allowing to be part of graduate programs as a requirement.
- Susi Long: This is important work…thinking of a large network….a lot of power for new teachers to come together in small groups to share ideas. Susi then discussed a program similar that she was once a part of that was very successful with first year teachers.
- Peter Duffy: There is an Innovation lab that takes on projects for the university every year with ideas that can be used for this.
- Cookie Winburn: Induction Symposium – state-wide June 28 and 29 with hundreds of induction teachers in one place where we could maybe become a partner across the state with induction.
- Roy Blakeney: At Dreher, there is a program called "Jump Start"…2nd and 3rd year teachers have a place to come together to talk about these issues. 80% of what we do is help them through the Induction Model.
- Lynda: As a first year teacher, she was very lucky to land in a state demonstration school for PE…she does not believe that she would be where she is today without all of the mentoring she received from this school. There was constant supervision of teaching and it made a huge difference.
- Tommy: We cannot flesh out all of the details in a large group, but we can meet with small groups on how to implement a model such as this and ideas on how to pilot this at a few sites. PDS site that is close by possibly.

VII. Adjournment

Lynda Nilges adjourned the meeting at 1:20 pm.

CITEP Meeting
February 12, 2016
1:00 PM
Wardlaw O29

Minutes

Members Present: Lynda Nilges, Stephanie Milling, Beth White, Paul Malovrh, Christine Lotter, Nate Carnes, Chris Christle, Lisa Peterson, Cindy Van Buren, Lauren Brown, David Virtue, Donna Watson, Cookie Winburn, Rob Dedmon, Tommy Hodges, Susi Long

I. Welcome and Introductions – Chairs: David Virtue and Lynda Nilges

Dr. Virtue called the meeting to order at 1:07 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes – Lynda Nilges

Donna Watson motioned to approve the minutes. Nate Carnes seconded his motion. The minutes were subsequently approved.

III. Proposed New Internship Evaluation – Cindy Van Buren

- Update Since November
    - November Meeting Recap: What we currently have is not a rubric, it is a met/not met checklist. We know that it will not meet CAEP requirements for a valid unit-wide assessment. This also does not represent best practice in assessment of effective teaching. The November CITEP meeting decision was that Cindy would develop a 4 level rubric to supplement the checklist. At the time, SDE told us not to wait on them because they were unsure of their next steps.
    - State Progress: Task force reviewed six rubrics and in December put forth Danielson and NIET as the top two. Kris Joannes (Director of SDE Office of Educator Effectiveness) said that Danielson is not the one that the state will select due to proprietary issues. Danielson must be purchased and used in their electronic environment, which is not feasible for SDE. NIET is likely to be the selected rubric although it has not been formally announced (going through internal SDE approvals process.)
- Benefits to Adopting NIET
    - Already deemed valid by CAEP and will not have to go through CAEP's review process/meet their 11 page assessment rubric…other institutions have said that it is a difficult process for approval
    - If selected by state, graduates will leave us with working knowledge of state evaluation rubric
    - If selected by state, SDE will provide the training for the university supervisors…some have gone through this training with a 5 level TAP rubric, but

this rubric we would adopt if 4 levels (Dennis Dotterer, Director of SC TAP, said that Clemson is using the 5 level version of this rubric)
- o Aligned to ADEPT and InTASC
- o Heavily based on research and best practice
- o Online features are offered if we wanted to pay for this (CODE, video observations)

- Drawbacks to Adopting NIET
  - o Cannot make changes to it since it is a nationally developed rubric…if we start changing it, it is not valid (we can though add a content domain/addendum for each specific program area and we can key elements of it to SPA standards)
  - o Change is hard for some– inter-rater reliability will have to be established (we will have to do this though with any instrument we use)

- Thoughts/Questions:
  - o Nate Carnes: Under benefits, if we went to the more deluxe version, would we have to pay for it or would students have to pay for it? Cindy: This would more than likely not be a student fee. For training for inter-rater reliability, the fee based system may be worth it for the videos.
  - o David Virtue: There is a professional library of exemplars…Nate and Chris have passwords and Dennis Dotterer would be willing to come to CITEP and bring an NIET representative to answer any questions. Tommy Hodges: Video supervisions are done at many schools and is moving to the norm, so that is not a huge leap or novel idea if we moved to this.
  - o Chris Christle: Why are we doing this now if the state has not yet adopted NIET? Cindy: We will not pass CAEP with our current Met/Not Met checklist. Our options: Adopt an existing rubric for internship evaluation or create our own rubric. We cannot use what we currently have, Kris Joannes said that they cannot send a letter to USC saying that we are doing what the state requires and using the forms. We require that it be aligned to ADEPT. If the state required us to use the forms, the state would write us a letter and CAEP would accept this.
  - o Christine Lotter added that she really likes NIET. It talks about student thinking, will push our pre-service teachers to up their game, and seems like a no brainier. Tommy Hodges added that there are pages and pages of citations available with the rubric with each domain.
  - o Cindy has guaranteed that as long as Molly Spearman is Superintendent, the state will have a 4 level rubric. The biggest shift for our students and faculty will be that Exemplary is not an A…Exemplary is the state teacher of the year teaching, not an intern in the field. We have to adjust the candidates' thinking that in rare circumstances you will be a level 4 but this doesn't mean that you will not receive an A. Until the state adopts the new rubric, we still have to report Met/Not Met…we would go through this process and determine what is Met/Not Met from the rubric. The rubric can be weighted.
  - o Susi Long: How is this intended to be used and at what time? Do we go in with our current ADEPT evaluation and observe? Cindy: Dennis said you go in with this rubric each observation and complete at the end to give a score. Dennis will come do the training for us this summer for free as long as he is at SDE. We have to show CAEP we are showing progress and we have to have at least one

semester of data using this rubric, so we will have to implement and use this fall. There would be a massive revision this summer and we would not use the Met/Not Met checklist at all. We would determine what Met/Not Met would mean in order to report this to the state. USC would determine what passing would be.

- o Tommy: One thing we were looking forward to is adding an additional domain to the rubric at the end based upon program areas…do we all need to have the same threshold across all programs? Cindy: Domain 5/the content domain could be its own key assessment separate. It can look like this rubric, have the same 4 levels, and have its own key assessment.
- o Lynda: PE assessments were returned based on co-mingling. Looking at the rubric, there is a lot of co-mingling of the outcomes. *Inter-rater reliability/co-mingling discussion.* Cindy: This really depends on the particular SPA's requirements and the raters.
- o Susi: It will be helpful when the state makes a decision on the rubric. Faculty will more than likely not be willing to create a new rubric in a short period of time. Paul Malovhr: this is one of the only choices that we have since we have not reviewed other rubrics

- Cindy concluded that we don't have to make a decision today regarding the NIET rubric, but would like everyone to consider this and have Dennis host a training to discuss further. David added that everyone should bring the rubric back to their program areas and discuss, attend an information session with David, and then reconvene at our March meeting and vote.
  - o Cindy's action items: Send everyone the technical guide, set dates for Dennis to come discuss the rubric, and determine the cost of online extras.

IV. Proposed Changes to GPA – Update – Rob Dedmon

- Rob began by asking what are we going to say is our cumulative GPA? You must have a cumulative GPA of 2.75 for the professional program…we can decide what that means to us. Does that mean just USC courses or all courses they have taken even at other universities?
- We are currently using their overall GPA (all courses even from other universities). This is going away. Advisors have access to Degree Works which students will have access to in May. In Degree Works, the registrar said that he could put GPA that includes all the coursework combined. It may be somewhat different than what we are looking at now, but will include everything that is required for LIFE scholarship. USC will have to maintain a combined GPA, this is required for LIFE Scholarship. Students will be able to see this GPA that we are holding them accountable for (but this will not be on transcripts, just on DegreeWorks).
- GPA Discussion:
  - o Lynda: A lot of our students are transfer students, so they may only have one semester of courses before they are applying to the professional program (especially PE)
  - o Rob ran a different number this time to see how the changes in GPA would affect htem - students that have between 45 and 75 credit hours…for COE students,

there were 28 who would not meet professional program entrance requirements based on overall GPA (out of 211 students), 32 who would not meet based on USC GPA. Arts & Sciences- 5 would not meet requirements with the overall GPA, 5 would not meet based on USC GPA (out of 34). The numbers are very similar for both GPAs. Lauren Brown: There is a new advising tool that Student Services will be trained on which will pinpoint, for example, if you get a C in 201, there is an indicator that a student is struggling, etc. We also have a first year advisor who will be looking closely at students during that first year.

- o Paul: What are the arguments for only looking at USC credits? Rob: For just using USC, students will see that is all the registrar is calculating.
- o David: Is there an option for us to accept the higher of the two? Rob: It is a state standard that we have 2.75 cumulative, so we have to define what that means. The state does still allow a small percentage to be admitted with 2.5 with petition. Lynda: Could there be a clause for transfer students? They will have to have a 2.5 to get in, but they have to have a 2.75 to get into the professional program. Lauren: We would see a lot of Anatomy & Physiology being taken at Midlands Tech.

- After the discussion, David Virtue then suggested that we will go with overall GPA unless there are problems, then we can change it. This decision was then made unanimously from the committee.

V. SLED/Background Check for Early Field Experiences – Rob Dedmon/Cindy Van Buren

- Rob: According to state regulations, we are required to have students complete SLED checks before going into schools for practicum experiences. In order to get into a school even for a 5 hour field experience, they will need this SLED check. We need to have a system in place so that by the fall, we will be compliant with state requirements.
- Cindy: This SLED check is done online (cost between $12-15). This should be used as a coaching tool…schools have to make a decision. OCE will notify districts and they can decide to say no to a student coming in.
- Stephanie Milling: If there is a problem, is it OCE that would talk to the student? Cookie: Cookie and Rob would talk to the students and ensure that they are not a threat to the school. Stephanie: Is this different than the SLED check that they do at the Children's Center? Rob: This is more than likely the same one.
- Cindy: There is a way in Chalk & Wire that they can handle this for us…they can upload their TB test and SLED check into C&W and be advised of this in Freshman orientation. We want to get away from these paper tests being sent to OCE.
- Christine: We will also have to figure out the best way to reach those students that are in Arts & Sciences programs.

VI. Technology Integration Discussion – Lynda Nilges/David Virtue

- Lynda: With CAEP steering, strategic planning, etc. we have noticed that there is a lack of technology training throughout the college. This is a beginning discussion of this need. ISTE standards are intertwined with CAEP standards. There are many skills that students are not receiving from our programs. Should room be made for a technology course?

- David: Looking at our exit survey results, graduates are frequently commenting that there is a lack of technology integration throughout the college.
- Cindy: District Contacts in Lexington/Richland 5 have notified her that student interns from USC across the board are very well prepared and come to the district technologically savvy, but do not have working knowledge of the ISTE Standards or a knowledge of technology integration. This is a SAMR district, and students are unaware of this and do not have these skills.
- Nate: Ed & Nate fought for Eno boards because they were cheaper than SMART boards, but they run very different. Faculty members across the board do not have the time to align Eno boards with SMART boards. Nate can only speak from one district, but there are issues with disconnect on technology
- Christine: There are two traveling SMART boards, but there is an issue with aligning the SMART boards. Could they be stationary and kept in one room? Suggestion for new dean: implement a possible check out system for laptops/iPads. Nate: We definitely need hardware, some software, and training is a requirement.
- Rob: There are two big issues. What we need here and how do we purposefully include this in our programs so that a student graduates and know how to successfully integrate technology into the classroom?
- Stephanie: Could a way to approach this issue holistically be to survey program areas on their use of technology and have each program area show how they meet the technology requirements and ISTE standards such as adding a course, beefing up a course already in place like this was done with Read to Succeed?
- Lynda: What this conversation helps to do is confirmation from this group that we need to do something with technology (Lynda and David are also in strategic planning group). As Matt is doing upgrades, he needs information from this group on what our needs are.
- David: Coaching Teacher Evaluation: Ask student teachers/recent graduates and coaching teachers what it is exactly that students need, including technology. We could have a workshop for faculty/staff and see what technology is out there in the district.
- Cindy: We cannot show them every type of technology that is out there, but they need to know how to integrate technology appropriately in the classroom. Technology is a cross cutting standard for CAEP, we do not have a lot of evidence to show for CAEP.
- Action: Put a question on the survey that is being sent out throughout COE regarding technology, and continue this discussion.

VII. Focus of CITEP – Information vs. Governance – David Virtue

- David: CITEP is a place that we have received information and had discussions, but it has not taken a governance stance in the past. As CAEP steering meets, somebody then needs to decide on these issues. We need to ensure that we have a process for discussing issues, bringing this back to program areas, and then making a decision. We will meet more often to act on recommendations from CAEP Steering Committee. Next Meeting Date: March 17th @ 11:15 – 1:15 (following the CAEP Steering Committee meeting)– Lisa Peterson will determine a room number for the March meeting and send out to everyone.

VIII. New Business

- Donna Watson: For Art, Music, Dance, FL programs: Raechel Blakeney will be our contact person for these programs, will be communicating with students about admission to the professional program. We are transitioning her into this position.
- Chris Christle asked Rob if all of our programs were approved for Read to Succeed. Rob replied that they were all approved and that this should be incorporated into syllabi.

IX. Adjournment

Dr. Virtue adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

CITEP Meeting
November 20, 2015
1:00 PM
Wardlaw 274-O

Agenda

Members Present: Cindy Van Buren, Lisa Peterson, Regina Wragg, Maggie Frick, William Morris, Paul Malovrha, Chris Christle, Christine Lotter, Lauren Brown, Nate Carnes, Rob Dedmon, Tommy Hodges, Lynda Nilges, Wendy Valerio, David Virtue, Donna Watson, Stephanie Milling

I. Welcome and Introductions

Dr. Nilges called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. New staff members in the Office of Assessment & Accreditation (OAA), Regina Wragg and Lisa Peterson, were introduced.

II. Approval of Minutes

Due to Laura Aboyan's departure after the previous meeting, minutes from this meeting could not be located.

III. Proposed Changes to GPA

- Rob Dedmon began by giving a Read to Succeed update. All 25 proposals submitted to the SC State Department have been approved. If your program has one of the courses listed on the program sheet, the syllabus for the course will need to eventually list how the requirements for Read to Succeed are met through the course.
- Praxis Core Requirements – new SAT with new scoring – in May, ETS will provide to the State Department how this score may be equivalent. A new cut score for Praxis Core exemption will be provided in late spring or summer of 2016.
- GPA Discussion: The University Registrar is recommending that the university no longer maintain an overall GPA and transfer GPA; the GPA will only consist of coursework completed at USC. For undergraduate teacher education, students' overall GPA is considered for admission to the professional program (2.75 GPA requirement) – if we no longer have access to this GPA, what do we do? State policy indicates a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.75, and it seems like this is up to interpretation – in the past, all coursework was considered no matter what school it is from. Other institutions such as Winthrop and Clemson state coursework from their institutions explicitly. USC will have to maintain Life Scholarship GPA so could refer to that GPA, considering a way to make that GPA available to students. Technical college courses are included in Life Scholarship GPA and any post secondary or remedial work will count in that.
- Discussion about GPA changes' affect – David Virtue contributed that someone could take a course at Midlands Tech and this course will not be factored into GPA– how will

this negatively affect those that take courses from a technical college for accessibility and affordability? Rob researched 42 students that he identified may be ready to enter the professional program. Out of the 42, this change would hurt 10 students who this change would hurt b/c they had at least 2.75 overall GPA, but their USC GPA was below that. This change though would help 9 of these 42 students, so he concluded that the change would hurt some, but help others. Cindy Van Buren contributed that factoring in the GPA from other institutions was foreign to her since this did not occur in other colleges that she had worked at. Rob would like input on the decision…it does not have to be made now, but finalized in the spring semester. David Virtue believes all coursework should matter and be added into GPA. Paul Malovrha added that most of the students in Arts & Sciences are transfer students and that this will definitely affect them since many come from Midlands Technical College. He believes that this would be detrimental for them if we did not include their GPA from Midlands Tech. Stephanie Milling added that in her program, most classes have to be taken at USC due to the program requirements, so this would not affect her students as heavily. Rob will continue to discuss options with the registrar's office, and he believes that we should only focus on Life scholarship GPA if students can actually see it. The decision will be voted on at the Faculty Senate.

IV. Chalk and Wire Discussion

- Stephanie Milling would like training on Chalk & Wire (C&W) before she begins using it. William Morris assures that OAA is putting a contact list together for trainings, and Dance Education is scheduled to begin with C&W in Fall 2016 (Laura set to launch programs into C&W in different phases).
- Paul Malovrha has had several students complain that they should have been notified of costs before they begin the course and he was going to introduce C&W in his methods courses to be fair if possible. In a Linguistics class this semester that he was not teaching, the students were not informed of the requirement. It was questioned whether C &W was used solely for assessment purposes – why are we having students pay for program assessment? Cindy Van Buren said that she knew many students were not informed properly this past semester, but she will be sending out an email next week to all students taking courses with key assessments in the spring notifying them of the C&W requirement, and will resend this email again in January. She also added that William Morris and Therese Maxfield (OAA's graduate assistant) can some to classes to talk to students about C&W's full capabilities.
- Chris Christle- a program guide is given when students interview for Special Education programs, and they are advised of the Chalk & Wire expense so they are aware before they begin program.
- Some SPA reports allow you to have GPA as a key assessment, this can be set it up in C&W. William Morris is taking the lead on learning how to do this.
- Lynda Nilges - training with school site teachers? Maggie Frick stated that coaching teachers will not be entering data…the site supervisor will actually be entering information into Chalk & Wire. OAA will set up internship evaluations that can completed as a guest, so coaching teachers will not need an account. ADEPT Classroom evaluations – those are not submitted through C&W. At some point, the whole ADEPT

packet will be in C&W, but now only the final internship evaluation will be entered into C&W.

- William Morris - Submission and assessment process has gone very well so far, most questions have been from those who waited and forgot what they were originally taught during training. C&W has many of the features that Blackboard currently has, but Blackboard is the university's official grading software and C&W is not replacing it at least at this time.
- William Morris had a question – are there comp finals that are not tied to a class? William needs to know how many there are so that he can fix an issue that is occurring in C&W…If the comp final is not tied to a class, the student may not have known to buy an account. Students are contacting William on how to enter these classes in C &W. At this point, we do not think we should request for these students to purchase C&W this later in the semester.
- Pricing scale concerns – make sure when students ask how much C & W is, you ask where they are at in their program and what courses they may need it for. Prices can be more if bought year to year instead of the 5 year price.
- Praxis II- Laura took the 6-8 key assessments for SPA report, they are all in C&W but only 4 or 5 may be linked to a class. We are figuring out how to get this information into the system when it is not linked to a class.

V. CAEP Standards and CAEP Steering Committee

- Cindy gave a very brief overview of the 5 CAEP Standards for Initial Licensure:
    - Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
    - Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice
    - Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity
    - Standard 4: Program Impact
    - Standard 5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity
    - Diversity and Technology are not their own standards as they were with NCATE; these two standards are not missing, but are embedded in all 5 CAEP standards and are called "Cross Cutting Themes".
- Paul Malovrha had a question- he helped with the SPA report a year ago. Does he submit as a program a CAEP report? Cindy assured everyone that OAA sends the CAEP report. CAEP is unit wide accreditation. Being nationally recognized by your SPA helps the COE meet Standard 1. If your programs aren't successful in your SPAs, we would not be CAEP accredited because we would not pass Standard 1. Cindy also shared that CAEP has asked if the Foreign Language SPA reports can be used as exemplars on their website.
- Nate Carnes – data sources for Standard 4? Cindy said that some of this will be our ADEPT data after candidates are employed in the state. OAA will be surveying principals that hire them, surveying candidates after they leave us, and possibly have a parent focus group. USC is the first institution in the state to have a CAEP visit in 2017, so our visit is a Phase-in visit. We do not have to have all data necessarily in place, but just the plan in place.
- CAEP Steering Committee scope of work – Cindy introduced the current members, and shared that the committee is willing to take on more members if anyone else would like

to join. The committee does not currently have P-12 representation, but has asked the Office of Clinical Experiences (OCE) for recommendations, but if anyone else has any recommendations, let Cindy know.

VI. Unit Wide Assessment/ADEPT Internship Evaluation

- Regina Wragg: OAA & OCE will work closely together due to unit wide assessment. CAEP Requirements: CAEP rubrics are available for evaluation of our assessment instruments, OAA has requested that an assessment portal be open to us for advanced feedback. Two particular concerns: There are only a few current unit wide assessments, and our current internship evaluation (Met/Not Met Checklist) for pre-service teachers will not meet CAEP requirements.
- Where we are now? The SCDE has a task force in place to revise the current ADEPT "met/not met" checklist to a rubric reflective of best practice (Danielson and NIET). Other SC EPPs have already moved forward with internship evaluation rubrics reflective of best practice. OAA and OCE are combining efforts to move us forward. SCDE does not believe they will have everything rolled out and ready for us to use right now.
- Discussion of two rubrics and their scale/requirements: NIET 4-scale rubric is currently used by SC Tap systems, has 12 criteria. Danielson 3-scale rubric has 4 domains with 5-6 subdomains each.
- Discussion of rubrics from other colleges that have specific program area 5th domain. Tommy Hodges believes that if we moved to a unit-wide rubric with this criteria it will be reflective of what they use now in their program area- Chris Christle agreed the met/not met is not helpful. The State Department has told OAA to not wait for the state's rubric changes and that we do not have to use their rubric once they implement it. The rubric must be aligned to the ADEPT performance standards / InTasc aligned. If any program area wants a content area Domain 5, OAA can support the process whenever the programs are ready.
- Moving forward: OAA will provide a 4-scale rubric that will enhance our current Met/Not Met internship evaluation checklist to meet CAEP requirements– they want to begin pulling some of that data on why some students have met/not met. Maggie Frick: if someone is not met, the supervisors have to put in comments on why and an action plan is usually attached.
- Timeline: Cindy Van Buren originally wanted to implement the changes starting in January, but OAA decided that they will work to make a unit wide 4 point rubric and possibly pilot this spring with interested program areas. This will allow for a semester of feedback and then training with university supervisors in the summer. A draft of the changes will be available at the next meeting.
- Tommy Hodges: it would be a really poor use of a rubric to at any time create a mean score as this assumes the data are linear and they are not. Caution – as we look across a rubric, we might value some criteria more than others.
- David Virtue – we have very few unit wide assessments – David finds this troubling, Tommy Hodges said that this was brought up at an Elementary program area meeting and they are discussing creating a key assessment for 201 to obtain baseline data since many candidates take this course. Also, almost everyone takes EDPY 401, so a unit wide assessment could be implemented there.

- Only initial licensure programs are a part of the CAEP visit in 2017 due to the timing of the visit. CAEP does not limit you on the number of assessments, only SPA limits the program assessments to 8. In C &W, you can have more than 8 key assessments, but the minimum is 6.

VII. *Paper Tigers*

- David Virtue – *Paper Tigers* is a film that deals with struggling teens and teachers armed with new science and fresh approaches that are changing their lives for the better. The COE will get to show this film for free, but we just have to decide when we want to show it. We can invite students, faculty, and K-12 partners. Nate Carnes- this could be presented to the Diversity Committee at the college –what is important when we talk about culturally relevant pedagogy.
- Lynda Nilges– Reminder of the screening of *Most Likely to Succeed* sponsored by COE at the Nickelodeon at 6:30 on Dec 8th.

VIII. Meeting Dates for Spring

1:00-3:00 PM in Wardlaw 274-O
February 12
April 22

Additional meeting dates may be needed to provide feedback on the unit-wide internship evaluation rubric.

IX. New Business

No new business was noted.

Dr. Virtue adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

Members present: Laura Aboyan, Lauren Brown, Nate Carnes, Rob Dedmon, Ed Dickey, Lara Ducate, Peter Duffy, Tommy Hodges, Olga Ivashkevich, Susi Long, Hiram McDade, Stephanie Milling, Lynda Nilges, Gerry Solomon, Lucy Spence, Wendy Valerio, David Virtue, Donna Watson, Lemuel Watson, Beth White, Cookie Winburn

I. Welcome and Introductions
Dr. Nilges called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes
Dr. Duffy moved to approve the minutes. Dr. Hodges seconded the motion. The minutes were subsequently approved.

III. Updates from the February Meeting
a. SPA Rejoinders (Laura Aboyan)
Next deadline is 9/15/15; Should shoot for this deadline; can submit in March 2016 as needed.

b. Read to Succeed Update (Rob Dedmon)
Mr. Dedmon reviewed the Read to Succeed information presented at the February 2015 meeting. He shared a document outlining the proposals from each program for how they plan to address the Read to Succeed requirements. Mr. Dedmon will review the proposals with Dean Watson and will then submit the proper documentation to the SC Department of Education (SCDE). Dr. Carnes asked about the deadline for submission. Mr. Dedmon said he would like to get the current group sent to the SCDE within the next two weeks.

Dr. Carnes asked about the need to address the number of credit hours in each program. Mr. Dedmon said programs will have to think strategically about how to address this concern without increasing the number of credit hours required for graduation.

Mr. Dedmon shared a document from the SCDE that outlines the proposed changes to the Read to Succeed requirements for each program area. Dean Watson shared this information with the committee after reviewing it with the SC Education Deans' Alliance. In some areas, the SCDE is requesting meetings with program representatives to determine how the requirements best fit into the content area. Mr. Dedmon covered the proposed changes to the requirements for speech language pathology, which may no longer require six credit hours, but rather incorporation of six specific areas of literacy into existing courses. Proposed changes in K-12 programs areas now ask for a three hour

course in reading and writing in the content area. Additional required experience will be earned during in-service work.

c. Reading Across the Content Area (Lucy Spence)
Dr. Spence explained the existing reading and writing in the content area course from the MEd program in Language and Literacy, which is designed to help content area teachers understand how reading and writing comprehension evolves in various areas at different ages. There is a second route this can take – how are these skills actually applied in a real world setting for a musician or a dancer. Dr. Spence offered to work together with each K-12 area to incorporate their areas into their existing course, or to help these programs develop their own courses. Dr. Milling is concerned that it isn't clear exactly what the SCDE is asking for. Dr. Dickey suggested looking at the competencies for each area and determine how they can apply to the discipline in question. Dr. Duffy mentioned that his theatre students take the existing EDRD 730 class (reading and writing in the content area), and they have found it to be very useful. This may be a solution for MAT programs in the PEU.

Dr. Ducate asked if there were any courses at the undergraduate level that could be removed to make room for this course. Mr. Dedmon said that as long as the accreditation requirements are met, it is possible, though it would be better not to. Dr. Nilges wondered if it was possible to create a course that included a practicum component so they could apply the knowledge as they're learning it, ideally before student teaching. This would require the development of a new course that could be taken concurrently with internship I/A. Dr. Virtue asked about an undergraduate course Dr. Spence had been working on that would possibly go across all areas. Dr. Valerio asked who would teach this course – would it be a content area specialist? Dr. Spence said it would be possible to find someone with an interest in literacy spanning all areas that could teach the course. Dr. Nilges thinks the best use of resources would be to have a centralized course in the College that touched each area in conjunction with a practicum. Dr. Carnes stressed that it is very important to demonstrate the connection between literacy and the specific content area.

Dr. Nilges asked when a proposed new course might need to be submitted. Mr. Dedmon said that the Fall 2016 bulletin needs to reflect the new information, so early in fall 2015, a clear path for implementing the course should be laid out. Bulletin changes would need to be approved by the College by October so they can go to faculty senate by December. Dr. Milling asked if the K-12 areas wanted to meet with Dr. Spence to work on developing a course or editing her existing course. Dr. Nilges will coordinate the meeting.

IV. New Business
a. Curriculum Update (Rob Dedmon)
Mr. Dedmon suggested that moving forward, as courses across programs are changed, these changes be shared with the committee so other programs can explore other options. In the past year, most changes have been related to the increase in GPA requirement and Read to Succeed.

b. SC Teacher's Loan and TEACH Grant (Rob Dedmon)
There are new areas eligible for the loan and grant this year. Programs in art, dance, and physical education are now eligible. Music is no longer eligible.

Dean Watson gave a brief CAEP update. He will be participating in training this summer. Marcia Berry from the SCDE will also attend training and will be bringing this training back to South Carolina.

Dr. Virtue adjourned the meeting at 2:49 p.m.

Agenda

Members present: Laura Aboyan, Mary Anne Byrnes, Chris Christle, Daniella Cook, Rob Dedmon, Olga Ivashkevich, Allison Jacques, Zach Kelehear, Julia Lopez-Robertson, Hiram McDade, Juliana Miller, Stephanie Milling, William Morris, Crystal Murphree-Holden, Lynda Nilges, Kortney Sherbine, Lucy Spence, Wendy Valerio, David Virtue, Donna Watson, Lemuel Watson, Beth White, Toni Williams

I. Welcome and Introductions
Dr. Virtue called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes
Dr. Kelehear moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Dedmon seconded the motion. The minutes were subsequently approved.

III. Updates from the November Meeting

Dr. Jacques discussed the upcoming Share Fair Nation event at River Bluff High School on March 7, 2015. It is being sponsored by the Morgridge Family Foundation, and provides free professional development for educators. Several members of the PEU will be presenting at the event. Concurrently, an event called the STEAMosphere will be running. This is a set of exhibitions in both the STEM fields and the Arts. In planning the event, partnerships have been forged with the SC Department of Education, the Center for Educational Partnerships, and several national exhibitors. Several departments from USC will also participate in the exhibitions. Dr. Jacques shared a video overview of the event. The video can be found here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=omV1eiiwrkQ.

      a. SPA Report Results (Laura Aboyan)
Ms. Aboyan received the results of each report at the end of January. All 30 programs did very well. Seven programs were nationally recognized on the first attempt, 22 were nationally recognized with conditions, and one was nationally recognized with probation. The items that need to be resubmitted were not unexpected. Ms. Aboyan will continue to work directly with program coordinators to prepare rejoinders for submission within the next 18 months.

      b. Chalk and Wire Update (Laura Aboyan)
Dr. Jacques introduced Chalk and Wire by thanking Dean Watson for his support of the program and for suggesting Dr. Morris as a faculty trainer. The assessment system can be tailored to meet individual needs. The Office of Assessment is working with individual programs to customize the system as needed. Ms. Aboyan, Dr. Jacques, Dr. Morris, and Dr. Jeremy Searson comprise the core group who went through 2.5 days of training in mid-February. Dr. Jacques outlined a tentative plan for training faculty and staff by program. She further discussed all of the things

Chalk and Wire can do, including tracking ADEPT, diversity of placements, and portfolios, though for now, the PEU will focus solely on items related to assessment and accreditation. Dr. Jacques is hopeful that eventually the PEU will be able to expand their use of Chalk and Wire to include all processes and procedures.

Dr. Morris expanded on Dr. Jacques' overview. As the PEU moves forward with implementation, it will need to identify the primary needs of each different program. To help the PEU move forward, Dr. Morris created a framework to describe the capabilities of Chalk and Wire and how they will be approached during implementation. There are five areas that focus on data collection, assessment, collaboration, distribution, and presentation. Training sessions will be held in each area, though for the time being, the focus will be on the collection and assessment stages. Undergraduate and graduates students will be part of the training team, and will assist in developing and leading workshops, and will serve as support during program meetings or on an individual basis.

Dr. Nilges asked if off-campus partners would be able to view assessments within Chalk and Wire. Dr. Morris explained that folks in that position would be registered as guest users and have access through the Chalk and Wire site, but not through Blackboard. Dr. Milling asked if Chalk and Wire has surveying capability, and whether or not this could replace the existing procedure for administering exit surveys and coaching teacher surveys. Ms. Aboyan said that it does have this capability, and that she hopes to implement similar functions after all of the assessment tools are firmly in place. Dr. Nilges asked about the cost and how it would be distributed to students. Ms. Aboyan explained that it is a one-time fee of $99 that will be handled through the bookstore. This fee covers a 5-year membership. Students will be required to purchase a subscription, but the details are still being discussed with the bookstore. Dr. Jacques mentioned that the PEU is working with the bookstore, and that this sort of subscription is done across the university. We are also working with the Career Center to set up training for students on the portfolio and presentation pieces so that students will be able to use Chalk and Wire during interviews. Dr. Morris said that all students will be trained in each of the five areas so they are able to use Chalk and Wire effectively. Dr. Byrnes asked how Chalk and Wire could be used in conjunction with the university's Graduation with Leadership Distinction program. Ms. Aboyan said Dr. Searson is already on tying the GLD requirements to Chalk and Wire. Dr. Virtue asked when training would begin. Dr. Morris is working on a plan and then will identify people and strategies for training. His hope is to begin rigorous sessions during the fall.

Ms. Aboyan provided a brief demonstration of Chalk and Wire. She explained the layout through a table of contents, provided a sample rubric, and showed what the system will look like when accessed through Blackboard. Dr. Cook asked how adjuncts would be able to access assessments. Ms. Aboyan said that their access will be given as guests through the Chalk and Wire site and not through Blackboard.

Dr. Sherbine asked who had access to student data after students have graduated. Dr. Morris said Chalk and Wire has their own server to keep things secure. Student portfolios are not shared unless students choose to do so. Dr. Nilges asked whether or not Chalk and Wire was mobile and tablet friendly. Dr. Morris said that it is optimized for use on mobile devices and tablets.

b. Read to Succeed (Rob Dedmon)

Mr. Dedmon has been working with the South Carolina Department of Education to articulate what our school licensure programs will need to do in order to meet the Read to Succeed requirements. He provided a brief overview of the new law. The 2016-17 bulletin must reflect the new requirements, which means all changes must be approved by the faculty senate and/or graduate council by December 2015. All licensure programs must have coursework that meets the appropriate set of elements (PK-5, Middle Level and High School, or Administrator). Specific requirements were further explained in Mr. Dedmon's PowerPoint presentation, which will be distributed to the committee via email.

Dr. Virtue asked how the approval timeline corresponds with the College of Education's approval process. Mr. Dedmon indicated that individual college and department approval processes must be factored in when considering the timeline, but it will vary by department. Ms. White asked if it was possible to rename existing courses to meet the SCDE's requirements. Mr. Dedmon said that for programs requiring 12 hours, there may be more latitude in the naming of courses and in the assessment of elements as the legislation more clearly articulate two courses required for those needing six hours as opposed to the 12 hours. Dr. Christle asked about a potential revision process to submit proposals for changing these regulations. She asked whether or not the PEU continues to move forward with changes, even though there is a chance that the requirements will change. Dr. Virtue suggested the PEU make a good faith effort to comply with the existing regulations. Dr. Byrnes asked if the PEU has done an inventory of existing programs to see if any currently meet the requirements. Mr. Dedmon said none of the programs are totally compliant, but there are several that are close to meeting all of the requirements. Dean Watson mentioned that he had met with Jen Morrison, where she indicated the SCDE has an idea of where each program in the state is in terms of meeting the requirements, and what changes each program is proposing. Dean Watson said there may be some tweaks made to the process, but for the time being, our programs should focus on the application as it currently exists.

Dr. Byrnes asked if there was a set plan to show how the application moves from each program to Mr. Dedmon for submission. Mr. Dedmon said there are two options for moving forward: programs can adopt courses the College of Education is designing to meet the standards or programs can design new courses to meet standards. Courses at 500 and 600 level can be taken for either undergraduate or graduate credit.

Dr. Milling asked when the form will be received. Ms. Aboyan will email it to the committee following the meeting. Dr. Milling also asked if courses are added, what could be removed. Dr. Kelehear said it is up to each program to decide what will best help students meet accreditation requirements, pass Praxis, and meet licensure requirements. Adding credit hours to graduation requirements is not a viable option.

Dr. Cook suggested investigating cross-listing courses across colleges. Dr. Spence mentioned she and Dr. Sherbine are working on developing an interdisciplinary literacies course to cover literacies in areas like the arts.

The committee will have an interim meeting to further discuss Read to Succeed on March 20 at 1:30 p.m. Ms. Aboyan will confirm a room and time and convey the information to the committee. She will also provide the PowerPoint and the link to find the standards.

Committee members will need to bring the following items to the interim meeting:
- List of existing courses
- Plan for changing courses – use COE courses or design your own
- How courses align to elements
- Descriptions for COE designed courses and what they meet

Dr. Virtue adjourned the meeting at 3:17 p.m.

IV. CITEP Meeting Schedule for 2014-15
- April 24, 2015, 1:30 p.m., Wardlaw 274-O

<div align="center">

CITEP Meeting
November 14, 2014
1:30 PM
Wardlaw 274-O

Minutes

</div>

Members Present:
Laura Aboyan, Nate Carnes, Christine Christle, Rob Dedmon, Ed Dickey, Lara Ducate, Peter Duffy, Karen Heid, Tommy Hodges, Allison Jacques, Zach Kelehear, Christine Lotter, Nina Moreno, Lynda Nilges, Ognian Trifonov, Wendy Valerio, David Virtue, Cookie Winburn

Welcome and Introductions
Dr. Nilges called the meeting to order at 1:36 p.m.

Approval of Minutes
Dr. Nilges asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Dr. Carnes moved that the minutes be approved and Dr. Jacques seconded. The minutes were subsequently approved.

Updates from the September Meeting
- **ADEPT Update (Cookie Winburn/Allison Jacques)**
  Dr. Jacques explained that she, Ms. Winburn, Dr. Carnes, and Dr. Margo Jackson attended a two-day ADEPT training session in October. As of that meeting, no formal decisions about the future of ADEPT had been made, and that much will depend on the direction that the new Superintendent of Education decides to go. Regardless of what is decided, we will be moving to an electronic system. As it stands now, one portion of the new evaluation instrument will be focused on student learning outcomes (SLOs). There is still much variability about what criteria will be used in the new evaluation model. Currently, 50% will be based on the new observation instrument which is still to be determined, 30% will be based on value-added measures for tested areas, and 20% will be at the discretion of the school district, which may involve SLOs. SLOs will definitely make up the 30% for areas without associated tests. The PEU will need to inform our candidates about the new measures once details are available, but the new measures may not impact the way we prepare our candidates. We will propose an ADEPT plan for what evaluation looks like at USC and submit it to the SC Department of Education in May.

  Dr. Lotter asked for an example of SLOs. Dr. Carnes said that in biology they took objectives then designed assessments and benchmarked for consistency. Dr. Heid that in the arts, it sounds like it will be up to individual teachers and districts to design the SLOs. Dr. Carnes said that SLOs could be introduced during unit work samples to teach our candidates about them. Structurally, SLOs will be the same, but they will all have their own nuances.

Dr. Nilges asked about an implementation timeline. Dr. Jacques said that it really depends on the way the new Superintendent prioritizes things. We will need to work on our ADEPT plan, even if it is transitional.

- **Read to Succeed Update (David Virtue)**
Dr. Virtue presented an update from Dr. Diane Stephens. By Fall 2016, all pre-service programs in early childhood and elementary must have a 12-hour sequence of literacy courses. All other areas are required to have 6 hours in foundations of literacy and content area literacy.

  In order to get these changes in the bulletin, courses need to be reviewed and revised. Curricula need to be reviewed and programs need to decide what courses will be offered and how those courses align with the Read to Succeed requirements.

  Dr. Heid asked for recommendations for courses that other programs could use. Dr. Virtue said that for graduate programs, EDRD 600 would meet the foundations of literacy requirement, and EDRD 730 satisfy the content area requirement. Dr. Ducate asked about undergraduate courses. Dr. Dickey said that we need to review all of our programs to see where things would fit or could be adjusted. Dr. Hodges said that the elementary program is currently three hours short, and so is looking at managing it by having the 3 required hours take place during student teaching and reallocating those 3 hours to ELA.

  Dr. Duffy asked if there is a clearly articulated goal so courses could be retooled to meet the standards. All new courses must be reviewed and approved by the Read to Succeed committee. Dr. Valerio asked if reading music would count toward content literacy. Dr. Dickey said probably not because it is unlikely to meet the IRA standards. Dr. Virtue asked if it would be helpful to get a group together with Dr. Stephens to help explain the standards and explore ways to rework courses. The committee was overwhelmingly in favor of this proposal.

  Dr. Virtue suggested that maybe the new requirements could be addressed through Carolina Core. Dr. Kelehear said we need to discuss it as a unit and come up with a plan for addressing them for continuity. Dr. Virtue said he will try to set something up with Dr. Stephens before Christmas. Dr. Jacques suggested we form a sub-committee or working group to concentrate specifically on this issue.

New Business
- **Electronic Assessment System (Laura Aboyan)**
Ms. Aboyan informed the group that the College leadership had a conference call with Chalk and Wire and that things were moving forward. We are in the early planning stages, but will continue to update the group as we move forward. We will be hosting training sessions throughout the spring, and plan to have two programs pilot it in the summer, with a full rollout scheduled for the fall. The system is fully customizable, so we will work with programs on an individual basis to make sure their needs are met.

- **CAEP Update (Allison Jacques/Laura Aboyan)**

The kickoff to CAEP will begin in January with a session at the All College Meeting. During that time, the Office of Assessment will discuss the new standards and what they mean for the PEU. During this session, we will also go into more detail about Chalk and Wire and what can be expected there. Additional training sessions on both CAEP and Chalk and Wire will be held throughout the spring.

- **Dispositions (Zach Kelehear)**
  Dr. Kelehear asked about the extent to which programs capture dispositional data over time. He stressed that as the PEU moves forward with CAEP, we will need to present continuous, reliable, and valid dispositional data across programs. The PEU will work with Drs. Monrad and Dickenson to reevaluate our assessments and establish the reliability and validity of those assessments. CAEP will review our plans to implement high-quality, reliable, and valid assessments. Dr. Carnes asked if this will be part of each program's QCom review. Dr. Jacques said that moving forward, we will use QCom as an additional method for evaluating existing assessment.

  Dr. Christle asked for a follow up report on the availability of Praxis testing in Columbia. This has not yet been done, but the PEU will need to advocate for a testing site in Columbia.

  Dr. Duffy mentioned that we will need to define what it means to be a teacher from our programs. Dr. Jacques said can be done through the CAEP process. As we move forward, we can change as needed as a unit to make sure that our candidates receive the training and skills needed to be successful in the field and to demonstrate exactly what that looks like.

- **PDS Update (Allison Jacques)**
  The PEU is very committed to having PDS, and fostering a formal partnership between schools and faculty, especially in terms of research involvement. The PDS Network meets needs at the school level and needs of faculty scholarship. Dr. Jacques provided an example of the work that Dr. Hodges has facilitated with Oak Pointe Elementary. Faculty should be reaching out to the Office of Clinical Experiences with ideas for PDS partnerships so that the office and facilitate the partnership. The office continues to look at expanding the network and integrating the needs of schools with faculty research needs. The office is working on modeling to show the implications of this type of partnership on teaching and research load and funding.

CITEP Meeting Schedule for 2014-15
- February 20, 2015, 1:30 p.m., Wardlaw 274-O
- April 24, 2015, 1:30 p.m., Wardlaw 274-O

Dr. Virtue adjourned the meeting at 2:47 p.m.

Welcome and Introductions
Members Present: Laura Aboyan, Lauren Brown, Nate Carnes, Chris Christle, Rob Dedmon, Lara Ducate, Peter Duffy, Tommy Hodges, Courtney Hoover, Allison Jacques, Zach Kelehear, Herman Knopf, Beth Looney, Christine Lotter, Lynda Nilges-Charles, Kristy Sokol, Wendy Valerio, David Virtue, Cookie Winburn

Dr. Kelehear called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. He asked everyone to provide a brief introduction to the group.

Approval of Minutes
Ms. Aboyan will send the minutes from the April 2014 meeting to the committee. At that time, she will ask for any needed corrections and the April 2014 minutes will be approved electronically.

Review of CITEP Mission (David Virtue)
Dr. Virtue shared the CITEP mission statement with the group. The mission can be found on the College of Education's NCATE website here:
http://www.ed.sc.edu/faculty_pdf_files/PEU%20Governance%20Structure%20and%20Diagrams.pdf

PEU Updates (Lynda Nilges-Charles)
- **Office of Clinical Experiences (Cookie Winburn)**
  Well over 300 students are in the field this fall, including a cohort of Palmetto College students. A second group of Palmetto College students will be placed October.

  Ms. Winburn also provided updates regarding ADEPT. At this time, the evaluation format and process is the same as it has been. On October 15th, the SC Department of Education is holding a workshop to discuss potential changes to ADEPT. Ms. Winburn will share any changes with the committee at the November meeting.

  Ms. Winburn is also working on changes to the ADEPT training structure with Dean Watson. Depending on whether or not the SCDE chooses to implement a value-added model, USC may need to investigate the use of a collaborative teaching model to replace the current student teaching model. However, no changes to USC's model will be made until the new system is announced at the October 15th meeting. Dr. Christle mentioned that the Palmetto State Teachers Association indicated that teacher reflection is being pushed for the 20% of the model labeled as "district choice." Ms. Winburn's understanding is that teachers will set their own goals. Dr. Jacques added that any changes may be modified after the SCDE has a new Superintendent and administration. There will likely be two phases to implementation: 1) The policies put in place by the current administration, and 2) New policies and goals set by the new administration.

Ms. Winburn announced that on October 3rd at the Seawell's Conference Center, SCASCD will be hosting a guest speaker and all candidates for state superintendent. This program is open to both in-service and pre-service teachers for $25.

Dr. Carnes asked how ADEPT impacts SPA reporting, as many SPAs require that ADEPT be program specific. Dr. Lotter asked what the teacher observation instrument will be. Ms. Winburn said its still pending, but it will likely have a 5th domain, which shouldn't impact pre-service teachers. She indicated that we will know for sure after the October meeting.

- **Licensure (Lauren Brown)**
- **Student Services (Rob Dedmon)**
  Mr. Dedmon shared the recent changes in the Office of Student Services with the committee. Emmie May is retiring at the end of September. Courtney Hoover has been hired to work with online graduate programs and with MAT and MT students. Kristy Sokol has been here since July, and is working with undergraduate programs outside the College of Education. Lauren Brown has taken on all licensure responsibilities.

Update on 2013-2014 CITEP Goals (Lynda Nilges-Charles)
- **ADEPT Training (Cookie Winburn)**
  Ms. Winburn said that two Coaching Teacher trainings have been held, and that they have received good feedback. Dr. Christle said she is waiting on the formal survey analysis, but based on the anecdotal evidence, she would like to require all of her new coaching teachers to attend a training session. She would like to have it offered once a year, preferably in August.

  Dr. Lotter asked if an additional session could be held in December because secondary programs don't necessarily know who their coaches are for the year prior to the fall semester. Dr.Nilges-Charles asked how many coaching teachers had attended the training. Ms. Winburn said that there were about 25 at their last session. Dr. Nilges-Charles suggested that if there was a way to pay for substitutes in the school so teachers could attend, it might increase attendance. Ms. Winburn said that she will look into the logistics of doing so. If that were the case, there would need to be multiple trainings, so that there were no more than 50 people at any session. Sessions could be organized by districts, and possibly opened up to university supervisors as well.

- **SPA Reports (Laura Aboyan)**
  All reports were submitted on September 15th. Results should be announced in 4-5 months. Dr. Nilges-Charles asked about only having one administration of data. Dr. Jacques said that we have to have the recognition from SPA, so we'll have to continue to submit data. Dr. Nilges-Charles asked for an update on the status of the electronic assessment system. Dr. Jacques said that we are waiting on a potential grant to come through so that we can work through the funding issues.

- **Updated syllabi to reflect Common Core State Standards**
  Dr. Kelehear said that CCSS is no longer the driving force in the state. The new emphasis will be on career and college readiness. Standards are currently being developed to address these areas. Dr. Jacques said the SCDE is now using the term the "New State

Standards." It is expected that the New State Standards will be released for ELA and Math in March 2015.

Updates from the SC Department of Education (David Virtue)

- **GPA Requirement (Rob Dedmon)**
  The SCDE is now requiring a 2.75 GPA for admission to undergraduate teacher education programs. This requirement is being phased in over two years. Students admitted to USC in 2014-15 need a 2.6 to be admitted to the professional program. Students admitted to USC from Fall 2015 forward will need a 2.75 to be admitted to the professional program. Dr. Lotter asked how this impacts MT students. Mr. Dedmon said graduate programs must have admission standards similar to other graduate programs at USC. He is currently working on bulletin updates to reflect these changes.

  There are similar issues for transfer student admissions to the degree program. Mr. Dedmon suggests that degree admission requirements for transfer students be set to a 2.5. Transfer students will still be required to have a 2.75 for professional program admission. State policy says that 5% of the total students admitted to the professional program may be admitted through a petitioning process if their GPA is between 2.5 and 2.75. Dr. Knopf asked how this might change as Palmetto College grows. How will we determine who the 5% will be, will there be a deadline, etc. He also asked if some of those 5% need to be allotted to non-COE programs. Dr. Duffy wanted to know how this will impact access and diversity across programs.

- **Praxis II Exam Changes (Rob Dedmon)**
  Mr. Dedmon provided a handout with a listing of new exams and passing scores. Ms. Brown asked committee members to direct students to the "prepare" page on the ETS website for study guides and other preparation materials. Dr. Hodges asked if we are able to influence which tests are adopted by the SCDE. He is concerned about the emphasis on content rather than pedagogy. Dr. Jacques said she would provide additional information as needed. Dr. Christle asked about availability of testing and sites. Dr. Jacques said she would work with Mr. Dedmon to speak to ETS client relations about test availability. Dr. Knopf suggested that we rent space in the College of Education to ETS so our students can take the exams here.

- **ADEPT Training (Cookie Winburn)**

- **Read to Succeed (David Virtue)**
  Dr. Virtue discussed the impacts of the Read to Succeed legislation on in-service and pre-service teachers. It appears that there will be requirements across all areas, not just early childhood, elementary, middle level, and secondary. Pre-service guidelines will be issued on October 1st. Dr. Virtue will update the committee in November about how these guidelines will impact other content areas. Curriculum changes need to be in place by the 2016-17 academic year. Changes will need to be approved by faculty senate by December 2015. Program areas will need to make recommendations for changes by fall 2015. Any proposed changes will need to be approved by CHE by end of spring 2015. Dr. Kelehear will work with the committee administrative team to submit a timeline and information about how this impacts non-COE programs for Read to Succeed changes. The team will contact the SCDE for clarification. Dr. Knopf asked how this will impact

the speech pathology program, and whether or not their program is aware of the impending changes.

New Business (David Virtue and Lynda Nilges-Charles)
- **Goals for the 2014-15 academic year**
  - Timeline for ADEPT implementation
  - Read to Succeed Implementation Plan
  - Continuation of Coaching Teacher Training

- **Professional Collaborations (Pecha Kucha) (Peter Duffy)**
  Dr. Duffy shared a method of presentation with the group, designed to provide a brief way to share information and provide a vehicle to discuss your passions. The presentation is timed, featuring 20 slides at 20 seconds each, and made up mostly of images. Dr. Duffy discussed how little we know about our colleagues in the PEU, and proposed that one or two people present their own Pecha Kucha at each CITEP meeting. Peter talked about how little we know about each other. Drs. Nilges-Charles and Virtue will present at the November meeting.

Dr. Virtue adjourned the meeting at 3:08 p.m.

CITEP Meeting Schedule for 2014-15
- November 14, 2014, 1:30 p.m., Wardlaw 274-O
- February 20, 2015, 1:30 p.m., Wardlaw 274-O
- April 24, 2015, 1:30 p.m., Wardlaw 274-O

Professional Education Unit
CITEP Meeting
April 17, 2014
3:00 PM
Wardlaw 274-D

MINUTES

Members present: Laura Aboyan, Nate Carnes, Chris Christle, Rob Dedmon, Ed Dickey, Peter Duffy, Bruce Field, Olga Ivashkevich, Zach Kelehear, Jeremy Lane, Lara Lomicka, Paul Malovrh, Emmie May, Diane McGhee-Valle, Nina Moreno, Lynda Nilges, Mary Styslinger, David Virtue, Lemuel Watson

1. Welcome, announcements and update on goals: Dr. Zach Kelehear
   - Floor opens for nominations for CITEP Chair
     o Dr. Kelehear opened the floor for nominations. There were no nominations put forward.
     o Dr. Lane is leaving the University. His colleague in Music Education, Dr. Wendy Valerio, will be taking on his current responsibilities.
     o Dr. Field will be leaving for Georgia Southern and his position is being advertised

2. Approval of Minutes from October 25, 2013 meeting
   - Mr. Duffy moved to approve the minutes.
   - Ms. McGhee-Valle seconded the motion, and the minutes were subsequently approved.

3. CAEP Update: Dr. Zach Kelehear
   - CAEP Accreditation Standards
   - CAEP Evidence Guide
   - Guide to CAEP Accreditation: The CI Pathway

Mr. Dedmon discussed new professional program admission requirements, specifically the change from Praxis I to Praxis Core. Praxis I will be accepted for admission until June 30, 2014. After that date, applicants must take Praxis Core. Students must take all three parts of the same exam.

Mr. Dedmon also discussed the new GPA requirement for professional program admission. There will be a brief period to phase in the new requirements, which will be based on the semester in which students first enter the university. Those entering prior to Fall 2014 will be required to meet the current 2.5 GPA requirement. Students entering during the 2014-2015 academic year will need to meet the minimum 2.6 GPA requirement. Beginning in Fall 2015, all students will be required to have at least a 2.75 GPA to be admitted into the

professional program. Dr. Nilges asked how these new requirements will impact transfer students. Mr. Dedmon said that it will be based on the student's overall GPA. Dr. Watson mentioned that CAEP recommends using 3.0 as a minimum GPA. As a result, the Professional Education Unit will likely change its policies in the future, but the time frame for doing so is still unclear. Mr. Duffy asked if the PEU would be able to track the impact of the new requirements on the diversity of its candidates. He is concerned that higher requirements will eliminate some students based on socio-economic status or other demographics. Dr. Field added that the CAEP standard actually reads that the 3.0 GPA requirement is an average GPA of all students, not an individual student requirement.

Dr. Kelehear discussed the new CAEP standards. He mentioned that the Unit is discussing focusing on Standard 1, which emphasizes the 10 InTASC standards. CAEP emphasizes using data to make decisions, rather than just collecting it. This will necessitate a shift in practice within the Unit.

4. CAEP 101: Dr. Zach Kelehear
    - Date to be finalized for early fall

5. Spring CAEP Report for Unit: Dr. Zach Kelehear
    - Choosing a standard of focus
    - New items for consideration

6. InTASC Standards: Beginning the Discussion: Dr. Zach Kelehear
    - A new level of importance
    - Relationship to CAEP Standard One
        o The InTASC standards are embedded within CAEP Standard 1
        o The College of Education is currently preparing national reports for submission, with a focus on CAEP Standard 1.

7. SPA Reports: Laura Aboyan
    - Deadlines for Data Reporting
        o Ms. Aboyan provided information about upcoming due dates for data submission, distribution of completed data summaries, and submission of completed SPA reports. The dates are June 1, July 1, and September 1, respectively.
        o Ms. Aboyan also announced a SPA 101 workshop to be help on April 29, from 12:30-2:30 in Wardlaw 274-D.

Dr. Dickey asked who would be responsible for the final submission of reports. Ms. Aboyan answered that she and Dr. Jacques would proofread each report and submit the final drafts. Dr. Styslinger asked when faculty would receive login information for reporting. Ms. Aboyan said that it would be provided during the SPA 101 session.

8. Background Checks and TB Tests: Rob Dedmon
   - Timeline and Logistics

Since Fall 2013, some districts have been requiring candidates to provide documentation of a negative TB test. Some districts have also asked for additional background checks. Dr. Field stated that districts are now requiring more of our candidates before they are permitted in the schools. He has worked with the districts this year to determine what exactly they require. Candidates will still need to complete background checks for student teaching as part of the SC Department of Education requirements. TB tests will be required to go into schools for any reason, but will only need to be done once. They are valid indefinitely. Dr. Field's office is working on a way to streamline this process.

Dr. Carnes voiced his concern over the cost of additional requirements, specifically about how the additional fees will impact candidates.

9. Electronic Assessment System: Dr. Zach Kelehear

Dr. Kelehear explained that we need an electronic assessment system to be more in line with CAEP reporting requirements, SACS, and SPAs. Two products were brought campus: Chalk & Wire and LiveText. Based on the features of each product and feedback from faculty and staff, Chalk & Wire is likely to be the system chosen.

10. Common Core Assessment Update: Dr. Zach Kelehear
    - South Carolina's withdrawal from Smarter Balanced Testing Consortium

Dr. Dickey said that the state board voted to rescind the letter sent in early April. The new plan is to put out bids for testing services, so Smarter Balanced may still end up being used in South Carolina. Florida and Alabama are using different tests. Indiana has dropped Common Core entirely. Dr. Kelehear said that more information will be forwarded to CITEP once a final decision has been reached by the state board.

Dr. Kelehear asked whether our goal of including Common Core in our syllabi is still appropriate. Dr. Lane mentioned that SCMEA has written new music standards that don't necessarily correspond to Common Core. Dr. Dickey suggested that programs continue to do what their professional associations suggest unless it centers on ELA or Math.

Dr. Christle provided an update on the coaching teacher trainings. She said that the December session went extremely well. The next session will be in August, along with ADEPT training. She has received good feedback, and most ask for additional practice with coaching scenarios. Dr. Carnes asked how coaching teachers are invited to participate in this opportunity. Dr. Christle said that the December session was used as a pilot, but invitations will be extended to all coaching teachers for the August session.

The work with SPA reports, including Common Core State Standards in curriculum, and with Coaching Teacher development all connect to the three goals outlined at the fall 2013 CITEP meeting. Important progress is being made toward full implementation of the three goals.

A lively discussion concluded the session as Professor Duffy asked about the PEU's need to lead change, to anticipate competing demands. Dean Watson affirmed Professor Duffy's comments and reflected on his presence at the various tables where these changes were being considered. Much is yet to be done, but the message was clear in this final dialogue that the PEU has a special opportunity to lead the way as opposed to being led along the way.

11. Election of CITEP Chair: Dr. Zach Kelehear

Dr. Virtue volunteered to be the co-chair. His self-nomination was accepted by the committee. Dr. Virtue will be the co-chair for the upcoming year. Upon leaving, Dr. Nilges also volunteered to work with Dr. Virtue as co-chairs of the committee.

University of South Carolina
Committee for Initial Teacher Education Programs (CITEP)
Friday, April 19, 2013
Wardlaw Room 274-O
1:30-3:00

Members present: Allison Jacques, Diane McGhee-Valle, Christine Lotter, Chris Christle, Emmie May, Laura Aboyan, Zach Kelehear, Dennis Dotterer, Gloria Boutte, Lara Lomicka-Anderson, David Virtue, Peter Dufy, Karen Heid, Beth Powers-Costello, Susan Quinn, Ognian Trifonov

This meeting was recorded and can be viewed here: https://breeze.sc.edu/p6l52yg6xfj/

I. Introductions: Chris Christle (2 minutes): Any new attendees

Dr. Christle called the meeting to order at 1:38 p.m.

II. Approval of the Minutes: Chris Christle (2 minutes)
Christine Lotter moved to approve the minutes. There were no corrections and the minutes were approved.

III. Common Core State Standards (CCSS): Allison Jacques: (15 minutes)

Dr. Jacques shared a brief PowerPoint presentation, outlining smarter-balanced assessment, focusing primarily on the new types of assessment items. Part of the presentation focused on what teachers should do to prepare for the move to CCSS. Dr. Jacques said that teachers should align assessment instructions with the standards, use clear measurement criteria, assess performance often and in a variety of ways, and require extended writing assessment. Further, assessments should be portfolio based with clear examples of progress and details about how the results will be used to inform future instruction.

Dr. Lotter mentioned that the new science standards have a large argument component, which ties directly to some of the new assessment characteristics. Dr. Christle expressed concern that students must complete some complicated test problems in a short period of time, whereas in real life such problems would take much longer to complete.

Dr. Jacques provided a handout with several resources on CCSS and encouraged everyone to visit the Smarter Balanced website and provide feedback on draft test questions: www.smarterbalanced.org

IV. Teacher Evaluation: Guest Speaker: Dennis Dotterer: Exec Director of SC TAP and Interim Director of the Office of Evaluation of SCDOE (45 minutes)

Mr. Dotterer discussed how the SCDOE is moving toward a new method of teacher and school evaluation. In their application for an ESEA Waiver, South Carolina chose Option B, and is using the existing guidelines as a basis for the current teacher evaluation standards. New standards will be tested through a pilot program for the 2013-14 academic year, using 8-12 school districts across the state. The SCDOE is using two different rubrics to see which works better, Enhanced ADEPT and SC Teaching Standards. He described the "Enhanced ADEPT," that includes a five-point rubric, that would replace

the current Met or Not Met evaluation. The SCDOE is building the evaluation system based on seven commitments:

- Evaluations will be used for continual improvement of instruction
- Differentiate performance using at least three performance levels
- Use student growth as a significant factor – All teachers much demonstrate student growth in a reliable way
- Teachers and principals will be evaluated on a regular basis
- Clear, timely, and useful feedback that identifies needs and guides professional development will be provided within approximately 48 hours of observation
- Generate data to inform personnel decisions
- Create buy-in to the system by training teachers, principals, and evaluators on the purpose, elements, and roles in implementing the system

Dr. Jacques asked if USC would get scores for our graduates.

Mr. Dotterer said they are working out the best way to return specific scores and their components to the colleges and universities throughout the state. The College of Education will receive data for their graduates annually. Mr. Dotterer explained that the revised ADEPT system is intended to be used as a holistic instrument, not as a checklist. He explained that teachers will all receive a "Teacher Effectiveness Rating" based on the following: 50% performance from observation data, 30% of student growth data-- individual value-added ratings, and 20% on school-wide value-added ratings.
Dr. McGhee-Valle asked how evaluators will be chosen based on depth of knowledge. Mr. Dotterer said that one evaluator must be a school administrator and the other must be an expert in the content area. There should be a content specialist identified as an evaluator for every school. This is one area where the SCDOE needs to determine how this process will be instituted for continuing teachers.

Dr. Kelehear asked what the incentive is for new teachers to go to low-performing schools. Mr. Dotterer said that low-performing schools are part of the reason the SCDOE is using a value-added model. Under this model, standards are adjusted to level the playing field. Expectations of student growth are determined by school. Student growth, rather than student attainment, will be measured over time.

V. Coaching Teacher Training update: Chris Christle (2 minutes)

Cookie Winburn and Jason Fulmer from CERRA have created a one-day workshop outline. The committee will meet in May to determine the logistics and what is needed for the workshop. General information about coaching will be provided during the initial session. After that, programs can create their own workshops to address specifics in each area.

Ms. Winburn, Dr. Field, and Mr. Fulmer are offering training on August 12-14 for foundations in mentoring. This session is designed for those who plan to train coaching teachers.

VI. Annual Goals: Zach Kelehear (3 minutes)

Dr. Kelehear explained that based on member feedback, we developed three goals for CITEP for the coming year:

- By April 2014 all syllabi that address curriculum standards in each program will be updated to include CCSS.
- By April 2014 a coaching teacher training system will be available for use by all teacher education programs.
- By April 2014 each program will have completed a SPA report for submission in Fall 2014.

The committee agreed to adopt these goals for the next year.

VII. Supply and demand of teachers in SC: Zach Kelehear (5 minutes)

Dr. Kelehear noted that there has been a 60% increase in unfilled teaching slots in the last year. English and STEM areas have the most vacancies. There are also high numbers of vacancies in low-performing districts.

VIII. Transition to CAEP: Allison Jacques (10 minutes)

Dr. Jacques said that the new CAEP standards should be finalized in June. Program reports for each program will be due in Fall 2014.

As a way to meet the University's SACS requirement, program change forms are being distributed to each program coordinator. These forms are due to either Dr. Jacques or Ms. Aboyan by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, May 17. Change forms are then sent from the College of Education to the Office of Institutional Assessment and Compliance, and are due to IAC by June 1 and will become part of the University Assessment System.

IX. Announcements: Chris Christle and Zach Kelehear (5 minutes)
The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for Friday, October 25th, 2013.

X. Good of the Order

XI. Adjourn

Dr. Christle adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Attendance: Chris Christle, Zach Kelehear, Allison Jacques, Laura Aboyan, Nina Moreno, Rob Dedmon, Karen Heid, Lynda Nilges, Bruce Field, Emmie May, Christine Lotter, Lara Lomicka, Jeremy Lane, Nathaniel Bryan (Elem & EC), Rachelle Washington (L&L), David Virtue, Katie Wolfe (SpEd), George Roy (ML Math), Bridget Miller (EC), Christie Martin (Elem), Kellah Edens

Introductions: Chris Christle asked everyone to introduce him or herself. Zach Kelehear introduced several new faculty he had asked to sit in on the meeting for them to get an idea of what CITEP does.

1. **Approval of the Minutes - Chris Christle** Dr. Christle called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m. Dr. Field moved to approve the minutes. Dr. Moreno seconded the motion. The minutes were approved.

2. **Old Business**
   a. Zach Kelehear spoke on the Progress on our CITEP Annual Goals:
      - By April 2014 all syllabi that address curriculum standards in each program will be updated to include CCSS.
         - Dr. Kelehear asked faculty to consider to what extent Common Core State Standards could be included in the curriculum. Dr. Jacques discussed implications for everyone, not just ELA and Math.

      - By April 2014 a coaching teacher training system will be available for use by all teacher education programs.
         - Dr. Christle discussed the creation of a coaching teaching workshop. The committee intends for the workshop to include information about the basics of coaching and also offer practice coaching scenarios. A 3-hour pilot workshop for coaching teachers on a general level will be held on December 7th. The committee's intent is that following this workshop, programs would be able to develop more specific workshop for their particular areas. The committee also hopes to offer future workshops discussing how to incorporate training for coaches and supervisors on the new teacher evaluation system. Linda Nigles asked Bruce if his office could offer the ADEPT training the same day as the coaching workshop. He agreed that this would be a good idea. Chris will send out an email to the CITEP membership announcing the workshop so they can send it to interested coaches and supervisors.

      - By April 2014 each program will have completed a SPA report for submission in Fall 2014.
         - Program report submissions must be completed by Fall 2014. Dr. Jacques said that she has met with several programs and is continuing to meet with others about submissions and changing standards. She stressed that it is very important not to wait until the last minute to submit data, so that the data summaries can be produced in a timely manner. Ms. Aboyan said that she has audited each COE program to determine what data are missing. She established deadlines for **submission of old data by November 22nd**, **submission of Fall 2013 data by January 24th**, and **submission of Spring 2013 data by June**

15th. Dr. Virtue asked if spring data needed to be included in the program reports. Dr. Jacques said that if there are enough administrations of each assessment without spring data, they do not need to be included.

3. **New Business:**
   a. Bruce Field
      - TB Tests and Criminal Background Checks
         - Since we have students in schools before student teaching, we should have extra background checks. Richland One already requires additional checks through their internal system. Lexington 1 and Lexington-Richland School District 5 are requiring proof of a negative TB test for everyone in the schools in any capacity, including practica, courses taught in schools, and internships. After conversation with districts, USC must provide proof of a negative TB test and a SLED check for every student who goes into any school for any reason. USC will require students to have the TB test and require students to carry the burden of getting the SLED check. Dr. Field plans to implement this policy beginning in Fall 2014. Students will still need to follow the current process for fingerprinting for student teaching. Dr. Lane suggested that this new process be embedded into a specific course. Dr. Field agreed, stating that the process will vary a bit by program.

      - New SC Educator Evaluation System
         - The SC Department of Education is designing a new system of educator evaluation to incorporate value-added measures. Teachers will be evaluated the same way as before, but now there will also be value-added components, to focus on student growth rather than achievement. There will also be a component concerning collective school growth. There are two different evaluation systems being piloted this year, TAP and Enhanced ADEPT. Full implementation of a new evaluation system is expected in Fall 2014. Dr. Field has put together a workshop on Thursday, December 5th from 4-6 p.m. to explain more about the new system and the process for implementation. Dr. Virtue asked what other institutions around the state are doing in response to this. Dr. Field said that he doesn't know yet, but it is one of the agenda items for the 31 Deans' Meeting in January.

      - I-95 Corridor Scholarship
         - Beginning in Spring 2014, there are six, $1000 scholarships for student teachers teaching along the I-95 corridor. Logistics will need to be worked out on a program-to-program basis, and coordinated through Dr. Field's office. Fairfield Co. will also offer scholarships for student teaching.

   b. Rob Dedmon and Allison Jacques
      - Changes in Praxis Testing
         - Praxis I is now Praxis Core. While the test itself has changed, there continue to be three sections – reading, writing, and math. Mr. Dedmon requested that all programs update their materials to reflect this change. Students can continue to take Praxis I through August 31, 2014. They must pass all three sections of the same test. They cannot mix and match scores from the Praxis I and Praxis Core. The Praxis Core is only

available via computer. Students can still exempt the Praxis Core through their ACT or SAT scores. The Praxis Core covers the same content as the Praxis I, but is a lengthier and more time-consuming exam. Test preparation is available through Office of Student Affairs.

- There have been several changes made in the required Praxis II exams. Dr. Jacques said that the SCDE is considering changing additional tests, one of which is the Elementary Praxis II. The proposed change would focus more on content and less on pedagogy. Dr. Jacques indicated that the change would be of interest to Special Education programs since their candidates currently take the Elementary Praxis exam to become "Highly Qualified" in Special Education, as required in Title II, Part A of No Child Left Behind. The SCDE is also moving away from general science licensure, and focusing more on licensure in a specific discipline. Teachers would then be able to obtain general science licensure as an add-on. Dr. Lotter commented that her students rarely get hired unless they have a general science licensure.

- Kellah Edens explained the changes being made in EDPY 401/401P:
    - The changes in EDPY 401 will go into effect in Fall 2015. Because many programs no longer require the associated practicum, the EDPY faculty decided to delete EDPY 401P from the course offerings. They are still planning to offer EDPY 401, and will embed field experiences within the course. The last offering of 401P will be spring 2015. Ms. May asked how students will have the hours to earn a cognate in education without the practicum. Mr. Dedmon said that this change may require changes to the curriculum listed in the bulletin.

c. Higher Ed Issues and Policies: How they affect us
- Dr. Christle pointed out the new website available that rates colleges and universities, the college scorecard, and suggested we keep up with issues affecting the teaching profession.
    - President Obama's plan for evaluating IHEs:
    http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/education/higher-education
    http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/09/05/margaret-spellings-reacts-obama-higher-education-plan

Zach Kelehear brought up a website that shows the percentage of low-income students in the nation, showing that low-income children are the majority in public schools in 17 states, 13 of which are in the South. The report suggests we need to improve how we educate low-income students. Dr. Christle asked, "What does it mean to teach children in poverty? How do we train our students to adequately teach impoverished children?" Dr. Edens said that some institutions in the state are developing courses to focus on dealing with children in poverty. Dr. Jacques said that the SCDE offers an add-on endorsement in this area. Francis Marion is leading the charge on developing the coursework, but the PEU might consider developing course work to offer candidates the opportunity to earn courses for that add on.

- Dr. Christle reported that a provision was included in the bill Congress passed to reopen the government that now gives Teach for America participants highly-qualified status for two years. She discussed that we are under pressure from competition of online institutions and alternative certification programs. She suggested we really need to advertise what we

do well and why students should come here. Dr. Lotter said that part of Dr. Dickey's grant money is used to advertise USC's STEM education programs.

4. Announcements: Chris Christle and Zach Kelehear
    a. Next meeting: February. Date TBD after faculty input, but will likely be the 3rd Friday of the month.
    b. Topics for future meetings:
        - Can and should we offer an education degree without teacher certification?
        - Field experiences: What does the research say?
            - Quality of experience vs. quantity. Quality trumps quantity. More diverse settings better for student teachers.
        - Others?
            - Email ideas prior to next meeting
            - Results of coaching teacher workshop
            - Requiring Praxis II before student teaching
            - Follow up on I-95 scholarships

5. Good of the Order

6. Adjourn
    a. Dr. Christle adjourned the meeting at 3:02 p.m.

CITEP
February 22, 2013
MINUTES

1. ATTENDEES
List here: Laura Aboyan, Erica Bissell, Mary Ann Byrnes, Christine Christle, Rob Dedmon, Dennis Dotterer, Peter Duffy, Bruce Field, Karen Heid, Marcella Heyward-Evans, Allison Jacques, Zach Kelehear, Camelia Knapp, Sandra Lindsey, Lara Lomicka, Christine Lotter, Emmie May, Erin Miller, Lynda Nilges, Morgan Platt, Bob Pruzin, Kim Smoak, Ken Vogler, Beth White, Cheryl Wissick

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Ed Dickey moved that the minutes from the October 2012 meeting be approved; Bruce Field seconded.

3. OLD BUSINESS
o Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and Assessment: Panel Discussion.
  Allison Jacques introduced the Common Core representatives and explained the purpose of their attendance. The presentation can be viewed in its entirety here: https://breeze.sc.edu/p99wteupb4u/

  Dr. Erica Bissell from Lexington School District Two spoke about her experience relating to Common Core in relation to the SC Department of Education. Her main points were:
  o Lexington Two has implemented Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in K-2. Implementation in grades 3-12 will start in the 2013-14 academic year. Smarter Balanced assessments will be fully implemented in 2014-15.
  o The district has instituted Professional Development Strategies:
    o Implementation Team – trained in CCSS, report all necessary CCSS information back to their schools
    o Instructional Shift Models – demonstrate instructional practices needed for successful CCSS implementation, and the best practices to move forward.
    o Conduct CCSS mini-conferences for administrators and teacher leaders to discuss implementation plans
    o Smarter Balanced Assessment policy director brought in to teach administrators and lead teachers about new assessment methods
    o Annual summer institute is a week-long professional development opportunity to learn more about CCSS.
    o Leadership & Learning Center to focus on rigorous curriculum design

  o ELA instructional shifts in practice represent a shift from narrative focus to a balance of informational and literary text, content-rich non-fiction, more complex text, and gaining evidence from text. The focus on writing is to inform, with sources of evidence.
  o Shifts in Math – coherence across and within grades

- o Other things to consider: Depth of knowledge, formative assessments to determine learning progression, technology integration, context over content because learning happens across content, preparation for 21st century skills
- o Smarter Balanced assessment to teach beyond the test so that students are college and real-world ready

- o Ms. Renee Matthews from East Point Academy provided an overview of the school's Chinese Immersion Program:
    - The mission is to provide proficiency in Mandarin by 8th grade, but proficiency in typical school subjects by 3rd grade.
    - They use a 50/50 Foreign Language Immersion model – most students have no knowledge of Chinese at the beginning and are not required to be tested in order to be admitted.
    - Because the school does not have a set attendance zone, it can serve anyone in South Carolina. Currently the school serves students from five counties.
    - This year, the school is piloting proficiency testing based on American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) assessments.
    - The curriculum focuses on self-regulation, with ten minutes of direct instruction followed by activities and inquiry based learning for the remaining time in each class.

- o Sandy Avinger, the math consultant from Richland School District One, spoke about her experiences with CCSS:
    - It is vital that PE and Arts teachers take ownership of how their curriculum interacts with CCSS.
    - Jude Barrineau, a 7th grade math teacher at Hand Middle School, spoke about how she has begun to incorporate CCSS into her classroom with her student teachers:
        - o Begin with the end in mind – Know what is the reality and what first year teachers will need to be successful
        - o Foster the ability to teach conceptually. Many teachers are heavy on content and lack the skills of how to teach the content.
        - o Teach strategies "how to solve" and provide multiple representations.
        - o Create a "toolkit" to allow students to take ownership of their skills.
    - Jennifer Guest, a math teacher from Hand Middle School, talked about secondary CCSS in relation to pre-service teachers:
        - o Vertical articulation is extremely important. She stressed that a combination of strong conceptual understanding and explanatory ability makes the ideal candidate because everything is interrelated.
        - o Teachers are facilitators and should enrich learning in conceptual fashion.

    Dr. Christle asked how we should teach our pre-service teachers to use the technology in the schools. Ms. Matthews included a teacher prep list in her packet that stressed the importance of adaptability and the evaluation of resources. The guest panel discussed the use and importance of technology in education. Technology must be used to enhance and deepen learning, as opposed to just being the only tool used because the students cannot miss out on tactile

experiences. They suggested that we need to teach "media literacy" for students to become cautious consumers—good digital natives.

o Teacher Evaluation: Dennis Dotterer, Interim Director of the Office of Evaluation from the SC Department of Education (SCDE), briefly presented on new teacher evaluation systems. The SCDE is currently beta testing TOPS (Teacher Observation & Performance Scale) evaluations this year. These were designed by reforming the existing ADEPT structure into a rubric-based evaluation tool. The intent is to keep the holistic nature of ADEPT, but also to give guidance in the evaluation process by moving to a five point scale.

TOPS is being tested as a means of providing continual improvement of instruction. The ultimate goal is to have all teachers evaluated multiple times over the course of the year. Eventually, TOPS will be combined with the Classroom Value-Added and School Value-Added ratings to provide an overall teacher effectiveness rating. The SCDE is investigating the best way to bring all three ratings together.

o Coaching Teacher Training: Dr. Christle gave an update on coaching teacher training. Cookie Winburn is putting together a workshop model to see what works best. She will provide a general information model so that it can be adapted to each program's needs.

4. NEW BUSINESS
   o Zach Kelehear led a discussion on CITEP developing annual goals and asked the committee to consider the list of possible goals to focus on and then decide at our next meeting. The group determined that we would like further information on teacher evaluation.

5. **ANNOUNCEMENTS: Next meeting: April 19, 2013**. Please send items to discuss with the group to either Christine Christle or Lynda Tilley.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 3:10.

<div align="center">

CITEP
February 24, 2012
MINUTES

</div>

ATTENDEES

Sign-in list attached.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ed Dickey moved that minutes from the October, 2011, meeting be approved; Bob Pruzin seconded.

OLD BUSINESS

Christine Christle reminded the CITEP committee of training that is being developed for coaching teachers and supervisors. There are only two volunteers on the committee and more are needed.

Zach Kelehear announced that Dean Watson was unable to attend this meeting. The dean's focus is on being able to show measurable ways our students impact the community. We need impact data. Christine Christle indicated that Special Education is developing a survey to stakeholders to learn how people feel about our graduates and the program. Discussion led to the following points:

- The vision is to learn whether innovative education is effective and to provide evidence;
- Narratives from the students and principals are valuable;
- Q-Com. reports allow programs to share impact;
- We have good evidence about what we are doing in the classrooms but we want to know how they are doing in the field;
- Ed Dickey suggested that we have data on impact on student learning from ADEPT unit work samples and asked how we might use the data we already gather and analyze to document the impact our teacher candidates have on student learning.
- Dr. Connolly reminded the members that while ADEPT data are collected; they may not be as helpful (in specific ways) as we need. Dr. Kelehear encouraged her to follow up on this for the PEU programs
- We need one, three and five-year data.

NEW BUSINESS

Admission to Student Teaching - Rob Dedmon and Bruce Field

Rob Dedmon indicated that a significant number of students of non-COE units are not meeting the deadlines for clearance for student teaching. The intention of the rules is to allow Bruce Field time to make placements. Bruce does not think that he knows enough about those programs to develop a solution. Meetings are being scheduled for Rob, Bruce and Zach to visit each program coordinator to get a better understanding of progression for their students, with the goal of determining a solution that meets everyone's needs.

Revising Exit Survey – Renee Connolly

Renee Connolly provided a hand out with exit survey data and would like input from the committee. Specifically, is the data still relevant or should the survey be amended? Please send suggestions to Renee for her to compile and then the group will make a decision. May and August graduates are set, so a new instrument would not go into effect until December, 2012.

Laura Aboyan announced that data summaries for 2011 have been posted on Blackboard. Please send any missing data and she will load to Blackboard. The Assessment Office is implementing a database to track diversity of placements beginning with the B.A. in Elementary Education. It will track schools/districts and compare to the demographics within the state. Christine Christle suggested using the employer surveys that are distributed every year to learn more about the impact of the teacher candidates n the schools in which they did students teaching and graduates employed in their schools.

Other

Zach discussed an issue with the application for professional programs. Rob reported that it had relatively invasive health questions. Review by the Legal Office and Disability Services found that several of the questions were inappropriate for the Admission to Professional Programs Form. The Application for Internship would be a more appropriate place for this information. Zach and Rob will coordinate with Disability Services for those who answer yes to questions on the internship form. For MAT students, as long as the questions are posed <u>after</u> admission, they are acceptable. The new form/procedure goes into effect immediately.

Common Core – Zach Kelehear and Ed Dickey

Zach reported that full implementation of core standards is scheduled for 2014-15. College and career readiness is the metric for success rather than test scores. Smarter Balanced Assessment is being considered for implementation of this assessment. Common Core State Standards and assessments are moving forward. Working groups are being assembled.

Ed Dickey reported that ELA is putting less emphasis on literature and more into informational texts (history, etc.). In 2014-15 students be expected to read more authentic tests and less fiction. Students exposed to inquiry-based curriculum should see improvements over past tests. Zach is sending out a handout to share information about the Common Core.

Announcements

Zach announced that Dean Watson asked him to convey to the committee know how important their work is to the process and his appreciation of their efforts.

Next meeting: October 26, 2012 in Wardlaw, Room 110. Please send items to discuss with the group to either Christine Christle or Lynda Tilley.

University of South Carolina
Committee for Initial Teacher Education Programs (CITEP)
Friday, October 26, 2012
Wardlaw Room 110
1:30-3:00

Attendees:
Lemuel Watson, Dean, College of Education
Zach Kelehear, Co-Chair, Associate Dean, COE
Christine Christle, Co-Chair, Special Education, COE
Lynda Tilley, Administrative Assistant, COE
Cookie Winburn, School-University Partnerships & Clinical Experiences, COE
Bob Pruzin, Music Ed., College of Arts & Sciences
David Virtue, Middle Level, College of Education
Christine Lotter, Secondary Science, College of Education
Nancy Freeman, Early Childhood, College of Education
Allison Jacques, Asst Dean for Assessment, COE
Laura Aboyan, Assessment Coordinator, COE
Rob Dedmon, Asst. Dean for Undergraduate Affairs, COE
Ken Vogler, Elementary Education, COE
Ed Dickey, Secondary Mathematics, College of Education
Peter Duffy, Theatre Ed., College of Arts & Sciences
Lara Lomicka Anderson, Languages, Literatures and Cultures, College of Arts & Sciences
Nina Moreno, Languages, Literatures and Cultures, College of Arts & Sciences
Lynda Nilges, Chair, PEAT & Physical Education, COE

1. Chris Christle opened the meeting and welcomed new attendees.
   Ed Dickey moved to approve the minutes from our last meeting. The minutes were approved.

2. Old Business

   a. Dean Watson spoke on national and state issues affecting the College.
      - National: bashing by NCTQ, Teach for America
        o COE is being forced to rethink what we do, particularly clinical experiences- AZ
      - State:
        o Push for online learning Higher Ed and K-12
        o Vacuum in leadership in regards to education: Oversight Comm for education
        o Riley Institute-data SC Innovative Initiative
        o Definition of knowledge, skills, dispositions to prepare 21st century students
        o What IHE is preparing teachers for the new prototype Retool ourselves
        o Research design
        o New Carolina – Apr 16 conference
        o Common Core
        o Assessment- Smarter Balance: what does it mean regarding pedagogy?

- o Technology skills of our graduates: we need data
- o CITEP who needs to deal with program changes

    b. Chris Christle:
- Reviewed the purpose of CITEP : Peter Duffy suggested having specific goals for the year. We will send out a list and have everyone pick the most important. Chris also pointed out that she has been Co-Chair since 2009 and that it is time to elect a new Co-Chair. She asked that those interested let Zach know before our next meeting.
- Discussed the training and professional development for coaching teachers/supervisors. Chris suggested creating a workshop format with approximately 4 sessions. Asked for those who have expertise or experience with coaching or who would be interested in developing these workshops. Cookie Winburn said that she has experience with Cognitive Coaching and would be interested. Peter Duffy, Lynda Nilges, Amy Donnelly, and Angie Baum had also expressed interest. Chris will set up a meeting for the group.

    c. Zach Kelehear
- Followed up on the need for evidence (data to track information that our graduates are having an impact on K-12 students in measurable ways)
  - COE website PEU Impact data
- Reported that the meetings with non-COE unit coordinators was informative and helpful in addressing their needs.

    d. Allison Jacques and Laura Aboyan discussed exit surveys and employer surveys
- Graduate surveys – Laura asked that we review the questions. She said that the response rate has been low. Ed suggested offering incentives, such as a drawing. Chris suggested a Facebook page may help as so many people use it. Allison asked for information on faculty needs regarding the surveys.

3. New Business:
    e. Zach Kelehear and Allison Jacques
- Reported on their experiences from The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) conference
- Reported on The proposed Educator Evaluation and Support Guidelines recently released by the State Department of Education
  - Operation Educate the Educators (http://aacte.org/Programs/Operation-Educate-the-Educators/
  - The group discussed inviting someone from the State Dept. to come and present the new evaluation system to our group. Allison will follow up on this.
  - The group also discussed the adoption of the Common Core Standards and how we should be helping to prepare faculty to incorporate the CCSS into their teaching. We decided that it was a larger issue than just math and ELA. The group agreed that we should bring more information back to CITEP.
  - The group discussed the issue of teacher evaluation in SC and agreed that we should be informed on changes being made. We decided that we should invite someone from the Teacher Advancement Program to discuss this issue.

    f. Ed Dickey facilitated a discussion on

- Adding Language Clarifying Certification Roles of USC and SDE to the Preservice Teacher Education Clinical Experiences Manual
- Teacher Candidate Access to Instructional Materials in Schools: The issue arose as school's responsibility to provide access to hardware and software passwords to interns. The group discussed the need to better prepare our students to use the technologies currently used in schools. We will discuss this issue with school leaders and determine our shared responsibilities.

4. Announcements: Zach suggested we set two meeting dates for Spring. We decided the next meetings would be February 22, 2013 and April 19, 2013

5. The meeting was adjourned at 3:00pm.

Mila Parrish, Dance Education
Lynn Keane, Business Education
Kevin Swick, Early Childhood Education
Christine Christle, Special Education
David Virtue, Middle Level Education
Christine Lotter, Secondary Education
Bob Pruzin, Music Education
Linda Nilges, Physical Education
Steve Thompson, Elementary Education
Paul Malovrh, Foreign Languages Education

Mary Styslinger, Secondary Education
Minuette Floyd, Art Education
Bruce Field, School University Partnerships
Irma Van Scoy, Associate Dean
Laura Aboyan, Certification & Assessment
Rob Dedmon, Student Affairs
Lynda Tilley, Dean's Office

a. Minutes of the February 12, 2010, meeting were approved with the correction of Bruce's name and adding the list of attendees.

b. Old Business:

   a. EEDA update, questions and answers
   Rob Dedmon reported that students seem to be doing well with access to the new program. Report any problems to Student Affairs now and they will correct them. Steve Thompson asked who is responsible for letting students know they need to take it. ITE, PE, COE Student Affairs all let them know. Special Ed. is adding it to their website so their students will know. It is now in every program's admission requirement on website. If you list program requirements in the bulletin, this must be added. Rob will follow-up on this.

   Over 340 students have taken training (including pilot group), of those 291 have passed and 178 have been admitted to professional programs.

   b. Praxis update (Irma Van Scoy)
   We're making some progress. The USC Office of Student Affairs has people who are ACE coaches, most of whom are graduate students from Higher Education Student Affairs. We asked if that office could support someone who can help students with PRAXIS I. However, they only pay $10 per hour for 10 hours per week which is much less than we pay our graduate assistants who were filling this role. Irma will work with Diane Stephens, Chair, ITE to continue to see if we can work something out.

c. Updates on accreditation/state approval: Irma reviewed the items on the NCATE checklist such as candidate work samples, highlighted syllabi, updated web information, etc. She emphasized that May 24 we submit the Institutional Report and online evidence and everything must be in. She asked for a short meeting w/each program coordinator and/or the program area faculty to review submitted materials and needs. She will be available to meet w/ITE faculty on May 7. Program coordinators will receive a request for a meeting and possible meeting times early next week.

Specific items on the checklist that were addressed included the following:

#3 ADEPT and Clinical Experience Form: This is information is needed by the state which includes how our candidates learn about ADEPT (including experiences that lead up to the full implementation of ADEPT in their final internship) and how each program fulfills the required hours of field/clinical experience prior to full time directed teaching/internship (75 hours for MAT programs, 100 hours for undergraduate programs). Syllabi should reflect the information that is submitted in the charts for each program.

#4 Web information: Since the NCATE off-site review is electronic, the reviewers will be linked directly to our website. We want to be sure that web-based information is consistent. All information needs to be updated and any inconsistencies resolved. Irma will assist faculty and work with department chairs as needed.

#5 Unit work samples: A key piece of evidence for NCATE is showing our candidates can assess student learning. The unit work samples for ADEPT are an important piece of our evidence in this area. These are also of interest to state reviewers because this is a component of ADEPT. Program are encouraged to have unit work samples available for evidence whether or not they are a key assessment in their program.

#6 Evidence of School-University Partnership initiatives. Please be sure to share any projects or work you have related to school-university collaboration so that we will include it in our evidence for our Target Standard (3—Clinical Experiences). Published articles or DVD's on work with schools are welcome.

#10 –Clinical Experience Survey: Please note that the Clinical Experience Survey includes a question regarding how your program is meeting the requirement for experiences with ELL and SPED students as adopted at the February CITEP meeting. Christine provided a handout with resources to provide information to students on ELL or students with disabilities, in case it would be helpful.

#11 – Assessment Plans: Spring 2008 program assessment plans included alignment with our conceptual framework, *Collaborative Educational Leader*. These charts will be used to provide evidence for our NCATE review that our

programs align with our conceptual framework. Please submit any updates or changes to Irma or Renee.

#12 – Assessments and scoring guides for clinical experiences: Be sure that Bruce has any ratings sheets/guides used for clinical experiences other than ADEPT.

#13 – *Collaborative Educational Leader:* Make sure that all program faculty are familiar with the conceptual framework and can answer any questions about how the CF is addressed in your program.

#14 - Program meeting minutes: Please advise Irma and Renee if you have program meeting minutes that show discussion of assessment data and program changes.

#15 - Blackboard site: Laura Aboyan, Office of Accreditation and Quality Assurance, demonstrated the new Blackboard site in which programs can readily find information related to their programs including their assessment plan, rubrics, program report, survey data, etc.

c. New Business

  a. Clinical experiences as target NCATE standard: Bruce Field discussed two areas that can help us demonstrate how we are moving to the Target level in relation to School-University Partnership and Clinical Experiences:
       o Challenging students in a deeper way
       o Collaborating closely with schools
  Bruce asked people to meet in small groups to discuss/share the kinds of things we are doing in clinical experiences that are moving toward the Target level.

  Small groups met and shared some of the following highlights:

  - Strength comes for sharing w/teachers and schools, planning together (Kevin Swick, Early Childhood)
  - Professional development workshops in theatre and dance with our students (Peter Duffy, Theatre)
  - Business Education is using a training sequence to involve teachers in developing more computer skills. This helped w/not only the technical part but in getting to know each other and getting a different perspective of what we do. It's important that there was so much building community. (Lynn Keane, Business Education)
  - We are blurring lines between universities and schools (Christine Christle)
       o Administrators and directors talk to teacher candidates about how to interview and have former students who are working come back to talk about their first year experiences and give advice.
       o Having teachers in the field help us revise and help with requirements for things students will need to know (realities of the classrooms). When we develop new courses, we get ideas from teachers in the field. Some of the assignments are revised based on their feedback.

- Having faculty sit on Education boards outside the university (e.g., Business Education Advisory Board). (Lynn Keane)
- Strategies such as placements with prior graduates strengthens consistency between our program and students clinical experiences (Bob Pruzin)
- Action research, classroom-based inquiry, and seminars that coordinate these efforts are important including involving school-based faculty in these projects (e.g., as our candidates collect data they work both at school level with cohort group and also share with their university supervisors and cooperating teachers). The PDS network helps with liaisons who are taking much larger role in supporting clinical experiences. We also had a project/grant with Engineering to involve engineering candidates in the schools (i.e., GK-12). (Stephen Thompson)
- PE works w/local schools in small groups of 10-15 per faculty (Lynda Nilges, PE)

b. Training supervisors and coaching teachers
    Irma noted that we are trying to find ways to continue to improve our connections between faculty and supervisors/coaching teachers. There will be an initiative in Early Childhood and Elementary Education beginning this summer through 2010-2011 to provide more extensive training for supervisors. PE has a program called Clinical Model Teachers in which they train their supervisors. We know that individual programs hold special events for their supervisors/coaching teachers. We would like to work on this more systematically in the coming year.

c. Announcements

    Next meeting: Friday, September 24 at 1:30 (with October 8th as an alternative if needed). Dates for February and April will be set next fall.

    Remember to share information from this committee with your programs

d. Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

<div align="center">

University of South Carolina
Committee for Initial Teacher Education Programs (CITEP)
Friday, February 12, 2010
1:30 p.m.
Wardlaw 110

</div>

Introductions

1. Minutes of the December 12, 2009 meeting were approved as written.

2. Old Business (30 minutes)

    a. Safe School Climate Act: Update
        Bruce Field explained the changes that he has made regarding anti-bullying language to the ADEPT manual, including ADEPT Standard 10, and to the USC Initial Certification Candidate Dispositions, number 7. All were as approved at the last CITEP meeting.

    b. EEDA: Update
        Rob Dedmon provided an update of the EEDA web program. It has been broken down by area. K-12 students now choose a module based on grade level. The system is set up so students may retake the test as many times as necessary. However, the Office of Student Affairs will notify the program when someone fails on the third attempt. It would then be dealt with as an exception so procedures for that will need to be devised and implemented.

    c. Accreditation State Approval Documents: Update
        Renee Connolly reported that the spring date to submit documents (e.g., syllabi) was January 15. Examples of student work from the spring semester should be submitted by March 15 or as soon as possible thereafter. The documents will be on a website for team review offsite. Please send to the three e-mail addresses provided in the handout.

    d. Ensuring clinical experiences involve diverse student populations
        Irma Van Scoy provided a handout with re-wording of the recommended actions from the last meeting. She noted that for item number one, we are focusing on English language learners and students with exceptionalities because we need additional evidence in these areas.

        David Virtue mentioned that he is teamed with an ESOL teacher at Dent Middle School. Dr. Van Scoy indicated is a good example of how we are addressing the requirement, but we also need to attend to documenting our work in this area. Discussion ensued about how to communicate this requirement and how it is met within the programs.

        Ed Dickey moved to adopt the re-wording of item one requiring all programs to document the provision of preparation and experiences with English Language learners and students with special needs. Bruce Fields seconded the motion and the motion carried.

        For item two (surveys of interns), it was noted that self reported data is helpful although limited. Peter Duffy questioned how this requirement could be met in a meaningful way. A number of ideas were shared. Dr. Van Scoy noted that Kellah Edens, Educational Psychology Program, would like to meet with CITEP regarding the course Learners and the Diversity of Learning and that the course was one avenue we could explore. It was agreed that this discussion should be added to the agenda for next year.

It was agreed that the wording of item two should be changed from "at least two" to variety. Peter Duffy moved to adopt the re-wording of item two. Kevin Swick seconded the motion and the motion carried.

 e. Ensuring evidence that candidates assess student learning and plan instruction based on assessment:
Chris Christle discussed the unit work sample requirements and the need for consistency across programs. She noted that we will need samples of unit work samples for the NCATE documents room. We need to know which programs use the exact description of Unit Work Samples as printed in the ADEPT Handbook and which adapt the description to their particular discipline. We also need to know if programs use their Unit Work Samples as key assessments. All members were asked to complete the questionnaire at the sign in table for their programs so that we will have this information.

3. New Business
 a. Update on administration and SPA reports
Irma Van Scoy reported the CHE is no longer reviewing PhD programs. She also announced that the Provost's Office has provided some support to free her time to work on the SACS Quality Enhancement Plan. Due to Dr. Van Scoy's changing responsibilities, Zach Kelehear will now be the Graduate Director for the College of Education and ex-officio member of the curriculum change committees. Renee Connolly is now Interim Assistant Dean for Assessment and Rob Dedmon is Interim Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Studies.

 b. Clinical experiences as target NCATE standard
Irma Van Scoy explained a handout about the NCATE target standard. She needs information for an electronic exhibit room and would like committee input on how best to collect information about how people are collaborating with schools. It was agreed that she would send out a request to program coordinators.

 c. Conceptual framework representation:
Irma Van Scoy displayed a new conceptual framework poster that will be distributed to help people remember it.

 d. Ensuring evidence that candidates are fair and believe that all students can learn:
Chris Christle explained that to ensure that it is clear that we are meeting this requirement we could amend the Dispositions by adding the following exemplar under #8 (Provision of Learning Experiences for *All*):

- Actions are consistent with a concern for equity *fairness, and the belief that all students can learn*

Bruce Field moved to approve the new wording, Steve Thompson seconded and the motion carried.

e. Articulating diversity proficiencies for NCATE
Irma Van Scoy provided a handout of our current diversity proficiencies as reflected in our dispositions ratings form. Members concurred that these are consistent diversity proficiencies that are assessed for all initial teacher certification candidates.

Bruce Field moved to formally approve the list as our "diversity proficiencies", Steve Thompson seconded and the motion carried. It was noted that these can be revisited and revised in the future.

f. Program pages

4. Dr. Connolly announced that she has set up a new site on Blackboard on the Content Collection tab that provides data summary reports, exit survey results, graduate survey, NCATE reports, etc. There is also a bucket for rubrics so they can faculty have a central location to check and be sure they are using the most current rubric. This system will provide easier access for faculty to data. Users can be extended to staff. The site can also be accessible to offsite users (with passwords just as they need to enter VIP/Bb).
She showed a demonstration using the for Early Childhood Blackboard site.

5. Other Business
As a follow-up to requests from the last meeting, Steve Thompson provided a handout with statistics about students receiving Praxis assistance. It includes only those who went beyond the initial computer-based analysis. He feels that it is important that funding be found to continue the program. He will provide more information about the costs at the next meeting.

6. Announcements
   a. Next meeting: April 23 from 1:30-3:00.
   b. Remember to share information from this committee to your programs
   c. Send proposed agenda items to Irma and Chris

7. Adjourned at 3:05

University of South Carolina
Committee for Initial Teacher Education Programs (CITEP)
Friday, February 12, 2010
1:30 p.m.
Wardlaw 110

Introductions

1. Minutes of the December 12, 2009 meeting were approved as written.

2. Old Business (30 minutes)
   a. Safe School Climate Act: Update
      Bruce Field explained the changes that he has made regarding anti-bullying language to the ADEPT manual, including ADEPT Standard 10, and to the USC Initial Certification Candidate Dispositions, number 7. All were as approved at the last CITEP meeting.

   b. EEDA: Update
      Rob Dedmon provided an update of the EEDA web program. It has been broken down by area. K-12 students now choose a module based on grade level. The system is set up so students may retake the test as many times as necessary. However, the Office of Student Affairs will notify the program when someone fails on the third attempt. It would then be dealt with as an exception so procedures for that will need to be devised and implemented.

   c. Accreditation State Approval Documents: Update
      Renee Connolly reported that the spring date to submit documents (e.g., syllabi) was January 15. Examples of student work from the spring semester should be submitted by March 15 or as soon as possible thereafter. The documents will be on a website for team review offsite. Please send to the three e-mail addresses provided in the handout.

   d. Ensuring clinical experiences involve diverse student populations
      Irma Van Scoy provided a handout with re-wording of the recommended actions from the last meeting. She noted that for item number one, we are focusing on English language learners and students with exceptionalities because we need additional evidence in these areas.

      David Virtue mentioned that he is teamed with an ESOL teacher at Dent Middle School. Dr. Van Scoy indicated is a good example of how we are addressing the requirement, but we also need to attend to documenting our work in this area. Discussion ensued about how to communicate this requirement and how it is met within the programs.

      Ed Dickey moved to adopt the re-wording of item one requiring all programs to document the provision of preparation and experiences with English Language learners and students with special needs. Bruce Fields seconded the motion and the motion carried.

      For item two (surveys of interns), it was noted that self reported data is helpful although limited. Peter Duffy questioned how this requirement could be met in a meaningful way. A number of ideas were shared. Dr. Van Scoy noted that Kellah Edens, Educational Psychology Program, would like to meet with CITEP regarding the course Learners and the Diversity of Learning and that the course was one avenue we could explore. It was agreed that this discussion should be added to the agenda for next year.

It was agreed that the wording of item two should be changed from "at least two" to variety. Peter Duffy moved to adopt the re-wording of item two. Kevin Swick seconded the motion and the motion carried.

e. Ensuring evidence that candidates assess student learning and plan instruction based on assessment:
   Chris Christle discussed the unit work sample requirements and the need for consistency across programs. She noted that we will need samples of unit work samples for the NCATE documents room. We need to know which programs use the exact description of Unit Work Samples as printed in the ADEPT Handbook and which adapt the description to their particular discipline. We also need to know if programs use their Unit Work Samples as key assessments. All members were asked to complete the questionnaire at the sign in table for their programs so that we will have this information.

3. New Business
   a. Update on administration and SPA reports
      Irma Van Scoy reported the CHE is no longer reviewing PhD programs. She also announced that the Provost's Office has provided some support to free her time to work on the SACS Quality Enhancement Plan. Due to Dr. Van Scoy's changing responsibilities, Zach Kelehear will now be the Graduate Director for the College of Education and ex-officio member of the curriculum change committees. Renee Connolly is now Interim Assistant Dean for Assessment and Rob Dedmon is Interim Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Studies.

   b. Clinical experiences as target NCATE standard
      Irma Van Scoy explained a handout about the NCATE target standard. She needs information for an electronic exhibit room and would like committee input on how best to collect information about how people are collaborating with schools. It was agreed that she would send out a request to program coordinators.

   c. Conceptual framework representation:
      Irma Van Scoy displayed a new conceptual framework poster that will be distributed to help people remember it.

   d. Ensuring evidence that candidates are fair and believe that all students can learn:
      Chris Christle explained that to ensure that it is clear that we are meeting this requirement we could amend the Dispositions by adding the following exemplar under #8 (Provision of Learning Experiences for *All*):

      - Actions are consistent with a concern for equity *fairness, and the belief that all students can learn*

      Bruce Field moved to approve the new wording, Steve Thompson seconded and the motion carried.

e. Articulating diversity proficiencies for NCATE
   Irma Van Scoy provided a handout of our current diversity proficiencies as reflected in our dispositions ratings form. Members concurred that these are consistent diversity proficiencies that are assessed for all initial teacher certification candidates.

   Bruce Field moved to formally approve the list as our "diversity proficiencies", Steve Thompson seconded and the motion carried. It was noted that these can be revisited and revised in the future.

   f. Program pages

4. Dr. Connolly announced that she has set up a new site on Blackboard on the Content Collection tab that provides data summary reports, exit survey results, graduate survey, NCATE reports, etc. There is also a bucket for rubrics so they can faculty have a central location to check and be sure they are using the most current rubric. This system will provide easier access for faculty to data. Users can be extended to staff. The site can also be accessible to offsite users (with passwords just as they need to enter VIP/Bb).
   She showed a demonstration using the for Early Childhood Blackboard site.

5. Other Business
   As a follow-up to requests from the last meeting, Steve Thompson provided a handout with statistics about students receiving Praxis assistance. It includes only those who went beyond the initial computer-based analysis. He feels that it is important that funding be found to continue the program. He will provide more information about the costs at the next meeting.

6. Announcements
   a. Next meeting: April 23 from 1:30-3:00.
   b. Remember to share information from this committee to your programs
   c. Send proposed agenda items to Irma and Chris

7. Adjourned at 3:05

Recommended actions

Initial Certification Programs:
1. *All programs include a requirement during one more field/clinical experiences that candidates <u>work with and/or observe teachers working</u> with*
   a. *one or more English language learners and*
   b. *one or more students with exceptionalities*

The requirement for an experience with each group (ELL; students with exceptionalities) appears in one or more syllabi, field experience packets/task lists, and/or other printed course materials. <u>The program specifies how candidates are supported in understanding the needs of these students and developing appropriate teaching strategies.</u>

2. *Add ~~two~~ items to the intern evaluation form:*
   Considering <u>all</u> of my field/clinical experiences and<u>/or courses taught on-site in school-based settings</u> in my program:
   - *I ~~observed and/or~~ worked with one or more English language learners during my experiences.*
   - *I ~~observed and/or~~ worked with one or more students with exceptionalities during my experiences.*
   - *I worked with students from a variety of socioeconomic groups.*
   - *I worked with students from at least two ethnic/racial groups**.*
   - *I received support and feedback from my coaching teacher, supervisor, and/or university faculty to reflect on my practice with students from diverse populations and students with exceptionalities.*

**Note: As per the CITEP minutes/vote, the wording on this item will be changed to "I worked with students from a variety of ethnic/racial groups".

University of South Carolina
Committee for Initial Teacher Education Programs (CITEP)
Friday, December 4, 2009
1:30 p.m.

ATTENDEES:

Rob Dedmon, COE Student Affairs   Susan Quinn, COE Instructional Support
Lara Lomicka, World Languages   Renee Connolly, Dir. Accred. & Quality Assur.
Lara Ducate, World Languages   Irma Van Scoy, COE Associate Dean
Mila Parrish, Dance Education   Christine Christle, Special Education
Kevin Swick, Early Childhood Education   Lynda Tilley, COE Dean's Office
Nate Carnes, Elem. & Middle Level Education   Sandra Schmidt, Secondary Education
Lynda Nilges, Physical Education   Peter Duffy, Theatre Education
Christine Lotter, Secondary Education   Diane Stephens, Dept. Chair, ITE
Mary Ann Byrnes, A&S Assistant Dean   Karen French, Physical Education
Steve Thompson, Elementary Education   Minuette Floyd, Art Education
Lynn Keane, Business Education   David Virtue, Middle Level Education
Bruce Field, School Univ. Partnerships

1. Minutes of the October 30, 2009 meeting were approved as written.

2. Proposals for meeting the Safe School Climate Act

    Chris Christle and a committee comprised of Kim Smoak and Mary Styslinger met to formulate a
    proposal for meeting the Safe School Climate Act. They proposed that on the disposition form an
    example be added to number 7 about bullying and harassment and that it be added to the
    assessment ratings. This will provide dispositional data related to bullying. The committee also
    proposed that when candidates turn in their report for ADEPT standard 10A, they address this
    issue as part of advocating for students. They proposed that wording be added to the ADEPT
    manual under APS 10 and that a Bullying Prevention Handout also be added to the manual.

    Nate Carnes noted that the "Back to School Inservice" DVD has a section concerning legal
    responsibilities for disciplining students and that it strongly suggests teachers refer to the district
    handbook. Discussion ensued about the need to address preventative measures and not just
    disciplinary actions. The CITEP agreed that it is important to encourage programs to continue to
    address this issue in a more thorough way and that the purpose of the items of the sample are to
    ensure consistency in providing some indication of an awareness of bullying issues. The CITEP
    committee approved adoption of the recommendations made by the sub-committee.

3. Unit work sample

    Irma Van Scoy suggested we review what format programs are are using for the unit work sample
    (UWS) if it is other than the exact description contained in the ADEPT manual. Several programs
    use additional language explicit to SPA standards.

    It was noted that the UWS will be an important component of our evidence that candidates assess
    student learning and apply that assessment to planning. NCATE recognizes that programs could
    assess differently so they do not expect one set of aggregated data across all programs. It is
    important that we are confident when the review team looks at individual program work samples

assessment of student learning will be clear even if formats vary to some degree. Units should email Irma to let her know if they use just the sample in ADEPT or exactly what they do use.

Another component is consistency in evaluating these or any other assessments. Whether assessments are graded by a faculty member, adjunct, or school-based supervisor, programs must ensure reliability/consistency in rating. We may need a long-term plan regarding how to provide professional development or training that would help us ensure reliability. ADEPT does ensure some training, but faculty need to consider if we need something more.

4. Funding for PRAXIS I Preparation

    Rob Dedmon announced that we need a new funding source for PRAXIS preparation/support for candidates. Irma indicated that the initiative so far is based on the COE. Should this be a PEU effort or COE? MaryAnn Byrnes asked if there is data available. Steve Thompson will provide a spreadsheet with the data. Kevin Swick noted that it will cut diversity of our student populations if they cannot pass PRAXIS. Bruce Field questioned exactly what the funding covers. Steve Thompson said it covers Plato which is a testing software licensed by ETS that shows individual student strengths and weaknesses. It also covers the cost of two graduate assistants to work with the students because those who get one-on-one training after their diagnostic tend to be more successful. Steve will bring back summary data and program demographics. Mary Anne Byrnes suggested Dennis Pruitt's Office might be a place to look for funding and that someone in the Student Success Center might specialize because this is a university-wide support system. Diane Stephens indicated that decisions need to be made quickly because there is not enough funding for next semester. Diane will continue to seek a resolution on this issue.

5. EEDA requirement for admission to professional program Spring 2010

    Susan Quinn reported that the EEDA Advisory Committee has reviewed the student feedback from the pilot program. Cindy Saylor is in the process of reworking the program to incorporate many of the suggestions (dividing modules so they are more program specific, reducing extra reading, etc.) It will be ready for use in January.

    Rob Dedmon stated that databases will be repopulated after the drop/add date each semester. It will drop off Blackboard for those who have passed. Irma Van Scoy reminded everyone that, beginning next semester, students must pass prior to admission to professional program. Cindy Saylor will continue to work with the program through spring semester and she is available to come to classes to discuss it for whatever amount of time you might want her to be there.

6. Update on accreditation process

    Irma reviewed the deadlines for submission of evidence to the e-mail addresses distributed at the last meeting:
    December 1 – Fall Syllabi
    December 15 – Summer/Fall samples of Candidate/Student Work
    January 15 – Spring/Summer Syllabi
    February 1 – Vitae (COE faculty only – except perhaps TESOL)
    March 1 - Spring samples of candidate/student work

    (Syllabi to ncatesyl@mailbox.sc.edu ; ncatestw@mailbox.sc.edu for student work; ncatevit@mailbox.sc.edu for vitas).

One addition to the original request is the clarification that the completed rubric for each work sample should be scanned/pasted at the front of the student work. A question was asked regarding large files—if files are too large to e-mail, they may be submit via CD.

We are awaiting the results of program reports from SPAs. NCATE changed the dates so if we have to do rejoinders, we have to do them by March 15.

We need to identify an NCATE standard where we are moving toward target level. The COE Administrative Council recommends clinical experiences be that standard.

7. Ensuring clinical experiences involve diverse student populations.

Irma noted that units must pass element "a" in the NCATE diversity standard or they cannot pass the standard. This element refers to program curricula and learning experiences that prepare candidates to work with diverse students. The syllabi and candidate work samples that faculty are submitting will help us provide evidence on this element.

We have continued to discuss how we can strengthen our evidence that our candidates are provided opportunities to work with diverse student populations including students with exceptionalities and English language learners. After discussions with a number of faculty and Bruce Field, Director of School University Partnerships, there are two recommendations:

1. *All programs include a requirement during one or more field/clinical experiences that candidates observe and/or work with*
    a. *one or more English language learners and*
    b. *one or more students with exceptionalities*

The requirement for an experience with each group (ELL; students with exceptionalities) appears in one or more syllabi, field experience packets/task lists, and/or other printed course materials.

2. *Add two items to the intern evaluation form:*

Considering all of my field/clinical experiences in my program:
- *I observed and/or worked with one more English language learners during my experiences.*
- *I observed and/or worked with one or more students with exceptionalities during my experiences.*
- *I worked with students from a variety of socioeconomic groups.*
- *I worked with students from at least two ethnic/racial groups.*

Sandra Schmidt pointed out that the language of the recommendations needs revision. Irma would like to get a group together to look at the language. The committee agreed that although they should be reworded, they agree with the spirit of the recommendations.

8. The next meetings are scheduled for February 12 and April 23 from 1:30-3:00.

Meeting adjourned 3:08

University of South Carolina
Committee for Initial Teacher Education Programs (CITEP)
Friday, October 30, 2009
10:00 a.m.

ATTENDEES:

Gail Barnes, Music
Robert Brookshire, Business Ed.
Mary Ann Byrnes, A&S Associate Dean
Nate Carnes, Middle Level Ed.
Paul Chaplin, Elementary Ed.
Christine Christle, Special Ed.
Renee Connolly, COE
Rob Dedmon, COE Student Affairs
Ed Dickey, Secondary Ed.
Amy Donnelly, Elementary Ed.
Lara Ducate
Peter Duffy, Theatre
Nancy Freeman, Early Childhood
Karen French, PE
Margo Jackson, Elementary Ed.
Herman Knopf, Early Childhood
Lara Lomicka-Anderson

Christine Lotter, Secondary Ed.
Emmie May, COE Student Affairs
Heidi Mills, Elementary Ed.
Lynda Nilges, PE
Bob Pruzin, Music
Sandra Schmidt, Secondary Ed.
Susan Quinn, COE
Kim Smoak, Secondary Social Studies
Mary Styslinger, Secondary English
Kevin Swick, Early Childhood
Steve Thompson, Elementary Ed.
Lynda Tilley, COE Dean's Office Staff
Irma Van Scoy, COE Associate Dean
Sharon Vogel, Elementary Ed.
Cheryl Wissick, Special Ed.
David Virtue, Middle Level Ed.

Introductions

1. The April 17, 2009, minutes were accepted as written.

2. Overview of accreditation process

Irma Van Scoy reported that NCATE is piloting a continuous improvement visit. The institutional report and electronic evidence room are due in April 2010 and feedback will be received by August 2009. Specific dates will be announced in early spring. The three-day visit focuses on any questions generated by the review and our selected target standard. The six NCATE standards are:
1. Candidate Performance
2. Assessment System
3. Clinical Experiences – This area is our greatest strength
4. Diversity
5. Faculty
6. Governance

NCATE Areas to Work on: Assessment of student learning –specifically consistency of the unit work samples and the Reliability of the assessment. We need the minutes of the program meetings where there is discussion about program change that can be posted. We need to document the preparation of school faculty and evidence of candidate preparation to teach diverse learners (including ELL and SPED).

State areas to work on include: Required clinical hours; ADEPT; we also need to address the State Department of Education requirements related to the candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions to address bullying .

EEDA

Cindy Saylor provided the results of the EEDA pilot assessment data and described how the pilot worked.

- 261 completed the assessment with an 82% pass rate (214 students). A passing grade is 80%.
- 158 passed on first attempt
- 29 on third attempt
- 15 never passed
- 190 completed assessment sheet to provide feedback on the program
- The time it took to complete the test varied but was within the target range of 1-1 ½ hours. The feedback did provide some issues to look at. An advisory committee was established to work with Cindy on those issues. The committee includes Ed Dickey, Margo Jackson, Margaret Gamble, Christine Lotter and Susan Quinn.

All candidates in ANY teacher education program are required to pass this test to meet the EEDA requirement. Even though it was a pilot, the results of this test were automatically downloaded into student records and this group will not be retested.

The requirement must be met for admission to professional program beginning with students who apply for the spring 2010 semester. Those who are already in the program are not affected.

Rob Dedmon reported that Professional Program requirements have been added to the DARS report. The COE is currently using this and students have access themselves so they can see which items are complete and which are still to be completed. For those who use DARS, it helps with advising students. For non-COE programs, if you want to participate, just let Rob know and our Student Affairs Office will set up your access. This applies to undergraduates, not MAT.

SCHOOL SAFE CLIMATE ACT

Christine Christle reported that the School Safe Climate Act requires that schools provide evidence that candidates have knowledge, skills, and dispositions to identify and prevent bullying, harassment, and intimidation (see resources at http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Innovation-and-Support/Youth-Services/Guidance/BullyingPreventionandIntervention.html and http://pathwayscourses.samhsa.gov/bully/bully_intro_pg1.htm).

Although there are no standards set yet, as long as we show some evidence that it is being addressed, we can meet this requirement. Christine wants to form a subcommittee to establish internal guidelines. She will be contacting Peter Duffy, Sandra Schmidt, Kim Smoak, Kevin Swick and Mary Styslinger to set up the meeting.

Accreditation Documents to be submitted by faculty

Information must be submitted via e-mail addresses on orange form. Please do not send them to Irma or Renee directly because of the impact on their e-mail accounts

The question was raised about whether syllabi for fall 2009 should be retroactively modified. Irma felt that it should because it would be an improvement for upcoming semesters. There was also a question about whether samples should include instructors' feedback or not. Irma will clarify and get back with the committee on this one.

Surveys of COE Undergraduates, Graduates, and Employers: Results and Plans

Renee Connolly reported that exit surveys results should have been received by all program areas. All information was disseminated even it if there was only one response.

Employer survey from 6 years ago needs to be done again. Also needs to include advanced programs. Please provide input on how to revise the form. Tweaking is necessary in order to incorporate the current conceptual framework. Otherwise, we will adopt the same protocol and send out to about 19 counties in midlands and low country.

Plans for Next meetings
- Future meetings will be December 4, February 13, April 23 from 1:30-3:00.
- Unit work samples were discussed and the requirement for consistency across programs, etc.
- <u>Send a message to please send unit work samples assignment description and bring a copy to meeting so they can look at during the next meeting</u>
- Preparing coaching teachers and supervisors to mentor interns; other??

Announcements
- Bruce Field, Director of School-University Partnerships and Clinical Experiences asks anyone who sends candidates out to schools "independently" to notify him: <u>fieldb@mailbox.sc.edu</u>; 777-3029 <u>Do not send students out into schools without contacting Bruce</u>.

Adjourn CITEP at 11:30

Introductions were made.

Christine Christle was elected co-chair.

South Carolina Department of Education Policies for Teacher Education Programs –A Quick Check Sheet and full requirements was distributed.

Quality Assurance Committee Tentative Schedule of Program Reviews for 2009-2010:

> Art Education (BFA, IMA, MAT); Music Education (BM, MME, PhD); Physical Education (BS, MS, MAT, PhD); Library & Information Science (Cert, MLIS, SLIS); Health Education (Cert, EdD); School Psychology (PhD); Speech Path. & Audiology (MCD, MSP)

Back to School Inservice:

DVDs are still available if needed. Make sure those in seminar courses use the DVD to cover SC Standards of conduct. Christine Christle stated that a PowerPoint on the website related to the DVD is very helpful. Irma Van Scoy suggested that in larger programs, it might be useful to have someone designated to watch it and determine what courses different sections would fit into. We will look into having more copies made for wider distribution.

Please make sure that syllabi say that students are being prepared to work with diverse populations. We need to be prepared to prove that diverse learners are being taught.

Education and Economic Development Act:

Cindy Saylor gave a demo of the EEDA website pilot last meeting. Cindy developed the site with a test bank of questions but only 3 of 7 modules are included in the pilot. The final product will have all 7. The minimum passing score will be 80%. Students will assess the pilot so she can refine it. We have $1400 left of CHE money to develop this. Ed Dickey suggested having a raffle for scholarships to get students to participate. An e-mail will be distributed to students telling them what to do. They will only be asked about 10 questions and half a dozen logistical questions about how it worked. It should be on the site of everyone in the meeting.

There was discussion of when in the student's program the assessment should be required. Although several suggestions were made, no consensus was reached.

It was agreed that if the pilots went well, full implementation will begin in spring 2010, allowing for advisement in the fall semester. Ed Dickey volunteered 402 students for the

fall pilot. In addition Diedre Cleary and Christine Lotter will be contacted and all will be asked work it into syllabus for the fall. Nate will figure out a class for middle level.

Clinical Experiences

Dispositions – Ed Dickey moved that the new form be accepted based on the fact that larger group agreed with adopting it for next year. The motion was approved. Irma Van Scoy requested that we accept the form but that programs can add exemplars that are more specific. The committee agreed.

Unit Work Sample – discussion on requirements, consistency across programs, etc. For fall meeting, bring descriptions of unit work samples. It is important that we meet this ADEPT standard. Training coaching teachers will be discussed at fall meeting.

Schedule for 2009-2010 (Proposed meeting dates: October (second or third Friday), November 13, February 13, April 23 as needed 1:30-3:00)

University of South Carolina
Committee for Initial Teacher Education Programs (CITEP)
Friday, February 27, 2009
1:30 p.m. - Wardlaw 110
Minutes

Attendees:

Mary Ann Byrnes, *Arts and Sciences*

Nate Carnes, *COE Elementary Ed.*

Christine Christle, *COE Special Ed.*

Ed Dickey, *COE Secondary Ed.*

Rob Dedmon, *COE Student Affairs*

Lara Ducate, *Lang., Lit., & Cult. (A & S)*

Peter Duffy, *Theatre Education (A & S)*

Bruce Field, *COE School University Partnerships & Clinical Exp.*

Minuette Floyd, *Art Ed. (A & S)*

Lynn Keane, *Business Education (HRSM)*

Lisa Lindley, *Health Education (SPH)*

Christine Lotter, *COE, Secondary Ed.*

Emmie May, *COE Student Affairs*

Lynda Nilges, *COE Physical Ed.*

Mila Parrish, *Dance Ed. (A & S)*

Cindy Saylor, *COE Hghr Ed. & Stud. Aff.*

Sandra Schmidt, *COE Secondary Ed.*

Diane Stephens, *COE Inst. & Tchr Ed.*

Kevin Swick, *COE Early Childhood Ed.*

Irma Van Scoy, *COE Assoc. Dean*

Sharon Vogel, *COE Elementary Ed.*

The meeting was called to order at 1:33 p.m.

I.   **Introductions**.
     The meeting began with everyone introducing themselves.

II. **CITEP Description and Co-Chair**
     Irma gave a description of the Committee for Initial Teacher Education
     Programs (CITEP) and explained the need for a committee of faculty and staff
     who work with initial teacher education programs. While the committee is
     comprised of one representative from each program area, those areas with
     more than one degree (bachelor's and master's) may choose have two
     representatives from their area.

     Irma cited the need for a faculty co-chair of the committee and asked for
     volunteers. Hearing none, she asked for nominations and it was decided that
     someone would be elected at the next meeting (April 2009).

     Irma told the committee that the proposal of this committee structure would be
     submitted to the Council of Academic Deans for approval.

III. **Appeals Processes**
     A. Undergraduate. Rob discussed the current process for undergraduate
     appeals, and then presented a handout proposing a new process. There was
     some discussion and faculty voted to adopt the new process (attached).

B. MAT/MT Admissions. Emmie advised the committee the MT appeals process is the same for that of all other graduate education degree programs but because the MAT degree is interdisciplinary, the process is different. She talked about the current system of an MAT Exceptions Committee which hears admission appeals and approves them on a regular basis. Irma explained the COE process which requires faculty to write a letter of alternative evidence when submitting a recommendation for students who do not meet the minimum GPA requirement (2.50 undergraduate GPA). The recommendation before the committee was to adopt the COE process for appeals and dissolve the M.A.T. Exceptions Committee. Kevin Swick moved approval of the recommendation and Ed Dickey seconded. The committee voted to accept the new process and dissolve the MAT Exceptions Committee.

C. Clinical Experience Appeals. Irma added that most of the appeals we have are those having to do with clinical experiences. She displayed a copy of the Clinical Experiences Manual and advised everyone that it is available on web. These appeals are quite complex but are delineated in the manual. Irma stated these may be addressed at the next meeting.

IV.   **Program Progression in Initial Teacher Education programs**

A. Praxis Support. Rob went over handout a handout about the Praxis I requirements and preparation information available for students. Irma added that ETS has webinars for students interested in taking any Praxis exam.

B. Admission to the Professional Program and other progression requirements. Irma went over undergraduate and graduate Professional Program progression handout (attached) and reminded everyone of the spirit in which the Professional Program was instituted.   Admission to the Professional Program is one of the points in each student's progression through a program at which her/his aptitude for teaching can be reviewed. College of Education staff monitor students at decision points up to and including student teaching/internship.

Irma pointed out a few differences between undergraduate and graduate progression and that the longest standing education programs (art, music, and physical education) don't require admission to the Professional Program until later in the program than those programs more recently instituted. Though NCATE does not have a mandated timeline, Irma suggested areas may wish to change the timeline of admission to the Professional Program to be earlier in the program, enabling students who are not suited for teaching to change majors before they are too far along. Renee advised faculty of the benefits for data collection purposes of requiring students to apply to the Professional Program sooner. Faculty were instructed to contact Rob (undergraduate programs) or Emmie (graduate programs) if they wished to change timelines.

A few questions were raised and explained about the difference in the Early Childhood and Elementary times, as well as work samples.

V.   Clinical Experiences

A. Dispositions. Irma compared the current Candidate Dispositions rating form with a proposed new format. She advised that Early Childhood faculty are piloting the new format because (1) they found they needed the dispositions to be more specific, (2) the assessments needed to occur earlier and earlier in program so they could be reiterated throughout all practica, and (3) faculty can use these data to track students and counsel them.

Irma recommended a subcommittee review the formats and/or create another format for all areas to ensure consistency throughout programs. The subcommittee would then make a recommendation to CITEP. There was some discussion and recommendations. CITEP members decided a committee was not needed and will send any edits or suggestions to Irma. She will make the recommended changes to the dispositions document before sending it to all committee members. It will be discussed at the next (April) meeting.

B. Unit Work Sample. Irma distributed a handout on the Unit Work Sample in ADEPT. There was some discussion and it was decided that the committee will talk more about it at the April meeting.

VI.   Education and Economic Development Act (EEDA)

Irma briefly introduced the act and stated that we are required to provide data as to how we meet the EEDA, a legislated requirement in teacher, counselor, and principal education programs. Irma introduced Cindy Saylor who reviewed a handout on EEDA and demonstrated the instructional website under development. The site is an interactive Blackboard site in which candidates follow links to further information, examples, and demonstration videos on the web. A web-based assessment component is also being developed.

A major question is how to ensure that all USC teacher candidates use the website and complete the assessment. One suggestion is to add it as a requirement for admission to Professional Program for all teacher education candidates. Irma stated that the committee needs to decide how we want to address this at the April meeting.

Irma noted that the state requirement is that we collect data beginning Spring 2009. We will pilot the assessment with groups of students this spring.

Cindy will sign everyone up so they can review the website on Blackboard.

VII.   Future Agenda Items

Irma reminded everyone that the next meeting will be April 17th. Several Secondary Education faculty noted this will conflict with AERA, but no other conflicts were noted. Potential agenda items include:

- Clinical Experience Hours
- Preparing candidates to work with diverse learners (including English Language Learners and diverse clinical experiences).
- Professional development for coaching/cooperating teachers and supervisors
- Surveys of interns, coaching teachers, and supervisors

The CITEP meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.