

CITEP Meeting
October 21, 2016
Wardlaw 274-O
1:00 – 3:00

Minutes

Members Present: Lynda Nilges, Cindy Van Buren, Regina Wragg, Lisa Peterson, George Roy (in place of Nate Carnes), Pamela Adams, Derrick Hines, Angie Baum, Stephen Thompson, Christine Lotter, Mary Styslinger, Chris Christle, Beth Looney, Collin Webster, Stephanie Milling, Catherine Wiskes, Wendy Valerio, Peter Duffy, Margo Jackson, Donna Watson, Lauren Sanborn, Rob Dedmon, Beth White, Kevin Smoak, Cassy Paschal, Tommy Hodges, Lara Ducate, Jon Pedersen, Olga Ivashkovich

I. Welcome and Introductions – Chair: Lynda Nilges

Dr. Nilges called the meeting to order at 1:05 pm.

II. Approval of minutes from September meeting – Lynda Nilges

Dr. Duffy motioned to approve the minutes, and Mr. Hines seconded his motion. The minutes were subsequently approved.

III. Election of Co-Chair – Lynda Nilges

At the last meeting, Dr. Milling was nominated as a co-chair. Dr. Nilges opened the floor for additional nominations, and there were not any. Dr. Nilges mentioned that she and others in the college have learned of Dr. Milling's experiences through working with CAEP and she brings in a lot of experience with accreditation to the table. Dr. Nilges then called for a vote: 17 hands up, majority vote. Dr. Milling was named the co-chair.

IV. Dispositions – Time to Vote – Cindy Van Buren

Dr. Van Buren reminded the group of the lengthy discussion on dispositions in the last meeting, and that now was the time to vote. She reviewed the recommendations that the outside consultant proposed over the summer.

- Initial self-assessment should occur early on in students' program so that there is sufficient time to ingrain these behaviors.
- Self-assessment rubric should be used in a formative way at least until near the student's final semester.
- An appropriate venue (course, workshop, meeting with advisor) for discussion of the rubric and what it means and why we are using it is necessary.
- Whomever are the staff members who will actually be assessing the interns using the rubric, they should have a calibration meeting once a year.
- To promote a culture that supports professional dispositions, the college could institute a once a week "professional day" sort of the opposite of "casual Friday."

Proposed Fall 2016 Implementations:

- Dispositions Procedures (handout)
- [Disposition Self Assessment Form](#) (handout)
 - EDTE 201 and MUED program are piloting the assessment now
 - Proposal to include the dispositions with professional program and/or internship application
- Professional Dispositions Intervention Form (handout) – Art Education has already piloted the dispositions intervention form and given us valuable feedback.

Dr. Van Buren then opened the floor for comments and approval. Dr. Ducate questioned the number of times that dispositions should be assessed...is this the recommended number? Dr. Van Buren replied that this is the minimum that we would do. CAEP suggests that it should not be a snapshot, but that this is something we should be assessing throughout the program. A program area is free to do more than the minimum when it comes to teacher dispositions.

Ms. Paschal commented that from the field, this makes so much sense. This will allow for candidates to see where they should be in their career prior to becoming a classroom teachers.

Dr. Styslinger questioned that with the dispositions self-assessment being presented with the application online, will this appear as summative? Dr. Wragg replied that once we get the information, the data will go to the Director of Clinical Experiences and then distribute to program areas...program areas will not have to go into Survey Monkey to retrieve the information. It's what we do with it, not how obtain the information.

Mr. Dedmon added that everyone will complete the self-assessment when entering the professional program, but others may take it at other times based upon program area decisions.

Dr. Christle then added that she believes we should catch the candidates' behaviors or questions regarding dispositions prior to their internship. Dr. Wragg replied that at any time, the program can request a link to the self-assessment to administer to your class or an instructor. We are not using the data to assign a grade, but we would have this data throughout the course of their program.

Dr. Van Buren added that another piece of data we will have is if anyone completes dispositions intervention forms, these forms will all go to one place. If Candidate A gets five different intervention forms from different areas, we will know that and be able to address it.

Dr. Christle said that if this will help us catch behaviors before they get too far, such as a student being rude in class, then we need to implement our own dispositions assessment in our program areas. Dr. Van Buren replied that if a student is being rude in class, she would recommend implementing the intervention form.

Mr. Dedmon added that he thinks that this will be fantastic because currently the only place we have time to do an action plan is during their internship.

Dr. Valerio then said that she selected this semester to include the dispositions in all of the Music methods courses and has made this part of the students' grades. She said that this makes the students very aware of the required dispositions.

Dean Pedersen then asked if there are there are any other programs outside of education that use dispositions. Dr. Milling replied that she would imagine that the medical healthcare fields would. Normally nursing programs have similar issues that we have to deal with. This may assist in implementing procedures for the College of Education.

Dr. Van Buren said that what we ultimately want to avoid is a candidate that is in Internship B with an issue and we all agree that we knew this was going to happen. If we have those conversations earlier with paperwork, then we could avoid that situation or help an intern early.

Dean Pedersen then said if you go back in history, dispositions were oftentimes used in not allowing students into internships and lawsuits were filed. He is supportive of the idea that we have got to get a hold on how we get the students to understand professionalism and what it means to be a professional. He warned to be especially cautious in how you assess and measure outcomes during these pilots.

The committee then voted on the implementation of the dispositions procedures. There were not any thumbs down or neutrals, and the committee decided to take out the part regarding the “professional day” (the last bullet) since there is a dress code explained in the clinical experiences manual.

Mr. Dedmon then added that now that the dispositions self-assessment has been approved, the professional program application should now be ready to implement electronically. Mr. Dedmon and Ms. Watson will work to move all program areas over to the electronic application.

V. Teacher Induction Model – Tommy Hodges

Dr. Hodges stated that one of the requirements of CAEP is that the college shows impact on our candidates’ performances on their students in the classroom. The state does not provide this data for us so we are tasked with providing this. One of the ideas here is to position us as a college to be able to collect data on our program completers during their first three years in the classroom. We wanted to bring the recommendation to this group...we would be able to collect data for CAEP to show impact on our completers.

Dr. Hodges then posed that although it is a requirement of CAEP, why is it good practice? We all believe that our candidates are not done learning after leaving our program. It is an initial program...providing support mechanisms to students during their first few years teaching is a practice that we should implement. This is a draft, general overview of what that might look like. This involves key personnel that we would have to hire such as an Induction Coordinator to oversee this for the college. We will have to implement Blackboard or something similar. We do need buy-in from this group and to decide how to collect the data.

A committee member then questioned if we would begin with a small group for the Induction Model. Dr. Hodges replied that when he and others initially discussed this, it was decided that we would pilot a small group first. Dr. Van Buren then added that Dean Pedersen has had a detailed discussion with the Superintendent of Lexington Two and the college may start with a group in this district. She emphasized this is just one possibility for how we might approach the initial implementation. We could also start with graduates from one major or we could start with teaching fellow graduates. From a CAEP perspective, the college would want to have a small pilot of this occurring by the time CAEP visits next fall. Philosophically, Dr. Hodges and the group just wants to know if CITEP is in agreement with this, but not to be concerned over logistics or funding.

Dr. Duffy shared that he felt it was a strong document and provided a really good vision of what this could look like. Having 11 graduate students, he is unaware of how we would implement this though. Dr. Hodges replied that there are different models where they have developed contracts with districts that include an instructor but also has facilitators that are doing the more day to day work. Doctoral students that have been classroom teachers can also be these induction specialists inside programs or facilitators

that are experienced teachers in districts. This is not necessarily all in-house or faculty that the college currently has. When surveyed, students felt confident in their content knowledge but less confident in classroom management, assessment, etc. so content knowledge may not be an area of concern to focus on.

Dr. Christle then added that this is definitely best practice because we cannot teach our candidates how to be good teachers until they have their own classroom. Behavior management or how to work with diverse populations can be something that someone provides to all teachers and does not need to be area specific.

Mr. Smoak agreed and said that he is a strong proponent of this. Statistically, more teachers are leaving the profession in 3 years than they were 5 years ago, so he welcomes additional resources and availability. He would also like to partner with the university so we are both helping each other.

Dr. Nilges said that she definitely sees the need for it and believes that it will also be very helpful with the candidates. What is the incentive for the candidates?

Mr. Smoak then added that teachers will have to agree to this and not be required to participate. Graduate courses could also be an incentive.

Dr. Roy replied that he believes that teachers would reach out to us more frequently. If they would like resources on classroom management, then they may be more willing to reach out to USC than their principal.

Dr. Van Buren added that Dean Pedersen met with Dr. Hodges and Dr. Roy and is very in favor of the proposal.

Dr. Hodges added that the proposal is generic and vague for a reason, so that we are not dictating policy. It should be design-based and changed over time.

Dr. Duffy said that he still had a lot of questions, but is in favor. What are the next steps? When can we propose questions?

Dr. Van Buren replied that she wants to notify Dean Pedersen that CITEP is in favor of this and begin crafting a job description for the University Induction Coordinator, seek approval for hiring someone, and then begin a subgroup that includes an Associate Dean to spell out some of these specifics. In the meantime, any questions can be sent directly to Dr. Van Buren. The committee voted in favor of the proposed model.

VI. Unit Work Sample – Update – Regina Wragg

Dr. Wragg began by “reviewing the ask.”

- All program areas have this key assessment, but no explicitly common criteria, to measure candidate planning, implementation, and assessment of curriculum
- Recommended as a Unit Wide assessment by CAEP Steering Committee
- From unit-wide review through the perspective of CAEP standards, we have two areas of deficiency– technology, college- and career-ready standards

SCTS 4.0 (previously called NIET) and USC COE UWS

- Select Unit Work Sample rubric criteria that are similar to or have been developed to enhance SCTS 4.0
 - Enhance technology and unit-specific planning, implementation, and assessment criteria
- Opportunity to promote continuity of expectations within the unit and the greater state professional community

Dr. Wragg then reviewed the comments from program review on the proposed rubric from Secondary programs and PEDU.

- can adequately measure planning, implementation and assessment of curriculum in your program area, and
- criteria you would add to effectively assess how technology is used to enhance and measure learning.

Dr. Baum said that Early Childhood just met this morning and discussed. Their initial thought was that they were fine. They don't currently use the Unit Work Sample as a unit-wide assessment. Are you asking us to use it as a key assessment?

Dr. Wragg explained the difference between a unit-wide key assessment and program assessment. Your program is contributing data to the Unit Work Sample, but your program area does not have to use this data for your program. You would have to implement this even if it is not used as a key assessment. The "ask" is ensuring that all program areas' candidates are contributing to this. Today is not the approval day, but just a discussion day.

Dr. Lotter added that "evidence of student learning" would need to be added. Secondary met and decided that there were several pieces missing. Dr. Nilges then added that PE agreed that we need more of a reflective piece.

Dr. Milling: Three areas: long range planning, unit goals and how they are assessed, and post-assessment analysis and results. Dr. Wragg: From the OAA perspective, if everyone agrees with the criteria, your assignments can differ and be 1 or 10.

Dr. Styslinger added that she was envisioning this as a supplemental rubric. A data collection tool for meeting the college's data needs. She would use this in addition to what she is already using for her Unit Work Sample.

Dr. Wragg replied that Dr. Styslinger is correct and the hope is that this task force would develop this criteria and decide which criteria is already being evaluated in their programs. Lynda Nilges, Peter Duffy, Christine Lotter, and Kevin Smoak volunteered to be a part of the task force. Dr. Van Buren also suggested that Jennifer Wise would be a good person to include.

VII. Online Internship Application – Cindy Van Buren

Dr. Van Buren shared feedback from program areas on the online internship application:

- Create a link for resumes and delete questions on P. 9 & 10. The supplemental candidate information seems more appropriate at the program admission point. These candidates will have been admitted and gone through screenings with similar questions. A link to a resume would provide similar information and seems more professional/less redundant at that point in the program.
- Page 4 question #8. The word supervisor is misspelled.

- Page 7 first question is somewhat misleading. Maybe it should read, "You must complete an internship in grade band 2-3 and an internship in grade band 4-6. Rank your preferences below."
- Previous Practica/ Field Experience (Experience is misspelled.)
- Is there a reason it says "New" in front of Lex./Rich 5?
- Is there a reason the information at the end is the same as the beginning with the exception of the date?
- Are we giving interns too much "choice" in where they are placed? What is our Diversity formula for placements?

Mr. Dedmon added that for background information, the previous internship forms varied on what was asked to students regarding internship placements.

Dr. Van Buren said that proximity is always an issue for students, but this is not something that we can always accommodate. Maggie Frick will invest a lot of her time in learning the Chalk & Wire field experiences module which already has the diversity of every school in SC built into it. If we can start making placements through Chalk & Wire, we will be able to track where a student has been placed for every experience and get a better understanding of where they should be placed for the final internship.

Dr. Van Buren then asked if everyone approves of going to one online internship application. There was not any negative feedback. The Office of Assessment and Accreditation will ensure that the online internship application is ready so that Music can implement next week.

VIII. Reading Courses – Lucy Spence

Dr. Spence presented to the committee on EDRD 500 – Content Area Literacy and asked if there would be any student interest across program areas in enrolling.

- Offered in Spring 2017 on Mondays at 4:40-7:25
- Goal: The candidate will understand the foundations of literacy research and practice as integral to learning in content areas. The candidate will use reading, writing, listening, speaking, viewing, and doing in relation to visual art, foreign language, movement, music, and other content areas in teaching.

Dr. Ivashkovich said that she had MAT and MT Art students would be interested...at least 2 students.

Ms. Sanborn said that the bulk of students will be taking this next year with the new Read to Succeed requirements. Mr. Dedmon added that it will vary across programs as to when they will begin enrolling in this course. This course was designed for MAT and undergraduates, so all coordinators will need to ensure that the program adopted this course and that all MAT students are being advised that this is now a requirement.

Ms. Spence gave everyone a copy of the syllabus and asked that if the course affects anyone, to send numbers and schedules to her so that she can begin scheduling for next year.

Mr. Dedmon also added that EDRD 500 was approved by the state to meet the Read to Succeed requirements. Dr. Milling added that Dr. Spence did a great job in spear-heading this to ensure that we have a course that is relevant to K-12 students and thanked her for the work she did on this.

IX. CAEP Update – All

Dr. Wragg started by giving an overview of the Self-Study Report Process and Employer Data:

- Site Visit is set for Oct. 22-24, 2017
- Self Study is Due Feb. 24, 2017
- Current Status—
 - First Drafts Written
 - Data Summary Reporting
 - Next Draft by December holidays
- On Sept. 27th OAA obtained induction-year teacher data for 49.8% of our requested 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16 graduate cohorts from SCDE.
- Top 5 employers of 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16 USC COE Graduates are— Richland 2 (14.6%), Richland 1 (11.1%), Lexington 1 (10.2%), Lexington/Richland 5 (9.2%) and Lexington 2 (7.1%)
- Current school employment data was used to send employer surveys to 352 school principals in 63 South Carolina school districts. As of today, the survey has a 12% response rate which meets CAEP criteria of 10-15%; to be determined is the representation of licensure areas.

Those that attended Fall 2016 CaepCon then shared some of the information they obtained from the conference. Dr. Nilges said that there was a lot of discussion on unit-wide assessments in several sessions that she attended and learned that we do need another unit-wide assessment and a focus on technology. Dr. Milling added that in working with Dr. Van Buren and Dr. Wragg on writing and pulling together evidence for Standard 2 for the self-study, they discovered a lot of procedural things that the college should refine. Looking at the TIM model, there is an opportunity of looking at best practices and setting the stage for beyond. Dr. Van Buren also added that CAEP is still figuring things out and it may help us in being one of the first visits.

X. Other Items

Dr. Van Buren said that her and Mr. Smoak are planning a committee (Educator Effectiveness Roundtable) to invite colleagues in Midlands districts and University faculty/staff to discuss enhanced ADEPT, SCTS 4.0, SLOs, and Teacher Induction. Lexington 2 will host the first location...she is excited about this collaboration and will invite some members of CITEP to some of the meetings.

Dr. Nilges adjourned the meeting at 2:55 pm.