

CITEP Meeting
September 16, 2016
Wardlaw 274-O
1:00 – 3:00

Minutes

Members Present: Lynda Nilges, Cindy Van Buren, Regina Wragg, Lisa Peterson, Nate Carnes, Derrick Hines, Angie Baum, Stephen Thompson, Christine Lotter, Mary Styslinger, Chris Christle, Beth Looney, Collin Webster, Stephanie Milling, Catherine Wiskes, Wendy Valerio, Minuette Floyd, Peter Duffy, Margo Jackson, Donna Watson, Lauren Sanborn, Rob Dedmon, Beth White, Kevin Smoak, Cassy Paschal, Tommy Hodges

I. Welcome and Introductions – Chair: Lynda Nilges

Dr. Nilges called the meeting to order at 1:05 pm and began with an introduction of new and old members. New members: Derrick Hines, Cassy Paschal, Lara Ducate, Catherine Wiskes and Kevin Smoak (Jennifer Wise, SC Teacher of the Year, is also on the committee this year but could not be at the first meeting).

II. Approval of minutes from April meeting – Lynda Nilges

Dr. Carnes motioned to approve the minutes, and Dr. Milling seconded his motion. The minutes were subsequently approved.

III. Charge from the Dean – Jon Pedersen

Dr. Pedersen gave a brief charge and introduction. He mentioned that he was a chair of a similar committee in Nebraska and knows the importance of everyone coming together to discuss preparation of initial licensure teachers. Even though the CAEP visit is in Fall of 2017, he stressed that this is ongoing formative assessment. He is very interested in the work we do and would like to be invited to meetings at any time.

IV. Election of Co-Chair – Lynda Nilges

Dr. Nilges said that an Associate Dean should be a chair of CITEP and that Dean Pedersen has requested that she serve in this capacity, but that does leave room for another co-chair. Dr. Nilges then asked if there were any nominations from the floor. Dr. Wragg nominated Dr. Milling, to which she replied that she would have discussion with Dr. Nilges and then make a decision. Dr. Nilges told everyone that they could nominate someone else by emailing Dr. Van Buren by September 23rd. We will then vote at our next meeting.

V. Dispositions – Review of Summer Progress – Regina Wragg, Cindy Van Buren

Dr. Wragg shared that the Office of Assessment and Accreditation worked with an outside consultant over the summer regarding dispositions, and she then shared these results from the consultant. The consultant gave the following recommendations:

- 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."

Dr. Van Buren then gave a description of exactly what dispositions are: a habit of mind or how one is pre-disposed to react to certain situations. At USC, we have 4 dispositions that we measure and we do not measure them until internship. Last year in CITEP we decided to move forward with the following proposal:

- I. Reaffirm or revise the dispositions adopted by the COE in 2001 and updated in 2006; ask faculty to assist with making links to research for each of the disposition items.
- II. Approve or revise the current dispositions rubric and submit it to the CAEP assessment shell for EPP created assessments.
- III. Begin to measure dispositions across time in addition to the internship dispositions assessment
 - Disposition self-assessment in an early class (perhaps 201 and others) and at admission to the professional program
 - Disposition assessment connected to all or most field experiences
 - Disposition assessment at admission to the internship
- IV. Institute a disposition concerns form/procedures as a coaching mechanism for students who are exhibiting behaviors that are in conflict with the COE Dispositions.

Dr. Van Buren then added that although CAEP does want us to focus on dispositions, her experiences with the clinical experience situations just this semester show that there are other important reasons to stress teacher dispositions in our program.

Dr. Nilges mentioned that with her work with students in the past and through internships, you really do know when a disposition is not there. Do they have the right attitude towards their professional work and what it takes to be a teacher?

Dean Pedersen added that the idea of dispositions and dispositional research has been around for more than 30 years. He applauded this group for taking this on and this is something we have wrestled with for decades.

Dr. Wragg then shared a dispositions intervention form and procedures and provided the opportunity for input. Dr. Hodges suggested that on #8, change the "unit" wording to program level and department level. He also suggested that we edit the program area committee definition so that it is more flexible and only provide suggestions rather than requirements. The programs' committees should be able to resolve it and determine the number. The areas of Dance and Theatre may feel they can work autonomously on this since they are smaller programs.

Dr. Wragg then recommended that the Office of Clinical Experiences compose this program area committee. Dr. Baum added that we do not want to take out the option of program level faculty being involved in some issues. Dr. Nilges said that the smaller program areas are at an advantage with determining issues and Dr. Baum agreed that in larger programs there are times where students can go until junior year without having a full time faculty member. Dr. Wragg reminded the committee that this intervention form would be initiated by a faculty member, university supervisor, or a coaching teacher.

Dr. Van Buren requested that Dr. Floyd discuss her use of the dispositions intervention form with an intern this week. She said that the student understood the seriousness of it all and she also gave feedback on how she would work on these behaviors. With her input on how she would improve, it worked really well. They both realized there was a communication issue and she did not realize some of the issues she was demonstrating until they were brought to her attention. Dr. Nilges then added that she has had similar issues and approves the use of this intervention form.

The conversation then shifted to dispositions self-assessments and assessments. Dr. Wragg said that the faculty team of EDTE 201, which all Early Childhood, Elementary, Middle Level, Music, and Foreign Language students take, has agreed to teach about the dispositions in that class and administer the self-assessment. If the students do not take that class, where do we do this in other program areas? Dr. Floyd said that Art students learn about dispositions when they enroll in the Early Childhood and Elementary methods courses. Dr. Carnes added that Middle Level has almost an entire section of EDTE 201, but they do not know many of these candidates until later in the program. Dr. Stysliger said that in 302 and 500 they have practicum experiences where they could tie dispositions in early in the English MT and MAT programs. Dr. Nilges said that PE students do not take 201, but they do take an intro to PE course where this could be implemented.

Looking at the dispositions rubric, Dr. Wragg added that her office will create a 4th Exemplary level based upon comments that faculty make over the past year on their candidates. Currently it is only a 3 level rubric.

Dr. Wragg then presented the committee with the self-assessment that students will take online. The results will then be reported back to program areas on the dispositions rubric. The students will only see an “I Statement” and they will agree/disagree on the self-assessment, so they will not know what level the question is (proficient/emerging, etc.) Dr. Baum suggested that some students have not yet worked with students, so some of these questions will not apply to them. These dispositions could still be captured pre-internship, but with different wording for students who have not yet been in a classroom.

Dean Pedersen added that he sees this as a formative tool to possibly counsel a student out of teaching as a major. Dr. Nilges said that she has found that at many times if a student for example is having an issue with punctuality, it affects other areas...dispositions and performance based seem to go hand in hand. Dr. Van Buren then added that we changed the wording from “Concerns form” to “Intervention Form” because this could become more than a coaching tool. She also said that she has looked at all of the action plans this semester and every action plan so far has dispositions tied to the problem and if we can address sooner, this may help. Dr. Milling mentioned that in order for this to be a tool for having someone leave a program, it would have to be included in program guidelines if it was going to be that kind of tool.

Dr. Christle suggested that there be a place on the intervention form where students write in what they will do to change the behavior and then sign the form.

Dr. Wragg recommended that the Office of Assessment & Accreditation take back all of this feedback regarding dispositions and make changes, and we will then vote in October. This was approved by the committee.

VI. University Supervisor/Coaching Teacher Evaluations – Regina Wragg

Dr. Wragg said that we did not get any feedback from areas on the supervisor/coaching teacher evaluations, so we are looking to move forward with the proposed summary formats unless there are other recommendations.

Dr. Van Buren asked of public school representatives: Do you think principals want the coaching teacher data or should they have that data? Both representatives agreed that they would like to receive the data. Mr. Smoak said that as the Induction Coordinator of his district, he would like to receive the data and then make the decision on where the information should go. Ms. Paschal then added that in her district, the principals have the authority to move the interns around, so she would like to receive this information. Dr. Wragg then added that the main question is does it go to the district or school building level? This could be teased out in MOUs with school districts.

VII. Unit Work Sample – Update – Regina Wragg

Dr. Wragg said that all program areas have this key assessment, but there are no explicitly common criteria, to measure candidate planning, implementation, and assessment of curriculum. The Unit Work Sample was recommended as a Unit Wide assessment by the CAEP Steering Committee. From unit-wide review through the perspective of CAEP standards, we have two areas of deficiency: technology and college- and career-ready standards. CAEP Standards 1.5, 2.3, and 3.4 involve technology while CAEP Standards 1.4, 2.3, and 3.4 involve college- and career-readiness standards.

Dr. Wragg then suggested that we 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). This will provide the opportunity to promote continuity of expectations within the unit and the greater professional community. However, we need a task force to meet between now and Oct. 21st. Dr. Wragg then asked of volunteers. Dr. Nilges volunteered to be a part of the task force.

Dr. Christle questioned that if we are going to have a unit-wide Unit Work Sample, shouldn't it be the same thing that teachers are required to do in school districts? Dr. Van Buren replied that she asked at the NEIT rubric training what would happen to the Unit Work Sample and Long Range Plans and the State Department said that they did not yet know.

Dr. Carnes added that is something that he would like to take back to his colleagues to digest. Although this is well-intended, the more we have of these unit-wide requirements, the less opportunity the degree program has to customize something that meets the SPA report. Whatever we create that is unit-wide, it cannot be used for Middle Level's SPA. Dr. Hodges then said that we cannot bypass the faculty governance process...we must have all faculty buy-in on the process before moving forward. Dr. Styslinger then added that her students create a Unit Work Sample that they do not use at all in the program, and then they have to create another assessment much more detailed and tied to SPA standards. It is becoming one checklist after another.

Dr. Van Buren then reminded everyone why we are focusing on this. The CAEP self-study determined that we have very few unit wide assessments and appear to operate in silos instead of as a unit. . Something everyone is already doing is the Unit Work Sample, so we are just trying to obtain unit wide

data...not change your assessments. There is nothing wrong with all of our program areas being different, but we have to have some data to share that is unit-wide since CAEP is accrediting the entire unit.

Dr. Wragg then added that we have done a crosswalk among all of the Unit Work Samples and looked at SPA standards, so we have that available for a smaller working group. It could solely be just three elements that we all assess unit-wide with the rest of the rubric. Dr. Hodges suggested that you could add elements of the rubric that your SPA would never even see. Chalk & Wire would only report SPA data.

Dr. Wragg then said that she would send program coordinators additional information and asked that by October 21st everyone meet with their faculty and bring feedback and then we can decide from there. She then thanked the committee for meaningful feedback.

VIII. Online Professional Program and Internship Application – Rob Dedmon, Cindy Van Buren

Dr. Van Buren said that her offices realized that everyone had a different application, so she had a graduate assistant this summer go through all of the professional program applications and internship applications, create a crosswalk and create one application for each. She also said that there are no longer going to be paper applications, but she wants everyone's buy-in on having 1 application as opposed to 15. By this point all students should have Chalk & Wire accounts and the Teacher Education Profile for SLED Reports & TB Test Results. In the past these paper applications would go to Student Services. Mr. Dedmon says that the professional program application can be implemented now. For the internship application, Dr. Van Buren wants everyone to look over it and ensure that there is not something missing in it to have ready to go by the December date. She will send everyone a copy of the application for review.

Mr. Dedmon said the basic purpose of the internship application is to notify the Office of Clinical Experiences when students will plan to complete their internship. He also said that on the current internship application, there is a place at the bottom that states "recommendation by program area" where the program area signs off before the student submits it to Student Services. This part is not currently on the electronic application, and Mr. Dedmon asked if this was necessary. Dr. Valerio replied that this is necessary for Music Education and asked if there was a way to route the application to different program areas. Ms. Peterson said she would check on this in Chalk & Wire and report back to everyone.

Dr. Van Buren and Mr. Dedmon agreed that they would move forward with the professional program application and then send the internship application for feedback from program areas.

IX. TB/SLED check processes – Rob Dedmon, Lauren Sanborn

Mr. Dedmon reviewed the TB & SLED check requirements. Before participating in any initial educator preparation program course that requires a PK-12 experience, students must have a cleared TB test and a SC Law Enforcement Division (SLED) check on file with the College of Education. These requirements apply to any course in which students spend time in a PK-12 school or interact with PK-12 aged children, regardless of the type of experience, number of hours, or number of days that will be spent in the PK-12 setting. TB and SLED checks must be uploaded to Chalk and Wire by students.

Mr. Dedmon then gave an overview of the work that was completed this summer. The Office of Student Services emailed every student in specified field experience courses. At least three email notifications were sent to students needing TB and/or SLED documentation prior to the start of the Fall 2016 semester.

At least one additional notification was sent out the first week of classes. At the start of the Fall 2016 semester, all instructors of these courses were sent an email notifying them of the students who had not submitted TB and/or SLED documentation. Two additional email notifications were sent out. All submissions came through Chalk and Wire with the exception of EDSE 302 and 500 and any student not in a teacher education major.

Ms. Sanborn added that they do not require students who are not majoring in a program area to purchase Chalk & Wire...these students can go through a different route.

Mr. Dedmon gave everyone a task to review the field experiences list and ensure that they have not missed any courses or if any courses need to be removed. This list was compiled after he received feedback from the March CITEP meeting.

Mr. Dedmon then discussed compliance rate and strategies for enforcement. Ms. Sanborn is emailing instructors frequently but asked of the committee if there is someone that should be copied on that or if there is something else that she can do to help with compliance? In the future, something more formal can come out from their office prior to the start of the semester. Dr. Baum suggested that program coordinators be copied on all of these emails. Dr. Carnes added that he has worked with Ms. Sanborn numerous times, and students are notified they will be removed from the course if they do not complete requirements. Ms. Sanborn then brought up those courses that are not tied to a program, such as 201, and asked who should be copied on those emails. Dr. Hodges replied that Christie Martin is the course coordinator for 201 and could be contacted. Dr. Nilges added that she would share the language that she includes in her syllabus to everyone regarding the SLED/TB requirement and deadline.

Mr. Dedmon then shared the proposed process for dealing with an arrest record. If the SLED report reveals a record:

- The student will be asked to meet with COE Assistant Dean Rob Dedmon, Assistant Dean Cindy Van Buren, and the Program Coordinator
- The student will be asked to describe the incident that led to the arrest
- It will be explained to the student that IF they are allowed to continue that some schools might have additional checks and they could run into future problems AND that the SDE will ultimately decide if they can do student teaching and become a teacher
- The student will be notified in writing of the decision.

Dr. Van Buren then asked Mr. Smoak, Lexington Two's Induction Coordinator, if a student had a charge that did not endanger children such as public disturbance and we went through this process and felt that it was safe for the student to come into your school, would that be enough or would you like to know everything on the SLED report? Mr. Smoak replied that he would have to check the district policies, but imagined that if it was something small and USC went through the proposed process, then the district would not need to know.

The committee agreed that we will finalize this process during our next meeting after receiving feedback from public school partners and program areas.

X. Status Update on Teacher Induction Model – Tommy Hodges

Dr. Hodges distributed packets with information on the Teacher Induction Model. Dr. Hodges and Dr. Van Buren requested for all committee members to review the information and provide feedback during the next CITEP meeting.

XI. Other Items

There were not any additional items for discussion. Dr. Nilges adjourned the meeting at 3:00 pm.