

**CITEP Meeting
March 17, 2016
Russell House 302
11:15 – 1:15**

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:
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - Lynda: How do we train and get everyone trained? We will have to be aware of this.
 - 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 is 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.
 - 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?
 - Stephanie Milling: Music is in favor, but they were not available to meet.
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - 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

Comment [PL1]:

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:
 - 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.