

Missouri Transforming Educator Preparation (MoTEP) Initiative

State MoTEP Team Meeting

FEBRUARY 27, 2017 MEETING NOTES

Outcomes

- Create the framework for two pilot data exchange projects between IHE and PK-12
- Provide guidance and direction for a first draft of a Support and Intervention Plan
- Review proposal for follow-up to the Cooperating Teacher Forums
- Pre-planning for NTEP national meeting

- I. Welcome and Introductions (Pete Kelly) 10:00
 - a. Share name, title, role and recent MoTEP communication

Members introduced themselves. Several new members attended representing other individuals.

- II. EPP continuous improvement 10:15
 - a. APR 2.0 (Daryl Fridley, Beth Kania-Gosche)
 - b. Support and Intervention Plan (Beth Kania-Gosche, Paul Katnik)

APR 2.0 moves toward measuring quality of preparation programs based on teaching standards as opposed to assessments. The APR is determined based on performance of candidates linked to the different indicators. One of the weaknesses of the employment outcomes is that only one survey item is being used on the first year teacher and principal survey. There are a large number of questions that are available in the surveys that can be used to provide further information about quality of program.

The move to standards will benefit continuous improvement. It needs to all come back to student learning. Also, it was suggested that we use all scores from the content assessments, not just two attempts. It was also noted that we are missing students who go to private schools instead of public schools. It would be helpful if private schools were interested in helping us track students. We need to figure out a way to track students who move out of state as well.

It is necessary to develop some type of data sharing agreement that clarifies what type of data is available, who will be using it and the purpose for using it.

One final thought was the possibility of including “points for progress”.

- III. Data Sharing: PK-12 and EPP 11:00
 - a. Missouri State (David Hough)
 - b. Ft. Zumwalt and Lindenwood (Mike Neill, Beth Kania-Gosche)
 - c. Edith Gummer, Kauffman

Missouri State University (MSU) conducted a study on how well their graduates performed after they were hired. They wanted to find out if they could use the teacher evaluation system to measure the impact of the preparation programs. They worked with 284 graduates working in 45 different school

districts in their first three years. Nineteen of the 45 districts said yes, which meant 139 of the 284 participated. MSU wanted at least three graduates in a single elementary school to be compared to three in another elementary school. The goal of the study was to summarize teacher evaluation scores on recent MSU graduates and compare evaluation MEEES scores from recent MSU graduates to other teachers in the school. This was an attempt to analyze the relationship between pre-service teacher assessment scores and 1st, 2nd and 3rd year teacher MEEES scores.

New teachers (recent MSU graduates) scored between 5.0 and 6.0 as did all other teachers. In other words, veteran teachers scored the same as MSU graduates. These results provided no differentiation and no information for continuous improvement of preparation programs at MSU.

Findings: Mike (Ft. Zumwalt): has done a lot with NCE data. This is available on all students who take state assessments. If we use student data to evaluate teachers or programs, we have to be very deliberate. It is very difficult to attribute data to the effects of a teacher and much more difficult to attribute K-12 data of a teacher as a measure of the quality of a preparation program.

An overview of studies commissioned by the Kauffman Foundation was presented. The purpose of the studies was to connecting content assessment and performance assessment to a teacher's growth data and then linked to the NEE evaluation data. Another study is underway on projection models that attempt to project what districts are likely to need for staff over the next 5 years.

WORKING LUNCH TO CONTINUE DISCUSSIONS

11:30

IV. PK-12 and IHE partnerships (Nicky Nickens, Alex Cuenca, Brandy Hepler)

12:15

- a. Cooperating Teacher Forums feedback
- b. Proposal for spring

Throughout the cooperating teacher forums held across the state, cooperating teachers mentioned that they are not trained to provide feedback to teacher candidates. They need professional development to do a better job as a cooperating teacher.

Themes from the forums included:

- mentor training for CMTs (cooperating mentor teacher) that includes how to provide better support and give better feedback
- provide training on how to evaluate a teacher candidate's performance (MOST videos should include clips of teacher candidate performance)
- CMTs want to feel like they are a part of the entire process
- They want more information about the apprentice model
- what does it mean when they hear about the co-teaching model
- more support for CMTs when there are issues

Possible ideas moving forward: Triad Seminars (teacher candidate, university supervisor and CMT) that features a morning with cooperating teachers and teacher candidates in separate rooms; afternoon is with all three audiences together. Use the CMTs who attended the forums to help train.

- V. MoTEP Sustainability (David Hough, Paul Katnik) 1:00
 - a. Setting priorities
 - b. Role and responsibility of MABEP

A discussion was held on the role of the Missouri Advisory Board for Educator Preparation (MABEP). MABEP is the logical body to take the role of CCSSO. It was recommended that the joint presentation to the CBHE and SBE each year includes an update on the progress that has been made by the MoTEP group.

- VI. MoTEP Wrap Up and Next Steps (Pete Kelly) 2:00
 - a. National NTEP meeting March 15-17, 2017

Continue work on the support and intervention plan

Develop a data sharing agreement

Proposal for Kauffman

- b. March 31, 2017