

**Missouri Advisory Board for Educator Preparation  
Official Minutes - July 24, 2014  
Sixth Floor Conference Room, Jefferson Building  
Jefferson City, MO  
9:00-2:00**

**Presiding**      **Rusty Monhollon, Assistant Commissioner for Academic Affairs  
Missouri Department of Higher Education,**

Meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

Members present: Commissioner David Russell, Assistant Commissioner Paul Katnik, Gena McCluskey, Erin Cary, Chad Bass, Linda Kaiser, David Hough, Karyn Chval, Cathy Cartier, Glenn Coltharp, and Alexander Cuenca

Members Absent: Mike Ponder, Kristen Merrill, and Karen Garber-Miller

**Meeting Minutes**

- I. Approval and discussion of June 11, 2014 meeting minutes
  1. Additional comments included
    - a. Minutes should attempt to contain the general flow of the discussion
      1. It was noted that these meeting minutes will be used as a communication tool
    - b. Minutes should note when consensus has been reached on particular action items
  2. June 11 minutes were approved unanimously
- II. Procedural Issues
  1. Review of parliamentary procedures for MABEP meetings
    - a. Roberts Rules will be generally followed, although discussions will be generally informal
    - b. Include votes when determining consensus
  2. MABEP Administrative rule (5 CSR 20-400.450)
    - a. Appointment of members
    - b. Public comment period
      1. No comments
    - c. Status
      1. Official approval of the rule will take place at the August State Board of Education meeting on August 12th
      2. Statute will become official on August 28th
- III. Joint meeting of the State Board of Education and the Coordinating Board for Higher Education
  1. Discussion of possible topics to be presented at the joint meeting of the two Boards on July 29
  2. Identify presenters who will represent MABEP
  3. Item will be discussed in greater detail towards the end of the meeting

#### IV. Implementation of MOSPE

1. Missouri General Education Assessment (MoGEA)
  - a. According to MABEP members present
    1. Steve Weiss, representing Pearson, was very knowledgeable and did a good job facilitating the meeting that occurred on June 6
    2. Participants at the meeting were able to share concerns and felt those concerns were heard
    3. Those that attended felt the activities supported the outcomes for the day
    4. People in content areas shared input on particular content items
  - b. The overall purpose is to develop an assessment of general knowledge prior to admittance to an educator preparation program and determine minimally acceptable standards for same
  - c. One member suggested there is an issue of a misalignment between the current MoGEA assessment and what is taught and assessed by the 41 different Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) in Missouri
  - d. Several MABEP members questioned how the 41 IHEs conform to a general education curriculum that would make the MoGEA valid. It was suggested that each IHE's generally education curriculum makes it distinctive and therefore creates a challenge in revising those curricula to align with the MoGEA.
  - e. If the suggested changes are made to the MoGEA framework as recommended at the June 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, it should reflect better alignment with current general education curricula
  - f. Several MABEP members notes that some Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) will have to subsidize their IHE general education curricula by developing and requiring specific courses and content to align to the MoGEA
  - g. A brief discussion occurred regarding the depth of content knowledge needed prior to admittance to an EPP versus the depth of knowledge needed before completing the program or obtaining a license
    1. Example: how much math does an English teacher need?
    2. Finding the appropriate levels is the challenge of revising the framework
  - h. Several noted that the original MoGEA framework was discipline-based while the new framework appears to be based more skills, knowledge and abilities
  - i. MABEP members discussed the purpose of an entry assessment
    1. An assessment is necessary at the end of General Education before the admittance into a preparation program as an important part of a recruitment strategy
    2. The assessment ensures that teachers entering the workforce have general knowledge and skills
    3. This assessment serves as a type of gateway and results in some people not passing. The very high pass rate of the C-BASE was noted.
    4. It was noted that a regression analyses performed in the past with student scores indicated that C-BASE subsection scores were strong predictors of Praxis pass rates
    5. MABEP members agreed that a valid entry level assessment that indicates a potential teacher candidate's success is a necessary component of any comprehensive assessment

6. It was noted that General Education is controlled by the IHE, not just the EEP, and many have rigorous requirements that are examined on a regular basis
- j. One member suggested that an entry assessment like MoGEA be administered in the freshmen year to then be used as a guide for what students need to take sophomore year
- k. One member offered positive feedback regarding the lengthening of the time for Reading
- l. One member questioned the process for setting the qualifying score (i.e. cut score) in regards to getting a broad enough sample given the timeframe between the first administration and the date set for the qualifying score?
- m. It was requested that DESE maintain a Q&A on their website regarding all topics related to the Missouri Educator Gateway Assessments (MEGA) to maintain an accurate record of responses to questions related to interpreting requirements/assessments. For example:
  1. If students get 5 attempts on the first version of MoGEA, do they get 5 attempts on the second version of MoGEA?
  2. What constitutes content in terms of the GPA you must have in content areas in terms of the APR-EPP?
  3. Everything related to certification should be included as a part of the Q&A?
  4. Include as a part of the Q & A the Pearson standards and rationale related to appropriate timeframe between administration and setting the qualifying score
- n. It was also requested that representatives of the Office of Educator Quality meet with the Missouri Council of Education Deans (MCED) at the September meeting to discuss issues and address specific questions and provide information and uniformed answers to timelines and other issues related to the assessments.
  1. Dr. Hough put this request forward as a motion stated as follows: The Office of Educator Quality at DESE meet with the Missouri Council of Education Deans in September to discuss all issues including timeline, reliability, validity, rigor, alignment with Gen ED requirements. After discussion, the motion was withdrawn with Dr. Hough stating that he would ask the leadership of MCED request such a meeting. A concern was noted regarding whether MCED or MACTE be the conduit to MABEP.
  2. There being no official recommendation related to the MoGEA, it was suggested that:
    1. DESE revisit the timeline for the revised framework for MoGEA and examine appropriate, representative “n” size, how it was determined, what steps need to be taken to ensure reliability/validity
    2. Create a steering committee to examine the timeline of the administration of MoGEA II
- o. Summary statements regarding MoGEA:
  1. The first step taken at the June meeting was positive
  2. MABEP members agree we are moving in the right direction

3. There is optimism that further development of the MoGEA frameworks done prior to establishing a state-required minimum “cut” score will ultimately ensure a valid assessment.
4. Further discussion:
  1. Extend the timeline to a point when the N is sufficient and is representative on the different groups in Missouri (university, gender, race, etc)
  2. Ensure that Pearson is doing what it should be doing? Meet with Pearson and discuss the time period necessary to have credible impact data – randomly select what that composition must look like before a qualifying score can be set
  3. Set up a conversation with Pearson to review the process for determining the qualifying score to ensure it is reliable and valid and representative of the state
  4. One member suggested the possibility of using different entry requirements during the year that data is collected on MoGEA II
  5. Another member noted that even if the test is taken in Sept and a score set in Dec, the timeline is still problematic for that cohort—perhaps the score for that cohort would be required for student teaching, not entrance. It was suggested that this be another discussion item between the Office of Educator Quality and the MCED.
  6. One member noted that she has done a great deal of work with ETS and believes that companies like ETS and Pearson know what they are doing when it comes to developing and administering assessments.
- p. Comments from students in attendance at the meeting (Note: in addition to Erin Cary who serves as the MABEP student representative, Cable Doyle, a history education major at Missouri State University, attended the open meeting as a guest, not a spokesperson. A MABEP member asked Mr. Doyle to comment. Mr. Doyle offered the following:
  1. There are big issues to address as you (MABEP members) talk about this; you are headed in the right direction; those who are in the process while you are trying to fix the process; people will choose an easier path if we make it too rigorous and difficult. You will reach a point when you lose people; the risk will out-balance the reward; for me (Cable Doyle), to be the most informed is a problem; there are a lot of people who are lost; my advisor doesn’t know what to tell me; are we over-correcting? Are we driving people out of the path to the profession;
  2. Mr. Doyle stated that he had seen several students who were so frustrated with the process that they switched into another program;
  3. Mr. Doyle concluded that he understands the state wanting to see quantitative data, but not everything can be measured
- q. Final decision on this topic:
  1. MABEP members will engage in a conversation with representatives from Pearson at the next meeting to address the timeframe between initial administration and when a qualifying score can be set.

2. This conversation will include discussion on the impact data and the appropriate N size and representation of those who have taken the assessment
  3. It was suggested that MCEd leadership be invited as guests at the next MABEP meeting, so a number of assessment issues could be addressed with a Pearson representative. One member expressed concern that she did not believe deans had a full understanding of these issues. It was suggested that MABEP members invite a panel of individuals with expertise in assessment to join in this dialogue. After discussion, MABEP members were asked by Co-Chair Rusty Monhollon to submit resumes of individuals recommended to attend the next meeting. Dr. Hough agreed to submit the names of two individuals (one in a PK-12 School district and one in higher education) to the Co-Chairs. Rusty Monhollon encouraged other MABEP members to do the same.
2. Missouri Educator Profiles (MEP)
    - a. Over a 100 questions are on the MEP
    - b. Over 6,800 students have taken this assessment so far
    - c. It was noted that MEP is a diagnostic tool.
    - d. It was initially a pre-post format but people questioned whether it was going to be a benchmark; pre-assessment was maintained and using it as a post-assessment is now an option for each institution
    - e. One member wanted clarification on the validity of this assessment? Why are we comparing pre-service teachers to experienced, effective teachers? The validity is always in question because they are taking it and talking about themselves
    - f. Another member commented that the post was intended after student teaching and could be a great way to determine the growth that occurred and what areas might still need work; also noted was that some post assessment scores went down because students were more honest the second time
    - g. One member discussed how their institution used it as a reflective piece
    - h. One member noted that while it is required that it be administered and students take it, there is still confusion as to the objective for why and what is it supposed to do
    - i. Another member responded that the objective is that we want quality educators with appropriate dispositions that are present in effective teachers. It is a growth, development tool that moves students towards being effective
    - j. Recommendation:
      1. At its next meeting, MABEP will draft a position on the use of MEP. Some suggested encouraging institutions to use it and even consider using it twice to achieve its original intent. It was noted that at the last MCEd meeting, the 22 IHEs in attendance requested a definitive purpose for MEP.
      2. MABEP members discussed creating a statement or resolution to share with IHEs regarding the best use of MEP
  3. Missouri Educator Gateway Assessments (MEGA)
    - a. Suggested this item be taken up at our next meeting
  4. Missouri Pre-Service Teacher Assessment (MoPTA)
    - a. Possible alternatives have been reviewed

- b. The core issue is with videotaping teacher candidates. When the recording leaves the district, there is concern that it is unprotected. Is it possible that keeping the videotape in the district could help with this issue?
- 5. Missouri Content Assessment
  - a. Communicating differences between general knowledge per MoGEA and content knowledge
  - b. This will be discussed further at the next meeting

V. Associate of Arts in Teaching

- 1. Report from July 15 meeting
- 2. Positive, moving in the right direction, how should the competencies be broken out; very open and very positive; 5 groups of 6 people came of recommendations that very much aligned one another; will be distributed to MACTE members;
- 3. Current AAT has 12 hours; the 4 year programs will be on the hook for what is accomplished in the AAT; defining competencies of where a student ought to be
- 4. Recommendation; mid-point competencies; initial professional education competencies; when they leave the AAT it is not an automatic "in"
- 5. Initial education professional competencies

VI. Joint meeting of the State Board of Education and the Coordinating Board for Higher Education  
1:30-3:30 at the Executive Center

- 1. Discussion of possible presentation topics:
  - a. What is MABEP and what is it charged to do
  - b. Establishing the MoGEA cut score and sampling of the "N" size that generates impact data for establishing the qualifying score
  - c. Timing of what to do with cohorts of students during transitions to new assessments
  - d. Communication – MABEP can assist in communication to constituent groups represented by members to identify confusion and misinformation
  - e. MABEP members share a mission of quality educators; positive and shared focus
  - f. MABEP members support high standards and bringing in the highest quality of candidates we can
- 2. Identify presenters
  - a. Rusty Monhollon and Paul Katnik will provide the history; composition of the board and a summary of its duties
  - b. Linda Kaiser suggested Kathryn Chval be one of the presenters and Gena McClusky volunteered to assist as well. Rusty Monhollon accepted these.
- 3. The Co-Chairs will send out the location and time to all MABEP members and all are invited to attend.

VII. For the Good of the Order

- 1. Accreditation, CAEP standards and NCTQ
  - a. NCTQ report
    - 1. NCTQ's goal is to analyze all preparation programs in the United States
    - 2. A summary of details on the NCTA approach was provided (i.e. requesting syllabi, catalogues, etc and lawsuits if they do not receive it; no data is collected from students; no observations done). Many

institutions think you cannot assess the quality of a program by looking only at certain documents

3. It was noted by some that it seems unfair to throw all programs by the wayside as was suggested in a recent DESE communication where the NCTQ report was cited. It was further asked why not cite Teacher Quality, or other sources, instead of choosing this one?)
  4. Alexander Cuenca moved that MABEP request DESE to remove their NCTQ press release from the DESE web site. Other MAPEB members voice their agreement that the press release was in no one's best interest. One member noted regular tweets from the Department citing NCTQ.
    1. A MACTE letter to DESE was shared with MABEP members expressing these concerns
    2. Also shared was a response from DESE to MACTE noting that the Department regularly draws on multiple sources of data and information
    3. Commissioner Russell urged the group to not put specific individuals in a compromising position.
  5. MABEP members agreed that it is important to endorse the positive side of collaboration and communication between the Departments of Elementary and Secondary Education and Higher Education as represented in this advisory board
  6. Rusty Monhollon and Paul Katnik noted that issues like this offer a learning opportunity to dedicate MABEP members to a commitment to deeper communication and collaboration through this board
  7. Rusty Monhollon noted that it is not within the scope of this advisory board to issue a request that this communication be withdrawn
2. Agenda items for the next meeting
    - a. Bring suggested MEP language to next meeting for the board to review in order to create a position to distribute
    - b. Review a draft table with each assessment with a description, purpose, cost and timeline of administration to review at next meeting
    - c. Add the continuous improvement part of MEGA
    - d. Set up a discussion opportunity at next meeting with Pearson
    - e. Discuss MoPTA
    - f. Future dates
      1. Rusty will send out a doodle of September dates for member consideration

Meeting adjourned at 2:10