

Missouri Transforming Educator Preparation (MoTEP) Initiative

State MoTEP Team Meeting 10:00 A.M. - 2:00 P.M.

Governor Office Bldg., Jefferson City

JUNE 3, 2016

Outcomes

- Final design for ED PREP APR 1.5
- Revised MoTEP budget for 2015-2016
- Specific Plans (IHE/PLK-12 Collaborative Conference and 30-60-90-120 day)
- Generate initial ideas for licensure changes
- Engage in initial discussions on a neutral data site

- I. Welcome and Introductions (Pete Kelly) 10:00
 - a. Share name, title and role
 - b. Share any communication you have about MoTEP since our last meeting

Notes:

Review of the agenda. Communication about MoTEP work has occurred thorough national conferences, to Deans and Assessment Directors. Cooperating teachers have been informed about the October conference. Information has been spread through the 2 year programs. Updates have also been shared with the executive board of MARE, and through emails to MASSP members. Communication has also been provided through MACCE and to the executive committee at SEMO, with superintendents and through the Internship program at Missouri State.

- II. Ed Prep APR 1.5 (David Hough, Daryl Fridley, Beth Kania-Gosche) 10:30
 - a. Review feedback gathered
 - b. Suggestions for changes
 - c. Next steps
 - i. MCED – MABEP – DESE

Notes:

Review of current design of EEP-APR 1.5. This began with an overview of the whole process. Discussion occurred on the reduction of N size from 30 to 15. Call for the question and approval to move the Ed. Prep. APR 1.5 forward. Also discussed was the 1.5 and 2.0 timeline, specifically when consequences would begin, and the weights of the various metrics.

WORKING LUNCH TO CONTINUE DISCUSSIONS

- | | | |
|------|---|----------|
| III. | MoTEP Budget (Pete Kelly, Shawn Young) | 12:00 |
| | a. Review existing budget amounts | |
| | i. APR 1.5 Sub-committee | \$5,000 |
| | ii. NTEP national Conference KC | \$10,000 |
| | iii. Planning committee fall conference | \$2,000 |
| | iv. IHE/PK-12 Conference | \$25,000 |
| | v. National consultants | \$13,000 |
| | b. Adjust budget as appropriate | |

Notes:

The members worked on a reallocation of funds to create a category for national consultants who would provide information to the EPP APR 2.0 and for a neutral data site.

- | | | |
|-----|--|-------|
| IV. | Higher Education / PK-12 Collaborative Conference (Shawn Young, Kim N. et al.) | 12:30 |
| | a. Purpose and responsibilities | |
| | b. Invitations | |
| | c. Programming | |

Notes:

The design of the collaborative conference would be for a preconference at the MACTE conference which would take place Oct. 23-24. The total invite list would include 80 people total. There would be 40 from IHE and 40 from K-12. There would be no charge for the preconference. Funds would also cover food, sub pay and travel for the K-12 people. IHEs would personally invite K-12 people. These would be existing partnerships that would improve as a result of the preconference.

The focus of the conference would be on making partnerships stronger; more mutual support; collectively dealing with challenges; for example, how do we help pk-12 understand MoPTA / MEES better. Breakout sessions would include one IHE and one K-12 person leading the session.

Who invites? Total number of slots is 80. There will be a person from each region who will assemble teams from that region that might include supts, principals, cooperating teachers, IHEs...etc. that will come to the preconference to build strong, more effective partnerships.

- | | | |
|----|--|------|
| V. | Licensure (Margery Tanner) | 1:00 |
| | a. Review of existing rules and statutes | |
| | b. Additional discussion | |

Note:

Review of rules and statutes that are currently in place. This included levels of the certificate (2 levels – initial (4 yrs) and then a 99 year certificate).

ABCTE was discussed. Candidates would have to meet the same requirements as all traditional programs. A suggestion was made that instead of getting rid of it altogether, add in additional requirements to ensure all candidates meet the same standard. Also reciprocity was discussed. Again, all standards for everyone, and perhaps a more tiered approach to licensure to support the notion of continuous improvement.

- | | | |
|------|---|------|
| VI. | Data site (Sweden – neutral site) (Pete Kelly, David Hough) | 1:30 |
| VII. | Wrap up and next steps (all) | 2:00 |
| | a. 30-60-90-120 Action Steps looking forward | |
| | i. Planning committee for conference | |
| | b. Feedback on NELP Standards | |
| | c. Key points for MoTEP newsletter | |
| | d. Joint Meeting of the CBHE and SBE, August 2, 1:00-3:00 | |
| | i. There will be an agenda item on MoTEP | |
| | e. Set next state MoTEP meeting date | |
| | i. Mid-september | |