

**Missouri Advisory Board for Educator Preparation
February 3, 2017
6th Floor Conference Room, Jefferson Building
Jefferson City, Missouri
9:00 a.m.**

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

Meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m.

Members present:

Cathy Cartier, Kathryn Chval, Alexander Cuenca, Karen Garber-Miller, Beth Houf, David Hough,
Linda Kaiser, Bailey Kraleman, Rusty Monhollon

Members absent:

Chad Bass, Dennis Carpenter, Glenn Coltharp, Paul Katnik, David Oliver

Guests present:

Tammy Allee, Gale Hairston, Zora Mulligan

Meeting Minutes

I. Approval of minutes November 7, 2016, meeting

Karen Garber-Miller made a motion to approve minutes, seconded by Alexander Cuenca. Motion passed 9-0.

II. Equity Task Force

Equity Task Force is composed of four DESE and four DHE appointees with expertise in assessment, evaluation, teacher education and/or bias reduction. Where is funding come from for a task force? Task Force would like to have someone cover costs for meeting room/space, mileage and meals, and substitute pay. They asked if Pearson would be willing to cover the costs. What specific data pieces do we want Pearson to provide? What are the most successful programs doing and what can it tell us?

Suggested appointees – DESE suggestions should be sent to Paul Katnik, DHE suggestions should be sent to Rusty Monhollon and they will take to the Commissioners for approval.

Suggestions to document are in rationale to make reference to existing work Andrea Dixon-Seahorn is doing through Grow Your Own and Equity Committee. Might be good to put Assessment in the title of the work Alex, etc. are working on.

Motion by Karen Garber-Miller, seconded by Linda Kaiser “To recommend to the Commissioner of Education and Commissioner of Higher Education to establish a joint task force to explore the root causes and possible interventions to mitigate testing disparities.” Motion passed 8-0. (Linda Kaiser had stepped out of the room and missed the vote.) MABEP asks that both Boards

receive information about the formation of the Disparity Task Force during their respective April meetings. The group discussed sharing the findings in a White Paper. The anticipated completion date is eight months.

1. Statement of Purpose
2. Charges

Changes made to this section were to add secondary school data to determine longitudinal effects. Extended charge of committee to eight months instead of six months. Emphasize in charge “to mitigate testing disparities...”

III. Pilot Projects

1. Data sharing between IHE and PK-12

Summative evaluations for early out teachers 1st & 2nd year, we need to find a way to get summative data back to institutions but still protect confidentiality of the teachers. K-12 thinks it can be done as long as confidentiality is protected. They want assurance that no identifying information leaves the school district. They understand need and that the information is helpful for teacher preparation programs. Group feels they are going to need DESE person to step in and have conversations with vendor to make the decisions. There is a willingness to get the project started but don't have the mechanism to actually have the project.

A working committee emerged at last national MoTEP meeting – Linda Kaiser is sharing in HR forums and with schools willing to jump on a pilot project. There has been no voiced dissention at this time, if there would be any it would likely be from IHE side as they want more information than K-12 is willing to share.

Park Hill will tell new teachers coming in to bring their last evaluation and PD plan from teaching experience in hard copy when they arrive. This will be part of the first week school. All teachers will have some type of evaluation or PD plan to share with new school. The best chance to help a teacher be successful is by seeing this information. No sense of how unions might look at this. This plan would be easier if current school vendors would participate in this for a data transfer. A DESE representative will have to step in to take this to the next step. Linda has talked to MoASPA state executive board, regionally and state MoTEP group, smaller conversations.

Several questions were asked:

- Why are we doing this? Teachers get evaluated to help identify areas that people are doing well and what they need to improve on. K-12 evaluation system morphed into MEES (Missouri Educator Evaluation System). Why are we giving every student an evaluation number? Why do we need all this data? We want to compare the quality of teachers from institutions/programs so districts have a better idea of where to go to get the best teachers to hire.
- How good is data when people are evaluating differently? Is all of this meaningful?
- If people are evaluating differently, how effective is the data and is it useful? When using the NEE model, evaluators have to go through training every year before

evaluating. You can have a teacher from a successful program that is not an effective teacher.

Rusty Monhollon told the group this information would be discussed further at MoTEP meeting later in February. We need to get a clarification of purpose, why, what are we hoping to accomplish, etc. If we can demonstrate that we are trying to make sure programs are doing what they are supposed to and teachers are effective, this process might have value beyond what data reveals.

Rusty and/or Paul will give an update from MoTEP on purpose and goal to bring back to next MABEP meeting as to how we will move forward, if we are moving forward.

IV. Feedback from Dean discussions

1. System for delivering training to cooperating teachers

Deans were appreciative of statewide MoTEP effort in this regard. Follow-up sessions by a few institutions brought principals into sessions.

2. System for delivering training to beginning teachers Ditto #1 above and recommend the groups work together to produce a unified approach from beginning teachers to master teachers. Deans also recommend developing a joint certificate in Teacher Leadership by having multiple IHEs contribute courses.

3. Oversight of private IHE education programs, e.g., “doctoral” programs and out of area programs

There is a growing concern among some institutions that inferior programs are being offered at the doctoral level that are damaging the profession. The deans recommend both DESE and the CBHE address this issue.

4. AAT compliance, specifically need for community colleges to align to four-year programs

Two year programs did a lot of work developing the AAT. The view of the deans is that the agreement between community colleges and four-year colleges is more of a political signature than a tool to assist students. Some of the competencies and curriculum aren't in alignment, resulting in students having to complete additional course work after they transfer. Deans would like MABEP to make a recommendation as to how they can make this work. Students are the ones suffering from taking additional classes. It was determined this is a MDHE issue and will be looked at by that office.

5. MoPTA, MoSCPA per DESE email dated 1/4/2017

Follow-up webinar by Educator Preparation on February 8.

6. NOTE project – future directions...

ETS is developing a new assessment that would have teacher candidates teach to avatars in a controlled setting. Students are being paid to pilot this project and could be

used in place of the video-taping project with simulations for assessment. A number of IHEs are piloting this with ETS. Deans recommend MABEP review any future assessments being considered as capstones to MOGEA that might be used in lieu of MoPTA.

7. Recommendation from COPHE Education Deans to the State Board of Education to make the MEP optional in the MEGAs.

Usage of the MEP varies by program, some have students take the test and never discuss the results with the student and others use it for discussions with students. Recommendation from Deans would be for MABEP to recommend to the State Board that this not be a required assessment. David Hough will take back to the deans that MABEP will consider a recommendation from the deans with additional evidence and facts to bring back for the May MABEP meeting.

V. Update on general coursework

1. 42 hour block

If a student completes the block courses at the sending institution they will substitute for 42 hours at the receiving institution. Colleges would also be required to create course by course transfers. MoGEA was one of issues that lead to formation of MABEP and discussions between K-12 and higher education as well as MDHE and DESE. Rusty will get faculty workgroup members to review this information which also might help address the AAT issue.

VI. Program Review

MDHE will be looking at programs that are low-producing with less than an average of ten graduates over a three year average, five at the masters level and three at the doctoral level. Programs will be reviewed by their Classification of Instructional Program (CIP).

VII. For the good of the order

1. Next meeting May 3, 2017

Motion by Karen Garber-Miller, seconded by Alexander Cuenca at 1:19 p.m. to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed 9-0.