

**Missouri Advisory Board for Educator Preparation
Official Minutes - November 18, 2014
Sixth Floor Conference Room, Jefferson Building
Jefferson City, MO
9:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m.**

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

Meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m.

Members Present: Chad Bass, Cathy Cartier, Kathryn Chval, Glenn Coltharp, Alexander Cuenca, Karen Garber-Miller, David Hough, Linda Kaiser, Paul Katnik, Gena McCluskey, Kristen Merrell, Rusty Monhollon, Margie Vandeven on behalf of Chris Nicastro

Members Absent: Erin Cary, David Oliver, David Russell

Guests Present: Tammy Allee, Hap Hairston, Marty Karlin

Meeting Agenda

- I. Approval of minutes, September 18, 2014, meeting
 - A. Motion was made by Glenn Coltharp to approve the minutes as presented. Alexander Cuenca seconded the motion. Motion passed.
- II. Discussion of content assessment qualifying scores - Rusty Monhollon, Hap Hairston, Marty Karlin to
 - A. Show impact data for seven assessments with n=30 or above. Panel base recommendations were completed between August & September. Impact data were calculated at the end of October.
 - B. Much discussion surrounded the scores. Suggestions were made not to go above the panel-based cutscore; to go with the panel-based cutscore. It was also suggested to go at -1 or -2 SEM due to lack of impact data. It was noted that MACCE recommended -2 SEM, and some discussion of that group's decision took place.
 - C. A suggestion was made to adopt -1 SEM as there is no trouble finding candidates at this time and then revisit again once more impact data are available to eventually reach the panel-based cutscore.
 - D. There were no members in agreement to go above the panel-based cutscore which left three choices PBC, -1 SEM, or -2 SEM.

- E. Members requested a rationale for MACCE going with the -2 SEM – one member who is a part of MACCE and MABEP stated that the group is twice the size of MABEP and predominately practicing teachers who advocate on the teacher side. It was also noted that MAACE passed a second recommendation calling for the SBE to examine impact data in August and readjust cut scores at that time if necessary.
- F. It was noted that MACCE, MABEP, and DESE will provide input to the State Board of Education which will make the ultimate decision. DESE has not yet made its recommendation and cannot at this time reveal any direction. The suggestion that MABEP recommend the SBE not set any cutscores until adequate impact data are available was determined not to be an option, because the SBE must set a standard for certification.
- G. It was noted that Praxis scores have been set for over 20 years, most times without any impact data.
- H. The Pearson representative shared that Indiana set cutscores six months prior to first test administration. Program pass rates are typical of other states. Stipulation in process to be reviewed as they get more data, likely again after 12 months.
- I. An informal straw poll was taken – one person wanted -2 SEM; one person wanted -1 SEM; all others were comfortable with the panel-based cutscore.
- J. The rationale is that without enough impact data available it is reasonable to accept the panel-based cutscore. Without complete impact data it may be misleading to refer to the current data as presented.
- K. Impact data and panel-based cutscores go hand in hand and both are not required to make an informed decision. What is under consideration is 56 assessments but only 7 assessments have impact data.
- L. Physics only had 5 test takers last year so it would be necessary to wait for 30 test takers which could take up to 6 years before it would be available.
- M. The group would have liked to know what the demographics were of people taking the assessments. Were they individuals who had failed Praxis multiple times, first time test takers, etc.? These data were not available. A DESE representative stated that only one other state, Alabama, had set their content assessment cutscore below the PBC, at -1 SEM. The Department representative indicated they would look into this.
- N. It was suggested as a recommendation that the State Board set the score at the panel-based cutscore; however, in making this recommendation we want to make the Board aware there are limitations to the available data (i.e. the n size is small).

O. Motion by David Hough – In the absence of impact data, MABEP recommends the State Board of Education adopt the Panel-Based Cutscore for Missouri’s 56 Content Assessments. Seconded by Kathryn Chval.

1. Friendly amendment by Rusty Monhollon, accepted by David Hough and Kathryn Chval to put in present tense. Motion accepted as written above.

2. Vote by show of hands- In Favor – 9; Opposed – 3. Motion carried.

P. Group felt that the oppositional votes (3 board members) should be documented/referenced for the State Board as a part of the overall discussion.

Q. Motion by Linda Kaiser – The State Board will review the qualifying scores for each of Missouri’s 56 Content Assessments based on available impact data or test abnormalities no later than August 2015. Seconded by Alexander Cuenca.

1. Vote – In Favor – 12; Against – 0. Motion passed.

R. Alex Cuenca will provide a dissenting rationale by Monday, November 24 that will be included in the State Board of Education packets to explain the rationale to the two motions and dissenting votes. Alex will share the statement with the other dissenting votes prior to submission.

III. Additional information on Accreditation and CAEP Standards as related to MoPTA

A. Training school administrators to complete the final administration in lieu of a video. Linda Kaiser spoke to this and had polled members in her HR group.

B. Multiple options on MoPTA were discussed at the Clinical and Field Directors meeting. Everyone was aware of multiple options but is waiting to hear more information. Questions arose from the MACTE group as to the purpose of Task 4. MoPTA focuses on reflection and being able to watch oneself teaching.

C. Hap Hairston addressed concerns about MoPTA being new which included a different first initial look and concerns about rubrics. ETS has addressed these issues.

D. Margie Vandeven informed the group that the video issue is not only a Missouri issue but nationwide. The emphasis is that it is a performance event, and it is critical to remain focused on that. Administrators concerned about one more thing on their plate. What if they are not the one to rate the teacher candidate? How does that work? One additional idea presented was the use of the Avatar, although this is likely to be one-two years before being fully developed.

- E. Rusty Monhollon explained that the accreditation issue between CAEP and MoPTA has been addressed for the present. We will continue to update MABEP as issues or information come up. Information will be requested from Pearson and ETS in writing that there is alignment between the two.

IV. Proposed U.S. Department of Education Educator Preparation regulations - David Hough

- A. Will be moved to future meeting.

V. Discussion of MoGEA v. 2.0 cut scores

- A. Update on MoGEA frameworks revision with timelines at next meeting.

VI. For the Good of the Order

- A. To what extent are educator preparation programs to blame for the challenges with K-12 student performance in Missouri?

- 1. Board member asked that the principals' evaluations of new teacher data be shared and discussed with the MABEP board. Topic for next meeting.

- B. Will the implementation of MOSPE lead to teacher shortages in Missouri?

- 1. This is an area of ongoing review and study by the Department. Topic for next meeting.

- C. Why tighten requirements for traditional teacher candidates while simultaneously loosening requirements for alternative certification entry into the profession?

- 1. One member asked why this appears to be happening, specifically in reference to ABCTE. Topic for next meeting.
- 2. This issue has been broached twice by MABEP and will be considered at a future meeting.

VII. Next meeting date – January 8, 2015, at 9:00 a.m. Meeting invites will be sent through Microsoft Outlook.

VIII. Motion by David Hough to adjourn, seconded by Alexander Cuenca. Meeting adjourned at 1:53 p.m.