

Missouri Transforming Educator Preparation (MoTEP) Initiative State MoTEP Team Meeting

JANUARY 19, 2018

Meeting Outcomes

- Action Plan through June 2020
- Timelines, benchmarks and budget
- Updates on status of current work

- I. Welcome and Introductions 10:00
a. Name, title, and role

As a part of opening introductions, the members of MoTEP were provided an overview of the option of not pursuing the performance assessment for teachers (MoPTA). Groups discussed the advantages of keeping the MoPTA in the RFP process and attempting to revise it so that it addresses the concerns that were shared with that instrument. The other option is to work on the MEES and set it up in a way that meets the requirements of serving as the state's performance assessment. The general feedback received was that working on the MEES would likely be a better use of our time and energy. However, there were a number of concerns voiced that need to be addressed including some of the following:

- Validity and reliability of MEES
- MEES acceptance in other states or by CAEP
- Process to keep the parts of MoPTA that have strengthened programs
- Training for University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers
- Transition from MoPTA to MEES
- Appeal and RE-Submission process
- INTASC Standards in the CAEP process

- II. Updates (Paul Katnik, Suzanne Hull, Hollie Sheller, Rusty Monhollon) 10:15
a. Assessment RFP
b. MEP Strands
c. Distribution List
d. Core 42

Updates were provided on the RFP process, the Distribution List-Serve and Core 42. A discussion took place on the disposition instrument (MEP) that is currently not included in the RFP process either. The discussion focused on whether or not there should be an agreed list of dispositions (or attributes) and a process to ensure that preparation programs have an instrument and process to assess on those areas. The disposition discussed included the following:

- Effective oral and written communication
- Professionalism and ethics
- Positive and enthusiastic attitude

- Social and emotional intelligence
- Self-reflection
- Preparedness in teaching and learning
- An appreciation and value for diversity
- Belief in students' ability to learn
- Collaborates effectively with stakeholders
- Takes initiative and is a self-regulated learner

Members of MoTEP further discussed whether or not the use of a disposition (attributes) instrument could be required as a part of the relationship between preparation programs and DESE. This discussion will continue in the Ed Prep APR workgroup.

- | | | |
|------|--|-------|
| III. | Review Long-Range Planning for Goals through June 2020 | 10:45 |
| | a. Partnerships: PK-12 / EPPs / DESE / DHE | |
| | b. Statewide Data System for PK-12 / EPPs / DESE / DHE | |
| | c. Ed-Prep APR | |
| | d. Communication and Transparency | |

WORKING LUNCH TO CONTINUE DISCUSSIONS	11:30
---------------------------------------	-------

- | | | |
|-----|---|-------|
| IV. | Partnerships (Kim Nuetzmann, Nicky Nickens & Brandy Hepler) | 12:30 |
| | a. Update on progress | |
| | b. Goals | |

An update was provided on the revisions to the MEES rubrics. It included some description of how the development has occurred from the beginning and where it needs to head next if it is to be the performance assessment for certification. The group reported on

- 9 quality indicators
- 0-4 scoring scale
- Revised language
- Revised format

An update was also provided on the status of the cooperating teacher training pilots that have taken place during the fall 2017. The tentative title is Triad Training (cooperating teachers, university supervisors, teacher candidates). It contained essential components for each group that included, among others

- Calibration
- Ongoing, high quality feedback
- Coaching
- Success in the internship

Lessons learned included positive feedback about the training, improvements needed (how to give high quality feedback and coaching skills), and identifying particular challenges (timing for training, clear communication, logistics, partnering with school districts) to be addressed.

- V. Statewide Data System (Beth Kania-Gosche, Dave Lineberry, & Hollie Sheller) 1:15
a. Update on progress

The statewide data system group reported their idea for surveying members of MoTEP regarding the two to four common data points and extracting those data from NEE as a way to think about data points on new teachers. This would allow for some exploration into consideration of how to think about impact of teacher candidates after they are hired.

- VI. Ed-Prep APR 2018 (Suzanne Hull & Daryl Fridley) 1:35
a. Shift from Conceptual to Functional
b. Items Not Waived Checklist

The work group for the Ed-Prep APR talked about getting their full group together in mid-February to work through some things prior the next MoTEP meeting on March 22nd. One thing to consider is whether or not there is a need to develop an “Items not Waived” checklist. If the workgroup decides yes, than what items do we put on it. The group also reported that creating the data system for the new revisions of the APR is on target. There are four phases to making this operational and the work is currently in phase two.

- Phase 1: setting up certification eligible candidates
- Phase 2: Standard 1
- Phase 3: Standards 2-5
- Phase 4: Standards 6-9

The workgroup concluded by reporting that there will be an initial release of this new version later this spring to be reviewed by all programs.

- VII. MoTEP Wrap Up and Next Steps 2:00
a. Next meeting is Thursday, March 22, 2018