

**Missouri Advisory Board for Educator Preparation**  
**November 7, 2016**  
**6<sup>th</sup> Floor Commissioner's Conference Room, Jefferson Building**  
**Jefferson City, Missouri**  
**9:00 a.m.**

**Presiding: Paul Katnik, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Educator Quality**  
**Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**

Meeting was called to order at 9:08 a.m.

Members present:

Kathryn Chval, Glenn Coltharp, Alexander Cuenca, Karen Garber-Miller, David Hough, Paul Katnik, Bailey Kraleman, Rusty Monhollon, David Oliver

Members absent:

Chad Bass, Dennis Carpenter, Cathy Cartier, Beth Houf, Linda Kaiser

Guests present:

Tammy Allee, Gale Hairston, Zora Mulligan, Stacey Preis

**Unofficial Meeting Minutes**

I. Approval of minutes, September 20, 2016, meeting

Motion was made by Glenn Coltharp, seconded by David Hough to accept minutes as presented. Motion passed 9-0.

II. Teacher Preparation Regulations

1. American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education

a. AACTE article: Teacher Colleges Driving Higher Expectations –

<https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/Teacher-Colleges-Driving-Higher-Expectations.pdf>

b. NY Times Editorial: Help Teachers Before They Get to Class –

<https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/Help-Teachers-Before-They-Get-to-Class-NYTimes.pdf>

David Hough suggested that MABEP be proactive on these issues. There is a need to do a better job of telling the story; need good PR on teaching – future conversation on how to work together to recruit quality students into education.

Grow Your Own Guide published by DESE gives ideas on first steps for creating a program. A collective goal would be to recruit 2-3 students from each high school into teacher education. Follow-up with a spring survey to see if this is happened. MU is working with Columbia Public Schools to give scholarships and to help with summer school to observe them with children to see if they are a

good fit for teaching. Avila University is working with 2-3 districts to look at different approaches/strategies to recruit students into the teaching profession.

Under the key provisions of the new Teacher Preparation Regulations, Missouri appears well situated to meet those requirements.

- i. Rate programs on at least 3 performance levels
- ii. Report on programs with at least 25 completers, or aggregate smaller programs with other like programs, or use multiple years of data (up to 4)
- iii. Rate programs on four required indicators
  - a. Employment outcomes
  - b. Feedback from graduates and their employers
  - c. Include student learning outcomes
  - d. Other program characteristics
- iv. Distance education programs are evaluated using the same process
- v. Ratings of programs impact TEACH grant eligibility

A subcommittee working of the Missouri Transforming Educator Preparation (MoTEP) group is now working on Ed Prep APR 2.0 which addresses many of these requirements.

### III. Equity Task Force

1. Statement of Purpose
2. Charges

Alex Cuenca – <https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/Equity-Task-Force.pdf> – Establish a task force to discuss disparities in K-12 education and teacher education. Co-Chair by MDHE and DESE appointees and appoint 4-6 folks, evaluation and assessment experts. The task force would be charged to report findings of disparities within six months to MABEP of with potential action steps to take forward. Qualitative data – program delivery and program preparation.

- i. Interview programs to see how they are preparing students for assessments.
- ii. Disparities exist in P-12 as well as higher education. How to address all the way through??
- iii. Technical manuals for 2015-16 assessments will be received this month and gone over at MoTEP meeting.
- iv. Study students of color that have been successful at testing. Have they participated in interventions at schools?
- v. Study factual trend data from PRAXIS II and MCA to see disparities.
- vi. Next steps – take information back to update and bring back in February for approval. Committee members would include 3 DESE appointed, 3 MDHE appointed. ETS and Pearson would serve as a resource. Come prepared with options of members to consider at the February meeting.

### IV. Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs)

1. Materials shared through NTEP –  
[https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/MSI\\_KelloggReportR5.pdf](https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/MSI_KelloggReportR5.pdf)

Diverse teaching core is the best thing for our kids. There is a lot to learn from institutions that are MSIs.

#### V. Beginning Teacher Assistance Programs (BTAP)

1. Mentor Standards 5 CSR 20-400.380 - <https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/5-CSR-20-400-380-Coversheet-Amend.pdf>

Standards have been out since 2009 and are being updated. Public comment period runs December 1 – December 31, 2016. The rule will be taken back to the State Board in February 2017.

2. BTAP guidelines 5 CSR 20-400.385 - <https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/5-CSR-20-400-385-Oct2016.pdf>

BTAP has been in statute since about 2002-2003. Public comment period runs December 1 – December 31, 2016. The rule will be taken back to the State Board in February 2017. Would like terms defined in rule such as “sponsored”.

A graphic on support available to a teacher in the first five years would be beneficial in promoting these rules.

#### VI. MoTEP Agenda

1. Next meeting: November 22

CCCSSO will provide another \$55,000 when MoTEP provides a budget. This is an agenda item at the next MoTEP meeting on November 22<sup>nd</sup>. These funds were used this past year to pay for the Cooperating Teacher Forums, including substitute reimbursement, supporting subcommittee work and sending MoTEP members to the national meeting in Kansas City, etc.

Teacher Preparation Data Project – it will be important to include both IHEs and K-12 schools. MoTEP will be part of a NTEP sponsored webinar on this topic with Delaware and Louisiana Departments of Education at the next MoTEP meeting.

2. National NTEP meeting (November 30-December 2)

#### VII. Regional Cooperating Teacher Forums

1. Summary information

Cooperating Teacher Forums have been held. One DESE person and nine other designated people were present. All forums were well attended and productive. Much was learned about the needs of cooperating teachers across the state. Cooperating teachers want more time with student teachers, a semester isn't long enough. Cooperating Teachers want more training to be better prepared. Better communication between universities and cooperating educators. Moving forward...create standardized

process to prepare cooperating teachers to be mentors of teacher candidates. Develop through RPDC models of mentoring, help on observation tools, and a profile function, matching mentors (cooperating teachers) to teacher candidates that might need more support. Some school districts interview student teachers to determine who to pair them with.

David Hough - IHEs struggle with multiple teacher candidates, from multiple locations with multiple sets of criteria. A suggestion/request was made that instead of calling them cooperating teachers, they would be called mentors. Bring together area IHEs together for further discussions.

## 2. Next Steps

Missouri State will bring area IHEs together in the summer. Others suggested investing money in some type of module to provide a basis for pre-service mentoring across the state available as a baseline resource. Perhaps it would be possible to provide cooperating teachers a certificate of recognition and appreciation. They are still working through data and thinking of the core competencies to prepare cooperating teachers to be better mentors. Create a database of cooperating teachers available to all programs. Establish a consistent idea of what co-teaching is.

## VIII. Carry-Over from last meeting

### 1. Program Productivity

A discussion occurred on low producing programs. Would like to explore options on ways to repackage or rethink how that information is delivered or provided. Rusty Monhollon will provide supporting data to MABEP members.

### 2. Higher Learning Commission (HLC) faculty qualifications requirement

Most programs are not content-based. Instructor must have 18 credit hours in curriculum area to teach dual-credit course in high school. What is the larger benefit—what are we trying to accomplish? This might make it more difficult to find dual credit instructors. Need to be equipping teachers with content. HLC is responsible to get teacher's transcripts to verify they have the necessary hours to teach. Rusty Monhollon will bring this back to MABEP when they have more data to share.

## IX. Additional Items

### 1. Institutions requiring a Master's Degree for Cooperating teachers

Dr. Preis reported that the Commissioner has an advisory committee made of superintendents and professional associations that meet every few months. A Missouri higher education institution won't let teachers be a cooperating teacher unless they have a master's degree.

Standard 3 of MoSPE outlines requirements for Field & Clinical Experiences. What MoSPE outlines is "ideal" and not always the person with the highest degree.

Encourage schools to look at continuum and find someone as proficient or distinguished to be a cooperating teacher.

2. Timeline for revised teacher education programs

A discussion occurred about the August 1, 2017 timeline for the implementation of the new certification requirements. The Deans group (MCED) expressed some concern about the process for approving program revisions and those being completed by the August 1, 2017 deadline. What happens if we require students to take courses that are not approved? Certification is working to approve matrices as they come in. Some institutions have been approved, some in process, and others that have not submitted any matrices for approval. July 31, 2017, the compendium becomes obsolete and the new requirements take effect August 1, 2017.

3. AAT Discussion (added per Rusty Monhollon's request)

Glenn Coltharp reported that in Spring 2014 a committee was formed of both two year and four year institutions to start work on a reorganization of Associate of Arts of Teaching (AAT). In November 2014, deans of four year institutions asked if that process could pause "until the dust settled" on new preparation requirements. The agreement was to come back two years later. This process has begun again.

How many hours would be accepted for AAT...12 hours foundation classes (current/old AAT) and 42 hours of general education? In discussion with deans with how many hours would be accepted, the number varies from 0 – 12. Teacher education faculty voted unanimously to move forward with proposal from Community Colleges, as well as the CAOs and the 2-year presidents/chancellors in Spring 2016. August 2016 CAOs met and agreed to delay until December meeting. MCCA will have a list of who has articulation agreements and who doesn't. This will be listed on Teacher Education web pages. Two year and four year institutions will meet the first of December for further discussions.

X. For the good of the order

1. Next meetings: February 3 and May 3, 2017

Glenn Coltharp made a motion to adjourn at 1:57 p.m. Karen Garber-Miller seconded the motion. Motion approved 9-0.