**DARTEP Minutes**

**Friday, February 3rd, 2016**

**Central Michigan University**

**195 E. Ojibway Court, Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859**

1. ***Welcome***
	1. Betty Kirby, acting dean COE CMU welcomes group.
		1. LEED buildings
		2. Slate walls -> teacher education
		3. Early childhood tour
		4. STEM space
	2. Sally Rae
		1. What is your institutional brand
			1. Set of perceptions or images
			2. What people can expect from you
			3. This is what I am, who I am, why I exist.
			4. Big schools, put the letter up their. But smaller schools “brand” has the name in the logo.
			5. How do you know if Brand is working or not.
			6. Today talk about DATA - to back up our brand.
		2. Approved December minutes.
2. ***Organization Reports***
	1. DARTEP Treasurer’s Report (Kevin Williams)
		1. See powerpoint (to be added)
		2. Balance:S 13,100.81
	2. Michigan Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (MACTE) (Betty Kirby)
		1. (see handout)
		2. Board member changes: Kathleen Crawford-McKinney staying on for historical contribution - thank you Kathleen
		3. Board starting updates
		4. Looking at strategic plan, mission and vision. MACTE summer retreat.
		5. MACTE summer retreat
			1. 4 years ago decided to organize around advocacy and examining practices.
			2. Retreat work session for members. At NMU
			3. June 12-14, 2017 this year. Wednesday ½ day for travel.
			4. Going to apply for grant from AACTE to help offset the cost for travel and/or hotel. Will keep posted.
			5. Select topics
				1. PD in MI - and what can we do as EPPs to become stronger players again.
				2. Rule changes coming up March
				3. K12 and higher education partnerships
				4. PRE and PRE/SAT
				5. Open to other
			6. Past success
				1. White paper on PRE from 2 years ago.
				2. Created professional dispositions
				3. Principal Survey (2016)
				4. TE competencies
				5. Made case for change in ACT passing scores (Writing 24 to 22)
				6. Make sure membership up to date.
				7. Send names of who should be on the membership roster.
				8. Myth - had to AACTE member to be in MACTE. Not true. Can just be a member of MACTE.
				9. AACTE meeting in March (2-4). We will have a reception
				10. AACTE State Leader institutions Jim Rookes (future president) and Anne Tapp (president elect) attending
				11. April Meeting - these are twice a year.
	3. Michigan Association Teacher Educators (MATE): No report
	4. Michigan Public Deans Council: No report
	5. Michigan Independent Educator Preparation Institutions (MIEPI): Strongly encourage MACTE membership, but we need to meet. Will be meeting after Dartep in April. Meeting briefly today after lunch in room 117.
	6. Consortium for Outstanding Achievement in Teaching with Technology (COATT): No report
3. ***MDE Updates***
	1. MDE Introductions
		1. Leah Breen
		2. Preston Hicks
		3. Kelly Cassidy
		4. Sarah Kate Levan
		5. Sean Koetke
		6. Catherine Wigent
		7. Phil Chase
		8. Steve Stegink
		9. Krista Reed
	2. Update legislation (Leah Breen)
		1. Back in session. (ask for handouts)
		2. Proposed 1 bill Senate Bill 79. Makes changes to interim certificate and alternate route. Team has not had a chance to look. It will come out through listserv. Please give feedback to Leah Breen (or your own rep)
		3. Proposed HB 469: Revises college credits 90 to 60 for subs
		4. Proposed HB 484: Reading diagnostic test no longer required. (Tetter put forward - PE teacher who didn’t like requirement).
		5. Proposed HB 485: PD days count as pupil instructional hours.
		6. Should see bill come through eliminating limitation of provisional certificate renewal
		7. Changes on criminal conviction rules. Right now MDE has to let the schools know if teachers have criminal conviction - want state policy do it. Have mechanism, but not law (yet)
		8. Open up bills for teacher evaluation requirements.
	3. MDE Data System - Big Picture- Catherine Wigent (powerpoint on website)
		1. Uses data for approvals and accountability
		2. Why? Required and want the data to be useful for EPP
			1. When MDE issues licensure we can back it up with confidence.
			2. Also need to have approval provide check for the candidates - quality program
		3. Data Use
			1. Licensure tests
			2. Surveys
			3. Educator Effectiveness
		4. EPP Continuous Improvement
			1. One piece is our EPP data (program/unit level)
			2. MDE Data
			3. EPP systems
				1. Look at program all the time to make sure meeting the standards and are successful.
				2. How do EPP continue to improve and using data
	4. Data from MDE//Information you can get: Phil Chase
		1. Extra tidbits
			1. Want to provide as many data points as possible
				1. EFF Rating
				2. Teacher Testing
				3. TC Survey
				4. CS Survey
				5. CT Curvey
				6. YO Survey
				7. Non-Renewal Survey
				8. Employer survey - don’t do
				9. Alt Rte TC/CT- don’t do
			2. EPI data on dashboard - Qualtrex. No longer get paper. Will have our own log in. (will have 2016, but also 2014, 2015)
				1. Working on how to collect all the survey data in real time.
				2. Might be able to get this data earlier than before.
				3. Maybe be able to drill down to program level.
				4. Should get institutional login in the next 6 weeks.
				5. (Valid and reliable -> technical manual) Jim Gullen publication helps with the survey. Can there be some common language for validity and reliability.
				6. Extending window collection Feb 15.
	5. Survey Data: Main focus for today: Preston Hicks
		1. 2014-2015 2015/2016
			1. TC/CC And CT surveys - fall/winter and spring/summer
			2. YO just spring/summer
			3. Junev2014 report just TC, CS
			4. April 2015 TC, CS, (YO - not in EPI score)
			5. Aoril 2016 TC, CS, (YO, CT-not in EPI score)
			6. April 2017 TC CS (YO, CT-not in EPI score)
		2. See ppt.
			1. “Effectiveness percentages - percent of people who put strongly agree or agree). Improving over all
			2. 3 lowest
				1. Connect content to real world problems
				2. Technology
				3. Special needs populations
			3. Issue - how do we address “did not observe”
	6. Small group work (4 groups) to discuss questions of interest surrounding the survey (generated by MDE based on feedback from membership). Driven by Sarah-Kate LaVan
		1. Addressing the needs of **English Learners [EHS 115]**
			1. What are some things your EPP is doing now and how does your EPP know it’s having an impact? (What data or metrics demonstrate this and lead to continuous improvement efforts?)
				1. Hope: Huge area of concern (as it’s lowest area in surveys AND the huge population increase in ELs in their region); ISDs & locals expressed need for support; local curriculum directors are coming to work with pre-service teachers & spread throughout curriculum - object strongly to separate course
				2. UM-Dearborn: colleagues across content areas don’t universally understand ways of working with ELs and can’t add into courses effectively; thus a need to add a course with a 45 hour practicum (required of BX & BT endorsement candidates)
				3. GVSU: it’s discussed & described, but lack opportunities to practice in field
				4. Calvin: we only add courses when we have to, as programs are stretched thin; needs MDE leverage to add such a course to the curriculum
				5. Baker: have been adding EL-specific content across curriculum, esp. in reading courses; data in survey is more positive on this, but small
				6. ? - are there any programs with required field experience for all students working with ELs? (only those in specialized endorsement programs); Hope - some specific items - ethnicity, special needs & low SES - that must be covered across corpus of field experiences
			2. Are there things the MDE can do to support better candidate preparation for meeting the needs of ELs regardless of the candidate’s discipline area training?
				1. See (4) above from Calvin
				2. Calvin: asks about CAEP standards as a driver of the conversation
				3. UM-D: can’t say we’re preparing teachers for classrooms of tomorrow if they don’t know how to work with ELs
		2. Addressing the needs of **special education students [EHS 117]**
			1. What are some things your EPP is doing now and how does you EPP know it’s having an impact? (What data or metrics demonstrate this and lead to continuous improvement efforts?

*NMU - student teachers required to track a population of K12 students relative to IEP/504/other intervention plans in place before or during their arrival for student teaching; check-in with seminar instructor, university supervisor, and cooperating teacher as to the effect of the interventions for the children being tracked - emotional, social, cognitive, academic needs; final portfolio lesson plan is an annotated plan showing how it would be altered based on the needs of the students using Danielson Framework Domains 1 and 4 rubric; final check is an interview with a practicing administrator at the final seminar whereby candidates show evidence of their ability to teach/assess/revise based on the individual needs of a student population*

* + - * 1. Have a special education class for all general education candidates for special education, EL, and diversity and there is a 15 hour field component.
				2. When students take off-campus, may not get that experience - one EPP.
				3. Report that some courses are K-12 and some Elementary and Secondary
				4. Addressed generally through a separate class on special education
				5. Found that students did not understand special education as well until they have had a field experience because no context. Required that they take after having field experience
				6. Special education students include - gifted, mental health, so should be integrated through multiple classes to fight the notion that a stand alone class.
				7. Data - key assessment within the course which brought up point of concern
				8. No stand alone course at some institutions
				9. Incorporate the ideas into all other coursework and requirements
				10. Methods courses have follow-up key assessment that requires that they incorporate information learned from class on special population
				11. Needs to be closer to using in the classroom/context of special education
				12. Twofold - know how to use and cooperating teacher seeing it.
				13. Better job mentoring our cooperating teacher to understand surveys
				14. Cooperating teachers - concerned about how the surveys may reflect on them.
			1. Are there things the MDE can do to support better candidate preparation for meeting the needs of special education students regardless of the candidate’s discipline area training?
				1. Simplify language in survey questions
				2. Summary with survey on how the data is used
				3. Adding a question about whether or not there are students in the classroom in special population that they can see in the school or classroom
				4. Add a question about poverty as diversity
		1. Addressing **technology for instruction [EHS 129]**
			1. What are some things your EPP is doing now and how does your EPP know it’s having an impact? (What data or metrics demonstrate this and lead to continuous improvement efforts?)

*NMU - 2 credit technology course in methods connected to content methods courses; candidate assigned to a local teacher where they are required to teach in the traditional classroom physical space and also teaching in Google Classroom space; all candidates given access to the Google Classroom space as a teacher by the LEA; use rubrics that show connection from ISTE to Danielson Framework*

*Adrian: 2 credit technology class that has been in place for a while. Originally worked on portfolio development. Divided into 2 - 1 credit: sophomore: overview; later- focus on portfolio*

*Oakland - Surveys: asking students what they see in K-12 but don’t have access to and have adapted resources at the college level...noticing that it’s difficult to meet the diverse resources being used in the field.*

*2 credit course usually taken as juniors*

*Do survey when student teaching asking how prepared they are in this area.*

*Marygrove: added smartboards into EDUC classes, but not a lot of use by faculty so now a lecture capture room that is used to help students record and analyze their teaching. Also a 3 credit technology course - being revised to include more up to date technology -- in every methods class they have an electronic portfolio assignment*

*Concordia: tech course*

*The question about “Using online system…” was created in response to NSTE…*

*The question is worded such that the candidates and other survey completers are completing for the student teaching context rather than full program experience*

*Should there be a baseline set of data?*

*Technology must be integrated at least one observation -- varies with placement/context/etc.*

*All students are taking graduate course work that includes a technology course; they also take technology into the field with them*

* + - 1. Are there things the MDE can do to support better candidate preparation in the area of instructional technology?

*Is there something MDE can do to help address the issue that some of the placements do not have access to technology?*

*Are there grants that institutions could apply for to help provide resources that candidates could take with them into the field?*

*Question clarification needed: students create online systems -- who is “students” in this case?*

*Check out the policy brief from Advancing Technology in Teacher Prep*

* + 1. We have noticed a preponderance of mentors and supervisors responding with **“Did not observe” on surveys**. We have situations where whole categories are being marked with “Did not observe” (e.g., real world problems and technology to maximize instruction). **[French Auditorium]**
			1. How does the routine use of “Did not observe” limit our data and understanding of teacher candidates’ abilities? How does this impact the ability to address continuous improvement efforts?
			2. What solutions do you propose for the MDE to collect more accurate responses/data related to candidate proficiencies?
			3. Discussion
				1. GVSU - given particular option as a response is limiting. Eliminate or if keep do not observe and go to a screen as why. The why would help understand better. Open ended or options. Could have options. Pilot having open ended text boxes, and then use those as possible responses. Or institutions can survey institutions and why. Awareness of the priority and have had to adjust observations where learning priority. Difference between not seeing when you visit vs. not an opportunity in classrooms.
				2. MSU- Surprised to see that people said in comment field - some couldn’t see. Mentor: Had ELL but didn’t think to have teacher worker
				3. CMU - as director of student teaching need to talk to supervisors about what these terms mean and why important so all coming from the same place.
				4. EMU - “could not observe” instead of “did not observe”???
				5. SVSU did address it with their supervisors and host teachers. Now looking to see if made a difference. Found there were miscommunications/understanding etc.
				6. MDE are they only using the survey what they see on site? Maybe they could videotape? Could share with supervising teaching.
				7. LSSU - survey asks what did you actually see person do. Maybe need to sensitize supervisors and cooperating teachers.
				8. Aquinas - concern that having the discussion (in advance) might impact result. Observations are for educative and mentoring purposes too, not just evaluative. The checklist doesn’t serve us well. Standards are good. Whether they are measured in this context.
				9. EMU -Don’t count do not observe - can’t you use the sample where it observed as a fair “representative sample.”
				10. ???. These descriptions are so narrow, might have problems. Start by looking at the questions.
				11. ??? Some of the questions might not be applicable at a certain grade level?
				12. Might mean more
	1. GoREACT: Preview and Presentation: Sally Rae and Catherine Wigent
		1. goREACT <https://goreact.com/teachers#/>
		2. Complete survey monkey [httCY7JRM6ps://www.surveymonkey.com/r/](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/CY7JRM6)
1. ***New Business***:
	1. Proposal/volunteers for MiCAEPCON.
		1. Identifying quality pieces of evidence in addition to the key assessments
		2. Exploring the CAEP rubric to improve local assessments
		3. Collaborating with EPPs that have similar visitation dates to create ideal timeline tasks
		4. Analyzing data: Reliability and Validity
		5. Creating and maintaining a quality assessment system
		6. Learning the critical attributes of Initial and Advanced Programs and what evidence is needed for both.
		7. Creating rubrics.
		8. Deadline
	2. Jerry Bush is going to have a table at lunch (Pearson rep)
	3. Need independent member for next year chair.
2. ***Job-Alike Sessions***
	1. Accreditation/Assessment Coordinators – EHS 118, French Auditorium

 Catherine --one quick announcement -- CAEP has suspended doing three year out assessment reviews, you will need to assess your own assessments with the CAEP tool

 CAEP doesn’t have a chief accreditation person (to the best of our knowledge)

 Sara Kate and Catherine have talked with CAEP about their concerns

 There will probably be only one pathway in the future at CAEP

 The trend is to emphasize the analysis of the data --need to talk about critical analysis of the data and ways to improve--be up front about this in your report

 Donna -- Why have they suspended early review of assessments?

 Catherine-- Perhaps because of conflict of interest and capacity.

 Donna has training in providing CAEP feedback on assessments

Question about principal survey

Beth: Several institutions are piloting the survey

 Waiting for feedback from principals right now

 Goal to share it widely across the state

 Protocol needs discussion-- e.g. every three years….

Karen: Getting good feedback from

White paper available from MACTE available on the methodology and validity of the survey

Catherine: AACTE group is working on a principal survey that will be coming soon.

Donna: How will it work when CAEP moves to one pathway?

Catherine: Not sure yet. State concern about equitability in terms of resources--lots of resources for SI

SI versus IB feedback has been different-- SI visit is focused on areas of concern

MDE has given feedback on this to CAEP to make the process more transparent for institutions

 Donna -- question about IB shell

 We are going to have to be vigilant during this transition process.

 IB folks--keep insisting on formative feedback

 CMU recommends considering moving to SI if you can

 CMU -- had no shell to work with

 Joe L.-- IB shell is not user friendly yet

 Joe would be happy to answer questions

 Doug -- Hope College shifting to SI from IB

 Hope-- shell hasn’t shifted yet

 Catherine is willing to provide support as you negotiate the transition

 CAEP will not change shell until 6 months before report is due

 Cole Bouwers--contact to set up date-- also contact Catherine to set up date for visit

 Question about program review with feedback --what do you get from the state…

 -- basically feedback on standard 1 -- with additional feedback on particular programs

 MTTC data, # of credits,

 -looking for discrepancies on what programs you think you are approved for and MDE has different data

 - if you close a program, you need to inform the state

 - or if your program is no longer active, you need to contact the state

 Program Review with Feedback

 - helps clear up discrepancies, often just paperwork

 Beth-- CAEP table of program approval --

 Put the date on the most recent letter

 Are there good consultants on CAEP available?

 If you aren’t getting responses from CAEP, cc Catherine on the emails or try calling directly

 B. Certification Officers – EHS 115

* + 1. Steve Stegink is considering common info we could all provide to CAEP about MTTC test development, reliability, etc.
			1. Two vendors applied for the MTTC testing contract, MDE is reviewing these bids, decision will be announced later this spring.
			2. Suggestion: if candidate asks for new official score report, we receive a paper report. Could we go paperless and have the score available in results analyzer instead? (institutions would need to be notified of the new score).
		2. Krista Ried’s updates are in the OPPS update summary. Lots of interest in the Advanced Professional Certificate, but very few actually qualify.
		3. Proposed changes to the Administrative Rules will be up for approval later this spring. Implementation timeline is under development. MOECS will need significant updates.
			1. Subbing experience will not count toward required teaching experience for the Professional Certificate, but, the Standard certificate can be renewed unlimited times.
			2. All Provisional certificates will retroactively be renamed as “Standard.” Those who had hit the dead end after three Provisional renewals will then be able to renew their Standard certificates.
			3. MDE received public comment concerned about changes to permits and quality of professional development for teachers.
		4. Teachers with valid teaching certificates can substitute teach for up to 90 days per year without obtaining the substitute permit.
		5. Alternate routes completed in other states: CCSSO pushes for reciprocity to be smooth between states, but states can still maintain their own requirements. MDE observes nationwide trend toward more alternate route programs...including some which only require passage of a test (although MDE will not accept out-of-state certification based on a test only). MDE will not pre-evaluate or guarantee in advance Michigan certification based on any out of state program or alternate route.
		6. Special education is a problem for reciprocity because other state special ed endorsements do not always match Michigan’s structure.
	1. Department Heads/Deans – EHS 117

1. Micro-Credentialing for Teachers

Sean and Leah, MDE. There is a push from K-12 and organizations for

micro-credentialing. MDE has to be assured of quality and currently do

not have the ability to do so. Two ways to approach this: 1) include with

MDE teaching certificate, different from endorsement 2) online portfolio with badges. MVU presented a mini-step to micro-credentialing to MDE. There is another meeting soon. Anything for which there isn’t an endorsement could fall in the category of micro-credentialing. A six-credit STEM or robotics package is an idea.

Concern for quality PD was discussed as was the deletion of district steps or incentives to continue teachers’ education. MOOCs were discussed and the UM Ann Arbor’s approach was briefly introduced. The benefit is expertise of the teacher, ease of PD, ability for teachers to have PD on the same topic. It’s also easy to navigate and to gain credentials.

It was stated that some in the room were against place micro-credentialing on teaching certificates.

 2. Appropriate Placement & Certification

 Leah - Middle of Feb. small stakeholder meeting with lots of feedback -

K-3, 4-6, etc. Group will review and discuss proposed models. Survey

data will be made available. Teachers feel you should be endorsed for your

placement. Administrators want the ability to place according to teacher

skill set and time in teaching within that area. Further, they do not want

these “endorsements” to leave the district with the teacher.

Teachers will have to placed within endorsement area. K-8 all subjects is too broad. Trying to learn the what and how.

Will currently certified teachers be grandfathered? Teachers may have five years to comply with new rule. MDE will handle the change of certification.

We need to help teachers understand their pathways. There needs to be a plan of progression. Do I want to be a reading specialist? Shall I expand my grade bands?

Focus on middle school as intentional. Early field experiences in programs was encouraged.

 3. PRE/SAT

 Phil and Leah- Recommendation will be given to Brian. Team met with

him in cabinet. They are leaning toward subject specific with cut around

the Career and College Ready cut. Brian said yet to the SAT and was

interested in a cohort to be admitted that fell above and below the cut

Score. They are close to a final decision. Further modifiers may be

considered. ACT may not be used until new score would is given. PRE will

not be maintained. March 5, 2016, or later reconfigured SAT needs to be

used.

D. Student Teacher Directors – EHS 129 -

Beth; Oakland University - question about accommodations for Student Teachers? They have Student Teachers asking for accommodations to be made to their fieldwork placements. How have other EPI’s handled this? MSU has dealt with this issue of accommodation for courses vs. fieldwork job essentials. This is something already in discussion at MSU within a committee. EPI’s should encourage open discussion with the school administration and the student - this should be a great resource. Work with your partner districts on what is work requirements vs. work accommodation. Martha - from U of M has a system/program of training Student Teachers on what is the job of being a Student Teacher. They include School District HR to be notified by Student Teacher, along with University faculty having a fact sheet on teaching responsibilities. EPI’s are encouraged to get out information to their teacher candidates early in their program and have a frank/factual discussion with Student Teachers on teaching requirements. Documentation also needs to be kept on every teacher candidate through their program and utilized for basis of these types of discussion. Concordia has implemented a 0 credit course for each year (Year 1,Year 2, Year 3) on what the teaching profession requires - they meet once a week for an hour. Candidates then choose to select out when they believe teaching is no longer a fit for them. Not entirely sure how many students are selecting out at U of M, at Concordia they believe it has screened out 30%.

Discussion on what if a Student Teacher comes to student teaching already employed as a teacher, but seeking a new endorsement that requires a clinical experience - how is that handled at other EPI’s? Student needs to go to school district and have frank discussion with Administration. Quite frankly this is up to that student to resolve, not the EPI.

Student Teaching at Concordia moved Student Teaching courses from 15 credits to 12 credits, with the thought that no other courses were to be taken during that semester of Student Teaching. Have since found out that has been taking place. Do other institutions have this issue, or a policy of no other classes to be taken? Highly encourage not to take additional courses while Student Teaching. At U of M there is a Professional Board that reviews student’s requests to take another course during the ST experience - requests need to have a very strong reasoning. Oakland also requires a petition, as does many other EPI’s. Albion requires their student teachers to calendar all of their time they will be using during their student teaching experience and they find that curbs most candidates from working and taking classes during their student teaching experience.

State approved Evaluator Tools use - How are the four state approved evaluation tools impacting evaluations EPI’s are using in their clinical experiences?

U of M is using Charlotte Danielson evaluation tool as it is what most of their area districts use that tool. They will also be using this observation tool with practicum students. Using one of these four approved evaluation tools ensures reliability and validity of the instrument. It also in something the Cooperating Teachers appreciate as it is familiar to them. U of M removed highest category (ex. Highly effective) and categories that obviously would not be observed in Pre-Service Teaching or Student Teaching. Northern Michigan has also been using one of the approved evaluation tools (Danielson?). MSU/ Concordia has not addressed this as they are looking at tools tied to their Program outcomes. U of M is also using import folios and all alignment has been done to InTASC, etc.

 Co- Teaching - Grand Valley and CMU - Yes Link to Co-Teaching at St. Cloud State University:

<http://www.stcloudstate.edu/soe/coteaching/>

Question on Student Teachers being allowed to teach AP courses during Student Teaching? Decision based on district requirements, and most do not turn their AP courses over to Student Teachers.

MDE sought clarification on why multiple instructors might be tied to one Student Teacher evaluation. This is due to students in multiple major/minor assignments.

MDE also asked how is teacher effectiveness determined/what criteria is used to be a Cooperating Teacher? Most EPI’s are using school administrators recommendations, database information of prior hosting experiences, Teacher Candidate survey information, etc. to make effective placements. This is hard to completely quantify how great placements are made.

MDE finding that there is a need to ensure quality placements are being made and this correlates to data needs. Wondering if there is a uniform placement process across the state? Does that need to be looked into? Most placements across the state are at the mercy of partnerships and districts. There are also Universities competing for placements in the same region. This is very political and difficult to navigate.

1. ***Job-Alike Session Reports***
	1. ***See above***
2. ***Wrap up - THANKS SO MUCH CMU!!!***
	1. *All materials will be on the web.*
	2. *Don’t forget survey*
	3. *Privates meet as working lunch in 117*
	4. *Everybody - talk to each other about what your brand is and what is your elevator speech. In the spring we are going to talk about our brand as a state.*
3. **Jerry Bush from Evaluation - Systems Group of Pearson**