

ALACTE Minutes

Agenda

Dates: October 13 and 14, 2014

Location: AUM, Library Tower, 10th Floor, Montgomery, AL

Handouts discussed in these minutes may be accessed by click on this link:

[ALACTE Minutes and Handouts.](#)

October 13 Minutes

12:00 Deans' Luncheon

Dr. Meyer was an invited guest during this meeting. She discussed the following topics:

ARI and AMSTI

During the State Board of Education work session on October 9, 2014, when Dr. Bice was discussing the K-12 budget for Fiscal Year 2016, several State Board members asked what IHEs were doing to prepare prospective teachers to implement ARI and AMSTI. Dr. Meyer indicated that the State Department of Education contacted ARI and AMSTI personnel, and their information is summarized in this chart: [ARI & AMSTI Matrix.](#)

edTPA Pilot Funding

Dr. Meyer discussed the edTPA pilot grant funding application.

Certificate Reciprocity

Dr. Meyer indicated that the Alabama State Department of Education is looking for ways to facilitate out-of-state reciprocity with Alabama. Forms are currently being revised.

Draft Code Regulations

Dr. Meyer disseminated copies of the draft Code. Broad concepts in this draft are summarized below.

- CAEP standards are included (in-lieu-of NCATE standards).
- The most recent version of SPA standards is included (verdict is still out on Social Studies). Efforts will be made to work with Alabama educators on standards unique to each area.
- Some standards need to be edited (e.g., Teacher Leader).
- References to AQTS were changed because to reflect the CAEP incorporation of InTASC standards (in the draft, these are called the Alabama Core Teaching Standards).

- GPAs were raised to 2.75 (includes Cumulative 2.50 GPA, Teaching Field GPA, and Professional Studies GPA), effective July 1, 2016. Candidates must have this GPA at admission and must maintain this GPA throughout their programs.
- What is a cohort? Institutions will have to define cohort individually; Alabama doesn't have a definition.
- For areas in which there is no SPA (e.g., Sports Management), ability standards will be used.
- There may be several draft versions in coming months as feedback as received. Please watch version by date at bottom of page.
- CAEP standards for advanced programs are in the current draft.

GENERAL SESSION

[Attendance Sign-In Sheet](#)

2:00 p.m. President's Welcome

President Kathy Chandler called the meeting to order. Attendees were introduced.

2:15 p.m. "Around Alabama" Updates

CAEP State Alliance

Dr. Lynne Mills and Dr. Jason Wingate briefly discussed the CAEP-State Alliance and announced that institutional representations would meet at 11:20 tomorrow for 60-90 minutes following the Business Meeting.

CAEP

Dr. Anna Kozlowski summarized what she learned at the recent CAEP Conference. She highlighted what she believed were the major take-aways from this conference:

- Three-Year Requirement: Three years before initial reviews, EPPs will be required to turn in instruments for CAEP Review. Feedback will be given regarding whether instruments are quality assessments. The intent is to improve well in advance of preparing the self-study, if needed. There will be an off-site report.
- Great emphasis is being placed on the quality of assessment instruments, rubrics, and scoring guides common to all programs. Note: Program-specific items for Alabama program review can be added as an addendum or embedded in these documents.
- A new handbook for EPPs and a revised Evidence Guide are expected to go before the CAEP Board in December and may be released in January.
- There was much discussion about Standard IV regarding completers' impact on P-12 learning. Strategies for how to address this in states that do not have or do not provide standardized test data were discussed.
- The program review with feedback option is still in the pilot phase and may not include program specific standards. Stay tuned for more information.
- Alliance Leadership: Lind McKee and Jim Kohlmoos reported that three sub-groups are working on documents that will eventually be shared with the wider CAEP community. The three subgroups are:

- Clinical Partnerships
- Clinical Experiences
- Clinical Faculty.

These subgroups were charged with exploring ideas to “push the envelope” in our understanding of best practices by using innovative research approaches. The goal is to deepen our understanding of what excellence is. These goals have not been restricted to the new CAEP standards. Their work will be released eventually, perhaps in a few semesters. Some State Alliances have been active, such as Ohio, in identifying ways to flesh out developmental levels of experiences prior to internships.

CIEP

[Revised CIEP Document 10-13-14](#)

Dr. Kozlowksi discussed several issues regarding the CIEP. She indicated that CIEP pilots from last summer were almost complete. A CIEP training session for IHEs is tentatively scheduled in late January, 2015. This session will be designed to provide information regarding how to prepare a report and what reviewers look for in their review.

Trial CIEP submissions will be accepted for 2015 (one program per Institution) with the understanding that there will be quite limited data available. Current approval will continue. The intent is to help all of our programs be successful in the future.

Summer 2015 reviewers are needed. An email will be sent asking institutions to identify interested faculty who:

- have experience with standards (e.g., SAS, NCATE/CAEP, SPAs, SACS, and NBPTS);
- able to work well with others to come to a consensus decision;
- able to write succinctly; and
- are of the caliber of people worthy of reviewing YOUR programs.

Templates and rubrics will need to be tweaked and will be sent to the Advisory Group soon. Packaging instructions will follow.

On October 23, 2014, faculty in IHE in Special Education will work with the ALSDE to look at CEC Standards and how these standards fit in with SPA requirements.

Teacher/Leader Evaluation

Dr. Alison Grissell explained that work is currently being completed at the ALSDE about the evaluation of teachers and leaders. A developmental pilot process will be undertaken in area school districts. In her PowerPoint presentation, some of the highlights were:

- The process will not include pre-existing tools and will focus on process and consensus building. Another focus will be on creating and validating tools and rubrics. Efforts will be made to determine how well tools and rubrics differentiate effective quality of practice.
- The new model will provide more flexibility and freedom, provide a framework, and will be a contextually significant process.

- Dr. Grissell reviewed the major features of the current Educate Alabama Model and provided a brief history of PEPE and its emphasis on compliance and scripting.
- An overview of the NCLB waiver from the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) was presented. Additionally, Dr. Grissell reviewed the USDOE requirements:
 - At least three rankings are required (four were chosen: Exemplary, Effective, Developing, Ineffective).
 - Student growth data is a significant factor (will count for 20-25%)
 - Student growth data will not be piloted during the 2015-2016 year.
 - The evaluation will have some sort of tie-in with personnel decisions.
 - Each Local Education Agency (LEA) will need to create a policy as part of the submitted plan.
- The committee focused on three areas of teaching effectiveness: (1) Professional Commitment, (2) Professional Practice, and (3) Impact on Engagement and Learning.
- The **Professional Commitment** component will include a self-assessment, conversation with an administrator, creation of a Professional Learning Plan, and evidence submission.
 - All teachers each year will go through this component which is basically Educate Alabama with a rubric. This component will contribute 30% to the overall classification.
- The **Professional Practice** component will include two observations, an analysis of instructional design, and a professional showcase. All non-tenured teachers and 1/3 of all tenured teachers will go through this process. Tenured teachers must go through this process at least once every three years. If teachers are deemed ineffective, they must complete the process the following year. This component represents 35% of the overall classification. Rubrics and tools will be included in this component. The first observation represents 15% of overall classification, is unannounced, is thirty minutes in length and will include a tool aligned to AQTS or InTASC standards. The second observation will comprise 10% of the overall classification and can be completed in any format (e.g., walk-throughs, unannounced, announced with pre/post conference, videotape with reflection).
 - The Reflection on Instructional Design portion will represent 5% of the overall classification and will include action research, professional learning communities, data-team meetings, lesson studies, and/or common assignments with work analysis.
 - The Professional Showcase will comprise 5% of the overall classification and might include activities such as art show, band competition, high percentage of AP scores, vertical teaming, school committees, mentoring, and graduate courses.
- The **Impact on Engagement and Learning** component will include student/parent surveys, classroom observation, and student growth data. All non-tenured teachers and 1/3 of tenured teachers must go through this process each year, and all tenured teachers must go through this process at least once every three years. This component represents 35% of the overall classification. If a teacher is deemed ineffective, he/she must repeat the process the following year. The actual data analyzed each year will be discussed relative to the self-assessment and Professional Learning Plan.
 - The student/parent surveys will take into consideration factors related to the student's age. The LEA will be able to choose the survey tool. Observations will include those completed during the Professional Practice component and will include a measure of student engagement.

- Dr. Grissell reviewed several questions that remain to be answered and discussed the next steps in the process including:
 - What tool should be used for observations?
 - Is there an existing rubric for this tool?
 - How do the tool and the rubric align to the standards?
 - How are we going to train observers on this tool?
- Dr. Grissell showed several example processes and rubrics that might be used.
- Dr. Grissell indicated that the process for evaluating **Leadership Effectiveness** is also likely to change, and the new process may include the following components:
 - Self-assessment and reflection
 - Professional learning plan and supporting artifacts
 - A survey of teachers showing shared leadership, instructional leadership, school culture, collaboration, and communication
 - Student/parent/community survey
 - Observations (minimum of two observations/walk-throughs are required)
 - One observation must be a formal unannounced observations.
 - Leaders will have an option to select the second observation type (e.g., formal announced observation, multiple walkthroughs with feedback/reflection, peer observation).

Code Changes

Dr. Jayne Meyer explained that copies of the draft Code were disseminated to the deans earlier this morning and the draft changes reflect the work of the Commission. She cautioned us not to advertise changes because this is a draft version. Dr. Meyer also explained that we need to watch the date on drafts because some components may change. She indicated that input/suggestions on the draft would be solicited in mid-November. The major changes in the draft include:

- CAEP standards are incorporated and replaced NCATE standards.
- The latest version of InTASC standards replaced the Alabama Quality Teaching Standards. In the Code, the InTASC standards are called the Alabama Core Teaching Standards.
- SPA standards replaced the current program standards.
- Grade point averages were raised to reflect CAEP requirements.
- New standards become effective July 1, 2016.
- There is greater flexibility for field and clinical experiences.
- References to a conceptual framework is not included because this issue is not addressed in the CAEP standards.

Dr. Meyer mentioned that the Commission is focusing on teacher performance assessment. She also indicated that there is discussion regarding what constitutes a “cohort” as there is some confusion about this across the country at the current time.

October 14 Minutes

[Attendance Sign-In Sheet](#)

9:00 a.m. President's Welcome

President Kathy Chandler welcomed attendees on the second day of this meeting.

Announcement: Glee Whitsett encouraged others to consider joining the Association of Teacher Educators. She disseminated the attached flyer: [ATE Flyer](#)

9:00 a.m. Roundtable Discussions

Drs. Kim Walls and Betty Lou Whitford from Auburn University provided a discussion on the topic of teacher performance assessment. Dr. Walls went over the purposes and definition of performance assessment. Major points from this discussion included the following points:

- It is every important that EPPs prepare candidates by incorporating each component of the performance assessment into pre-student teaching coursework.
- EPPs should make efforts to have former graduates share their specific experiences with the teacher performance assessment.
- EPPs may want to consider becoming an Exploratory Member of the edTPA and adding faculty members to this community. This will allow others to share resource son the site.

Several handouts were disseminated: [edTPA Fact Sheet](#); [edTPA Implementation Recommendations](#); [edTPA Myths and Facts](#); [Why eTPA & Map](#); [Using the edTPA](#)

Attendees were divided into groups and asked to examine the pros and cons of performance assessment. The following handout was used as a part of this group activity: [edTPA Discussion Handout](#). Small groups reported out their thoughts near the end of the discussion. Some questions asked during the report-out discussion included:

- What about the cost?
- Is the edTPA still in the exploratory phase in Alabama? It was noted that in November and December, webinars will be held. These webinars will be co-sponsored by the ALSDE and Pearson. It was pointed out that at least one person at each institution needs to go through scorer training, which is free.
- How are we going to handle the transition for students in the pipeline? Dr. Grissett explained that the pilot years will help institutions address issues related to the timeline.
- What about programs with dual certifications (e.g., elementary/special education)?
- Will ABC and Teach for America students be required to complete performance assessments? The answer to this question was "yes."
- Will edTPA score results be received prior to graduation?

The importance of mentor/cooperating teacher training was mentioned. Auburn University is to send a compilation of group comments from this discussion.

Dr. Grissett made the following points about the edTPA pilot grant application:

- This is truly a pilot. There are no expectations about how to pilot this. EPPs may want to request ¼ of the funds across the four-year period.
- In terms of technology, no computers are allowed. Send any technology equipment rests to Dr. Grissett before submitting the grant application.

10:50 Business Meeting

During this meeting, an amendment to the [Constitution Bylaws](#) was discussed. The following amendments were approved: [Proposed Bylaws Amendments](#).

11:30 CAEP State-Alliance Meeting

Drs. Lynne Mills and Jason Wingate presented a PowerPoint presentation on the CAEP State Alliance Group. They have asked EPPs to participate. Details from this invitation are provided in these documents: [CAEP State Alliance Email 1](#); [CAEP State Alliance Email 2](#). Major points of their discussion included:

- Drs. Mills and Wingate asked institutions to choose six interns to participate (preferably between the 10th and 14th week of the internship).
- Interviews should take about one hour.
- Use the same interview sheet with each intern.
- The same person should conduct the interview.

Anyone interested in participating in this study should contact Drs. Mills and Wingate. Data should be gathered/compiled in December. The hope is that data will be compiled and coded at the national level in January. By June, the goal is to have some type of toolkit for IHEs and CAEP.

CLOSING REMARKS

The spring ALACTE meeting will be held on April 20-21, 2015. Location is to be announced.

Dr. Chandler thanked the membership for the attendance at the meeting. A motion was made to adjourn the meeting and was seconded. The meeting was adjourned.