

CITEP Meeting
February 12, 2016
1:00 PM
Wardlaw O29

Minutes

Members Present: Lynda Nilges, Stephanie Milling, Beth White, Paul Malovrh, Christine Lotter, Nate Carnes, Chris Christle, Lisa Peterson, Cindy Van Buren, Lauren Brown, David Virtue, Donna Watson, Cookie Winburn, Rob Dedmon, Tommy Hodges, Susi Long

I. Welcome and Introductions – Chairs: David Virtue and Lynda Nilges

Dr. Virtue called the meeting to order at 1:07 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes – Lynda Nilges

Donna Watson motioned to approve the minutes. Nate Carnes seconded his motion. The minutes were subsequently approved.

III. Proposed New Internship Evaluation – Cindy Van Buren

- Update Since November
 - November Meeting Recap: What we currently have is not a rubric, it is a met/not met checklist. We know that it will not meet CAEP requirements for a valid unit-wide assessment. This also does not represent best practice in assessment of effective teaching. The November CITEP meeting decision was that Cindy would develop a 4 level rubric to supplement the checklist. At the time, SDE told us not to wait on them because they were unsure of their next steps.
 - State Progress: Task force reviewed six rubrics and in December put forth Danielson and NIET as the top two. Kris Joannes (Director of SDE Office of Educator Effectiveness) said that Danielson is not the one that the state will select due to proprietary issues. Danielson must be purchased and used in their electronic environment, which is not feasible for SDE. NIET is likely to be the selected rubric although it has not been formally announced (going through internal SDE approvals process.)
- Benefits to Adopting NIET
 - Already deemed valid by CAEP and will not have to go through CAEP's review process/meet their 11 page assessment rubric...other institutions have said that it is a difficult process for approval
 - If selected by state, graduates will leave us with working knowledge of state evaluation rubric
 - If selected by state, SDE will provide the training for the university supervisors...some have gone through this training with a 5 level TAP rubric, but

this rubric we would adopt if 4 levels (Dennis Dotterer, Director of SC TAP, said that Clemson is using the 5 level version of this rubric)

- Aligned to ADEPT and InTASC
- Heavily based on research and best practice
- Online features are offered if we wanted to pay for this (CODE, video observations)
- Drawbacks to Adopting NIET
 - Cannot make changes to it since it is a nationally developed rubric...if we start changing it, it is not valid (we can though add a content domain/addendum for each specific program area and we can key elements of it to SPA standards)
 - Change is hard for some– inter-rater reliability will have to be established (we will have to do this though with any instrument we use)
- Thoughts/Questions:
 - Nate Carnes: Under benefits, if we went to the more deluxe version, would we have to pay for it or would students have to pay for it? Cindy: This would more than likely not be a student fee. For training for inter-rater reliability, the fee based system may be worth it for the videos.
 - David Virtue: There is a professional library of exemplars...Nate and Chris have passwords and Dennis Dotterer would be willing to come to CITEP and bring an NIET representative to answer any questions. Tommy Hodges: Video supervisions are done at many schools and is moving to the norm, so that is not a huge leap or novel idea if we moved to this.
 - Chris Christle: Why are we doing this now if the state has not yet adopted NIET? Cindy: We will not pass CAEP with our current Met/Not Met checklist. Our options: Adopt an existing rubric for internship evaluation or create our own rubric. We cannot use what we currently have, Kris Joannes said that they cannot send a letter to USC saying that we are doing what the state requires and using the forms. We require that it be aligned to ADEPT. If the state required us to use the forms, the state would write us a letter and CAEP would accept this.
 - Christine Lotter added that she really likes NIET. It talks about student thinking, will push our pre-service teachers to up their game, and seems like a no brainer. Tommy Hodges added that there are pages and pages of citations available with the rubric with each domain.
 - Cindy has guaranteed that as long as Molly Spearman is Superintendent, the state will have a 4 level rubric. The biggest shift for our students and faculty will be that Exemplary is not an A...Exemplary is the state teacher of the year teaching, not an intern in the field. We have to adjust the candidates' thinking that in rare circumstances you will be a level 4 but this doesn't mean that you will not receive an A. Until the state adopts the new rubric, we still have to report Met/Not Met...we would go through this process and determine what is Met/Not Met from the rubric. The rubric can be weighted.
 - Susi Long: How is this intended to be used and at what time? Do we go in with our current ADEPT evaluation and observe? Cindy: Dennis said you go in with this rubric each observation and complete at the end to give a score. Dennis will come do the training for us this summer for free as long as he is at SDE. We have to show CAEP we are showing progress and we have to have at least one

semester of data using this rubric, so we will have to implement and use this fall. There would be a massive revision this summer and we would not use the Met/Not Met checklist at all. We would determine what Met/Not Met would mean in order to report this to the state. USC would determine what passing would be.

- Tommy: One thing we were looking forward to is adding an additional domain to the rubric at the end based upon program areas...do we all need to have the same threshold across all programs? Cindy: Domain 5/the content domain could be its own key assessment separate. It can look like this rubric, have the same 4 levels, and have its own key assessment.
- Lynda: PE assessments were returned based on co-mingling. Looking at the rubric, there is a lot of co-mingling of the outcomes. *Inter-rater reliability/co-mingling discussion*. Cindy: This really depends on the particular SPA's requirements and the raters.
- Susi: It will be helpful when the state makes a decision on the rubric. Faculty will more than likely not be willing to create a new rubric in a short period of time. Paul Malovhr: this is one of the only choices that we have since we have not reviewed other rubrics
- Cindy concluded that we don't have to make a decision today regarding the NIET rubric, but would like everyone to consider this and have Dennis host a training to discuss further. David added that everyone should bring the rubric back to their program areas and discuss, attend an information session with David, and then reconvene at our March meeting and vote.
 - Cindy's action items: Send everyone the technical guide, set dates for Dennis to come discuss the rubric, and determine the cost of online extras.

IV. Proposed Changes to GPA – Update – Rob Dedmon

- Rob began by asking what are we going to say is our cumulative GPA? You must have a cumulative GPA of 2.75 for the professional program...we can decide what that means to us. Does that mean just USC courses or all courses they have taken even at other universities?
- We are currently using their overall GPA (all courses even from other universities). This is going away. Advisors have access to Degree Works which students will have access to in May. In Degree Works, the registrar said that he could put GPA that includes all the coursework combined. It may be somewhat different than what we are looking at now, but will include everything that is required for LIFE scholarship. USC will have to maintain a combined GPA, this is required for LIFE Scholarship. Students will be able to see this GPA that we are holding them accountable for (but this will not be on transcripts, just on DegreeWorks).
- GPA Discussion:
 - Lynda: A lot of our students are transfer students, so they may only have one semester of courses before they are applying to the professional program (especially PE)
 - Rob ran a different number this time to see how the changes in GPA would affect them - students that have between 45 and 75 credit hours...for COE students,

there were 28 who would not meet professional program entrance requirements based on overall GPA (out of 211 students), 32 who would not meet based on USC GPA. Arts & Sciences- 5 would not meet requirements with the overall GPA, 5 would not meet based on USC GPA (out of 34). The numbers are very similar for both GPAs. Lauren Brown: There is a new advising tool that Student Services will be trained on which will pinpoint, for example, if you get a C in 201, there is an indicator that a student is struggling, etc. We also have a first year advisor who will be looking closely at students during that first year.

- Paul: What are the arguments for only looking at USC credits? Rob: For just using USC, students will see that is all the registrar is calculating.
 - David: Is there an option for us to accept the higher of the two? Rob: It is a state standard that we have 2.75 cumulative, so we have to define what that means. The state does still allow a small percentage to be admitted with 2.5 with petition. Lynda: Could there be a clause for transfer students? They will have to have a 2.5 to get in, but they have to have a 2.75 to get into the professional program. Lauren: We would see a lot of Anatomy & Physiology being taken at Midlands Tech.
- After the discussion, David Virtue then suggested that we will go with overall GPA unless there are problems, then we can change it. This decision was then made unanimously from the committee.

V. SLED/Background Check for Early Field Experiences – Rob Dedmon/Cindy Van Buren

- Rob: According to state regulations, we are required to have students complete SLED checks before going into schools for practicum experiences. In order to get into a school even for a 5 hour field experience, they will need this SLED check. We need to have a system in place so that by the fall, we will be compliant with state requirements.
- Cindy: This SLED check is done online (cost between \$12-15). This should be used as a coaching tool...schools have to make a decision. OCE will notify districts and they can decide to say no to a student coming in.
- Stephanie Milling: If there is a problem, is it OCE that would talk to the student? Cookie: Cookie and Rob would talk to the students and ensure that they are not a threat to the school. Stephanie: Is this different than the SLED check that they do at the Children's Center? Rob: This is more than likely the same one.
- Cindy: There is a way in Chalk & Wire that they can handle this for us...they can upload their TB test and SLED check into C&W and be advised of this in Freshman orientation. We want to get away from these paper tests being sent to OCE.
- Christine: We will also have to figure out the best way to reach those students that are in Arts & Sciences programs.

VI. Technology Integration Discussion – Lynda Nilges/David Virtue

- Lynda: With CAEP steering, strategic planning, etc. we have noticed that there is a lack of technology training throughout the college. This is a beginning discussion of this need. ISTE standards are intertwined with CAEP standards. There are many skills that students are not receiving from our programs. Should room be made for a technology course?

- David: Looking at our exit survey results, graduates are frequently commenting that there is a lack of technology integration throughout the college.
- Cindy: District Contacts in Lexington/Richland 5 have notified her that student interns from USC across the board are very well prepared and come to the district technologically savvy, but do not have working knowledge of the ISTE Standards or a knowledge of technology integration. This is a SAMR district, and students are unaware of this and do not have these skills.
- Nate: Ed & Nate fought for Eno boards because they were cheaper than SMART boards, but they run very different. Faculty members across the board do not have the time to align Eno boards with SMART boards. Nate can only speak from one district, but there are issues with disconnect on technology
- Christine: There are two traveling SMART boards, but there is an issue with aligning the SMART boards. Could they be stationary and kept in one room? Suggestion for new dean: implement a possible check out system for laptops/iPads. Nate: We definitely need hardware, some software, and training is a requirement.
- Rob: There are two big issues. What we need here and how do we purposefully include this in our programs so that a student graduates and know how to successfully integrate technology into the classroom?
- Stephanie: Could a way to approach this issue holistically be to survey program areas on their use of technology and have each program area show how they meet the technology requirements and ISTE standards such as adding a course, beefing up a course already in place like this was done with Read to Succeed?
- Lynda: What this conversation helps to do is confirmation from this group that we need to do something with technology (Lynda and David are also in strategic planning group). As Matt is doing upgrades, he needs information from this group on what our needs are.
- David: Coaching Teacher Evaluation: Ask student teachers/recent graduates and coaching teachers what it is exactly that students need, including technology. We could have a workshop for faculty/staff and see what technology is out there in the district.
- Cindy: We cannot show them every type of technology that is out there, but they need to know how to integrate technology appropriately in the classroom. Technology is a cross cutting standard for CAEP, we do not have a lot of evidence to show for CAEP.
- Action: Put a question on the survey that is being sent out throughout COE regarding technology, and continue this discussion.

VII. Focus of CITEP – Information vs. Governance – David Virtue

- David: CITEP is a place that we have received information and had discussions, but it has not taken a governance stance in the past. As CAEP steering meets, somebody then needs to decide on these issues. We need to ensure that we have a process for discussing issues, bringing this back to program areas, and then making a decision. We will meet more often to act on recommendations from CAEP Steering Committee. Next Meeting Date: March 17th @ 11:15 – 1:15 (following the CAEP Steering Committee meeting)– Lisa Peterson will determine a room number for the March meeting and send out to everyone.

VIII. New Business

- Donna Watson: For Art, Music, Dance, FL programs: Raechel Blakeney will be our contact person for these programs, will be communicating with students about admission to the professional program. We are transitioning her into this position.
- Chris Christle asked Rob if all of our programs were approved for Read to Succeed. Rob replied that they were all approved and that this should be incorporated into syllabi.

IX. Adjournment

Dr. Virtue adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.