

WACTE meeting minutes – Thursday, January 30, 2020

The Dean of Education and Kinesiology at Pacific Lutheran University, Karen McConnell, welcomed the membership to our conference, and she also gave acknowledgment to the Native American connection to the land on which we were meeting.

Tariq Akmal gave his welcome to the group and outlined points of information relevant to the membership. AACTE is having an advisory council of States, and Washington State is highly involved in the AACTE organization. Both AACTE and WACTE are undergoing bylaws review. All members of WACTE are invited to the AACTE and AILACTE conferences. Tariq is a regional representative for ACSR, which is a political arm of AACTE. He is also holding monthly phone meetings with Alexandra Manuel, PESB executive director, to keep the lines of communication open. PESB has indicated that they need to hear from individual institutions in public comment at the PESB Board meetings, not just from WACTE as an organization. Tariq reported that the assessment directors have been challenged by the changes surrounding the data manuals. They are working with the PESB and the ERDC to address these issues. Individual WACTE institutions may wish to make public comment at the board meetings regarding their issues with the data manual. Public institutions have been rated by NCTQ, which continues to request information for its report on the status of teacher preparation programs. WACTE is also currently involved in formulating a response to questions regarding the edTPA. Pearson's contract is under examination, so it may be a time to comment on this aspect of the assessment practices. Elections will be held at the April WACTE meeting. Those interested in running for office may contact Tariq or Keith Lambert.

Sharon Straub, WACTE secretary thanked Tara Haskins and Joyce Westgard for completing the October minutes in lieu of her being ill. The minutes were approved as written.

Doreen Keller, WACTE treasurer, and Joyce Westgard reviewed the budget for the membership. Increasing the membership dues and the conference fees has placed WACTE on a more secure financial footing. The treasury would like to reach a goal of a 3-6 month reserve with 3 years. The books have just completed an audit.

The field directors reported that they are working in pilot format with the BEST mentoring program for preservice teachers. They are discussing the differences between preservice and inservice mentoring. This program looks to be available for rural districts. In the area of field placement plans, the directors are working on policy clarity and advocacy. The directors are also working on inclusive placements that addresses such issues as diversity, anxiety, range of dispositions, ADA accommodations, and self-care initiatives. They are awaiting recommendations from the Assessment workgroup on the edTPA and are also investigating alternative route issues.

The data administrators reported that they have previewed the 1010-21 data manuals and working on a process for bringing deans and directors into the conversation. One major challenge is a common understanding of the terms involved with each file. The group discussed how they might provide public comment at the next PESB meeting, especially regarding the drain on resources for the programs. They are looking to provide a report that will cover the following: How many hours data administrators spend on the data manual and the cost? To what degree is the data manual process going to be an on-going issue? How many changes will need to be made to make the process viable? How will the data manual process support program accountability and improvement? Why is certain data being requested? Is it

for the legislature reporting or research or other? Are the data administrators able to collect what is being asked? How does the process address differences among programs?

Bob Cooper reported on the legislative agenda. The McCleary decision has receded into the background. The focus this session is on homelessness and behavioral health. The following bills have been introduced: SB 6067 to eliminate the edTPA, not scheduled for a vote. The legislators have been encouraged to wait for the PESB workgroup's report; SB 6138 would expand the BEST program; SB 6262 – School districts would be required to report on how they have implemented the STI curriculum. It also requires that the STI curriculum information be incorporated in administration preparation programs; HB 2012 provides for an ESA bonus related to National Boards; HB 2660 allows for free food in schools in low income areas.

The Day on the Hill has received positive reaction from both program participants and legislators, using this opportunity to make relationships. Think about follow-up by inviting legislators to campus, where you might include students and cooperating teachers in the dialogue. Advocacy is a part of the mission of the schools of education as well as WACTE. Keep your legislators informed.

Alexandra Manuel greeted the membership and encouraged them to read the PESB minutes posted on the PESB website. She reported that HB 1139 sections 202 and 203 requires a collection of field placement information. The first report is due July 2020, so the PESB is developing a tool for this collection. All programs must submit their plans by July 1, 2020, and will be collected in even years, with the report being published on the PESB website. The reports should be submitted with input from PreK-12 partners and respond to the WASC rural report. The reporting should further the ability of programs to meet domain and cultural competency standards, and meet subject matter challenges. Please submit feedback on the tool and the process to the PESB by February 15. The PESB is going to conduct a field placement survey to inform the legislature about relationships with partner districts and to discuss the challenges of finding field placements. Questions raised at the meeting included: Will districts be called out by name? The law does not require districts to engage, which places an onus on the programs. How will this be addressed? How will the publishing of this data affect program comparison? The PESB is reviewing programs to assess the extent to which they are meeting knowledge, skill and performance standards in all areas. Concern again exists about how this affects program comparison. Will data dashboards have elements that represent program interests? In the "report card," what are the categories that matter and how will they compare programs? Contact Nick Gillon with the following information: What should the PESB make sure that we don't do? What should the PESB make sure that we do? What are questions? A new contract is being negotiated with Pearson. They will reduce the cost of the various tests and increase the number of vouchers available within the state. They will provide sample test items, provide additional support materials, facilitate webinars and workshops, and strengthen support for new programs. Programs are also reminded that SB 5082 requires that all preparation programs include social/emotional learning in their curricula.

The ERDC will take feedback from the data administrators to the ERDC taskforce. They will need new data-sharing agreements moving forward that include the concept of critical questions. The data administrators are concerned about checks and balances. They are also concerned about how requests for research be approved. Please send questions to Tess and Nick.

Please send any ideas for data summit activities to Tariq. Also consider what your program might contribute to the program. The Executive Board will take all ideas into consideration.

The University of Washington presented an engaging program on identity caucusing to close the meeting.