

WACTE Deans' and Directors' meeting – January 25, 2017

WACTE president, Vinny Alfonso, welcomed the group.

The minutes of the last Deans' and Directors' meeting were approved

Introductions were given.

The legislative breakfast was reviewed. The meeting was well attended by WACTE members.

However, only 4 legislators/staffers were in attendance. WACTE might need to consider another format. Also, the organization might brainstorm ways to support legislators in understanding who we are. Historically, WACTE has tried lunches in addition to the breakfasts, and attendance was not particularly good at those luncheons. Should we try a "Day on the Hill" format similar to AACTE. It was suggested that pre-session visits in our own legislative districts might be the most helpful. Also, how might all institutions speak with a common voice, and how might we link to other education groups. The following WACTE members volunteered to be members of a task force to work on this issue: Terry Bergeson, Paul Ballard, Kathleen Boyle, Bob Cooper, Tariq Akmal.

AACTE has encouraged members to call their legislators regarding erasing the HEA regulations.

Debra Coolbeck is the legislative liaison. If the federal regulations remain as written, then the Washington State Indicator Model needs to be changed significantly. If the regulations are rescinded, then the Indicator model can move forward. For those institutions who are due for review, there will probably be an extension since there are so many unanswered questions. Jennifer Wallace should be asked during her presentation.

Strategic Planning for WACTE was discussed. Patrick Sexton is heading this effort. What should be the first steps? Should we hire a consultant? The PESB hired a consultant to help them with this process. Should the Executive Board serve as the focusing group? What are our strengths and weaknesses? What are the opportunities and threats? It is an essential time to think about who we are and what we are doing with the goal being to be as proactive as possible. Also, we need to think about how we seek out groups with whom to partner.

How can we use our meetings to move forward in the process? We should be as inclusive as possible. Once the plan is completed, it needs to be posted on the website.

Appreciation was expressed to the Executive Board for their work on beginning the thought process on the plan.

The application process for new members to join WACTE was reviewed. The applying institution must submit a letter of intent. Then the application form is sent to the WACTE President. The application is reviewed by the Executive Board and finally presented to the entire WACTE membership. The last member to be approved was WGU-Washington. Pierce College has not submitted an application, which will be presented at this WACTE meeting. It is in our interest to welcome any group approved by the PESB into membership. However, in the WACTE bylaws by definition, only Colleges of Higher Education may be full members. We have

two groups who may be applying to the PESB for permission to issue teaching certificates that are not institutions of higher education. ESD 112 in Vancouver, WA, and Northwest Educational Development LLC. They may become affiliate member should they choose to apply.

Concern was raised over the number of institutions applying to offer teacher certification and the issue that teachers are professionals, not just technicians. Teacher shortage is not a capacity issue since current institutions have the capacity to enroll all who meet the application qualifications. What will happen when the teacher shortage no longer exists? WACTE's role is only to give feedback to the PESB and the SBCTC, as they are the approving bodies. Too many institutions offering certification can strain all institutions. It was suggested that WACTE contact Gene Sharratt for his perspective. Would it be feasible for WACTE and the PESB to sit down and grapple with the issues together?

Conversation moved to allowing ERDC in the office of OFM to handle institutional data. Can we send our data to the ERDC rather than directly to the PESB? The ERDC already collects information from the publics. The ERDC needs money from the legislature to add a staff person to be able to handle this increased work load. This would make the PESB an equal partner with the institutions. What would this process look like? How might we build common ground with the PESB for rational, responsible data use. How do we collect "good" data that reflects who we are? Data would be used for program improvement. Melissa Beard manages the data sharing and data governing processes. Paul Ballard, Craig Scheiber, Patrick Sexton, Mary Jo Larsen, and Rick Eigenbrood volunteered to look more deeply into the possibilities. What would be the appropriate research questions? Could these questions be developed by next January? For what reason are we collecting certain data? How would we vet the data? How could we develop a trust level? What might be the role of TELC (Teacher Education Learning Cooperative)? It is thought that participation with this group might be left to individual institutions. Vinny, Patrick, and Deena will have a conversation with Dan Goldhaber. The PESB would request reports from the ERDC. Individual institutions would still do the Title II reports. The following motion was made by Patrick Sexton, seconded by Deena Sands and passed unanimously: WACTE will engage with the ERDC in the next set of steps to move the data reporting system from the PESB to the ERDC. WACTE must assume good intent on the parts of TELC and the PESB.

A data summit for the April meeting will be planned by Francisco Rios, Patrick Sexton, Craig Schieber, Ron Jacobson, Vinny Alfonso, and Pat Naughton. One thought would be to work with a case study protocol. A protocol will be finalized and sent out for feedback at the end of February. The work will be done in March and April with information brought to the April WACTE data summit. The information from this work might be used to develop a sophisticated protocol that might lead to a white paper, article, or a longer piece.

A question was posed regarding background checks for university supervisors. It was found that the requirement was not pervasive throughout the state.

WACTE will look forward to a meeting with Jennifer Wallace, Cheryl Ricevuto, and the data administrators and deans this spring.

A question was posed as to whether there should be monthly meetings with Jennifer regarding the progress of the indicator model and other PESB agenda items.

Members were encouraged to sign up for AACTE's action alerts.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sharon Straub, recording secretary