

WACTE Field Director Meeting Minutes
April 24, 2019 Centennial Hotel, Spokane

Attending: 24 members present from 19 institutions

Caryn Park (Antioch), Caitlin Morrison (Central), Bryan Carter (City U), Tim Sedor (Eastern), Carissa Gran (Eastern), Jeremy Delamarter (Northwest), Mary Ewart (Northwest), Amanda West (PLU), Terry Hickey (St. Martins), Emily Huff (SPU), Kathryn Walton-Elliott (Evergreen), Fred Hamel (Puget Sound), Jon Howeler (UW Bothell), Emily Appel (Walla Walla), Chris Sodorff (WSU), Laura Wellington (WWU), Keith Lambert (Whitworth), Stacey Hill (Whitworth), Cathy Dieter (Gonzaga), Deborah Nieding (Gonzaga), Candis Eckert (Pierce), Erin Bird (UW Seattle), Morena Newton (UW Seattle), Netty Hull (Yakima Valley)

Minutes:

Topic Topic & Key Points		Action Item / Question
Welcome Updates Introduction	<p>Fred – welcomed group / room arrangement Appreciation for previous great discussions Guest presentation today – research and discussion Passing of colleague – Keshia Korman, UWT, voice of insight</p>	<p>Memorial Service on Monday, April 29 at UW Tacoma, 4:30 – 6:00pm; see email</p>
Keith Lambert – Pearson and edTPA scoring considerations	<p>Thanks to all for feedback on EdTPA - Pearson facing challenges in training reviewers for the new Student Voice Rubrics -Whitworth received report back with 8 out of 9 failed (caught off guard); two of failed were error codes which Whitworth disagreed with. forced to redo; noted significant differential in scores -URLPs out; Pearson said there were very minor to no changes, but actually there are significant changes Pearson was less than responsive We are not sure how to help the candidates.</p> <p>Whitworth has developed a proposal to address these concerns and has share this with Deans and directors Of WACTE</p> <p>Keep looking at your data; Student voice scores have gone down Rubric 17/18; National data shows decline; Elementary math and literacy were almost equal -this spring – on month there was a decline across the nation; Review URLPs closely it has changed</p>	<p>Proposal to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student voice delayed for one year (multiple fixes for improvement of monitoring of scores) too many variables – thus we will argue it isn't ready 2. to change how we define passing – to allow for standard error of measurement – and to give programs the power to determine whether someone should be “passed” within the standard error band -- with alternative documentation. (e.g. if standard error is 5 points, and if passing bar is 40, then a score as low as 35 could be reviewed by programs to determine if the student should pass). <p>There currently is no recourse w/ Pearson (in New York) or an alternative way to pass (multiple measures review). Will use New York’s alternative outcomes (consistent measure) as a model.</p> <p>Comments: Candidate get scores close – yet the cycle of paying to Pearson over and over (alternative measures would be a way for accountability) Comment/Question: All the money goes to Pearson – what if remediation was in-house? EdTPA –this is one of the barriers to the profession (we have to do our best to remove barriers) Still some work – w/ RCW; WAC can be changed through RCW It will be discussed with Deans and Directors How can folks share / be part of the discussion process? Send email to Keith</p>

Jeremy Delamarter, "Helping Pre-service teachers overcome their false expectations of teaching"

Fred introduced this research presentation as a way to meet WACTE's strategic plan goal to "Develop agenda items that include research on cutting edge issues facing the profession and our pre-service education programs." Jeremy Delamarter of Northwest University recently published a book on preservice teacher identity development. The book comes out in May: *Pro-active Images for Preservice Teachers*. Jeremy shared about the complex internal shift with a preservice teacher's new identity is...how do pre-service teachers grow into teachers? Learning to see themselves as teachers. How do we support them during this process? Focus on identity disequilibrium – and how we might better support candidates programmatically. Jeremy presented for about 25 minutes (see handout, attached), followed by discussion.

Big Idea #1 Re-orientation of self - Negotiating w/ students/Negotiating w/ content

Big Idea #2 Predictable Process - Internal and external concerns/Nature of external I/CD Framework

Big Idea #3 Roadblocks along the way-Past experiences/Limited perspectives/Shadow narratives Either or Identities

Big Idea #4 Preparation programs removing some of the roadblocks-Early Awareness/Space for critical reflection for becoming; normalizing both/and

Internal shift – preoccupied with self (it is normal); This is predictable There are roadblocks between these negotiations. Much of this has to do with past experiences, with which we have conflict to move beyond false expectations. Their reality isn't necessarily real-false idea of what teaching is going to be. New identity involves the students in the process of dialogue with these expectations.

How do we help students to take up this concept of "becoming"?

We have to have the conversation as early as possible – identity or emotional crisis that comes us (we don't want to get to the panic role)

1. Proactive images (address it before). Help students confront and revise the barriers.
2. Acknowledge – these are the things (you will feel this way – ideas will be false)
3. We cannot wait until the crisis comes up – soul searching w/ internal dialogue.
4. Space for critical reflection (go a step deeper by challenging the assumptions). What did you think would happen? Where did that idea come from? What was it built on? Has it worked in a classroom? What was the source? What is the underlying experience that brought you to this conclusion? How do we foster this with less resistance?
5. We need to provide vocabulary for becoming. I am turning into... the label you have with perceived of self (language about self – away from normalization); here are some reflective tool/vocabulary to assist you.
6. Being a learner/teacher – I am learning to teach and I am learning (you are becoming something new).
7. This isn't the one answer to our preparation process but it is a piece. It provide them with a framework for interpreting what is happening to them. It provides a schema.
8. We have done this, but maybe not as intentionally and move to a more problematic and institutionalized habit of practice.
9. Use dialogue – not monologue – in a dialogue when two voices come together it is a melody (middle space for dialogue) something new emerges. Dialogue starters about self-It isn't what I thought... Past self and self I am going to be ... Group Discussion:

Small group discussion: In what ways do you in your program address or facilitate issues of identity development and becoming? What is new or challenging to you in what Jeremy has presented today?

Whole Group Comments: A big thank you for getting us to think in a different way. Allowed us to hear what different institutes are doing. Emotional changes – what to expect. Make sure mentors are part of the process. Models of application to use?

Cathy Dieter, Gonzaga University: What policies exist for making changes to placements based on concerns raised by students?	<i>Significant amount of candidates come to ask for a change in placement. Decisions making more complex. How do institutions manage these requests? What protocol or policy do you use?</i>	
	What are you experiencing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mentor teachers are mean (I bought it) moved her (she lied to us) burned a bridge and six years before we could put a student back in there -my mentor teachers aren't supporting me
	What is the policy? Several policy ideas were offered; Policies exist at Evergreen, Central Washington, Eastern Washington, Washington State, & City University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -always consult on the report (is it accurate) -talk to all parties involved -nothing in writing -student teaching in handbook what to do if student wants to be moved in student teaching (all parties have to be heard) -judge each instance (at the end of the day – faculty, staff, and director make the call) -focus of concern form (anyone can fill out) -candidate concern committee (when decision was on me, I was the only one making the decision) this way, we want all parties -documentation is available -student handbook student and district) generated. There is a process for moving forward to replacement -verbiage on changes
	Other Questions / Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -if we make a policy public, does this <u>increase</u> the instances of students requesting change? -does one change increase MIT candidates advocating for selves (I heard so and so go to change their placement)? -We have to be transparent, yet create guidelines so it doesn't become so entitled -more of a problem solving process -transparency critical -consider the elements of positions for candidates (they need a platform for expressing cause) -dynamics of privacy/equity etc. -don't want to burn bridges <p>Please send policies and practices to the group – via Fred's group email.</p>
Other Business	<i>edTPA Acceptable Feedback</i> We revisited this issue from January meeting. Fred summarized issues from the Feb. 26 PESB meeting.	Student Voice Rubrics are consequential as of Fall 2019 (not withstanding issue shared above) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Rubric 16 is tied to task 1 -Rubric 17 is tied to task 2 -Rubric 18 is tied to task 3 Retakes in any one task must include the corresponding S.V. Rubric.

	<p>Any thoughts and/or reflection on the issue?</p>	<p>edTPA Acceptable Feedback – at Feb. 26 meeting: -Agreed on: <u>OK for students to give one another support</u>. But students need to know the acceptable guidelines (basically four unacceptable areas of support) -Agreed on: <u>OK for students to get support from a university writing center</u>, but be sure to share guidelines with writing center staff...</p> <p>We didn't agree on- <u>Should we have a policy on faculty not reviewing edTPA?</u> -1/2 were against having a policy -1/2 said we should have a policy What is the rationale? It is partly to do with the size of the institution. There are philosophical differences. Some don't want faculty divided from students. We don't want to be firewalled off from students. But not all institutions can give faculty support – so there is an equity issue.</p> <p>Can a previously reviewed lesson be used as part of edTPA? No agreement</p> <p>What is our role we want to play with our candidates? It is a game we play. We should be able to negotiate and work with them about the process. Not sure if we have to hold on to our own values and how we are going to move them into teaching.</p> <p>Acceptable Use – are they the rules of “their” game” This is formative in nature – high stakes testing – if we view it as formative assessment we should be able to ask questions / guide questions</p> <p>We don't want to allow Pearson to dictate whether our candidate is a good teacher or not. If we were to create a policy of mandated separation – we take away our ability to help our candidates grow as teachers.</p> <p>Whose decision is it? What is the thought behind this? Why is SCALE leading this discussion and possible decision making?</p> <p>Difficulty justifying repaying when no feedback comes back-where is the equity?</p> <p>Equity for our candidates. We always provide feedback on lesson plans. The question is are we reading the entire EdTPA. There are two different conversations about the EdTPA.</p>
--	---	---

		<p>One institution looks for conceptual misunderstandings on hard to track questions – like student voice. Not telling them how to answer, but making sure they get the question.... We try to catch them, so they are not being punished (having to pay for retakes) for problems with the test itself.</p> <p>Acceptable feedback-are we talking with the first submission vs. redo? Is feedback in terms of initial/or retake?</p> <p>Do we want to try a straw-poll (not binding)? Decided against this – some field directors were not present.</p> <p>PESB is holding another meeting on this topic in Fall 2019.</p>
	<p><i>Alt Route & Dual Endorsement Management</i></p>	<p>This is a hot topic – alt route 4 (getting released for dual endorsement) -districts pushing back</p> <p>Dual endorsement was pushed from the start – this has become an atomic issue Districts are pulling out of route 2 – best folks (Vancouver) because of issues of pay, insurance, etc.). PESB was warned about this, yet nothing has been done.</p> <p>The idea of alt route is partnership. It is not a partnership if we have mandates and policies that don't have solid coding in WAC for the other half of this process. Districts need to be full partners. The current process is not sustainable/districts can opt out.</p> <p>Please send in email policy/language about placement agreements – roles/responsibilities.</p>
	<p><i>Chris Sodorff is retiring</i></p>	<p>We acknowledged Chris' significant and long term service at WSU and through WACTE. Chris has been strong advocate for the work that field directors do, a knowledgeable resource to her colleagues, a great voice at our meetings, and a friend to all -- for many years. We will miss you Chris!</p>