

MINUTES for WACTE Field Director Meeting
October 23, 2019, 9:00am – 12:00pm
Red Lion Hotel, Sea-Tac
Olympic Room

41 total attending: 36 members from 23 institutions plus 5 guests.

Caryn Park (Antioch), Leann Torgerson (Antioch), Julia Daniels (Antioch), Ian Loverro (Central), Ann Grande (Centralia), Bryan Carter (City), Leanna Aker (City), Susan Gray (City), Tim Sedor (Eastern), Carissa Gran (Eastern), Cathy Dieter (Gonzaga), Yusef Incetas (Heritage), John Pizarro (Highline), Jeremy Delamarter (Northwest), Mary Ewart (Northwest), Danielle Gunns (NW Development), Kathlyn Mickel (NW Development), Megan Anderson (PLU), Candis Eckert (Pierce), Terry Hickey (St. Martins), Emily Huff (SPU), Kathryn Walton-Elliott (Evergreen), Fred Hamel (Puget Sound), Jon Howeler (UW Bothell), Karen Brusseau (UW Bothell), Morena Newton (UW Seattle), Ariane Gauvreau (UW Seattle), Maggie Allen (UW Seattle), Marisa Bier (UW Seattle), Liz Donat (UW Seattle), Megan Kelley-Peterson (UW Seattle), Carey Kirkwood (UW Tacoma), Emily Appel (Walla Walla), Matt Coulter (WSU), Melissa Oscarson (WWU), Netty Hull (Yakima Valley). 5
Guests: J. Lee Schultz (WSAC), Terese Emry (OSPI), Sue Anderson (OSPI), Jill Heiney-Smith (SPU), Terry Bergeson

- Welcome & Introductions

- Fred Hamel (Puget Sound) opened meeting (9:00 am)

- Preliminaries –

- Introductions around the room (Field Directors and guests)
 - Call for volunteers for taking Minutes at future meetings
 - January – Jeremy Delamarter
 - April – Netty (tentative)

- House Bill 1139: Recruiting and retaining teacher candidates to serve in rural and remote areas. Work group report (J. Lee Schultz, WA Student Achievement Council [WSAC]) and feedback

Background -

- J. Lee's provided history of Omnibus bill, specific to recruiting and retaining teacher candidates in rural and remote areas
 - Report due Dec. 1, Report to include policy recommendations to encourage/require programs to support ST placements in rural/remote areas
 - idea - to expose ST to rural and remote placements to get candidates to remain in these areas to teach
 - Advisory group has met with multiple stakeholders/groups – broad-based meetings to get input re. barriers to rural field placements

FOCUS TODAY – to elicit INPUT regarding glaring oversights or real concerns in provided table of potential barriers and recommendations – goal to refine the draft they have created.

- Questions –
 - Is there currently any money for this? goal to get this report to legislature as beginning term so it might frame discussion and lead to funding discussions
 - what are “rural-specific” courses? Need to get more info, but language came from xxxxNW literature review (candidates who might lack knowledge about that specific setting)
 - do we have access to the report in its entirety? Now in comment stages/review, not to be opened beyond the advisory committee because of the timeframe – available after Dec. 1st timeframe
 - how did Advisory group get formed – no one seemed to know how this happened, how to participate, how group was formed. Possibly it went through Deans?
- Small group/partner discussion to look at barriers, specifically to see if there are any missed barriers
 - students in Internships are taking classes on campus while in internship, so cannot be too far away from the campus in their placement because of this concurrent course experience (Program Structure)
 - This was true with both year-long and one semester Internships (the concurrent classes on campus)
 - Virtual courses and virtual supervision: is it possible to leverage resources and focus on online courses to remove/address possible barriers
 - possible but obstacles from ones who are not familiar with system/edTPA (asynchronous)
 - most rural areas do not have good broadband
 - remote schools lockdown broadband
 - schools with more resources will have greater ability to reach out to rural areas – how can small schools equitably be part of funding so can have ability too
 - retention – how will this be supported? Grow your own seems to have more success at retention than someone being placed into a location – what can be a longer-term look at this to address retention issues/concerns?
- Small group/partner discussion to look at recommendations
 - rural location comment – has different issues/not these:
 - They train instructional coaches that might be shared across multiple small communities (Centralia College), they also provide training as a partnership to small rural areas. This promotes people from within the small communities who share the values of the communities/areas
- going beyond institutional practices to look at funding practices in a different way, more flexible to create systems

- paraeducators in their work (insurance, etc.), possibly come up with a plan for grow your own, then each district could shape it the way they see best
 - funding for paraeducators to make this transition better financially supported (paras forced to take leaves to complete coursework, etc.) need more financial backing/support people who are pursuing teaching
 - Should this be for every program or should this be for some? Money and support Who will have to build these programs and supports – districts and schools don't have time
 - Funding on grants versus real funding – grants are too limited and are not producing very many diverse candidates
 - The Requirement idea – will schools be required to place? None of the language is “require” – “encourage” is the language
 - Limit – the language is vague, but even if this is intentional, it needs to be more specific so that field directors know more specifically what this will mean or should look like
 - language is still vague/high level because it is still for a legislative audience
 - field directors should be present when it comes in front of the legislature – voices needed
 - looking for final input by Nov 1st
- House Bill 1139: Partnerships for preservice mentor development. Work group proposal and feedback (Terese Emry, OSPI & Sue Anderson, OSPI - Beginning Educator Support Team (BEST program)) (Jill Heiney-Smith, SPU) (Terry Bergeson)
 - Background –
 - Jill Heiney-Smith (JHS) – begin with overall frame: long running discussions re. training for mentor teachers MT
 - from Jill's research has found: MT expect skillful instruction, want make and take resources to promote dialog with ST, want resources on co-teaching, want somehow to adapt the BEST program for MT
 - Sue Anderson (SA) – section 202 – field placement provisions, gave \$ for 1139
 - BEST for early career teachers, field directors already offer MT training, so the idea is to partner BEST with schools to offer training for MT
 - Terese Emry (TE) – background on BEST – mentor academy training programs for teachers who are mentors to novice teachers
 - Could a partnership work around the base training or some of the other trainings (101, base; 201, equity; 301, refinement of skills)?
 - **IDEA:** with the new funding, would it be of interest/a supportive partnership to think about the 101 training and make it applicable to what field directors are doing already in training mentors?

- jointly revising BEST Mentor Academy 101 – much would not change as good mentoring is good mentoring, but the idea would be to change it/to revise it to apply to preservice teachers versus novice teachers?
- could there be also higher ed partners to present – so that someone from both groups is represented
- where pilot? east side and west side, possibly both to gather feedback
- is there possibly money – yes - release time supported for MT or cooperating teachers to come to Mentor Academy, possibly fees for space, Mentoring Matters books, etc. covered by OSPI, enough funding to pilot this on east and west side
- would field directors/tprep members want to come to this to help develop this? possibly attach it to a WACTE Field Director meeting, maybe stay an extra day or so to provide additional feedback
- 3 invitations:
 - advisory group – invitation to become part of this
 - invitation to be a co-planner with a Mentor Academy Faculty trainer to plan and also present pilot training
 - invitation to try this out/attend and give feedback (and where it should be)
- Clarifying reading/questions/thinking: (10:15) – partner talk
- Share out feedback/comments (10:20)
 - can this be a sustainable piece, guaranteed to continue?
 - this has been tried before. This is a good idea, but instead of additional trainings, can you make an adaptable module that every program can use in its own way? to allow for programs to use it in their own ways?
 - Alt routes versus paras – would this training be more developed for/focused on traditional students instead of paras and others?
 - Access – don't want to have it as a separate entity that you have to go out to
 - Can it be both? A partnership mentor model AND/OR a specific module-based, so that it can be a flexible, differentiated model
 - Over-helping has happened in the past (when mentor trainers from the program *and* from BEST) – would this be a way to trim the helping and make this more simplified?
 - one Northshore school – already beginning some of this with a continuum of support from preservice to novice
 - another school - focusing already on specific district needs – one district already using BEST training, training on implicit biases helpful – has put money aside to access
 - SPU – seems MT development has decreased, so looking forward to offering release time,
 - possibly couple this with the first topic – rural areas, maybe these MT in rural areas can get access to this to help with retention
 - possibly use the ESDs to help, and use modules too to increase reach

- the idea of breaking through some barriers and bringing this program in to encompass pre-service teachers too is very exciting

10 minute break (10:38)

- House Bill 1139: Field Placement Plans
 - Sue Anderson – agreed to provide clarifying remarks
 - need to verify scores and see scores – fd will not be given these scores, this is not available information to any of us, so not a concern of FD
 - this can be another quality assurance for your program that you are finding qualified MT, can say when a district gives a MT that you have a MT who has a verified scored of competency
 - do HR departments know this is coming? principal might not even know,
 - when does this begin in terms of timing – not sure how PESB is interpreting the July 1st date (might be on the planning tool) Maybe for placements beginning in the 2020 school year? remember it is just a plan
 - why can't it be in current MOAs/MOUs instead of another new contract to pursue with districts? Is this going to be a separate plan for every single district?
 - Beth Geiger at PESB will have more information
 - Our Questions/Concerns:
 - if got a basic on criterion 3 or 6 many years ago, this would further limit the pool of candidates who might be MTs – would a score many years ago prevent one from being in the pool of future MTs, even if improvement had taken place...
 - the language says attempt – what does this mean?
 - where is the accountability? who does this fall on? the districts pick the mentors, not the universities. What happens if we have a MT given who is not in compliance?
 - how is this information going to be communicated to school districts – this should not be a requirement that is coming from/being communicated to districts (to preserve relationships)
 - what is the plan? is this a minimal (just put another line in the letter) to show that we have asked,... or is it more?
 - what about private schools who do not use TPEP? Can call a content mentor? can we use an additional person to be considered the
 - do not want to just add it to current contracts because a lengthy legal check required for just a few lines
 - is there one general plan allowed or are these individual plans?

- does this conflict with the plan to place people out of your area in rural/remote because it says to collaborate with own district? Is this a conflict? why?
 - What bodies are being monitored here? Who is being monitored and being checked re. accountability? Whose professionalism is being called into question here?
 - one thought after a conversation with PESB person – in grow your own programs, it has been a help
 - point of concern – one program does a full year Placement and has a process which starts in mid- to late February, how should this work given the timing proposed?
 - if there are additional stipulations re. MT training, then the state must support this or provide resources – regarding the training discussed prior BEST involved, should be more locations than just east/west and should not take 3 full days....
 - from a school in Eastern Wa - 1 in 8 teachers are not willing to take an intern (edTPA main concern) so this seems to provide another barrier
 - privacy issue – did they collect any data on negotiated agreements and does anyone even have this information to share?
 - is this really a problem? should this really even be a discussion?
 - could this be automated and just a thing that could be accomplished through entering a cert. number, instead of requiring a contract change or addition
 - how can the state support districts in vetting candidates as Mentors, to allow districts to name a group of people who might be candidates for MT
- Conclusion
 - this body has some significant concerns with this particular issues that will be shared at the full WACTE meeting
 - is it a concern with the requirement or with meeting the expectations of the requirement?
- Alternative-route programs & field placements – balancing candidates' roles as employees with endorsement-specific placements
 - GYO with SPED endorsement and/or teachers of record who want a SPED endorsement (with dual endorsement SPED) candidates are struggling to have to take time off
 - one school solution – used with their paras – they offer gen ed in summer and do a summer reading program to meet the practicum hours during the summer time

- why is the dual endorsement requirement even there for SPED teachers? this limits – a comment made by a rural school member, this has caused problems with districts, who have closed doors to paras in their district (Elem has to be a program, and the test only is designed for in-service teachers, there is a SPED option of testing if the teacher has an initial endorsement)
 - is this rubber-stamping someone’s endorsement if not providing a real placement for SPED and allowing test only?
 - what should be the minimum requirement for dual endorsements? 8 and 8? or is 1 week and 9weeks okay?
 - one school - struggled to find a dual placement for second endorsement students – asked the students to write a petition on why they should be passed out of the 90-hour requirement – they counted this as good
 - one school – the school placed interns in SPED setting and found they only have 2 students who need services – is this enough to meet the requirement?
 - are we setting ourselves up for retention issues if not adequately preparing students in the SPED environment?
 - one school – the problem with SPED is that there is no one kind of SPED, if they are going to be SPED teachers, then have them spend time in a variety of SPED classrooms, this is much more valuable than putting them into the gen ed classroom for a few weeks. If they had elem and SPED, tells candidates to spend as much time as possible in the gen ed classrooms and report back, also have to do the gen ed evaluations on them, but they do not have one rule on how many hours in an actual elem ed classroom. (this has always been a problem in SPED)
 - what is morally right for the program, what is best for the candidates – in alignment with the rules
- Conclusion
 - no clean answer, we have to respect the difficulties that are present and represent that some things are not working well
 - dilemma management – told to do so many things, but the art of the work is actually improvising to find the best possible solution with a set of circumstances that don’t quite fit
 - is it about preparing the candidate in name only or deliberately under-preparing people for endorsements that they will eventually carry
 - it cheapens the work, it is a “taint”
 - people are avoiding the option?
- edTPA updates and questions:
 - meeting with Jisu, Ray Pichone, Kendall SCALE to take the feedback from edTPA coordinators meeting and feedback re. discrepancies on scoring from Whitworth

- concerns from all present ; recommend to modify, or eliminate Student Voice
 - historical point: WACTE as a full body voted to eliminate S.V. in 2012
 - lengthy discussion – discussed strengths of SV, role of metacognition, reflective cognition, etc. then the negatives. The negatives far outstripped the positives. A debate between to what extent to we modify it or eliminate it.
 - Rubric 17 – a dramatic drop showing something is wrong with the metric and prompt1 option – drop rubric 17, (is the teacher presenting learning targets and is the teacher reflecting on what is being learned?)
 - what if took the two rubrics and dropped their wight in half, reduce the weight of the idea
 - at end – 7 voted to eliminate, 1 voted to keep/modify
 - Jisu’s role – to take the results to PESB for discussion, to represent that people are leaning toward eliminating it
 - Comments on this
 - edTPA too big, too time consuming. The ideas re. SV can still be used in support of other ideas.
 - edTPA is already too big, being scored erratically, something is wrong
 - in education, many things we have worked very hard on that have turned out to be bad ideas....
 - SPED – what questions have been considered regarding developmental levels, there is a large degree of artificiality in getting candidates to jump through these artificial hoops
 - must consider this for all candidates and programs
 - WA state chose SV early, and is only state
 - now feel concept is over-weighted
 - what is the real relationship between the for-profit Pearson and the edTPA requirement
 - the phrase SV people found highly problematic, not an accurate description. A high stakes assessment where the language is not consistent is a problem.
- Other Business
 - 2 Program Questions for discussion
 - Question 1 - edTPA video permission forms – ones signed by k-12 parents and guardians – question – whether and/or how are institutions storing the documents?
VARIOUS school answers:
 - one school – don’t collect the documents, just the form saying the candidates collected them
 - students turn in a class roster with oks to video indicated, then students provide an electronic copy of all, school also

recommends students keep a physical copy/binder of hard copies

- collect hard copies from students, then put in hard/student files
 - no guidance on how long should keep these or how should be kept (form)
 - cannot store all paper copies, so get edTPA handbook with consent letters, scan them in files to the coordinator, then
 - not collecting them – generally told
 - flash drive put in student record
 - used to store in paper and then pdf, but now legally need a .png or .tiff for regulations of 10 years (if it is image release, it can be deleted 1 year after Pearson’s 4 year need) because a file can be corrupted after 6 years or so, a files requirement to change
 - bigger concern – what is the purpose of the form? a liability issue. If there is a violation, then it falls on the university. What is the statute of limitations pertaining to a lawsuit – that should guide the time?
 - Is this a FERPA violation? this is asking to hold information about students that are not ours....
- Question 2 - How deal with a K-8 candidate who is teaching middle school science who are only allowed to use the elem literacy or math
 - no time to discuss but the question was put forth for thought
- Adjourn (12:00 noon)

Next WACTE Meeting: January 29-30, 2020, at Pacific Lutheran.