

ACT Meeting Minutes
11/18/15

Participants: Patricia Irvine, Dania Massey, Shira Lubliner, **Shubha Kashinath**, Peg Winkelman, Brad Porfilio, Linda Smetana, Dianne Mukerjee, Tom Soo Hoo, Eric Engdahl, Thomas Wiley, Ann Halvorsen, Angela Tang, Ardella Dailey, Valerie Lempeis

Before we get into the meeting, Ann has something to show us

SWIFT video from swiftschools.org

Inclusion Course (Winter 2016) 6999

We will have a 1 unit course/conference in February for students. Students from different areas will come together, take into account school-wide nature, looking at resources, profile of school, its demographics, student needs, how to address issues. We want to do this as a model then do this on different topics every quarter.

Congratulate Greg and Angela – both approved Program Assessment Documents

Still waiting on MS/SS/SPED

Item 3:

Decision on continuous improvement plan

Eric – part of me worries about this is a new way of doing accreditation, if we are more sharply focused, might get through process easier.

Ann – definitely needed GLAD, certain extent feel same way about SPED, there has to be a way to call it out within so we don't keep doing the same thing

Peg – pragmatically, on data, disaggregated EL and Students with special needs, we have exit survey and still know that our approach is much broader idea. We are being intentional about special needs and EL and working toward broader notion. By keeping exit survey the way it is, it's clear so we can see where we need to support teachers more.

Specifically broke EL and Students with special needs apart to get more targeted information.

Diane-think about level of work to monitor both, but it's hard to not argue that we need to do both.

Ardella echoes Diane's sentiment, if we're not doing it how are we going to ask others to do it.

CONSENSUS that we will do both EL and Students with Special needs as areas of improvement

Shira requests that all program coordinators take this back to their faculty so we have a broad consensus of our unit to focus on EL and students with special needs

Item 4:

CAEP and Title II – focus heavily on programs collecting impact data

Not dealing with a single school district, we are dealing with graduates scattered all over. Right now working with pilot group (team 92) – gave them employment survey and all of them are in a different district which illustrates the challenge that we face that we have people everywhere.

So how are we going to do this? How do we gather data? If possible – try to collect preexisting data because we don't have resources to send people out into districts all over Northern California

In Teacher Ed plan to pursue BTSA data, we are in the process of figuring out

Peg – EDLD - we have students in Tier 2, look at portfolios from Tier 1, track and see a subgroup because we know they are employed

We have to proceed cautiously – privacy concerns, we are being shoved to do this though by Title II regs Value added measures are not reliable but they want us to collect this data.

We have not choice – we don't have to do everybody, but in every program we have to follow subset of students.

So far we have no guidance, so the size of the subset is not known.

Shira asked Terry Clark to give some guidance, Terry said she would convene a meeting and give guidance. Ultimately this is going to have to be done by the state. State has test scores, CTC has data on where teachers are teaching, but those datasets are not linked.

In TED we are trying to follow pilot group, moving forward we will try to set up MOUs for BTSA, won't be in place until current candidates are graduates.

Patricia – Terry Clark was proposing pre and post test for program impact if you do a lesson in xyz. Graduates could be persuaded to give us pre and post test data, but we have very little leverage to get that data.

Kevin Brown said there are two bodies of info that can be collected – 1) body of info for purpose of dissemination –always require IRB 2) other body is what we collect to provide to our accrediting agencies, does not require IRB.

If we are going into districts and into schools, we ask individual teachers for their consent, but if we are asking for aggregated data we don't need consent.

Leads us to next issue – meetings with district personnel, first meeting we need to have is with superintendents with alameda and contra costa county. Layout what we need to do and ask how do we approach schools to get this information – do we need to work with unions, what if they say no?

The other possibility is if candidates and graduates are primarily in a few districts, you can choose to work with those districts.

We will have to do this by program because all of our graduates are doing different things. Look at common standard 5(CTC) and CAEP standards and Title II regs when approved.

Would also be useful to collect data on EL and students with special needs.

Each of the program coordinators should take this back to departments and have detailed discussion about you can do. At the next meeting, bring a plan as to what you can do – we will have to show a plan for accreditors.

Whenever possible if there is a preexisting source of data, that's the way to go. Get preexisting data first.

Try to avoid relying on the survey data because it's self-report and because it's the kind of data that is composed mostly of data from negative responders.

Every program will be different so everyone needs to make a plan between now and the end of the year.

Look in the literature and see what is being used, talk to your colleagues. No one is exempt because of CAEP – graduate programs are required to produce this.

Retention is specifically mentioned in the CAEP requirements

Patricia – CTC does not support this.

One of the factors that needs to be considered – what is going to happen with Title II – if you rank at the bottom, your students can't qualify for federal loans.

If you are nationally accredited you get extra points in your ranking(this is not for sure, only a possibility)

ITEM 6:

CAEP/CTC Crosswalk

CTC cares about inputs, CAEP does not care about inputs

Blue is CTC, not CAEP.

Look at standard 5 on page 6 – program impact data – CTC is very vague, CAEP is more specific

Satisfaction of employers and completers we can get in TED, in SPED we can get through 3 year out surveys. Can't really send out people to observe for difficulty and legal reasons.

ITEM 7:

Completer Survey

Anyone have suggestions on revision of the completer survey – employment survey, before we can collect any data, we need to know where graduates will be working.

Plan is to have the program coordinators to send out the link to the survey. Try to do by January coming year. Each year try to catch previous years graduates. Can't do anything unless we know where they are working. Employment and retention is useful data.

Interns retention data is collected by the state – report where you were during, after.

We have the email addresses that we already have and collect employment information.

Start including Hugo in these meetings – he has DEL candidate info

We plan to merge the data, we'll be developing survey, Tom will create a link and prog coordinators will send out. This is just retention data – knowing where they are.

If we want to follow up with satisfaction surveys then we will be able to send out because we have their employment info.

ITEM 8:

Program Improvement Cycle

Summary of Achievement

See handout for Reading example

Represents the 3 year cycle of program improvement – 2/3 is already done – objectives and implementation already done and on sharepoint. Now look at the data and determine if you have met your goals or not. Needs to be done by May.

If you are missing any pieces, you can fix it, by May must turn this in.

Next year we start brand new cycle.

