

## CAEP Unit Assessment Committee Meeting

December 14, 2015

### **Members present:**

Dr. Cala Coats, Dr. Tracey Hasbun, Dr. Jannah Nerren, Dr. Heather Olson-Beal, Dr. Barbara Qualls, Dr. Pauline Sampson, Dr. Josephine Taylor, Dr. Liz Vaughan, Dr. Carol Wright

**Members absent:** Dr. Jared Barnes, Dr. Lesa Beverly (conflicting meeting), Dr. Deborah Buswell (conflicting meeting), Dr. Marc Guidry, Dr. Frank Mullins, Dr. Chris Sams (conflicting meeting), Dr. Nancy Shepherd (conflicting meeting), Dr. Kathy Sheriff, Dr. Christina Sinclair, Dr. Scott Slough, Dr. Mark Turner,

### **Recap**

Dr. Nerren provided a brief recap of the last meeting for those who were not able to attend the October meeting. Dr. Nerren discussed the update on the crosswalk T-TESS Dimensions with CAEP Standard 1 and InTASC Standards (Update included InTASC 2 and correction to 2.4).

### **Discussion: Draft Proposed T-TESS Procedures and Forms sheet**

Dr. Nerren mentioned that the UT Dallas Student Teaching program has seen an improvement in teaching practices after using a modified version of the T-TESS. She noted that they are not CAEP accredited but that the director stated that the students now seem to know the T-TESS procedures better than many of the classroom teachers. Dr. Nerren thought this might strengthen our relationship with the classroom teachers and assist them in become more familiarized with the instrument themselves.

Dr. Nerren thought it would be better to pilot with a small group of supervisors in fall of 16 and to be selective of which supervisors piloted this. We may want to consider many that have administrative experience. Dr. Sampson said it would be helpful to include at least one who does not have administrative experience.

The committee agreed that we should include four people in the pilot; two with administrative experience and two with classroom experience. Dr. Sampson noted the number of candidates assigned to the field supervisor needs to be considered when supervisors are selected for the pilot.

The committee agreed that the Timeline on the Draft Proposed T-TESS Procedures and Forms looks appropriate.

Dr. Olson-Beal wanted to clarify why we would not alter the T-TESS. Dr. Nerren stated that it is what the students will actually use when they get into a classroom; therefore it would be beneficial to familiarize them with the procedures and instrument. Additionally, the committee feels that it will make our student teachers more effective.

Dr. Qualls mentioned that the new Education Commissioner for the state might delete the whole T-TESS procedure and that is something to consider for the future.

Dr. Nerren asked for input on the number of observations currently required for clinical teaching versus with the implementation of T-TESS as an observation tool. Dr. Vaughan discussed the issues with split placement as affecting the number of observations necessary to fully support student growth. The committee decided to stay with the current number of observations and then revisit this issue after the pilot.

On the Part II Goal/Reflection, they go back to the Professional Practices sheet in the Part II section. The field supervisor is responsible for the end-of-the semester conference. Dr. Nerren provided the T-TESS End-of-the-Year Conference Overview so they will know what this looks like.

**Dr. Nerren then discussed the Professional Practices and Responsibilities sheet**

This document can be tagged with CAEP standards, Danielson domains, and InTASC standards.

Dr. Nerren stated the students would address the Data Analysis and Goal setting during the first two weeks of student teaching. Then, they would schedule a conference. This, too, would take place within the first two weeks. The goals are specific and are aligned to the goals on the T-TESS rubric.

The committee believes the students should upload the signed and dated initial conference form. There was discussion about training about the verbiage on the Data Analysis and Goal Setting portion. If they don't know the terms, hopefully, this will create a teachable moment where the student is trained and does not graduate with gaps in language about this assessment.

**Dr. Nerren discussed the T-TESS Observation Evidence Sheet**

This is very open ended. It gives the appraiser an opportunity to type in what they see and then enter the rating. A rating of Proficient is the target rating, however, there are specific examples that should be listed to support any rating assigned. Dr. Sampson said it would be helpful for the supervisors to have that information beside them as they complete the sheet. Dr. Olson Beal suggested we make the items a drop-down menu in LiveText. Dr. Nerren will investigate this as a possibility in LiveText.

**Dr. Nerren discussed that the Clinical Teacher Evaluation Report**

It is not from TEA but is a modification from UT Dallas. It is only the form that is modified; the content is consistent to the Proficient column of the T-TESS rubric. It includes elements that could be listed in the dropdown menu of LiveText. That is why she included it and noted that UT Dallas is happy with us using it. Dr. Qualls stated that she did not like page four and Dr. Nerren agreed.

**Dr. Nerren discussed the T-TESS Post Conference Plan and the Post Conference Self-Reflection form**

She noted that the Self –Reflection form is optional but the plan is not.

It was discussed changing score and evidence to strengths and challenges.

She discussed the Teach for Texas Online Training portal.

**Conclusion**

The timeline and procedures presented at the meeting were approved for a fall 2016 pilot. At the January meeting, we will revisit the criteria for passing student teaching based on the indicators under the domain. Dr. Nerren's office will begin work on training tools to support the pilot in the spring 16 semester.