

## CAEP Group Interview Information ~ General Introduction ~

### *Purpose of Interview Sessions:*

The Teacher Education Program has provided evidence that we are meeting all standards; however, when teams come to Winthrop they want to verify what we said was true. We contend Winthrop's program is special and as such there are things they are not completely understanding (as they are atypical) or they question whether it is possible to do what we say we do. You are being asked to verify or clarify points related to your role. Giving examples from your interactions (including on committees or in field) will help to provide the context and verification of the claims we have made.

### *Tips for participation:*

- Treat this like an interview, even when asked your weaknesses you typically try to present in a positive light. This is not to say we are perfect nor is it to say raising points for further exploration is bad, just please consider how widespread the issue might be and whether you might soften the presentation.
- Don't be nervous. You were selected to participate because you have examples to add that verify the story we have already told.
- The reviewers do not expect any one group or person to know everything. You will be in groups and unless someone is dominating a conversation, individuals will likely not be called upon unless they volunteer.
- Provide opportunities for all to speak. Two or three brief examples for a question are sufficient, so if you are not able to add something new to a question then just wait. Also if you sense you have answered several questions in a row, sit a couple out.

### *Various Standards*

Our curriculum and assessments are aligned to a number of standards. If you are able to talk about experiences in terms of the standards please do so. The four big sets follow, but others include technology standards (ISTE), content specific standards (for teacher preparation such as NCTM, NCTE, NASD), and SC College and Career Standards (P12 learners).

CAEP Standards: These are typically broader and applicable to all content areas and student populations. The CAEP standards are the focus of the following pages of this document. (<http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standards-one-pager-0219.pdf?la=en>)

INTASC (Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) Standards: These standards were written to provide a model for knowledge and skills all teachers should develop to ensure positive impact on P12 learners. There are ten standards placed in one of four themes. Although coursework and assessments are aligned with these standards, we do not necessarily talk about our work in these terms. If you can refer to the themes a couple of times that will help.

([https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-12/2013\\_INTASC\\_Learning\\_Progressions\\_for\\_Teachers.pdf](https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-12/2013_INTASC_Learning_Progressions_for_Teachers.pdf) or <https://ccsso.org/resource-library/intasc-model-core-teaching-standards>)

*The Learner and Learning:* 1. Learners Development; 2. Learning Differences; and 3. Learning Environments

*Content:* 4. Content Knowledge and 5. Application of Content

*Instructional Practice:* 6. Assessment; 7. Planning for Instruction; and 8. Instructional Strategies

*Professional Responsibility:* 9. Professional Learning and Ethical Practice and 10. Leadership & Collaboration

SCTS 4.0 Rubric: This is the state teacher assessment system. Although Winthrop has maintained a locally developed rubric for the Internship experience, we have aligned all assessments with the expectations in the SCTS 4.0 Rubric. The primary reasons were: a) the alignment of all field assessment rubrics back from the Internship II rubric which was built around the skills a candidate needed at graduation and b) the SCTS 4.0 rubric has many skills within each rubric item and our rubric tries to break these appropriately to provide more actionable feedback to candidates. ([https://ed.sc.gov/scdoe/assets/File/educators/teacher-evaluations/SC%204\\_0%20Rubric%20Printable%20FINAL.pdf](https://ed.sc.gov/scdoe/assets/File/educators/teacher-evaluations/SC%204_0%20Rubric%20Printable%20FINAL.pdf))

*Instruction:* Standards & Objective; Motivating Students; Presenting Instructional Content; Lesson Structure and Pacing; Activities and Materials; Questioning; Academic Feedback; Grouping Students; Teacher Content Knowledge; Teacher Knowledge of Students; Thinking; Problem Solving

*Planning:* Instructional Plans; Student Work; Assessment

*Environment:* Expectations; Managing Student Behavior; Environment; Respectful Culture

*Professionalism:* Growing and Developing Professionally; Reflecting of Teaching; Community Involvement; School Responsibilities

**Unit Standards:** These are the locally defined guidelines for our work across all programs. They are aligned with the previous sets and many times are the basis of our discussions. These were established with our stakeholders as we were reconsidering the teacher education program. This process and these standards ultimately led to the structure we have today (especially for Education Core Coursework). <https://www.winthrop.edu/uploadedFiles/coe/UnitStandardsOct2016.pdf>

*Diverse Needs of Learners*

*Learning Environments*

*Technology*

*Assessment*

*Instruction and Learner Engagement*

*Literacy*

*Professional Learning and Ethical Practice*

In addition to these standards, the Teacher Education Program has defined four Dispositional Areas that help guide our examination of candidate readiness. Dispositions are attitudes, values, and beliefs that are demonstrated through verbal and non-verbal behaviors as professionals interact with students, clients, colleagues, families, and communities. Graduates of the College of Education are expected to uphold the highest standards of the profession as they relate to other professionals and the constituents they serve. Although example subskills are provided for each category, the four primary categories are *Commitment, Integrity, Communication, and Fairness*. Candidates complete self-reflections; faculty evaluations are conducted in key courses; and field expectations are tied to these categories (<https://www.winthrop.edu/uploadedFiles/coe/2014DispositionsPDSAAssessmentRev.pdf>).

#### **Themes:**

After examining the feedback we have already received, there are two areas that seem most problematic for us. As you are in various sessions please consider ways that you might provide examples and support for what we do.

1. **Diversity of Placements.** Traditionally programs track an individual student and make the case that the individual student has had opportunities to work with diverse students. Although we are able to track (and will share examples on site) by individual students, our approach to this requirement is to define experiences. Specific courses have themes so that we have systematically ensured that in early clinical all candidates explore poverty, English Learners, and students with exceptionalities. In the Developmental Sciences course candidates are in a school with high concentrations of individuals that are considered low-SES, working primarily with a single learner or they engage at the Boys and Girls club in tutoring with a similar demographic of students. In the Intro to English Learners course the candidate is placed in a school with sufficient EL population so that the candidate is assigned a single EL, but designs a co-taught lesson with his/her needs in mind. Likewise, in a course provided as an Intro to Students with Exceptionalities, each candidate plans a co-taught lesson where the needs of a specific student with exceptionalities is considered. After admission to the Teacher Education Program, programs consider diversity of disciplinary areas, grade levels, and other characteristics to ensure candidates are prepared through a variety of school placements. We refer to these later experiences as Field Experience, Internship I, and Internship II. These experiences are content specific. Coupled with these are a semester in which the candidates are focusing on technology integration and another on Positive Behavior Supports.
2. **Technology.** There were a number of questions related to how we prepare candidates for the various uses of technology. This concern was triggered by the fact that although our completer and employer surveys are overwhelmingly positive, technology was identified as an area where more exposure would be helpful. Please consider technology use for: instruction, student engagement, communication with parents, assessment, and general management. Consider examples where candidates have opportunities to use technology in the field. EDCO and program faculty should be able to provide ways you support a candidate's development around the various uses of technology.

**Thoughts/experiences you would like to share based upon information above:**

## CAEP Group Interview Information

### ~ Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions ~

- 1.1 – *Understanding of InTASC standards* (the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility) Full document: [https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-12/2013\\_INTASC\\_Learning\\_Progressions\\_for\\_Teachers.pdf](https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-12/2013_INTASC_Learning_Progressions_for_Teachers.pdf)
- 1.2 – *Use research and evidence* (understand teaching profession; measure student progress; explore individual professional growth)
- 1.3 – *Content Expertise* (program recognition; appropriate content knowledge)
- 1.4 – *Content Expertise with eye on equity* (knowledge of appropriate P12 standards; commitment to rigorous expectations for each and every student)
- 1.5 – *Technology* (model and apply technology standards; design, implement and assess learning; use technology to improve learning and enrich practice)

Highlights from Self-Study	Questions from CAEP Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All assessments aligned with InTASC, SCST 4.0, CAEP, and content standards, as appropriate</li> <li>• Strong documentation of use of evidence and research (<i>would be good to have examples if you have seen this</i>)</li> <li>• Lesson planning and requirements for use of appropriate standards (<i>Talk about preparation for content specific standards as appropriate</i>)</li> <li>• Use of data from courses and field to consider change in candidate experiences or course content (<i>would be good to have examples</i>)</li> <li>• Multiple opportunities to use technology noted as a strength (<i>However, technology overall was a concern. So be prepared to talk about how you incorporate technology as either a build up for the technology course or as a follow-up in methods.</i>)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% of the programs have the appropriate national or state recognition. <i>Having examples of how programs are positively impacted by the program review would be helpful.</i></li> <li>• Consider how candidates use technology in the field at all levels <i>What do you see while you are in field? Do you see candidates teaching with technology (especially more than just presentation) or working with the host/mentor on management systems?</i></li> <li>• Consider content as well as pedagogy preparation <i>How do EDCO faculty accommodate the various content areas and how do program faculty build on EDCO concepts?</i></li> <li>• Host and mentors will likely be asked about their impressions of teacher candidate readiness at various stages. Recent graduates will be asked about their perceived preparation overall and in content. <i>EDCO and program faculty can talk about what they hear when in schools.</i></li> <li>• Again, take any opportunities to talk about how you have seen candidates use technology in a variety of ways.</li> <li>• Consider the professionalism and ethical preparation of our candidates. <i>What is included early in EDCO as well as in methods and field courses later?</i></li> </ul> <p>Other related topics you might be thinking of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Be prepared to talk about how we use Program Advisory Council feedback</i></li> <li>○ <i>Please remember we share data through Via and OneDrive</i></li> <li>○ <i>Talk about work you do to create Continuous Improvement Reports and well as program review processes.</i></li> </ul>

**Thoughts/experiences you would like to share based upon information above:**

**CAEP Group Interview Information**  
**~ Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice ~**

- 2.1 – *Partnerships for Clinical Preparation* (co-construct partnerships; focus on continuous improvement)
- 2.2 – *Clinical Educators* (co-select/prepare/evaluate school and university-based educators who positively impact candidate development)
- 2.3 – *Clinical Experiences* (collaboratively design experiences for candidates to impact diverse student learners; multiple assessments throughout program)

Highlights from Self-Study	Questions from CAEP Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback opportunities and structures that allow stakeholder participation in planning and decision making (<i>Any time you can mention role of partners on committees is important for this standard</i>)</li> <li>• Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs) with school partners</li> <li>• Structures for evaluating teacher candidates in the field (<i>role of hosts; response to needed changes in early field rubric; team approach to internship; feedback through surveys and rubrics</i>)</li> <li>• Connection between courses and field expectations (<i>have some examples ready</i>)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How are mentor and host teachers selected? (Specifically that use of <i>quality, evidence-based practice</i> is part of the review process when a host or mentor applies) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The process for early field placements involves negotiations and data from schools around availability of needed experiences and school demographics. Then once schools are identified, the students are matched with approved host teachers through discussions with the school and as needed the associated EDCO faculty.</i></li> <li>○ <i>The process of placing students in field experience and internship involves a list of host/mentors that have been recommended and reviewed; the faculty provide recommendations; then Dia and Carolyn work with schools; if necessary they continue to work with the schools and faculty to make placements both through email and by phone.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• How do we ensure 100% of students have diverse placements? <i>Diversity in our districts; specific experiences with low-SES, ELs, and students with exceptionalities in early clinical; diversity in grade levels and content courses</i></li> <li>• How do we prepare for and ensure candidates are capable of technology integration (in teaching, assessment, management, etc.)? <i>Definitely need examples here of how host and mentor teachers include candidates in use of technology across experiences. Impressions of readiness of the candidates.</i></li> <li>• Examples of how we have used data to improve clinical experiences. <i>We included changes in Early Clinical Rubric to support developmental feedback; addition of the Supplemental Education Experiences (similar to Continuing Education Units) for candidates; trying full-semester versions of EDCO201 and 202; expanding EDCO 200/601 to include opportunities to explore community; changing EDCO 350 (behavior management course) to have level specific sections.</i></li> <li>• Other topics that may be questioned: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Role of co-teaching in the field experiences</i></li> <li>○ <i>Process for addressing issues with a mentor/host that is not performing well or having difficulty with a teacher candidate.</i></li> <li>○ <i>Availability of online resources.</i></li> <li>○ <i>Processes for working with a teacher candidate who is struggling.</i></li> <li>○ <i>Role of various groups with examples of how you have engaged (e.g., Program Advisory Committees; Core Course Advisory Committees; Partnership Advisory Council; Educator Preparation Committee; partner involvement in searches and other committees)</i></li> <li>○ <i>How you have made an impact on a committee</i></li> <li>○ <i>Use of Partnership Resources online (core course information, handbooks, evaluations, videos, etc.)</i> <a href="http://www2.winthrop.edu/rex/">http://www2.winthrop.edu/rex/</a></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Thoughts/experiences you would like to share based upon information above:**

### CAEP Group Interview Information

#### ~ Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity ~

- 3.1 – *Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs* (focusing on area school needs)
- 3.2 – *Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement* (Admission to Teacher Education Program)
  - Undergraduate Candidates and MAT Accelerated Pathway must have: 2.75 GPA; at least C or better in early EDCO coursework; meet testing requirement (ACT, SAT, or Praxis Core) in reading, writing, and mathematics; reflect on dispositions
  - Graduate Candidates must have: 3.0 GPA; at least C or better in early EDCO coursework; reflect on dispositions
- 3.3 – *Additional Selectivity Factors* (monitor and assess non-academic or dispositional qualifications)
- 3.4 – *Selectivity During Preparation* (candidates must maintain admission GPA listed in 3.2; successfully complete EDCO and program coursework with minimum stated grade; acceptable field evaluations; passing Praxis Subject Assessment before Internship II)
- 3.5 – *Selection At Completion—Content* (Praxis Subject Assessment; acceptable internship evaluation; edTPA for certification)
- 3.6 – *Selection At Completion—Professional Standards* (understands the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies)

Highlights from Self-Study	Questions from CAEP Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The college has a recruitment plan to focus on increasing enrollment and retention. <i>(Please consider some of the unique things your program or area are working on in either recruitment or retention)</i></li> <li>• We provided data on students by program, gender, and race.</li> <li>• Support of programs such as Ambassadors, Teacher Cadet, Teaching Fellows, Call-Me-MISTER, and WISE. We set goals associated with EL teachers, STEM, and SPED. <i>(If you can talk about recent work that is grant related please discuss)</i></li> <li>• Talked about retention efforts such as test prep and program-specific mentoring.</li> <li>• Have a process for monitoring dispositions that includes student self-reflection, faculty evaluation at key stages, use in Admission to Teacher Education process, and link to field evaluations.</li> <li>• Specifically mentioned strength of Internship Evaluations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The original report looked at statewide shortage areas and our related efforts. This includes but is not limited to Special Education, STEM, Middle Level, and Physical Education. Further, we talked about the need areas identified for SC Teachers Loan <i>(includes all mentioned before as well as others such as all CVPA programs and World Languages)</i>. The reviewers asked what local needs were. In the response, we talked about how the state needs were actually more severe than local needs and tried to make the case we see our mission as preparing for statewide needs. However, we were able to discuss:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the recently funded grant to explore teacher residencies in targeted partner districts;</li> <li>○ the current work to add additional Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) options (SPED, MLED, ELEM, and ECED), also;</li> <li>○ BS in Educational Studies to support individuals with a two-year degree prepare for MAT;</li> <li>○ NEXT LEVEL grant working on ESOL Certification and endorsements;</li> <li>○ hire of new Pre-college Program Coordinator;</li> <li>○ new recruitment and retention committee in college <i>(Again if you have specifics from the WIG work include)</i>;</li> <li>○ regular meetings with admissions; and</li> <li>○ looking at add-on options for special education and other cohort programs.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The reviewers are confused about the MAT-Traditional vs MAT-Accelerated pathways. <b>Bottom line is we have one MAT degree and two pathways</b> (the residency will be a third pathway eventually). The traditional pathway was designed for career changers or individuals that seek certification later. While accelerated pathway allows undergraduate students in some areas to seek certification as a blended process across the undergraduate and MAT degrees.</li> </ul>

**Thoughts/experiences you would like to share based upon information above:**

**CAEP Group Interview Information**  
**~ Standard 4: Program Impact ~**

- 4.1 – *Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development* (partner districts are providing unidentifiable data on student growth such as MAP, EOC, and SLOs; individuals have share SLO data; action research)
- 4.2 – *Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness* (Used ADEPT evaluations; case-study observations of some completers)
- 4.3 – *Satisfaction of Employers* (employer surveys and interviews)
- 4.4 – *Satisfaction of Completers* (completer surveys and interviews)

Highlights from Self-Study	Questions from CAEP Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiple measures for impact on P12 learners.</li> <li>• Three data cycles for ADEPT (<i>note SCST 4.0 rubric results not available when we submitted, but if you have comments from completers who feel or felt prepared for this assessment share</i>)</li> <li>• We piloted instruments and have shared data with groups such as Program Advisory Council and district leaders. Our partners have made suggestions for various curricular tweaks / improvements as per our data sharing sessions. (<i>Here faculty could talk about the advisory groups that either meet in December or April</i>)</li> <li>• We identified both strengths and areas in which we are looking to improve. Data were from multiple sources, which suggests conclusions made are reliable and accurate.</li> <li>• Over 96% of completers reported we equipped them to be effective in their professional roles.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The primary concerns center around the fact we still have small numbers as this is a new standard and process for us. Having said that, we have a plan in place to merge all of our data together over time, which will enable us to disaggregate data by program and detect more reliable trends regarding our completer's impact on their P12 students' learning.</li> <li>• Consider examples of how you have seen preparedness to teach in Winthrop graduates in schools when you are out for other supervision. Also, consider examples of times when you have seen Winthrop graduates "impact" their students' growth (this can be academically, interpersonally, intrapersonally/within the P12 learner). <i>This might also be a place to discuss where you have completers that are now hosts/mentors.</i></li> </ul> <p>Note preparation in technology was an area for future examination and the CAEP Site Visit team seems concerned we are not doing what is needed. So if you have examples based on time in school, please speak up! <i>This would be even better if you have examples from completers not teacher candidates.</i> After talking through the data with the Program Advisory Council, some of the issues may be that one can never know enough about technology, as it keeps changing. In addition, each school has different resources, so it takes time to adapt to the technologies available (or there may be very limited technology in a given school). So, if you have examples where/when we have positively prepared WU completers for the following, please let the site team know.</p> <p>Areas to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using technology to promote learning</li> <li>• Using technology for management of data and information</li> <li>• Using technology to communicate</li> <li>• Using technology to assess learning</li> </ul> <p>FYI: The Teacher Preparation program is working on a Supplemental Education Experiences program that mirrors teacher expectations for CEUs (Continuing Education Units) that will allow us some flexibility in providing professional development and experiences beyond coursework. Categories will include for now:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Critical Incidences (mental health, resilience, mandatory reporting, etc.)</li> <li>2. Diverse Learners (right now this will be exploring IEP process per feedback but will grow)</li> <li>3. Professional Practice (could include PD in schools)</li> </ol> <p>We are still exploring how to incorporate advanced exploration in assessment. We consider the first steps in this area to be further exploration of coursework and the results we derive from a study we are conducting on data literacy (i.e., how teachers use data in the field). <i>However, if you have examples where you explore role of assessment please share.</i></p>

**Thoughts/experiences you would like to share based upon information above:**



### CAEP Group Interview Information

#### ~ Standard 5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity ~

- 5.1 – *Quality and Strategic Evaluation – Multiple Measures* (Winthrop has a set of assessments that are common to all programs and this was the focus of data used)
- 5.2 – *Quality and Strategic Evaluation – Quality of Measures* (relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and interpretations of data are valid and consistent)
- 5.3 – *Continuous Improvement – System* (compares to goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations, and uses results to improve program)
- 5.4 – *Continuous Improvement – Completer data* (used and shared)
- 5.5 – *Continuous Improvement – Involvement of stakeholders* (appropriate groups are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence)

Highlights from Self-Study	Questions from CAEP Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reviewers agreed that we provided a variety of measures.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Learner Support, Case Study, EDCO 191, Technology Integration, edTPA</i></li> <li>○ <i>Early Clinical Rubric, Field Experience, Internship I &amp; II</i></li> <li>○ <i>Disposition, Testing Requirements (admission &amp; certification), Enrollment/Retention</i></li> <li>○ <i>Completer/Employer Surveys, Interviews, SLOs, MAP scores, etc.</i></li> <li>○ <i>Core Curriculum, Partnership (including committees), Glossary of terms, Recruitment Plan</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• We would appreciate you providing examples of when you have been involved with:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>looking at assessments and providing feedback;</i></li> <li>○ <i>engagement in validity or reliability processes;</i></li> <li>○ <i>data sharing;</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Please consider cases when you saw us make changes based on feedback.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We did receive some questions about our processes for establishing content validity and reliability. I suspect most questions on this will be directed to Dr. Costner, but be ready to discussion examples of examining data or assessments (program advisory meetings, program advisory council, committee, through Rex Institute) will help verify we are doing what we said.</li> <li>• You can check out many of our completer measures at: <a href="https://www.winthrop.edu/coe/candidate-performance-data.aspx">https://www.winthrop.edu/coe/candidate-performance-data.aspx</a></li> </ul> <p>Other topics to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Our overall approach to data use and examination</i></li> <li>○ <i>Our committee structures</i></li> <li>○ <i>Role of partners</i></li> <li>○ <i>Validity and Reliability plans (multi-year cycle)</i></li> </ul>

**Thoughts/experiences you would like to share based upon information above:**