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Kentucky: A Climate of Collaboration
A Partnership Model: State Leadership Team
Implement and support state and IHE/LEA reform teams

- Analyze program content, and program pedagogy using innovation configurations and reform rubrics
- Improvement in teacher/leader preparation and ongoing professional development using TA tools
- Revise licensure/certification standards to support reformed programs
- Refine teacher and leader evaluation systems to strengthen preparation
- Increase capacity for scale up

CEEDAR Intensive Technical Assistance
The purpose of the partnership is to ensure that teachers and leaders are educated to implement evidence-based practices for effectively educating K-12 students with disabilities to achieve college and career ready standards.
Intensive Technical Assistance Focus

Focus Areas
- Standards, Licensure, and Program Accreditation
- General Education
- Special Education
- Leadership
- Preparation Program Reform
- Preparation Program Evaluation

Collaborative Partners:
- University of Louisville
- EPSB Education Professional Standards Board
- Thomas More College
- University of Kentucky
- College of Education
A Statewide Blueprint to Improve Educator Effectiveness for All Learners
Kentucky Process
Vision

Every learner taught by effective teachers and every district and school led by effective leaders to ensure excellence and equity.
Mission

To empower teachers and leaders through intentional experiences to implement and sustain evidence-based practices in supportive environments to ensure opportunity and equity for all learners.
Goal #1

1. Create explicit alignment of statewide initiatives, including CAEP, INTASC and CEEDAR.
   - Create a crosswalk document to align statewide initiatives
   - Develop a glossary of terms to ensure clarity across programs as well as all constituent groups (EPPs, SEA/LEAs, EPSB)
Goal #2

2. Review/renew statewide standards, licensure assessment/certification and program approval process
   ◦ Identify ways to leverage CEEDAR to revise standards for EPPs
   ◦ Review licensure and identify areas for recommended changes (e.g. dual certification, grade level restrictions, etc.)
   ◦ Update program approval process to include focus on EBPs/HLPs and Tiered Instruction
Goal #3

3. Create a common knowledge base of Evidence-based Practices (EBPs) and High-leverage Practices (HLPs) across the curriculum

- Integrate EBPs/HLPs into all coursework across programs
- Revise coursework to ensure integration of EBPs/HLPs with a focus on multi-tiered system of support
- School leader candidates will be prepared to recognize and support EBPs/HLPs within their school context
Goal #4

4. Co-construct partnerships with LEAs to provide intentional/high quality clinical experience in diverse settings where evidence based practices are coherent and linked to coursework.

◦ Establish partnerships between EPPs and LEAs that provide models of EBPs/HLPs in action with diverse learners
Goal #5

5. Disseminate and scale models to enhance educator preparation and clinical based opportunities across state.

◦ Disseminate the work of the state team to key stakeholder groups
◦ Create statewide network to scale model to all EPPs
◦ Ensure all EPPs are utilizing statewide data system
Process of State Strategy

1. **Identifying State Needs and Priorities**
   - Review of student, educator, preparation, and policy data

2. **Leveraging Existing Efforts**
   - Identify existing SEA, IHE, and LEA Efforts

3. **Targeting Efforts**
   - Vision setting and high level review of existing efforts

4. **Statewide Blueprint**
   - Establish goals and action steps
Alignment of Initiatives

- Network for Transforming Educator Preparation (NTEP)
- State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)
- State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
- Novice Reduction Plan (KDE)
- State Consortium on Educator Effectiveness (SCEE)
- State Equity Plan (KDE)
- Teacher Recruitment & Retention for Educator Excellence (TRREE)
- Dyslexia Task Force
Establish Consistent Communication

- Development of a statewide email listserv (KyEdPrep@lsv.uky.edu)
- Adoption of a common Lexicon/vocabulary to be used by all stakeholder groups (see AACTE’s Clinical Practice Commission)
- Planning for a statewide summit for educator preparation to scale Statewide Blueprint (Summer 2018)
- Consistent EPP presence at state level meetings
## Program Performance

The reports included in this section provide information on each institution’s selectivity of candidates, the performance of candidates on required new teacher assessments, the percent of candidates who achieve full certification in Kentucky, and the results of surveys of candidates and their supervisors regarding the effectiveness of the candidate’s preparation.

Below are the list of reports under Program Performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Report Type</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>The report contains analysis for the 2006-2007 through the 2013-14 in three year cohorts of initial teacher preparation program completers by IHE, cross-referenced against the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board Teacher Certification database to see those that received a Statement of Eligibility, Provisional and Professional Certificates.</td>
<td>Educator Preparation Institutions Admission and Exit Reports and Teacher Certification Database</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>The report contains the analysis of the Average GPA, Average PPST scores for Math, Writing and Reading for the 2006-2007 through the 2012-2014 cohorts of students admitted to an initial teacher preparation program.</td>
<td>Educator Preparation Institutions Admission and Exit Reports.</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 25% and First Time Pass Rates</td>
<td>This report shows the pass rates and top 25% and first time pass rates for candidates that have completed an initial teacher preparation program between September 1, 2006 and August 31, 2013.</td>
<td>Educator Preparation Institutions Admission and Exit Reports, Teacher Certification Database.</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II Program Completers</td>
<td>The examination pass rates for each college are reported to EPSB by the Education Testing Service (ETS). The data is collected by the Division of Educator Preparation as required by the Federal Title II programs.</td>
<td>Counts and percentage summary of the assessment data are provided by ETS.</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of New Teachers’ Results</td>
<td>The focus of the survey is to ascertain how well new teachers and their</td>
<td>KEPP Report Card</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collaborative Impact

UK/UofL Partnership

Establishing an Alliance Network to Enhance Faculty Engagement
Research Base

Benefits of organizational collaboration (Kanter, 1994; Senge, 1990)
- Greater efficiency and effectiveness
- Enhances student learning

Accreditors, foundations, business and industry, and government agencies value collaboration (Ramaley, 2001)
- Knowledge creation and research
- Improved student learning and increased engagement
- Improved organizational functioning

50% of collaborations between IHE’s fail (Kezar, 2004)
- Departmental silos, bureaucratic/hierarchical administrative units, unions and other rigid structures act as barriers to cross-divisional work and partnerships (Kanter, 1994; Senge, 1990)
Research Base

Defining Collaboration

◦ “a process in which a group of autonomous stakeholders of an issue domain engage in an interactive process using shared rules, norms, and structures to act or decide on issues related to that domain” (Wood & Gray 1991, p. 437).

Focus on an interactive process (relationship over time) and development of shared vision, rules, norms, and structures (Kezar, 2005)
Research Base

**8 CORE ELEMENTS TO ENABLE COLLABORATION**

(KEZAR, 2006)

1. Mission and philosophy
2. Campus networks
3. Integrating structures
4. Rewards
5. A sense of priority for people in senior positions
6. External pressure
7. Values
8. Learning
Research Base

Three stage model to facilitate collaborative work (Kezar, 2005)

- Stage 1: Building Commitment toward Collaboration
  - “Build a story” in support of a new way of conducting work

- Stage 2: Commitment to Collaboration
  - Senior executive/leadership support

- Stage 3: Sustaining Collaboration
  - Establishing rewards and incentives
Research Base

Phases of Collaboration Development (Mohrman, 1995)

- **Phase 1**: Laying the foundation clarifying values, identifying key outcomes, identify performance gaps and organizational issues affecting collaboration

- **Phase 2**: Designing and redesigning to develop a framework focused on team-based organization providing assistance and support for new collaborative work

- **Phase 3**: Evaluation of the new systems and on-going adjustments to provide needed supports for collaborative work
Institutional Profiles

University of Kentucky

Public, land grant, research intensive institution; Kentucky’s Flagship institution

Dedicated to becoming one of the nation’s 20 best public research universities

Seeks to transform the lives of students and advance the Commonwealth—and beyond—through teaching and learning diversity and inclusion, discovery, research and creativity, promotion of health and deep community engagement

Student enrollment = 30,000+

University of Louisville

Public, research intensive institution located in Kentucky’s largest metropolitan area

Dedicated to achieving preeminence as a nationally recognized metropolitan research university

Seeks to pursue excellence and inclusiveness in its work to educate and serve its community through teaching diverse students to develop engaged citizens leaders, and scholars; provide engaged service and outreach that improve the quality of life for local and global communities

Student enrollment = 22,000+
College Profiles

University of Kentucky

7 Academic Departments
125 Full-time Faculty
Student enrollment
  ◦ Undergraduate = 2,000+
  ◦ Graduate = 800+
70+ Degree and Certification Programs

University of Louisville

6 Academic Departments
110 Full-time Faculty
Student enrollment
  ◦ Undergraduate = 2100+
  ◦ Graduate = 1200+
90+ Degree and Certification Programs
Purpose

• Provide collaborative leadership model for other Academic Units and Institutions of Higher Education

• Shift from a culture of competition to one of collaboration among faculty

• Establish a unified voice for increased policy leverage

• Improve educator preparation programming

• Enrich academic experiences for undergraduate and graduate students

• Effectively respond to changing needs of LEAs and health and community partners
Bi-annual Summits

December 15, 2014
(Initial Retreat)

January 26, 2015
(UK Hosted)

May 8, 2015
(UofL Hosted)

March 30, 2016
(UK Hosted)

November 11, 2016
(UK to Host)

March 24, 2017
(UofL to Host)
Summit Format

- Program Area Conversations
- Cross-program Conversations
- Hot Topic Roundtables
- Identify Collaborative Opportunities
- Outline Next Steps and Resources Needed

Next Steps...

- MSE ~ UK/UK school visit @ Westport Middle School
- More time for international coll...
- STEM faculty provide shared experiences in graduate program

Edu Leadership
- Study on perspective applicants - why go elsewhere?
- Principalship / PhD - innovative, rural/urban - non-traditional approach - B - look @ different models (joint mon)
- Fed grant = leadership prep program

ECE
- International learning for pre-service teachers (i.e. beyond KY/ILN states)
- Infrastructure for K experience (i.e. winter internships, 2 weeks embedded in schools, education + grant experts) connected to action

ECE
- Candidates' culminating experience - develop criteria for admission / retention - measure/evaluate candidates' experience, assess their learning competencies - demonstrate competency

Resources
Roundtable Conversation Simulation

HOT TOPICS AND ISSUES IN EDUCATOR PREPARATION
Walk and Talk: Hot Topics/Issues

First Steps
Find a group of three to join
Share the air (“step up, step back”)
Be specific

Walk and Talk Protocol
Select three topics for discussion from the list on the reverse side.
Each topic should get 10-15 minutes of focused conversation.
Designate a team timekeeper to ensure every topic receives equal attention.
Share your thoughts and ideas related to the selected topic.

Create one statement that sums up conversation to share out.
## Hot Topics/Issues in Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Model of Educator Preparation in Urban Settings</th>
<th>Global Exchange Programs/International Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Leader Programs</td>
<td>Educational Policy and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Partnerships on High Need Schools and Teacher Candidates</td>
<td>National Standards (Common Core, NGSS, C3 Framework)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration and Leadership in Educator Preparation</td>
<td>Dissemination of Data to Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Data for Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>Enrollment/Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation to Teach English Language Learners</td>
<td>Exchange Programs between IHEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM Initiatives</td>
<td>Achievement Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends in Accountability, Data Systems, and Strategic Data Projects</td>
<td>Federal Regulations for Teacher Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any other topic of interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Roundtable Conversation Simulation
GROUP SHARING
LEA Engagement Approaches

EXEMPLARY MODEL FOR INTERSECTIONS OF PROGRAM AREAS
Middle Level Education

EXEMPLARY MODEL FOR INTERSECTIONS OF PROGRAM AREAS
Preparation
(Content Area Coursework, Foundational Courses)

Pre-Practicum
(Embedded Field Experience, Minimum 160 hours, General Methods, Reading in Content Areas)

Practicum
(Content Methods, Management and Discipline, Writing in Content Areas, Field Experience Minimum 160 hours)

Student Teaching I
(2nd Content Methods, 8 weeks student teaching in 1st Content Area)

Student Teaching II
(16 weeks student teaching in 2nd Content Area, Assessment Course)
Theory into Practice

- The Adolescent Learner and Methods in Middle Level Education
- 1st Content Literacy Course

  Intentional

- Focused field experiences
- Shadow an Adolescent Day
- Ethnographic Study
- Teacher Work Sample
Intentional, focused field experiences

- School Embedded courses
- Co-teaching
- Focused observations
- Live-streaming classrooms with LEA partners
Through backchanneling our class can have a conversation while lessons are taking place, classes are transitioning, or other special events are taking place.

- Focus questions
- iPad minis
- Todays Meet
- Facetime
Feedback from Students

“The whole experience has been incredible and challenging...it has opened up outlets for questions to be answered. The best way to learn is to be immersed in a situation and I am learning a ton. This experience has been way more valuable than any class I could have taken in a lecture hall. We talk about something in class and then immediately get to see it in action in a real classroom.”
Feedback from Students

“I’m able to see the tangible... I’m able to see how people strategically handle issues that might come up in the classroom instead of just coming up with hypothetical situations.”
● Communicating the vision and mission of the CEEDAR work to faculty to gain “buy in” for program improvement

● Recognizing the diverse contexts and needs of individual IHEs and LEA partners and bringing them together for a common goal

● Turnover of key personnel in all aspects of the work

Challenges
Questions?

Amy Lingo, Associate Dean, University of Louisville
amy.lingo@louisville.edu

Laurie Henry, Associate Dean, University of Kentucky
lauriehenry@uky.edu