

## DEANS COMPACT QUARTERLY MEETING SUMMARY

MARCH 25-26, 2021

### **DAY 1 WELCOME, OVERVIEW, & INTRODUCTIONS:** *Dr. Tachelle Banks, Compact Chairperson*

Dr. Banks welcomed all and provided an overview of the schedule. She thanked the specific SST and regional participants who were joining the Quarterly meeting.

### **UPDATE/EXCHANGE WITH STATE LEADERS:** *Ohio Department of Higher Education: Krista Maxson, Ph.D., Associate Vice Chancellor for P-16 Initiatives, Ohio Department of Education: Jo Hannah Ward, MEd, LMHC, Director, Office for Exceptional Children*

Jo Hannah Ward shared an update on the state's *Each Child, Our Future* plan. She discussed the aligned plan for special education, *Each Child Means Each Child*, which was released on March 8, 2021. It is available on the ODE website: <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Special-Education/Improving-Educational-Experiences-and-Outcomes>. She urged Compact members to challenge themselves to influence the current belief systems and structures—adopting a "philosophy of change" to create inclusive systems across the community at large. She challenged Deans and IHEs to plan for these supports and to teach high-leverage practices. She also discussed Ohio's Educator Prep connections to this work—why it's important now, especially for the teacher education programs.

Dr. Krista Maxson discussed the progress of SPA reviews. A new committee, which is meeting every Wednesday, is working to design the manual for the Ed Prep State Review process. She shared how participants will be able to engage before and during CAEP site visits. The ODHE is also developing a crosswalk for each program to demonstrate how assessments align to national standards. The common elements report will be reviewed by the Chancellor's Council for Educator Preparation Programs (CCEPP), and program reviews will be conducted by faculty panels organized in disciplines "bundles" (i.e., groups of related disciplines). Krista Maxson also noted other issues the new committee (EPPRR) is working on: video-conference options, providing transition time, allowing for programs to be reviewed up to the time of their scheduled state review. She noted that they hope to implement the new system fully in fall of 2022. She offered additional progress updates and noted opportunities for stakeholder feedback, and encouraged participants to reach out to EPPRR committee members.

Dr. Brobeck provided a LETRS update from Walsh University. He is developing a network to provide support to the 157 higher education and PK12 educators who are participating in LETRS training under the sponsorship of the Deans Compact. Participants have finished the pre-test, and 17% have completed the first unit. Twenty-one IHEs are partnering in this effort across the state. He offered himself as a resource for anyone going through the training.

Dr. Banks discussed the Diversifying the Educator Workforce (DEW) advisory group—its purpose and what it's been doing since it came together last year. She addressed an RFA developed to help fund IHEs' efforts to diversify their workforce and asked folks to include ideas for the scalability of their plans in their proposals. She then shared that the group will be identifying policy-related issues for the Compact's Policy Committee to review.

**PREPARING ALL NEW TEACHERS TO PROVIDE INCLUSIVE INSTRUCTION:** *Julie Cohen, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at the Curry School of Education and Human Development, University of Virginia; and Nathan Jones, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Special Education, Boston University (BU) and Founding Member of the BU Faculty of Computing and Data Sciences*

The presenters began by discussing the challenge for IHEs, that "preservice teachers in general education typically enter the field with limited preparation to work with students with disabilities." They noted that this is a serious issue because 14% of the student population are students with disabilities. Dr. Jones spoke about the silos that develop in teacher preparation programs. Both presenters noted that perhaps a broader challenge is that fields like Special Education and Mathematics Education do not see eye-to-eye on what "good teaching" looks like. Candidates are left to their own devices to navigate the competing disciplinary messages. The presenters explained that their research focus is on filling a gap in the special education research, which is primarily focused on Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. They noted that the support to students with disabilities that general educators can provide through Tier 1 instruction and intervention hasn't been researched as much. The presenters asked the audience to discuss the challenges they see in preparing teachers to work with all students. Some of the responses included that general educators don't see "special education" as within their purview or lack suitable models of inclusive education in the schools with which they partner.

The presenters shared the core elements of their project, and two high-leverage practices (HLPs) in particular: cognitive modeling and schema-based strategy instruction. They shared the research basis for their framework development (Grossman et al., 2009) and explained that they want to test learning modules focusing on these two HLPs. They shared a demonstration of their simulation training and outlined the steps in their research. Then they addressed their grounding assumptions and concerns, especially regarding racism and intersectionality.

The presenters also addressed four themes that arose from their interviews with scholars, experts, and special education professionals:

- Theme 1: "What goals were foregrounded in talking about the aims of mathematics?"
- Proximal vs Distal goals: Nearly all special educators foregrounded proximal goals and nearly all general educators foregrounded the distal goals.

Theme 2: "The key to effective instruction is a deep understanding of students."

- Using both formal and informal ways to recognize which instructional activities and knowledge are appropriate for individual students was a priority for all interviewees.

Theme 3: Labels, individualization, and engagement: This theme related to fears, discomfort, and lack of belief in "special education" as being real. Interviewees expressed the idea that disability was a manufactured construct.

- Special educators had different ideas about labels, individualization, and engagement, often beginning with "well, that all depends on the disability."
- General educators felt considerable discomfort with using the word "disability" for fear of being seen as taking a deficit approach. This is not how the disability community itself sees and discusses disabilities, so it was a concerning finding.
- Also, the researchers saw some general educators who discounted the expertise of special educators.
- These dynamics may point to what keeps mathematics educators and special educators from sharing perspectives and working together productively.

Theme 4: Time and goals

- There was a shared consensus surrounding the importance of coverage of critical content even at the expense of the wide coverage of the curriculum.
- Special education researchers focus on the "tyranny of time" and "placing bets" on what approaches will maximize the likelihood of positive outcomes for students with disabilities. There's a tension between addressing the need to progress with the curriculum and the need to reteach and provide support.
- Mathematics educators focus on developing mathematical thinking through dialogic processes.

The presenters concluded with an activity. They shared a video recording of math instruction and asked participants to discuss what they saw and what they learned. Compact members were placed in breakout groups to discuss the video. In the large group discussion that followed the breakout group conversations, one participant commented about the fact that so many people lack confidence in their math skills. This appeared to the participant to be a particularly challenging problem when it was coupled with the fact that many general educators do not understand how to address the needs of students with disabilities. Another participant agreed and spoke about how the dual-licensure programs in Ohio are trying to address this problem.

## **DAY 2 WELCOME AND OVERVIEW OF SCHEDULE – *Dr. Mark Seals, Compact Vice Chairperson***

Dr. Seals welcomed participants to the meeting and reviewed the schedule. He welcomed first-time attendees: Alexandra Pavlik, of the UC SDI Center; Natalie Rhein, a student at Mount St. Joseph University; and George Csanyi, Director of SST 7. Dr.

Seals thanked the Compact leadership, state partners, and keynote presenters, and he recognized the efforts of Compact members.

## **COMMITTEE AND INCENTIVE GRANT COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE (CoP) REPORTS**

Dr. Seals asked each meeting chairperson or facilitator to summarize their committee's focus for new members in attendance and then to provide a summary of the discussions that took place at their meetings.

**Incentive Grant CoP:** *Drs. Jennifer Ottley, Judith Monseur, and Michelle Duda, Facilitators*

**Purpose:** The IG CoP supports Incentive Grant recipients in planning, problem-solving, and implementing their grants. The group also celebrates the victories and outcomes of this work.

**Meeting Summary:** A panel of teacher candidates from Mount St. Joseph (MSJ) University answered questions and shared information about the dual licensure program at MSJ. Members of the CoP found this presentation to be very valuable because it offered insights that applied to programs at other institutions that had received incentive grants. The students' demonstrated their understanding of the importance of meeting the needs of all learners. Next, the group talked about the expansion of the CoP to include State Support Team (SST) directors as a way to provide a forum with the aim of creating mutual understanding among different agencies and institutions as well as leveraging state supports in an effort to bridge the candidate-teacher gap. The aim would be to provide a more seamless bridge between teacher preparation and practice within Ohio school districts. Finally, members shared how they are implementing high-leverage practices (HLPs). The CoP also learned that the CEEDAR Center is collecting resources on practice-based learning opportunities. These will be made available on their website. The need for videos demonstrating HLPs in practice was an issue of concern to CoP members.

**Dissemination Committee:** *Dr. Jim Gay, Chairperson*

**Purpose:** The committee focuses on outreach and is primarily involved with planning and preparing the Compact's annual conference.

**Meeting Summary:** The committee reviewed the evaluation results from the past conference, which focused on the quality, relevance, usefulness of the conference and also on its effectiveness in a virtual format. Dr. Gay shared that feedback was very positive. He noted that next year's conference would again be virtual. He explained that the committee discussed ideas for the next conference. One idea was to make concurrent sessions available to watch after the fact. The committee discussed opportunities to learn from preservice students by inviting them as presenters and organizing panel discussions with preservice students or first-year teachers. The committee also reviewed the Deans Compact website to provide ideas for its

restructuring. Members of the committee will share their ideas with the Deans Compact Core Team.

**Impact Evaluation Committee:** *Dr. Barb Hansen, Chairperson*

**Purpose:** The committee's goal is to examine the outcomes of Deans Compact's grants and initiatives by measuring the work's impact across the state.

**Meeting Summary:** Dr. Hansen shared that the group received updates on two studies currently in progress. The first is the Wisdom of Practice study. Domains of knowledge related to the implementation of Deans Compact incentive grants were identified from 49 interviews among IHE participants across four different grant cycles. By the end of June, the full report of the study should be completed. Work on the Intervener Studies case study is just beginning. It will focus on the program's first year from the perspective of program developers, faculty, and students. Data collection will involve interviews, review of program data (during a "data day"), and observations of program events (e.g., meetings, classes). Dr. Hansen reported that the committee is also brainstorming ideas for future studies, and Dr. Aimee Howley will help prioritize how to move forward. Finally, the committee has been intentionally working to integrate its work with the work of the CoP so that the research agenda of the Deans Compact helps meet the needs of incentive grant institutions.

**Low Incidence Committee:** *Dr. Sally Brannan, Chairperson*

**Purpose:** This committee considers the needs, services, and supports for students with the most intensive needs and how to support the educators who work with them.

**Meeting Update:** Dr. Brannan explained that the group had received an update on the TVI and D/HH consortium. The TVI program is in its fifth cohort, and the D/HH program is in its second. Both programs are growing, and there continues to be high interest, leading to a discussion of tiering the TVI applications. The group also heard updates on two studies. The first study, the Supply and Demand study, focuses on the adequacy of personnel to meet the needs of students with blindness/visual impairments, deafness/hearing impairment, and deafblindness. The final report has been provided to the state and will be available to the committee in the summer or fall. The second study, the Intervener Studies case study, will involve students and faculty as informants about the program. The second study is still in progress. The group also discussed reviewing the moderate-intensive licensure requirements to identify gaps. The purpose of such a review would be to help ensure that preparation programs positioned candidates to provide high-quality instruction to students with complex needs.

**Policy Committee:** *Deb Tully, Chairperson*

**Purpose:** The committee examines major issues relating to the provision of inclusive, equitable education in Ohio and considers ways to provide pertinent guidance to state policy makers.

**Meeting Update:** The committee discussed the DEW committee work and the forthcoming Request for Applications (RFA). Takeaways from the discussion included the importance of having a retention plan in place before recruitment, encouraging collaborations for candidates across institutions, and considering the option of using College Credit Plus to cut down on costs and time-to-degree for candidates. The committee also discussed the "Educators Rising" program and the need to expand and embed a focus on teacher preparation into high school programming. Finally, they discussed aligning this work with ODE's efforts. The committee then discussed the crosswalk for dual licensure, which will be released by the end of May. In addition, the group discussed the early childhood: birth-to-two gap in licensure. The committee also discussed IHE's role in preparing candidates for remote learning in a post-pandemic environment. The committee will begin reviewing the pros and cons of remote learning that research reveals, and the group will prepare a document outlining concerns. The final topic of discussion was SB 135, which focuses on higher education reform. There are areas of concern; the committee suggested that institutions of higher education should review it and be prepared to share their perspectives if the bill gains traction in the legislature.

**PREPARING ALL NEW TEACHERS TO PROVIDE INCLUSIVE INSTRUCTION (CONTINUED) - Julie Cohen, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at the Curry School of Education and Human Development, University of Virginia; and Nathan Jones, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Special Education, Boston University (BU) and Founding Member of the BU Faculty of Computing and Data Sciences**

Dr. Cohen discussed reflections on Day 1 based on responses provided on a Google doc. She noted that finding the intersection points between general and special education is an important piece of this work. She noted the need for video demonstrations and lessons showing the use of HLPs. She shared that they will be creating a video library of practices. Dr. Jones also reiterated the need to shift the concept of "responsibility" for students with disabilities, which has been slow to change. Dr. Cohen compared general educators' responses to students with disabilities with their responses to English learners (ELs). She said that with ELs, there is more of an understanding that responsibility is shared among all educators. Members then worked in breakout groups to identify one large-scale and long-term strategy and three to five smaller strategies for preparing new teachers to provide inclusive instruction. These were collected in a Google document:

<https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1DWxoUGZB9IzIz6wePiC4Fk0chONt4WnjNUkEEtLAAsg/edit?usp=sharing>

Dr. Cohen reported that one of the small groups had discussed the role of lesson planning in teacher preparation programs. She indicated that she thought it was important to weigh the pros and cons of including lesson planning in the curriculum for preparing teachers. Other discussion points included the need to develop the curricular tools that teachers will need to help them be successful in the classroom, preparing

candidates with the ability to teach on their feet, the importance of differentiation in lesson planning, having candidates know their specific students and meet their needs, and lesson plans as a teaching tool for designing instruction to meet the needs of all students. Dr. Jones added that aligning the work in schools and strengthening PK12 partnerships will support candidates when they transition into classrooms.

### **CHAIR WRAP-UP / NEXT STEPS**

Dr. Seals thanked the presenters and opened the floor for final questions. He encouraged the group to complete the meeting evaluation survey, a link to which was provided in the chat box. He announced that the final meeting of the year will take place on June 10 and 11. He noted that next year the first two meetings and the conference will be virtual. The meeting adjourned at 11:52 am.