

Minutes – Stakeholders Accreditation Advisory Board Meeting, 8/22/17

Dean’s Conference Room, 3:00-5:00PM	<p>In Attendance: Assistant Dean Kathleen Crawford-McKinney, Interim Assistant Dean Kate Roberts, Faculty Member Elizabeth Corah-Hopkins, Dean Russell Whitman, Ben Allen (University Prep), Billie Sczepaniak (Van Dyke Schools), Youssef Mosallam (Dearborn), Robert Livernois (Warren Consolidated), Alycia Meriweather and Toni Clover (DPSCD)</p> <p>Absent: Representation from New Paradigm and Ferndale</p>
--	---

Agenda Items

No.	Topics for Discussion	Outcome (Brief Summary)
1	Welcome!	Dean - provided a brief history/accomplishments of the College
2	Purpose of the Board	<p>The thought process behind the representation on this board: 1. All represented districts are est. partners with the teacher education unit and this provides an opportunity to deepen relationships and 2. The board can provide feedback on important issues regarding the teacher education unit’s programs and processes for quality assurance and ongoing improvement purposes.</p> <p>The group will meet three times year (possibly four)</p>
3	Intros	Attendees shared why they decided to serve on the Board – all spoke of the history their districts (and for some, they themselves) have with the university, their commitment to the est. partnership, and their interest in data/curriculum/etc.
3	Overview of the Accreditation Expectations	<p>The teacher education unit’s accreditation history was described.</p> <p>Board members were asked to review contents of the informational packet. CAEP and InTasc Standards were reviewed and tied to core CAEP principles. Board members were informed that all syllabi are now tied to standards.</p>
4	Data and Trends	<p>Principal Survey Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • linked to the four InTASC areas • origin of the survey described (WSU was a part of it) • lowest is <i>Instructional Practices</i>, would also like to see improvement in <i>Content Knowledge</i> • it was noted that Eastern Michigan University has a return rate and results similar to WSU • problem: principal responses are not weighted to align with the number of grads in that particular building • Problem: it reflects all of our programs combined so for programmatic improvement it isn’t a helpful measure <p>Year Out</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • goes out to public and public charter schools • question asked whether teachers who drop out after one year are included in this survey (they are if they receive it and respond) • candidates must complete a survey at their portfolio/graduation celebration – number drops for year out teacher responses • when this survey is sent out moving forward, teachers will be asked to attach their teacher effectiveness paperwork with it <p>Proprietary Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moved through the <i>Student Teaching Assessments</i> (F15, W 16, F 16 by InTASC Category and Standard) and gave board members time to review it – it was clarified that these are complete scores • Explained the <i>Lesson Plan</i> rubric (all districts represented by board members in attendance use the FfT) and described the addition of two columns (<i>not observed but expected</i> and <i>not observed and not expected</i>) – explained the color-coding and the beginning/middle/end data points <p>MTTC Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed some of the lower scores, looked at the N, and noted the revision of curriculum for some areas including Special Education • Explained that this data has gotten particular focus in program areas and that one area identified for improvement is that in the elementary area, several domains tested need more instructional emphasis • Noted that low numbers of test-takers in certain subject areas aligns with hiring challenges districts have in these areas <p>MDE Survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Categories reviewed
5	CAEP Reviewers Feedback	<p>The teacher education unit is working on the following based on feedback from the CAEP reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • validity and reliability – the unit is moving through a formalized IRR training process • partnerships – the unit is working more closely with our partnering districts, teachers, graduates, students – headway made with the formation of this board • How/when the unit assesses and provides clinical experiences - data collection points at the beginning/middle/end of programs have been determined • develop/implement a dispositions plan - Support for having a dispositional approach beginning with admissions was expressed • consider more deeply and document <i>diversity</i> and <i>technology</i> as threads woven throughout our programs
6	Action Plans and Discussion Points	<p>Board members shared their thoughts/observations re: Technology:</p> <p>Warren Consolidated – we need to support teachers in how to get students to use technology to think critically – how they can use it to think/learn instead of using it because it is trendy – maybe <i>metacognitively</i> given how quickly it</p>

		<p>evolves; Teachers need to understand that they need to facilitate in terms of technology in particular and not control everything (maybe a particular concern with math teachers)</p> <p>University Prep - ISTE standards – not known/referenced often by teachers – teachers tend to look for the easiest way to weave it in without necessarily thinking about technology as an enhancement – they need to be able to type, read from computer screen, navigate tabs (low level but important stuff)</p> <p>Dearborn - Students should be actively engaged in the technology for their own learning or to help others learn – this needs to be a strong focus</p> <p>Van Dyke – basic things such as typing need to remain as expectations and teachers need to be aware of it</p> <p>DPSCD – we need to work to support students to understand the technology itself so that they can then shift to that application piece; think about the proficiency about using the tool (what are the students doing? What are the teachers doing? What is the added value?) – information retrieval is at a very low level – you must understand technology and what it can do</p>
6	Current Status and Projected Decision by CAEP	The board was informed of the unit’s AFIs and Stipulations and that a final decision about the unit’s accreditation status will come in October (stakeholders will be informed of that decision)
7	Moving Forward	The group agreed to set future meetings on Mondays, 3:00-5:00 (but not the second Monday of the month)

Minutes – Stakeholders Accreditation Advisory Board Meeting, 11/6/17

<p>Dean’s Conference Room, 3:00-5:00PM</p>	<p>In Attendance: Assistant Dean Kathleen Crawford-McKinney, Faculty Member Elizabeth Corah-Hopkins, Youssef Mosallam (Dearborn), Alycia Meriweather (DPSCD), Ralph Bland (New Paradigm), Benjamin Allen (U Prep), Billie Sczepaniak (Van Dyke), Robert Livernois (Warren Consolidated)</p> <p>Absent: Beth Gonzalez (DPSCD), Toni Clover (DPSCD), Dina Rocheleau (Ferndale), Wanda Cook-Robinson (Oakland Schools)</p>
---	---

Agenda Items

No.	Topics for Discussion	Outcome (Brief Summary)
1	Welcome!	
2	Mission and Goals of the Board	Referenced handout (attached) – mission is based on language from the CAEP handbook; conversation focused on the fourth bullet point under <i>Above Sufficient</i> .

		<p>A sizeable amount of evidence will be the minutes we generate and archive.</p>
3	National CAEP Board Meeting Insights	<p>CAEP will provide language for us to put on the website once the accreditation results are in.</p> <p>If needed, MDE will place us under their accreditation umbrella until we are ready to go back up for CAEP accreditation.</p> <p>We will be operating within a 2-year timeframe to fully address stipulations.</p> <p>Results will be in place by Nov. 23 and will be sent to University President.</p> <p>Kathleen noted that positives are already in place: this Board, some faculty are more deeply involved than they have been in the past, and better and more holistic documentation.</p>
4	Continuous Improvement Accomplishments to Date	<p>Shared progress document (attached) and Board members reviewed it independently. Board members lauded the volume of progress made to date.</p> <p>Question re: #6 and hand pulling – this was an internal issue, where data was entered manually – addressed immediately and no longer happening.</p> <p>Exploring assessment software (e.g. <i>LiveText</i> and <i>Chalk and Wire</i>) – noted one student benefit - they can come back to it and use it when they are in the field.</p> <p>Traditional LMSs are courses specific whereas assessment software addresses data at a program level and permits a more efficient, high-level view.</p> <p>Suggestions for putting together a proposal for the Board of Governors: 1. ask students in our already planned focus groups if they would buy in and/or see value and 2. poll teachers and then administrators from districts to get their thoughts.</p> <p>Full-time faculty (FTF) = roughly 65% / Part-time faculty (PTF) roughly 35% = a reflection of the declining enrollment – we are working to place data collection in the hands of FTF, esp. if assessment software becomes a part of the quality assurance system.</p> <p>Several Board members expressed interest in “touring” <i>Chalk and Wire</i> via the archived demonstration - link will be shared with the entire Board.</p>
5	Dispositions – Our Instrument and Process	<p>Described the need to establish and monitor dispositional qualities in our applicants/candidates along with the future goal of establishing a dispositions process that predicted completer success in the field. Current process was shared with Board members as was the PPSSR instrument (handout). Board members were asked to provide feedback on the PPSSR as it will be reviewed in the future by a faculty committee – that feedback is archived on a separate document and made available to Board members.</p> <p>The interview process will be piloted with 6 volunteer undergraduate applicants on Nov. 17 @ 10:00 in Room 255. Board members were invited to attend and observe.</p>

		Information about the interview itself, the interview questions, and research that guides the pilot interview approach will be shared with the Board separately and in advance of 11/17.
6	Clinical Practice – Paired Placements	<p>Planned discussion with the Director of the Office of Clinical Experiences will be rescheduled in the future.</p> <p>Dearborn described the co-teaching model – two student teachers in classroom working with students and teamed up with highly effective teachers - completers slide very well into the full-time position.</p> <p>U Prep – challenge: teachers aren’t familiar with the model, many request one, not two ST – have had to reframe for teachers sometimes – found to be very beneficial at the elem. level in particular.</p> <p>WSU is working to make entire program with partner placements – our goal is to carve out deep, authentic partnerships.</p>
7	Open Discussion and Moving Forward	<p>See discussion on Principal Survey below.</p> <p>All Board members are invited to participate in Capstone Days in December.</p>
8	Principal Survey	<p>Discussed the challenge of meeting Standard 4 (MI does not provide the data as other States do – WSU needs to collect it for completers up to 5 years out) – CASE STUDIES (a suggestion of Chris Koch, president of CAEP at State meeting on 11/3/17) may be a better approach.</p> <p>WSU will be reaching out to Grand Valley to learn more about their process because they had a 34% return rate this most recent cycle (significantly higher than WSU’s response rate).</p> <p>Ideas to increase feedback:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Potential Union issue if this isn’t done anonymously 2. All follow-up calls to principals can be placed with the secretary, who can then reach out to the principal. 3. Superintendents (and separately, Principals as well) meet every month, so those are other potential outlets. <p>DPSCD noted it may need to work through a data sharing agreement.</p> <p>Possible (broad) timeline cycle: request “kid data” in the fall and “teacher data” in July with data analysis in late fall. Past data could be available now, permitting analysis.</p>

Minutes – Stakeholders Accreditation Advisory Board Meeting, 3/5/18

Please park in Lot 31, which is near the College of Education, and bring your ticket to the meeting so we can validate it for you.

Dean’s Conference Room, 3:00-5:00PM	<p>In Attendance: Wanda Cook-Robinson; Benjamin Allen; Alycia Meriweather; Billie Szczepaniak; Saliha Koca; Lynne Morgan-Bernard; Elizabeth Corah-Hopkins; Miranda Vancoppenolle (notetaker)</p> <p>Absent: Youssef Mosallam; Ralph Bland; Beth Gonzalez; Robert Livernois</p>
--	--

Agenda Items

No.	Topics for Discussion	Outcome (Brief Summary)
1	Welcome!	
2	New Core Team and Pathway to Full Accreditation	<p>The initial certification program is fully accredited for the next two years but must address 3 stipulations and 5 areas of improvement. Our accreditation outcome is shared on the website as per CAEP requirements. A fresh self-study is due to CAEP in the fall and a shortened site visit will happen Spring 2019 when all stipulations must be fully addressed (see handout).</p> <p>New structure for continuous improvement (see PPT slide) – goals are better communication and transparency:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Core team (made up of administrators, faculty, and the data manager) meets once a week, determines priorities and the direction the initial cert unit moves in. We have a 2. Support team is comprised of people with specific expertise or who lead committees. Expertise are helping us with validity and IRR. Program coordinators and panel leaders are part of the support team. 3. The 'other ring' is the faculty, who are providing input on a range of things during College, divisional, and panel (elementary and secondary) meetings. They have helped “block” professional core courses and are now focusing on clinical experiences. 4. The 'outer ring' is for the stakeholder groups, such as this board and the student organization. The medical school has been aiding us in our process of accreditation. <p>Pathway to accreditation (see handout): this is a master to-do list, we have seven things in place to achieve by the end of the semester. We are on track! CAEP annual report is due at the end of April.</p>
3	MDE Updates - CAEP	MDE announced in December that the parameters are changing - additional endorsements are being added to initial certification accreditation, and we are looking ahead to the next academic year to start doing so potentially. Advanced

		<p>accreditation for the administrator program (?) has separate standards but is meant to mirror what we are doing now for initial accreditation. Advanced will go up for accreditation when initial accreditation does in 7 years (not in spring 2019).</p>
4	<p>Dispositions - Cornerstone Welcome</p> <p><i>Lynne Morgan-Bernard, Chair of Dispositions Committee</i></p>	<p>Dispositions: Interview pilot went very well, so we are expanding this semester to include all new teacher prep students. Newly formed disposition committee is made up of faculty and is working to improvement the instrument and the process.</p> <p>Read the handout on dispositions for an overview.</p> <p>A video on the importance of dispositions will be ready for Cornerstone Welcome on April 6 — the video will involve teachers that have graduated from Wayne State, and they will each talk about one dispositional piece. Cornerstone Welcome is the mandatory orientation for students and will include the brief overview of dispositions and a group interview. One interview session will be videotaped for IRR purposes.</p> <p>Board Suggestion: Couldn't the mentor teacher have an evaluation on how the disposition of the student teacher? Because there is a lot that happens 'out in the field.'</p>
5	<p>Completer Survey – feedback requested</p>	<p>Trends: Supervisor survey was much more positive, some completers indicated they have difficulty with ESL students and digital materials.</p> <p>Board Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SIOP training (or another methodology that is proven to be helpful), may be helpful for those teaching ELL students. 2. Could different programs talk to each other? Because you can learn from the different program areas. How do teachers approach the challenges that children come with? Is there something that SED 5010 provides that BBE 5000 might not? Consider if there is anything to put into place to prepare candidates for what children are really like and their backgrounds. 3. Technology really depends on the school district. Have not noticed anything specific re: LMS – teachers are stepping into routine tech situations without issue.
6	<p>Other Continuous Improvement Updates</p>	<p>We have shifted all of our data collection from Blackboard to Qualtrics, and it is working well. This addresses one part of our stipulations – no hand-keying of data.</p> <p>We are focusing on improving our pass rates on the MTTC. Students learn a lot in the field that could prepare them to take and pass the MTTC. So, we are no longer requiring students to take it before student teaching – this is in line with most institutions in the State. We purchased software for students to use to help prep them take the MTTC.</p> <p>Board suggestion: Would sequencing the syllabus with the MTTC test in some way be helpful?</p> <p>Technology: We start with TED 6020, this is not a content specific class. The plan is that we will later move to the content specific knowledge.</p>

7	CAEP Annual Report – Website Revisions	New annual report template – report now requires institutions to provide annual measures evidence (hyperlinks) that data is available to stakeholders on the website. There should be explanations that anyone can understand. This is all to be done by April. Board suggestion: Making things compliant for those who cannot access the website like usual—legally they have to have these items. K12 schools and OCC had to take things off their website and redo them. As we build our site now, make everything accessible.
8	Open Discussion and Moving Forward	At our next meeting we will show the new Dispositions video and will share the Annual Report.
9	Final Meeting of 2017-2018 is May 21 @ 3:00	

Stakeholders Accreditation Advisory Board Meeting, 5/21/18

Please park in Lot 31, which is near the College of Education, and bring your ticket to the meeting so we can validate it for you.

*****Note – we are meeting in the Faculty Lounge, which is next to the Conference Room where we typically meet.**

Faculty Lounge (next to the Dean’s Conference Room), 3:00-5:00PM	<p>In Attendance: Accreditation Director Elizabeth Corah-Hopkins, Youssef Mosallam (Dearborn), Billie Sczepaniak (Van Dyke), Benjamin Allen, (UPREP), Faculty Member Kate Roberts, Alycia Meriweather (DPSCD), Robert Livernois (Warren Consolidated)</p> <p>Absent: Beth Gonzalez (DPSCD), Wanda Cook-Robinson (Oakland Schools), Dina Rocheleau (Ferndale), Ralph Bland (NP)</p>
---	--

Agenda Items

No.	Topics for Discussion	Outcome (Brief Summary)
1	Welcome!	Today will focus on updating everyone regarding current progress. Presentation by Academic Services: Jeff Lisiecki and Deborah Gibson
2	Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Visit Date • New Assistant Dean • Cornerstone Welcome • Website • CAEP Annual Report • Future Educators/Newsletter 	Chart with 5 standards displayed. Will be updated to the website soon, showing what steps will be taken each semester. Important Dates: Annual report has been submitted to CAEP. The largest piece focused on MTTC/Data. Pass rate significantly lower than other institutions. After surveying other institutions, we will be moving forward with a new process similar to what they are using. MTTC requirement for student teaching has been eliminated.

- Technology Assessment – Expert Panel Review
- Clinical Component SED 5010 – F 2018

Greatest concern is WSU does not want to hold up the student teaching portion of their education.

New Assistant Dean joining the Teacher Education Department on July 1, Dr. Roland Sintos Coloma.

Next site visit coming up March 3 -5, 2019. May want to meet with stakeholders.

Self-study is now due September 30th.

General Updates:

Dispositions: Cornerstone Welcome – Welcome to the College of Education. Group interviews with students. Data was collected and stored. Follow-up surveys went out to Faculty and Academic Advisors who were part of the process. We received positive feedback from students and good connections were made between students.

Video clip: Continued Learning and Success (Professional Dispositions) (DRAFT)

Committee would like volunteers to record segment regarding Professional Dispositions from an Administrator’s perspective. (See action items)

Next Cornerstone Welcome July 19, 2018.

Pilot piece – Dispositions: Final piece will be instructors identifying students who are progressing in a satisfactory way, those that are exceptional, and those that will need additional support.

Clinical Experiences: We have put professional courses in blocks 1, 2, 3. (Beginning middle and end).

Where can we add additional clinical experience? SED 5010 will begin a 10 hour clinical experience beginning in the fall. Assessments will be included.

Faculty Technology Professional Development this past March.

Breaking barriers: Academic rep at TED/COE meetings now, and vice versa.

Data Submission Update: Winter 2018: Collected 100% of data collection. Will continue to improve data collection process.

Piloted new Tech Assignment in Ted 6020 – Content Validity Protocol (Expert Panel) Hopeful to have a valid assessment in place for fall 18.

Standard 5.5 – deals with following all of our stakeholders and involving them in the program evaluation and improvement.

		<p>Newsletter for the students, by the students. The idea is to keep our students informed so they can give us good feedback, so that we can work towards improvement.</p> <p>Website improvements continue and should be in place by the fall 18 semester.</p> <p>Continuous improvement 2018/2019 – indicating that we could do a better job with our special populations. Those trends will be focused on in the next Academic year.</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>Standard 3: Recruitment Plan Deborah Gibson and Jeff Lisiecki</p>	<p>Reference handout that was distributed to all present.</p> <p>Recruitment Plan: 3 key factors.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Had to be Data driven. Discussed all the different types of data they need. 2. Had to adhere to CAEP, specifically standard 3. 3. Increase enrollment for the College of Education. <p>Focus on the need to collect data, share with the college, establish plan, and make recruitment decisions. This will be an annual process.</p> <p>Looking down the road 5 years: We looked at immediate need.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor career and web pages to see what students will need. (Ongoing) • CAEP Standard 1 and 2: Address diverse populations, shortage fills, while also adhering to candidate quality and selectivity. • Maintain Academic Achievement, Minimum GPA, SAT Scores. • Need to be selective, while at the same time improving shortage. <p>Discussion: How can we adhere to CAEP standards?</p> <p>Discussion of Goals and Tasks (Included in handout)</p> <p>Priority Hiring Idea: Districts that want access to our students. Good for students and schools. Could it be reciprocal, teachers in the high schools who could recommend students to come and have a visit day at Wayne State.</p> <p>Create Target 1 population: Level 1 - Building achievement and having that success. Prepare students at Level 1, so that they are meeting the requirements at Level 2.</p> <p>Community Colleges: Contact specific student organizations, e.g. Arab student group, trying to increase diversity. Target it specifically to what we are looking for, e.g. math, stem, etc.</p> <p>GOALS: Have not yet been pre-approved by Asst. Dean.</p>

		<p>CAEP Website: Area for parents and families with accessible information.</p> <p><u>Brainstorming:</u> Students a bonus to bring another student to WSU Proactively promote the profession of teaching Advertise Loan Forgiveness Programs for teachers Celebrity Campaign for Teaching Developing Cohorts: “Small school approach that has proven to be successful.” Regular meetings between Faculty and students throughout their time at WSU</p>
--	--	--

Stakeholders Accreditation Advisory Board Meeting, 8/27/18

As a distinguished, urban EPP, WSU’s initial certification programs prepare reflective, innovative educators who are committed to diversity.

<p>Dean’s Conference Room, 3:00-5:00PM</p> <p>Notetaker: Susan Orr</p>	<p>In Attendance: Alycia Meriweather, Dr. Robert Livernois, Benjamin Allen, Dr. Elizabeth Corah-Hopkins, Dr. Roland Sintos-Coloma, Dr. Wanda Cook-Robinson, Dr. Youssef Mosallam</p>
--	---

Agenda Items

No.	Topics for Discussion	Outcome (Brief Summary)
1	Welcome!	Roland and Elizabeth would like to thank you all for the support you have given WSU through this process!
2	<p>Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important Dates • QAS Visual • Data/Evidence Chart 	<p>Important Dates: Please see insert in folder for full list.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 30th: Report due to CAEP (Self-study specific to Standard 5 will be ready and reviewed by a visiting site team. • March 3-5: Follow up site visit. Based on the report the site visit could cross all 3 days, and have up to 3 visitors. • October 2019: Final decision will be determined. We anticipate accreditation for 5 years. • December 11th: Capstone Conversation • November 16 – 19, 2018: Cornerstone Welcome • May 3, 2019: EdCAMP Detroit – We welcome you all and encourage you to please share this date with your district teachers.

- April 2019: WSU Job Fair

QAS Colored Visual: Please see insert in folder.

CAEP measures our effectiveness on the 5 standards. We will have a document for all of you on how we meet these standards.

This past January we carved out a fresh system to collect all data in Qualtrics. We collected 100% of data in winter and spring semesters. This is a major accomplishment, and indicates that this new system is working.

Is it possible to present to CAEP before the visit to obtain feedback (Yes – we first submit our stipulation report and then the assigned site team provides us with feedback, which we will reference as we prepare an addendum, which is due Feb.2)
Is it possible to obtain information from another University regarding the CAEP visit? (We have been working with other institutions across the State on an ongoing basis but do not have information about other institutions that have successfully navigated a probationary visit.)

Data Evidence Chart: (Please see insert in folder) A list of our data and evidence. Column specific to how it contributes to different components of CAEP Standards.

Completer Survey: We sent out the survey for the first time to those who completed up to 5 years ago. We wanted to know where they thought they were best served by WSU or where there were gaps. We requested that completers attach copies of their annual evaluations, but that didn't work out as well as we hoped and we will go in a different direction for the future.

Principal survey: We had some issues with this survey and did not collect the data we had hoped. We now have a better understanding of the process regarding the surveys and will work to improve the data collection moving forward.

Thoughts about a recruitment plan?

It is important to start with Elementary age students.

Brainstorming Thoughts:

- Is there a way to offer incentives for people who advocate for WSU?
- Students today want to know what are some of the new innovative directions that WSU is focusing on.
- In the past (10 – 15 years ago) WSU sold itself on the urban educator. Things have changed. What does this mean now?
- How do we create viable certified teacher pipelines?
- What about Alternative Certification Programs? What could work?
- On the Job training for student teachers.
- We need on the job training for student teachers.
- How do we shift the mindset so that teachers are respected?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donors • Teacher Education Scholarship Funds • Dual Enrollment Programs • Increase offerings of Evening, Hybrid and Weekend Courses
3	Partnership: How WSU might best support your needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative Certification • PD • Other 	Partners would like to know: What is it Wayne State is asking us to do? It would be helpful to have our role in this process clearly defined. Are there specific topics that WSU could provide for your teachers? Multicultural Education STEM: How to use STEM teaching strategies across the program. For example, how would you use STEM techniques in a Language Arts classroom? Special Education Universal Design Learning: How do we create opportunities for learning for everyone? Elementary Math What are you seeing down the road for your districts or even the University? Understand and support that poverty is trauma.
4	Future Meetings	Doodle poll will be sent out
5	Roundtable	

Action Items

No.	Action Items/Ideas to Pursue and Person(s) Responsible	Due Date (if applicable)
1	Elizabeth – send out poll for November meeting	
2		
3		
4		

Helpful Links

CAEP Handbook

<http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/caep-accreditation-handbook>

CAEP Policy Manual

<http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/accreditation-resources/accreditation-policy.pdf?la=en>

WSU Website – CAEP

http://coe.wayne.edu/accreditation/initial_certification_quality_assurance_dashboard.php