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 >> ROBBIN: We're at the top of the hour. This is Robbin Bull, with the national center on deaf‑blindness. It looks like we're at the top of the hour. We'll get started here. I want to welcome everyone. I'm going to go through some housekeeping items before I hand it over to Kristi who will be introducing today's presenters. I do want to mention that all phone lines have been muted to reduce the background noise. We do ask that you keep your phones on mute, unless you're going to speak, at which time you can use star ‑‑ excuse me, you can use pound 6 to unmute your phone line if you wish to speak. Star 6 will mute your phone line. Pound 6 will unmute your phone.

 And we do want to let you know that this webinar will be recorded and it will be archived on our website, and you can access that at a later date or share that with others. You might want to view this at a later time. And we do want you to be mindful of saying or posting personal information in the chat pod that you might not want to have recorded. So I'm going to set the recording to go now, and then Kristi, that will be ‑‑ right now is the time for you to get started.

 >> KRISTI: Welcome, everyone. Thank you for joining us today for our last webinar in our three part series on mentoring interveners with the National Intervener Certification E‑Portfolio process.

 In November, we held the first two webinars providing information on mentoring interveners through an electronic certification process. I would like to take a moment to direct all attendees to the NCDB intervener personnel home page. Going there, you will find intervener training and certification resources, including information about the NICE process and the instructional NICE modules 1 and 2. We'd also like to highlight the applying for NICE certification policies and procedures link on the NICE page.

 On the home page, you'll also find the link to the first and second webinars with their accompanying material. The first bullet under the 2019 NICE mentoring series is the events page link to information about the full webinar series. This page includes an in‑depth description of each webinar. The second bullet is the library link to the recording, transcript, slide presentation, and accompanying materials from the first two webinars. Contents from all three webinars will be posted at this same location. NCDB would like to welcome Dr. Ritu Chopra, director of research center at the university of Colorado, Denver. And one of her team members that supports the National Intervener Certification E‑Portfolio, Leanne Cook. NCDB sought out partnership from Ritu years ago and has benefitted from her expertise, provides outreach to states regarding para educator support, including mentoring. Thank you, Ritu and Leanne for conducting this last webinar and the entire webinar series on successfully mentoring interveners through this electronic certification process.

 >> RITU: Thank you, for the introduction. We'll get started now. One of our team members, Willie, he's not here today. He is not well, so he'll be missing the webinar. And hopefully he'll listen to the recording later on [chuckling].

 So what we'd like you to do is in the chat box, go ahead and type in your name and your affiliation. And again, tell us if you have served as a NICE mentor or if you're serving as a reviewer. So if you can go ahead and type that, that will be great. You can also unmute yourself by pressing pound 6, and you can speak. Whatever works for you. We'll give you a few minutes to type or share with us where you're from, what your name is, and we'll get going. So couple of minutes, we'll just wait.

 We have Utah, South Dakota, Virginia. That's great. Every people are typing. All right. This is great. Keep adding information, and we'll move on to the next slide in the meantime.

 We just want to start this off by giving you a quick recap of what we did in webinar 1 and 2. Those two webinars t they focused on ‑‑ the first one was on NICE mentor role and expectations. We also had an activity, self‑examination of own self as a mentor. We talked about the different stages of the mentoring process and we shared several [indiscernible] which are on the web links that Kristi just talked about. And then we talked the last second webinar, how we attend the two components of the portfolio, which are documentation and explanation. And then we also spent a lot of time talking about self‑reflection and self‑assessment and the importance of both in terms of the NICE process as well as ongoing growth and development of the intervener.

 Now, this particular webinar is focused on ‑‑ we're really ‑‑ today, what we'll be doing is having you participate in an exercise. We really want you as a mentor to take on the role of the reviewer. If you had a particular artifact, how would you rate it? And then also, we're going to talk about the start ‑‑ start by talking about some of the competencies that are particularly hard to assist and we find that interveners don't score very well on those and how we can transcend those. We talk about that and then we'll go to the scoring process, the scoring exercise. And one of the things that we're excited about today is we have two of our mentors who are also reviewers, hear their perspective around how being a reviewer improved their practice as a mentor and what other tips they have for other mentors. And then again, we will review some of the checklist and forms that we have already shared, which will help you to make sure that the portfolios are submitted, are complete, and they are also done in a timely manner.

 On the screen, what you see is there are six competencies which are typically we see the interveners are receiving low scores on. I won't read out the ‑‑ we're going to talk about each one of them on the next slide. We have combined this content with how we can help interveners score higher on those.

 So the first one is effect of deaf‑blindness on psychological development and on the development of self‑identity. And what we have found is interveners who use series of photos, not just one photo, and who use ‑‑ include ‑‑ it's a knowledge competency. So it's hard to demonstrate. So the easiest way is have series of photographs, really strong reflection, explanation of questions in a reflective kind of a way. So that we have seen has been helpful.

 The other ‑‑ the other knowledge competency is differences between concept development and skill development and the effect of deaf‑blindness on each. And this also, again, we have seen there's series of pictures which are related to the concept and written work samples. And again, a really good reflection, that helps.

 Third competency which is a skill competency that scores low is facilitation of individual's understanding and development of concepts. And what we have seen is videos are used as an artifact for this particular ‑‑ as a documentation that is very, very helpful and those interveners who have used effective videos have been ‑‑ have scored well in that particular competency.

 Another skill competency is share observations of the individual's communication skills with others, even ‑‑ this is another one which is hard to assess as well as hard to demonstrate. We have seen if there are data sheets, IEP, detailed IEP notes, communication book, emails, those kind of detailed information and then strong explanation is really important in all these hard to assess competency.

 Another knowledge competency that is hard to assess is strategies that ‑‑ promote visual and auditory development. And in this, we have seen those who present professional development products, that the training that they have attended and reflected on what they learned from those, those are the kind of artifacts and documentation guides that are effective with this particular competency.

 And the last one, which is hard to assess is vary the level of intensity of input and the pacing of activities. And we've seen video is again an effective documentation for this particular scale as well. Leanne, would you like to add to this?

 >> LEANNE: I'm bringing myself off mute. One of the things that I think is really wonderful is we selected ten random portfolios of the ones that have been successful and looked and listed all of the different ones ‑‑ the documentation types, and these are the lists. If they passed, this is what they used. If we're looking at standard 5 at that skill competency 6, vary the level of intensity of input and pacing, the only thing that was successful were videos in the portfolios we looked at. Umm, they're not getting it, then this is a useful tool for saying, maybe there's a way to make them more successful. These are ideas for competencies that we know are more difficult.

 >> RITU: All right. So again, how else interveners ‑‑ what else the interveners did that they were able to score higher on those as Leanne said, these examples are taken out of top ten successful portfolios. Strong narratives were a part of it. And we already talked about it, the importance of strong narratives and importance of addressing how the documentation is linked with each competency, how the documentation demonstrates each competency also reflecting carefully and thoughtfully and deeply about, you know, those three questions that are part of the explanation. And then under the thing that we have ‑‑ we feel that helped interveners score higher on these competencies is if the mentor has a deeper understanding of the scoring process and can explain to the intervener and prepare documentation and explanation, knowing that how when a reviewer is going to look at their portfolio or artifact, what length are they using? And that is the focus of our webinar today, is really looking at some of the artifacts with the reviewers' lens.

 Before we go into ‑‑ deeper into the scoring exercise, this, you have probably seen many times, the scoring rubric. There are two parts to it. The first part is the documentation, which is, you know, demonstration of the CEC competencies in terms of documentation. And again, there are four ‑‑ the rating scale is advanced, proficient, emerging, no evidence, and 60 percent of the score goes to that. And the second part is the explanation, which provides the context for the documentation. And again, it's the same four rating scale is the same. And one of the questions that always comes up is, what does it mean ‑‑ majority of identified competencies are demonstrated or minority are demonstrated. And on the next slide, we explain that. We're going to be sharing ‑‑ this rubric will be on the screen for you because when you participate in the scoring exercise, you need it in front of you. And this information is shared in NICE 1 and 2 modules also. What majority and minority means. And again, as I said, the rubric is going to be in front of you as we move into the scoring exercise. Leanne, anything else you need to add to this? Or should we just move on to the next slide?

 >> LEANNE: I think we're good to keep on going.

 >> RITU: All right. Go ahead.

 >> LEANNE: So you are going to come with me and we're going to do some scoring. We're going to look at all three parts of artifacts, check boxes, documentation and explanation. These are three complete artifacts adopted from portfolios. More than one, so this is repetition. And then we will have you score. We'll bring up a poll for you to score, and then we'll talk about the results and what we would recommend our reviewer score them as. From our side of things we train our reviewers to have a certain scoring and how we would like them to use this content. So you can see it from a reviewer's lens. Because we know reviewer mentors score higher. We want you to have that opportunity.

 So I'm going to ask Robbin to pull up the rubric to be down at the bottom. So while we go through this, think about what's going on with this rubric because we're going to score. So just to help as we go through. I'm going full screen for myself because I'm going to enter reading land.

 The first artifact is box of deaf‑blindness. We have photo, self‑study, in school, district training, self‑directed or team effort. This is information about that.

 And then those of you who were with us last time saw this box of deaf‑blindness, the competency they're using is the effect of combined vision and hearing loss on development and learning. Next one is learning style and communication of the individual. Lastly, audiological and ophthalmological conditions and functioning of the individual. I'm going to describe the documentation real quick. There's a box of deaf‑blindness that talks about their eye condition. They have a couple there. It talks about do they use implants, Braille and sign language? It talks about tactile input is important for them, really important because they've lost some parts around vibration. It also says they have a wheelchair. They love jokes and they have awkward social skills, wait times, social skills are near the head. Two implants. Love their mouth. Hearts around it. With that, there is an audiogram, and it shows their hearing without implants or without any correction and then corrected hearing.

 So I'm going to go to the explanations. I would say if you're using captioning, you're going to read it faster reading from the screen rather than listening to me. So I encourage you to hop on over there. Box of deaf‑blindness explanation.

 How does the documentation provided for this artifact support each associated competency? The documentation illustrates 1.K5 and 1.K16 demonstrating the ways that his vision functions, resulting in no vision in UN eye and patchy vision in the other. It also clarifies hearing with two CIs that yield great auditory attention in quiet environments. It exemplifies that how he access things in the classroom, change based on the environment as well as how he is processing such as the he was tired or hungry. The ways that he accesses Braille, touch, and need for reduced environmental sounds is also noted. 1.K15 is also addressed inasmuch as what his needs are.

 Now we're going to continue on with our two selected ‑‑ competency selected prompt 1 and 2. Describe the activity or activities depicted by the documentation and explain what the student or client is doing. How is it related to his or her goals or needs? [Reading prompt question 1].

 [Reading Prompt 2].

 So that is the artifact. So what I'd like to do now is we're going to do a little scoring. Let's go back to ‑‑ we're going to go through it one more time. I'm going to give you time to look at it and read if you would like to. Here's the box of deaf‑blindness. I'm going to stay on the slide for a minute and then a minute on the one after. Right now, just be thinking about what you would score, and then we'll bring up those polls.

 >> RITU: Should we move on to the explanation now?

 >> LEANNE: We are headed there now. And we're going to move on to our last one. Just a couple more seconds. And then Robbin, I'm going to have you bring up those polls for us. You're going to give a score for documentation. Here's the first one on your screen now. Explanation on the other. So if you want to go ahead and put those in. Someone's got to be brave and start. Thank you to whoever's the brave one that gave it a go.

 >> RITU: Oh, we see another one. Good. We're going to give you a few seconds. I know someone is trying to vote on explanation. I know you are.

 >> LEANNE: I would like to go on to the next slide. We're going to put those polls away. Thank you.

 So here's what we would recommend. One of the things that's really important if you would like ‑‑ let me end the poll. Here we go. One of the things that is important here is that when we look at the difference between artifacts looking at proficient and advanced, it's not [indiscernible]. The difference between emerging and proficient is different. That line is very hard for us. So the first one for documentation, we have provided a score of proficient because majority of the identified competencies are demonstrated. Suggestions that we would provide is to further demonstrate the impact of audiological and ophthalmological conditions and the impact of combined loss on development. So they had a lot of different parts of them and we felt that there was one competency it didn't demonstrate and one competency they needed to beef up. Still with that, if we go to majority, minority ‑‑ that's what our readers have to do. They have to look down to the fine line of where does it fall? 12? 3? Where are we at? That's the score we provide there. For explanation ‑‑ sorry ‑‑ provided score of advanced because explanation clearly described how the documentation provides support for the majority of competencies. That's what we would do there. Sounds good? Are there any questions on that one? Throw those in the chat pod and we'll answer them as we go.

 >> RITU: Leanne, could you talk a little louder?

 >> LEANNE: I can. I apologize. I'm talking soft. Is that any better?

 >> RITU: That's better. Thank you.

 >> LEANNE: We are at our second artifact, calling it transition bear. So this is a work sample, classroom, and it is a team effort. So there are competencies are use of touch to supplement auditory and visual input and to convey information and observe and identify communicative behavior and intent. There are two images. One is of ‑‑ it looks like a monkey, hot pink monkey attached to a wheelchair. It looks to be on one of those badge extenders that you can pull. And then the other image is of a student, they have it in their hand. It looks like they hold it and plopped it down. Set it down. Not sure what's going on there. But there is a hand on the monkey, hot pink guy. I like this. It's a fun animal, right? Okay.

 This is an explanation. We're going to start with the requirements prompts, how does the document provided for this artifact support each associated competency? [Reading text on slide]. I guess they're ducks. [Chuckling].

 [Reading Prompt 1]. [Reading Prompt 3].

 So I'm going to go back to the previous slide so you can take a look at that there, those competencies and the images that are associated. We're going to be here about 30 seconds.

 >> RITU: Do we need to insert the poll?

 >> LEANNE: I'm going to let them have time to look. Here's the explanation. I'm going to sit on this one for 30 seconds to a minute as well so you can take a look at it and score your best. Now I'm going to have Robbin do her magic again for me and do the polls. I'll like to give Robbin a real shout out. She was willing to make it all fit on one screen. I appreciate that. We'll give you a minute to think about the score and throw it up there and then we'll talk about what we would do. I'm feeling proud of them. Feeling proud. There's so much changing on this one, guys. It's tricky. It's tricky. At the end of the day, go back to the rubric. That's the only thing that can guide us in this process.

 Okay. We're going to call it. We're going to call it. Okay.

 So I will show you what we would have said. We would have given it emergent for both. Documentation, emergent because only minority of the competency is demonstrated. Consider using different documentation in conjunction with the images to further strengthen. This is something we talked about last time. A lot of times, you need multiple images of a thing whether it be throughout the day ‑‑ all we saw in that image was holding a bear. That was really all we saw. And then the bear was on the chair. So we needed to see more of that and how does that actually look? It's hard so we have to see it. There's that little bit there that we would suggest. And for explanation we would also say emergent. This is not clear and provides support only for a minority of competencies. That title there, the number, that's one of the things our reviewers love. When you talk about a competency, you have the number of the competency right there to give us a road map. They did that with one and addressed that really well. But they need to talk about the others. It's showing support for only a minority. Show more connection and evidence for the bear as a communication tool on behalf of the student is what our team would suggest. Connect that bridge for us. It talked about being too loud, but is it because all transitions are loud? How do we do to make it clear that that communication is getting across? There's ‑‑ we're left with a lot of questions. We want our reviewers to know that they really understand the skill, understand the knowledge. And leaving that gray area is what tips this one. We're going to go and do one more.

 Again, if you have questions, throw them down there. We'll get them. This is artifact 3 calendar. This is a photo work sample in school, district training, self‑directed and team effort.

 This is one we used from last time, use of calendar system. There is a calendar, cycle calendar mounted on some squares. There's 3 D objects with a ring, looks like a piece of newspaper, a chip clip, balloon and pork. They're on the wall. I think it's mounted on a piece of Velcro that runs along the wall. And with that, there is a chart. We'll call that a chart that has activities, symbols and phrase. There's the activity, like the activity is PE. The symbol is ball and the phrase is go, go, go. So showing how they use each of those.

 We're going to go to the explanation and here's a big one. [Reading text from slide].

 These are the two prompts that they selected, prompts 3 and 4. [Reading Prompt 3].

 [Reading Prompt 4]. Don't we wish every kid had a para educator like this? So then what I'm going to do is go back, look at that calendar real quick for about a couple seconds here. This is one you saw last time and had some chats about. Maybe a hint if you remember. Going on here is the explanation for the first one. We're going to stay on this slide. You'll have a chance to look at that real quick. Going on one more time.

 And now, Robbin, could you bring up those polls one more time for us? Thank you so much. She's making this magic happen. I think when we do webinars, we're going to do more polls because it's riveting watching you guys vote, guys. This is the best one I had all day. I'm going to call it ‑‑ oh, we have some new voters.

 >> RITU: Oh, I'm excited.

 >> LEANNE: Okay. Thank you. We're going to show you what we would have suggested and what we would have said for our reviewers. Document is emergent. Justification is it did not demonstrate the use of a calendar. This is a skills competency so we want to show that you know how to use it. Suggestions for improvement would be include an image of the student using the calendar with the candidate. Even a simple how do we use this, how do we take him off. Are we doing it together? So some more information that it's being used. Explanation we would have given advanced. Most of us were on the same page. This was a great explanation. It clearly described how the documentation provided support the competency. And this is really quickie going back to the rubric because there's only one competency, right? How does the majority identify? Right? So again, how we really lean on that rubric, it's really down to the number of competencies, down to that majority, minority, demonstrating it in a way that's clear, no guessing. Any questions on that one? You're a quiet bunch today.

 Okay. We're going to keep going. I'm going to pass it over to Ritu.

 >> RITU: Yes. So one of the things that we wanted to share today was really the perspective of those mentors who are reviewers. And we ‑‑ there's ‑‑ we have two mentors here who are also in the reviewer role, and I'll just give a brief instructions about them and they can tell us a bit more about themselves and we'll probably leave the prompts on the slide and they will address the question. First is about in their role as a NICE reviewer, what is it that they've learned which has helped them in their role as a NICE mentor. And they'll also ‑‑ the next question that is focused on really what advice they have for other mentors so that they can help their interveners to obtain high scores, what feedback practices are effective with the interveners, how they may show that the completion of the portfolio is timely. These are the kind of things they will share their perspectives on. So the two mentors reviewers we have are Nicole Marcelo and Tina Hertzog. Nicole is from the Utah [indiscernible] project. And Tina brings in a lot of experience as a teacher. She works with students with visual impairments and she's been doing a lot of work in Pennsylvania and she probably shares more about all her experience. And I'll let her speak for herself rather than me trying to say things that I may not be communicating as accurately as she can. So I would like to invite now Nicole and Tina to kind of share their perspective. And Tina, Nicole, you can unmute by pressing pound 6.

 >> NICOLE: Hey, perfect. I can go and share, Tina. Or if you want to start, you can. Can you hear me okay?

 >> RITU: Yes, we can hear you, Nicole. Please go ahead and tell us a bit about yourself and address the questions that are on the slide.

 >> NICOLE: And I'm really lucky to work in Utah where we've got a pretty big intervener base. And we've also got ‑‑ I work on our training team to help train the interveners. So we've got a lot of support here for the interveners, and we are really, really excited when they started the opportunity for them to do a portfolio. So we've had a couple of ours go through. It's been a really good process. I see how it benefits the interveners and how their confidence goes up as they complete this process.

 So I've had a couple interveners go through and finish and I'm working with one right now, to complete her portfolio. I'll start off with the first question that she talked about, is just that how did being a reviewer kind of help me as a mentor. I think mainly it gave me a better understanding of the whole process. So I kind of from that understood better ‑‑ for example, one of the things I realized as I was a reviewer, if the person doing a portfolio just views one artifact the whole time, maybe they just wrote some used documentation and wrote everything, it was really hard for me to read that for as many hours as it takes to review it. And so I understood kind of the importance of having some variety in the artifacts that they chose.

 I think it also helped me understand the importance of clarity when they're writing their explanations and the importance of tying that explanation to each of the competencies that was chosen. So that's it. It really has kind of benefitted me as a mentor, being a reviewer. I think it's given me a greater depth of knowledge.

 One of the things as far as advice goes, like how to obtain a high score, I think the biggest thing both myself and another colleague in Utah, Debbie has helped the interveners as they go through the NICE process that we feel is really important is making sure that when they do the artifact and also the explanation that they connect each of the competencies to it. We've noticed if we can help them make sure they're doing that, then they can obtain that higher score. And I'm just going to kind of go on to the feedback because they all kind of tie together. As far as our feedback practices, one of the things we found really helpful is if we front load with them instead of kind of giving them a little here and there. It's at the beginning. We help them understand the process. We try and look at their artifacts together and help them understand what makes a good artifact, ask them questions to help them think about their artifact. Then we found after they've done a couple of those artifacts really well, we've gone over that process, then they can begin to do it more on their own and they don't need as much as that feedback which can kind of free you up. Then we say, why don't you do a couple artifacts and send them to them and we can give you some feedback?

 And what that kind of looks like with our first meeting, so when we first meet with them, we kind of discuss with them what an artifact should be, so making sure they understand that. And then we go over that rubric with them. We talked about the different types of documentation for an artifact and then we look at the standards for note taking and talk about how they can go through the competency and start writing down things that they think could be artifacts for that.

 And then the other thing that we feel was important was to talk about the job of the mentor and their job so that we understand clearly what my responsibilities are and what their responsibilities are and that one of their responsibilities is to make sure that they show up for those meetings. And then our responsibility is to help give them that feedback and that support that they need. That's what we kind of do for that first meeting.

 And then once they've got one or two artifacts, we try and meet together with them. If we have more than one person going through it at the same time, sometimes we've been lucky enough to have two of them meet together and then it's been nice. They've been able to give each other feedback as they share the artifacts too if they want to do that. Some of the questions that we feel are important after they've created that artifact and we're giving them some feedback, we found instead of just giving them direct feedback, it's better if we ask them questions to get them thinking about it and then to discuss it. Then it helps them as they create the artifact to keep thinking about these questions. The first thing we ask them is always just making sure that the artifacts, is this something I can change or responded to to make sure that they're not pulling something off of, like, YouTube or something that really is not something they created. And then the next things that we really feel is important is we ask them about the artifact and making sure that those competencies are clearly defined. We say, just looking at the artifact, could I say what competencies can goes with? And if not, could you attach a word, a video document that explains it?

 So the other questions we ask, like with the written work sample, we ask, have I given enough examples of my writing that she how I apply the knowledge of the competencies to working my job? Or do I have broad statements? Have I addressed each of the competencies that each of the artifacts represented? And we have those questions written down so they can see them each time. But as we discuss those, it helps them to internalize, oh, I kind of did a broad statement as they read it out loud. Or you know what? I only did two of the competencies. And once they start to look at that critically, then the rest of the time, they're able to do the artifacts a lot more on their own and we don't have to give them as much of a feedback. We usually meet with them over a Zoom meeting. And when we do that, I try and make sure that the feedbacks I'm giving to them, I write down in an email so they've got that also.

 And then I say as far as that goes, one of the last things that's really important is it's so easy to get caught up in this might be better this way or this, critical feedback. And they need that good feedback too. They need you to be their cheer leaders. They are going to feel overwhelmed and you need to help them see, no, you're doing a good job. Keep going. To really help them move forward and to see the work they're doing is making a difference.

 As far as helping them complete it timely, again, we kind of remind them at the beginning that part of their responsibilities. We originally tried scheduling the meetings for the entire year but that didn't work because times changed. So we did one meeting and we used the CEC standards for note taking to kind of go over different artifacts they can do and say what are the first ones we want to tackle and then what's the next one? And one of the things we found is standard 1 is a little harder to tackle at the beginning so we usually start with standard 5. The other ones are a little easier for them.

 The other thing that was helpful for us is we try and let them know in the beginning that we want them to finish maybe a month before the deadline so we have time to review it ourselves and give them the extra feedback that they need. Those are just a little of some, I guess, things we have found beneficial as mentors as we kind of have gone through this process.

 >> RITU: Thank you, Nicole. Tina, go ahead and please share your thoughts.

 >> TINA: Thank you. I think this is a great ‑‑ I was taking notes when Nicole was talking because this is an established protocol they have put together. Here in Pennsylvania, we're at step 1. I think that's a good comparison in terms of where we're at. So to answer the first question, I don't want to do an infomercial for the reviewing program, but I feel if you're mentoring, the best you can do for your intervener candidate is to become a reviewer because I've been a reviewer, reviewed about five e‑portfolios, not that many, but I've been part of it from the beginning and I was just very surprised how rigorous the program is and how high the bar is to reach that proficiency for a class of competencies. So I think you understand the depths and rigor of this certification program, becoming a reviewer would be to your benefit.

 As you can see just a little bit of scoring, there's a lot of nuance to how things are scored. And I'm so ‑‑ the more practice you have in that, the better you can be a mentor.

 In terms of the advice, we are just kind of beginning this step in Pennsylvania. So what we've done ‑‑ and because I also facilitate these [indiscernible] modules in the state. One of the things is that we try to get to our candidates early in the training process for them to think about certification. So when I'm providing feedback to them while they're going through the modules, we can start thinking about who's going to be the best match for mentor. We're lucky that we have several of our students that are intervener candidates who are ‑‑ have onsite mentors who are ‑‑ one is a certified ‑‑ a credentialed intervener herself, and the other two are very ‑‑ have a lot of knowledge in deaf‑blindness. So they don't have to have that distance piece. But we get the mentor set up, and they take NICE 1 and 2 right away.

 And then after the candidate has taken the first 8 modules, they take NICE 1 and 2. So they see the process at that far end of where they're going. And while I am providing feedback to them as a facilitator in the modules, I can ‑‑ I can also be kind of like a mentor for them as well by giving them some feedback in the work that they're doing. So as a mentor, I would say, if you are ‑‑ if you are working with a candidate that is just going through the training program, to really touch base with whoever is facilitating that program. So that person will be able to let you know what their candidate's strengths are as they're doing the work in the modules.

 You might even ask to have you become a non‑editing teacher in the module so you can see the work that's being done and the feedback that they're given. I just did that last night with a mentor. The candidate completed module 27, which is kind of a pre‑e portfolio module. So I said here, take a look at what the candidate did and my feedback. So get involved in that process. We get all of that out of the way before we even start getting the student, the candidate a mentor. All of the training is done. They're hooked up with their mentor at least six months in advance or even a year before we even talk about mentor system because we want to make sure that we are really working towards mastering proficiency in collecting their artifacts and in starting to write their documentation. So when it comes to timely completion, we hope to get a lot of the work out of the way before they even get into venture. It's a matter of getting it into the venture system and the mentor and candidate, you know, looking at it from that point of view. But a lot of the work has been done ahead of time.

 The other thing I'd just like to share is if you're a mentor that is not within a close proximity of the candidate you're mentoring, they're in another part of the state or maybe another state, you need to connect with that individual as much as you can face‑to‑face. And I see that Nancy Steele is on the call. She does mentoring some people out of state and she's made the track to talk to them face‑to‑face because it's important that you get that understanding of that person, spend some time observing, see that candidate at their work site.

 And then when you're looking at artifacts, especially video artifacts, that takes a nuance in itself in terms of video analysis. And so you want to ‑‑ I always, you know, would say about videos is that the transition is important as the activity. So you might want to say to your candidate, look, I want to see what's happening before the activity that you want me to see and after the activity that you want me to see because there's a lot of instruction that goes on in those acts of transition as well. So that's the only thing I would say if you're working with them at a distance, is that making sure you're seeing more than just what they want you to see.

 Again, just last night, sometimes as an intervener, it's so accustomed to thinking about the student. I don't know if it was Leanne or someone that said that in another webinar. It's about them, and they're not used to looking at it from their perspective. You know, the competency is what they're doing in terms of interaction with their student and not the student. So I think that's also something for you to really stress. Okay. That's it for me.

 >> RITU: All right. Thank you Tina. Thank you so much. And I think the statement you made about being reviewers, there's a few who are not reviewers, please let us know if you're interested in becoming a reviewer.

 Taking you to the last slide, most of it was covered by what Tina and Nicole shared with us. It's the planning that goes on before they start uploading their artifacts that's the most important part of the whole process. We talked about all these forms we have shared. Action plan form is the one that you start in your first or second meeting. You know, what competencies ‑‑ what are the [indiscernible] different competencies and timeline, all the process around feedback form, how to provide timely feedback. You don't wait for them to complete all the artifacts and then start providing feedback. It should be the first few, you might need to go back and forth a lot and then ‑‑ it's really as you go along, you provide feedback. And the mentor checklist is the final document. It's a new checklist we have added right before submission, making sure that everything is checked off. All the permissions are there, all the artifacts are complete, anything else that is needed is there. So all these forms are on the website that Kristi talked about in the link that she provided. And we are one minute away from 2:00 at our end [chuckling]. If you have any questions, feel free to share those. One of the things we wanted to tell you was is the data we collect from interveners after the completion of their portfolio, the factor that this is most important is the [indiscernible] what we get from mentors. What you do, the mentors, you play a crucial role in what you do for your interveners. It's priceless. That's why we really want you to use these tools. Come to us if you have more questions and let us know if we can help you in any other way. Typing. I know exactly the time is up, but we still ‑‑ we are here if you have any questions about any of the artifacts that we shared. We are here. We're happy to address those.

 >> ROBBIN: Thank you, Ritu and Leanne.

 >> RITU: Thank you for all your help, Robbin.

 >> ROBBIN: Thank you, Nicole and Tina. That was good information you shared as well.

 >> RITU: Yes. Thank you very much. And thank you to all the attendees for coming and listening to us.

 >> ROBBIN: We're going to wrap it up.

 >> RITU: All right. Thank you.

 [End of webinar].