

**Teacher Education Coordinators Meeting**  
**January 14, 2011**  
**Minutes**

Attending: Joanne Arhar, Nancy Barbour, Rebecca Chism, Sarah Rilling, Robin Vande Zande, Erin La Sala, William Kist, Averil McClelland, Janice Kroeger, Andrew Wiley, Lyle Barton, Janice Hutchison, Connie Collier, Donna Bernert, Jim Kanpp, Lowell Zurbuch, Lori Wilfong, Sandra Pech, Pat Grutzmacher, Meghan Harper.

Absent: Margaret Haas, Andrea Shearer, Patrick O'Connor, Drew Tiene, Bette Brooks, Charity Snyder, Ramona Freeman, Sue Grogan-Johnson.

Guests: Claudia Khoury-Bowers

**Welcome and introductions**

**Call for volunteers to revise student teaching evaluation**

The student teaching evaluations will need to be updated to reflect the new teacher performance standards. Coordinators interested in working on this project should contact Connie Collier.

**Blue Ribbon panel report on clinical practice**

Joanne asked the coordinators to go to the link (provided) and read the AACTE Endorsement of the NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel Report on Clinical Preparation. The CEAC will be reviewing the disposition assessment and will provide guidance to TEC with regard to direction for the assessment. For consideration: School districts need to have greater role in preparation of teachers; the report contains a number of references to the medical model; there is a need for us to address some of the concerns in the report. The report was completed by a diverse panel and it appears that we may need to think somewhat differently regarding student teaching.

**Disposition assessments**

TLC faculty and University Counsel met to discuss a series of case studies related to student dispositions. There was great discussion about issues and several suggestions for changes including shortening the assessment to 10 – 12 items, collapsing and simplifying language for students, getting professional language to students at the beginning, emphasizing behavioral language, not personality. It was noted that some faculty are reluctant, unsure or fear legal issues when completing disposition assessments. TEC needs to discuss next steps for the discussion. Disposition assessments are part of NCATE and state metrics. During discussion, coordinators learned that at Stark campus, disposition assessments were used to dismiss two students. As a result one student filed a grievance and won. The student was permitted back in the program, although she did not return. The faculty wasn't sure about the process and would like more tangible guidelines. The question presented was then whether grievance hearings should be heard at the regional campus level or if they should be heard at the EHHS level. Joanne shared a sample copy of the disposition assessment and asked coordinators to consider if it is time to change the assessment. She told coordinators that they should be looking at how students apply the knowledge they have; that evaluation is required in three courses – Education in a Democratic Society, a methods course and student teaching, but that evaluations may be done in any other course as well. She asked for volunteers to review the disposition assessment with Alexa Sandmann and her. Those volunteering were Janice Kroeger, Robin Vande Zande. Additionally, programs should agree on what items mean for the specific program.

**Timeline for TPA**

Joanne shared a draft timeline for the TPA which was provided at the December SUED meeting. She said that the state will set the cut score for student teachers to be licensed and also that they may use the TPA to evaluate 3<sup>rd</sup> year resident teachers. The group who went to Columbus will get together and decide if one of the programs will volunteer for the pilot. We have some information from the State about the MOU but legal has some concerns and nothing has been decided yet. In the MOU, the TPA is to be fully implemented in 2013 but metrics are to be reported to the State in 2012. The student teaching evaluation will need to be revised before 2013. Joanne shared that our TWS is good; it may have a couple of missing pieces but just needs some adjustment. One missing item was noted as videotaping; it was suggested that flip cams work well and are already in use by some faculty. No equipment purchase is needed – the student is responsible for getting the camera when it is needed. Andrew Wiley will invite a new faculty member who has used this technology to share her work with the TEC. A coordinator asked if the MOU addressed the copyright of materials and Nancy responded that it is complex but she was pleased with the complexity of the language. She said that it highlights the notion of content knowledge and expertise to be demonstrated through the use of language (reflections, conception, and organization). She recommended visiting the PACT website for handbook related to content areas.

### **Ohio preparation metrics**

The OBR metrics committee began as the Deans' of state and private institutions response to HB1 (legislation that required metrics to evaluate teacher education programs). The committee worked for eight months to develop minimum standards – licensure exams, TPA, value-added growth metrics (most difficult) and looked at many models. The value-added will be determined by ODE. The committee also all agreed to remain in CAEP (NCATE).

### **Poverty curriculum group discussion** (Claudia Khourey-Bowers)

Claudia briefly described the work of the poverty curriculum group and summarized their goal as working to better prepare teachers to teach in low income environments. Claudia distributed a survey to coordinators and asked them to complete it and also take extra copies back to their faculty members for completion and return to her. She also shared that this spring the faculty will develop the first curriculum module for classroom use and will make it available to others. It will be a video and will provide students with different situations and in which they will address the needs of diverse populations. In all, there will be five modules. Claudia asked that respondents rank their preferences in order. The top three will modules will be piloted in Fall 2011. The group has already received much positive feedback and is anxious to move forward.

### **NCATE update** (Nancy Barbour)

Nancy shared a handout listing the new options for program review. She also reminded coordinators that NCATE is now CEAP. She and Joanne will be attending a meeting in April (in Atlanta) that will provide additional information for us. EHHS chose the continuous improve option (as opposed to innovation). TEC needs to choose which NCATE standards to focus on. The choices are:

1. Candidate knowledge
2. Unit assessment
3. Field experience standard
4. Diversity (this was an area for improvement)
5. Faculty
6. Governance (resources)

Nancy said that she will be interviewing individuals about how we are doing on these. Discussion reflected that most coordinators were interested in the diversity standard, and it was noted that improving diversity can/will result in improvement in other standards. Nancy said that the focus needs determined soon and reminded coordinators that the first offsite visit is six months prior to the site visit. The site visit

is a summative visit –the committee will be looking at the pieces earlier. SPA reports are due Sept. 2012. She recommended using Option C (from the handout).

#### **Charter school proposal update**

Joanne shared that that she had attended another meeting with the Provost and others to discuss the proposed charter school. Gloria Dunnivan presented the proposal and the discussion paralleled the TEC December discussion. Items noted were money, time and resources. The Provost asked the Deans to have groups to consider the focus *if* this happens. A charter school would need to fit with the university mission and be supported by both EHHS and A&S. It was noted that Bowling Green is doing something similar now and that Akron might be a better location – that they need a STEM high school. For now, nothing is happening.

#### **Clinical Experiences update**

Jim said that the placements for Fall 2011 will be going out on Feb. 14 and that he is expecting delays in responses as school preparing for budget cuts. He will email the coordinators an update.