

**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**Ohio Association of Private Colleges of Teacher Education**  
**MVNU Campus, 2000 Polaris Parkway Columbus, Ohio**  
**May 13, 2011**

**Call to Order** – Amy McClure, in Mif Obach’s absence, called the meeting to order at 10: 05 AM and welcomed all visitors.

**Special Reports**

- I. Discussion on issues raised during “Academic Quality and Assurances Q & A Day”
  - a. A number of people attended the Q & A
  - b. Some concerns remain regarding the US Department of Education’s acceptance of the new CAEP accreditation though Bonnie Beach indicated that AACTE does not believe that is a problem.
  - c. HLC is now going to review dual enrollment programs
- II. Tom Bordenkircher – OBR follow-up
  - a. Role of State in Program Review process needs some clarification
    - i. State role in CAEP reviews still unclear because of the close relationship between OBR and the institutions
    - ii. A continuing review process may be redundant. Rather than a form, the Standards might be posted on a website that institutions and institutions would enter data that indicate meeting standards and keep data updated annually.
    - iii. Tom thinks the national review process is important as outlined in Option 2. Option 2 is a peer review process conducted at the national level. This is a free option folded into the institution’s CAEP fee but not the same as the SPA review.
    - iv. Next week is the CAEP Clinic when Option 2 and other considerations will be ironed out. Check the Educator website in two weeks for updates.
    - v. Tom helped us consider the role of metrics in Program Review. Tom suggested that 3 years of low performance might trigger a Form A requirement to resubmit a program. Low performing benchmarks need to be clearly defined for programs.
    - vi. The future in teacher education is looking at the performance/success of each school’s teacher candidates not the program. This new view will minimize program review.
    - vii. Website: The updates to the metrics Tom referenced are now available on Ohio Educator Central -  
<http://www.uso.edu/newsUpdates/media/releases/2010/12/docs/OhioPreparationMetrics.pdf>

- b. Option 2 is scheduled to start in 2013
- c. Tom is meeting with the Chancellor to discuss the metrics and the role of metrics in our program assessment/evaluation process. The dominance of metrics to evaluate the program at the state level would suggest that state continuing program review is not necessary.
- d. New elements will be/may be added to Form A by the Chancellor
- e. During a visit, the State visitor would randomly check course syllabi and faculty credentials that provide evidence of meeting the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession, Ohio School Operating Standards, and Dyslexia or future Ohio Standards. There might be some checklist to confirm this evaluation.
- f. Every outside provider must also go through the Form A review process other than Teacher for America.
- g. Unit and Program Reviews by the state will be holistic and total.
- h. In fall may need to form sub-committee with SUED around some certification requirements that can be met by undergraduate and graduate programs.
- i. Tom suggested that he will present this plan to the Chancellor and hopefully in 30 days confirm that the following will occur:
  - i. Program review is important. Continuing program review for approved and functioning programs through FORM A may not be best use of our time. The cost is also \$1000/program.
  - ii. Assurance programs will a check of of Ohio Standards during the onsite CAEP visit. A checklist could be created will be used to evaluation incorporation of the Ohio Standards for Teaching Profession and Ohio Operating Standards during the onsite review. There would be no additional costs.
  - iii. Form A will be required for new programs or for State designated low performing programs
  - iv. All units must choose Option 1 or 2 for their individual programs as part of CAEP.
- j. NOVA is moving into Ohio in the Holmes/Muskingham Counties area to deliver teacher education.

### III. Business Meeting

- a. Acceptance of April minutes – Carol Ziegler presented the April Minutes. Judy Wahrman to accept the minutes. Jeannie Sternad seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.
- b. Treasurer’s update - Judy Wahrman presented the Treasurer’s Report. There was little discussion. Mike Smith moved to accept the report. Carol Ramsay seconded the motion. The report was unanimously approved.

- c. Old Business
  - i. Amendment to HB 51 (Teach for America) was accepted by the House
  - ii. AICUO representation on State Board of Education – The participants engaged in a brief discussion of this issue. No conclusion was reached though participants felt their presidents should be aware of what might appear to be a conflict of interest.
- d. New Business
  - i. 2011 OCTEO fall conference schedule (Joy Cowdery/Jennifer Fager)
  - ii. Proposed financial support for OCTEO speakers (Judy Wahrman). At this point, the conference committee does not believe they need the OAPCTE financial support. No decision was made at this time.
  - iii. 2011 OCTEO fall conference grants – Participants were encouraged to take advantage of the conference grants. New faculty and graduate students are the primary target audience of these grants.
  - iv. Update on meeting with new Chancellor, Jim Petro – Mike Smith shared a few comments on his meeting with the Jim Petro. The new Chancellor is eager to partner with schools of education and work with SUED and OAPCTE as he crafts his vision for education.

#### IV. Announcements

V. Adjournment at 12:04 PM.

VI. Next Meeting: June 10, 2011