



Executive Committee Meeting
Ohio Association of Private Colleges of Teacher Education
Ashland University – Columbus Center, Route 161, Columbus, Ohio
June 8, 2012

Linda Billman called meeting to order at 10:04

Updates

- I. AICUO—Dustin Holfinger—Cooperating teacher compensation
 - a. Dustin talked to Todd and nothing is moving now. They are monitoring response to the Ethics Commission Decision
 - b. The only viable response is new legislation. There is the conviction that this decision needs to be reversed.
 - c. Linda noted that both public and private institutions share a vision. A simple online survey will be created to assess the numbers of student teachers/cooperating teachers throughout the state. It was noted that the survey should include number of placements since some student teachers have two or more placements.
 - d. The survey questions must be carefully articulated to emphasize the importance and justice of the compensation.
 - e. A comment was made that this decision did not represent a change in practice for some institutions. The survey should ask about current agreements that some IHEs use.
 - f. Mid-Ohio Educational Service Center (ESC) is working with Mt Nazarene on a grant where the paperwork documents that teachers can be compensated for their work. ODE approved this RFP and someone may have missed this element of the Mid-Ohio RFP Grant. This documentation points out the complexity and inconsistency around the issue.
- II. Metrics – Karen Herrington
 - a. The committee is reorganizing and editing the metrics as established by the OBR
 - i. Teacher Preparation Quality Measures: 4 measure confirmed
 1. Assurances (now in Section A)
 2. Continuous Improvement (Section B)
 3. Excellence and Innovation (Section C). An operating definition is provided for the phrase Excellence and Innovation.
 4. The Mentor Survey was changed to an Alumni Survey and is included in Section B (Continuous Improvement). Alumni Survey is the 4th data point. This survey will come from OBR using the Resident Educator

database. The question was raised if the IHEs could have access to the alumni survey to send to candidates who may be hired out of state.

- b. This year, the Pre-Service Survey yielded 1586 responses across institutions – Overall state response rate was 56.2% with 19 institutions involved. Karen will send out a State mean. Some of this new data may allow us to have statewide conversations around the data at OCTEO.
- c. Carol Ziegler made a motion that Karen Herrington’s report on the reorganization and the changes within the metrics be accepted by OAPCTE. Rae Harriott White seconded the motion . The motion passed unanimously with one “no” vote and one “abstain.”
- d. A second motion was created focusing on the Alumni Survey. The proposal was made that OBR send out a web link with the same Alumni Survey that OBR sends directly to resident educators. The link will be sent to each institution that in turn could send this Alumni Survey to their non-resident practicing teachers to collect the same data regarding their teacher preparation experience. Amy McClure made the motion and Katie Kinnucan Welsch seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.
- e. Karen presented the Principal Quality Measures Draft for review
 - i. Same language of Assurances (Section A)
 - ii. Continuous Improvement (Section B) The fourth bullet notes the mentor and employer surveys
 - iii. The committee deleted the point that assessed international experience
 - iv. A question was raised regarding the final bullet in both Quality Measures documents. The final bullet states “other initiatives determined by the Chancellor”
 - v. The suggestion was made to retain the same language around surveys for the Principal programs. This document would be companion piece to the Teacher Preparation Quality Measures.
 - vi. Katie Kinnucan Welsch made a motion to endorse the Principal Preparation Quality Measurements draft document with the noted changes. It was also noted that OAPCTE wants full clarification of each item with specific attention to value-added element. Sonya Smith seconded. Motion carried.
 - vii. Every metric on the report will have an introductory paragraph that will articulate the meaning of the data and possible limitations.
 - viii. The Report Card will be a web-based report. Several teams are working on creating this report.

III. Ohio Board of Regents—Sheryl Hansen

- a. A new website is now available: <http://ohiohighered.org>. On this new OBR site, there are a number of changes and updates. Sheryl asked every institution to review the site.
- b. Sheryl confirmed that OBR does not need to review a program there is less than 50% change in a program curriculum.
- c. Update on Program Review Process that will begin in fall 2012
 - i. Program meeting review scheduled for early July

- ii. Sheryl distributed 4 copies of a new Form A draft. The new change is that every institution will be required to do a curriculum map. The matrix will be the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (OSTP on the X-axis) in relation to the institution's courses go along top of the matrix (Y-axis). A simple code of **I** – Introduce or **A** - if Assessed must indicate where that OSTP is addressed in coursework.
 - iii. Form C – Continuing Program Review is a little different. See new format.
 - d. Sheryl will work with individual institutions regarding the form to use especially over the summer. Institutions can use the forms that are presently in place. If you used the curriculum map for form C, OBR will reduce the cost by \$500. This should save work and target the information
 - e. Newest form from OBR is Form Z: Candidate Information and Data – This report summarizes the Student Outcome Data. OBR will communicate with institutions regarding the form/s to submit.
 - f. Sheryl has a plan for an information day with an update on forms, an update on CAEP, and an update on data requirements in these new program review processes.
 - g. Sheryl updated us on new out of state/online programs requesting permission to deliver programs in the State of Ohio. They must all comply with the Ohio metrics.
 - h. Sheryl will communicate final versions of new forms when approved.
- IV. Teacher Performance Assessment—Donna Hanby will send out updates electronically
- a. Pearson has indicated that the data will not be available until July or August given the fact that there is still a June submission date.
 - b. There will be no charge for fall data and TPA. There is no decision about spring yet.
 - c. OBR hopes to make the TPA a part of licensure. Several are involved in this decision: three from OBR, three individuals from ODE and a representative from the Governor's Office.
 - d. A Design Team (DT) went from Ohio to Stanford University. There will be new TPA handbooks given the need to edit the present handbooks and the rubrics.
 - e. The Design Team (DT) meeting is evaluating the elements of the rubric to avoid redundancy. Remember, two certified scorers review each TPA
 - f. DT looking at adding a classroom climate element to the TPA. Given feedback, the DT is looking at prompts and other elements that will simplify the directions. Fall candidates will use the previously published handbooks and rubrics.
 - g. Remember the TPA is one piece of many parts leading to the licensure decision.
 - h. At the State Level, Donna reminded us of the annual reports due. She will summarize these reports at the fall OCTEO meeting.
 - i. Donna is analyzing the student teacher TPA follow-up surveys as well as those submitted by IHE faculty supervisors and cooperating teachers.
 - j. Let Donna know if you have ideas. They are looking for more ideas for the Resource Kit for the TPA.

- k. Donna is willing and able to come and do TPA presentations to institutions for faculty supervisors, student teachers, cooperating teachers.
- l. Donna noted that there will be new training with the new handbooks. Watch for this in fall. There will be regional meetings.
- m. Pearson does not know submission windows for fall.
- n. Donna looking for a technology “go to person” to support TPA and Student Teachers

Business Meeting

- I. Approval of May Minutes—Carol Ziegler
 - a. Participants reviewed copies of the minutes distributed at the meeting.
 - b. Katie Kinnucan Welsch made a motion to approve May Minutes, Diane Nelson seconded. Minutes from May approved.
- II. Treasurer’s Report—Judy Wahrman
 - a. The auditor’s report is complete. There were two discrepancies related to uncashed checks. Those discrepancies will be corrected.
 - b. Judy did not have books or checks for May and June to write the reimbursement checks. Judy will work with Sally to guide her through the reimbursement process. MapQuest documentation will be a new part of the reimbursement process.
 - c. The 14 members of the Executive Committee are reimbursed for mileage.
- III. New Business
 - a. OCTEO Planning Meeting – We will have an update in fall outlining the role of the planning committee
 - b. Melissa Cardenas is working with a new committee around Reading and Writing Standards. Question surfaced whether this new committee is only open to public universities. John Carroll indicated that they are part of this committee.
 - c. Madeline Smith is a new member of the Academic Assurance Office at the OBR. She is an Ohio State graduate pursuing a law degree as she works at OBR.
 - d. OBR has hired Rebecca Watts to work on PreK - 16 initiatives was chief of staff for the President at Ohio University.
 - e. Request was made for Education Department Faculty Handbook. Linda Billman will help facilitate the collection and sharing of Education Department Faculty Handbooks.
 - f. A question surfaced about the Intervention specialists and their ability to become highly qualified. The reading endorsement is most commonly used as a path to becoming highly qualified.
- IV. Other
- V. Adjournment—Meeting adjourned at 12:08 Diane Nelson moved to adjourn, Susan Constable seconded the motion.