

OREGON ASSOCIATION
OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

DRAFT MINUTES—FEBRUARY 9, 2011

GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY, SALEM CAMPUS

Present (Those who signed the roster)

Jan Albrecht, Concordia University
Janine Allen, Corban College
Mark Ankeny, Pacific University
Dana Barbarick, Concordia University
Steve Bernhisel, Linfield College
Dew Anna Brumley, Warner-Pacific College
Michael Bullis, University of Oregon
Jan Carpenter, George Fox University
Scott Fletcher, Lewis and Clark College
Thomas Greene, University of Portland
Bob Hamm, University of Phoenix
Randy Hitz, Portland State University
Jim Howard, Northwest Christian University
Sheila Joshi, Multnomah University
Margaret Mahoney, University of Oregon
Joe Mannion, Concordia University
Lynn McMahan, Marylhurst University
Keith Menk, Teacher Standards and Practices Commission
Debi Miller, Multnomah University
Geoff Mills, Southern Oregon University
Bonnie Morihara, Teaching Research Institute
Rita Moore, Willamette University
Hilda Rosselli, Western Oregon University
Tom Ruhl, Marylhurst University
Linda Samek, George Fox University
Shelley Smolnisky, Pacific University
Heather Stanhope, Eastern Oregon University
Sue Thompson, Western Oregon University
John Watzke, University of Portland
Bruce Weitzel, University of Portland

Pre-Meeting: Notes about Video Analysis Tool (Notes are rough. –B.H.)

EVIRX, Web-based,

Person being watched can use any kind of camera; doesn't matter what kind of file.

Upload video file. Upload into system. No edit, no convert.

Share videos

Once video is uploaded, go to analysis. Preloaded assessment instrument.

Can upload state standard or whatever assessment template we want.

Accessible to people who have an acct

HIPPA aware of issues

Store videos up to a year after student graduates.

Univ can keep certain videos in library

Can create a video library for instructor to share with class

Can set up two cameras, one focused on teacher and one on students

License \$49.95 account for Supervising Teacher and Cooperative Teacher 12 month license unlimited upload. Tech support. Training.

Interface with TaskStream or other electronic portfolio? Single sign-on.

It's up to TaskStream to allow Video Analysis in. VA is open to it.

If multiple organizations come together, there are discounts.

How many people can view same video at same time from multiple locations? Unlimited.

Any concern from accreditation agencies? Built to meet security needs

State accrediting or NCATE? State more than national

Using video = power of evidence. Not relying on personal memory

Can build teams, tutorials

Minimum number of student accounts? No.

arecesso@evrix.com

OACTE Feb 9, 2011

Meeting called to order 9:05 by Mark Ankeny

Introductions

All 19 institutions in attendance

Minutes sent out by Bob earlier in week. **Motion Hilda Rosselli /Scott Fletcher. Approved.**

Question by Hilda: Have we set up with Chuck White about meeting next fall. Other items getting our attention at this time. Will still arrange for this.

Other agenda items:

1. Hilda Rosselli: Are we planning on anyone representing OACTE in June at Day on the Hill?
If we want to plan work time other than meeting time for summer, we can put on calendars. Mark: Process has been president who normally goes to Day on Hill. Randy Hitz is next year's president. If Randy available, he should be our representative in June.
2. Rita Moore: will return as faculty at Willamette so will not continue as treasurer ("financial wizard")
3. Bonnie Morihara: T.J. Chandler of EdZapp wants to know if we want a presentation on teacher supply and demand. Suggestion: Fall meeting with OSPA

Rita Moore: Treasurer's report.

1. \$7,825.43. One payment to Pac Univ for 2010 meeting in Bend.
2. Two universities need to send in their dues.
3. Motion to approve cost for lunch out of treasury **Motion Margaret Mahoney / Dew Anna Brumley. Motion carried.**

Website update: Bonnie

1. Handout #1. OACTE member list. Who should be taken off or added? Please update Bonnie.
2. Handout #2. Deans and directors for 2011.
3. Handout #3. Contacts at universities
4. Print out of meeting information on website.
5. Check out websites to make sure that information is correct.
6. Oregon papers at OACTE: send to Bonnie PowerPoint or papers can be part of the resources
7. Reimburse Mark Girod at WOU for OACTE.org domain name. \$45.39 for three years. **Motion to continue domain name: Heather Stanhope/Hilda Rosselli. Approved.**
8. Only one university website difficult to find local program: Univ of Phoenix

Dew Anna: Maintains email listserv at Warner-Pacific. Please send to her any updates.

Mark Ankeny: Where are minutes of OACTE in website: They are under the dates link.

Hilda: Password protected so no one else can change?

Linda: Parts can be password-protected.

Division 17 draft rules (Keith)

Some people have been involved in over a year with this.. Higher ed doesn't write rules for TSPC to accept, but TSPC has responsibility to put into rule language that fits with TSPC philosophy. Ready to be considered by Commissioners. Information item only for TSPC. It is being introduced to Commissioners. There are some new commissioners so this is just to

present the whole large concept. Intent this meeting and next meeting to have dialogue about drafts because we have only talked about concepts. Timetable next meeting in May to move to hearing. It will be an action item. Official testimony at that time. Rules to be adopted by August meeting. Today will be just what is different from rules in effect now. Tweaking Division 10 about process of program review.

- Asking for waivers for private or out of state not in there.
- Concept of retaining consortium but retain language.
- Put major standards in Division 17
- Rubrics in handbooks
- Utilize site visit handbooks
- Policy discussions regarding timing. Who will approve program reports when written? When submitted? Also language within the rubrics. Require doctorates? Require engage in scholarship?

Mark Ankeny: Some rules are different from what we talked about this past year.

Geoff Mills: Is there an executive summary because curious what this group sees as controversial?

Keith: Moving to assessment systems and resources it takes will be an issue for some institutions. No controversy over Standard 1 except how to collect data. Cultural competency requirements. Faculty professional development. Student learning data collecting. Require doctorates? Or stay with exceptional expertise. Scholarship apply to adjunct? Should have scholarship in there at all? Goal for May: Identify policy questions that the commission needs to consider.

Geoff Mills: Faculty qualifications starts to tinker with colleges and universities' policies.

Seems like odd thing for commission to talk about. Keith: work load requirements?

Geoff Mills: Two-thirds of institutions not NCATE accredited because can't afford it.

Hilda Rosselli: Division 17 just says that faculty performance is evaluated. Doesn't spell how.

Geoff Mills: Why have it in there if no rubric?

Mark Ankeny: "Unit personnel for program" "Faculty Qualifications" Colleges' responsibility: faculty qualified? Different standards for full-time, adjunct, clinical faculties? Some groups are within contracts that might be in conflict with rules. Bargaining unit definitions are identified. Time to weigh in before these come rules.

Mark:Ankeny: Consortium good idea to keep, but also representation by school districts. We wanted collaborative, collegial group to move forward on issues of quality, vision, increasing institutions' sphere of influence. Old model that came out of unions in 1960s when TSPC created may not be best models going forward into this century. We have to abide by rules when they are in place.

Hilda Rosselli : Overall these have come a long ways. Thanks to Keith. Two more for further discussion: Page 2 data on applicants. Also: Page 10 under Cultural Competency trying to figure out "a cohort of..." Need to bring clarity to it.

Linda Samek: Teacher prep standards much talk about but not so much counselors and other groups. Will commission approve in whole or part by part?

Keith Menk: Whole. No conversation with school psychologists or administrators.

Margaret Mahoney: SLPs pulled out?

Keith: Will not be pulled out.

Margaret: That group is hardest to get agreement that they must have an Initial teaching license. In SLPs' preparation they do not touch the same kind of information about teaching.

Keith Menk: in talking with this group they want to keep contact with licensure.

Margaret Mahoney: Not issue to have a license but should be a different kind of license.

They want their set of rules more applicable as school psychologists and counselors have. I thought we were moving that way.

Mark Ankeny: Vickie's email this morning we are not moving this way. Need to clean this up.

Margaret Mahoney: Makes it really difficult for one of the most high-needs areas for school districts.

Mark Ankeny: Any change in authorization levels in draft? With current rule and interpretation, elementary license to teach up through grade 8. Raised question do we still need middle level authorization? Do we still need four authorization levels? Some school districts lobbying for three authorization levels rather than four.

Keith Menk: Will probably not be part of this discussion because it will put off adoption by a year or so. Will engage in this conversation after Division 17 standards are set.

Bob Turner: National English Language Arts (ELA) and Math common core standards on teacher prep programs: Here to open conversation about the common core standards. Adopted by ODE. Two standards for ELA and math standards by 5-4 vote.

- What is your extent with familiarity with common core standards?
- Ways already considering to insert into curricula for students who will teach math and LA?
- What sorts of measures will you use to judge students to see if they have mastered the concepts?

Hilda Rosselli: #3 we are not sure we would go out to create another assessment. We have multiple ways to link to standards thru performance standards, state tests aligned. Within coursework unique indicators will occur. We won't create another assessment. Every TWS shows a link to assessment to state standards.

Bob Turner: No issues unique to these new standards. New standards are folded into classes.

Scott Fletcher: Too new to determine.

Linda Samek: Some difference in ELA and math standards: People are happy with ELA. With math, no such agreement. Grade level changes, other problems. ODE level concern: at teacher prep level we will have students learn new standards but ODE much concerned about current teachers.

Bob Turner: Math standards dissatisfaction framed differently?

Linda Samek: Separated process standards from formulaic standards. If documents not coupled, people will read some standards and ignore process standards. At HS level, standards are way beyond what we now expect. If a teacher is not fresh out of preparation program, the

terminology may not be familiar. Problem is that standards built by college math profs, not “real” teachers.

Bob Turner: The math needed by, say, biologists or technology people is not the same as what math majors would need.

Hilda Rosselli: Now we have to be further aware of co-op teachers know these standards.

Bob Turner: How to deal with this issue?

Mark Ankeny: Timeline for other subject areas?

Bob Turner: science framework has been circulated. Bill Becker at PSU has participated in putting this out.

UCTQ/U.S. News:

Bob Turner: OUS stance: One institution supplied info but others declined to participate. It is a decision, not a recommendation. No OUS institution will participate. The one institution supplied info before this decision.

Kudos to Scott L&C for coming up with position paper. **Motion Randy/Hilda endorse position paper. Motion: Passed.** Sent out Saturday Feb 5

Include OUS statement? No. Probably not appropriate.

Scott Fletcher: Media will fail to convey picture accurately.

Mark Ankeny: How should we distribute statement? Send to university presidents, Oregon coalition, chancellor’s office, TSPC, OEA, COSA, OSPA,

Scott Fletcher: What about *The Oregonian*?

Hilda: We can use it to write editorials or columns. Send to legislators? Maybe aides will read it. Also send to all TSPC Commissioners.

Randy Hitz: Send full document out but maybe need to edit it for particular groups and then send it to appropriate groups.

Scott Fletcher: OICA position here

Hilda Rosselli: OACTE stance.

Scott Fletcher: Do we want separate document from OICA?

Randy Hitz: Powerful to have separate OUS, OICA, and OACTE statements. When OUS makes a statement, it is from the presidents, chancellors.

Mark Ankeny: There is a separate OICA group of college presidents and provosts.

Mark Ankeny: Threats and opportunities Allows us to look at what constitutes a quality teacher-ed program.

Hilda: Might get us to whatever changes come about we develop a one-page chart that says how we hold ourselves accountable and how others hold us accountable.

Scott Fletcher: They will try to fix worst issues and then ask us to cooperate since they complied with issues presented to them. Future is unclear. Not playing at all will not be an option later. They will come back and say we’re reasonable, so you need to participate.

Mark Ankeny: *Ed Week* this morning has article today. NCTQ will not call programs that do not cooperate as failure. Tension brewing. They are adamant that study will continue. *US*

News looking for new ways to report, and we have used their stats in the past to promote our programs.

Keith Menk: The more we can command the high ground on the issue before we have lost control of this, we're better off. We will have a story to tell—the “Oregon story.”

Randy Hitz: We ask Mark to send op-ed piece in *The Oregonian* and other papers and distribute to right newspapers. Suggested we have op-ed piece now and have it ready.

Scott Fletcher: Have we heard from NCATE about this? NCATE holds programs accountable. CAEP and TEAC weigh in on this. **Randy Hitz/ Tom Ruhl motion for Mark to write op-ed piece. Passed.**

Hilda Rosselli: Randy Hitz will send out PPT by Linda Darling-Hammond presented yesterday at Portland State University. OACTE should make presentation to TSPC. We have to take responsibility to educate the Commissioners.

--Robert L. Hamm

University of Phoenix, Oregon Campus

Webinar: NCTQ

**Notes from NCTQ Webinar
(Notes by Hilda Rosselli)**

Feb 9, 2010

400 people logged in

Commitment to a review that is scrupulously accurate

Open to revisions

Indicators now available

Issue- widespread evidence that new teachers relatively ineffective

LUASD Los Angeles data that 1st year teachers are less effective than 2nd years

Includes vast majority of Teacher for America- what about district based

Believe that it will be used as a comprehensive resource for candidates, superintendents and legislators

Not much difference between alternative and traditional thus opportunity to excel

17 standards-developed through:

- Research (selectivity and early reading/literacy)
- Experience of high performing states and countries (elementary Math)
- Recommendation from technical panel=(instructional design)
- Common Sense (student teaching)

What about outcomes—only 3 states enable value-added analysis. Even with outcome data, how would you know how to adjust programs accordingly?

Ambition of reviewing all programs.

Will track how programs make use of performance based licensing assessments

Will develop an outcome standards using value-added data (where available) in coming months. Did recognize complex issue.

Looking at course descriptions, textbooks, student teaching manuals, syllabi, surveys. Full list of evidence we are collecting on their website.

No teacher prep structure built on flawed principles can systematically produce well-prepared teachers

Documents we are collecting reflect collective decisions of administrators and professors about the design of their programs. Trusting faculty syllabi as accurate aspects of the program.

How we assess if programs meet standards—

- Off-site experts to assess evidence where indicators require it (ex early reading)
- Trained analysts where evidence is straightforward (course requirements) two sets of eyes

Will use a rolling cycle across the next 12 months for larger request for documents, conducting analysis over an 18 mth period, review published in Fall 2012

Myths—setting the record straight

- Disregard for accuracy—accuracy of ten NCTQ reports are extremely high
- Opposed to innovation—NCTQ accommodates innovative programs
- Approved list of textbooks—reviews every textbook it comes across
- Methodology is opaque—explained our methods repeatedly and released standards

All institutions licensed to perform a public function should be subject to public scrutiny

Will pursue open records requests at every level to obtain needed documents, including private institutions where state law permits

When cannot obtain records—will issue estimated ratings based on info obtained.

Pledge

Must deliver accurate ratings for us to meet goals

Deliver regular updates on review

Will respond to challenges raised by schools of ed

At end of review—will post any challenge and post our rationale for reaching the ratings and documents

Q&A

Including alternative teacher program? Reference 80-90% coming through traditional programs

Are there sub-standards? Will be transparent—using field trials in Austin and Illinois

Input and outcomes are complimentary –looking at what universities value—universities spend enormous time establishing courses and what is taught

How arriving at final grade—mathematical formula?—looking to panel-the more indicators the higher the rating. Similar process to reports (Texas, Illinois)

In TX and ILL didn't use the additional resources and responses universities provided. In this case, they will provide space for universities to post but will require chance for NCTQ to respond. May change their ratings but challenges will remain on the website—the public will determine how valid. If engaged in a hatchet job, would only use a couple of standards but instead are using lots of standards.

Two reviewers—how insuring reliability? If you look over the indicators—most are clear—Yes No, number of courses

Estimated time for a program coordinator to respond to all of the requests? If gone through accreditation recently, 5 hours—should be readily at hand. Example current year syllabi,

They're asking: Let us see all the syllabi and materials related to student teaching.

Believe they can request very specific information, unlike other reports-

What about the use of other resources besides textbooks—will look at other required materials-reading materials, etc.

If each state can set their own standards—how can you compare? Should be seen as the floor, not the pinnacle.

Found big problems where states have set up big barriers to quality programs.

Say not bias—but report on Illinois—has a negative slant What is your bias? If you talk to anyone—just meeting with AACTE and NCATE, not a single person who doesn't have a major problem with quality programs.

Acceptance of the widespread brokenness of programs

Why not accept what programs' national accreditation has shown? Referenced Art Levine's report—not much difference between accredited and non-accredited. Found majority of accredited programs in Illinois-did not reflect scientific consensus of what is needed to teach reading.

Acknowledged NCATE is improving its own process.

Is VAM only outcome based measure? The outcome measures they have examined have a high 98%-99% pass rate. Interested in fair outcome measures.

Hilda wonders:

WILL THEY USE STUDENTS TO OBTAIN INFORMATION?

MIGHT THEY BE APPROACHING FACULTY FOR COPIES OF SYLLABI?

ARE THEY ANTICIPATING USE OF INCENTIVES?