

**OREGON ASSOCIATION
OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION**

DRAFT MINUTES

AUGUST 3, 2010—THE RIVERHOUSE, BEND, OREGON

Mark Ankeny called meeting to order at 2:00

Present:

Mark Ankeny, Pacific University, mankeny@pacificu.edu
Jay Casbon, Oregon State University, jay.casbon@osucascades.edu
Sharon Chinn, Lewis and Clark College, schinn@lclark.edu
Claudia Green, Corban University, cugreen@corban.edu
Tom Greene, University of Portland, greene@up.edu
Robert Hamm, University of Phoenix, bob.hamm@phoenix.edu
Barbara Herzberg, Northwest Christian University, bherzberg@northwestchristian.edu
Randy Hitz, Portland State University, hitz@pdx.edu
Jim Howard, Northwest Christian University, jhoward@northwestchristian.edu
Margaret Mahoney, University of Oregon, mmahoney@uoregon.edu
Rita Moore, Willamette University, rmoore@willamette.edu
Hilda Rosselli, Western Oregon University, rossellih@wou.edu
Tom Ruhl, Marylhurst University, truhl@marylhurst.edu
Linda Samek, George Fox University, lsamek@georgefox.edu
Shelley Smolnisky, Pacific University, smol0924@pacificu.edu
Heather Stanhope, Eastern Oregon University, heather.stanhope@eou.edu
Sue Thompson, Western Oregon University, thompss@wou.edu
John Watzke, University of Portland, watzke@up.edu

Guests:

None.

- 1. Introductions, updates**
- 2. Minutes** from previous meeting. Mahoney motion, 2nd Rosselli. Approved.
- 3. Treasurer's report.**
 - a. Opening balance: \$9041.97.
 - b. Hilda Rosselli Day on the Hill: \$2581.59.
 - c. New balance: \$6460.38.

4. **AACTE Day on the Hill.** Hilda. Update: Sent summaries electronically. Important to have representation at these meetings. At Day on the Hill many states send multiple reps but we had only one (Hilda). Current study is supposed to examine three institutions from each state about how colleges prepare student teachers. **National Center for Teacher Quality.** This is their third round of studies. No institution present has been contacted. Getting syllabi from students. Also data quality campaign. We need to be aware of this group. Oregon governor did sign document stating that ODE will follow all...

Indiana shared interesting example of how state chapter stopped state actions that were nonsensical in that state. For example, they were going to do away with all administration programs. Good to hear that our efforts can make a difference.

Kathleen ___ of Council of Chief State Officers told of changes. Policy implications.

TPAC—Teacher Performance Accountability Collaborative (Linda Darling-Hammond presented). If they have a similar product as TWS, why change? Distinctions: Stanford uses videotapes to analyze. Shorter snapshot of teacher than what we have. Also have academic language. Anything we can do with TWS to enhance it?

Day on the Hill: Steve Robinson on White House Domestic Policy Institute. From Oregon (six years as a teacher). What the White House envisions for reauthorization of elementary and secondary (*see attached*). Tight on goals and loose on means. Want tighter monitoring of teacher outcomes. Money to go to state departments of education and not to colleges. Keep in contact with Oregon DOE.

5. Mark: **InTASC report.** Vickie Chamberlain is vice chair of the group and wants to take report to TSPC board. We need to have a political voice in the discussion. We need to take a good look at InTASC standards and have our input. We should come up with what needs to be added or changed. We need to spend some time looking at these standards.
- a. Tom Ruhl: InTASC is not alone in trying to set standards. A similar process has been undertaken for initial admin programs. Only two standards had comparison. Made process of Oregon adopting those standards made it manageable. It is a huge task to try to go through all programs' standards to make sense of them.
 - b. Keith Menk: TSPC hears (not owning these statements but the statements are out there): Reading and literacy; cultural competency; use of technology; perception that graduates are not able to assess data. We hear this from board of education.
 - c. Linda: I am puzzled when I hear those things because we spend a lot of time addressing these in programs. Least controversial is the use of technology. Candidates in our programs come through programs where there is a lot of technology. We help them practice with newer technologies and we send them out into classrooms. What I don't understand is when people criticize their abilities—are they talking about new candidates or those who have been around for a while? What specifically are they objecting to? Does anyone ever give you (TSPC) specific examples of practices? Keith: nothing specific.

- d. Mark: People take generalities and apply to everyone. Some new teachers get jobs as tech coordinators in their schools because they are savvy in technology.
- e. Margaret: Criticism is that we're not teaching what they are using in the schools.
- f. Keith: Perceptions, true or not, drive grant money and projects. People don't have data but we don't have arguments against their ideas.
- g. Linda: We may need to engage in K-12 in tighter collaborations so we are more visible to them.
- h. Hilda: Communication has fallen apart because we are in separate silos. Until we "inter-marry" there won't be trust or tolerance of different opinions and will have dismissal of ideas. When I looked at Mickey Garrison's work language shifted slightly. Where we fall short is that we don't work together and put out a quick response such as here are some examples of courses that address these concerns. Because we don't respond, people think that we agree with the criticisms. Concerns: 1) mentoring for new teachers; 2) SB 443 looking at professional development (We have fallen off as place for professional development); 3) formation of HB 3619 ways of strengthening teacher and faculty involvement in schools; newly adopted national core of standards math; 4) vendors commercially reaching into areas they never did in the past—interactive materials and developing assessments of teachers. If we don't insert ourselves in that, it is a matter of time that companies will start virtual college training; link data—teachers and students; revised standards: not just for new teachers but for all teachers; 5) agreements on how and why teacher retention and employee satisfaction; 6) monitoring career ladders. We need more commonality with districts to show that we want to work hand-in-hand with districts.
- i. Mark: Project Alder is Oregon's tracking system of data
- j. Randy Hitz: Add to list: 1) NCATE and TEAC unified standards; 2) National Board of Prof Teaching Standards; 3) Chair HB 3619 wants some kind of consensus of themes—meeting standards. A strong statement from this group about meeting standards. Is this group willing to go to TSPC to say that our standards are aligned. 4) Assessment. Are we committed to creating strong assessment systems. 5) Clinical experience. What can we say as a group about how to improve clinical experience. 6) Engaging with K-12 community. Seamless system also focusing on student achievement. Overriding theme is accountability. But we need to talk about responsibility.
- k. Mark: Must continue to talk and influence other organizations. Need to dialogue with these other groups.
- l. Linda: Vice chair of Oregon Educator Professional Development Commission (OEPDC) group. Jim Mabbott chairing. Talking with school administrators about promotions, scholarship. We don't speak the same language as K-12 even though those people all came through colleges for teacher-prep coursework. Agree with Randy that it needs to be done immediately.

- m. Jay Casbon (OSU Cascades): Oregon has difficult time going forward because funding is precarious. Finding quality experiences for our students is difficult. Some classes are huge which makes it really difficult for student teachers. Must pay attention to placing faculty in clinical experiences. Must explain to dean how what we do is important and different from other departments. Hiring more non-tenure track positions.
- n. Tom: Does not solve much if we just adopt the InTASC standards. If it comes to meet standards, we all do. Maybe we don't meet the right standards. Oregon has been pretty innovative with assessment. Will changing the licensure structure make any real difference? We should go ahead and adopt standards and continue forward. We continue to get an F in standards, so we must be doing something right.
- o. Mark: InTASC: Time may be right to get connected. They are much in line with what we've been doing. In some ways it is stronger. Our graduates are fully able to continue learning their art of teaching.
- p. Randy: We have to speak to legislators and K-12 about how we buy into this. Underlying all of this is research. We must do this to add to knowledge base.
- q. Hilda: If we consider which institutions have greatest influence, a lot of districts use Danielson's framework. Many districts use other systems. Must crosswalk to what we do as well. We should be the ones to convene other stakeholders: COSA, OEA, others. There needs to be a unifying vision of what an educated teacher looks like. Bring preservice and inservice people together.
- r. Keith: Alignment important—standards. State has silo issue, with data folks not talking to other folks, ODE/TSPC, OUS/privates.
- s. Mark: Public comment by October 15.
- t. Hilda: K-12 administrators will not have time to read entire document. Proposal: Perhaps we could set up a summary of why they should want to join OACTE. Someone needs to set up chart analyzing items with TSPC standards and Danielson's work, important to create tool to evaluate teachers. Aligning supervision documents around the new standards. That would be a big plus for administrators.
- u. Mark: Can't draft it today but small group could do this work.

Tom: Idea is to have continuous standards. Willing to do TSPC part, Hilda to do Danielson standards.

- v. Mark: Then bring that back to group. But we won't have a full OACTE meeting before October 15.
- w. Margaret: Greatly impacting work on Division 17. We are meeting again soon (end of month).
- x. Hilda: Everyone scan document and note anything you can't agree to and make list of items that reflect the work that colleges already do.

- y. Mark: Divided room into various groups to look at the standards. Each group reported out.
- z. Send specific changes/suggestions to Mark so he can send on to CCSSO.
- aa. Randy: Also include compliments on the strengths of the document.
- bb. Linda: Rubric will be critical for site visits.
- cc. Mark: Decide now to make a suggestion to TSPC to adopt
- dd. Tom: Good idea to get superintendents to buy into this.
- ee. Linda: Does OEA, COSA, ODE need to buy in, too?
- ff. Tom: Best to build coalition of all groups.
- gg. Margaret: Let's wait to get all involved.
- hh. Hilda: Strategize how to approach other groups.
- ii. Mark: Next TSPC meeting is November 4.
- jj. Tom: Stronger if coalition of organizations agree.
- mm. Mark: Enough time to bring together other groups?
- nn. Randy: Can't adopt these standards anyway because they are still in draft form.
- oo. Tom: We need to have local OEA affiliates, school board chairs, and local superintendents agree to this.
- pp. Hilda: We need to be on agendas of these organizations.
- qq. Mark: Wording something like this: At OACTE meeting held Aug 3, 2010, we examined the draft of teaching stands by CCSSO. After careful analysis we believe that the Ore professional education community should adopt these standards and evaluating teachers by Oregon schools and supporting professional development.
- rr. Mark: Need to invite all superintendents to face to face meeting.

6. Announcements:

- a. Keith: Site visit preparation. September 13 at OEA headquarters
- b. Tom Ruhl invited OACTE meeting Nov 3 at Marylhurst

Meeting adjourned 5:05

--Bob Hamm

*University of Phoenix | Oregon Campus
Portland*