

SUED Meeting Notes – March 4, 2015

Sajit Zachariah, Brian Yusko – Cleveland State University; Phil Martucci – University of Akron; Regina Sapona – University of Cincinnati; Joanne Arhar, Erica Eckert – Kent State University; Ginny Keil – University of Toledo; John Henning – Ohio University; Richard Lomax – The Ohio State University; Denise Sharp – Central State University; Debbie Weber, Paul Madden – Shawnee State University; Matt Lutz – Ohio Dept. of Education; Wendy Adams – Ohio Board of Regents; Mary Lou DiPillo, Marcia Matanin – Youngstown State University; Mary Murray, Brian Colwell – Bowling Green State University; Charlotte Harris – Wright State University;

Approval of minutes – 1st Ginny Keil, 2nd Brad Colwell – Approved unanimously

Wendy Adams OBR

- Program reviews were due on Monday; programs will be matched up with consultants by Friday March 6. Deadline of April 13 to have the reviews back to OBR.
- Pre-Service survey data are available for download in MRS.

Matt Lutz ODE

- edTPA has been discussed in other venues; ODE will not take a formal position on whether IHEs should use edTPA. No formal timeline on next round of conversations about edTPA in the future.
- The 2013-2014 RESA scores did not go to OBR, but the current year's scores will.
- OAE – Middle School 4-9 conversation was postponed until May, which will push everything back.
- The FEA conference is at Ohio Dominican next week... John Soloninka thought it would be worth mentioning to the group.
- Value Added scores are not going to be linked back to individual teachers until late winter 2016. Value-added data available in the past for the student growth portion of educator evaluation has been in grades 4-8 English language arts and mathematics. As Ohio's new state tests are unveiled during the next few years, more teachers will be involved with roster verification because data from more tests will be included in student growth measures. Test data from the 2014-2015 school year will include: *Elementary and Middle School Tests: Grades 4-8 – English Language Arts and Mathematics; Grade 5 and 8 – Science; Grade 6 – Social Studies. High School Credit End-of-Course Tests: Algebra I, Integrated Mathematics I, English I and Physical Science.* Additional secondary content areas will be added in future years – ELA II, History, Government, and Biology.
- VA linkage: <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/Student-Growth-Measures/Value-Added-Student-Growth-Measure/Value-Added-Roster-Verification>. Also see this site about VA: <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/Student-Growth-Measures/Value-Added-Student-Growth-Measure>
- John will give an update on Title II on Friday at OCTEO.
- There are several pieces of pending legislation that have an impact on P12—all subject to change, competing bills—many changes are possible. Bill numbers 64, 7, 3 are some to pay attention to. Will likely include School Psychologist evaluations.
- Jennifer Kangas retired at the end of 2014.

- Principal licensure changes – (Brad Yusko question) – there is language in one of the pending pieces of legislation that speaks to changes about principal licensure, specific to certain situations. It is still pending.
- There is legislation pending that seeks to change the Chancellor title to a “director” and give this person the authority to set minimum requirements for entry in to educator prep programs. It would also potentially change the name of OBR to the Ohio Department of Higher Education.

General Items

- We can request, through the ODE website, representation from ODE to appear at meetings on whatever topics we’d like (legislation, state board of education, state superintendent can come).
- Discussion of ways we can become more informed about pending legislation that affects teacher education:
 - Discussion of lack of lobbying representation for SUED
 - Suggestion of asking OACTE if they want to pursue this
 - Could we find someone to monitor all Ohio legislation and warn us (e.g. doc student)
- Advocacy
 - Day on the Square
 - Good turnout, unverified numbers – 69 people RSVP’d; 43 attended the orientation (4 were not pre-registered). Additional people came for DOTS and didn’t attend orientation. Final numbers will be provided later.
 - Data on the rest of the day is forthcoming, including data on the legislators visited and topics of conversation
 - Joanne and Amy McClure met with the chairs of the house and senate education committee (Bill Haines and Peggy Lehner) and brought the Ohio Teacher of the Year—and the legislators *loved* her. Lori Michalec talked about her work as a cooperating teacher and mentor for residents and the importance of traditional teacher education programs. She talked about the importance of co-teaching, edTPA, the confidence and preparation being strong. She also talked about the “goofy timing” of the PARCC assessments.
 - General discussion about training candidates in advocacy, so they can represent their profession to groups like the Educator Standards Board. (Ginny suggested one of the things that we should focus on is if we add edTPA, then we must subtract the pedagogy test in OAE.)
 - AACTE Presentation – by doing advocacy work, we are striving for continuous improvement (examples provided: Day on the Square and Day on the Square Talking Points; Clinical Alliance)
 - AACTE Presentation from Gallup was exceptional; they saw in the polling data from parents and educators that education is viewed positively *locally* but this changes at the national level because the media portrayal of education is so negative. The presenter suggested we need to work on our message so we can change the narrative.
- TPA Discussion
 - Penn State is doing a study (they are not doing edTPA as of now) of their student teachers to help inform the Pennsylvania Department of Education comparing edTPA vs. PPAT (ETS version of edTPA) vs. a home-grown assessment.
 - Group showed interest in hearing what their results of the study are...
 - Who has decided to stay with national scoring vs. local scoring

- UC – ¾ have agreed to continue with national scoring – one program is still deciding
- OU – national scoring
- OSU – national scoring
- CSU – national scoring – to do local scoring is too much pressure on faculty/supervisors
- KSU – local scoring; discussion will continue March 13
- Wright – national scoring was the previous method... future is up for discussion
- YSU – national scoring
- Shawnee – national then local, up for discussion
- BGSU – national scoring
- UT – local scoring
- Central State – local scoring
- UA – not present (Phil had to leave meeting)
- CAEP Concerns Letter – a group from SUED will be meeting with Rebecca Watts to discuss this. Ginny noted that in the Accreditation Coordinators meeting today, Rebecca indicated Jim Cibulka from CAEP emailed her wanting to discuss the SUED letter.
- Moral Code of Ethics for Educators – Two philosophy faculty drafted a response to NASDTEC's Moral Code of Ethics for Educators. The response was sent to the Deans only listserv for approval. Questions were raised and there was no sufficient time to discuss the issues before the submission deadline, so SUED's response was not sent.
- June SUED meeting coincides with Dean's Compact Meeting... Sharon Robinson is coming on June 3. Discussion of whether we want to add event with Sharon for SUED.
- Clinical Alliance
 - Design team discussions (purpose, function); they will model after the CAEP alliance (clinical partnerships, experiences, and educators); there will be a breakfast tomorrow for people interested in that kind of work. They want to provide resources for helping or supporting or being part of a dialogue of moving further along this road of clinically based teacher education.
 - Small partnership grants are already in progress at a few schools.
 - At AACTE John noted different clinical experience models 1) studio schools (replaced the traditional experience) – candidates worked with a group of teachers, such as a math department and were a member of the team and would go where needed, 2) learning for a team (candidates worked as a team), 3) demonstration classroom, where candidates were all in the room together (mentor teachers, new teachers, interns) and everyone exchanged ideas.

Meeting adjourned at 6:39pm.

Submitted by Erica Eckert, KSU