

Executive Committee Meeting
Ohio Association of Private Colleges of Teacher Education
Ashland University – Columbus Center, Route 161, Columbus, Ohio
December 9, 2011

Meeting was called to order – Mif Obach at 10: 00 AM

- I. Meeting began with comments and the an update from OBR – Karen Harrington
 - A. The Standards alignment project will be finished next week
 - i. Alignment will be sent to CCSO/CAEP/Donna with TPA (Donna’s completed)
 - ii. Group seeks external confirmation of alignment
 - B. OBR is need of reviewers for multiple programs. Contact Sheryl
 - i. Dance, Gift, Math all levels...
 - C. Metrics for Race to the Top in relation to Principal’s License and Teachers
 - i. Requirements from Section D of RtT
 - ii. State of Scope of Work for Principals reviewed in a one page handout
 - iii. OBR is concerned because the n is small. A discussion followed considering the n both how to expand the number and accurately report the number of principals serving in that capacity who have value-added data associated with their position.
 - iv. At this point, the goal is to track data for 3 years
 - v. This year, 2011, Ohio does not need to present data. Next year Ohio is expected to present data on 30% of 3,500+ principals. There are a number of ways to analyze the data for 1, 2, and 3-year principals.
 - vi. Karen distributed electronic copies of handouts of the first draft of principal data for Race to the Top – *State Scope of the Work and the Chart* indicating the number of Principals Prepared 2010 – 2011.
 - vii. Data focused on those recommended/applied for the principal license. Data does not include alternative licensure. Data does not include those in Catholic or private schools. Data does include charter schools.
 - viii. There is not enough confidence in the data to publish this data. There are multiple limiting factors that must be addressed. We have no idea what percentage of licensed principal this value-added data represents particularly in relation to preparing institutions.
 - ix. Each column must be accurately labeled, important considerations should not be in footnotes. All the data needs to be accurately represented to the reader.
 - x. A recommendation was made that the chart **should only document** the number of principals who are employed in schools where value-added data is available. In relation to the preparing institution, data should document the licensed principals not the total number prepared.

- xi. The consensus was to keep the chart as simple and accurate as possible. A question surfaced about what the value-added data means to the public at large.
- xii. *Race to Top – Scope of Work* needs to be part of the report that goes to DOE. The executive committee asked that those preparing the report confirm the version of the chart that ties data to the specific preparation institutions.
- xiii. Several comments reminded Karen and the OBR to consider audiences reviewing the data: general public, the education community. Therefore, OBR needs to be very careful and accurate with language. There is difference between principals and teachers who are prepared and those licensed.
- xiv. A suggestion was made that OAPCTE create a committee that examines and supports the specifics of this reporting process from the perspective of the larger group?

D. The Program Review Committee is meeting December 15th to consider the effectiveness of Form A for Program Review to date

II. Business Meeting

A. Approval of Minutes (Carol Ziegler)

- i. October minutes: Katie Kinnucan-Welsch made a motion to approve minutes. Carol Ramsay seconded the motion. Minutes were approved.
- ii. November minutes: Diane Nelson made a motion to approve minutes. Rae Harriott White seconded the motion. Minutes were approved. Attachments from NCTQ and from the OBR summary of the Initial Data on the Principals program must be included.

B. Treasurer's update (Judy Wahrman)

- i. \$13,000 approximately because bank statement did not arrive
- ii. Travel reimbursement checks typically given at the meeting.
- iii. Judy will email the financial report.

C. Old Business

i. TPA update

- 1. Question surfaced about the number of institutions who have submitted request to videotape to their internal IRB.
- 2. Ongoing regional meetings scheduled from January – March
- 3. Donna's summary re: videotaping is attached as Appendix A
 - The video issue surfaced again because the videos can be a problem for schools. Lack of compensation for the cooperating teacher adds to the difficulty.
- 4. Further TPA concerns
 - a. We should get some clarity on what the fee for the TPA covers and try to minimize the cost to student teachers.
 - b. Pearson indicated there will not be a charge during the pilot.

- c. Each institution should train the approximate # of scorers that they would need for the # of portfolios they submit. (Donna has a chart that can help each institution.)
 - d. A note was made that the TPA is included in the RtT application and reporting. This requirement may mandate that we must begin TPA in 2012. ODE has not clarified whether TPA is part of the licensing mandate. No decision has been made on the Resident Educator summative evaluation.
 - e. Everyone should review the RtT email that Mif sent out.
 - ii. Feedback on stipend issue
 - 1. Mif did write to Todd and Dustin to ask about the stipend issue. They said they could not do anything. They suggested that the IHEs request that the State Board of Education create an exception or ruling that allows Teacher Ed institutions retain the stipend practice. SUED is also concerned about the stipend issue and TPA.
 - 2. OACTE will look at both of these in March. How can we reinstitute the stipend? Can there be an “equal pay” compensation across the state for all cooperating teachers?
 - iii. CAEP update; Option 2 update
 - 1. Mif also posted Option 2 information at www.oapecte.org
 - 2. Information is also posted about the transition from NCATE to CAEP and re-accreditation
 - 3. OBR is negotiating with CAEP in regard to Option 2 for the State of Ohio.
 - 4. Mif reiterated that OAPCTE needs to consider our voice in Option 2. This is a one-time opportunity to help shape the agreement between CAEP and the State of Ohio.
 - 5. We also need to revisit Option 3 with the State of Ohio to see if that is still a viable choice for institutions.
- D. New Business – Postponed until the next meeting until January.
 - i. Discussion on the Capital Conference’s University Square (participants)
 - ii. Nominees for OAPCTE Executive Committee positions – some potential candidates in place. Amy McClure, Carol Ziegler, and Judy Wahrman will be on the election committee.
 - iii. Early college issues (Shirley De Lucia) will be discussed at January meeting.
- III. Update on NCTQ – Tom Lasley provided a handout to the group
 - A. Tom noted that a number of the large urban areas are asking for the NCTQ review
 - B. Context is that a number of policymakers have given up on teacher education institutions.
 - C. Arthur McKee heads the NCTQ review process. The state universities will be reviewed first.

- D. Tom Lasley stated that NCTQs standards and indicators are transparent. He will send those to us electronically.
- E. Tom believes that NCTQ's endeavor is in the best interest of teacher prep institutions.

II. Adjournment by 12:10 PM