

## TEACHER EDUCATION COMMITTEE

October 20, 2009

### APPROVED MINUTES

(Approved 11-17-09)

Members present: Dennis Ballard, Dan Clark, Hema Ganapathy-Coleman (Secretary), Kara Harris, Myung-Ah Lee, Melissa Nail (Chair), Amanda Solesky, Brad Venable

Members absent: Chia-An Chao, Denise Collins, Catherine Tucker, Chad Becker, Rebecca Hinshaw, Susan Kiger, Damon Krug, Claire Marchese, Amy Norris, Yong Joon Park, Steven Pontius

Ex Officio Members present: Dan Clark, Susan Powers, Becky Libler

1. Call to Order: M. Nail, TEC Chair called the meeting to order at 3.35 pm.
2. Approval of Minutes for September 15, 2009: B. Venable moved approval. M. Lee seconded and the minutes were approved 8-0-0.
3. Old Business
  - No Old Business
4. New Business
  - Assessment Day

#### Reports/Outcomes and Next Steps:

M. Nail sent around a handout about Field Operations noting that on assessment day, two groups recommended that a work study group continue throughout the semester for the next year. The faculty effectiveness group wanted to continue work study and develop a rubric to assess faculty effectiveness. The other two groups presented that they had had conversations but wanted data collection to be refined. S. Powers said that two groups are waiting for a charge from the TEC. She noted that faculty effectiveness cannot be assessed by a single rubric. M. Nail said that the rubric was only one of the ideas floated and that many other ideas were proposed, and that we must capitalize on the large number of people interested in participating in that activity. Noting that the remarks offered on Assessment Day were so broad that they needed defining and a TEC subcommittee may be needed to do this, R. Libler suggested that there might be a clear call for a subcommittee to make recommendations to fill the gaps identified. When a question was raised about whether a charge should be given by the TEC to the assessment committee, S. Powers suggested that an ad-hoc committee be formed instead. R. Libler moved a motion to establish an ad-hoc committee. M. Lee seconded the motion. This was followed by a discussion. D. Ballard said that the assessment committee has been doing this for three years and so, a fresh perspective may be called for. D. Clark said that with the idea of accomplishing the goal in a timely manner, TEC members,

assessment committee members, and members from the groups of that day should be part of the ad-hoc group. S. Powers raised the issue of the initial and advanced groups being reconstituted. M. Nail emphasized that good representation is required across campus and said she would contact members to enquire if the ad-hoc committee's membership rules would be voted on: one advanced, one initial, more than one noncollege person etc. B. Venable asked what would happen if people did not volunteer. S. Powers said that we would operate with volunteers. The motion passed 8-0-0 for forming an ad hoc subcommittee.

D. Ballard, speaking to the topics discussed in the initial assessment committee, said that the issues were similar to those raised in the advanced committee. S. Powers noted that we should ensure that they do not serve at cross purposes. D. Clark sought clarification on data collection and the role of TEC. S. Powers clarified that they could talk about how field operations would be assessed and then TEC would have to act on it. D. Ballard raised the possibility of sending out surveys or emails to alumni. Two charges for the assessment committee were proposed by M. Nail.

S. Powers made a motion for assessment committees to be charged to cooperatively work to determine assessment needs for field operations and alumni and employer data to determine steps and make recommendations to TEC and the UAS. D. Ballard seconded. R. Libler said that last year, through Project PRE, the DOE ran a list of alumni and so we have a list of over a 1000 alumni. D. Ballard added that we can ask for lists of graduates from secondary programs too. D. Clark observed that programs would be highly supportive of that. S. Powers pointed out that legislatively, the state is required by federal laws to provide us with data about graduates. The motion passed 8-0-0.

Members of assessment committees did not go to some of the meetings. Considering that some people are unable to participate, there was a brief discussion about whether we should send out an open invitation. S. Powers said that the by-laws require certain participation. Department chairs are ex-officio forever. Certain TEC people are program coordinators and committee members; they are participants twice over. If current members want to continue, that is alright but last year we did not go by by-laws. M. Nail asked if non-contributing members should be asked to resign or whether they would like to contribute. In the Initial UAS e.g., 5-7 members were nominated by the Dean's office and elected by TEC; the committee chair is selected in spring. The group was directed to 9.3 and 9.4 in the by-laws and intent was expressed to bring up the topic in the next meeting of the TEC.

- TK20 Updates—M. Nail informed the group that the remediation form is ready and a half hour tutorial is also planned for all faculty members for the coming Tuesday. The 3 point scale we have has been frustrating because it is not discriminating enough and fails to provide information about areas or standards that our students struggle with. We know anecdotally that faculty work with individual students to enable them to attain standards. There is no communication between different faculty members who may have worked with the same student.

We want a way of aggregating the information about standards. The remediation form will help us to pull this information out. It is not tied to a class but is under the advising tab but is completed by faculty only if there is a reason to do this. S. Powers said that faculty will be able to see the information submitted by another faculty member when they try to submit a remediation form. R. Libler inquired as to who would pull out this information and aggregate it, noting that it is entirely up to faculty for them to find this information. D. Clark and S. Powers said that this will also be used in unit assessment reports. Content area students and faculty should also preferably be involved in it because they have dispositional issues too. With regard to the advising survey about entrance in BCP, S. Powers clarified that the +/- change in GPA has not been properly set up by OIT. It is being repaired.

- Proposed Rule Revisions for Educator Preparation and Accountability (REPA): S. Powers encouraged that if we have not provided feedback we should by October 26. When D. Ballard noted that the state association has commented on the absence of information about P-12, R. Libler encouraged individuals to reinforce what their professional associations have commented on. S. Powers cautioned that contradictory information is being provided on dates when licensure will become void etc. Parents need to be alerted so that they can speak out. D. Ballard asked if an education specific area of content area will become null and void. S. Powers answered in the affirmative clarifying that Math Education will be affected. R. Libler said that there has been lot of discussion about whether the state can dictate how many hours a student must take to finish a content area. There was extensive discussion about the implications for content areas.

- TEC Seminar Topics—R. Libler suggested “Faculty Effectiveness” as a possible topic.

5. Associate Deans’ Report: Becky Libler & Susan Powers--B. Libler reminded the group that Sycamore Educator’s Day is on November 7th. It is open to student teachers, principals, interns, and those completing their immersion experience this semester.

6. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 4.55 pm.

Respectfully submitted by  
Hema Ganapathy-Coleman,  
TEC Secretary