

Elementary Teacher Education Senate
3:30-5:00 Thursday, December 5, 2013
319 Curris Business Building
Minutes

I. Welcome and Roll

Present: J.D. Cryer (Coordinator, Elementary Teacher Education), Sohyun Meacham (Literacy Education), Tony Gabriele (Professional Sequence), Denise Tallakson (Elementary Education), Rip Marston (Physical Education and Health Education), Ellen Neuhaus (Liberal Arts Core), Michelle Swanson (Music Education), Chad Christopher (Coordinator, Secondary Teacher Education), Katheryn East (Chair, Teacher Education Faculty), Linda Fitzgerald (Early Childhood Education), Kim Miller (Special Education), Merrilee Betts (Teacher Practitioner), Matt Webb (Assistant Professor, Mathematics), Ariel Aloe, Assistant Professor (Ed. Psych & Foundations-ALT), Jean Schneider (Middle Level Education), Amy Lockhart (Clinical Experiences), Wendy Miller (Art Education)

Absent: None

Guests: Becky Hawbaker (Coordinator, Student Field Experiences), Rob Boody (Director of Assessment), Dwight Watson (Dean, College of Education)

II. Approval of minutes for November 7, 2013

Tony moved to approve the minutes and Jean S. seconded.

III. Update on matters arising at the State (Cryer)

a. Elementary Praxis II Content Knowledge Multi-State Study

This test will be changing in fall 2014. There is a multi-state study and revisions will be made. If anyone would like to apply they need to do so by Dec. 10. The trip to Princeton is Dec. 16-17 which is paid.

b. 2014-2015 Accreditation Visit Reviewer Sign Up

Apply by Jan. 1, 2014. There will be trips to different institutions and four colleges are being reviewed next year. JD and Becky visited ISU.

IV. Update on Teacher Education Executive Council (Cryer)

- a. edTPA Presentation by Lyn and Rob - They both explained edTPA, evaluation process, roll-out plan, scoring numbers from fall, scoring needs in spring (future), and ideas for incentives. Becky asked what the incentives are and JD said service and finances were discussed.

Per Tony, Lyn said edTPA's are getting easier to score of the 60-70 who are doing it. The implication is that edTPA scoring could be done locally with the number of participants we have. There is software to allow for easier scoring. Impression was not payment but rather recognition as part of work load which could include merit consideration and service in reviews.

V. Update on Teacher Education Faculty Meeting (East) - The following points were discussed:

Katheryn mentioned doubled participation. The intent is to give faculty the opportunity to talk about things to bring to TE Executive Council. She feels we need to discuss how UNI wants to participate in educational issues that impact Iowa and the nation.

Kim said the articles Katheryn sent out were helpful. We need to encourage colleagues to come. Please send any topics for discussion to Katheryn. Ellen could work with Katheryn to get a link set up.

The last Teacher Education Faculty meeting what it means to be a “Highly Qualified Teacher” was discussed:

- Highly Qualified Teacher?
 - What are valid indicators of good teaching?
 - What are valid indicators of effective teaching?
 - What are underlying competencies for good/effective teachers?
 - High Leverage Practices

VI. Old Business

- a. Praxis I/Praxis Core Cut Scores—vote from Secondary meeting

Current cut scores for Praxis I:

170—Reading
170—Mathematics
170—Writing
Composite—522

Current cut scores for Praxis Core (recommended by state):

Reading - 156

Writing - 162
Mathematics - 150

Recently the first sets of data have come out. We are finding nationwide there have been about 1,800 test takers. However, based upon the current cut scores students are performing at the following levels:

Reading - 156 equates to the 81%
Writing - 162 equates to the 54%
Mathematics - 150 equates to the 50%

It has been our philosophy to have students meet the 5% for passing with the composite score moving them up to the 25%.

From this analysis there was a vote in Secondary Senate on this matter; the motion follows: "I move that we maintain the same Praxis cut scores with the new Praxis tests empowering Rob to calculate new Praxis cut scores based on the current philosophical structure related to percentiles".

It is being proposed to the Executive Council to waive the Praxis I if they have sufficient ACT or SAT scores. Other states have this option. If legislators are interested in reducing costs this would be a way.

Becky thought there were quite a few students who didn't pass one or more Praxis I sub tests.

Michelle asked what the scores were of the 39% that have passed.

Rob can find out.

The Dean asked about the correlation between Praxis and SAT percentiles.

Katheryn said they are correlated but she doesn't know the percentile.

Tony said the scores on ACT can be measured against the Praxis I.

Michelle mentioned a grade range being set up.

Matt wondered if students would relatively pass at same rates as before.

Rob recommends new cut scores be created under the old system with new test. Katheryn asked Rob about the old scores. He said they were 174 across all three areas. Per Rob the score was 173 in Math but 185 in both Writing and Reading. Rob mentioned keeping a low individual bar but also keeping the average higher.

Tony mentioned that cut scores are going to be higher than what we have in our program. He questioned Rob as to what makes him feel that students will score as poorly as the low scores as provided so far. He also questioned translating into a new scale.

Rob said 26 states have accepted the standard as well as Iowa and UNI. Rob said teachers and faculty did cut score analysis but the scores he provided are based on student data.

Tony asked how this connects to CAEP and is there anything related to CAEP accreditation.

Katheryn asked "Do we want to have broad entry or do we want to screen people out at entry?"

Kim said in Finland they take the top 1/3 of students at the beginning, not at the end.

Merrilee asked what the cost is.

Per Rob the cost for Praxis I is \$135.

Merrilee also asked where students can go for help.

Per Wendy they can contact Academic Services or go online.

Rob said they can take courses at UNI.

Denise asked how our scores compare to other states.

Rob said for Praxis I, some states have higher and some have lower scores. UNI doesn't have the lowest. We are close to the highest which is Virginia at 176. We have a vote from secondary. He asked if this is something that Elementary Senate would like to pursue.

Tony asked if there is a reason that Elementary has to have the same requirements as secondary.

Kim asked why they are moving away from Praxis I to this new test.

Rob said it is the same three areas just new scores. The old Praxis I scores were 150-190. The new scoring range is 100-200.

Tony asked "What is your recommendation, Rob?" "How do you want to let people in the program - wide, narrow?" "We don't want to knock out really good people that don't fit the parameter."

Denise questions if we lower scores will we be knocked down for having lower scores.

Wendy wonders if we want to align scores from the old test to the new test.

Chad said yes.

Tony said ETS is coming out with recommendations but we will be below them. He said we used to be among the highest scores.

Rob doesn't know the past history and said it isn't ETS making the recommendations.

Tony said CAEP would require our entrance requirements to be raised so we should re-think our entrance requirements. He mentioned maintaining a broad net and have a stiffer exit requirement.

Linda feels that the motion is enough and that we need to do something now. We don't want to only take the top 50% based on just that. Linda moved that we have the motion that the secondary people passed. Tony seconded.

A vote was taken and it was passed:

"I move that we maintain the same Praxis cut scores with the new Praxis tests empowering the Director of Assessment to calculate new Praxis cut scores based on the current philosophical structure related to percentiles."

b. edTPA update and feedback

70 raters from across campus were trained

112 edTPA's were scored

145 will need to be scored in spring

Additional raters are needed in Elementary Mathematics and Elementary Literacy

Surveys will be sent out to raters and students

- c. InTASC--vote to update all TE classroom syllabi with new InTASC standards by fall of 2014.

"It has been recommended by the Assessment Subcommittee that the UNI teacher Education Program adopt the new InTASC standards and all those connected to the UNI Teacher Education Program will update course syllabi to reflect these standards by the start of the fall semester 2014."

Tony recommended, Denise seconded. Vote taken and passed.

- d. edTPA—vote to establish ESA's into our assessment system

"It has been recommended by the Assessment Subcommittee that the UNI Teacher Education Program will establish Embedded Signature Assessments (ESA's) into the Teacher Education Program Assessment system."

Handouts were provided to show:

- Examples
- Pilot
- Future

Three different assessments are being piloted this spring in Level III. If anyone is interested in using these in class that option is available. The data from the pilots will be brought back to the committee and then to the Senates.

Becky said "Shouldn't we wait to see how the pilot goes in the spring before we vote?"

Rob said this is about the general concept (adding to the system as a whole) and specifics would be brought in later; the Senates would be involved in piloting and evaluating.

Linda stated that however you do your course with points you would have something that must be passed regardless of how many points you have accumulated.

Rob mentioned a common assessment where everyone takes the assessment. This would be for the program as a whole not just a grade in one class.

The Dean asked if this would be with core courses.

Rob said yes. With Level III it would be whatever methods courses there are. They could be done in every content area. Schools are looking at student work and students would go in as first year teacher with this knowledge.

Merrilee feels this is important. When interviewing they hired the person that had worked with Common Formative Assessments and they weren't from UNI.

Tony asked Rob for clarification and if this course is embedded.

The Dean said that the assessments are getting students to better pass the edTPA in the end.

Rob said we should check for empirical correlation. We should interview students.

Per the Dean what we are doing should fit content of course.

Rob feels it should be part of the grade of the course and should be part of the gate keeping system.

Linda feels it should be set up so that if you don't do this you don't pass. There should be a minimum level.

Merrilee said in her school if elementary students don't obtain 80% on first CFA they go to remediation. If they continue not to pass they go through a second set of remediation.

Rob said we don't want someone to graduate from UNI until they meet a certain level.

Tony said the concept is essential as part of a functioning assessment system. He would like Rob to go out and explain to faculty rather than the Senate voting on this. He feels that there is a fairly receptive audience.

Soyhun asked "Is there an exemplary case that was used before?"

Chad said there is a pilot.

Denise said other states have done things like this. We need everyone to understand edTPA so the signature assessments make sense then.

Matt said it is a good idea for a common standard that all students can meet. This is a great idea. He feels that establishing a standard is difficult but appropriate. There would be academic freedom; tenured professors can do what they want. This could be outside the course.

Tony feels it may technically not apply given the way people operate as professors. They should be brought into this as a good thing.

Linda said when the state comes to accredit us we need to be able to show what we can do.

Michelle asked "What if student doesn't get 80% for example?" "Will we remediate at that point?" It scares her with regards to the academic freedom idea. She wonders if we are truly set for that type of remediation with our students.

Rob said we will have to discuss this.

Merrilee said we should decide how many CFA's we are going to do. You may only do one in a semester.

Tony feels there will be a lot of redundancy across methods courses. He doesn't feel we have thought this through enough.

Linda said as an example, 3rd graders have to go onto fourth grade but Linda's students can switch majors, etc.

Matt said in terms of remediation it may be that the students who do poorly have to rewrite. We could give feedback and then they turn it in again. He is afraid of that level of remediation.

Katheryn feels that by end of methods semester you need to complete this skill with your courses.

Rob will try to talk with departments as Tony has suggested. Rob feels we need to agree in principle but details will be worked out. The Assessment Subcommittee feels they should vote after they are informed rather than voting now and risk miscommunication.

Linda asked Tony if he feels that the motion is premature at this point and he said yes.

Linda moved that we table this and Tony seconded.

Matt said this is a big piece and he is for it.

Denise said it will be essential for students to do well on edTPA. She feels that we should start with people at Design Studio. She feels we should vote to table this.

Amy asked if ISU has an embedded assessment. JD said they have eportfolio. With student teaching you have to produce several artifacts.

The vote was passed to table until January meeting.

VII. New Business

a. CAEP

Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Standards

- Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
- Clinical Partnerships and Practice
- Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity
- Program Impact
- Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity

The Dean said he went to a two day workshop regarding the National Accreditation for Teacher Preparation (INCATE and TEAC). Mary Herring and Rob Boody will attend in spring. You can register for workshops early. This is investigatory. This is a Teacher Education piece and has to be vetted through Provost and President's Office. This summer the preliminary focus was viewed by College of Education's leadership team. The team viewed the five goals of CAEP. The Dean asked what we are already doing and what do we need to aspire to for CAEP accreditation. The draft standards were being viewed but the new standards have come out. We haven't prepared the document with the revised standards yet. What are the pros of CAEP and cons? Handouts were provided. The Dean would like to hear from us regarding National Accreditation. He asked if the pros and cons list could be modified.

Linda indicated that four of the five CAEP standards are post graduation for us. Most of it is data we collect while students are here. Iowa is not going to collect direct student data. Linda said the CAEP discussion is big and we need more data.

Linda mentioned Larry Bice and a state based committee and submitting our state based alignment with CAEP. The document is done by state.

Rip asked if there was any conflict with national associations if we go towards CAEP.

The Dean mentioned the SPA model. There are two different reviews in accreditation, the large program review which is TE in its entirety and individual program review. There are 86 licenses that have to be reviewed. Some licenses are connected to professional organizations. If state goes with SPA route it would be aligned with SPA. Some states like this. Larry may think the SPA route is a bit cumbersome. The state will decide.

Rob said CAEP is taking over for INCATE, TEAC and NCATE which is now CAEP. There will be no NCATE.

Dean mentioned presenting through TEAC model? He asked if the Senate has any thoughts for pros and cons. The consensus was no.

- b. Center for Educational Transformation (CET) Director Update
 - Three candidates are on campus this week
 - Dr. John Moravec
 - Dr. Mark McDermott
 - Dr. Scott McLeod

c. Teacher Education Advisory Board Reports

Undergraduate Teacher Education Student Advisory Council

- Positives
- Communication Methods
- Teacher Education Program Advice

Teacher Education Program Improvement Board

- Positives
- Areas of Possible Focus
 - Current Initiatives
 - Collaboration
 - Technology
 - Management and Assessment
 - Student Portfolios

d. Other?

VIII. Upcoming dates (subject to change)

Elementary Senate

January 16

February 6

March 6

April 8 (Tuesday)

May 1

Secondary Senate

January 23

February 20

March 27

April 17

May 8