



UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION COUNCIL (UTEC)

April 7, 2017, 8:00 to 9:30 a.m.

Faculty Club, Rooms A, B, C

MINUTES

Present: Co-chairs, Cheryl Achterberg and Randy Smith; Eric Anderman, Anika Anthony, Tami Augustine, Rebecca Bias (for Glenn Martinez), Mollie Blackburn, Michele Brown, Erica Brownstein, Chris Faltis, Caryn Filson, Steve Fink, Anne Gee, Howard Greene, Garrett Heysel, Alan Kalish, Tracy Kitchel, Jason Ronis, Greg Rose, Francis Troyan, Bryan Warnick, Andy Zircher

Absent/Excused: David Bruenger, Christopher Hadad, Karen Hutzel, Ben Kanzeg, William MacDonald, Glenn Martinez, Susan Olesik, H. Rao Unnava

Guests: Kelly Crawford and Kathleen Lynch

1. Greeting and introductions
 - a. Guests Kelly Crawford (EHE Fiscal Officer) and Kathleen Lynch (Ed Prep Projects Director)
2. New Business
 - a. Review of February 2017 Minutes
 - i. Motion to approve, all in favor with no changes.
 - b. Senate Bill 199: Concealed Carry Ban Lifted
 - i. This is an informational only agenda item. The current status allows weapons to be carried in preschools and universities, with the approval of the Board of Directors. It's important for faculty to inform teacher prep students accordingly.
 - c. Chancellor's Directive on the Opioid Crisis (Bryan Warnick)
 - i. The Chancellor's directive recommends that all state-assisted institutions of higher education update their teacher preparation curriculums for all content and grade levels so that teachers have the necessary information to educate students about the consequences of opiate and other substance abuse.

An ad hoc committee will be created to discuss various ways to respond to this mandate. It is important to form a committee with faculty from various licensure areas, along with experts on the subject, including faculty from social work, public health, school psych, etc. The committee will offer recommendations.

Other areas of the university are working on this including Dean Martin, Tom Gregoire, Trevor Brown. OSU offers an online training program, *At-Risk*, designed to help identify students in mental distress. The simulation takes about 45 minutes to complete, but it doesn't have to be completed all at one time. This will be an ongoing agenda item.

- d. National Performance Assessment Data: edTPA Results (Erica Brownstein)
 - i. The data compares well with national averages. We are pleased overall with our scores.
 - ii. The dean stated that the university's position is that we want to have edTPA.
 - iii. Question: What are the advantages to staying with edTPA? Principals are looking at those scores when hiring, and with regards to accreditation, we are required to have assessments that are reliable. Also it is nationally averaged.
 - iv. Will other Educator Prep programs want to stay with edTPA? Yes, but there are 2 state institutions that do not. With privates, about 2/3 do and 1/3 do not.
 - v. What is the cost of scoring this? \$300 per student. If it became a state law, it will eliminate one other test (\$105 per student).
 - vi. Passing scores range from 35-42.



- vii. This is a valid consideration; accreditation is also a concern. Assessments are required to be valid and reliable. It takes approximately three years to establish reliability and validity. We can develop ways to assess other additional skills.
 - viii. On a straw vote, there was general support of keeping edTPA, with some undecided.
 - e. CLEP/TAG and Ed Psych (Eric Anderman)
 - i. College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exams are college level exams. Any undergrad student, if they get above a certain score, can receive CLEP credit to opt out of a course, similar to AP courses. Individuals from ETS will meet with TAG teams from around the state to discuss TAG teams.
For Ed Psych, the recommendation is not to allow CLEP credit for the test. When you align the 9 learning outcomes, the CLEP test does not address these outcomes. The Ed Psych learning outcomes requires that you can apply and demonstrate proficiency. The College Level Examination Program is mostly a test of knowledge. Educational Studies recommends not awarding CLEP credit for licensure. It is recommended for General Education courses but not for licensure. The recommendation is specific to licensure.
 - ii. CLEP scores have to count towards credit. Does the CLEP test count towards a degree? Gen Ed requirements don't match up to the CLEP test either.
 - iii. Randy Smith: on a state-wide level, the state standardized AP scores, and is considering standardizing CLEP scores (OSU does not want this). The decision was to break the scores down into 13 areas.
 - iv. We will continue to monitor the discussion (Randy Smith is on state oversight board).
 - v. Randy will update the committee on the process at the next meeting. We're making sure someone is at the 13 tables.
 - f. Alumni Survey (Andy Zircher)
 - i. With regards to alumni surveys, EHE used to use just the student graduation survey. EHE wanted to do a follow up survey for 6-12 months after graduation. Last year, we had close to 20% response rate but this year it is much lower. We will ask program managers to ask students to respond. Response rates vary by programs. The survey was sent to all EHE graduates and other teacher prep programs including Agriculture Ed and Music Ed. Andy Zircher filtered out all non-teacher education students for this UTEC meeting.
3. Old Business, Updates
- a. Employment of Ohio State students during P-12 experience (Erica Brownstein)
 - b. CAEP
 - c. The General Education (Randy Smith) review is underway, chaired by Cathy Montalto (Human Sciences) and Larry Krissek (Earth Sciences). Work is proceeding in 3 phases.
 - i. **Phase 1)** listening (10 or so listening sessions mostly in A &S) and sessions will be scheduled for each regional campus. We are asking that faculty not make pitches for their own programs and to disregard the budget for now. We want to define what the new General Education looks like, then discuss what resources are necessary to make it happen. Most faculty were not here when the current Gen Ed requirements were developed.
 - ii. **Phase 2)** Based on the listening sessions, what have we learned? What might the new General Education requirements look like?
 - iii. **Phase 3)** For this phase, the committee will return to the groups that were originally brought into the conversation and get feedback (2017/18) about the proposals.
 - iv. We want an honest discussion about the approach we are currently taking. Can we think about thematic areas, then create content areas that would come under thematic areas? For example, should citizenship be a thematic area? What about



- sustainability? Consider the distinction between content-based and theme-based requirements.
- v. Should Gen Ed requirements be more distributed throughout four years instead of the first two? What about interdisciplinary courses? Across colleges?
 - vi. Students have said they are leaving it to faculty to decide content. How do students maneuver their way through Gen Ed requirements? What implementations of Gen Ed requirements could change? There is a high level of commitment. We had a good meeting with FAES, and with chairs of Arts and Sciences with very substantive input.
 - vii. Randy will keep UTEC updated on the process. Our listening session is set up for next week, Friday April 14 in Bricker 200. Bryan Warnick will send out a reminder.
- d. Higher Learning Commission (HLC) visit update (Randy Smith)
 - i. We submitted all documentation – 7 person team; chair came in for pre-visit.
 - ii. They wanted more information about 3 things: 1) the budget model; 2) advising; and 3) governance at OSU. They don't see these as areas of weakness but just wanted to know how they're done here. We're hoping to pass (5 "mets", no "non-mets").
4. Subcommittee Reports
- a. Voucher Subcommittee (Greg Rose)
 - i. Guest presenters Kelly Crawford and Kathleen Lynch
 - 1. Report – high level overview with what's been happening with the voucher program now that one whole cohort has gone through.
 - 2. There are 5 steps to the coding process and many people are involved.
 - 3. PowerPoint slides showed the detailed process from the beginning.
 - 4. The total number of students in the voucher program = 642
 - 5. Number of graduate students = 85
 - 6. They are looking at trends across different programs and tracking these trends. The timing can affect when fees are released; they always try to err on the side of the students.
 - b. Forms Subcommittee (Erica Brownstein)
 - i. No report. Next meeting scheduled for April 11
 - c. Appeals Subcommittee (Helen Malone)
 - i. No report
 - d. Program Lead Subcommittee (Karen Irving)
 - i. No report. Next meeting scheduled April 14.
5. Discussion from floor
- a. UTEC should consider whether to meet in summer.
 - b. Last summer, we changed the structure of summer semester – one of the things we need to think about is how we're incentivizing enrollment over the summer. Summer 16 went fine. We're also talking to CSCC about this.
 - c. Another issue – syllabi on campus. Inconsistencies – Academic affairs does not control syllabi. Some colleges have templates for syllabi. There is a group looking at this.
 - d. There are a number of vacancies in the Office of Academic Affairs and the Provost is moving to hire these positions.
 - e. Going back to the summer plan – how does the summer tuition discount affect Education? EHE is losing money since it has always had high summer enrollment. This conversation is turned over to the associate deans in various colleges.