



SMSU School of Education



Teacher Education Advisory Council

Minutes
10.11.17

1. Introductions – Pres. Gores, Dean Oyeaghala, Chair Vierstraete;
CFO Deb Kerkhart, CIO Dan Bahn
 - a. Dr. Matt Loyd, Director of Assessment & Accreditation
 - b. SMSU faculty – and Amy, Jen
 - c. TEAC members

2. Review of Spring 2017 recommendations and current School of Education projects

Looked at edTPA results overall and by program. Based on feedback from last spring's TEAC, we started holding edTPA support nights for our ST candidates. Also have full day programs on campus as part of our seminar days. Goal is to help prepare them to complete the edTPA and to put their best foot forward. Explained what the edTPA is for and what it wants to report on – planning for, instruction, and assessment of student learning.

Shared the dual Health/PE licensure application, has been reviewed, hope to have approval yet this spring.

Shared that we have created the Institutional Report and artifacts in Livetext for an electronic portfolio.

Shared info on new structure of PELSB.

3. Current accreditation status for licensure programs – all previously approved programs have been re-approved. PERCA legislation now has the reaccreditation process

happening every 2 years.

4. Board of Teaching site visit – Nov. 5-7, 2017
 - a. TEAC member meeting with site team
 - b. Possible interviews with mentor teachers with site team

Invitations will be going out by email to TEAC members soon – please be looking for them and attend if possible.

5. edTPA & MTLE Information & Scores Reporting overview, then by licensure area
edTPA scores improving in all content areas due to changes made in preparation in coursework and offering candidate support sessions during student teaching.
6. Focused Round-Table Discussions and
Feedback by licensure area

On each table were scores from 15-16 and 16-17 for each content area along with the Essential Academic Skills tests. Also on the tables were the goals developed by each licensure program and the itemized listing of what substandards were on each subtest for each content area. TEAC members reviewed these and provided feedback on three areas: strengths noted, weaknesses noted, and recommendations for future considerations.