

James I. Perkins College of Education
Advisory Committee for Educator Preparation Programs
February 9, 2015
Meeting Minutes

Members Present:

Scott Bailey	Michael Martin	Janet Tareilo
John Cannings	Jannah Nerren	
David Flowers	Barbara Qualls	
Mike Gencarelli	Maria Betancourt Smith	

Those not present:

Latonya Goffney	Katie Synder
Malinda Lindsey	
Gene Moon	

A welcome and introduction was offered by Jannah Nerren. A discussion regarding student teaching began the meeting. Dr. Nerren shared the numbers of student teachers placed in the spring semester and their placements. EC-6 has the largest placement with 77 students. Other discussion points included the differences in the numbers of student teachers from the fall to the spring semester, the impact of the GPA 2.75 policy, and the possibility of capping the number of times a student may retake the content test.

The issue of capping the number of times a student could retake the content test before being admitted to student teaching was discussed in length. Committee members spoke of the message sent to the public regarding repeat test takers and how this might impact high-need subject areas such as math and science. Dr. Nerren informed the committee members of the path non-passers must take once they have been denied student teaching; alternative certification, and post-bac paths. During the discussion, a suggestion was made to pilot a practice of allowing student teaching candidates who have not passed the test to seek a school district that would approve of their placement.

If the school district was willing to take a “non-passer,” the student would be able to complete his/her student teaching with the understanding the content test must be passed before the end of the student teaching experience. School district representatives voiced how helpful their teachers could be in preparing these students for their content tests. One committee member shared that he did not want to “miss” a great applicant and that his district would help these students as much as possible. Many of the committee members discussed how this could be a way to bridge positive partnerships between the University and the school districts.

The comments about improving partnerships between the University and the school districts led to a discussion about CAEP Standard 2. Dr. Nerren introduced the standard and explained many components

of this standard as well as the connection to CAEP Standard 4. When asked how the University could better strengthen these relationships, the committee members provided several suggestions:

1. strengthen the student teaching experience;
2. arrange a meeting for all mentor teachers/school personnel (possible after the Job Fair, May 8);
3. create an Executive Board from school personnel to avoid feelings of alienation;
4. develop a newsletter/report of what is taking place in student teaching;
5. work with school districts to offer “mini-training” conferences for mentor teachers;
6. develop ways to show University appreciation for the work done by mentor teachers; and
7. examine ways the University can take on some clerical responsibilities of the mentor teachers.

Dr. Nerren made the suggestion that some of the mini-conferences could be done in the larger areas such as Dallas, Houston, and Austin in lieu of mentor teachers having to travel to the University. The committee members agreed that the bond between the University and the mentor teachers needs to be strengthened to provide support, professional development, and recognition for their efforts. Pasadena ISD representative offered to host one of these mini-conferences. The intent of this outreach discussion was to discuss creative ways to better develop positive working relationships with the mentor teachers.

In addition to the discussion regarding CAEP Standard 2 and the impacts of creating more cohesive ways to work with school partners, Dr. Nerren also mentioned CAEP Standard 4 that requires EPPs to determine the impact their candidates have on P-12 student learning. She shared the reporting systems that will need to be in place to assist the University in meeting this accreditation standard: (1) ways in which the University continued to develop positive relationships with school partners; (2) the impact of student teachers on student populations; and (3) the impact of student teachers on student performance on standardized tests. This will require a refined tracking system of graduates from the student teaching experience as well as collected data on student performance.

From this discussion, Dr. Nerren shared information on the co-teaching method and how this might be helpful in strengthening the mentor-student teacher relationship. In addition, Dr. Nerren spoke of how the student teaching experience of old may need to be refined to make student teachers “real” partners in the classroom experience, not relegated to a defined schedule of classroom duties and responsibilities. These classroom partners could actually work side-by-side to provide instruction to students.

The handouts and agenda were provided to committee members through electronic means. The next meeting will be in the Fall of 2015.