

## **Illinois Mathematics Teacher IMTE Annual Meeting Minutes**

Meeting Date: Thursday, November 30, 2017

Place: Hilton Garden Inn - Board Room, Chicago, IL

Time: 4:00 pm

Attendees: Astrida Cirulis, 2 guests from Latvia, Keith Drew, Adam Poetzal, Jim Olsen, Aleksandra Veselovsky, Bob Mann, Todd Oberg, Cathy Kaduk, Mary McMahon

Welcome from Astrida

Introductions were made

### **REPORTS**

#### **Minutes:**

Approval of minutes from the 2016 meeting: – Motion to approve the minutes by Mary McMahon, Alex seconded.

#### **Treasurer's Report:**

Approval of the treasurer's report: Motion to approve from Todd and seconded by Bob.

Note that pay \$80 for dues as an affiliate for AMTE.

#### **President's Report**

Discussion on past meeting locations in preparation for future meetings.

Discussion of the meetings for the year – ISMAA is a tri-state meeting, so it may be trickier to get space for a IMTE meeting.

#### **Membership**

Update on good standing for dues.

#### **Elections**

Identify new people for positions that are unfilled:

Secretary: Denice Love

4 year college/university: Aleksandra Veselovsky

Professional Development: open

K-12 Representative: Kelly Remijan

Board Members Retained:

Treasurer: Barbara O'Donnell

4 year college/university: Tammy Voepell

2 year college: Catherine Moushon

ISBE/IBHE/Government: Jennie Winters

At the end of the meeting Mary McMahon moves from being president-elect to president and Astrida Cirulis moves from being president to past-president.

The slate was accepted.

Discussion:

Discussion on changes in licensure There is discussion of including "C-" as an acceptable grade, a change from the "C" as the lowest acceptable grade for licensure.

Discussion on use of ACT or SAT scores instead of using the TAP test for entry into programs, and what might be long term effects of those choices.

Discussion on consequences regarding meeting State requirements given the likely choices of what the state decides to do with CAEP. – What happens if an institution decides to stay at the State level, what CAEP standards will apply for those programs?

ISBE State licensure board (SEPLB) is looking at the image of IL teacher preparation and trying to change the climate to be more professional.

ISBE State licensure board is looking to recruit more people to go into Teacher Education programs.

Discussion on how to encourage people to go into teaching and what IMTE could do to help:

- go to the high schools to recruit
- hiring an administrator to help with recruitment
- have a short summer camp for students who are interested in teaching led by a PhD student. (UIUC)
- look at limited pathways model with education as one of the limited pathways, (NLU).
- Have a first generation program that includes "teach first" (North Central)
- New Center Partnership run by Jan Fitzsimmons Project LEAD partnership is focused on recruitment of a diverse pool of teacher candidates (includes Posters – if my teacher looks like me-funded by State Farm.)
- ISBE or other state level agency could increase communication on a more personal level rather than a website post (say a letter, etc.) to various groups to support efforts to encourage stronger potential candidates to become teacher candidates.
- how to counter the trend that current teachers are not necessarily encouraging students to enter the field.

edTPA success was discussed, with an emphasis on how data trends could lead to program improvement. The current passing score is "37"; however, the data showed students' edTPA scores in

secondary math, world languages, early childhood and PE are going down, not going up. The trends seen in IL are comparable to national score trends.

Secondary Math candidates struggle equally and have lower task scores in all three task of the edTPA: planning, instruction, and assessment. The particular rubrics that these candidates score low on are Rubrics 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, and 15. The group agreed these areas need more attention based on this data.

Theories for why scores were going down from the results of the initial year(s) of giving edTPA were shared:

- Failing scores are included and these lower the averages.
- Rubrics 2, 5 and 13 have an automatic “1” – if the student is not addressing IEP or 504s in their response(s), the score would be an automatic “1”. If there are not students with needs, a candidate needs to say there are no students with IEP or 504s.
- Candidates will have a harder time on the edTPA if they pick an advanced class to write about, as it may be very hard to talk about meeting the needs of struggling students in this environment as most of the students will not have any needs or will struggle. Thus, candidates need to complete their edTPA in classrooms with a variety of needs, including students who struggle learning math, i.e. candidates need to have interesting students to write about.
- Candidates struggle with distinguishing between “conceptual” and “procedural” fluency when writing their planning commentary and engaging students in assessments. This is an area that needs additional work. It is important that the candidate show they can get students engaged in developing conceptual and procedural understanding. Candidates need to plan for including procedural and conceptual understanding in their lesson and be able to write about this in their commentary.
- The feedback that candidates give to students needs to be sufficient enough to help students close any gaps in their learning and needs to be phrased in such a way that it ties back to the learning objective(s) for the lesson and the central focus of the lesson.
- One thought about the low scores for the assessment task (Part 3) is that since it is at the end, scores may be low from writing fatigue. Also, when candidates write about what changes they would make to their lesson or teaching plan, they tend to focus on superficial changes, i.e., talking louder, placement of materials, management issues, or a different classroom setup, but the rubrics focus on what students need to do next time to close the learning gap and that connect back to the central focus of the lesson.

Discussion regarding students’ timely completion of edTPA followed. Windows from colleges are suggested to make sure students submit edTPA - perhaps connected to the Seminars, etc. Some programs have specific days to submit, others set due dates with more flexible times for submission of the assessment.

Discussion on general suggestions to help students do well on the edTPA included:

- Reminding candidates they need to pick interesting students to discuss.
- Objectives need to be written where it is possible to demonstrate partial understanding.
- Candidates who use more probing questions with students (why, explain, etc.) seem to be able to learn more about their students’ conceptual understanding, thus are able to write about it.

- Emphasize that candidate respond specifically to the questions, not write other things.
- Emphasize that candidate document their ideas with citations. Remind students that the list of citations are not included in the page count.
- Thinking Organizers from ISU for every content area have been helpful for Alex. She is going to send them to Mary and Todd to make sure they are distributed to members. She also indicated they are on the IACTE website, though not necessarily easy to find.

Discussion on academic language and the need for more information about academic language at higher ed level followed. Use of academic language for both specific content and language used in school is viewed as inadequate in teacher candidates. Candidates need to support students' academic language, and one way to improve academic language in teacher candidates is for their professors/instructors to model appropriate use of academic language. For example, "solve" is not academic language). Melanie Hundley at Vanderbilt provides good resources.

The agenda item regarding the opportunity to do something special as there is money in the budget was presented, but there was not a lot of discussion due to time constraints. Having a summit with a topic focus and including an expert in the topic was suggested.

Interest in the success rate for the new elementary education math test compares to previous tests was expressed. Not much information was available about success rates, but Adam noted that ILTS has a practice test for \$20.

Motion to adjourn from Cathy, seconded by Bob.