

UW System PK-16 Teacher Quality Initiative
UW System Advisory Council Activities
Updated November, 17 2005

Introduction

The UW System Advisory Council was constituted in the fall of 2002 as the UW System PK-16 Task Force. In the fall of 2004, this body evolved into the PK-16 Advisory Council following the successful attainment of their original charge.

This document details key events that directed the work of this system-wide entity (e.g., Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative [PI 34] and the 2001 Board of Regents resolution and briefly describes the relevant activities in which the council has engaged since their initial meeting.

The report concludes with a summary of outcomes, their current status, and comments and recommendations to guide future efforts.

Background Information

In June of 2001, the UW System Board of Regents passed the following resolution:

The Board of Regents adopts the PK-16 Principles directing each UW System Chancellor to work collaboratively with PK-12 and other postsecondary education leaders to develop a well-articulated plan for achieving local quality PK-16 education; and to report plans, initiatives and achievements to the Board in June 2002.

The Board of Regents identified two principles to guide the work associated with this resolution:

1. Strengthening teacher preparation and professional development is central to improving Wisconsin's schools and in preparing all students to participate in a vibrant 21st Century society and economy.
2. The quality of learning is directly affected by the quality of teaching; therefore, institutions should assume responsibility at the all-university level for teacher quality and work in partnership with PK-12 and other postsecondary education leaders toward school renewal.

In addition to the Board of Regents resolution, the Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative (Chapter PI 34 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code) has also had significant influence over UW campus efforts to enhance the quality of educational preparation programs. PI 34 governs all educational preparation program approval and teacher licensure. PI 34 was developed to ensure quality preparation and professional development of early childhood through grade 12 educators by focusing on performance outcomes rather than program inputs. This initiative also requires education faculty to collaborate with their colleagues across the campus as well as partner with local school districts.

On June 6, 2002, a progress report on UW System PK-16 was presented to the education committee of the Board of Regents (A Profile of PK-16 Collaboration across the UW System: A Report to the Board of Regents). This report, which provided a baseline of current collaborative efforts, was based on data collected from each of the thirteen campuses offering teacher certification. Overall findings revealed the following:

- Numerous PK-16 partnership activities are underway across system, however most collaboration is between education faculty and K-12 practitioners
- Some campuses report broad-based involvement with Letters and Science faculty
- Limited outcome measures reported and few campuses with well-articulated, campus-wide plans
- Most campuses state that all university support for quality teacher preparation is just emerging
- Most campuses recognize need to address rewards and recognition structures and role in promoting PK-16 collaboration.

Following a brief discussion period, the education committee presented and approved the following resolution

That, upon recommendation of the University of Wisconsin System, the Board of Regents accepts the report, endorses the future directions, and directs UW System Administration to place a high priority on the development and maintenance of the collaborative activities with the Department of Public Instruction, Wisconsin Technical College System, Independent Colleges and Universities, and UW System Institutions identified in the June 2002, UW Institutional and System Report on PK-16 Collaboration.
Resolution I.1.e

In keeping with the spirit of this resolution, to develop and maintain broad-based collaborative ventures, it was recommended that a task force/advisory board be established to work in collaboration with the UW System Director of PK-16 Initiatives and other system leadership.

In the fall of 2002, the UW System PK-16 Task Force was established under the direction of Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Cora Marrett. Please see attachment [A] for current membership list. In recognition of the complexity of activities that are implied within this resolution, and in an attempt to be sensitive to the most pressing issues facing education today, the charge to the task force was presented as follows:

To assist in the development of processes that will serve to guide and support campus initiatives consistent with creating institution-wide responsibility for the preparation of future teachers.

The following are the major outcomes related to this charge:

- To identify one to two priority areas deserving of *system-wide* attention
- To make operational the PK-16 guiding principles as endorsed by the Board of Regents, including the identification of indicators of progress (i.e., benchmarks of quality)
- To establish campus- and system-wide communications structures that will serve to facilitate institutional commitment
- To review and provide input into a progress report for the Board of Regents

Advisory Council Activities

2002-2003

During the 2002-2003 academic year, the task force met four times. At the end of the year, members had successfully identified a priority for their work: *to support campus efforts to align curriculum and assessments with content area standards as set forward in PI 34, Teacher Standard #1.*

The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

Although the initial focus of this priority was to meet the compliance requirements of PI 34, task force members were very clear to support moving beyond this orientation to take on a more intellectually challenging opportunity for transforming teacher education in Wisconsin. This priority has come to be known as the UW System Teacher Quality Initiative (TQI).

During this year, the task force worked to educate themselves on relevant national, state and campus level issues. They identified and discussed strategies intended to promote campus level implementation efforts consistent with the guiding principles put forward by the Board of Regents; with particular attention paid to the promotion of all university responsibility for teacher preparation and professional development.

One of the most significant outcomes attained by the Task Force was the redesign of the PK-16 grants program, which resulted in a reallocation of system resources to support campus work associated with the TQI. Please see attachment [B] for sample proposal applications.

2003-2004

During the 2003-2004 academic year, each of the thirteen campuses were provided with financial resources in the form of planning grants. This fund was used to support plans consistent with implementation of PI 34 (focus on teacher standard #1) and the Board of Regents resolution on teacher quality preparation (i.e., to promote reform within an all university, highly collaborative environment).

With the input of the Task Force, UW System submitted a proposal to SHEEO. This proposal was accepted and system received a Teacher Quality Grant for the 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 academic years. The fiscal and technical support provided by this Carnegie Corporation of New York funded initiative allowed UW System access to SHEEO consultants who were instrumental in helping the task force focus its Teacher Quality Initiative.

In addition to the pragmatic orientation of the task force, that of helping campuses effectively respond to the implementation challenges of PI 34, the SHEEO grant has provided a scholarly element to this work. During 2003 and 2004, discussions between members of the Task Force and SHEEO representatives have focused on trying to identify how campuses would go about documenting and evaluating the role of all university responsibility on the quality of teacher preparation and professional development. The SHEEO grant supported research designed to answer the following questions:

1. What does all university responsibility in teacher preparation/professional development look like at our campuses?
2. How can we know if these practices make a difference in the quality of teacher preparation and professional development?

Although numerous professional organizations have called upon teacher preparation institutions to bring arts and sciences faculty into the integral work of teacher preparation and professional development, we do not know what this means in practice. In addition, we do not know how specific actions/behaviors resulting from these collaborations affect the quality of teacher preparation.

By the end of the 2003-2004 academic year, the original charge to the task force had been met. A system-wide priority had been identified and PK-16 grant funds had been reallocated as a central strategy for promoting reforms in teacher education and institution-wide responsibility for teacher preparation/professional development.

In addition, the Task Force recommended that a research design team be created to provide technical support to campuses as they work to respond to various aspects of TQI.

At the end of the 2003-2004 academic year members of the task force acknowledged that there is still much work still to do to sustain reform efforts in teacher preparation. As a result, members voted to continue their work under a slightly reconfigured structure of an advisory council.

2004-2005

The PK-16 Advisory Council continued to work with UW System leadership to provide input into TQI/SHEEO grant related activities. The council met twice during the academic year (September 27 and May 12). A meeting of what was referred to as the research design team met in December.

The focus of the September 27, 2004 meeting was on accountability in higher education and teacher preparation programs. President Reilly joined us for lunch and welcomed council members. He spoke about the need to address state priorities around teacher preparation and to communicate how UW institutions contribute to the quality of PK-16 education.

The remainder of the meeting addressed the national and state issues relevant to accountability, with particular attention on how to validly and reliably document and assess the impact of teacher preparation.

The December 10, 2004 meeting of the research design team was a follow up on accountability, with a focus on creating a coherent plan for evaluating educational preparation programs within the UW System. The members of this ad hoc group agreed upon a set of outcomes, including the creation of a website to post on-going work. They also shared a variety of initiatives underway on their campuses. Tricia Coulter from SHEEO attended and helped us clarify that our focus was on accountability from a UW System perspective (i.e., how UW institutions are meeting the needs to prepare high quality educators), with institution level data used by the individual campus for continuous improvement. Several needs were put forward, including:

- Identify the key issues/elements for accountability/evaluation and clarify priorities within this set of issues
- Identify what we are already doing e.g., broad reform initiatives as well as specific campus actions such as surveys of graduates. Part of this work would enable us to “tell the story” to the legislature and public regarding UW IHEs contribution to quality education.
- Identify what other states are doing and how we can benefit from their work. We need to discuss a process for building upon these connections. Part of this work is being done by our involvement with SHEEO
- Discuss short-term and long-term goals. For example, we can achieve some “quick wins” by sharing current tools and finding ways to assist each other in meeting basic requirements of PI 34; discuss benefits of creating common tools or common elements for surveys of graduates. This sharing might include the future website, holding system-wide meetings, regional discussions, etc.

It was originally envisioned that this ad hoc group would function as the research arm of the advisory council and implement its recommendations related to PI 34 and the Board of Regents resolution on all university responsibility. After further reflection by UW System staff, it was determined that the work would require additional human resources for success. A formal recommendation was presented to the full PK-16 Advisory Council at the May meeting for their consideration.

The focus of the May 12, 2005 meeting was to discuss a formal recommendation to collaborate around three priorities and align a portion of the PK-16 grant resources with these priorities. To help understand the context of this work, Ed Crowe, consultant with SHEEO, provided the council with an overview of national level activities associated with program accountability.

The council endorsed the recommendation to focus on the three priorities and approved funding to support the work teams. Please see appendix [C] for details of the three priorities. The three work teams will present an update of their work at the fall 2005 meeting.

2005-2006 Plans

It is anticipated that the PK-16 Advisory Council will meet at least twice during this academic year. These meetings are in addition to the work team meetings, which have been on-going since the summer of 2005.

At the request of SHEEO, UW System Administration responded to a set of questions that required detailing what specific objectives we would identify for improving teacher preparation in Wisconsin. Please see appendix [D] for this document. SHEEO is exploring potential funding with the Carnegie Corporation of New York to help support our work in collaboration with several other states.

The council also co-sponsored an education roundtable, which was held October 19, 2005. Please see appendix [E] for details of this meeting.

Summary of Outcomes, Status, & Comments/Recommendations

Outcomes	Status	Comments/Recommendations
1. Identify one-two priorities deserving of system wide attention	<p>Attained Priority originally identified in 2002 as alignment of curriculum and assessment with content standard #1 of PI 34; 04-05 priorities amended to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduate follow up • Quality assurance • Role of higher ed. rep on initial educator professional development plan 	<p>>Additional efforts still needed to fully comply with PI 34 and Board of Regents >November Board of Regents meeting with Education Committee expected to shed light on additional priorities >Workteam progress reports to be presented at Nov. 2005 meeting of council</p>
2. Identified processes to guide campus initiatives consistent with Board of Regents (BOR) resolution and PI 34.	<p>Attained Council realigned PK-16 funding to support campus implementation efforts</p> <p>SHEEO grant obtained (03-04; 04-05)</p>	<p>>Currently analyzing status of grant activities (UWSA and SHEEO) to determine value in advancing priorities; may need to revise current UWSA grant guidelines; submitted proposal to SHEEO(05-06)</p>
3. Operationalize Board of Regents guiding principles & define benchmarks of quality	<p>Attained Council fully endorsed principle #1= Quality Educators is key to vibrant economy</p> <p>On-going Principle #2=All University Responsibility discussed, not yet clearly defined</p>	<p>>UWSA conducted preliminary report and presented to BOR in 2002 documenting current all U activities >Need to explore usefulness of conducting survey update</p> <p>>Work exploring Quality Assurance [workteam #2] will further address how to document and assess its impact on educational preparation</p>
4. Establish campus and system wide communication structures to facilitate commitment	<p>Attained and on-going</p>	<p>>Advisory Council created from original Task Force; System leadership meetings (e.g., Ed & L&S Deans meetings, Provosts and Chancellors, faculty reps); Board of Regents meetings all used to continue conversations >Created three work-teams >Website under development</p>
5. Progress report to BOR	<p>Attained and on-going</p>	<p>>Initial report provided June 2002 on status of All University... >Presentations scheduled for Board of Regents during 2005-2006 session</p>
6. Build partnerships with other states/systems engaged in similar work	<p>On-going</p>	<p>>Contacted various states/systems >Created overview report on national initiatives >Need to enhance partnerships with key states (e.g., OH, TX, CA)</p>
7. Other?		

