Teacher Education Council

December 10, 2010

3:00Pm-5:00pm

Jacobus Lounge

**Minutes**

**Members Present:** C. Pass, C. Widdall, E. Jampole, E. Kudela, J. Bailey, J. Lykos, K. Hempson, K. Rombach, L. Campbell, L. Couturier, M. Gfeller, R. Janke, W. Buxton, M. Barduhn, J. Cottone, B. Mattingly, D. Farnsworth, E. Gravani, J. O’Callaghan, J. Mosher,M. Canfield, N. Aumann, K. Seibert, V. Marty

1. Approve Agenda: Agenda approved without modification
2. Approve Minutes from 11/12/10: Approved as written
3. Standing Committee Reports: (See written reports from Chairs)
   1. TEC Bylaws Committee-J. Cottone, M. Barduhn, N. Aumann, J. O’Callaghan
      1. Results of the e-vote on adoption of updated language-Approved
   2. TEC Assessment Committee: A. Lachance
   3. Conceptual Framework Committee: J. Mosher
   4. TECRC: N. Aumann
   5. TEC Curriculum Committee: E. Gravani
4. Old Business : None
5. New Business (Discussion Items)

a. Unit Assessments-Planning & Implementation

* + 1. M.S.E.d. programs need for data in Unit Assessment-Why? List of Programs- The need for data in advanced programs other than those in MST and MAT (considered initial programs) lead some faculty to believe that they were off the radar as far as having to report out to NCATE under the IR. All programs dealing with teacher education must collect, analyze, and use assessment data to improve program and instruction. The issue seems to be that our advanced programs do not have key assessments that can be routinely analyzed and used to improve program and instruction. All of the advanced programs have a culminating experience from which data can be derived that speaks to the efficacy of the instruction and the performance of candidates within the programs. The TEC Assessment Committee will be focusing on the development of a key assessment that can be used for this purpose by all advanced programs in the future.
    2. Report on Teacher Education Dispositions- N. Aumann reviewed with the council the members of the dispositions committee and spoke briefly about the process that they employed to develop the new dispositions list. For the most part, the sub-committee chose to follow the exemplar institutions around the state such as SUNY Oneonta. She also spoke about NCATE terminology in our identifiers and in our rubrics. The current list of dispositions represents best practice, timing, candidate self-reflection, etc. It is important to note that the new dispositions are closely correlated to the various transition points identified in our unit assessment system. Additionally these dispositions will be reviewed through methods other than a simple check box, which is not a true assessment. Nancy indicated that her committee is recommending that the dispositions be articulated in the methods courses so that peer-to peer interaction can be employed to better exemplify what the desirable dispositions are and what they look like. The committee wants to emphasize the need for a unit assessment coordinator, a common technology platform, etc. in order to promote quality feedback not quantity feedback. Marley added that this is not a finished product but work will continue. Lynn asked that this be an electronic process as producing these on paper would be prohibitive. A question persists about how best to implement this at the graduate level? Point of entry and/or point of internship, etc., were two suggestions. This is technically an existing process. This does not preclude departments from adding whatever dispositions they feel stronlgly about. The committee believes that the dispositions should be broken down by academic and social dispositions. We really get at the professional dispositions through their coursework but the social components are very difficult to provide feedback on. Nancy indicated that she would also like to see logic (use of) included in the dispositions. This area represents an enormous problem because many of our students do not display any sense of logic. Chris Widdall asked if they found reference to “approaching” a level and/or representing the dispositions on a continuum . This needs to have additional work. We are already looking at this in a developmental way. We may ask reps from graduate programs to join and/or provide feedback to the committee as our work progresses.
    3. Update from the Title II Technology Committee-Chris Widdall shared some background and advised the council that the committee is actively seeking liaisons from the departments who can work with the Title II committee to implement this set of standards. The focus group will then work to identify ways for us to meet the 5 standards and 20 elements of the ISTE. Marley answered a question from Gigi about why this committee is doing this type of work- ANS. Title II requires that we report out on the ability of our candidates to teach all students effectively through the integration and use of technology. Chris described a recent experience that her students were able to participate in using net books, which involved research, creating a storyboard, writing the storyboard to integrate curriculum and produce movies. They also received feedback from the host teachers which let Chris know what deficiencies her teacher candidates had, they corrected them and went back a second time. Things got better and it was a quality experience all the way around. Gigi brought up the serious nature of workload issues with this initiative. Faculty do not have time to oversee this and most do not have a technology person to oversee it so. . . Bruce Mattingly talked about the requirements of Title II report. Look at Standard 2d. Chris indicated that the committee can certainly go back to the drawing board, look at the standards again and see if they can be pared down so that we meet the intent of the effort. The discussion will be continued at another meeting.
  1. Distribution of Materials for Conceptual Framework-J. Mosher advised the council about her work with Tony DeRado and Gradin Avery on the production of materials to support the site visit by NCATE that are consistent with approved SUNY Cortland Marketing logos and strategies.
     1. President’s Opening Meeting- The focus of the meeting will be the NCATE visit in March of 2011
     2. The Updated Crosswalk and Preparation of Course Syllabi-Joy asked that everyone review the updated crosswalk prior to updating syllabi for the Spring 2011 semester.
  2. ID Badges and Online Modules for Field Experience-K. Beney provided sample badges for the council to examine and reviewed the rationale for requiring that all SUNY Cortland students wear name tags while in the public school settings used for early field experiences as well as student teaching.
  3. Overall Preparations for the NCATE BOE Visit – Marley reviewed some of the developments with regard to preparations for the upcoming SUNY Cortland Site Visit by NCATE and asked that all Faculty and staff familiarize themselves with the following items and/or attend the President’s Opening Session where NCATE will be highlighted or an upcoming Sandwich Seminar that will be held on January 27th:
     1. SUNY Cortland Teacher Education Candidate Assessment System Overview
     2. Marilyn Feldman’s Questions for review
     3. Pre-Visit by Suzanne George, Chair BOE Team
     4. Update from Mickey Gibbons

1. Adjourn: the meeting adjourned at 4:59pm. The next meeting of the committee will be held on January 28, 2011 from 3:00pm to 5:00pm in the Exhibition Lounge, Corey Union.

***Happy Holidays!!***

December Update

TEC Standing committee on By-laws

At this point in time the committee on by-laws has not convened a meeting to review possible changes to the By-laws of 2009. The committee did, however recommend a number of changes to the by-laws document representing updates to titles, conveners, and membership (both voting and non-voting). The proposed changes were reviewed with the full Teacher Education Council and it was recommended that the issue be put to a vote. The issue was put to a ballot on 10/28/10. The result of the ballot was that a majority vote of the TEC was not established by the close date of the ballot. At the November meeting of the TEC a vote was taken to reopen the ballot for an additional week. That was done and the results are as follows: 28 votes constitute a majority.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | **1.**  Shall the updated language of the SUNY Cortland Conceptual Framework be recommended for approval by the Provost for use in conjunction with the NCATE Unit Report and for other Unit accreditation purposes? |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | | **Response Total** | **Response Percent** | | Yes | Response equal to 89 | **34** | **89%** | | No | Response equal to 11 | **4** | **11%** | | **Total Respondents** | | | **38** | |

The updated language is adopted.

December Update for the Teacher Education Council

Standing Committee on Assessment

Andrea Lachance-Chair

The TEC Assessment committee has been meeting weekly for the past few months on the following issues:

- Taskstream adoption: Will Taskstream be adopted as the data management system for the college? We have asked for a decision on this issues several times and still do not have one.

- Unit Assessments: Feedback from the NCATE steering committee and NCATE consultants suggests we do not have enough unit-wide assessments to illustrate the strength of our programs. The committee is in the process of drafting two potential unit-wide assessments. One will allow for the collection of data on teacher work samples or similar existing activities in initial certification programs across the college. A second unit assessment will collect data on culminating activities in advanced teacher education programs at the masters level.

- Process for adopting unit assessments: The committee has proposed a process for adopting unit-wide assessments to the Assistant Provost for Teacher Education. The process would include the following steps: TEC Assessment Committee proposes a unit-wide assessment and sends it to all TE faculty across the college for feedback; the committee revises proposed assessment based on feedback and presents to TEC for feedback; the committee will finalize the assessment and ask TEC to vote on its implementation as a unit-wide assessment.

Report of the Teacher Education Candidate Review Committee

December 2010

The Teacher Education Candidate Review Committee (TECRC) meets on a regular basis every two weeks during the academic year, convening this fall semester on August 25, September 10 and 24, October 8 and 22, November 5 and 19, and December 3. One recommendation as approved by the Teacher Education Council was to update the TECRC brochure. Otherwise, the committee reviews from a dozen to about fifty teacher candidates at each meeting with the semester result of a total of 607 teacher candidates reviewed as indicated below:

393 Approved -- “Standard Operating Procedure” names as forwarded from the

Field Placement Office

25 Approved – “Standard Operating Procedure” names as forwarded from the

Educational Leadership Program for Internships

156 Approved – candidates who have self-disclosed

27 Approved -- pending Reflection Papers on behavior

6 Pending -- denied fieldwork until Disciplinary Probation is concluded

In terms of teacher candidate behavior, the TECRC notes an increase in reviews during the fall semester at the time of Cortaca Weekend and during the spring semester at the time of Scholars’ Day.

TEC Standing Committee on

The Conceptual Framework

December 2010

The Conceptual Framework Committee reports that

* Lapel pins have been ordered and should be here in time for the opening meeting.
* Preliminary plans for posters, brochures and table tents have been submitted and a meeting with Gradin Avery is scheduled to assure compliance with branding requirements.
* Posters should be up in all classrooms related to Teacher Education (including GE classes), dormitories, and some public areas.

Familiarizing students with the Conceptual Framework is important. Members of the committee will present to the student ambassador group, and any other interested group. The committee will assist faculty and administrators in efforts with students. The handout and crosswalk and PowerPoint will be available on the web for use.

Based on feedback from NCATE consultant, Marilyn Feldman, the committee will prepare the full unexpurgated version of the Conceptual Framework (complete with updated resources, etc.) to accompany the brief summary.

TEC Standing Committee on Curriculum

December 2010 Update

Eileen Gravani, Chair

This committee has not met since the last report. No Report Submitted.

Report of the Dispositions Committee

The Dispositions Committee was appointed in early fall semester to review the current dispositions expected of teacher candidates at SUNY Cortland. Meeting on a weekly basis since the beginning of October, the committee has done “research of the literature” from NCATE exemplar institutions and is forwarding its recommendations for Teacher Education Council consideration as part of the December 10 agenda. These recommendations include a listing of dispositions – character, pedagogy, and professional – as well as the assessments of dispositions from participants and timing of assessments to the descriptions of each disposition using the NCATE terminology of “target,” “acceptable,” and “unacceptable.”

To: The Teacher Education Council

From: The Dispositions Committee -- Nancy Aumann, Mary Gfeller, Jerome O’Callaghan,

Nanette Pasquarello, Renee Potter

Date: December 3, 2010

Re: Recommendations for Teacher Candidate Dispositions -- Disposition Identification,

Assessments, and Rubrics

Recommendations for Unit Core Dispositions

Teacher candidates exhibit the following Character Dispositions:

* Integrity
* Empathy
* Emotional Maturity
* Work Ethic

Teacher candidates demonstrate the following Pedagogy Dispositions:

* Belief that all children can learn
* Fairness
* Passion for the subject matter and for teaching
* Non-discriminatory and inclusive pedagogy, fostering equity and

social justice

* Promotion of high standards and fulfillment of academic expectations
* Creation of a safe and nurturing classroom environment
* Appropriate and effective use of technology and other teaching materials

Teacher candidates model the following Professional Dispositions:

* Commitment to ongoing assessment for student-improvement
* Continual reflection on self-improvement, receptiveness to guidance,

and professional development

* Collegiality
* Understanding of and respect for policies and procedures
* Sensitivity to the particular school culture including expectations of

teacher candidates

* Appropriate initiative
* Effective communication with all stakeholders (e.g., students, parents,

administrators, community partners)

Recommendations for the Timing of Assessments

1. Point of Application to a Teacher Education Program -- The approach is recommended for online rubrics for teacher candidate self-awareness at the point of entry into the program with that as a requirement on the teacher education application. Early self-awareness would become part of a portfolio for future reference. Since students do change majors, and due to some large programs, a “check box” response would be utilized. In addition, because the point of application involves new transfer students as well as freshmen, only the Character Dispositions would be assessed, and in those cases where “red flags” appear, those students would be contacted by a faculty colleague.
2. During Early Fieldwork and/or During Methods Class(es) -- The specific teacher education programs should determine exactly when assessments of the Unit core dispositions should occur in this time period, and specific programs could add dispositions to the Unit core dispositions according to academic discipline. At this stage of teacher preparation, the rubrics should be combined with self-reflective essay questions, and that faculty feedback is paramount. In those instances where teacher candidates’ behavior is clearly “unacceptable,” individual appointments should be scheduled, and our normal procedure of candidate consultation should take place.
3. At the End of Student Teaching -- Existing STEs represent an assessment of dispositions with teacher candidate self-reflection and feedback from field supervisors and host teachers.
4. Exit from the Program -- Before graduation, teacher candidates must complete a survey about their teacher education program. Such an assessment could indicate areas of recognized strength as well as of needed improvement.
5. Post-Graduation Surveys of Graduates and Employers -- Already done through Career Services, more focused questions for our graduates of teacher preparation programs as well as their employers could be explored for program assessment.

Recommendations for Institutional Commitment to Assessments

* Creation of a Unit Assessment Coordinator for Teacher Education -- Realizing that sister SUNY institutions have recognized the necessity to employ a Unit Assessment Coordinator for Teacher Education, such a position is needed to coordinate assessment efforts across the SUNY Cortland NCATE Unit.
* Identification and Support of Appropriate Technology (TaskStream?) for Continuous Assessments -- Designation of a campus-wide technology to support ongoing assessments must occur.
* Recommendations for Assessment Rubrics -- Refer to the Accompanying Chart at the following link:
* [\\shares\ncate\dispositionschart2010.xls](file:///\\shares\ncate\dispositionschart2010.xls)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |