 **Teacher**

**Education**

**Council**

**Meeting Logistics**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | December 12, 2011 |
| **Time** | 3:00pm to 5:00pm |
| **Location** | Exhibition Lounge, Corey Union |

Members present: A. Schutt,J. Mosher, C. Pass, C. Benton, D. Smukler, D. Pfennig, E. Kudela, G. Peterson, J. Bailey, K. Stearns, L. Campbell, M. Gfeller, M. Gonzalez, R. Janke, W. Buxton, A. Lachance, B. Mattingly, D. Farnsworth, D. Weiczorek, E. Gravani, J. O’Callaghan, J. Cottone, M. Barduhn

**Pre-Reading**

|  |
| --- |
| Dispositions Rubrics Attached |
| Standing and Ad Hoc Committee Updates Attached |
| Link to the power point presentation delivered at the meeting with Commissioner King and and members of the Board of Regents (combined presentations).  <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/resources.html> |
|  |

**Agenda Items**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item #** | **Description** |
| **1** | **Approval of Meeting Minutes from 11-21-11, Standing and Ad Hoc Committee Updates: Minutes and committee updates were reviewed. No corrections were noted. Motion by D. Smukler to accept the minutes, second by R. Janke. Minutes and all updates were approved unanimously. Two pending votes were also discussed as there were not enough votes on the date of this meeting to ratify and approve either recommendation. D. Farnsworth reviewed with the council that 31 votes are required to constitute a majority of voting members. There was some discussion about the ballot on the Fair Process Policy, as some titles and other language employed in the document require additional updates to reflect current realities. It was decided that the enti9re policy would be sent to the full TECRC for review and recommended modifications to titles and other language changes prior to forwarding the modified document to the Provost for final approval.** |
| **2.** | **Discussion of Teacher Education Candidate Dispositions:**   * **MSEd Dispositions Recommended (Attached)** * **UGMATMST Dispositions Recommended (Attached)**   **Motion to conduct e-vote on these rubrics: After discussion, this item was tabled until such time as the Dispositions committee can meet meet with or receive feedback from the graduate coordinators with regard to the proposed character, professional and pedagogical dispositions. There was also some discussion about the number of categories in the rubric. L. Cambell felt that there should only be 2 (met: not met), as the third category makes it difficult to rate candidates and can lead to misunderstanding and argument by candidates that they are meeting the disposition by “degrees”, especially where remediation is indicated. It was also noted that the categories on the rubric should not be used to indicate what candidates are lacking. It was also suggested that if and when the dispositions and associated rubrics are approved by the TEC it may be advisable to have SUNY Counsel review them prior to full implementation. We should also avoid and term on the rubric or in the dispositions that can be seen to impose limits. If deemed unacceptable, we need to be able to defend our decisions to place the candidate in remediation.** |
| **3.** | **Discussion of comments with regard to:**   * **Rubric for Initial Teacher Candidate Assessment of Student Learning** * **Rubric for Advanced Candidate Assessment of Student Learning**   **Motion to conduct e-votes on these assessments: There was no substantive discussion of the rubrics and no comments were received by members of the TEC Assessment Committee with regard to modification of the rubrics. A. Lachance moved and C. Benton seconded a motion to put the 2 proposed rubrics to electronic vote. (the ballots will not be posted until faculty and voting members return from the break. (see November 2011 minutes for copies of the rubrics)** |
| **4.** | **Update to the TEC on the recent meeting with the Commissioner, Merryl Tisch and other members of the NYS Board of Regents: M. Barduhn, A. Lachance and S. Wilson were in attendance at this meeting where 3 items of note were discussed via a power point presentation. The 3 items reviewed were: 1) Current reform in general and workforce trends 2) effectiveness in teaching (the new APPR) and 3) the new teacher certification tests/educating all students. The tests will apply to all initial cert candidates and all Educational Leadership candidates. After going over several slides regarding the new cert requirements a common question was, “Are public schools on board with the proposed changes in teacher certification?” This questions was answered by M. Barduhn who pointed out that New York City schools have a policy of no videotaping of students but Commissioner King brought forward the example of Hunter College and how they have hundreds of videos taken in the NYC Schools and wondered how that happened in light of the policy. His point being that this is going to happen and whatever roadblocks that are currently in place will be removed. (a link to the power point presentation can be found above)** |
| 5. | **Reporting out on the work of the FEAC: D. Weiczorek provided a summary of the continuing work of the FEAC as follows:**  **We opened by reviewing NYSED regulations 52.21 regarding the field experience, practica, and student teaching, as well as the SUNY New Visions documents governing same.**  ** We discussed “What will be our message or goal of the meeting today and our documents?” We decided that we will contemplate options to consider around the field experience in the short- and long-term- broken down by the early field experience and the student teaching experience. We will present these options in summary form for additional conversations with faculty and administration.**  ** We hope to avoid a panic- we want to be proactive. The panic could come sometime in the future (perhaps as early as spring semester) when students who are enrolled in programs and registered for classes are told they will not be able to take the class because there is no placements for them. We will then have students and parents both panicking and mad. This should be avoided and can be if we have strategies ready to address these possibilities. We do not necessarily like or endorse some or many of the ideas put forward because they will weaken our education program, but it is at a point of making a choice between telling students their graduation will be delayed or in the interim a weaker program.**  ** We decided that we would not eliminate options because of feasibility; meaning we did not eliminate options because of the difficulty of implementing them. It is important to understand that we have a situation in which there could be few options short of telling students they cannot enroll in a course or take student teaching. We believe this issue requires honest dialogue and consideration of the state of the field as it stands today.**  ** We also believe strongly that current conversations regarding ‘clinically-rich’ experiences and the current press/research in teacher education to increase the number, length, and quality of the field experience for students will not manifest itself locally if these current/local issues around the field experiences at SUNY Cortland are not discussed.**  ** Questions raised, generally: Is SUNY New Visions a mandate or a goal? How/when was this accepted as the guide for field experiences at SUNY Cortland? Who enforces it? Is there a real possibility for us to waive certain aspects? If the time comes, what will be our response if students are not placed in the field for appropriate experiences? Are we at or near that point?**  **DEFINITIONS**  **Early Field Experiences**  **\*\*\*Defined: “Field experience means direct observation of teaching, participation in teaching, or teaching itself that is related to the teacher education program in which the candidate is enrolled; engaged in prior to student teaching or practica; and carefully selected and planned by program faculty.”(NYSED reg.52.21, vii, page 2).**  **We also note 52.21 (2), page 7-8, field experiences….”(c) provide candidates with experiences in a variety of communities and across the range of developmental levels of the certificate, experience practicing skills for interacting with parents or caregivers, experiences in high needs schools, and with each of the following student populations: socioeconomically disadvantaged, ELL, SWD..”**  **Practica**  **Definition: “Practica means structured, college-supervised learning experiences for a student in a teacher education program in which the student teacher practices the skills being learned in the teacher education program through direct experiences with individual students, or with groups of students. These skills are practices under the direct supervision of the certified teacher who has official responsibility for the students.” (NYSED reg. 52-21, xi, page 3 of 45)**  **Student teaching**  **SUNY New Visions: “Student teaching will consist of a minimum of 75 days in classrooms and schools [with 90 days being desirable] in two separate experiences, at least one of which is a high-needs school.”**  **NYSED Regulation 52-21, (2) Field experiences, student teaching, and practica (p. 7 of 45):**  **“(i) The program shall include at least 100 clock hours of field experiences related to coursework prior to student teaching or practica. The program shall include at least two college-supervised student-teaching experiences of at least 20 school days each; or at least two college-supervised practica with individual students or groups of students of at least 20 days each. This requirement shall be met by student teaching, unless specific requirements for the certificate in subdivision require practica.”**  **\*\*\*We note in the Commissioner’s regulations 52.21 (iii), page 8: “Upon written application by the institution, the commissioner may grant a time-limited approval for an alternate model for field experiences and college-supervised student teaching or practica, provided that that the institution demonstrates the success of such model or has an adequate plan for demonstrating that the model will be successful.”**  **Thoughts: Early field experiences require attention and improvement. Are particular sets of learners in our field experiences? Early field experiences start later and later in the semester, which diminishes the curricular congruence with the field experience. Departments are feeling as though they cannot include the field experience as part of the course in a meaningful way. Why are we straining ourselves at both ends when we are not meeting our obligations anyways?**  **1. We have successfully placed students in the EF component in the past using ‘oversampled’ classrooms with several students with the same teacher at one time during a semester. The partners do not want this to continue, and we have concerns over quality of these experiences. This also directly affects the numbers of students we can place in the schools.**  **2. Can we expand the definition of ‘field experience’ to fit the regulations, including valuable experiences that many faculty and students currently implement with children, community organizations, service learning, and other partners in the community. We have great relationships already and schools/places that love us- can we make this count for something? Can we set up separate outreach experiences, not directly tied to course work, which can count towards students’ work in schools? (ex. Tutoring after school). This may relieve pressure on the EF placements, and in turn, then release pressure for ST placements- many teachers take early field but then cannot take ST due to district limitations and personnel policies.**  **3. Can we include EF high-needs placements to satisfy the SUNY high needs mandate programmatically? Many students have high needs placements during the early field component. Can we relax this definition to allow for more flexibility to place student teachers later in the program in non-high needs areas?**  **4. Reimbursement- we do not reimburse for early field in a meaningful way. Nor for student teaching.**  **5. Scheduling- is there a way to better align course offerings and start/end times to allow students to be in the schools longer than 45 mins. to 1 hour at a time, 2x per week. These experiences may fill hours, but lack meaningful or rich learning experiences. Can we go to a cohorted 4 day a week calendar so students can be in the field regularly?**  **6. Observing at home in January. Students are not local, not taking spots that we can use for student teaching.**  **Student teaching**  **1. Reducing # of days across selected quarter placements, or entire semester: NYSED requires 20, SUNY requires 75. Sense that if this is necessary at some point this will significantly degrade the quality of our program and our candidates’ preparation. If this can be avoided, we should.**  **2. Canvassing one year in advance. This may help secure placements but will need some coordinated effort on campus for reviewing candidates and their status.**  **3. High needs- waiving this may help also. Securing a ST placement at a location where one is available appears to be a necessary option at this time.**  **4. Geography: this is a school/department concern. SoE/PE has the system in place across state, but also has higher numbers. AED programs are smaller and would need resources and investment to make a supervisory system work for student teachers placed across the state. There would have to be purposeful training of supervisors, resources to pay personnel, and an emphasis on contact time with the campus. Do we need expanded centers near urban areas with larger, denser school populations? Do we need more supervisors across the state? New York City- more capacity? Out of state program? (like LeMoyne; is SU looking into it?).**  **5. Designate ST placements rather than offer choices: To create consistent placements, and more options, we could designate places where student teachers are placed- at home, in and around major urban areas, or in selected regions. The local supply of placements is not able to keep up with our demand and does not appear this will change in the near future- will only be more constricted. Should students from/in and around NYC stay in NYC to student teach? We have local control over that. Other centers?**  **6. Grade levels: Again, department specific concerns will need to be addressed. Can we place in one grade level for the length of the experience? Can we place in one grade levels, or close grade levels across two experiences? Can we apply for a waiver of this? Are these grade level designations arbitrary anyways (ex. 6th grade as a middle school placement in most districts and not elementary, or 9th grade as a middle school and not a high school for adolescent programs- does this make sense?).**  **7. Reimbursement- we do not pay or offer enough for student teacher hosts.**  **8. Calendar: Can we adjust Q3 and Q4 to begin sooner? When classes resume for K-12 in January then our ST would begin Q3-would free up testing time at the end. Considerations would be staffing, registration, and supervision during the winter session.**  **9. Reduce the responsibilities of Q4 ST obligations. Can we advertise this as a side-by-side duration of the placement- similar to the St. Cloud model? Would this allay school hosts’ and admins. fears about testing and letting go of the class?**  **10. Students’ drive: CH goes out 60 miles. Some departmental concerns over this. If raised, choice may be a placement/far drive, or no placement. Supervision a concern too. Some campus programs in NYS advertise this as a possibility. Not popular, but may be necessary.**  **Summary:**  **Short-term: high needs waiver of ST placements seems do-able, but will unlikely solve the issue entirely; necessary to exceed the 60 mile radius if necessary (acknowledged not desirable); reducing Q4 obligations for ST- duration and/or model and expectations; grade levels counting within cert area- not split.**  **Other ideas will require longer-term, and/or departmental and unit-wide considerations/approval; conversations among faculty are needed extending beyond this session today.** |
| **6.** | **Marley Barduhn distributed 2 documents on assessment system data needs and asked the membership to look the documents over for discussion at our January 30, 2012 meeting.**   1. **Gap Analysis SUNY Cortland NCATE Unit Report-Advanced Programs** 2. **Professional Education Unit Operations Data and Timetable** |

**Meeting was adjourned at 4:51pm.**

**Announcements**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item No. | **Title/Description: It was noted that on January 11, 2012 a session will be conducted on the new Common-Core Standards. The sessions will be facilitated by Dr. Heather Sheidan-Thomas.** |

**Next Meeting Details**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Next Meeting Date** | **Monday January 30, 2012 from 1:00 to 3:00PM** |
| **Next Meeting Location** | **Exhibition Lounge, Corey Union** |

Teacher Education Council

Standing Committee Reports

December 12, 2011

**TEC ASSESSMENT: Andrea Lachance, Chair**

The committee has been engaged in collecting feedback regarding the scoring guides/rubrics for Initial and Advanced Candidate Impact on Student Learning. The two rubrics will be discussed again at the December 12, 2011 meeting of the TEC and motions will be entertained to put the items up for evote. The scoring guide for Unit Assessment: Upon the Completion of an Advanced Program is currently available for evote by voting members of the TEC until 12/13/11.

**TECRC: Jerome O’Callaghan, Chair**

The TECRC continues to meet on a regular schedule for the purpose of reviewing teacher education candidates. The last meeting was held on December 2, 2011.

**TEC Curriculum Committee: Eileen Gravani, Chair**

The TECCC has approved PED 189 (alteration of course). We are meeting on Monday December 12, 2011 to review Alteration of program of the MST in Childhood Education and several courses in Physical Education.

**TEC Conceptual Framework Committee: Joy Mosher, Chair**

Members of the Conceptual Framework Committee have been put on the agenda for a future meeting of the Graduate Coordinators. The Committee also will be receiving electronic responses from the School of Education Curriculum Committee.

**Assessment portion on the CF**

* Joy emailed JoEllen Bailey about the status of the Assessment document to find out who will be responsible for that document and what the plans are.
* Joy sent Emilie Kudela the revised “old” plan. Emilie sent thanks to the committee.
* Once we know the status of the Assessment document, we can finalize how to represent assessment on the CF.

**Ad Hoc Committees**

**TEC Dispositions Committee: Jerome O’Callaghan, Chair**

On behalf of the sub-committee on Dispositions, we are happy to forward our recommendations in the two attached documents. As you know the TEC has seen versions of this in the past; we have recently revisited the recommendations in light of comments from graduate coordinators and program coordinators. We believe it is now in good shape for TEC approval. The recommendation comes in two parts as the previous rubric, if applied to MSED programs, would have been impossible to satisfy. Breaking the recommendation into two parts recognizes the absence of field work in the MSED programs. The committee will entertain questions with regard to the draft rubrics at the TEC meeting on December 12, 2011.

**TEC Bylaws Committee: Dennis Farnsworth, Chair**

The updates to the language contained in the 2009 TEC Bylaws have been completed. A full review of the bylaws of 2009 will take place during the 2012-2013 academic year. The committee is still seeking additional members, however. If you are willing to serve on this committee please contact Dennis Farnsworth via email or at X4213.

**Recommendation from Ad Hoc NCATE Dispositions Committee**

**December 2011**

**Recommendation for MSED programs only:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Target** | **Acceptable** | **Unacceptable** |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Candidate demonstrates** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **• Character Dispositions** |  |  |  |
| Integrity | Exhibits exceptional character | Exhibits character through | Displays dishonesty and/or |
|  | through honesty, trustworthiness, | honesty, trustworthiness, | unlawful behavior as may be |
|  | transparency, and responsible be- | transparency, and responsible | evidenced by a TECRC review. |
|  | havior. Is always dependable in | behavior. Is usually dependable | Fails to follow-through, honor |
|  | follow-through and honoring | in follow-through and honoring | commitments, or maintain |
|  | commitments. Maintains | commitments. Strives to achieve | confidentiality. |
|  | confidentiality. Displays | confidentiality and remain un- |  |
|  | a lack of bias in interacting with | biased in interacting with |  |
|  | others. | others. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Emotional Maturity | Expresses an awareness of self | Expresses an awareness of self | Fails to recognize |
|  | and acknowledges personal | and usually acknowledges | personal limitations. Is unable |
|  | strengths and limitations. Main- | personal strengths and | to maintain self-control. |
|  | tains self-control. Accepts | limitations. Maintains self- | Displays behavior that is |
|  | responsibility for own actions, | control. Is developing an | disrespecful to others. |
|  | is open to different ideas, and | increased sense of responsibility |  |
|  | interacts well with others. | for own actions. Is open to sug- |  |
|  |  | gestions, and interacts with others. |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Work Ethic | Is consistenly well organized, | Is generally organized, prepared, | Is not prepared for class and/or |
|  | prepared, punctual, and reliable. | punctual, and reliable. Demon- | regularly late to class. Produces |
|  | Produces work that is complete, | strates genuine and sustained | work that is characterized by |
|  | timely and evident of detailed | effort. Produces work that is | errors and/or is frequently |
|  | planning. Works above and | correct yet lacks evidence of | late or missing. |
|  | beyond expectations. | detailed planning. May need to |  |
|  |  | improve time management skills. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **• Pedagogy Dispositions** |  |  |  |
| Belief That All | Exhibits solid knowledge of all | Exhibits an emerging knowledge | Lacks knowledge of all learners' |
| Children Can Learn | learners' abilities, learning styles, | of all learners' abilities, learning | abilities, learning styles, and |
|  | and cultural backgrounds. Pro- | styles, and cultural backgrounds. | cultural backgrounds. Provides |
|  | vides numerous and various | Provides numerous and various | limited learning experiences |
|  | learning experiences designed | learning experiences that meet | that meet the needs of |
|  | to meet the needs of all | the needs of most learners. | learners. |
|  | learners. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Fairness | Listens to all opinions, | . Normally | Displays inability to listen to all |
|  | makes reasoned deci- | listens to all opinions, makes | opinions, make reasoned |
|  | sions, and shows empathy and | reasoned decisions, and shows | decisions, and/or show empathy |
|  | concern for others. | empathy and concern for | and concern for others. |
|  | AND/OR | others. AND/OR | AND/OR |
|  | Consistently interacts with stu- | Usually interacts with students, | Fails to interact with students, |
|  | dents, parents, colleagues, and | parents, colleagues, and admin- | parents, colleagues, and |
|  | administrators in an effective and | istrators in an effective and | administrators in an effective |
|  | unbiased manner | unbiased manner | and unbiased manner. |

**Recommendation from Ad Hoc NCATE Dispositions Committee**

**December 2011**

**Recommendation for Undergraduate Teacher Education programs and MAT and MST programs:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Target** | **Acceptable** | **Unacceptable** |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Candidate demonstrates** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **• Character Dispositions** |  |  |  |
| Integrity | Exhibits exceptional character | Exhibits character through | Displays dishonesty and/or |
|  | through honesty, trustworthiness, | honesty, trustworthiness, | unlawful behavior as may be |
|  | transparency, and responsible be- | transparency, and responsible | evidenced by a TECRC review. |
|  | havior. Is always dependable in | behavior. Is usually dependable | Fails to follow-through, honor |
|  | follow-through and honoring | in follow-through and honoring | commitments, or maintain |
|  | commitments. Maintains | commitments. Strives to achieve | confidentiality. |
|  | confidentiality. Displays | confidentiality and remain un- |  |
|  | a lack of bias in interacting with | biased in interacting with |  |
|  | others. | others. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Emotional Maturity | Expresses an awareness of self | Expresses an awareness of self | Fails to recognize |
|  | and acknowledges personal | and usually acknowledges | personal limitations. Is unable |
|  | strengths and limitations. Main- | personal strengths and | to maintain self-control. |
|  | tains self-control. Accepts | limitations. Maintains self- | Displays behavior that is |
|  | responsibility for own actions, | control. Is developing an | disrespecful to others. |
|  | is open to different ideas, and | increased sense of responsibility |  |
|  | interacts well with others. | for own actions. Is open to sug- |  |
|  |  | gestions, and interacts with others. |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Work Ethic | Is consistenly well organized, | Is generally organized, prepared, | Is not prepared for class and/or |
|  | prepared, punctual, and reliable. | punctual, and reliable. Demon- | regularly late to class. Produces |
|  | Produces work that is complete, | strates genuine and sustained | work that is characterized by |
|  | timely and evident of detailed | effort. Produces work that is | errors and/or is frequently |
|  | planning. Works above and | correct yet lacks evidence of | late or missing. |
|  | beyond expectations. | detailed planning. May need to |  |
|  |  | improve time management skills. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **• Pedagogy Dispositions** |  |  |  |
| Belief That All | Exhibits solid knowledge of all | Exhibits an emerging knowledge | Lacks knowledge of all learners' |
| Children Can Learn | learners' abilities, learning styles, | of all learners' abilities, learning | abilities, learning styles, and |
|  | and cultural backgrounds. Pro- | styles, and cultural backgrounds. | cultural backgrounds. Provides |
|  | vides numerous and various | Provides numerous and various | limited learning experiences |
|  | learning experiences designed | learning experiences that meet | that meet the needs of |
|  | to meet the needs of all | the needs of most learners. | learners. |
|  | learners. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Fairness | Listens to all opinions, | . Normally | Displays inability to listen to all |
|  | makes reasoned deci- | listens to all opinions, makes | opinions, make reasoned |
|  | sions, and shows empathy and | reasoned decisions, and shows | decisions, and/or show empathy |
|  | concern for others. | empathy and concern for | and concern for others. |
|  | AND/OR | others. AND/OR | AND/OR |
|  | Consistently interacts with stu- | Usually interacts with students, | Fails to interact with students, |
|  | dents, parents, colleagues, and | parents, colleagues, and admin- | parents, colleagues, and |
|  | administrators in an effective and | istrators in an effective and | administrators in an effective |
|  | unbiased manner | unbiased manner | and unbiased manner. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Passion for the Subject | Enthusiastically demonstrates | Demonstrates adequate | Demonstrates a lack of content |
| Matter and for | depth and breadth of content | depth and breadth of content | knowledge and pedagogical |
| Teaching | knowledge and pedagogical | knowledge and pedagogical | skills. Exhibits little under- |
|  | skills. Exhibits deep under- | skills. Exhibits understanding | standing of learning process |
|  | standing of learning process and | of learning process and is | and conveys little or no interest |
|  | is dedicated to life-long learning. | dedicated to life-long | in life-long learning. |
|  |  | learning. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Non-Discriminatory | Regularly selects activities/ | Normally selects activities/ | Fails to address diversity in |
| and Inclusive Peda- | materials, assignments, and | materials, assignments, and | reference to teaching |
| gogy, Fostering | assessments that accommodate | assessments that accommodate | strategies and/or assessment |
| Equity and Social | student diversity in terms of | student diversity in terms of | techniques. |
| Justice | cultural background, ability, | cultural background, ability, |  |
|  | achievement, interest, and | achievement, interest, and |  |
|  | special needs. | special needs. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Promotion of High | Routinely provides opportunities | Generally uses students' | Ignores students' strengths |
| Standards and | for students to hold high stand- | strengths and interests as a | and interests. Displays |
| Fulfillment of Aca- | ards for themselves and holds | starting point for the attain- | ineffectiveness and/or |
| demic Expectations | students accountable for the | ment of high standards and | disinterest in high standards |
|  | fulfillment of their academic | the fulfillment of their | and the fulfillment of students' |
|  | potential. | academic potential. | academic potential. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Creation of a Safe and | Consistently maintains and | Maintains a safe and nur- | Exhibits little or no evidence |
| Nurturing Classroom | encourages others to foster a | turing classroom environment | for establishing a safe and |
| Environment | respectful, inclusive, flexible, | by recognizing the needs of | nurturing classroom |
|  | and supportive classroom | all students. | environment. |
|  | environment. |  |  |
| **• Professional Dispositions** |  |  |  |
| Collegiality | Regularly models courtesy in | Routinely models courtesy in | Demonstrates discourteous |
|  | communication and works well | communication and works well | communication and does not |
|  | with all members of the learning | with all members of the | work well with members of |
|  | community. Excels in forming | learning community. Is | the learning community. |
|  | positive relationships through | making acceptable progress | Has not formed positive |
|  | sharing ideas and knowledge, | in forming positive relation- | relationships with colleagues. |
|  | discussing issues, and managing | ships through sharing ideas | Does not share ideas or |
|  | conflict. | and knowledge, discussing | knowledge, fails to assist |
|  |  | issues, and managing conflict. | others, and lacks conflict |
|  |  |  | management skills. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Understanding of | Routinely demonstrates behavior | Seeks clarification of policies | Frequently expects policies |
| and Respect for | consistent with policies | as needed | to be waived. |
| Policies and | AND/OR | AND/OR | AND/ OR |
| Procedures | Can easily describe and explain | Can describe and explain | Displays lack of awareness |
|  | school policies relevant to | basic school policies and | of basic school policies and |
|  | stakeholders (e.g., students, | regularly makes an effort to | violates those policies. |
|  | teachers, administrators, parents, | comply. Seeks clarification |  |
|  | community members). Routinely | of policies as needed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment to | Demonstrates regular and | Demonstrates acceptable | Demonstrates an absence of |
| Ongoing Assess- | intentional evaluation of | progress in evaluation of | planning and does not evaluate |
| ment for Student | student progress through a | student progress through a | student progress through a |
| Improvement | variety of evaluative means. | variety of evaluative means. | variety of means. Does not |
|  | Plans and articulates evaluation | Plans frequent evaluation but | articulate intentional design |
|  | as displayed in lesson planning | not always consistent in regular | for ongoing student assess- |
|  | and implementation in the | lesson planning and/or imple- | ment as seen in lesson |
|  | classroom on an ongoling basis. | mentation in the classroom. | planning and/or implementa- |
|  |  |  | tion in the classroom. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Continual Reflection | Consistently expresses reflection | Increasingly expresses reflec- | Rarely expresses reflection |
| on Self- | on own progress with regard to | tion on own progress with | on own progress with regard |
| Improvement, | SUNY Cortland dispositions and | regard to SUNY Cortland | to SUNY Cortland dispositions |
| Receptiveness to | further professional development | dispositions and further | and further professional |
| Guidance, and | without prompting. Displays | professional development | development. Seldom asks |
| Professional | this disposition through asking | with little prompting. Displays | for suggestions for improve- |
| Development | for suggestions, evaluative | this disposition through | ment. Responds inappropri- |
|  | activities, and lesson planning for | frequent asking for sug- | ately to required self- |
|  | improved performance. Seeks | gestions, evaluative activities, | reflection activities. |
|  | professional development | and lesson planning for |  |
|  | opportunities (e.g., in-service | improved performance. |  |
|  | days, conferences). | Seeks professional develop- |  |
|  |  | ment opportunities (e.g., in- |  |
|  |  | service days, conferences). |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sensitivity to the | Exerts effort to understand the | Seeks to understand the | Fails to understand the |
| Particular School | accepted norms of the particular | accepted norms of the | accepted norms of the |
| Culture, Including | school environment and adapts | particular school environment | particular school environment |
| Expectations of | behavior accordingly. Demon- | and to adapt behavior | and does not adapt behavior |
| Candidates | strates flexibility in adjusting to | accordingly. Demonstrates | accordingly. Demonstrates |
|  | changing expectations. | progress in adjusting to | indifference to the reasons |
|  |  | changing expectations. | why and how schools differ |
|  |  |  | in culture. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Appropriate | Makes a positive contribution | Occasionally seeks an | Expresses indifference to |
| Initiative | through creative ideas. | opportunity to recognize | Program/curriculum |
|  | Recognizes value of existing | and improve existing | improvement |
|  | Programs/curriculum | programs/curriculum as | and/or to the needs of |
|  | and seeks to improve them | well as to help school faculty | faculty/staff. |
|  |  | and staff achieve goals. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Effective | Regularly and frequently | Regularly communicates | Resists communication with |
| Communication | communicates with stake- | with stakeholders. Pro- | stakeholders. Displays |
| with All Stake- | holders. Identifies obstacles to | motes greater participation | indifference to the concerns |
| holders (e.g., | be overcome for greater partici- | by families and commun- | of others. |
| Parents, Adminis- | pation by families and commun- | ities. |  |
| trators, Commun- | ities. |  |  |
| ity Partners) |  |  |  |

**OPTIONAL ELEMENTS IN DISPOSITIONS ASSESSMENT**

Each program can add to the rubric customized elements as seen fit at the program level.

Two examples follow:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Target** | **Acceptable** | **Unacceptable** |
|  |  |  |  |
| Candidate demonstrates |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
| Empathy |  | Understands and respects vari- | Identifies with few perspec- |
|  | Understands and respects various | ous perspectives. Listens well | tives or needs of others. |
|  | perspectives. Listens well. Is | and is generally sensitive and |  |
|  | sensitive and empathetic to | empathetic to others' needs. |  |
|  | others' needs. Supports, en- | Supports and encourages others. |  |
|  | courages, and advocates for |  |  |
|  | others. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Appropriate and | Creatively and effectively inte- | Integrates technology and | Uses technology and other |
| Effective Use of | grates technology and other | other teaching materials into | teaching materials super- |
| Technology and | teaching materials into lessons | lessons, but the technology | ficially and without evidence |
| Other Teaching | to enhance student learning. | and/or the other teaching | of student learning. |
| Materials |  | materials do not consistently |  |
|  |  | enhance student learning. |  |

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **• Professional Dispositions** |  |  |  |
| Collegiality | Regularly models courtesy in | Routinely models courtesy in | Demonstrates discourteous |
|  | communication and works well | communication and works well | communication and does not |
|  | with all members of the learning | with all members of the | work well with members of |
|  | community. Excels in forming | learning community. Is | the learning community. |
|  | positive relationships through | making acceptable progress | Has not formed positive |
|  | sharing ideas and knowledge, | in forming positive relation- | relationships with colleagues. |
|  | discussing issues, and managing | ships through sharing ideas | Does not share ideas or |
|  | conflict. | and knowledge, discussing | knowledge, fails to assist |
|  |  | issues, and managing conflict. | others, and lacks conflict |
|  |  |  | management skills. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Understanding of | Routinely demonstrates behavior | Seeks clarification of policies | Frequently expects policies |
| and Respect for | consistent with policies | as needed | to be waived. |
| Policies and | AND/OR | AND/OR | AND/ OR |
| Procedures | Can easily describe and explain | Can describe and explain | Displays lack of awareness |
|  | school policies relevant to | basic school policies and | of basic school policies and |
|  | stakeholders (e.g., students, | regularly makes an effort to | violates those policies. |
|  | teachers, administrators, parents, | comply. Seeks clarification |  |
|  | community members). Routinely | of policies as needed. |  |

**OPTIONAL ELEMENTS IN DISPOSITIONS ASSESSMENT**

Each program can add to the rubric customized elements as seen fit at the program level

Two examples follow:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Target** | **Acceptable** | **Unacceptable** |
|  |  |  |  |
| Candidate demonstrates |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
| Empathy |  | Understands and respects vari- | Identifies with few perspec- |
|  | Understands and respects various | ous perspectives. Listens well | tives or needs of others. |
|  | perspectives. Listens well. Is | and is generally sensitive and |  |
|  | sensitive and empathetic to | empathetic to others' needs. |  |
|  | others' needs. Supports, en- | Supports and encourages others. |  |
|  | courages, and advocates for |  |  |
|  | others. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Appropriate and | Creatively and effectively inte- | Integrates technology and | Uses technology and other |
| Effective Use of | grates technology and other | other teaching materials into | teaching materials super- |
| Technology and | teaching materials into lessons | lessons, but the technology | ficially and without evidence |
| Other Teaching | to enhance student learning. | and/or the other teaching | of student learning. |
| Materials |  | materials do not consistently |  |
|  |  | enhance student learning. |  |