 **Teacher**

 **Education Council**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Members Present: A. Schutt, A. Burns-Thomas, B. Hodges, C. Pass, D. Smukler, D. Phennig, H. Steck, J. Duncan, J. Shedd, J. Mosher, K. Hempson, K. Stearns, K. Rombach, L. Campbell, L. Couturier, M. Gfeller, M. Gonzalez, M. Collins, R. Grantham, W. Buxton, A. Lachance, B. Mattingly, D. Farnsworth, E. Gravani, J. Cottone , M. Canfield, S. Wilson, M. Barduhn**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **March 19, 2012**  |
| **Time** | **1:00pm to 3:00pm** |
| **Location** | **Exhibition Lounge, Corey Union** |

**Pre-Reading/Review**

|  |
| --- |
| **Teacher Education Council Members: Please see the invitation from NYSED Commissioner** **John King regarding an RFP for Undergraduate Clinically Rich Program Proposals which we forwarded to you in a separate email on 03-12-12.** |
| In order to prepare for discussion of Item #6 on Unit Assessment and Expectations from the Departments please review the scoring guides for Unit Assessment Upon Completion of an Advanced Program, Unit Assessments of Initial and Advanced Candidate Impact on Student Learning, Graduate and Employer Surveys, information from the 2010 annual report of the program/Department to the Dean of the School, review requirements for updating syllabi. All documents are appended to this agenda. |
| Title II Students With Disabilities Presentation: Can be accessed by going to the TEC MRD Worksite and clicking on the folder for TSWD. Title 2SWD Final4Tec.pptx  |

**Agenda Items**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item #** | **Description/Action****Meeting was called to order by M. Barduhn, Chair, at 1:05pm** |
| **1** | **Approval of Meeting Minutes from 02-20-12: Marley asked for feedback on the minutes and agenda. Hearing none a motion was made by B. Hodges with a second from R. Grantham to approve the minutes as written. Motion carried.****D. Farnsworth reviewed the results of recent ballots as reflected below:****Electronic Ballot Results:**1. **Recommend Rubric for Initial Teacher Candidate Assessment of Student Learning (re-vote) Passed 27-5 with 32 ballots cast.**
2. **Recommend Rubric for Advanced Candidate Assessment of Student Learning (re-vote) Passed 23/10 with 33 ballots cast**
3. **Unit Core Dispositions: Passed 25/9 with 34 ballots cast.**

**All items will be forwarded to the Provost for signature.****Standing and Ad Hoc committee reports are appended to the minutes. Marley thanked the chairs of all committees for their diligence in helping us to provide direction for teacher education issues.**  |
| **2.** | **Bylaws Amendment to change voting to simple majority of members voting: D. Farnsworth updated the council on difficulties being experienced with the current balloting process. He indicated that the bylaws committee met on March 16, 2012 to discuss making the balloting process more user-friendly. The committee considered a recent suggestion by the TEC Steering Committee to institute a simple majority vote of members present at a TEC meeting. Although advantages were noted it was also noted that a process such as this could lead to other related issues. H. Steck brought up several other measures that may make the balloting process more effective such as not using anonymous balloting so that voting could be tracked and reminders to voting members could be sent out. The committee also discussed refining the current system in some way that would let me know who voted while simultaneously maintaining the confidentiality and anonymity of the vote. It was decided that, until such time as these obstacles can be avoided we would use a double blind paper balloting process for upcoming votes of the TEC. It was also decided that Dennis would work with Justin Stewart to devise a more effective distribution and accountability process for future ballots.**  |
| **3.** | **Reporting out on the work of F.E.A.C.: Marley also provided a brief update to the council in Doug Weiczorek’s absence on the activities of FEAC and current field placement efforts.** |
| **4.** | **-Higher Ed Network Teams: Nothing to report****-Update from SUTEC Advisory Board: Marley updated the council on recent initiatives. SUTEC has purchased 6 apartments where we have the option to house our students if student teaching in NYC. There is room for increased capacity and as it becomes more and more difficult to place our student teachers locally, it may be advisable to speak with your students about the possibility of student teaching in the NYC area. Students would need to be closely screened as they need to be committed to that type of environment to meet with success. She also noted that SUTEC is currently searching for new offices.****-Advanced Programs’ Self-Evaluation on field Experiences: Advanced program self assessments will still be required by all advanced programs by June, 2012. If you have already submitted your self assessment. . .thanks! If you need to have another copy of the self assessment instrument, please contact Dennis for that ASAP.** **-Invitation from NYSED Commissioner John King to prepare RFPs for Undergraduate Clinically Rich Teacher Preparation Pilot Programs: See the announcement above.** |
| **5.** | **Report of the Title II Committee on Students with Disabilities: Marley reminded the council of the work being conducted by three Title II Committees. She indicated that the reports of the individual committees would start today with the report of the Students With Disabilities Committee, next month the Committee on Technology will be delivering their report and the work of the ELL Committee continues with the SIOP Pilot Project. Hard data from that project will be collected and reviewed at the end of the program with a report to follow. Marley introduced Janet Duncan, Chair of the Title II Committee on Students with Disabilities who is scheduled to present the findings and recommendations of the committee.*** **Power Point Presentation (40 min.) See above for access.**
* **Q & A (15 min): None**
 |
| **6.**  | **Unit Assessment Requirements and Timeline: Dennis distributed a handout to members outlining data expectations from the departments and programs that will feed into the unit assessment requirements, particularly for Standards 1 and 2. One missing component is the identification of a platform to interface with TECAS and other unit assessments such as the scoring guides upon completion of an advanced program, scoring guides for assessment of initial and advanced candidate impact on student learning, etc. We will notify everyone once such a platform is identified. A suggestion was made that the timeline for completion and submission of data elements by departments and programs be staggered so that not all of the elements are due at one time, thereby causing extra work and stress for the departments. As a result of not having full approval (Provost’s signature) for the most recent assessment scoring guides on candidate impact on student learning and disposition data will not be collected until the Fall 2012 semester.**  |

**The meeting was adjourned at 2:16PM Next Meeting Details:**

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

**UNIT ASSESSMENT: SCORING GUIDE UPON PROGRAM COMPLETION**

Directions: Each advanced program on campus has a culminating activity. These include comprehensive exams, master’s projects, master’s thesis, and/or program portfolios. Each semester, the coordinator of each advanced program on campus is asked to supply the unit with data on the quality of the culminating activities completed that semester. For each of the elements listed below, the program should provide the number of candidates who can be categorized as Target, Acceptable and Unacceptable based on their performance on the culminating activity.

**Program Name/Department\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Semester\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Number of candidates completing culminating activity:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Elements** | **Unacceptable**  | **Acceptable** | **Target** |
| **Knowledge of Pedagogical Theory Standard 1.b.** | Ideas presented by the candidate in the culminating activity closely follow conventional concepts with little expansion and development of new directions. Ideas and concepts are generally and satisfactorily presented although lapses in logic are apparent. Theory is minimally applied to the context addressed in the activity.**Number of Candidates:** | The candidate’s work in the culminating activity is organized, carefully focused and clearly outlines the major issues addressed by critical theory in this field. Ideas are logically arranged to present a sound scholarly argument. Depth of understanding related to teaching and learning in the field. Theory is accurately applied to the specific context addressed in the activity. **Number of Candidates:** | In the culminating activity, the candidate excels in the explanation and discussion of theory related to the field. Depth of understanding is apparent and clearly related to the given area of certification. The candidate’s work synthesizes theoretical concepts and coherently applies them to the specific context addressed by the activity.**Number of Candidates:** |
| **Understanding of Educational Research and Policy****Standard 1.c.** | In the culminating activity, the candidate includes some summary of the research and policy in the given field. The gaps in current knowledge and approaches that fill these gaps are not identified.**Number of Candidates:** | In the culminating activity, the candidate presents a credible summary of the research and policy in the given field. The gaps in current knowledge are identified and directions and approaches that fill these gaps are identified.**Number of Candidates:** | In the culminating activity, the candidate effectively summarizes important research and policy in the given field. Important issues or ideas from the research/policy are raised. The gaps in current knowledge of the field are clearly identified and logical suggestions for addressing these gaps are offered.**Number of Candidates:** |
| **Analysis and Application of Theory and Research Standard 1.b. and 1.c.** |  In the culminating activity, the candidate struggles to analyze and evaluate the research and theory in the field. The candidate has difficulty critiquing, synthesizing, and applying the research findings to learning and teaching in the area of certification.**Number of Candidates:** | In the culminating activity, the candidate provides an adequate analysis and evaluation of research and theory in the field. The candidate demonstrates ability to critique, synthesize, and apply some research findings and theory to learning and teaching in the area of certification.**Number of Candidates:** |  In the culminating activity, the candidate presents a critical analysis and evaluation of research and theory in the field. The candidate is able to effectively critique, synthesize, and apply research findings and theory to the learning and teaching in the area of certification.**Number of Candidates:** |

*Adapted from California State University, Fresno, Department of Biology and SUNY Cortland’s Physical Education Department*

Each of the elements are designed to assess NCATE Unit Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions, with particular emphasis on Standard 1.b: Knowledge and Application of Pedagogical Theory and Standard 1.c: Understanding and Analysis of Educational Research and Policies.

**Unit Assessment**

**Initial Teacher Candidate Assessment of Student Learning**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Elements** | **Unacceptable** | **Acceptable**  | **Target** |
| **Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills***Standard 1c* | Teacher candidates do not apply professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.  | Teacher candidates can apply the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to facilitate learning. Their work reflects major schools of thought about schooling, teaching and learning.  | Teacher candidates’ work reflects a thorough understanding of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. They develop meaningful learning experiences to facilitate learning for all students. Their work demonstrates knowledge of how students learn and how to make ideas accessible to students.  |
| **Context for Student Learning***Standard 1c* | Teacher candidates lack knowledge of school, family, and community contexts, and they are unable to develop learning experiences that draw on students’ prior experience | Teacher candidates consider the school, family, and community contexts in which they work and the prior experience of students to develop learning experiences.  | Teacher candidates consider school, family, and community contexts in connecting concepts to students’ prior experience to develop meaningful learning experiences.  |
| **Reflection on Practice and Student Learning***Standard 1c* | Candidates do not reflect on their work, nor do they use current research to inform their practice. | Candidates reflect on their practice and make necessary adjustments to enhance student learning.  | Candidates reflect on their practice and make creative adjustments to enhance student learning. They are able to incorporate educational research findings into their practice as appropriate.  |
| **Assessment of Student Learning***Standard 1d* | Teacher candidates do not accurately assess student learning or develop learning experiences based on students’ developmental levels or prior experience.  | Teacher candidates assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, and monitor student progress. Based on their assessment, they are able to develop and implement meaningful learning experiences for students.  | Teacher candidates focus on student learning and study the effects of their work. They are able to develop and implement meaningful learning experiences for students based on their developmental level and prior experience. They assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and have a positive effect on learning for all students. |

**Unit Assessment**

**Advanced Candidate Assessment of Student Learning**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Elements** | **Unacceptable** | **Acceptable**  | **Target** |
| **Leadership & Professional Development** *Standard 1c* | Advanced candidates do not reflect on their practice and cannot recognize their strengths and areas of needed improvement. They do not engage in professional development. They are not engaged with the professional community to develop meaningful learning experiences.  | Advanced candidates reflect on their practice and are able to identify their strengths and areas of needed improvement. They engage in professional activities. They are aware of and utilize school and community resources that support student learning. | Advanced candidates reflect on their own practice and collaborate with other professionals to identify and design strategies and interventions that support student learning. They assume leadership roles by engaging in professional activities such as presenting at workshops, sharing data with colleagues, and contributing to school improvement and renewal.  |
| **Context for Student Learning***Standard 1c* | Advanced candidates do not demonstrate an understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which they work. They do not collaborate with the professional community to create meaningful learning experiences for all students.  | Advanced candidates demonstrate an understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which they work. They collaborate with the professional community to create learning experiences for all students.  | Advanced candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which they work. They collaborate with the professional community to create meaningful learning experiences for all students.  |
| **Pedagogical Knowledge & Skills** *Standard 1c* | Advanced candidates demonstrate a limited understanding of the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning. They do not keep abreast of current research and policies on schooling, teaching, learning and best practices.  | Advanced candidates apply current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices. They are able to analyze educational research and policies and can explain the implications for their own practice.  | Candidates in advanced programs for teachers develop expertise in certain aspects of professional and pedagogical knowledge and contribute to the dialogue based on their research and experiences. They are able to analyze educational research and policies and can explain the implications for their own practice and the profession. |
| **Assessment of Student Learning***Standard 1d* | Advanced candidates do not use classroom performance data to make decisions about teaching strategies. They do not use community resources to support student learning. | Advanced candidates demonstrate an understanding of assessment. They analyze student, classroom, and school performance data and make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning so that all students learn.  | Advanced candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding for the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning and regularly apply these in their practice. They analyze student, classroom, and school performance data and make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning so that all students learn. |

**For the 2010 Teacher Education Graduate Survey please go to:**

[**http://oira.cortland.edu/NCATEdocs/sv/survTeacherEducation2010Steve.pdf**](http://oira.cortland.edu/NCATEdocs/sv/survTeacherEducation2010Steve.pdf)

**For the 2010 Teacher Education Employer Survey please go to:**

[**http://oira.cortland.edu/NCATEdocs/sv/survTeached-employersv-2010-onlinedraft.pdf**](http://oira.cortland.edu/NCATEdocs/sv/survTeached-employersv-2010-onlinedraft.pdf)

**You will need to enter your SUNY Cortland User ID and Password when prompted.**