**Teacher**

 **Education**

 **Council**

**Meeting Logistics**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | October 24, 2011 |
| **Time** | 1:00pm to 3:00pm |
| **Location** | Exhibition Lounge, Corey Union |

Members Present: A. Pagano, B. Hodges, C. Gascon, C. Benton, C. Moriarity, C. Sarver, D. Pitman, D. Smukler, D. Pfennig, E. Kudela, G. Phelan, J. Bailey, J. Shedd, J. Mosher, K. Hempson, K. Stearns, K. Sheets, K. Rombach, L. Campbell, L. Couturier, M. Gfeller, M. Gonzalez, M. Collins, R. Grantham, R. Janke, T. Hughes, W. Buxton, A. Lachance, B. Mattingly, D. Farnsworth, D. Wieczorek, E. Gravani, J. O’Callaghan, J. Cottone, M. Barduhn, S. Wilson (36)

Members Absent: A. Schutt, A. Burns-Thomas, B. Klein, B. Smith, C. Pass, C. Widdall, C. Temple, D. Dickerson, G. Zarote-Hoyos, G. Peterson, H. Steck, I. Jubran, J. Duncan, J. Curtis, J. Ouelette, K. Silverman, K. Mack, M. Lessig, M. Pitcher, M. Kniffin, P. Alikakos, P. Quaglio, P. Ducey, P. Buckenmeyer, R. Storch, R. Darling, R. Spitzer, S. Anderson, S. Asumah, S. Steadman, S. Todd, W. Skipper, C. VanDerKarr, G. Wood, L. Rosengarten, L. Melita, M. Chandler, M. Prus, M. Canfield, M. Pitaro (40)

**Agenda Items**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item #** | **Description** |
| **1.** | **Welcome and Introduction of new members: At 1:04pm Marley called the meeting to order. Marley called for introductions of new members and each member introduced themselves. She reviewed the pre-reading items for this meeting.**  |
| **2.**  | **Approve the Minutes of the Sept. 26, 2011 Meeting- Approved** **Approve the nomination of Joy Mosher as voting member representing Professional Studies at-large: the nomination was approved unanimously** |
| **3.** | **Approve the Standing/Ad Hoc Committee Updates:****TEC Advisory Board: Dennis informed the council that the Advisory Group met on 10/11/11 with 9 members in attendance. The group discussed the impact that the new APPR, common-core standards, and revisions to the NYS Learning standards is having on the regional school districts and the college and discussed the ways in which we could provide support for each other. A recommendation was made to include an association (union) member to the group and the number of meetings that we would participate in this academic year. The next meeting of the Advisory Group would be held in February, 2012.****TECRC: Eileen Gravani reported that the committee continues to meet and review candidate cases on an individual basis. This report was delivered on behalf of Jerry O’Callaghan, Chair.****TEC Assessment Committee-See Agenda item #7 for a full report.****TEC Curriculum Committee-Eileen Gravani reported that the curriculum committee has not yet met this semester but that their first meeting is scheduled to take place shortly.****Conceptual Framework Committee-Joy Mosher reported that the CF Committee is currently meeting to refine issues related to the CF and Advanced Programs as well as an issue with missing descriptions of general assessment in undergraduate teacher preparation programs. This issue was discovered when Emilie Kudela asked her students to write an essay on the SUNY Cortland CF and the candidates were unable to find anything related to assessment in the framework. Joy indicated that some verbage that was removed from the framework for the NCATE revision was added back into the document until such time as new language can be developed.** **TEC Bylaws Committee-Dennis Farnsworth reported that the TEC Bylaws committee had its first meeting on 10/20/11. The focus of the meeting centered on the need to revise the current language and job titles so that they reflect current actual practice. The committee will also be looking at general revisions to the bylaws provisions for the 2013 mandatory review.****TEC Dispositions Committee-Eileen Gravani reported that the Dispositions that were presented at a meeting last year are still pending although some revision, particularly with regard to scoring our candidates on a continuum (read as approaching a level), and applicability to our Advanced Programs. A full discussion of the TEC Dispositions will be scheduled once we have appropriate feedback from the program coordinators from advanced programs.** |
| **4.** | **-FEAC role/update on September and October committee sessions****-Introduction to the ‘clinical model’: definitions, theoretical frames, and synthesis of the research (facilitated discussion of 3 articles above)****-Models: exemplars; and the flexibility to fit our campus identity****-Purposes of the field experience: reflection and challenges****-Ongoing work: to-do’s****See link to Pre-reading articles above which served as a foundation for this discussion: Marley set the stage for the presentation prepared by Doug Wieczorek. Doug went into his power point presentation (appended below). Discussion provided the following points of interest from the slides demonstrating the three models of clinical approach:*** **Marley Barduhn felt that comparing teaching to conducting an orchestra created an appropriate analogy**
* **Bruce Mattingly shared that he disagreed with the end of the Darling-Hammond Article where she described the clinical nature of teaching today as being analogous to the medical profession in 1910.**
* **Joy Mosher felt that “clinically rich” would offer more if our candidates were able to follow an experienced practitioner and hear their explanations of what they were seeing in classroom/teaching situations. Currently, our candidates are not prepared to explain what they see in clinical terms.**
* **J. Bailey asked if feedback from Doug’s interviews with administrators in school districts was consistent across all schools and all programs. Doug indicated that the feedback was consistent. LEAs feel that there are too many candidates in their districts, expectations are unclear, and building administrators do not have a clear idea of why/what candidates are there for, i.e. early field practicum, student teaching, etc.**

**There was substantial discussion related to newly created hybrid spaces linking practitioners and academic knowledge to more** **closely connect campus courses and field experiences in university-based pre-service teacher education. Kim Rombach discussed her feeling that we, as a teacher preparation institution, need to strongly consider which elements from the 3 models we discussed might contribute to K-12 student outcomes, as that will be a prominent component the efficacy of any clinically rich model, particularly with the advent of the new APPR and the implementation of the common-core standards.****Cynthia Sarver questioned whether one specific model would be adopted for all programs? Doug responded no, not really, that the model would need to be collectively designed. He emphasized that he is only exploring these models as exemplars of clinically rich field experiences, he is not proposing or endorsing any particular model. He also emphasized that he is here to support the faculty. Bill Buxton asked how we reconcile with the fact that most programs employing a clinically rich model are much smaller than we are and he asserted that overall, the issue of numbers needs to be addressed. Doug summarized that enrollment, workload, and compensation are related issues needing to be addressed. Chris Gascon stated that he would be interested in having the opportunity to explore other but related models for clinically rich experiences, such as the student teacher in residence mentioned in the Zeichner article.****3 Essential Questions for FEAC to address at its November 1 meeting were identified as action items:**1. **What sets each of our programs apart- what sets our college apart?**
2. **Establishing teacher-faculty communication structures and pathways- grass roots?**
3. **Clear next steps- what models, and if changes could be department or campus wide?**

**Other inquiries and comments for FEAC to consider moving forward:****-establishing shared goals between our campus and the K-12 system****-qualifiers of student performance- measured- how? Designs that facilitate this data collection?****-aligning curriculum and instruction- how?****-making contributions to the K-12 partner school** **-making time useful for practicum students- making connections between theory and practice****-gathering data and generating ideas to fit us.****The membership of the TEC encouraged the FEAC to address the 3 essential questions above and asked that Doug Wieczorek return to the TEC at its November Meeting to provide a report/update on progress.** |
| **5.** | **Updates from the Title II sub-committees:*** **SWD – No Report**
* **ELL – No Report**
* **Technology – No Report**
 |
| **6.** | **Synopsis of the Blueprint for Teacher Preparation Reform – Marley asked that the members of the TEC take a close look at the recommendations being proposed by Arne Duncan and the Obama Administration.** **Update from the Sandwich Seminar and Student Session of Changes to the NYS Teacher Certification Process and proposed testing requirements****NCATE Accreditation: Marley’ reviewed her work with Gradin Avery and Fred Pierce in preparation to contact the top 75 public schools in which we place our teacher candidates, advising them of our new NCATE Accreditation Status and thanking them for the significant roles they played in making our success a reality.** |
| **7.**  | **Introduction to the Unit Assessment Scoring Guide for Culminating Activity as proposed by the TEC Standing Committee on Assessment: Andrea Lachance described the process employed by the TEC Assessment Committee in identifying a unit-wide assessment to address some of the elements (1.b, and 1.c) of the NCATE standards (specifically knowledge and application of pedagogical theory and understanding and analysis of educational research and policies) and to create the scoring rubric for a reporting structure that can be used with assessments that are already being used. Each advanced program on campus has a culminating activity and the data to be reported for this new assessment would be drawn from these existing assessments without creating a totally new assessment instrument. The members of the committee were asked to review each of the scores and report feedback to the TEC Assessment Committee through Andrea. A vote on the revised rubric will be discussed/authorized at the November TEC meeting.**  |
| **8.** | **Marley reviewed the new teacher education certification exams and the new teacher education portfolio design, as they were presented and described by John D’Agati, Deputy Commissioner of Higher Education in a power point presentation delivered at the October 21, 2011 NYSED/NYACTE Conference at Saratoga Springs.** |

**Action Items**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ITEM #** | **DESCRIPTION** | **PERSON RESPONSIBLE** |
| **1** | **Updates from Title II Committees:****SWD:** **ELL:****TECH:**  | **Chairs:****Janet Duncan****Paulo Quaglio****Chris Widdall** |
| **2** | **Advanced Programs Workshop Outstanding Items: The due date for all items was to be Sept. 30, 2011. These items need to be submitted to the Assistant Provost for Teacher Education ASAP****Identified Assessments for Advanced Programs****Potential Field Experiences for Advanced Programs****Advanced Program Alignment to the Conceptual Framework** | **Deans** |
| **3** | **Director Doug Wieczorek will report back to the full TEC on progress at the FEAC committee meeting in addressing our need for clinically rich field experiences.** | **Doug Wieczorek** |

**Announcements**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item No. | **Title/Description** |
| 1 | **Information regarding the Teacher Education Council, including agendas, minutes, member items, news items and miscellaneous documents can be found in the following****areas:*** **www2. Cortland.edu/Teacher Education/Professional Education Unit/Teacher Education Council/Teacher Education Council Meeting Minutes Where to find documents related to the Teacher Education Council/Meetings?**

**My Red Dragon Groups-Teacher Education Council Group Site. (You must request membership in the group. We are located in the Academic Groups area.** |
| 2.  | **Waiting for Superman. . .Or Not: Documentaries and Discussion about School Choice****Wednesday November 9, 2011, 7:00 – 9:00PM****Jacobus Lounge, Brockway Hall, SUNY Cortland** |
| 3. | **The next meeting of the SUNY Cortland Regional Professional Development School will take place on November 10, 2011 in Corey 209 from 3:00pm to 4:30pm. Please join us.** |
| 4. | **Marley advised the members of the TEC of a FOIL Request from NCTQ requiring the submission of a large number of course syllabi and other institutional records. She also advised the council on a ruling by the SUNY Counsel that syllabi are not proprietiary and must be submitted. Part of the rationale for this decision is the fact that syllabi are distributed to students.** |

**Next Meeting Details**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Meeting adjourned**  | **2:56pm** |
| **Next Meeting Date** | **November 21, 2011 from 1:00pm to 3:00pm** |
| **Next Meeting Location** | **Exhibition Lounge, Corey Union** |

**Attachments**

**Field Experience Issues Raised – SUNY Cortland and K-12**

**Framing the Problems and Prioritizing**

**Constraining Assumptions: enrollment, faculty workload, and compensation (host, faculty) will remain at similar levels in the foreseeable future.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Issues Raised on Campus | Issues Raised in K-12 |
| * Professionalism and dispositions of candidates
* Readiness of candidates for field
* Transportation; expectations/responsibilities of students
* Effectiveness of candidates/development
* Volume of candidates (the math)
* Numbers of hours/courses (the math)
* Length of hours (the math)
* District connections; guidance, policy, communications
* Presence/partnerships
* Structure of the field experience; purpose; models
* Placements transitioning in same places over time
* Marketing programs; we \_\_\_\_, our students \_\_\_\_, therefore \_\_\_\_\_\_; questions about these- what are we good at? What can we sell to schools?
* Clinically rich; needs defining; curricular connections; purposes; places
 | * Curricular and standards changes
* Evaluation changes
* Assessments changes
* Pedagogy/methods changes
* Time/structure of field experiences
* Volume of placements and candidates
* Mutuality of goals
* Support of mission and goals
* Screening of candidates before field; criteria.
* Technology integration
* Aggressive competition with other institutions
* Embedded structures exist with K-12/institutions: visibility and communication between partners
* Overwhelmed; pressure.
* Want effective PST
* Professionalism of candidates
* Achievement
* Curriculum; pedagogy; specificity in methods and congruence with us
* Host teacher compensation
 |
| Prioritizing: short term | Prioritizing: interim |
| NOW* Connections: timelines; policies; clocks/deadlines
* Transportation; communicating new expectations via email, memo, web
* Field placement structures; hours; places; purposes
* Department level feedback and reflection
* Determine appropriate campus process for FEAC committee to make recommendations; Joint Chairs; TEC; other?
 | LATER* Field placement structures; hours; places; purposes; ongoing
* Needs assessments
* Marketing
 |
| Prioritizing: long-term | Action Items |
| FUTURE VISION | To-Do’s* Each department will discuss and review their needs regarding timelines for placements; processes that can be expedited;
* Transportation; departments will review and discuss current procedures and suggest solutions and impacts on department processes;
* Departments will review and discuss courses/hours/and purposes; structures;
 |

Submitted and ongoing; FEAC 10-4-11/dw

**UNIT ASSESSMENT: SCORING GUIDE FOR CULMINATING ACTIVITY**

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 give 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 suggested.**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.

**NYSATE/NYACTE Conference**

**Allison Armour-Garb**

**Executive Director, Office of Teaching Initiatives, NYS Education Dept.**

**October 21, 2011**

Educator Workforce Trends

**Shrinking Job Market** −

More than 7,000 of the state’s teachers laid off this year (almost 3% of teachers)

20,000 teaching positions lost over the past 3 years (almost 10%)

**Persistent Shortages** − In some certificate areas (e.g., Special Education, Bilingual Education, ESL, Science, Math) and in highest poverty locations

**New Teaching Certificates Issued** − In 2010-11, NYSED issued 62,000 new classroom teaching certificates

13,500 in Childhood Education (Grades 1-6)

5,850 in Early Childhood Education (Birth-Grade 2)

Educator Workforce Trends

**Attrition and Retention**

* Attracting and retaining principals, especially in high-need schools, is problematic. Leadership is critical to teacher retention.
* Schools serving poor and minority students have higher attrition rates than others.
* Teacher attrition does not vary by effectiveness. However:
	+ Among those leaving low-performing schools, teachers who are more effective tend to transfer to higher-achieving schools with fewer poor, Black, and Hispanic students
	+ Less-effective teachers tend to transfer to other low-performing schools.

Educator Workforce Trends

**Diversity** − Attracting and maintaining a diverse corps of effective educators remains challenging.

* + 15% of NYS educators are Black and Hispanic, compared with 40% of students.

**Inequitable Distribution** − 1st-year elementary and middle school teachers tend to get students who are less prepared academically than teachers with 4+ years of teaching experience.

Clinically-Rich Preparation Programs

Recent Federal policy directions reinforce NY’s directions for educator preparation

* Outcome measurements
	+ - Teacher and building leader certification initiatives
		- especially around clinical practice
* Strengthened state standards for preparation programs
	+ - especially around clinical practice
* Performance-based certification requirements in addition to improved written testing

Teacher and Principal Evaluation
Design Principles

Connecting Teacher Evaluation with
College and Career Readinesss

Changing Roles for Principals

Future: Teacher Career Ladder

Discussion

* How can higher education community help with workforce trends we face?
* Thoughts on evaluation system and impact on education schools?

Thank You.

**NYSATE/NYACTE Conference**

**New York State Education Department**

**John D’Agati, Deputy Commissioner for Higher Education**

**October 21, 2011**

Educator Certification Exams

Higher Education Engagement in Developing Exams

Initial Certification for Teachers

Teacher Performance Assessment

**What is the design?**

* Electronic portfolio system
* Evaluates practice-based skills proven to have a positive impact on student achievement

**What are the tasks?**

* 2 videos, each of a 15-20 minute lesson
* Lesson plan based on student achievement data
* Outcomes-based analysis and reflection on the lesson
* For childhood (1-6) and early childhood (B-2) candidates, one video must be of a math lesson

Teacher Performance Assessment (cont’d)

**How does this fit into preparation programs?**

* Candidates may complete the portfolio in the context of their student teaching/internship assignment
* Prior to submitting completed portfolio to Pearson for scoring, candidates can submit their work to faculty for feedback
* Faculty may review candidates’ work and annotate videos
* Based on feedback, candidates may decide to record a new video or otherwise revise their work

Educating All Students Test

Academic Literacy Skills Test

Content Specialty Tests

Initial Certification for School Building Leaders

School Building Leader Performance Assessment

* Designed to evaluate practice-based skills proven to have a positive impact on student achievement
* Will include simulation tasks, including:
	+ data-driven instruction
	+ video-based teacher observation and feedback using a rubric based on NYS Teaching Standards

Discussion: Opportunities and Challenges for Preparation Programs

Thank You.