 **Teacher**

 **Education**

 **Council**

**Meeting Logistics**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | February 20, 2012 |
| **Time** | 1:00pm to 3:00pm |
| **Location** | Exhibition Lounge, Corey Union |

**Members Present: A. Schutt, A. Pagano, B. Klein, B. Hodges, C. Pass, C. Widdall, C. Temple, D. Dickerson, D. Smukler, G. Phelan, J. Shedd, J. Mosher, K. Silverman, K. Hempson, K. Stearn, K. Sheets, L. Campbell, L. Couturier, M. Gonzalez, P. Alikakos, P. Quaglio, R. Grantham, R. Janke, W. Buxton, D. Farnsworth, D. Weiczorek, E. Gravani, J. O’Callaghan, J. Cottone, M. Barduhn, S. Wilson Guests: Marcie Doll (Representing Pearson)**

**Pre-Reading**

|  |
| --- |
| Standing and Ad Hoc Committee Updates (Attached) |
| NYSTCE Performance Assessment for Teachers-field Manual <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/pdf/fieldmanual12162011.pdf>  |

**Agenda Items**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item #** | **Description** |
| **1** | **Motion to Approve Meeting Minutes from 01-30-12 and Standing and Ad Hoc Committee Updates by D. Smukler with second from J. O’Callaghan. Minutes were approved as written.** **Electronic Ballot Results: D. Farnsworth provided an update on the open ballots for Unit Assessment Instruments and informed the council that both pending ballots failed due to inadequate voting activity (majority of 31 votes not reached). Dennis indicated that this is becoming a problem where each time a ballot is opened but not enough votes are cast to constitute a majority the ballots need to be re-posted, causing delays in the unit data collection process. Dennis also informed the committee that we are seeking new methods for posting the ballots and casting e-votes, as the current process contains flaws that make it difficult to ensure that only voting members are casting ballots and only one ballot per issue.** 1. **Recommend Rubric for Initial Teacher Candidate Assessment of Student Learning-Failed-no majority**
2. **Recommend Rubric for Advanced Candidate Assessment of Student Learning-Failed-no majority**

**Dennis also mentioned that the TEC Bylaws committee will be meeting to propose a new amendment to the Bylaws establishing that a ballot will be valid once opened to the voting membership, no matter how many votes are cast, and simple majority position will carry or defeat the issue.****M. Barduhn also provided a very brief update on the recent AACTE National Conference in Chicago. SUNY Cortland Representatives (Barduhn, Farnsworth, Weiczorek) focused on relevant sessions related to the NCATE/TEAC merger, TPAC, Field Experiences (Avatars, University of Central Florida), NCTQ, Assessment innovations, and education reform and trends. A number of presentations from the conference will be available for members to view in a couple of weeks through the AACTE Website. We are only allowed 10 memberships to the organization so if there is something you would like to preview please contact one of the members mentioned above.**  |
| **2** | **Merger of the Regional Professional Development School and the TEC Advisory Group into a new entity. Reporting out on the work of F.E.A.C. : D. Weiczorek provided a handout outlining some of the ideas/needs related to our partner schools and how we might support and bolster these identified initiatives. Doug also informed the council of the integration of the Regional PDS and the TECAG members (new name to be determined) that will hopefully guide ongoing conversation, facilitate committee work, and lead to better connections among schools, leaders, teachers and faculty. Not included in the handout were initiatives from Tully SCD, who is always open to new and innovative programming, Lafayette SCD where the focus is currently on Early Childhood-Data needs, Whitney point with a strong focus on Technology, and an open offer from the Cortland Teacher Center to participate in other initiatives.**  |
| **3** | **1) Dispositions****J. O’Callaghan distributed a handout highlighting the revisions to the SUNY Cortland Teacher Education Candidate Dispositions for both initial and advanced candidates. He also reviewed the modified timeline and provided guidance as to what happens at each of four transition points, 1)Upon entry to the program a candidate would acknowledge that they are aware that there are specific dispositional outcomes to be achieved, 2) the 1st assessment would be during the first methods course, 3) the second assessment would occur during student teaching and 4) the final assessment would be administered at the end of student teaching. Jerry entertained a number of questions:*** **If this is a self-assessment how will anyone fail? A) there will be commentary on the assessment from the course instructor/student teaching supervisor/master teacher**
* **How will data be collected? A) TaskStream or some other unit-wide method. This would take effect in the fall.**
* **What consequences would be employed? A) It would go to the Candidate Consultation Process. This would be viewed as an ‘early warning system’.**
* **A concern about the number of data points was raised as well as concern for the fact that we are collecting meaningful data. In response, Marley asked the committee to look at implementation and see how this will filter back program to program.**

**Regina Grantham move the question to ballot and the motion was seconded by A. Pagano. Motion carried and the issue will be moved to the ballot.**1. **TECRC Process-Students on Disciplinary Probation: J. O’Callaghan informed the council that from this point forward once a candidate has placed on Disciplinary Probation they will no longer be allowed to participate in and will be removed from all field experiences until a final determination has been made as to their status in a teacher education program. In the past, candidates were allowed to remain in placements if they filed an appeal, at time subverting the intent and purpose of Disciplinary Probation. This move is intended to equalize the effect for all candidates.**

 |
| **4** | **Marci Doll of Pearson completed an informational presentation on the Sheltered Instructional Observation Protocol and SUNY Cortland Pilot for members of the TEC. She described the basic research and methodology for the protocol. The SIOP Model is widely accepted as a proven solution for English Language Learner Achievement and is scientifically validated for English Learners, increases teaching effectiveness (which will have positive benefits for our Title II assurances), and works well in content area classrooms. The SIOP Model consists of eight components and 30 features that help teachers to systematically, consistently, and concurrently teach grade-level academic content and language. The components are: Lesson Preparation, Building Background, Comprehensible Input, Strategies, Interaction,****Practice and Application, Lesson Delivery, and Review and Assessment. The pilot will commence immediately and continue for approximately 8 weeks. The oversight committee will provide a final report to the TEC once the pilot is complete. M. Barduhn informed the council that Marci would be orienting the participants to the model as soon as the TEC meeting was over. She thanked Marcie for her presentation.** |

**Next Meeting Details**

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

Teacher Education Council

Standing Committee Reports

February 20, 2012

**TEC ASSESSMENT: Andrea Lachance, Chair**

No report submitted for this month**.**

Currently there are two ballots pending approval by the Council: (Closing date is February 15, 2012)

1. Unit Assessment: Initial Candidate Assessment of Student Learning
2. Unit Assessment: Advanced Candidate Assessment of Student Learning.

**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 February 10, 2012. Agenda item for this meeting will deal with TECRC Process- Students on Disciplinary Probation.

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

No report submitted for this month

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

February 13, 2012 Meeting MINUTES

Next meeting: March 19\*, 2012, 9:15 EDU 1240

*\*Joy moved the date a week ahead, anticipating possible absence on her part on 3/12. Problems? Let me know please.*

Present:

Brian Barrett

Diane Craft

Joy Mosher

Katina Sayers-Walker

Absent:

Mary Ann Murphy

Angela Pagano

Review of Feedback from Graduate Programs, etc. from the fall:

* Katina spoke with Bill Buxton who was going to consult with the School of Education Curriculum Committee. He has not gotten back to her. She will follow up.
* Diane spoke with graduate programs in P.E. The feeling was that some components were not pertinent: e.g. Liberal Arts, and more emphasis was needed in other areas – e.g. leadership and research (at least as a consumer of research).
* Brian will follow up with TSD and Katina will check with Kim Rombach and Beth Klein.

We consider the above an appropriate prompt to comments about the issues at the Graduate Coordinators meeting.

Planning for the Graduate Coordinators Meeting February 27.

* Joy will consult with Angela about the time of the meeting, and distribute the information.

We will take the questions formulated at the November 14, 2011 meeting.

*The overarching question to be addressed*

*Is the existing CF adequate to represent both undergraduate and graduate programs:*

* *Does it need subdivisions based on initial or advanced programs?*
* *Does a separate CF need to be created in order to adequately represent graduate programs?*

*In what ways is the CF congruent with the goals and outcomes of your graduate program?*

*Are there areas of the CF that may be superfluous to the goals and outcomes of your graduate program?*

*Are there areas that should be added to the CF to more effectively represent the goals and outcomes of your graduate program?*

*Some graduate programs have advanced standards. If your program has advanced standards, does the CF adequately address them? If not, what areas should be added?*

We agreed to work via email on a questionnaire to be distributed at the end of the meeting of the Graduate Coordinators, (and to other constituents) which calls for specific suggestions from programs and committees. (No comment – we’ll assume they do not have a concern).

Joy will work on a draft to be circulated and refined by the whole committee.

Early Childhood Education and the CF

We reviewed the discussion from fall. Brian provided the original, which was also in the minutes from October 17, 2011.

* The Assessment Handbook prepared by Jo Ellen Bailey is focused on Unit Assessment, so is primarily extraneous to what should be in the CF regarding assessment of our candidates and how they assess students.
* We need to return a component on assessment to the CF.
	+ We revised the section when preparing the CF for the NCATE visit. (We could not recall why it was deleted entirely at some point). See attached:
	+ We can follow the 3 paragraph approach we used in other sections of the CF for the NCATE visit.
		- Do we need to follow the restrictions on character count?
		- Joy will ask Dennis the above, and also whether future NCATE reviews will require a CF.
	+ We will first address the task via email discussion.
	+ Joy will communicate with Early Childhood regarding using the “old” CF for candidate assignments this spring.
* We should complete the revision in time for submission for TEC review in March or April.
* From the 2003 CF:
* *Assessment*
*
* Our candidates must **use multiple and authentic forms of assessment to analyze teaching and**
* **student learning and to plan curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of individual**
* **students.** Implemented effectively, evaluation serves as a basis to improve learning and
* instruction, and a fundamental principle of effective evaluation is that no single assessment
* measure is best, nor can it accurately reflect performance (Gronlund, 1965). As such, effective
* evaluation necessarily includes a variety of evaluation techniques. The need for such an
* approach is especially compelling when it is taken into account that equally “intelligent”
* individuals demonstrate their intellectual competencies in very different ways (Gardner, 1983).
* Along these lines, meaningful evaluative information is most likely to be yielded through
* multiple assessments grounded in authentic performance applications conducted in different
* contexts and at different times (Wiggins & McTighe, 1998). As Eisner (1993) observes, “The
* tasks used to assess what students know and can do need to reflect the tasks they will encounter
* in the work outside schools, not merely those limited to the schools themselves” (p. 226).
* Similarly, Gardner (1983) notes the need to “include actual elements and symbols of the
* particular realm under consideration “ (p. 387) when assessing knowledge and skills.
*
* In order to promote the use of multiple assessment methods, SUNY Cortland’s teacher education
* program exposes students to the variety of available techniques – formative vs. summative,
* traditional vs. alternative, and quantitative vs. qualitative – as well as the relative advantages and
* weaknesses of each approach. For example, Popham (1999) warns against the use of
* standardized tests in assessing the quality of teaching and education, and Gardner (1983)
* criticizes paper-and-pencil tests as a means of measuring intelligence.
*
* All teacher candidates at SUNY Cortland receive instruction in multiple and authentic
* assessment in their methods courses and have the opportunity to complete assignments
* demonstrating use of multiple assessments. Candidates’ ability to assess their students directly
* begins with the 100 hours of field experience and is reported in their journals. Candidates are
* further evaluated on their ability to assess their students during the culminating student teaching
* experience. The Student Teacher Evaluation Form has a question that is specific to the
* candidate’s knowledge of assessment strategies and ability to implement them. The cooperating
* teacher and the college supervisor complete this form at both the mid-quarter and the end of
* quarter points. Feedback is shared with the student teacher in a three-way conversation.
* Exemplars of K-12 student performance appear in the candidate’s portfolio.

* We had edited it down to the following, but for some reason we  never included it in the final version of the CF:
* *Assessment*
* Candidates must **use multiple and authentic forms of assessment to analyze teaching and student learning and to plan curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of individual students.** Evaluation serves as a basis to improve learning andinstruction and includes a variety of evaluation techniques. Meaningful evaluative data is best yielded through both formative and summative assessments grounded in authentic performance (Wiggins & McTighe, 1998).

Brian D. Barrett, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Foundations and Social Advocacy
1224 Cornish Hall
SUNY Cortland
P.O. Box 2000
Cortland, NY 13045

Tel: 607.753.2330

**Ad Hoc Committees**

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

**See Report and memo attached to agenda**