 **Teacher**

**Education**

**Council**

**Meeting Logistics**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | November 21, 2011 |
| **Time** | 1:00PM to 3:00PM |
| **Location** | Exhibition Lounge, Corey Union |

Members Present: A. Schutt, A. Pagano, B. Hodges, C. Widdall, C. Temple, D. Pittman, D. Smukler, G. Peterson, J. Bailey, J. Mosher, K. Silverman, K. Hempson, K. Stearns, K. Sheets, L. Campbell, L. Couturier, M. Gfeller, M. Pitcher, M. Gonzalez, R. Janke, T. Hughes, W. Buxton, A. Lachance, B. Mattingly, D. Farnsworth, D. Wieczorek, J. Cottone, M. Chandler, M. Barduhn, S. Wilson

**Pre-Reading**

|  |
| --- |
| Teacher Education Candidate Dispositions <http://www2.cortland.edu/dotAsset/1754584a-cb1a-4eb1-b428-b6a1e9bd2b61.pdf> |
| Fair Process Policy & Procedures for Review of Professional Competencies in Teacher Education  <http://www2.cortland.edu/dotAsset/194346.pdf> Original Version, See Revisions in the attachments |
|  |

**Agenda Items**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item #** | **Description** |
| **1.** | **Approval of Meeting Minutes, Standing and Ad Hoc Committee Updates:** The meeting was called to order at 1:05pm by Chair, Marley Barduhn. Standing and Ad Hoc Committee reports and Minutes from the 10-24-11 meeting were approved as written. |
| **2.** | **Discussion of Teacher Education Candidate disposition and Motion to conduct an e- vote to recommend the Dispositions Rubric to the Provost-**This item was tabled at the request of the Dispositions Committee Chair until the December meeting. |
| **3.** | **Becoming a ‘TPA (Teacher Performance Assessment) Scorer’-**Lynn Couturier briefly shared information regarding becoming a TPA Scorer and encouraged any interested faculty members to apply as soon as possible. |
| **4.** | 1.  FEAC Update/intro: Doug Wieczorek and department program coordinators (5 minutes)  2.  FEAC ongoing field experience discussion, continued from TEC October meeting: (15 minutes)  a.  Establishing communication structures/pathways with faculty and teachers- grass roots?  i. Report on data collection: Partnership inventory across programs- Building on/Enhancing what is under way  Open Question to consider: How can we better meet the needs of our partners?  Their students?  Our students?  b. What sets each of our programs apart? What sets the college apart? Our students? (ongoing)  c.   Clear next steps…what model(s)? Is there a program level or campus level design? (ongoing)  3.  Next steps in FEAC, TEC, and questions/comments from committee, and closure. (5 minutes)  Doug Wieczorek updated the council on progress being made by FEAC with regard to the field experience discussion conducted at the October 24th meeting of the TEC. He indicated that an inventory will be taken at the next meeting as there are currently many good things happening that could be used more widely. He further indicated that there is a great deal of discussion on the Charlotte Danielson model for APPR evaluations and noted that there is also much discussion surrounding the other 8 models proposed by the state. Michele Gonzalez clarified that even though there are 9 models proposed there are really only 4 domains that overarch the areas for evaluation. A suggestion was made to bring in the 2 presenters that Kevin Mack used in his administrative breakfast in October to do the same presentation for college faculty so that we have equal understanding of the new evaluation process and can instruct our candidates appropriately. Doug indicated that he wants to ensure that we cover all the bases in making things better for ourselves and for our school partners moving forward. Doug disseminated a number of documents summarizing existing relationships in the various programs (all appended) that may serve to build upon our existing relationships toward a replicable model that can be employed across all programs as a future possibility. Once the preliminary review by FEAC is complete we would then have a portfolio of options to explore. In this regard we need to look at what is working as well as what is not working. Marley summarized that in reviewing existing initiatives and evaluating what works and what does not work we will be able to move closer to a useable k-20 model that breaks down the barriers to effective partnerships in both environments. Doug finished his presentation by informing the council that the next FEAC meeting will focus on “What we are proud to be known for.” |
| **5.** | **Update on the Unit-Wide assessment of Culminating Experiences in the Advanced Programs & Motion for E-Vote:** Discussion was opened by Andrea Lachance, as Chair of the TEC Assessment Committee. D. Pittman shared a number of concerns related to the new unit-wide assessment: scoring guide for culminating activity in an advanced program, not the least of which was that the elements of the scoring guide do not correlate to elements evaluated in a math program at the advanced level. Andrea shared that the design of the guide as well as the elements of the standards to be assessed is pretty much taken directly from the NCATE standards. She further indicated that the rubric is to be used to assess unit effectiveness (where their candidates are strong and/or weak when measured against the NCATE requirements). B. Hodges shared that her department grappled with this issue as well but finally looked at how they scored the culminating activity more as a cross-walk. She indicated that when they employed this approach it became clear that the instrument is not perfect but it is broad enough to be able to categorize candidates as unacceptable/acceptable/target. Marley reinforced that we must have a point in our advanced programs where the candidate is assessed in more than just advanced content, even when that goes against program requirements for content. After much discussion, the idea of renaming the instrument to Unit Assessment: At the Completion of an Advanced Program was introduced and the TEC voting members approved the name change by acclimation. This would minimize the one size fits all model, and provide additional latitude to the programs as to when each of the elements is being assessed. Lynn Couturier reinforced her thought that we must begin looking at ourselves as a “UNIT” so that we begin to align to the NCATE standards across the board. Bonnie Hodges moved the item with a second by Cynthia Benton to put the item to an e-vote. |
| **6.** | **Introduction and review of:**   * **Rubric for Initial Teacher Candidate Assessment of Student Learning** * **Rubric for Advanced Candidate Assessment for Student Learning**   Both documents were briefly reviewed and will be posted for two weeks for comments and proposed changes by the council membership. A request was made that the documents be redistributed by separate email to the voting members. D. Farnsworth agreed to redistribute. |
| **7.** | **Discussion of the Fair Process Policies and Procedures for Review of Professional Competencies in Teacher Education Revisions:** M. Barduhn reviewed a proposed modification to the language of Section 14, paragraph A, dealing with the composition of the Board of Appeals for Graduate Candidates. This change was necessitated by the dissolution of the graduate studies office. Marley opened the floor to discussion and C. Benton indicated that the proposed wording had been problematic in the past and recommended that it be modified to read as follows: **If the candidate is a graduate student, then an additional member from the graduate faculty will be included. The preference would be a** **faculty member who has graduate faculty status and experience in teacher education.**  The proposed language was adopted by the council and the item will be posted for e-vote. |

**Announcements**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item No. | **Title/Description:** M. Barduhn updated the full TEC on the presidential breakfast that was held on November 18, 2011. Discussion was rich and included many items such as the APPR, Common Core Standards and revisions to the NYS Learning Standards. The superintendents and building administrators in attendance noted that they are dealing with these issues and concerns and indicated that it is a huge burden on the local districts impacting time and resources. Marley asked others who were in attendance for their reactions to the meeting: J**.** Cottone noted that it was evident there are differences of opinion between superintendents and principals as to how best to implement these changes. The districts are looking for ways to form better partnerships, plan for additional professional development and improve collaboration and shared-responsibility, especially where communication is concerned. B. Hodges noted the collective need for a transitional model as we both struggle and scramble to meet our short and long-term responsibilities. M. Gfeller cited the need to have training on the new APPR requirements. A. Lachance wanted the council to know that this was not a ‘your students can’t be in our schools’ gripe session. She also noted the need for our students to be getting instruction on the new common core standards, the new APPR and other issues that will be faced by our candidates during student teaching. D. Weiczorek agreed that there is a real desire to have better dialogue with our partners regarding these important issues. He also emphasized that we do not want to let this momentum stall and hopes that we will continue to seek input from these partners along the way. Marley emphasized that what we need is equally important to our partners as what they need. We need to explore both sides of the issue to determine what our partners in the districts can do to help us as well as to determine ways in which we can help the districts. On 11/29/11 Marley, Andrea Lachance and Sue Wilson will be heading to Albany to discuss these very issues with the Chancellor and the president of the Board of Regents. She will update the council at the next meeting. She also informed the council on her meeting with our NYC partner schools, indicating that they are far ahead of us in implementing the common core and where their students would score on the rubrics. Other initiatives with our student teachers involve monthly breakfast meetings with administrators and mock interviews. Marley encouraged faculty to increase exposure to these partner organizations as a means of improving collaborations in the City Schools. Mariangela Chandler encouraged faculty to send their candidates to career services for mock interviews as well and spoke very highly of the efforts by John Shirley and his staff to prepare our candidates for the interview process. Marley indicated that the minutes of the Breakfast Session would be distributed to the TEC members as they become available. |

**Next Meeting Details**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Next Meeting Date** | **December 12, 2011 from 3:00 to 5:00PM** |
| **Next Meeting Location** | **Exhibition Lounge, Corey Union** |

**ATTACHMENTS**

State University of New York at Cortland

**Fair Process Policy & Procedures for Review of Professional Competencies in Teacher Education**

**Article I**

**GENERAL PROVISIONS**

Section 1. **Scope**

Teacher education programs at SUNY Cortland are located in each of the three schools within the College: the School of Arts and Sciences, the School of Professional Studies and the School of Education. The provisions of the Fair Process Policy & Procedures apply to all teacher education programs at SUNY Cortland.

Section 2. **Definitions**

**A. Checkpoint**: one of six times during a student’s academic program whereby various requirements and/or criteria are assessed to fairly and accurately determine progress toward degree completion.

**B. Professional organization**: a professional body which governs and regulates standards for the profession.

**C. Mail**: letters sent to students under Articles II and III will be sent via overnight registered and certified mail, return receipt requested through the United States Postal Service to both the local and permanent addresses of the student.

**D. Business**: a “business day” is Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday Thursday or Friday on which the College conducts regularly scheduled business.

**E. Address of record**: the student’s local and permanent addresses as listed on the Banner System. Students are responsible for maintaining up-to-date addresses on the College computer system, Banner.

***F. Dean****: Dean of the teacher candidate’s School*.

***G. Chairperson;s Designee:*** *In the event that an academic chairperson is away from campus for an extended time, they should designate another member or administrator to act on their behalf for any actions under this policy.*

Section 3. **Academic and Professional Criteria for Admission, Retention and Graduation**

A. All SUNY Cortland teacher education programs prepare candidates to become competent teachers who make a positive difference in the lives of their students. The Teacher Education Council is the recognized governing body for all teacher education programs at SUNY Cortland.

B. In deciding whether to admit to, retain in or graduate from a program, SUNY Cortland teacher education programs consider the individual’s competencies related to serving in the teaching profession, including personal characteristics, conduct, personal responsibility and integrity, and potential to serve effectively and ethically in the teaching profession.

1. General Academic Criteria: In deciding whether to admit to, retain in or graduate from a program,

SUNY Cortland considers:

a. The values set out in the university’s mission statement and written student policies. (see Appendix A)

b. The values set out in the Teacher Education Council’s NCATE mission statement, the SUNY

Cortland Conceptual Framework for Teacher Education and written policies and procedures for

teacher education candidates, as well as professional competencies as defined by each teacher

Education program at the College. *(Appendix B to be included when completed by departments/programs)*

c. Applicants and candidates for state-approved programs; the legal requirements and professional

expectations as set out in the applicable laws and regulations governing state certification and

program registry.

d. The standards and rules adopted or recognized by the applicable professional organizations.

2. Specific Academic Criteria: In deciding whether to admit to, retain in or graduate from a program,

SUNY Cortland teacher education programs consider:

a. Whether the individual has submitted a timely and complete application to the program.

b. Whether the individual meets the admissions criteria set out in the university’s catalog(s), and

in the written admissions materials for the teacher education program.

c. Whether the individual has maintained the required cumulative grade point average at each

applicable checkpoint.

d. Whether the individual has received the minimum required grade as set out by the program for

each course taken as part of the degree program.

e. Whether the individual has met all the other program completion requirements for retention and graduation as set forth in the university’s catalogs as well as each program’s written candidate policies, procedures and professional competencies.

3. Professional Competencies and Criteria: In deciding whether to admit to, retain in or graduate from a program, SUNY Cortland considers:

a. The individual’s ability to communicate and work effectively with others, including those from

different backgrounds, those with exceptional needs or limitations, those from different racial or

ethnic populations, and those of both genders and different sexual orientation.

b. The individual’s moral character, fitness and dispositions for the teaching profession, including,

but not limited to any felony conviction(s) that would bar state certification.

c. The individual’s behavior in light of appropriate professional and ethical standards.

d. The individual’s general and specific knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to successfully

complete the particular program and to function effectively in the teaching profession, as set

forth in each program’s written candidate policies, procedures and professional competencies,

as well as the standards and rules adopted or recognized by the appropriate professional

organizations.

1. When, in the opinion of the department chairperson or designee a student’s ability to satisfy the academic and professional criteria listed in this section is in doubt, the department chairperson or designee will complete the Candidate Consultation Report.
2. Before completion of the Candidate Consultation Report, the student will receive at least 3 days notice of the consultation meeting and will be informed of the opportunity to bring to the meeting a member of the Cortland faculty to serve as third party witness. The student will be invited to sign the report but is under no obligation to do so. When the report is complete it will be distributed to the student, the faculty attending the meeting, the program coordinator and the student’s associate dean. (If the student fails to appear for the meeting, the report will be completed in absentia.)

Section 4. **Disclaimer**

Admission to or graduation from a teacher education program at SUNY Cortland does not constitute a guarantee that the candidate will be granted a New York State teaching certificate, extension, endorsement or licence.

Section 5. **Academic and Professional Decisions Subject to Review Under This Policy**

An individual who is terminated from a program by a department under Article II of this policy may request a review of such a decision by the Dean of the candidate’s School following the procedures set out in Article III of this policy.

Section 6. **Academic and Professional Decisions Not Subject to Review Under This Policy**

An individual who is denied entrance to a SUNY Cortland teacher education program cannot request a review of that decision beyond the department/program level. In addition, an individual cannot request a review under this policy of any of the following:

A. A decision denying a request to have a program or course requirement waived.

B. An evaluation by a College Field Supervisor during field placements.

C. A decision that a candidate should be removed from a class.

D. A decision to withdraw a candidate from, or reassign a candidate to, a field placement or clinical

experience.

E. A determination of eligibility for field experiences.

**Article II**

Section 7. **Grounds for Termination from a Program**

A department may terminate a candidate from a program for failure to meet, satisfy or demonstrate satisfactory performance with respect to one or more of the academic and/or professional criteria in *Article I*, Section 3B.

Section 8. **Candidate Withdrawal from a Program**

If at any time a candidate chooses to withdraw from a teacher education program, the candidate should notify the department chairperson, or their designee, by either completing a change of major form or withdrawal from college form.

Section 9. **Notification of Proposed Action to Terminate a Candidate from a Program**

A. It is normal practice for a department chairperson or designee to informally consult with a candidate about a proposed decision to terminate that candidate from the program. The department chairperson or designee will refer to the academic and professional criteria listed above and the student’s record as reflected in the Candidate Consultation Report(s) and transcript. At this point, the candidate may choose to withdraw from the program (see Section 8) and the matter will then be considered concluded.

B. If a candidate chooses to continue in the program after informal notification, but before the department finalizes a decision to terminate a candidate, the department chairperson or designee will mail the candidate a letter:

1. Notifying the candidate of the proposed action, including the effective date of that action.

2. Identifying the reasons for the proposed action.

3. Providing the candidate ten business days after the postmark date to make a written

request to meet with the department chairperson or their designee, to discuss the decision.

Section 10. **Department-Level** **Review Meeting**

A. If the candidate does not request a meeting with the department chairperson or designee within the time

frame set out in the notification of proposed action, the department chair or designee will mail to the candidate a program termination decision letter (Section 2), which may be appealed through the Office of the Dean of the School (Article III).

B. If the candidate wishes to meet with the department chairperson or designee, the candidate must make a *formal* written request *(no email or faxed communication is permitted)* for such a meeting within ten business days after the notification of proposed action was postmarked. This written request for a meeting should be addressed to the department chairperson or designee and shall provide all the information and explanations the candidate wants the department chairperson or designee to take into consideration in making the decision. This written request for a meeting must be signed and dated, and contain all the following information:

1. A statement identifying the program decision that is being requested for review.

2. A statement explaining why the candidate believes that the program decision should be changed.

3. Any information and relevant documentation that the candidate has to support his or her belief that

the decision should be changed.

4. The candidates’s current address of record, telephone number and e-mail address.

5. A signed statement giving the department chairperson or designee permission to talk to person(s)

who may have relevant documentation and information. If the candidate refuses to sign such a

release, the review process is thereby concluded and the program decision stands.

C. Within ten business days of receiving a written request from the candidate, the department chairperson will schedule a meeting among the candidate, the department chairperson or designee and the academic advisor. Whenever possible, the meeting should be held within ten business days of the date the candidate’s request for review was received by the department chairperson.

1. This meeting will be conducted by the department chairperson or designee. The candidate should

be given the opportunity to provide participants with information and/or documentation relevant to

the candidates’s performance and clarifying questions may be asked.

2. Since all SUNY Cortland teacher education programs are professional programs, candidates are

expected to be personally present at the meeting, to speak on their own behalf, and to appropriate-

ly participate in the process of the meeting. If the candidate elects to do so, the candidate may be

accompanied by a faculty or professional staff member of their choice, who may observe but not

actively participate in the meeting, except at the department chairperson’s sole discretion. The

candidate may elect to provide such faculty or professional staff member with previous cor-

respondence related to this appeal. The department chair’s office will not be responsible for pro-

viding the faculty or professional staff member with information. At least one day prior to the review meeting, the candidate shall inform the department chairperson of the name of the support person, if any.

3. The duration of this meeting is at the sole discretion of the department chairperson or designee.

Section 11. **Program Decision Letter**

A. Whether or not the candidate chooses to meet with the department chairperson or designee as described in Section 10, the department chairperson will finalize the departmental decision. The department chairperson or designee will then mail to the candidate a program decision letter notifying the candidate of the outcome. If the decision is to terminate the candidate from the program, the program termination decision letter will notify the candidate of the opportunity to have the department’s decision reviewed through the Office of the Dean of the School (Article III).

B. Once the department chairperson or designee has mailed to the candidate a program termination decision

letter, the candidate will not be permitted to attend or register for classes in that major. If a candidate requests entry into a new teacher education major, this request will be subject to joint review by both department chairpersons or designees.

**Article III**

Section 12. **Standard for Appealing a Program Termination Decision**

A department’s decision to terminate a candidate from a program, as specified in *Article II, Section 7* will be overturned only if the Dean of the School determines that the department’s decision was based upon an unfair process. The Dean will not reverse a department’s decision simply because the Dean might have reached a different decision given the performance of the candidate.

Section 13. **Candidate Request for Appeal Meeting**

A. A candidate who wishes to appeal a department decision to terminate the candidate from a program must

submit a *formal* written request for an appeal meeting *(no email or faxed communication is permitted)* within ten business days after the program termination letter was postmarked, to the Office of the Dean of the School. If the candidate does not deliver this request within these time limits, the candidate waives his or her right to an appeal and the program termination decision stands.

B. The request for an appeal meeting must be in writing and must contain the following information:

1. A statement identifying the program decision that is being appealed.

2. Any evidence that demonstrates the decision to terminate was arbitrary and capricious and should be changed.

3. The candidate’s current address of record, telephone number and e-mail address.

4. A signed statement giving the Dean or Dean’s designee permission to talk to person(s) who may

have relevant information. If the candidate refuses to sign such a release, the appeal process is thereby concluded and the program termination decision stands.

Section 14. **Appeal Procedure for Candidates**

A. The office of the Dean of the School will schedule an appeal meeting between the candidate and the Teacher Education Board of Appeals. The Teacher Education Board of Appeals consists of the Associate Dean of the candidate’s School, department chair, as well as faculty representatives from the Teacher Education Council, including at least one representative from another School with in the College. If the candidate is a graduate student, then an additional member with Graduate Faculty status and experience in teacher education will be included as the preferred member whenever possible. The Dean’s Office will notify the candidate and the Board of Appeals of the date, time and place of the appeal meeting. Whenever possible, the appeal meeting should be held within ten business days of the date the candidate’s request for review was received in the Dean’s Office.

B. If, without good cause as determined by the Board, the candidate fails to appear for the appeal meeting, the candidate shall be deemed to have abandoned his or her appeal and the original program decision shall stand.

C. Candidates are expected to be personally present at the appeal meeting, to speak on their own behalf and to participate in the process of the appeal meeting. If the candidate elects to do so, the candidate may be accompanied by a faculty or professional staff member of their choice, who may observe, but not actively participate in the appeal meeting, except at the Board’s sole discretion. The candidate may elect to provide such faculty or professional staff member with previous correspondence related to this appeal. The Dean’s Office will not be responsible for providing the faculty or professional staff member with information. At least one day prior to the appeal meeting, the candidate shall inform the Dean’s Office of the name of the support person, if any.

D. As a general rule, the following process will be followed at the appeal meeting:

1. A recording or verbatim record of the meeting is permitted. However, no recording or verbatim

record of the Board deliberations will be made.

2. The Associate Dean of the candidate’s School will be the facilitator of the meeting.

3. The Associate Dean will provide the candidate with an opportunity to explain the candidate’s reasons for requesting that the program’s decision be changed. The members of the Board of Appeals may then ask questions of the candidate. The Associate Dean may conclude the meeting at any time after the candidate has been heard by the Board.

4. The duration of this meeting is at the sole discretion of the Associate Dean.

E. After the conclusion of the appeal meeting, the Board will deliberate the request for review. After deliberation, the Associate Dean will forward the Board’s recommendation to the Dean of the School, who will forward the Board’s decision to the candidate.

F. Upon review of relevant documents and the recommendation of the Teacher Education Board of Appeals, the Dean of the School may take any of the following actions:

1. Affirm the original decision to terminate the candidate from the program.

2. Reverse the original decision to terminate the candidate from the program.

3. Conditionally reverse the original decision to terminate the candidate from the program, subject to the candidate meeting additional requirements.

4. Request additional information before making a final decision.

G. After reaching a decision, the Dean’s Office will mail a letter with the decision of the Dean of the School to the candidate, the Dean of the School of Education and the department chairperson within ten business days of the review meeting whenever possible.

H. A candidate may request a meeting with the Dean of the School after receiving the decision letter. The time, place and duration of the meeting will be scheduled by the Dean’s Office

I. The decision of the Dean of the School is final and is not subject to further review or appeal.

Adopted by TEC on 10/7/04.

Updated on 09/03/08

Updated on 10/28/11

**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.

**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. |

**Field Experience and School Partnerships—Building Upon Our Existing Relationships—Building Toward a Model**

Dear FEAC Leadership, Chairs, and Coordinators: Please use this template to identify current and potential partnerships within your respective departments. As we discussed at FEAC on 11-1-11, this information will be compiled across departments and shared with the TEC. This information will also be used as a starting point for continued partnership development through FEAC and other campus/K-12 structures which are inter- and intra-departmental in nature. ***Please email this back to Doug as an email attachment by 11-14-11.*** Thank you.

1. **“Partnerships”** are broadly defined as: course-related relationships, grants, projects, outreach, study groups, field supervision, informal connections, and mini-workshops, or any existing conversation that is ongoing/in development that your department hopes to cultivate in the near- or long-term future. In essence, any field model the faculty creates will be flexible and will encompass many types and levels of school partnerships.
2. **“Identity”:** Building on our conversation, what do we want to promote? What are we proud of? What do we want to build on as we go?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Program/Department | Current Partnerships (please include who, where, etc.) | Possibilities to Build/Expand/Hopes |
| **Childhood/Early Childhood Education**  **Faculty Members:**  Andrea Lachance, Beth Klein  Susana Davidenko **(EDU 373; Block I)**  Chris Widdall **(EDU 315)** & Valerie Behr **(EDU 379)**  Shufang Shi **(EDU 315)**  Karen Hempson  Kim Rombach **(EDU 379-479; EDU 510)**  Orvil White  Joy Mosher **(CPV 400 Internship)**  Susan Stratton, Gail Tooker, Beth Klein  **(EDU 374: Science & COR 101)**  **COURSE-SPECIFIC CHILDHOOD PLACEMENTS**  Valerie Behr, Kim Rombach, Katina Sayers-Walker  **(EDU 379)**  Renee Potter, Cindy Benton, Katina Sayers-Walker (**EDU 479)**  Susan Stratton **(EDU 657)**  **COURSE- SPECIFIC EARLY CHILDHOOD**  Emilie Kudela & Tricia Roiger & EC Faculty  **(ECE 270, ECE 332, ECE 333; ECE 334; ECE 479)**      Mona Ivey-Soto **(ECE 332)**  Emilie Kudela  Linda Pickett **(ECE 479)** | **Teacher Leader Quality Partnership (TLQP)**  Local BOCES, McGraw, Cincinnatus, Homer,  Multiple initiatives for faculty development and school partnerships focused on improving instruction in math, science, ELA (Chris Widdall, Trainer).  **Cortland PDS Mathematics Peer Mentor Program**  Parker, Barry, Randall currently; Smith, Virgil possible; workshops and 10 individual teachers trained to peer mentor in three schools; some teachers have taught in college methods classes; practicum placements with trained mentor teachers.  **Practicum and Service Learning Technology Partnership** with Whitney Point Elementary (prek-3) and WPTR Academy (4-6 gr.) and Syracuse (Blodgett). Partnership practicum and service learning experiences with a technology emphasis (ex: creating classroom and community information fliers, Smartnotebook and PPT interactive games, classroom audio books for student use, iPad use and Skype as tutoring tools, teacher support to enhance or create websites or blogs for students.  Classroom teacher guest speakers in EDU 379.  **Wiki Literature Circle with Parker ES**, Initiated through IMPACT project Spring and Summer 2011 and carrying on Fall 2011 and Spring 2012. Working with Parker ES teachers on Wiki Literature Circle activities; students will work with EDU315 students in the College on-site and online.  **Tully Schools Videoconferencing.** Working with classroom teacher who interacts with candidates to show preparation and debrief teaching.  **IMPACT Grant & MST Program**; Paired student teaching in Parker ES. Field experiences for MST students as a cohort in past.  Piloting **PDS on-site course teaching** and field placement for one section of EDU 379, spring 2012, Parker School, Cortland.  **Thailand Science Teacher Training Exchange**: University of SWI, Thailand National Education Office. Science initiative to better train Thai teachers in inquiry learning. Partnership with SUNY Cortland, visiting teachers at local schools and workshop in science.  **Internship(s) with Migrant Education Outreach Program. 40-120 hour placements** working with the staff, families and children of the Migrant Education Outreach Program.  **Field trips to Lime Hollow** hosting local school students for outdoor education experiences  **Various Schools: 50 hour field placement** (125 candidates per semester) meets requirement for observation and participation in 1-6 classrooms  **Various Schools, 50 hour field placement** (125 candidates per semester) in K-6 classrooms, meets requirements for 3 taught lessons, host teacher evaluation of candidate preparedness  **Various Schools; 100 hour field experience**. MST Students seeking initial certificate work with classroom teachers in a practicum  Early Childhood Placements with Head Start, Local School & Community Agencies UPKs. SUNY Cortland Child Care Center, Cortland Child Development Center, YMCA, YWCA.  **ECE 270:** **Var. hours** (25-30 candidates per semester) Visiting/observing Head Starts in Cortland Schools--Randall, Parker & Smith. Barry School, kindergarten, Abby Withey, students teach math lessons.  **ECE 332: 75 hours,** various placements.(25-40 candidates per semester)  Establishing partnerships with Syracuse City Schools and agencies for Early Childhood experiences. Current placements: SUNY Cortland Child Care Center, Cortland Child Devel. Center, YMCA, YWCA.  **ECE 333:** **10 hours** with child and families (25-40 candidates per semester)  **ECE 334: 15 hours** with infants/toddlers (25 candidates per semester) SUNY Child Care Center  **ECE 479:** **50 hours in K-2 classrooms** (15 candidates per semester | Ongoing Faculty Development (12+ years of the grant). Addressing emerging school-based issues (Core Standards, Assessment, etc.)  Trainer of trainers model, additional teachers each year; soft money, so needs to be institutionalized or additional support. Practicum student placements being displaced by APPR issues? Math Common Core standards being addressed, could be expanded.  Expand classroom teacher and K-6 student support, faculty development in technology use to other partner schools (McGraw and Cincinnatus). Increase classroom teacher interaction with college instruction and candidate engagement with classroom students and community service.  Expanded field experiences and assistance in schools with technology expertise and instruction.  Continue to provide school-based technology assistance among candidates, students and teachers.  Expand number of teachers and candidates working with Tully and other schools through videoconferencing, Skype, etc.  Future inclusive special education dual certificate students who will provide much-needed skills in schools. Need to anticipate quality/appropriate placements for Master's level students doing Teacher Work Sample, practicum & student teaching.  Expand exchange of students, graduate students, teachers to travel, teach and learn about science instruction.  The Migrant Education Outreach Program is a viable potential partner site for experiences working with English Language Learners and social issues such as poverty.  Collaboration with community science teaching & learning resources should be sustained goal.  Reorganize to follow Physical Education model of placing candidates after completing Block I instruction. Require focused field observation and participation assignments to be completed before EDU 479. Continue to develop ELA/Math nights and other activities in partner schools to give candidates direct experience with developing & delivering plans.  Reorganize-- faculty and candidates in Block II sections of EDU 479 and EDU 480 participate with one or two schools/districts. School partners can participate in instruction of block, host candidates in classrooms. May require re-organization of campus schedule.  Consolidate and work with particular schools, teachers and administrators to focus research projects on issues to support APPR/student evaluation and achievement.  Multiple field sites giving Early Childhood students a wide range of experiences which add to their skills and employability.  Organize and monitor choice of high quality placements, and provide well-prepared candidates with focus on strong ELA/math preparation to assist and co-teach (as appropriate).    Continue to expand relationships toward stronger ELL/ESL, special needs and multicultural experiences for early childhood and dual certificate experiences.  Proposed Partnerships with Northern Ireland for field experience in (cities/schools????). International/ Study Abroad to complete some field experiences in a foreign country, with a focus on peace studies. |
|  |  |  |
| Program/Department | Identity/Pride in…. | How can we build on this? Outcomes? |
| Childhood/Early Childhood Education Department | Successfully provide high quality professional preparation for the large number of students in teacher education aimed at elementary and early childhood teaching and child care leadership. | Recognize the value of providing a strong, liberal arts preparation; expand on the possibility of double majors and specialization in high-needs areas (ELL, inclusive special education, STEM fields for early learning). Recognize the need for integrated curriculum teaching & learning. Connect to national Core Standards as we develop our curriculum and field experiences. Provide earlier and more frequent guided experiences in schools, which also contribute to the achievement of program goals in K-6 schools, and provide professional development opportunities for classroom teachers who work with our teacher candidates. |
|  |  |  |
| Campus-Wide- Big Picture | Identity/Pride in…. | How can we build on this? Outcomes? |
| Early Childhood, Childhood, Physical Education, Health Leader in State and Nation | We're not only big, we're incomparable at transforming candidates and preparing them to be long-term professional educators dedicated to student learning and personal growth. | Be more responsive to K-12 school needs and to professional development of partner classroom teachers. |

**Field Experience and School Partnerships—Building Upon Our Existing Relationships—Building Toward a Model**

Dear FEAC Leadership, Chairs, and Coordinators: Please use this template to identify current and potential partnerships within your respective departments. As we discussed at FEAC on 11-1-11, this information will be compiled across departments and shared with the TEC. This information will also be used as a starting point for continued partnership development through FEAC and other campus/K-12 structures, which are inter- and intra-departmental in nature. ***Please email this back to Doug as an email attachment by 11-14-11.*** Thank you.

1. **“Partnerships”** are broadly defined as: course-related relationships, grants, projects, outreach, study groups, field supervision, informal connections, and mini-workshops, or any existing conversation that is ongoing/in development that your department hopes to cultivate in the near- or long-term future. In essence, any field model the faculty creates will be flexible and will encompass many types and levels of school partnerships.
2. **“Identity”:** Building on our conversation, what do we want to promote? What are we proud of? What do we want to build on as we go?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Program/Department | Current Partnerships (please include who, where, etc.) | Possibilities to Build/Expand/Hopes |
| Inclusive Special Education UG major – Foundations and Social Advocacy Department  Teaching Students with Disabilities MS Ed. Program – Foundations and Social Advocacy Department  C.U.R.E. – Foundations and Social Advocacy Department  IM: PACT Grant – FSA and C/ECE Departments | * Dr. King School, SCSD, for FSA 101: Introduction to Urban Education (C.U.R.E. & ISE major) and Block courses (FSA 410, 420, 436 & LIT 310/311) for ISE major. * Dr. King, Delaware and Porter Schools in the SCSD have been ongoing partners to the ISE program, providing ST hosts, and supporting our initiatives. * Franziska Racker Center in Cortland for FSA 280: Perspectives on Disabilities & 281: Perspectives Field Experience in ISE Program and FSA 630: The Learner with Disabilities in Context in the TSD MS Ed. Program. Students are partnered with a local family with a child who has a disability. * Historically, FSA has had a relationship with Parker Elementary, Cortland School District, for FSA 210: Principles of Inclusive Education & FSA 211: Inclusive Education Field Experience for ISE major. * Corcoran High School, SCSD, for FSA 101: Intro To Urban Ed for C.U.R.E. Program. * Cortland School District and Syracuse City School District – Partnering with SUNY Cortland for IM: PACT Grant. At one time or another a co-student teaching pair related to this project has been placed in four out of five elementary schools in the district. We are placing a pair at Smith, the fifth school, during the upcoming semester (spring 2012). | * The ISE Program would like to expand its relationship with SCSD to include other strong partnerships in addition to Dr. King School. The number of ISE majors continues to grow and we cannot expect that Dr. King School will be able to continue to accommodate all of our ISE majors. * FSA would like to develop additional partnerships with schools that provide inclusive classrooms for all students. * The ISE and TSD Programs are continually in search of partnerships with program and families for FSA 280/281 and FSA 630. * The ISE Program needs more partnerships to support students in the major’s initial course in inclusive education – FSA 210 & 211. * The ISE and TSD Programs need partnerships with schools and classrooms that support students with multiple and severe disabilities in positive ways. * C.U.R.E. is working with Corcoran High for the first time in Fall 2011. C.U.R.E. needs to develop strong partnerships with other urban schools in Syracuse and Binghamton at all grade levels. |
|  |  |  |
| Program/Department | Identity/Pride in…. | How can we build on this? Outcomes? |
| FSA Department | FSA is proud of its commitment to creating positive, inclusive learning experiences for students with disabilities in K-12 schools and on the SUNY Cortland campus, urban education, and diversity in general. |  |
|  |  |  |
| Campus-Wide- Big Picture | Identity/Pride in…. | How can we build on this? Outcomes? |

**Field Experience and School Partnerships—Building Upon Our Existing Relationships—Building Toward a Model**

Dear FEAC Leadership, Chairs, and Coordinators: Please use this template to identify current and potential partnerships within your respective departments. As we discussed at FEAC on 11-1-11, this information will be compiled across departments and shared with the TEC. This information will also be used as a starting point for continued partnership development through FEAC and other campus/K-12 structures which are inter- and intra-departmental in nature. ***Please email this back to Doug as an email attachment by 11-14-11.*** Thank you.

1. **“Partnerships”** are broadly defined as: course-related relationships, grants, projects, outreach, study groups, field supervision, informal connections, and mini-workshops, or any existing conversation that is ongoing/in development that your department hopes to cultivate in the near- or long-term future. In essence, any field model the faculty creates will be flexible and will encompass many types and levels of school partnerships.
2. **“Identity”:** Building on our conversation, what do we want to promote? What are we proud of? What do we want to build on as we go?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Program/Department | Current Partnerships (please include who, where, etc.) | Possibilities to Build/Expand/Hopes |
| Literacy Department  Literacy Department    Literacy Department  Literacy Department  Literacy Department  Literacy Department | Ithaca City School District—literacy specialists  Ithaca City School District  LIT 683/684; LIT 693  LIT 669/Professional Development Workshops  Placement Outreach  Service-learning | Our hope is to use this collaboration for our full-time students seeking secondary literacy certification, to provide them with a more well-rounded, insightful, authentic field experience. Through this collaboration, teacher candidates will be observing literacy specialists, working with students independently and in group settings for assessment and intervention purposes, and experiencing collaborative teaching between content area teachers and literacy specialists.  Our teacher candidates are invited to participate in PLC with the ICSD teachers every morning from 8:05-8:45. During this time, various professional development texts are analyzed.  In these courses, teacher candidates assess children’s strengths in literacy and plan instructional programming based on the analysis of their assessment data. Teacher candidates work one-on-one or in small groups with students who experience a variety of literacy needs.  The final assignment for LIT 669 is a professional development workshop that teacher candidates offer to local teaching professionals. The workshops are held on SUNY Cortland’s campus. The focus of each workshop varies, however each emphasizes current issues in the field of literacy instruction or assessment.  Along with , the literacy department has visited two school districts this fall semester in order to obtain field placements. The meetings have created good communication between the college, the literacy department, and teachers in local school districts.  In the fall semester, at least one of Christina Caravella’s sections of LIT 371 will be a service-learning course. At this time, the type of service-learning activity that the students will be engaged in has not been finalized. |
|  |  |  |
| Program/Department | Identity/Pride in…. | How can we build on this? Outcomes? |
| Literacy Department | Literacy Specialist Panels | We held a literacy specialist panel discussion at the beginning of this semester focusing on the role of the secondary literacy specialist and plan to have one in the spring that emphasizes the role of the elementary literacy specialist. We have decided as a department to make these panel discussions an annual event and to mandate attendance by new students entering our program to enable them to better understand the importance of their coursework. Moreover, two of the literacy specialists on the fall panel are part of the ICSD collaboration, and the two remaining panelists are literacy specialists in the Dryden School District, with whom we would like to develop a similar collaboration at the elementary level. Additionally, we would like to use these sessions as a means of providing interested undergraduates (and others) with insight about our program and the various roles and responsibilities of the literacy specialist. These panels serve as excellent PR for the school systems involved and for the literacy department, especially since the panels include graduates of our program. the secondary literacy specialist and plans to have one in the spring that emphasizes the role of the elementary literacy specialist. We have decided as a department to make these panel discussions an annual event and to mandate attendance by new students entering our program to enable them to better understand the importance of their coursework. Moreover, two of the literacy specialists on the fall panel are part of the ICSD collaboration, and the two remaining panelists are literacy specialists in the Dryden School District, with whom we would like to develop a similar collaboration at the elementary level. Additionally, we would like to use these sessions as a means of providing interested undergraduates (and others) with insight about our program and the various roles and responsibilities of the literacy specialist. These panels serve as excellent PR for the school systems involved and for the literacy department, especially since the panels include graduates of our program. |
|  |  |  |
| Campus-Wide- Big Picture | Identity/Pride in…. | How can we build on this? Outcomes? |
| Community Outreach  Presentation by emeritus faculty  Oliver Button Project  Faculty presentation on young children and adolescent children’s literature and bullying prevention | The Cortland County Community Action Program (CAPCO) started the “snackpack” program (initially as a pilot program) in the spring of 2010. It was in response to realizing how many families in the community struggle to make ends meet, and learning that chil-dren in our community were actually going hungry over the week-ends (between lunch on Friday and breakfast on Monday when they got back to school). CAPCO started the “snackpack” program in Marathon and the response was immediate and overwhelming.  “We heard from teachers that recognized the difference in children who weren't coming back to school hungry. We heard from par-ents appreciative that there was food for their children that in-cluded fresh fruit that they often couldn't afford. The children were excited to have food to share with siblings” (Lindy Glennon, CAPCO).  The way the “snackpack” program works is children are identified by school personnel (teachers, nurses, etc.) and referred to CAPCO. CAPCO purchases backpacks that look like the back-packs that everyone else is carrying. “We didn't want them to be identifiable as “CAPCO Snackpacks" so there was no stigma on the children” (Lindy Glennon). The backpacks are packed on Fridays and given to the children. They take them home, eat the food and bring them back to school with them on Monday.  With 46% of the children in the Cortland City Schools eligible for free/reduced price lunches, there are a lot of families struggling to make ends meet and provide healthy food for their children. Unfor-tunately, the numbers are very similar in the rural school districts.  The Literacy Department is supporting CAPCO’s efforts in sup-porting children and their families. Please consider making a contri-bution to this project by bringing in an item (see the list to the right) to give to your instructor or the drop-off box in the Literacy Department Office.  Dorothy Troike, professor emerita of the Literacy Department, presented a Power-Point presentation titled "Images of Tibet" on Tuesday, November 8th at 7PM in Sperry 204, followed by a Q&A session. The presentation combined photos from a 2007 trip to Tibet with children's books about Tibet, its people and customs. An emphasis was placed on the culture of Buddhism, the dominant religion of Tibet for more than 1000 years. A brief history of Tibet and its relationship to China over the centuries was also included.  Students will work with first and second-grade children on bullying prevention. This project will be held at the Blue Frog in late February/early April.  Charlotte Pass will present young children and adolescent children’s literature on bullying prevention to the campus and community. | We’re making a commitment to this program in the long run.  We plan to continue to sponsor this type of programming/professional development.  The goal of this project is to develop an understanding that all people should be treated with dignity and respect. We hope to continue this project every year. |

**Field Experience and School Partnerships—Building Upon Our Existing Relationships—Building Toward a Model**

Dear FEAC Leadership, Chairs, and Coordinators: Please use this template to identify current and potential partnerships within your respective departments. As we discussed at FEAC on 11-1-11, this information will be compiled across departments and shared with the TEC. This information will also be used as a starting point for continued partnership development through FEAC and other campus/K-12 structures which are inter- and intra-departmental in nature. ***Please email this back to Doug as an email attachment by 11-14-11.*** Thank you.

1. **“Partnerships”** are broadly defined as: course-related relationships, grants, projects, outreach, study groups, field supervision, informal connections, and mini-workshops, or any existing conversation that is ongoing/in development that your department hopes to cultivate in the near- or long-term future. In essence, any field model the faculty creates will be flexible and will encompass many types and levels of school partnerships.
2. **“Identity”:** Building on our conversation, what do we want to promote? What are we proud of? What do we want to build on as we go?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Program/Department | Current Partnerships (please include who, where, etc.) | Possibilities to Build/Expand/Hopes |
| Mathematics | Cortland Enlarged City School District  Current CECSD faculty: Zachary Darrow, Cheri Olsen, Paul Drexler  SUNY Cortland faculty: Mary Gfeller  We will be meeting at the high school and working on the implementing a teaching strategy for differentiated instruction as a way to teach key ideas in addition to specific math skills. | We are in the beginning stages of the partnership and will be discussing the direction of the partnership this year. |
|  |  |  |
| Program/Department | Identity/Pride in…. | How can we build on this? Outcomes? |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Campus-Wide- Big Picture | Identity/Pride in…. | How can we build on this? Outcomes? |
|  |  |  |

**Field Experience and School Partnerships—Building Upon Our Existing Relationships—Building Toward a Model**

Dear FEAC Leadership, Chairs, and Coordinators: Please use this template to identify current and potential partnerships within your respective departments. As we discussed at FEAC on 11-1-11, this information will be compiled across departments and shared with the TEC. This information will also be used as a starting point for continued partnership development through FEAC and other campus/K-12 structures which are inter- and intra-departmental in nature. ***Please email this back to Doug as an email attachment by 11-14-11.*** Thank you.

1. **“Partnerships”** are broadly defined as: course-related relationships, grants, projects, outreach, study groups, field supervision, informal connections, and mini-workshops, or any existing conversation that is ongoing/in development that your department hopes to cultivate in the near- or long-term future. In essence, any field model the faculty creates will be flexible and will encompass many types and levels of school partnerships.
2. **“Identity”:** Building on our conversation, what do we want to promote? What are we proud of? What do we want to build on as we go?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Program/Department | Current Partnerships (please include who, where, etc.) | Possibilities to Build/Expand/Hopes |
| 1. PE – Graduate - School Partnership – Grad. Assistants in Adapted PE paid by school districts to assist schools with adapted PE programs. 2. PE – Graduate - School Partnership - Leadership Masters Program (PED 526, 621, 660, 661) – Grad. Students assist schools with developing/expanding their PE programs, increasing student activity levels, applying for grants, etc. 3. PE – Undergrad (PED 201, Motor Development) – Afterschool programs where our students create environments which encourage movement (help students acquire fundamental motor skills) 4. PE – Undergrad (EDU 256, Seminar for Field Experience) – Students learn the culture of a school (observe and assist) 5. PE – Undergrad (EDU 355, Physical Education Curriculum: Planning and Practice) 6. PE – Undergrad (PED 356, Adapted Physical Education and Sport) 7. PE – Undergrad (EDU 455, 456, Student Teaching) 8. PE – Undergrad (PED 447, 499, adapted undergrad concentration) 9. PE – Graduate (PED 530, 635, 638, adapted PE graduate program) | 1. Homer, DeRuyter, CAPCO (Preschool and Headstart), East Syracuse Menoa, Marathon – 20 hrs/week for full schl. yr. 2. Cortland Christian Academy, Covenant Love Community School (Freeville) 3. St. Mary’s (Cortland), Dryden Elementary, J.M. McDonald Center – 10 hrs. 4. Schools throughout New York State – 60 hrs. immediately following end of semester (one week in middle school, one week in high school) 5. Public elementary/middle schools in Cortland, Dryden, Freeville, Groton, Homer, Ithaca, LaFayette, Lansing, Marathon, McGraw, McLean, Truxton, Tully, Virgil, as well as St. Mary’s and Cortland Christian Academy – 18 hrs. 6. On SUNY campus with community children – partnership with BOCES – 15 hrs. 7. Schools throughout New York State – One semester, full time 8. Special Olympics, Homer, Fransziska Racker Center, Cortland – 20-40 hrs. 9. SUNY Upstate, Schools throughout NY, 45 hrs total. | 1.  2. Plans to expand to public schools. |
|  |  |  |
| Program/Department | Identity/Pride in…. | How can we build on this? Outcomes? |
| PE | We take pride in the level of preparation our candidates have to be successful in student teaching and beyond. |  |
|  |  |  |
| Campus-Wide- Big Picture | Identity/Pride in…. | How can we build on this? Outcomes? |
|  |  |  |

**Field Experience and School Partnerships—Building Upon Our Existing Relationships—Building Toward a Model**

Dear FEAC Leadership, Chairs, and Coordinators: Please use this template to identify current and potential partnerships within your respective departments. As we discussed at FEAC on 11-1-11, this information will be compiled across departments and shared with the TEC. This information will also be used as a starting point for continued partnership development through FEAC and other campus/K-12 structures which are inter- and intra-departmental in nature. ***Please email this back to Doug as an email attachment by 11-14-11.*** Thank you.

1. **“Partnerships”** are broadly defined as: course-related relationships, grants, projects, outreach, study groups, field supervision, informal connections, and mini-workshops, or any existing conversation that is ongoing/in development that your department hopes to cultivate in the near- or long-term future. In essence, any field model the faculty creates will be flexible and will encompass many types and levels of school partnerships.
2. **“Identity”:** Building on our conversation, what do we want to promote? What are we proud of? What do we want to build on as we go?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Program/Department | Current Partnerships (please include who, where, etc.) | Possibilities to Build/Expand/Hopes |
| Adolescence Education: Science 7-12 | PDS Grant with Nancy Hummel at Lafayette HS for Vernier software to do water quality studies on two local bodies of water. One student teacher helped facilitate this grant. Project completed fall 2011 | Will continue to develop project if another student teacher is placed with Ms. Hummel. |
|  |  |  |
| Program/Department | Identity/Pride in…. | How can we build on this? Outcomes? |
|  | Students have strong foundations in content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and professional demeanor on which to build as they begin their careers. We consistently hear that teachers prefer our students over Cornell, Ithaca, Binghamton, LeMoyne, SU etc. because they are better prepared and more professional than candidates from other schools. |  |
|  |  |  |
| Campus-Wide- Big Picture | Identity/Pride in…. | How can we build on this? Outcomes? |
|  |  |  |

**Field Experience and School Partnerships—Building Upon Our Existing Relationships—Building Toward a Model**

Dear FEAC Leadership, Chairs, and Coordinators: Please use this template to identify current and potential partnerships within your respective departments. As we discussed at FEAC on 11-1-11, this information will be compiled across departments and shared with the TEC. This information will also be used as a starting point for continued partnership development through FEAC and other campus/K-12 structures which are inter- and intra-departmental in nature. ***Please email this back to Doug as an email attachment by 11-14-11.*** Thank you.

1. **“Partnerships”** are broadly defined as: course-related relationships, grants, projects, outreach, study groups, field supervision, informal connections, and mini-workshops, or any existing conversation that is ongoing/in development that your department hopes to cultivate in the near- or long-term future. In essence, any field model the faculty creates will be flexible and will encompass many types and levels of school partnerships.
2. **“Identity”:** Building on our conversation, what do we want to promote? What are we proud of? What do we want to build on as we go?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Program/Department | Current Partnerships (please include who, where, etc.) | Possibilities to Build/Expand/Hopes |
| SST: About a dozen teachers and administrators make presentations to our AED students in the fall, fewer in the spring. From these, we have developed partnerships and field trips. | Examples:  1) A middle school teacher provided our candidates with free membership to the Central New York Council for the Social Studies. Dr. Schutt and Dr. Shedd went on to make presentations at the CNYCSS. Our AED 301 students now go on a yearly field trip, attending the CNYCSS annual meeting in Syracuse.  2) A rural school teacher visited AED 301 to discuss expectations of host teachers for student teachers. This eventually led to a rural education committee. Three of our  students with strong preference for teaching in a rural setting did placements and student teaching in rural schools.  3) A teacher from Homer H.S. visited AED 391 recently. His presentation on good teaching was from the perspective of a successful, veteran teacher. | More active involvement in CNYCSS by Field Experiences staff? I think Mary already uses the newsletter to recruit host teachers. Perhaps a table at the conference?  We are currently seeking funding for an SST rural education internship that will put SST students in rural placements to work with teachers and their students on local history projects.  He will see what he can do about getting used grade school history textbooks for our TMC. We do not want our student teachers to teach from textbooks, but we often find that they need to start their lesson plans by referring first to what a textbook says about the topic. |
|  |  |  |
| Program/Department | Identity/Pride in…. | How can we build on this? Outcomes? |
| SST | Good reputation for producing teachers to put together fine, engaging lessons and who are very good at teacher-student relations. | Identify host teachers, especially for student teaching, early on. This would enable us to contact the host teachers early in the term prior to student teaching, asking them to identify a unit of instruction our candidates will almost certainly teach during student teaching. Some teachers might even be willing to assist SST staff in evaluating the unit plan as it develops. Improved student teaching experience almost guaranteed, as our students would be able to hit the ground running in terms of lesson preparation. |
|  |  |  |
| Campus-Wide- Big Picture | Identity/Pride in…. | How can we build on this? Outcomes? |
|  |  |  |