**DRAFT**

**TEC Meeting Minutes**

**February 19,2009**

**Members Present:**  G. Porter, C. Widdall, M. Barduhn, Joy Mosher, N. Auman, B. Buxton, R. Janke, E. Jampole, V. Marty, J. Cottone, J O’Callaghan, J. Bailey, K. Howarth, K. Beney, K. Hempson, B. Mattingly, C. VanDerKarr, L. Melita, G. Peterson, J. Governali, E. Gravani, L. Couturier, H. Bridge

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m. by G. Porter

1. **Acceptance of Today’s Agenda**

The agenda was accepted.

1. **Approval of Minutes**

The Minutes were approved with the following changes/additions**:**

 J. Governali noted that p.2 implied a decision made about function of TEC but he did not recall a clear outcome. The minutes will be revised to reflect the following, “many of the members present felt that the TEC should be considered a disseminating body. . .” Revision accepted by vote.

1. **Old Business**
2. **Professional Development School:** Waiting for Karen Hempson to arrive.

**Dr.** Porter advised that most activity has been in strengthening existing projects. Plan for upcoming year-proposals will be accepted; they are eager to have secondary-level proposals. Karen Hempson will be accepting proposals through April for secondary. There is interest at Cortland Schools. She is willing to assist with proposals and plans. There has been positive feedback from Cortland Schools on existing programs. For example, in literacy project have seen qualitative improvement in student learning. March 4 Event- “Time To Teach The Truth”, Alan Singer on slavery in NYS. This is an initial Cortland Schools/SUNY Cortland initiative. Publicity about this function will be forthcoming.

1. **NCATE**

SPA’s are now due on February 1, 2010.

Gerry announced that the NCATE Steering Committee now has subcommittees organized around the 6 NCATE Standards. Committee chairs are as follows: Standard 1: Carol VanDerKarr

Standard 2: Merle Canfield

Standard 3: Rena Janke & Maureen Goodwin

Standard 4: Sheila Cohen

Standard 5: Bruce Mattingly

Standard 6: John Cottone.

There are additional subcommittees empaneled to look at Electronic Exhibit Room, BOE visit, and format and continuity among reports (headed by Gerry). Please feel free to contact committees for support.

A new timeline was handed out but it doesn’t include “what we as an institution will do for these.”

NCATE Steering Committee will “help work through the particular strategies’ to implement goals.

Jerry O’Callaghan asked if there will be a one year shift in the data sets since the reports have been moved back. G. Porter answered that it is not clear at this time but keep collecting data.

Lynn Courturier mentioned that SPA reports can be submitted in September, so submit then if you want to stick with existing data and not have to revise the text. She was at an NCATE meeting as an NCATE Rep and learned that reports could be submitted early. C. VanDerKarr added that you can present new data but as an addendum to previously submitted data.

G. Porter: At site visit programs will still be accountable for data up to that point.

H. Bridge noted that the problem is that there is inconsistent attention to preparing for reports and accreditation. We’re not getting support in exploring what all subjects need to do to get through reports. Data collection hasn’t been routinized or institutionalized.

G. Porter responded that we did provide support for training for programs, external trainers, travel to trainings, external reviewers of draft reports. Our struggle is to not have these activities be a one-time response.

Heather Bridge stated that there seems to be no question we need an institutional coordinator of data collection and support for programs.

Bruce Mattingly advised that the annual report format could be revised so assessment for programs within teacher ed will include data for accreditation reviews, every year, include critical data.

G. Porter stated that programs were given data “in time” to have written reports this February.

G. Peterson: data \_\_\_\_?\_\_\_\_ in fall-inadequate time on top of regular workload. This issue of workload and person-hrs. not addressed.

M. Kelly: Yes, data came in Fall, not really in time.

L. Couturier: one issue is that we need to have consistent data. Example: their program has had three different sets of data for CST. Need accurate data, well- explained.

G. Porter: Yes, we’ve had flawed data systems and at this point we’re scrambling to put something together. I understand that there is frustration.

J. Mosher: Who is the point person for questions? Who will follow-through and get back?

G. Porter: Dennis Farnsworth is the person to send these to. He is the first line of contact.

J. Mosher: What’s the rule or expectation for responses to questions? We need a clear-cut procedure.

G. Porter: Some procedural questions need to be forwarded on to the steering committee.

G. Porter: OK. NCATE is a big topic but we need to move on to an equally big topic: Bylaws.

1. **TEC Bylaws**

J. Governali: Needs to know what NCATE expects before revising bylaws and function of TEC.

Subcommittee on Bylaws asked Mark Prus and he felt that without TEC we had clear policy making groups and procedures.

G. Porter: M. Prus said the disseminating function key but expects a sometimes role with policy.

Discussion revolved around continuing challenges:

\_\_if TEC sets policy then representation is an important issue

\_\_not all programs can send representatives at this prime teaching time.

B. Mattingly: Send bylaws changes and proposals to seemingly existing members. That’s their opportunity to respond.

N. Aumann: Silence implies consent. If programs don’t respond to email query, including about who represents their program, they will be assumed to support the status quo.

C. Widdall: Carol VanDer Karr brought up the idea of an online discussion board.

L. Couturier: Low attendance at meetings could be a result of lack of accomplishment by the group vs. time of day.

Question: Exactly what policies might the TEC shape? Wouldn’t these need to go through EPC and the regular channels?

M. Barduhn: Problem is that we might have people without a teached ed background acting on policy. Would you want someone from Geology voting on teacher ed policy?

G. Peterson: Concerned about the idea that non-teacher ed faculty can’t make good judgments. Mistakes have been made by teacher ed faculty too. . .example of NCATE Template.

Problem: We aren’t given the full information for some decisions. For example, why not send the bylaws change proposal out with the actual NCATE text about what is required as a governing body.

ACTION ITEMS:

* The TEC will receive positions on TEC continuing/no TEC with NCATE Standards and excerpt from the IR/2004.
* All programs will be sent an email attempting to confirm who is actually voting for the program. This will identify the voting TEC Membership
* Will allow an opportunity for discussion at the next TEC meeting
* After a full discussion of the issues, an e-vote will be conducted
1. **NEW BUSINESS**

Kathy Beney discussed the issue of fingerprinting, stating that we need to have an institutional decision on fingerprinting policy. This issue needs to be resolved with dispatch, as it could halt placements in Cortland schools. There is also concern that some students finding out about options elsewhere could be misdirected.

C. Widdall: The need is not the same for every program. Some programs have only 2 to 3 students going to Cortland schools.

M. Kelly: $17,000 for system is not a huge amount.

K. Beney proposes a task force which would include representatives from admissions, registrar, the 3 schools and the field placement office to develop proposals. Kathy asked for two recommendations:

1. Recommend fingerprinting as a condition of matriculation/declaring a teacher ed major

2. Laser fingerprinting and set-up of TEACH profile (this will be possible with a 72 hr. turnaround and can be facilitated at orientation.

 Question: How can we know/record compliance?

**Action Item: K. Beney will draft a recommendation and explanation to disseminate to the voting membership.**

**The meeting was adjourned at ? p.m.**

**The next scheduled meeting of the TEC is March 19, 2009**

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis C. Farnsworth

NB: Appreciation is expressed to G. Peterson for recording the TEC Minutes in my absence.