Advisory Group to the Teacher Education Council

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday Oct. 11, 2011

3:30pm to 4:30PM

Room 1304 Cornish

Members Present: Shana Snyder, Maureen Goodwin, Jo-Anne Knapp, Larry Hinkle, Johanna Hartnett, Douglas Wieczorek, Joy Mosher, Marley Barduhn, Dennis Farnsworth, Andrea Lachance

1. Welcome to New Members and Old:

Marley Barduhn called the meeting to order at 3:30pm and asked that the members present introduce themselves. Marley thanked everyone for coming and set the stage for topics of interest to the group by reviewing the agenda for this meeting.

1. Old Business-
   1. Review SPA Rejoinders and NCATE Status: Marley asked that everyone take a look at the synopsis of SPA (Specialized Professional Associations) results to date. Marley emphasized that although it looks on paper to be a large number of our programs rejoining the findings of the associations it really only amounts to 2, as all of the sciences are reports to the same SPA, as are the 2 math rejoinders. Marley also emphasized that even though some of our programs are still involved in responding to their SPAs all SUNY Cortland teacher education programs that submitted SPA Reports are now Nationally Recognized. The SPA process is the first step in the National Accreditation Process through NCATE (National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education). Last Spring we hosted a team of reviewers from NCATE and the initial finding of the BOE was that SUNY Cortland be Fully Nationally Accredited. The Unit Accreditation Board, which makes the final decision, is meeting from the 23rd to the 28th of October and we will be notified some time during that period that we are Nationally Accredited by NCATE.
2. New Business
   1. Current changes in teacher education and principal assessment (APPR) (see a summary of the new legislation at the following URL: Shana Snyder, Jo-Anne Knapp, and Larry Hinkle shared what their respective districts are doing to meet the new requirements for APPR (Section 3012c). Each of the districts is fully engaged in attempting to meet all of the provisions of the new requirements (with the exception of the 20% composed of data from NYS Standardized Tests. The degree to which they have identified/approved local components is currently at a different stage in each of the districts and dependent, in large measure, on whether the local associations are ready to approve identified elements outside the legal challenge filed by NYSUT on behalf of all districts in New York State. The feeling is that teachers are fairly stressed over the benchmarks by which they are to be evaluated and the state has done little, up to this point, to reduce and/or relieve that stress. Larry Hinkle stated that it appears that new teachers (those who are untenured) seem to be having less difficulty in accepting the new form of evaluation than more seasoned teachers. One of the major challenges to the full adoption of the new requirements is the training of the master evaluators. The B.O.C.E.S. Units have taken the lead on this area and inroads are being made although the general feeling is that this process be take years to be routinized. Marley and Andrea Lachance shared some of the effects of this legislation on the post-secondary environment and they both underscored that we are attempting to communicate those changes and modifications to our students without simultaneously terrorizing them. In order to accomplish this task we have conducted a sandwich seminar, we have employed news blasts via email, and a series of panel discussions has been conducting sessions that are very well attended by students and faculty alike. We will continue to communicate changes and solutions as they become evident.

<http://library.constantcontact.com/download/get/file/1101446401014-469/APPR+Draft+Regs+Overview.pdf>

* 1. Pending changes in the New York State Teacher Certification Examinations (see attachments below)- Marley review changes to the NYSTCE exams that are due to take effect in May 2013. She reviewed the chart that is appended to these minutes and talked briefly about how these changes are impacting current students.
  2. Deepening partner schools’ involvement in modifications to clinical field experience and teacher education programs: Douglas Wieczorek, the new Director of Field Experience and School Partnerships reviewed that he has met with approximately 23 or 24 groups from local districts with whom we currently place student teacher and candidates requiring early field experiences. He further explained that, as meeting the challenges from SED become more intense he feels that local associations and some Superintendents and leadership teams are advising their teachers not to take on the added stress of student teacher and field experience students, causing difficulty for the college in placing our students in appropriate settings. As this becomes a reality for more districts we will need to consider how we can meet our responsibilities for providing these critical experiences in new and innovative ways (such as sending students home to student teach, providing transportation to multiple sites for field experiences, etc.). In preparation to meet these challenges, Doug and the FEAC (Field Experience Advisory Committee) have met for a total of about 3 hours to brainstorm how best to meet our responsibilities. One product of those meetings is a chart that Doug distributed that allowed the committee to frame the problems and prioritize them into short, intermediate, and long term action items. Work on this chart will continue as additional constraining assumptions, problems, and action items are identified. The Advisory Group will be kept informed through electronic communications as new developments become evident.
  3. Presentation by John Shirley of Career Services on new program to better prepare teacher candidates for interviewing: John Shirley was unable to attend due to a schedule conflict but Marley shared the major points of a new initiative that partners SUNY Cortland alumni with Teacher Education candidates to give them a leg-up in the hiring process by acclimating them to the initial telephone screening interview, as this is a critical and first step in continuing on in the hiring process. This program will expand as candidates become accustomed to the phone process and as needed.
  4. Elect a chair of advisory group : Dennis Farnsworth reviewed the purpose for the TEC Advisory Group. The group is to promote two-way communication between the college and our partners in education from the broader educational community so that we are receiving the benefit of the practitioners perspectives as they relate to issues and challenges, and the local practitioners understand the challenges that the college faces. Once these perspectives are shared in the small group the intent is for those identified challenges/issues/programs/initiatives to be shared with the full TEC, which is the policy-recommending body here on campus for all teacher education. In order for that to happen, our TEC bylaws require that a representative from the educational community outside the college be designated as a voting member of the TEC. In the past this role has been filled by the Chair of the Advisory Group. Dennis called for volunteers to serve in that role but no one came forward. Dennis asked that the members consider volunteering and or nominating someone from the group to serve in that capacity at our February meeting. Marley also mentioned that the Chairmanship need not be vested in one individual but could be a rotating chair or any other method the group cares to employ.
  5. Set meeting dates for the 2011-2012 Academic Year-The identified dates for meeting during the 2011-2012 academic year were approved by the Advisory Group. Marley informed the group membership that additional meetings may be advisable as we get more into the policy promulgation phase of the new APPR requirements, testing requirements, and Common Core and State Standards implementation.
  6. Recommendations for new/additional members: Dennis encourage members in attendance to recommend other practitioners as members of the Advisory Group. He also noted that upon nomination he would be willing to make contact with the individuals and invite them to participate. Maureen Goodwin recommended that a representative from a local association be invited to attend.

1. Other- Dennis reviewed that the agenda he prepares for our meetings is not set in stone and that any member of the Advisory Group is welcome and encouraged to suggest agenda items for discussion by the full group. All that is required is that you send an email to Dennis informing him of the item you would like to include.
2. Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 4:41pm.

Attachments

**SUNY Cortland Program Review Status**

**NCATE Accreditation Process**

**8/01/11**

**RECOGNIZED:** **SPA:** **Rejoinder Submitted:**

Health Education All Grades AAHE

Health Education MST AAHE

Inclusive Special Education CEC

Special Education Masters CEC

Early Childhood Education (Birth – Gr. 2) NAEYC

Physical Education NASPE

Adolescence Education: English 7-12 NCTE

MST in Childhood Education (Grades 1 – 6) ACEI 9/15/10

Childhood Education (1-6) ACEI 9/15/10

Adolescence Education: Biology 7 – 12 NSTA 3/15/11

Adolescence Education: Physics 7 – 12 NSTA 3/15/11

Adolescence Education: Chemistry 7 – 12 NSTA 3/15/11

Adolescence Education: Earth Science 7 – 12 NSTA 3/15/11

MAT Adolescence Education: Biology 7 – 12 NSTA 3/15/11

MAT Adolescence Education: Physics 7 – 12 NSTA 3/15/11

MAT Adolescence Education: Chemistry 7 – 12 NSTA 3/15/11

MAT Adolescence Education: Earth Science 7 – 12 NSTA 3/15/11

Adolescence Education: Spanish 7 – 12 ACTFL 3/15/11

Adolescence Education: French 7 – 12 ACTFL 3/15/11

MAT Adolescence Education: English 7 -12 NCTE 3/15/11

Bachelor of Arts in Teaching English as a Second Lang. TESOL 3/15/11

**RECOGNIZED WITH CONDITIONS:** **SPA:**

School Building Leader ELCC 9/12/11

School District Leader ELCC 9/12/11

MSEd Literacy Education (Birth – Grade 6) IRA 3/15/11

MSEd Literacy Education (Grades 5 -12) IRA 3/15/11

Adolescence Education: Mathematics 7 – 12 NCTM 3/15/11

MAT Adolescence Education: Mathematics 7 – 12 NCTM 3/15/11

Adolescence Education: Soc. Studies 7 – 12 (Dual Majors) NCSS 3/15/11

**New Exams for Teacher and School Building Leader Certification to be Released in 2012**

**Candidates graduating in May 2013 or after should wait for the new tests to be available before beginning testing.**

New testing requirements for initial certification of teachers and school building leaders are scheduled to be implemented beginning with candidates graduating from NYS educator preparation programs in May 2013.  As currently planned, teacher and school building leader candidates graduating in May 2013 or after will need to pass a new set of New York State Teacher Certification Examinations (NYSTCE).  
For teachers, these new examinations are planned to include both a portfolio-based performance assessment and the following written assessments:

* a more rigorous content specialty test in the candidate’s field of preparation
* a Writing Skills test
* an Educating All Students test

The content specialty tests will reflect candidates' knowledge of content in their field of certification, including their knowledge of the New York State learning standards for Science and Social Studies, the P-12 Common Core Learning Standards in Mathematics, and the P-12 Common Core Learning standards in English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Science, Science and Technical Subjects.  
For school building leaders, the examinations are planned to include a portfolio-based performance assessment and a written assessment.  
The following table compares current testing requirements for teacher and school building leader initial certification to the planned new requirements, beginning with graduates in May 2013.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Field | Current Requirements | Planned Requirements Beginning with Graduates of 2013 |
| Teacher | * Liberal Arts and Sciences Test * Assessment of Teaching Skills – Written (Elementary or Secondary) * Content Specialty Test(s) | * Performance Assessment (Portfolio) * Written Assessments:   + Content Specialty Test(s)   + Writing Skills   + Educating All Students |
| School Building Leader | * Written Assessment (2 Parts) | * Performance Assessment (Portfolio) * Written Assessment (1 Part) |

The new tests are scheduled to be implemented in 2012. However, they will not be required of all graduates until May 2013.

Candidates graduating in May 2013 or after should wait for the new tests to be available before beginning testing.  Once the new tests are required, it is anticipated that the policy of the state will require candidates to take only the new NYSTCE tests.  Regulations have not yet been established to determine if candidates who have already taken components of the current New York State Certification Examinations can use passing results of some of those components to satisfy some of the new requirements. As information on this issue becomes available it will be posted on this web site.

Last Updated: July 21, 2011

[**Contact OTI**](http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/contact.html) **|** [**Related Links**](http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/relatedlinks.html) **|** [**Frequently Asked Questions**](http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/faq.html) **|** [**Office of Higher Education**](http://www.highered.nysed.gov/)

**University of the State of New York - New York State Education Department**

[**Contact NYSED**](http://usny.nysed.gov/contact.html) **|** [**Index A - Z**](http://usny.nysed.gov/topics/) **|** [**Terms of Use**](http://usny.nysed.gov/notice.html)

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

**Framing the Problems and Prioritizing**

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

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

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