Teacher Education Council

September 17, 2010

3:00Pm-5:00pm

Jacobus Lounge

MINUTES

Members Present: A. Schutt, A. Lachance, A. Pagano, B. Klein, B. Hodges, C. Pass, C. Widdal, C. Gascon,C. Moriarity, D. Dickerson, E. Jampole, E. Kudela, E. Malmberg, J. Duncan, J. Bailey, J. Shedd, J. Lykos, K. Hempson, K. Mack, K. Rombach, L. Campbell, L. Couturier, M. Gfeller, M. Kelly, P. Ducey, R. Grantham, R. Janke, W. Buxton, W. Skipper, G. Peterson, M. Barduhn, J. Cottone, B. Mattingly, D. Farnsworth, E. Gravani, J. Mosher, K. Beney, K. Smith, M. Canfield, N. Aumann, V. Marty

Guest: S. Snyder

1. Approve Agenda: Agenda was approved without modification and/or addition.
	1. N. Aumann moved with second by J. Mosher
2. Approve Minutes from 5/06/10: Minutes were approved without modification and/or change.
	1. E. Jampole moved with second by R. Grantham
3. Standing Committee Reports:
	1. TEC Bylaws Committee-J. Cottone, M. Barduhn, N. Aumann, J. O’Callaghan: John Cottone updated the council on changes that have been updated over the course of the summer, most important of which was the reactivation of the TEC Steering committee. By and large the remaining changes to the by-laws represent changes in titles of unit representatives to reflect newly added/discontinued positions from the ex-officio membership.
	2. TEC Assessment Committee: No Report but M. Barduhn informed the council that they are just getting organized and will be charged with looking at some specific tasks.
	3. Conceptual Framework Committee: J. Mosher updated the council on the work of the update committee and reviewed a number of changes that resulted from their review. The only substantive changes were the sequence of the outcomes to better align with standards . She also reviewed the new crosswalk and informed the council that they may need to reflect these changes in the crosswalk in the Spring 11 syllabi. She also informed the council members that there is a handout and a power point that can be used to familiarize students and other stakleholders with the updated conceptual framework. She asked if there would be a motion to accept the revised conceptual framework.
		1. Moved by J. Mosher with second by R. Grantham. Discussion: R. Grantham asked if this is how the CF will be presented. Bill Buxton asked what level of response they got in the public/campus presentations. Joy indicated that acceptance was almost universal. Bill indicated that he had raised some objections that were not necessarily shared as part of the feedback. Bill was reluctant to take additional time to repeat his concerns at this meeting. Angela Pagano shared that the committee did note all feedback, both positive and negative but that, due to the short timeline/deadline there was not sufficient time make all changes and reflect all feedback. Laura Campbell asked if the intent was to keep it general enough that it is not measureable so that the departments can make it measurable. J. Mosher stated that it is not measureable due to our desire to be able to include future technological changes. M. Barduhn informed the council that these outcomes are already a part of the current assessment system but as to whether or not we are measuring them currently or not the answer is probably “no”. We will be working in the coming months to refine and strengthen our unit assessments. We will now put the item up for electronic vote according to our by-laws.
	4. TECRC: N. Aumann shared that she published a portion of the annual report as a means of updating the council yesterday. So far this year they have had two meetings and the issues they will be working on this semester will be an update to the brochure which has already begun and a review of dispositions. Any changes to the SUNY Cortland dispositions will be reviewed and also put up for electronic vote in the near future. Laura Campbell brought up an issue of graduate students not being checked for disposition violations until they go out to student teach. Will they be reviewed and how? Nancy indicated that right now when disclosures are brought to someone’s attention the student is simply advised to disclose the violation and then they are directed to the appropriate associate dean. Nancy did indicate that the TECRC would hear and consider all recommendations for improvement.
	5. TEC Curriculum Committee: E. Gravani-No Report as the committee has not met this semester.
4. Old Business
	1. Update and Approval of the SUNY Cortland Conceptual Framework (Power point, Crosswalk, Handout): J. Mosher and Committee: See above.
	2. Results of the Professional Development Needs Faculty Survey: D. Farnsworth with input from M. Barduhn: Marley drew the attention of the council members to the survey result of needed professional development items and indicated that we would focus on some of these major themes during the course of the year and there will be concerted effort including the resources available to Laura Gathagan to help us bring these items to the fore. The list of prioritized professional development needs identified through the administration of the survey are appended to these minutes.
5. New Business
	1. Presentation of the Reliability and Validity Study on the current SUNY Cortland Student Teacher Evaluation: Merle Canfield: Merle shared a presentation he compiled related to the reliability and validity of the current student teacher evaluation. We have over 40,000 completed evaluations since 2004. The STE originally had 124 items and now includes only 10. There are a number of different categories of raters yielding data for this study, including students themselves, supervisors, cooperating teachers, etc. Merle reviewed the items and related them to the desired outcomes. The ratings are based on 3-MET; 2-APPROACHING, and 1-NOT MET. With this type of scale you will not usually get good correlations but the result here was OK. In the final analysis we have an instrument that is reliable. For validity Merle took the mean and related it to GPA and certification scores (3 factors). He also verified that indeed, in terms of validity, student self-ratings were poor, teachers were moderate and college supervisors were the group who do the best job. Again, in the final analysis we have a valid instrument. Merle recommends that we continue to use the current version of the STE. Based on the numbers that Merle displayed (low), Gigi wondered whether some cooperating teachers were not completing mid term and final evaluations. She wondered whether this was the result of only offering our supervisors $200 even though there are increasing responsibilities. Marley talked about a committee she serves on with SUNY Deans and an initiative to increase that stipend over a period of time to compensate those increasing responsibilities appropriately. Highlights of the presentation are appended to these minutes.
	2. The Teacher Work Sample: The impact of teacher candidates on K-12 student learning. – JoEllen Bailey and Andrea Lachance: JoEllen shared a power point on teacher work samples. TWS are used to meet program/SPA standards for assessment. She explained the Teacher Work Sample Methodology. The full power point presentation is appended to the meeting minutes. Marley asked how the students have fared in meeting the requirements of the TWS. JoEllen responded that so far our candidates have done very well. M. Gfeller asked if the college supervisors are trained in the use of the TWS. JoEllen indicated that each year they review the TWS with supervisors. Andrea Lachance then did a presentation on what her department does and, although not exactly a TWS, it does focus on assessment through rubric development. This evolved after a change at ACEI when the department consolidated 20 assessments into 8. They call this instrument the Assessment and Teaching Sample of Developmentally Appropriate Practice. It focuses on developmentally appropriate instruction and assessment. Marley asked if the students seem to get this pretty quickly. Andrea responded that it depends how well the supervisors understand the newer terms so they are currently working with the supervisors to train them on the use of the assessments. Bruce asked about evidence of candidate effects on student learning. Are we really evaluating our candidates ability to use, collect and analyze data from student assessment or are we looking at how the students do after our candidates implement an instructional plan. There will be two additional opportunities to hear about TWS from Andrea and JoEllen, as they will be conducting Sandwich Seminars a bit later on in the semester on this topic.
6. Other: Document/Exhibits for Review: (all are appended to the minutes)
	1. Update of the TEC Bylaws with tracked changes. (See Hyperlink)
	2. Title II Committee on Technology-
	3. Title II Committee on Students with Disabilities-
	4. Title II Committee on English Language Learners-
	5. TEC Steering Committee and Regular TEC Meeting Dates:
	6. Committee Vacancy and Appointment Status Report-
7. J. Cottone congratulated the writers of a 325 grant that we learned today has been awarded in regard to Special Education. It will start small this year as a collaboration between FSA and Childhood Ed but will eventually spread to all aspects of the campus. Much work has gone into the preparation and writing of this grant and those involved should be proud of their accomplishment.

PSA from John Shirley: The Career Services Staff is than willing to come and speak with your classes and/or at student teaching seminars on fingerprinting, the TEACH system, etc.

M. Barduhn asked about the Board of Regents and how we might obtain TEC input about developments coming through the Board of Regents. How can we get the word out to all Teacher Education Faculty about these changes? Suggestions from the council were to included the changes as an announcement on the MRD TEC site. Announcing changes as email announcements.

Creating a link on MRD for NYSED/Regents. Including a bulleted list of changes and or initiatives announced through email with clear subject headings. Some members felt that all three methods should be used while others felt that they would be inundated with emails as there were so many changes coming about. It was decided that D. Farnsworth and M. Barduhn would determine the most effective method to use. It was also mentioned that some of these changes/initiatives may need to be added to the TEC agenda for discussion by the full council.

Announcement about the AACTE Web Conference on 21st Century Assessment.

1. Adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

The next meeting of the TEC will be held on October 8, 2010 in the Hall of Fame Room, Park Center from 3:00p.m. to 5:00p.m.

Teacher Education Council

May 6, 2010

3:00 – 5:00pm

Fireplace Lounge, Corey Union

MINUTES

Members Present: A. Shutt, D. Dickerson, J. Bailey, J. Shedd, Juliann Lykos, K. Howarth, L. Campbell, L. Couturier, M. Gfeller, R. Ponterio, K. Hempson, W. Buxton, C. VanDerKarr, M. Barduhn, J. Cottone, B. Mattingly, D. Farnsworth, E. Gravanni, J. O’Callaghan, K. Beney, K. Smith, M. Canfield, N. Aumann, G. Marty

1. Review and Approve Agenda: Approved without modification or addition
2. Review and approve minutes, April 1, 2010: Approved without modification or addition.
3. Old Business
4. Standing Committee Reports:

1. TECRC-J. O’Callaghan-J. O’Callaghan and J. Bailey- A brief overview of the committee was delivered by J. O’Callaghan. Jerry passed out a copy of the TECRC brochure to use in presenting the goals and objectives of the committee. A sub-committee of the TEC, the TECRC is charged with reviewing applications to the teacher education program; developing a rubric for evaluation; continually assessing candidate qualifications at various checkpoints, and notifying questionable applicants of the committee’s decision. Jerry also talked briefly about the process that the committee employs to ensure that they are fully informed of any violations of law or codes. He also talked about candidate due process rights and the appeal process. Jerry also informed the committee that in excess of 600 teacher education candidates were reviewed in this academic year. We now also have a reliable database to store information on who was reviewed and what the consequences levied were. K. Smith asked whether it was possible to be excused from charges in the courts but still held to consequences here at SUNY Cortland up to and including being barred from becoming a teacher. The answer was that his scenario was possible based on a full review and looking at the evaluation rubric. JoEllen Bailey also discussed the two applications to teacher education programs for both undergrad and grad students. With the dissolution of the Grad Office, JoEllen was asked to combine the two applications to come up with one unified application that would meet the needs of all teacher education candidates. Bill Buxton has always believed that there should be a different application for grad students as they are already certified, indicating that they are of good moral character. However, not all graduate students have been certified (MAT, MST candidates). Discussion ensued with some disagreement among voting members. Rationale was provided by several members for including the questions relating to past convictions. Motion to put the issue of combining the two current applications up to ballot was accepted .

1. TEC Curriculum Committee-E. Gravani: Met in April to approve the MST in PE, the BSED in PE, Adolescence Education- Chemistry, and Teaching Students With Disabilities. There will be another meeting in May. Need to check the TEC bylaws on protocols for appointing new members to the standing committee. There have been some questions with regard to the flow of the curriculum review process before curriculum goes to CCRC for a final decision. It is rare for something to go back to the CCRC once the TEC curriculum committee approves or reviews. The TEC review centers on making certain that the new or revised curriculum addresses appropriate standards.
2. NCATE Steering Committee: J. Cottone, B. Mattingly, M. Barduhn: We are waiting to hear who our reviewers will be for the on-campus visit by the Board of Examiners from NCATE. Knowing who our reviewers are will facilitate you telling us if there are conflicts with any of the reviewers such as being former employees/faculty of our institution and/or SUNY, etc.
	* + - 1. Draft Institutional Report due on May 30, 2010-M. Barduhn
				2. Standards Sub-committee Updates:

Standard 1-C. VanDerKarr: Carol did a powerpoint on Standard 1 elements outlining the work of the committee. A link to the PP is appended to these minutes. Bruce asked if the Career Services survey can be used and if not can we modify it so that there is only a need for this one survey.

Standard 6-J. Cottone: John also reviewed progress in the development of language addressing Standard 6. He feels that we are in very good shape with this standard and that we will certainly meet the standard at an acceptable level if not at target.

Report on Data from the QC Survey Results-Dennis reviewed the survey results with the TEC and indicated that he has not yet had time to sit down and do a full analysis of the results in order to determine whether or not we will continue using the Quality Circle Process with SPA Program reports and other NCATE related documents.

1. Update from the SUNY Cortland Ad Hoc Conceptual Framework Review Committee-J. Mosher & K. Howarth: A great deal of work has been completed in order to pare the original document down to approximately 3 pages, the references and citations have also been updated and several open forums have been conducted to share the guiding document and to get feedback about how the many constituencies view the conceptual framework. Joy and Kath shared the vision for the unit’s TE programs by talking about the power point that was prepared to highlight the framework’s main elements. The logo is the visual representation of what we think about teacher education and we will keep on explaining this. An online survey polling opinions on how well the conceptual framework reflects our view of teacher education is still up. If you have not had time to take the survey please do so at your first opportunity.
2. Discuss the re-establishment of the TEC Standing Committee on Teacher Education Unit Assessment
	1. Charge to the Teacher Education Unit Assessment Committee
	2. Committee Membership-Call for volunteers
3. Discuss the re-vitalization of the TEC Standing Advisory Committee: Purpose, Responsibilities, Committee Membership, etc.- What is most useful to the programs as a matter of purpose? The inaugural meeting of this committee is scheduled for June 7, 2010. We will provide a full report of the Advisory Group activities to the full TEC at the commencement of the Fall 2010 semester.
4. Present the ballot for the vote on use of data, aggregated by school, from CTE’s in support of NCATE Standard 5-B. Mattingly: There was a question (L.Couturier) about whether or not this was our only option. Bruce indicated that he is asking to create a report that we don’t usually use. Perhaps we should consider what we might want to do in future with regard to formative assessment.
5. Update on the effort to revise the TEC Bylaws of 2009 and the TEC Policy and Procedure Manual: J. Cottone indicated that there has not been any activity toward updating the bylaws and P & P Manual at this time. Related to this item is a new business motion to reauthorize a Standing Committee on the Teacher Education Council Bylaws.
6. Professional Development School (PDS) update and National Conference Report-K. Hempson: See appended report by the PDS Coordinator.
7. Review and Discuss changes to the proposed “Disrupted Placements Flow-Chart” and the “Disrupted Placements Narrative” Documents-K. Beney reviewed changes that were made to the original documents after TEC input at the April 2010 meeting. She also included a narrative section to the graphic that provided clarifying language. The committee had no further recommendations on the documents.
8. New Business:
9. Proposals to reinstate the following standing committees of the TEC:
	1. The Standing Committee for Teacher Education Unit Assessment-Motion by Julianne Lykos with second by Kath Howarth carried 7-0, with 5 abstentions.
	2. The Standing Committee for the Review and Revision of the Teacher Education Council Bylaws –Motion by Kath Howarth with second by JoEllen Bailey carried 9-0, with 3 abstentions.
	3. Proposal to create a Standing Committee of the TEC on the SUNY Cortland Conceptual Framework-Motion by Kath Howarth with second by Karen Hempson carried 8-0, with 4 abstentions.
10. Professional Development Series through the Faculty Development Center: L. Gathagan (Guest) Laura indicated that the her office would very much like to do some PD specifically for TE (Teacher Education Professional Development Series) and she would be happy to speak with any of the members about subjects/topics that might be developed. Also a book chat has already been arranged for next year on Nancy Zimpher’s book, Boundary Spanning. Dates and times will be published as soon as they have been set. B. Mattingly also supported this idea as a routine and regular process that is in line with NCATE standards.
11. Title II: Leading to the Business of Reaccreditation: M. Barduhn discussed the following elements that are requirements of the new Title II, and asked members to be thinking about how we might address these elements in future iterations of the new Institutional Report Card:
	1. Identifying institutional goals for teacher shortage areas in math, ESL, science and special education
	2. Assurances
	3. Use of Technology
	4. Preparation of all teacher candidates to effectively teach students with disabilities
	5. All candidates to participate as members of IEP Teams
	6. All candidates to teach students with limited English proficiencies effectively

V. Other? Nothing further.

Next meeting: This is the last meeting of the Teacher Education Council for this Academic Year. We wish to thank all voting and Ex-officio members for their service. The schedule of meetings for the 2010-2011 Academic Year will be distributed as soon as dates, times and locations are identified.

**TEC Steering Committee and Regular TEC Meeting Dates-2010/2011**

**Steering Committee Date/11:00am-12:00pm** **TEC Meeting Date/3:00pm-5:00pm** **LOC**

Friday September 3, 2010 Friday September 17, 2010 Jacobus

Friday October 1, 2010 Friday October 8, 2010 Hall of Fame

Friday October 29, 2010 Friday November 12, 2010 TBD

Friday November 19, 2010 Friday December 10, 2010 Jacobus

Friday January 14, 2011 (optional) Friday January 28, 2011 Exhibition

Friday February 4, 2011 Friday February 11, 2011 Jacobus

Site Visit for NCATE is March 5-9 No TEC Meeting this month

Friday April 1, 2011 Friday April 8, 2011 Exhibition

Friday April 29, 2011 Friday May 6, 2011 Exhibition

All steering meeting to be held in 1242 Education

[C:\Documents and Settings\dennis.farnsworth\My Documents\Teacher Education Council\TEC Ratified By-Laws of 2009\TrackedProposed 2010TEC By-Laws.doc](../../TEC%20Ratified%20By-Laws%20of%202009/TrackedProposed%202010TEC%20By-Laws.doc)

**Conceptual Framework Final Draft\* May 20, 2010**

1086 characters (to fit NCATE Template)

*I. Our Vision for Teacher Education –* SUNY Cortland’s vision for teacher education programs is shared by our faculty who appreciate Cortland’s historical commitment to teacher education and to program excellence. Teacher candidates are the focus of all our endeavors. SUNY Cortland is dedicated to developing candidates’ knowledge, integrity, professional standards and commitment to their future students and school community. Our vision is based on a set of common values related to teacher preparation.

The College:

-provides opportunities for candidates to “graduate with the knowledge, integrity, skills and compassion to excel as leaders, citizens, scholars, teachers and champions of excellence” (SUNY College at Cortland, 2009);

-values the collective knowledge, skills and talents of its teaching community;

-provides diverse learning experiences and quality instruction, based on best practices and a strong knowledge base;

-expects collaboration among liberal arts and professional members of the unit;

-supports collaboration among members of the unit and professionals in public schools;

-expects faculty leadership in professional organizations;

-celebrates faculty commitment to lifelong learning and engagement in social issues.

*II. Our Mission* is congruent with the College mission and is framed by a fundamental commitment to liberal learning. Program curricula are based on a sound theoretical and empirical framework to provide candidates with knowledge and practical experiences necessary to become reflective and effective teachers. The unit prepares teachers to contribute to their profession, their communities and to the democratic development of society.

*III. Our Philosophy* for teacher education is built upon a foundation of liberal learning and pedagogical knowledge and skills emphasizing **personal responsibility**, **social justice** and **global understanding**. Personal responsibility is addressed as candidates confront issues of integrity, ethics, commitment and moral choice. Social justiceis addressed as candidates seek, through words and actions, full participation for all people in a global society. Global understanding is developed as candidates are exposed to multiple perspectives and a variety of school environments; they are prepared to teach immigrants and international students and to address the physical, emotional, and intellectual needs of a diverse and multicultural student population. The Cortland apple tree symbolizes our approach to teacher education (link) as detailed below.

*IV. Candidate Proficiencies and Knowledge Base* – Our teacher education programs provide opportunities and experiences to help candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required for effective teaching. The following thirteen proficiencies ensure that our teacher candidates will make a difference in the classroom and beyond:

*• KNOWLEDGE BASE –* Candidates will:

1. Demonstrate a solid foundation in the arts and sciences;

2. Possess in-depth knowledge of the subject area to be taught;

3. Understand how students learn and develop;

4. Manage classrooms structured in a variety of ways to promote a safe learning environment;

5. Know and apply various disciplinary models to manage student behavior.

*• Professional commitments –* Candidates will:

6. Collaborate with other staff, the community, higher education, other agencies, and cultural institutions, as well as parents and other caregivers, for the benefit of students;

7. Continue to develop professionally as ethical and reflective practitioners who are committed to ongoing scholarly inquiry;

*• Standards –* Candidates will:

8. Know state and national standards, integrate curriculum across disciplines, and balance historical and contemporary research, theory, and practice;

9. Demonstrate appropriate professional dispositions to help all students learn;

*• Diversity --* Candidates will:

10. Apply a variety of teaching strategies to develop a positive teaching-learning environment where all students are encouraged to achieve their highest potential;

11. Foster understanding of and respect for individuals’ abilities, disabilities and diversity of variations of ethnicity, culture, language, gender, age, class, and sexual orientation.

*• Assessment –* Candidates will:

12. Use multiple and authentic forms of assessment to analyze teaching and student learning and to plan curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of individual students.

*• Technology –* Candidates will:

13. Demonstrate sufficient technology skills and the ability to integrate technology into classroom teaching/learning.

 These outcomes align with national, state, institutional and SPA standards (see Crosswalk). The narrative below explains how faculty based them on existing research and best practice.

*• Knowledge Base*

Candidates **demonstrate a solid foundation in the arts and sciences**. Our philosophical commitment to a foundation in the arts and sciences in teacher education programs can be traced to John Dewey’s (1916, 1938) stance that the liberal arts connect the growth of democracy and sound educational practice. Candidates must acquire a broad foundation in the arts and sciences as well as critically analyze that knowledge and recognize its often contested nature (e.g., Banks, 1999; Apple, 2004; Nieto and Bode, 2008).

Candidates **possess in-depth knowledge of the subject area to be taught**. Alongside pedagogical knowledge, teachers’ subject matter knowledge has consistently related positively with student achievement (e.g., Monk, 1994; Darling-Hammond and Youngs, 2002).

Candidates **understand how students learn and develop**. Candidates acquire understanding of a broad range of historical and contemporary developmental and learning theories in order to select appropriate pedagogical strategies and materials to support students’ cognitive, social, physical and emotional growth (Darling-Hammond, 1998); Gardner, 1993; Piaget, 1970; Vygotsky, 1978).

Candidates **manage classrooms structured in a variety of ways to promote a safe and orderly environment for learning** and to teach the skills of living responsibly in society. The skills and attitudes students learn are powerfully related to the nature of the society. Democracies give great power to citizens; responsible citizenship is built in some part through what students learn from teachers’ approach to classroom management and discipline. Candidates must understand the theoretical perspectives and practical applications of the range of humanistic and behavioristic management/discipline models.

*• Professional Commitments*

Candidates **collaborate with other staff, the community, higher education, other agencies, and cultural institutions as well as parents and other caregivers for the benefit of students**. Research demonstrates that family involvement in schools has an especially positive impact on student achievement (cf., Fan & Chen, 2001). Teachers, college faculty and community members should collaborate to design effective and up-to-date curriculum for teacher education programs (Goodlad, 1990; Darling-Hammond, 2006).

Candidates **continue to develop professionally as reflective practitioners who are committed to ongoing scholarly inquiry**. Technical skills, knowledge, behavior and ethical and political judgments are critical components of reflective thought and effective teaching (Zeichner & Liston, 1996). The reflective practitioner (Schon, 1983) keeps abreast of current research and technology in the field. The reflective practitioner constantly reads, researches, analyzes and questions issues in the profession (Berliner & Biddle, 1995).

*• Standards*

Candidates **know state and national standards, integrate curriculum among disciplines and balance historical and contemporary research, theory, and practice related to their subject**. Candidates’ understanding of the social, historical, and philosophical context of education informs their critical analysis of existing theory and practice. When learning is disconnected from a meaningful context, student engagement in the process is minimized. Candidates link knowledge across areas of study to help students make connections. Benefits include increased learning, motivation, ability to apply concepts and utilize higher-order thinking, comfort and constructive behavior. Candidates **demonstrate appropriate professional dispositions**. Candidates learn to educate for character as well as for intellect. They embody the highest ethical standards in establishing and maintaining a psychologically and socially safe, respectful, and supportive environment where all children can learn (Noddings, 2002).

*• Diversity*

Candidates **apply a variety of teaching strategies to develop a positive teaching-learning environment where all students are encouraged to achieve their highest potential**. Candidates utilize a variety of strategies to address the individual needs of students in diverse classrooms (Bruner, 1960; Gardner, 1993; Delpit, 2006).

Candidates **foster understanding of and respect for individuals’ diverse variations of ability, ethnicity, culture, language, gender, age, class, and sexual orientation.** Respect for diversity is one of the most central tenets of social justice. Many factors contribute to children’s “difference,” including race, ethnicity, social class, culture, gender, ability and need for support, linguistic variation, and sexual orientation (Nieto and Bode, 2008). Candidates must transcend simple recognition and “tolerance,” promoting respect and appreciation for differences among humans.

*• Assessment*

Candidates **use multiple and authentic forms of assessment to analyze teaching and student learning and to plan curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of individual students.** Evaluation serves as a basis to improve learning andinstruction and includes a variety of evaluation techniques. Meaningful evaluative data is best yielded through both formative and summative assessments grounded in authentic performance (Wiggins & McTighe, 1998).

*• Technology*

Candidates **demonstrate sufficient technology skills and the ability to integrate technology into classroom teaching/learning**. The positive impact of technology on learning and development is well substantiated, but effective instruction requires thoughtful guidance. Candidates must know how and when to use and integrate technology effectively and appropriately (Floden and Ashburn, 2006).

*V. Candidate Assessment*

Candidates are assessed at key transition point. Assessments address knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Candidates in initial programs are assessed at: program application, completion of field work, student teaching eligibility, student teaching, program completion, and post-graduation. Candidates in advanced programs are assessed at: program application, candidacy, practicum eligibility, practicum completion, culminating project, post-graduation.

**\***The original CF can be found at:

 <http://www.cortland.edu/ncate/conceptual%20framework.pdf>
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**Crosswalk DRAFT**

 CF Committee 9-10

**2003 Conceptual Framework Learning Outcomes and 2010 Conceptual Framework Learning Outcomes**

**Note that the outcomes have not changed.**

* **In some cases, they have been rephrased.**
* **The sequence has been rearranged to more effectively relate to the overarching principles of the Conceptual Framework.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Outcomes that have changed in phrasing or the sequence are indicated in red and underlined.*** ***The change is described in the column below.*** | **2003 Learning Outcomes** SequenceSpecifically, the Teacher Education Unit expects that SUNY Cortland Teacher candidates will: | **2010 Learning Outcomes** Sequence |
|  |  | ***KNOWLEDGE BASE –***Candidates will:  |
|  | 1. Demonstrate a solid foundation in the arts and sciences; | 1. Demonstrate a solid foundation in the arts and sciences; |
|  | 2. Possess in-depth knowledge of the subject area to be taught; | 2. Possess in-depth knowledge of the subject area to be taught; |
| ***2003 Standard 3 has been rephrased and is*** ***2010 Standard 9*** | 3. Demonstrate good moral character; | 3. Understand how students learn and develop; |
| ***2003 Standard 4*** ***is now Standard 3*** | 4. Understand how students learn and develop; | 4. Manage classrooms structured in a variety of ways to promote a safe learning environment; |
| ***2003 Standard 5 is******2010 Standard 4*** | 5. Manage classrooms structured in a variety of ways to promote a safe learningenvironment; | 5. Know and apply various disciplinary models to manage student behavior.  |
|  |  | ***Professional commitments –***Candidates will:  |
| ***2003 Standard 6 is******2010 Standard 5*** | 6. Know and apply various disciplinary models to manage student behavior; | 6. Collaborate with other staff, the community, higher education, other agencies, and cultural institutions, as well as parents and other caregivers, for the benefit of students; |
| ***2003 Standard 7 is******2010 Standard 10*** | 7. Apply a variety of teaching strategies to develop a positive teaching-learningenvironment where all students are encouraged to achieve their highest potential; | 7. Continue to develop professionally as ethical and reflective practitioners who are committed to ongoing scholarly inquiry; |
|  |  | ***Standards –*** Candidates will: |
| ***2003 Standard 8 has been rephrased. The number remains the same.*** | 8. Integrate curriculum among disciplines, and balance historical and contemporaryresearch, theory, and practice; | 8. Know state and national standards, integrate curriculum across disciplines, and balance historical and contemporary research, theory, and practice; |
| ***2003 Standard 9 is******2010 Standard 12*** | 9. Use multiple and authentic forms of assessment to analyze teaching and student learningand to plan curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of individual students; | 9. Demonstrate appropriate professional dispositions to help all students learn; |
|  |  | ***Diversity –*** Candidates will: |
| ***2003 Standard 10 is*** ***2010 Standard 13*** | 10. Demonstrate sufficient technology skills and the ability to integrate technology into classroom teaching/learning; | 10. Apply a variety of teaching strategies to develop a positive teaching-learning environment where all students are encouraged to achieve their highest potential; |
| ***2003 Standard 11 has been rephrased. The number remains the same.*** | 11. Foster respect for individual’s abilities and disabilities and an understanding andappreciation of variations of ethnicity, culture, language, gender, age, class, and sexualorientation; | 11. Foster understanding of and respect for individuals’ abilities, disabilities and diversity of variations of ethnicity, culture, language, gender, age, class, and sexual orientation. |
|  |  | ***Assessment*** *–* Candidates will:  |
| ***2003 Standard 12 has been rephrased and is*** ***2010 Standard 6*** | 12. Promote parental involvement and collaborate effectively with other staff, thecommunity, higher education, other agencies, and cultural institutions, as well as parentsand other care givers, for the benefit of students; and, | 12. Use multiple and authentic forms of assessment to analyze teaching and student learning and to plan curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of individual students.  |
|  |  | ***Technology*** *–* Candidates will:  |
| ***2003 Standard 13 is*** ***2010 Standard 7*** | 13. Continue to develop professionally as reflective practitioners who are committed to ongoing scholarly inquiry. | 13. Demonstrate sufficient technology skills and the ability to integrate technology into classroom teaching/learning. |
|  |  |  |

.

**

*SUNY Cortland Conceptual Framework Learning Outcomes*

*KNOWLEDGE BASE –* Candidates will:

1. Demonstrate a solid foundation in the arts and sciences;

2. Possess in-depth knowledge of the subject area to be taught;

3. Understand how students learn and develop;

4. Manage classrooms structured in a variety of ways to promote a safe learning environment;

5. Know and apply various disciplinary models to manage student behavior.

*Professional commitments –* Candidates will:

6. Collaborate with other staff, the community, higher education, other agencies, and cultural institutions, as well as parents and other caregivers, for the benefit of students;

7. Continue to develop professionally as ethical and reflective practitioners who are committed to ongoing scholarly inquiry;

*Standards –* Candidates will:

8. Know state and national standards, integrate curriculum across disciplines, and balance historical and contemporary research, theory, and practice;

9. Demonstrate appropriate professional dispositions to help all students learn;

*Diversity --* Candidates will:

10. Apply a variety of teaching strategies to develop a positive teaching-learning environment where all students are encouraged to achieve their highest potential;

11. Foster understanding of and respect for individuals’ abilities, disabilities and diversity of variations of ethnicity, culture, language, gender, age, class, and sexual orientation.

*Assessment –* Candidates will:

12. Use multiple and authentic forms of assessment to analyze teaching and student learning and to plan curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of individual students.

*Technology –* Candidates will:

13. Demonstrate sufficient technology skills and the ability to integrate technology into classroom teaching/learning.

[\\Shares\ncate\CF 8-10 PowerPoint Suggested changes.pptx](file:///%5C%5CShares%5Cncate%5CCF%20%208-10%20PowerPoint%20Suggested%20changes.pptx)
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Teacher Education Unit Faculty Professional Development

Prioritized Topics for Training Development

**Program Need Rank**

**Teacher Work Samples 1**

**Assessment of Teacher Candidate effects on K-12 learning 2**

**Assessing Candidate dispositions and Applying Them to Practice 3**

**Differentiated Instruction 4**

**Effective Strategies for Teaching English Language Learners 5**

**Committee Vacancy and Appointment Status Report**

**NCATE Accreditation Process**

**September 7, 2010**

**TEC Assessment Coordinator:**

Brief canvass of interested parties has yielded 5 adjunct faculty, all without background experience and qualification.

**TEC Assessment Committee:**

1. Jo Ellen Bailey
2. Lynn Couturier ? John to confirm

3. Kathleen Beney

4. Amy Schutt

5. Faculty Rep from Education……….

6. Merle Canfield, OIRA

7. Donna West

**Title II-English Language Learners Committee:**

1. Luis Columna

2. Paulo Quaglio

3. Charlotte Pass

4. Robert Ponterio

5. Lin Lin

6. Hong Li Fan

**Title II Special Education Committee:**

1. Janet Duncan-Chair
2. Michelle Kelly
3. Kim Rombach

 3. David Smukler

 4. Tim Davis

 5. Arts and Sciences Representative-Psychology (Judy)

**Title II Technology Committee:**

1. Shufang Shi (has related proposal for Cortland PDS, but not submitted in spring)

 2. StephenYang

 3. Gretchen Douglass

 4. Chris Widdal

 5. Cynthia Sarver

**Institutional Report: Standard 4 Sub-committee:**

1. Regina Grantham will co-chair until January 1, 2011 and then assume full responsibility.
2. Noelle Paley

**Regional Professional Development School Coordinator Position (Release Time)**

1. Joy Mosher (filled)

**Teacher Education Unit Assessment Coordinator Position (Release Time)**

1. Vacant as of September 14, 2010

**Teacher Education Council Advisory Group (Voting Only)**

1. Connie Filzen-Miller
2. Eileen Wright
3. Dennis Wright
4. Lawrence Hinkle
5. Mary Lee Martens
6. Maureen Goodwin
7. Shana Snyder
8. Thomas Turck
9. Bonnie Calzolaio
10. Jo-Anne Knapp
11. Vacant

**NCATE Board of Examiners Site Visit Committee**

1. Mickie Gibbons-Chair
2. Karen Seibert
3. Karen Hempson
4. Dennis Farnsworth
5. Sheila Gregoire
6. Mike Pitaro
7. Phil Buckenmeyer
8. Amy Dahlman
9. Mary Ware
10. Orvil White
11. Jeffrey Walkulski
12. Beth Klein

**Dispositions Committee**

1. Chair
2. Vacant Renee Potter?
3. Vacant Mary Gfeller
4. Vacant Ann Burns-Thomas
5. Vacant Nan Pasquerello
6. Vacant Brian Barrett
7. Vacant Mike Kniffen

**Teacher Education Council Steering Committee (as mandated by T.E.C. by-laws)**

1. **Chair of T.E.C…..Marley**
2. **Vice Chair of T.E.C…….Bruce and John**
3. **Teacher Ed Coordinator……Dennis**
4. **Unit Head……Mark**
5. **A member of the teaching faculty from each school:**
	1. **Education: Joy Mosher (tentative)**
	2. **Prof. Studies: Vacant**
	3. **Arts and Sciences: Vacant**

**NOTE: FIRST MEETING OF THIS COMMITTEE IS SCHEDULED FOR 11:00 A.M. FOR Friday, Sept. 3**

**ASSESSMENT AND TEACHING SAMPLE**

**EDU 490/491: STUDENT TEACHING**

Instructions To Candidates:

The purpose of the Assessment and Teaching Sample is for you to use your skills in assessing student understanding prior to instruction, using that assessment information to develop lesson plans based on students’ prior knowledge, and assessing student learning after instruction.

The assignment consists of four parts: (1) Conduct an assessment of students’ prior knowledge and analyze the results of that assessment; (2) Use the assessment results to write a connected and integrated lesson plan that includes an assessment of students’ learning from that lesson; (3) Teach the lesson plan; and (4) Analyze the assessment results and assess student learning from the lesson plan based on the results.

The following ACEI Standards are assessed through this assignment:

*Standard 1* - **Development, Learning, and Motivation -** Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to development of children and young adolescents to construct learning opportunities that support individual students’ development, acquisition of knowledge, and motivation.

*Standard 3.1* **Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction -** Candidates plan and implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, connections across the curriculum, curricular goals, and community.

*Standard 4.0* **Assessment for instruction** - Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student.

Materials needed:

(1) Informal assessment recording form that you design

(2) C/EC lesson plan

(3) Formal assessment recording form that you design

(4) Lesson plan reflection form

Completion of the Assignment

You are required to complete the Assessment and Teaching Sample assignment twice. Complete it during both quarters of Student Teaching, in grades 1-3 placements and in grades 4-6 placements. However, because children in grades 1-3 and in grades 4-6 are developmentally different, you are required, in consultation with your cooperating teacher, to make **key decisions** about the use of developmentally-appropriate assessment and teaching methods that fit the particular needs of the children in your host classrooms.

Steps in completing the Assessment and Teaching Sample

**Step 1:** Use an informal and/or formal assessments recording to carry out a formative assessment of each participating student’s current understanding of a topic to your teaching (ACEI Standard 4).

* In consultation with your host teacher, decide upon which content area(s) and topics you will focus your Assessment and Teaching Sample assignment. Ideally, you should choose a topic that integrates two or more subject areas.
* In consultation with your teacher, select the children who will participate in the Assessment and Teaching Sample assignment and decide upon a timeline for implementing all parts of this assignment.
* Choose any informal or formal assessment method to assess the prior knowledge of children in your host classroom on your chosen topic. Methods can include – but are not limited to: observation; oral questioning; KWL; rubric; tick-list; portfolio; teacher-made test; performance task; project; child self-assessment; peer assessment; standardized test; norm-referenced test; criterion referenced test and diagnostic test. The method you choose should be developmentally appropriate for the children in your class.
* Design appropriate informal or formal assessment recording forms to record the results of your assessment. Decide on which form of technology to use to facilitate the assessment process and the analysis of your results.
* Carry out your assessment in a small cooperative group or with the whole class, as determined by class environment.
* Use technology to analyze and store the data. Analyze the data qualitatively and/or quantitatively. Write a short evaluative summary of each student’s prior knowledge of your topic.

**Step 2:** Based on your assessment results, plan a lesson on your chosen topic that addresses each student’s learning needs (ACEI Standard 1 and 3).

* Use the results of your initial assessment to write a lesson plan for instruction. Ideally, this plan will integrate at least two content areas. Build upon the assessment results to write a lesson plan that is developmentally appropriate, differentiated and challenging for each child. Use the C/EC Departmental Lesson Planning Form and complete all sections.
* Align your lesson plan and teaching with relevant New York State Learning Standards and write appropriate learning objectives.
* Choose a developmentally appropriate assessment method and include it in your lesson plan to record, measure and evaluate each student’s learning either during or resulting from the lesson.

**Step 3**: Implement your lesson plan and final assessment (ACEI Standard 3).

* Teach the lesson you planned.
* During or after you have taught the lesson, implement your chosen assessment method to measure each student’s learning from your lesson. Record assessment data on an appropriate form.

**Step 4**: Analyze your data, evaluate each student’s learning, and explain how this data will inform your future teaching of this topic (ACEI Standard 4).

* Use technology to analyze and store the data. Analyze the data qualitatively and/or quantitatively. Write a short evaluative summary of each student’s learning from your lesson. Be sure to include the results of your previous assessment of student’s learning.
* In a brief reflection, describe how you will use your assessment of student learning in your future teaching of your chosen topic.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EDU 490/491 Assessment and Teaching Rubric** |  |
|

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| http://rubric.taskstream.com/css/i/spacer.gif | **Target 3** | **Acceptable 2** | **Unacceptable 1** | **Score/ Level** |
| Criteria 1 1.0 Standard : Candidates know and understand the major concepts, principles, theories and research related to adolescents and young children. (as demonstrated in writing developmentally- appropriate lesson plan)   | Candidates draw upon an in depth knowledge of the physical, social, emotional, cognitive, and linguistic developmental and learning characteristics of children and young adolescents to understand students’ abilities, interests, individual aspirations, values, and social and cultural backgrounds.   | Candidates have adequate knowledge of the physical, social, emotional, cognitive, and linguistic developmental characteristics of children and young adolescents from a variety of theoretical perspectives.   | Candidates do not have a thorough knowledge of the physical, social, emotional, cognitive, and linguistic developmental characteristics of children and young adolescents.   |   |
| Criteria 2 1.0 Standard : Candidates know and understand the major concepts, principles, theories and research related to adolescents and young children. (as demonstrated in writing developmentally- appropriate lesson plan)   | Candidates know a variety of approaches to adapt curriculum and teaching to differentiate instruction to facilitate and support student learning and development.   | Candidates know some approaches to adapt curriculum and teaching to differentiate instruction to facilitate and support student learning and development.   | Candidates do not know many approaches to adapt curriculum and teaching to differentiate instruction to facilitate and support student learning and development.   |   |
| Criteria 3 3.1 Standard: Candidates know and understand the connections among concepts, procedures, and applications from content areas.(as demonstrated in writing integrated lesson plan)    | Candidates consistently apply connections among concepts, procedures and applications across the content areas in K-6 classroom teaching.   | Candidates recognize and make adequate connections among concepts, procedures, and applications across the content areas.   | Candidates do not recognize and/or fail to make connections among concepts, procedures and applications across the content areas.   |   |
| Criteria 4 3.1 Standard: Candidates know and understand the connections among concepts, procedures, and applications from content areas.(as demonstrated in writing integrated lesson plan)    | Candidates consistently apply connections among concepts, procedures and applications that demonstrate scholarly habits of mind.   | Candidates adequately demonstrate scholarly habits of mind.   | Candidates do not demonstrate scholarly habits of mind.   |   |
| Criteria 5 3.1 Standard: Candidates plan instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, subject matter, curricular goals, and community(as demonstrated in writing integrated, differentiated and challenging lesson plan built on formative assessment results)   | Candidates routinely integrate and apply knowledge of students, knowledge of learning theory, K-6 subject matter content, and curriculum development to plan instruction.   | Candidates adequately integrate knowledge of learning theory, K-6 subject matter content, curriculum development, and knowledge of students to plan instruction.   | Candidates demonstrate limited awareness of learning theory, K-6 subject matter content, curriculum development, and student development.   |   |
| Criteria 6 3.1 Standard: Candidates plan instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, subject matter, curricular goals, and community(as demonstrated in writing integrated, differentiated and challenging lesson plan built on formative assessment results)   | Candidates use a variety of instructional approaches, including the effective use oftechnology.   | Candidates use some varied instructional approaches with possible uses of technology identified.   | Candidates use a limited range of instructional approaches.   |   |
| Criteria 7 3.1 Standard: Candidates plan instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, subject matter, curricular goals, and community(as demonstrated in writing integrated, differentiated and challenging lesson plan built on formative assessment results)   | Candidates collaborate with others to make plans that highly engage students in learning in subject matter content.   | Candidates plan for active involvement so that students are engaged in learning the subject matter content.   | Candidates make limited use of collaboration and active learning strategies to maximize student learning.   |   |
| Criteria 8 3.1 Standard: Candidates plan instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, subject matter, curricular goals, and community(as demonstrated in writing integrated, differentiated and challenging lesson plan built on formative assessment results)   | Candidates’ plans center on effective teaching strategies, including problem finding/solving, critical thinking, and self-directed learning that builds on skills previously acquired.   | Candidates’ plans use effective teaching strategies such as activating prior knowledge, and encouraging exploration and problem solving.   | Candidates’ plans do not make good use of effective teaching strategies.   |   |
| Criteria 9 4.0 Standard: Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies.(as evidenced in assessments in grades 1-3 and 4-6.)   | Candidates consistently integrate assessment and instruction as integral parts of designing and aligning instruction and learning goals.   | Candidates integrate assessment and instruction as integral parts of designing and aligning instruction and learning goals.   | Candidates administer both formal and informal assessments, which may or may not be aligned to instruction and learning goals.   |   |
| Criteria 10 4.0 Standard: Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies.(as evidenced in assessments in grades 1-3 and 4-6.)   | Candidates make good use of assessment (i.e., formal and informal) to inform and make decisions about objectives and materials.   | Candidates administer assessments (i.e., formal and informal) to inform and to make decisions about objectives, materials, and the effectiveness of teachingstrategies.   | Candidates do not consistently use assessment to inform instruction.   |   |
| Criteria 11 4.0 Standard: Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies.(as evidenced in assessments in grades 1-3 and 4-6.)   | Candidates consistently use assessment data for planning and evaluating teaching strategies.   | Candidates use assessment data for planning and evaluating teaching strategies.   | Candidates don not consistently use assessment data for planning and evaluating teaching strategies.   |   |
| Criteria 12 4.0 Standard: Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of and ability to use assessment strategies to strengthen instruction.(as demonstrated in use of formative assessment results in lesson plan and in collaboration with cooperating teacher)   | Candidates know the reasons to implement certain assessments based on type, use, advantage, disadvantage, limitations, and developmental appropriateness as related to students’ learning experiences, and abilities.    | Candidates know the reasons to implement certain assessments based on type use, advantage, disadvantage, limitations, and subject matter.   | Candidates know the reasons to implement certain assessments based on type (i.e., formal and informal), use, advantage, disadvantage, limitations, and subject matter.   |   |
| Criteria 13 4.0 Standard: Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of and ability to use assessment strategies to strengthen instruction.(as demonstrated in use of formative assessment results in lesson plan and in collaboration with cooperating teacher)   | Candidates consistently use assessment data to monitor and promote learning for each student, such as the need for adaptations to strengthen instruction.    | Candidates use assessment data to monitor learning for each student, such as the need for adaptations to strengthen instruction.   | Candidates do not consistently use assessment data to improve student success.   |   |
| Criteria 14 4.0 Standard: Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of and ability to use assessment strategies to strengthen instruction.(as demonstrated in use of formative assessment results in lesson plan and in collaboration with cooperating teacher)   | Candidates consistently use assessment date to monitor their own teaching effectiveness.   | Candidates use assessment data to monitor their own teaching effectiveness.   | Candidates do not effectively use assessment date to monitor their own teaching effectiveness.   |   |
| Criteria 15 4.0 Standard: Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of and ability to use assessment strategies to strengthen instruction.(as demonstrated in use of formative assessment results in lesson plan and in collaboration with cooperating teacher)   | Candidates use technology to promote the efficiency of assessment data collection and management ofinstruction.    | Candidates use technology to promote the efficiency of assessment data collection and management ofinstruction.    | Candidates do not use technology effectively to promote the efficiency of assessment data collection and management of instruction.   |   |
| Criteria 16 4.0 Standard: Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of and ability to use assessment strategies to promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each student.(as demonstrated in assessment analysis anduse results in lesson plan.)   | Candidates effectively adapt assessment strategies to accommodate and promote the developmental needs of students.   | Candidates adapt assessment strategies to accommodate developmental needs of students.   | Candidates do not effectively adapt assessment strategies to accommodate developmental needs of students.   |   |
| Criteria 17 4.0 Standard: Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of and ability to use assessment strategies to promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each student.(as demonstrated in assessment analysis anduse results in lesson plan.)   | Candidates routinely consult with others (i.e., specialists) to gather information to identify and address the development of students with exceptionalities.   | Candidates consult with others (i.e., specialists) to gather information to identify and address the development of students with exceptionalities.   | Candidates do not tend to consult with others (i.e. specialists) to gather and use assessment information to identify, address, and promote the development of students with exceptionalities.    |   |

 |
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