Teacher Education Council

May 6, 2011

3:00Pm-5:00pm

Fireplace Lounge

**MINUTES**

**Members Present:** Angela Pagano, Charlotte Pass, Chris Widdall, David Dickerson, Janet Duncan, Kevin Mack, Kevin Sheets, Laura Campbell, Lynn Couturier, Michelle Kelly, Regina Grantham, Rena Janke, William Buxton, Marley Barduhn, John Cottone, Bruce Mattingly, Eileen Gravani, Joy Mosher, Lorraine Melita, Mark Prus, Gigi Peterson, Judith Ouelette, Andrea Lachance, Dennis Farnsworth

1. Approve Agenda: Agenda was approved as written.
2. Approve Minutes from 4/08/11: Minutes were approved as written.
3. Standing Committee Reports: (See written reports from Chairs): Standing Committee reports were approved by consent.
   1. TEC Bylaws Committee-J. Cottone-Electronic Ballot –D. Farnsworth announced that this item is currently an open ballot and he encouraged all voting members to cast a vote prior to Thursday 5-12-11.
   2. TEC Assessment Committee: A. Lachance-No Report
   3. Conceptual Framework Committee: J. Mosher-No Report
   4. TECRC: N. Aumann
   5. TEC Curriculum Committee: E. Gravani
   6. TEC Dispositions Sub-committee-N. Aumann
4. Old Business :
   1. Discussion with Provost Prus on the adoption of TaskStream as the Teacher Education Unit Assessment Data Repository-M. Prus, M. Barduhn-Marley set the stage for a discussion on this topic by reviewing the history of last month’s meeting. Marley read the resolution and asked the group for discussion on the questions. Gigi brought up the issues of staff support and also student accounts support was called for by Laura Campbell. It was mentioned that a full implementation plan, approved by the TEC would also be required for members to be comfortable with the adoption of this program. Members also discussed the fact that a recommendation for a specific software program was not as important as the need to have some type of consistent warehousing of data across all three schools and in all programs that the college offers even though TaskStream supports teacher education programs currently. The main issue is that we all are using the same program so that there is consistency across the board in all teacher education/preparation programs.

Mark indicated that he needs to understand what kind of commitment can be offered to support “sustainable training”. What kind of training do we think people would need. Non-users feel it is very time-intensive to learn how to use this particular program so there was concern about time taken away from other duties. These types of tasks become a workload issue because many of them fall to junior faculty. There was a general question about whether or not the time commitment is more related to the training or to developing and loading the required rubrics? General consensus is that It really is a combination of the two elements but more emphasis is added to the time it takes to collaboratively decide what would be loaded. The other piece is that there needs to be a coordinator who works with the faculty to keep up-to-date with the rubrics, changes to curriculum, etc. Chris Widdall mentioned that once the program is fully loaded it is easier to manage than the initial responsibilities would suggest. She also mentioned that generally TaskStream support has been very good. She also informed members that it takes time to acclimate the students/faculty to the use of TaskStream. She estimated 4 – 5 years. David Dickerson thought that the college would have access to our programs and that we would get what we needed as a college by aggregating the available data. David mentioned that, as users, they found that they were not always collecting data at the department level that was helpful in preparing institutional reports/data.

So when many of the users are new to the TaskStream program what would the impact be? Chris indicated that the set-up of the system is critical to the utility of the data. In many instances the faculty is reluctant to change the data in the portfolios. She talked about DRFs (directed response folios). Bruce talked about time savings associated with the workload if TaskStream is utilized as opposed to doing the binders manually. He indicated that that was oppressive. With TaskStream it has made the process easier except for the TaskStream coordinator. Mark clarified that the rubric work goes more directly with the work of assessment and not directly with the TaskStream product. Gigi Peterson talked about companies profiting from a demand for electronic data and the incumbent related responsibilities that result. Bruce Mattingly indicated that there needs to be a broader discussion about data collection for our reporting needs but we do need to look at the time dedicated to completing these tasks as an associated discussion. Judy Ouelette asked what the spas are looking for if they don’t want portfolios. Marley explained what the SPAs are seeking in the way of data requirements. Laura Campbell indicated that the work of the program coordinator has increased dramatically in the last few years. Although she feels that TaskStream would be more in line with what we are being asked to do in the area of accountability, there is still way too much work for the coordinators to accomplish in addition to all of the other requirements they must satisfy, particularly if untenured and needing to meet service and scholarship requirements. Chris acknowledged that we are concentrating on TaskStream in our discussion almost exclusively but noted that there are other programs like blackboard that are out there and would interface with our programs but they are much more expensive than TaskStream and students cannot take their portfolios with them, which is a value added in TaskStream. Bruce asked what role the TEC Assessment committee would play in the identification of these needs. What role do we envision for that committee? Andrea Lachance informed the membership that, at the present time, there really is no system for unit wide assessment. The TEC Assessment committee was asked to look at that for advanced programs in particular, as that area presented the greatest challenge to consistent/uniform data for completion of the Institutional Report. The committee actually saw the use of some type of program for storage of assessment data as very important. She indicated that right now what works individually for programs (sticky notes, spreadsheets, etc) does not work or causes inordinate delays in producing unit-wide data. Another area that causes some concern is the pending merger between TEAC and NCATE and what will result from that merger. When all is said and done though. . . we need a tool. Lynn Couturier talked about the experience of the unit Standard 1 sub-committee and the challenges they had in pulling unit level data from the programs. She felt that they had to beg for the information they needed. Angela Pagano mention that one other problem is that the programs could not reconcile the data they were receiving from the college with the program faculty as they were attempting to compile the data they needed. Whose charge will it be to determine what the common assessments are across the campus? Laura Campbell asked if it would be possible to hire a number of secretaries to assist in managing these data and assessment issues. There was consensus that it really isn’t the data collection and or assessment but the work that goes along with it. A secretary needs to be inputting the data as a primary job function and not just a related activity for the secretary. Judy Ouelette suggested that as we know there are a large number of candidates who will not get jobs upon graduation that we hire them as professionals to input the data and manage the system. Bruce suggested that we get rid of the A word and agree that we need to have clearly identified outcomes, that we have a way to measure those outcomes, and come up with a way to record those outcomes. He believes that it is conceivable that TaskStream could be useful in that process and that we get rid of the portfolios, etc. and redefine what it is we are going to need . We need to have a discussion about the difference between what NCATE is looking for and what we know constitutes good teaching. There was a call for someone to tell us whether or not we would be able to hire support for the assessment and data tasks. Mark asked to go back to his list: ‘through appropriate college-supported sustainable training activities’ should be modified to indicate the type of support that you would like to see. The other 3 points are that the college will not continue to pay for student licenses due to the expense involved to the college. There may be an issue with the cost as they are not reflected in the catalog. There is a possibility that TaskStream may be adopted system-wide (the unit part). Andrea mentioned that there would be pushback but Amy Berg indicated that she would attempt to implement a phase in program, for instance, incoming freshmen would need to purchase. Implementation plan and are there other systems/programs that folks would like to consider?

Mark suggested then that the resolution be reworded as follows: Recognizing the need for a Unit wide assessment system for outside accreditation, the TEC recommends to the provost that all teacher education programs at the college adopt TaskStream by Fall 2012 for the collection of unit assessment data, with an implementation plan approved by the TEC, and the college providing ongoing training and support staff.

* 1. Update on the NYSED Mandate on Special Education-Teaching Students With Disabilities-M. Barduhn and the Deans: Marley spoke about PED 530, Psych 331 Psychology of Children with Exceptionalities. Discussion on whether this constitutes a level one or level 2 change and the Provost will reserve judgment . You need to get clarification from Marley on this. In the end it is up to the programs. There is a recommendation for Psych 101 as a pre-requisite but it is not actually required. Bruce suggested that we respond to NYSED, once this is all over, that this was not an appropriate period of time for implementation, as indicated in Joe Frey’s rationale for the emergency adoption of the new regulations. Marley indicated that she would draft a letter and disseminate for editing and review.
     1. Review and distribute the Q & A Sheet-distributed electronically
     2. Dean’s Report on Program Readiness to Comply-no longer an issue as there is no option for compliance other than as dictated in the regulation.
  2. NCTQ – Update on Correspondence from Nancy Zimpher to Kate Walsh, President of NCTQ -M. Barduhn Tabled
  3. Status of preparation of SUNY Cortland Response to the NCTQ study on Childhood Student Teaching-Tabled

1. New Business (Discussion Items)
   1. Status of AFIs (See Chart) and strategy for Campus Response-Barduhn-Reviewed where the AFI occurred. Marley indicated that we need to report out on what we are doing to address the AFI, particularly for advanced programs. The upcoming workshop for Advanced Programs will address the need to develop a plan for improvement in all areas where we are not in full compliance.
   2. Title II Report Card Status-Barduhn: Marley asked for reports from the two Title II committee chairs on their work. Janet Duncan and Chris Widdall reported out on the reports that were generated by their committees. Paulo could not be present and reported that his committee would continue their work as time goes forward. It was noted that further refinement is required for all Title II Reports but Marley congratulated the Chairs of the committees on the outstanding work that has been done to date.
   3. New Structure of the Field Placement and School Partnerships Office-Barduhn: Marley explained that the current search for a Director of the Field Experience and School Partnerships Office is continuing with a strong response from potential candidates.
   4. Update on Recent Changes to Teacher Certification-Barduhn-Tabled
2. Other: Recognition of Member Service: Marley thanked all registered and ex-officio members of the TEC for their outstanding service during the 2010-2011 Academic Year.

Adjourn: Our next meeting of the TEC will be in September 2011, schedule of meetings TBD.

**TEC By-laws Committee-Recommendation to put the item up for a vote**

John Cottone, Chair

1. Student Representation (Current)

Undergraduate student representatives must be sophomores, juniors, or seniors. Student representatives will be registered as voting members of the TEC.

One undergraduate and one graduate student from each school appointed by the Dean of the school in consultation with department chairs.

1. Student Representation (Proposed)

Undergraduate student representatives must be sophomores, juniors, or seniors. Student representatives will be registered as voting members of the TEC.

One undergraduate and one graduate student from each school appointed by the Dean of the school in consultation with department chairs is preferred. If a particular school does not have a nominee for a student representative, qualified nominees from the other schools may be considered for appointment by the Deans.

**TEC Assessment Committee**

Andrea Lachance, Chair

There have been no meetings of the TEC Assessment Committee since the last report.

**Conceptual Framework Committee**

Joy Mosher, Chair

The Conceptual Framework Committee will not meet again until the Fall 2011 Semester

**TEC Curriculum Committee Minutes**

**Eileen Gravani, Chair**

New Course Proposals – Approved

SPE 275 Teaching Students with Disabilities in Adolescence Classroom

This course meets the NYSED mandate.

SPE 520 Teaching in Inclusive Classrooms

This course meets the NYSED mandate for programs at the graduate level.

Alteration of an Existing Course - Approved

EDU 688 Graduate Health Education Seminar

This course now has a co-requisite of SPE 520 reflecting a new NYSED requirement.

Alteration of an Existing Program - Approved

MST – Health Education (track B)

This reflects the change in the NYSED requirement.

Alteration of an Existing Course - Approved

EDU 470 Foundation of Education in American Culture

New course title and description. Note: the description includes the term physical education.

Alteration of an Existing Course - Approved

PED 611 Research Methods in Physical Education

New course description and elimination of the prerequisite.

New Course Proposals - Approved

GRY 581 Teaching the Geography of New York State

GRY 585 Teaching the Geography of Sub-Saharan Africa

Alteration of an Existing Program - Approved

Geography

Adolescence Education: Social Studies (7-12) SSA M.S. Ed. – Geography Concentration

**Pending Items**

**Alteration of Existing Program-Pending**

Adolescence Education-Mathematics 7-12

Change reflecting the new NYSED Requirments on Teaching Students with Disabilities at both initial and advanced level

**Alteration of Existing Program-Pending**

Health Education

Change reflecting the new NYSED Requirments on Teaching Students with Disabilities at both initial and advanced level

**Dispositions Committee**

Nancy Aumann, Chair

                No meetings have occurred since the NCATE site visit.

**TECRC**

Nancy Aumann

                Since the last TEC meeting on April 8, the TECRC has convened on April 22 and will meet on its regularly scheduled two-week format on May 6.  The review of teacher candidates has reflected “business as usual” through self-disclosures and program applications.