

University Council on Teacher Education
Minutes for November 9, 2009
1:00-3:00
200 Academy Street

Members Present: Suzanne Burton, Kara Cashwell, Dena Deglau, Laura Glass, Gillian Guadagnino, John Hartman, Kathy Minke, Joe Pika, Donald Unger, Barbara VanDornick, Carol Vukelich

Members Absent: Anne Ardis, Janice Bibik, Michael Gamel-McCormick

Guests Present: Lynn Worden

The minutes of October 12, 2009 were approved unanimously.

Announcement

- I. *Fall 2009 Professional Education Enrollment Reports (Barbara VanDornick)***
Barbara distributed updated information detailing the University's fall enrollment figures. This year professional education enrollment is slightly under 10%. Enrollment information, by program, is posted on the UCTE website (www.udel.edu/dcte/ucte).

New Business

- I. *Annual Review of Candidate Performance Data (Laura Glass, ETE; Lynn Worden, ECE)***
As part of the Unit Assessment System, administrators are required to share their findings regarding candidate performance in each of their professional education programs with the Council. Lynn Worden and Laura Glass updated the Council on the Early Childhood Education (ECE) and Elementary Teacher Education (ETE) candidates' performance.
- Lynn indicated that ECE candidates met all standards. Overall the program faculty are pleased with the findings relative to candidate performance on each of the performance tasks, tasks linked to the National Association for the Education of Young Children's (NAEYC) standards. Lynn highlighted candidates' performance relative to NAEYC's Standard 2 (building family and community) as a standard of some concern. However, the faculty's comparison of the candidates' performance on the Praxis II exam with their performance on the student teaching evaluation form suggests that the candidates possess the knowledge; the application to work with parents and families is the challenge. They conjectured that the challenge is the students' age; armed with knowledge and some maturity, the faculty are convinced that candidates will perform better with parents and families. The faculty's analysis of the candidates' performance in the math area resulted in changes to the grade required in the math content courses. The faculty now requires candidates to earn a grade of C- or better. Finally, in the area of measuring student

learning, the faculty determined that the candidates' performance on the assessment of student learning projects was mixed. They concluded that student teaching supervisors did not have sufficient information to support the candidates' work in this area. Consequently, the program coordinator is now providing better training for the supervisors; the result is that candidates' performance on this assessment has improved.

Laura described candidate performance in the six ETE programs. She highlighted candidate performance on the three common assessments across all programs. (See the attachment for details regarding candidate performance.)

- The middle school social studies candidates struggled to pass the Praxis II exam. (The program meets the mandatory 80% or better pass rate.) As a result, the program is considering having the U.S. History for Teachers course in the History Department as an option if the scores do not improve.
- Forty one percent of the ETE students earned the Education Testing Service Record of Excellence this past spring. Five of 24 Middle School Math candidates earned a perfect score on the Middle Level Math Praxis II test.
- To ensure greater consistency between the ETE Field Experience Coordinators' and the cooperating teachers' evaluation of candidates during student teaching, the Field Experience Coordinators are holding formal meetings with the cooperating teachers before the three-way meeting and offering an increased number of Pathwise training sessions.
- At the middle school level, the student learning performance task has been revised each year for the last three years. Initially, the faculty asked candidates to engage in an Action Research Project. This was followed by an Inquiry Project. In both instances, the faculty discovered that allowing the candidates the freedom to investigate an area of interest to them did not always result in them focusing on students' academic learning. Therefore, effective last year, the faculty began to require candidates to complete a Teacher Work Sample.

II. *UCTE-NCATE Discussion*

The unit will need to determine on which standard it will argue that it is at the target level. While the unit may be aiming at target in all areas, it may not be at target in all areas. There was general agreement that the unit may be at target on Standard 5 (faculty) and Standard 3(field experiences).

The Council engaged in a discussion of the exhibits that need to be collected this semester in preparation for the writing of the Institutional Report in summer 2010. Barbara will be contacting program coordinators to request copies of all professional education syllabi. She also will contact faculty with a brief survey asking them to identify how they address diversity, including English Language Learners, in their professional education courses. The Standard 5 committee (see below) will meet in December to prepare an instrument to gather the needed information to address the Standard 5 elements. They will begin by reviewing the survey used in the past to determine whether or not it is sufficiently comprehensive. The Standard 6 discussion evolved around whether there was a sufficient supply of technology tools for candidates use. The availability of smart boards was a topic of particular interest. Many schools

will be using stimulus funds to purchase smart boards. Currently, the ERC and MSERC have smart boards available. Joe Pika agreed to investigate where else on campus they are available and how professional education faculty might use them to train our candidates.

The following task forces were created to gather information and write the Institutional Report to address the following components of the Institutional Report:

Overview and Conceptual Framework: Carol Vukelich and Barbara VanDornick

Standard 1: Barbara VanDornick, Laura Glass, and John Hartman

Standard 2: Barbara VanDornick, Laura Glass, and Kate Scantlebury

Standard 3: John Hartman, Ann Jornlin, Lynn Worden, Laura Glass, and Todd Dunn

Standard 4: Melva Ware, Barbara VanDornick, and John Hartman

Standard 5: Joe Pika, Kathy Minke, Don Unger, Dena Deglau, and Carol Vukelich

Standard 6: Michael Gamel-McCormick, Joe Pika, and Carol Vukelich

Barbara will contact program coordinators to ask them to contact the faculty teaching each course in which an assessment is embedded to ensure the gathering and saving of candidates' performances at each score level.

III. *Title II Reporting (Barbara VanDornick)*

The Title II report is a required NCATE exhibit. We must identify our "entry into our teacher education programs." The Council tabled consideration of this question until the next meeting.

IV. *Preservice Programs (John Hartman)*

John distributed a draft of the preservice Field Experience Matrix that is a required exhibit for Standard 3. John will be working with program coordinators for accuracy and more complete information. He also will include information on the advanced programs. The Council suggested that he add a column for the evaluation form. When the candidates are evaluated using a particular form, the reviewers will be able to click in this column to see the actual form. John will have an updated document for the Council to review in December.

Meeting adjourned at 2:40 pm.