

## Minutes of the Meeting of November 4, 1998

---

Members Present: Pam Beeman, Jinfa Cai, Kate Conway-Turner, Bob Hampel, Skip MacArthur, Ann McNeil, Rob Palkovitz, Dan Rich, Bonnie Robb, Mary Roe, Barbara VanDornick, Carol Vukelich

Also Present: Doug Archbald and Elaine Stotko

### Old Business

#### *I. Approval of Minutes of the September 28 Meeting.*

The September 28 minutes were approved.

#### *II. Course Evaluations*

(Presenter: Dr. Doug Archbald)

At previous meetings, UCTE has discussed the integration of the conceptual framework into courses and programs. Student course evaluation feedback is one means to obtain information about students' perceptions of each course's integration of reflection, problem solving, partnering, and scholarship. Interim Director of the School of Education Bob Hampel previously agreed to work with evaluation experts from the School of Education to consider how the current course evaluation forms might be amended to gather such data. Dr. Hampel asked Dr. Doug Archbald to prepare a recommendation for School of Education faculty and UCTE consideration. Dr. Archbald presented an interim report of his findings. He suggested replacing or adding items to departments'/school's current course evaluation form and keeping the three "critical" questions (How do you rate this course? How do you rate this instructor? How much did you learn in this course?) that are mandatory in departments and the School of Education intact. Rather than dictate a set of required questions linked to the conceptual framework, he recommends providing several models and allowing faculty to personalize the items to their course. Dr. Ann McNeil described a Michigan State University evaluation system being considered by one of the University's general education task forces. She suggested Dr. Archbald contact Dr. Judith Green in the Center for Teaching Effectiveness for information on this system. After continued discussion, Dr. Archbald agreed to meet with Dr. Green and to return to UCTE with additional information and a specific proposal.

#### *III. NCATE/DOE Team Visit.*

UCTE was reminded of the NCATE/DOE visit which will occur November 7-11. Details of the visit were shared, and members were requested to keep their calendars as free as possible in order to permit time for preparing and gathering any requested information. UCTE will meet with representatives from the teams on Monday afternoon.

Chair Vukelich reminded UCTE members that the State Department of Education's focus is our programs while NCATE's focus is the unit. Both teams will provide an overview of their findings on Wednesday, November 11 at 11:30. Chair Vukelich will send a brief e-mail message to UCTE members immediately upon return to her office. Within 30 days, the University will receive a draft of these reports. With both reports, the University has an opportunity to provide a rebuttal as part of an appeal process.

#### *IV. Program Review Procedures.*

As promised, Chair Vukelich drafted Program Review Procedures, building on the procedures approved at the September 28 meeting. Generally, the procedures call for professional education programs to be reviewed once every five years, in the years between NCATE continuing accreditation visits and beginning with graduate programs. The specific criteria to be used build on what is required by the university review process and incorporate a careful look at the integration of the conceptual framework into the program. Following discussion of the implementation of the procedures, a motion was made and seconded suggesting the approval of the procedures. The motion was approved unanimously.

#### *V. Electronic Resume*

Dr. Ann McNeil and Ms. Barbara VanDornick had agreed to explore the possibility of creating a template that could be put on the Web so students could enter descriptions of their clinical field experiences, and instructors and clinical placement professionals could access the information to track each student's placement history to ensure placements with diverse and exceptional populations and with students of varying ages. They sought advice from Ms. Pat Sine to prepare the proposal. In the subsequent discussion, they described the logistics of students' use of the electronic resume. Features such as offering opportunities for student reflections about the experience, locking the information semester by semester so students can not change entries, requiring faculty to check each student's entry to verify accuracy, providing a description of the number of hours required by each course, requiring students to demonstrate their ability to use the Web, and maintaining the record over each student's undergraduate years were discussed. A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved requesting Barbara and Ann to move forward with the Web-based template and to seek more information about using the SIS system.

#### *VI. Praxis I for All Teacher Education Candidates*

Ms. VanDornick stated that the State has put the decision to require all teacher education programs to require their students to pass Praxis I on hold. Of course, if we think this is a good idea, we can move forward with this requirement. Discussion included such points as when students might be required to pass the exam, which students would not need to take the exam, the good performance of our students who have chosen to take the exam in the past, the versions (paper/pencil and computer) of the test, and the cost of the test. Dr. Mary Roe moved that UCTE require Praxis I for all teacher education candidates and that an implementation plan be prepared which addresses the points raised in the discussion. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

## *VII. Ethnic Breakdown*

UCTE had asked Ms. VanDornick to provide data regarding the ethnic diversity of professional education candidates as of this fall semester. While UCTE has approved a Minority Recruitment and Retention Plan, we know we need to focus on increasing the diversity of our professional education candidates. Professional education candidate current percentages are not high but are comparable to the University's figures. While not reflective of the State's overall population, the percentages are comparable to the number of currently employed Delaware minority teachers. Minority recruitment will be a continuing item on the UCTE agenda.

## *VIII. Faculty Recruitment and Retention Plan [\(See attachment.\)](#)*

Chair Vukelich reminded UCTE members that we approved a version of the plan at the last UCTE meeting. She identified the additional details embedded in the enhanced plan. Dr. Kate Conway-Turner questioned the section on the target of opportunity positions. Dean Dan Rich suggested that, with modification, this section would be appropriate to include. We do want to support colleges', departments', and school's efforts to bring minority faculty to campus. If a minority professional is interested in the University, UCTE should support the unit's efforts to convince the Provost to create a position for this person from the pool of potential future positions. Dan noted that colleges do have flexibility in their use of their position pools and that the Provost is eager for the University to achieve greater faculty diversity. Therefore, he proposed rewording the proposal to make it clear that it's a matter of working together with the colleges and the university.

A second item of discussion was the creation of a minority advisory group to support UCTE's efforts and to lend advice on this topic. After discussion it was decided to invite members of the professional education faculty to volunteer to serve on this advisory group. Chair Vukelich was directed to place a call for volunteers to this important advisory group.

The enhanced plan was approved unanimously as amended.

## *IX. Graduate Professional Education Minority Recruitment*

The discussion of the Minority Faculty Recruitment Plan lead to a discussion of the recruitment of minority graduate students. UCTE was reminded of its decision to support departments' preparation of graduate minority recruitment plans, as per the current University policy. Chair Vukelich had written to each professional education graduate program coordinator reminding him/her of the October 19 closing date for funding from the Office of Graduate Studies for graduate minority recruitment, the importance of targeting recruitment of minority professional educators in his/her department's or school's minority recruitment plan, and the need to send UCTE a copy of this plan. Plans were received from all programs.

## *New Business.*

### *I. Revisions in MED Programs.*

Chair Vukelich noted that two MED programs had requested UCTE approval for proposed changes. Consistent with UCTE's program review procedures, she alerted the program coordinators that changes would not be considered by UCTE until evidence was provided that the conceptual framework had been integrated into the program. She received this required evidence and placed the two requests on the agenda. She called upon Dr. Bob Hampel to explain the changes since both requests were from the School of Education.

The MED in Educational Leadership and in Exceptional Children and Youth both forwarded requests that the Graduate Record Examination be removed as an entrance requirement. A majority of applicants are returning students and their GRE score does not add to the program faculty's ability to predict the applicants' performance in the programs. In addition, the requirement puts these programs at a competitive disadvantage for recruiting students. A motion was made, seconded, and the request was unanimously approved.

Secondly, the MED in Educational Leadership requested permission to add a specialization in adult learning and the MED in Exceptional Children and Youth sent forward three courses for UCTE approval. These requests were approved unanimously.

## *II. Admission of Students to Teacher Education Programs*

Ms. VanDornick has been working with program coordinators on UCTE's behalf to make the criteria used to admit candidates to each program clear. These are not new admission criteria. However, UCTE was not certain the criteria were as visible as they needed to be. In past years, UCTE approved the Elementary Teacher Education programs junior-level clearance for upper division. Other faculty, in part because of the time their students elect to enter teacher education, have chosen to admit students to their programs prior to student teaching. Barbara provided materials detailing each program's requirements for admission to student teaching/admission to the program.

Discussion focused on the variability of the overall grade point average required and the acceptability of a grade of "D-" as passing a course. UCTE members were directed to discuss requiring a grade of no lower than "C-" with their faculty and department for at least courses in the professional education component of the program. This item will be placed on the next UCTE agenda.

The motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved to accept the criteria as provided in the attached document as each program's admission to student teaching/admission to the program criteria.

## *III. Selection of Cooperating Teachers*

It is important that we select cooperating teachers who exhibit the qualities of our conceptual framework in order that they will provide models of reflective practitioners who engage in the roles of problem solver, partner, and scholar. Dr. Mary Roe presented the draft of a proposal for the selection of cooperating teachers prepared with the assistance of the student teaching coordinators. Rather than dictate a common set of criteria, the proposal allows each program

faculty to develop a plan and a set of criteria appropriate to the program. The Director of Clinical Studies would be required to report to UCTE each semester on each program's use of the criteria to select cooperating teachers. UCTE will approve each program's selected criteria and plan. A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved supporting the implementation of this procedures for the selection of next year's cooperating teachers. Chair Vukelich will write to each program coordinator requesting the submission of his/her program's materials in time for UCTE approval and the program's use for the selection of fall 1999 cooperating teacher selection.

#### *IV. Evaluation of Student Teachers* ([See attachment.](#))

On behalf of UCTE, Chair Vukelich met with student teaching coordinators to discuss the need to link the student teaching evaluation instruments with the conceptual framework. A set of procedures was approved by this group to provide this ensurance. (See attached.) Based on continued discussion, this group (with one exception - the Early Childhood Development and Education program) decided to begin using the Pathwise student teaching evaluation instrument effective with fall semester. The ETE student teaching supervisors and Dr. Mary Roe examined the items on Pathwise and established the links between the conceptual framework and Pathwise, the outcomes and Pathwise, and the Delaware State Professional Teaching Standards and Pathwise. This evidence provided a compelling reason for all but one programs' faculty to accept Pathwise as their student teaching evaluation instrument. ECDE program faculty engaged in the same behaviors and established the links between its student teaching evaluation instrument and the conceptual framework and its instrument and the NAEYC standards.

The request is for UCTE's approval of Pathwise and the ECDE evaluation instruments as the tools to be used to evaluate student performance in student teaching. A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved.

ETE student teaching supervisors will provide the training needed by other program cooperating teachers and student teaching coordinators to ensure fidelity to the Pathwise instrument.

#### *V. Survey of Graduates Follow-Up*

Ms. VanDornick reported on the draft results of the recent follow-up study of program graduates. Basically, students feel good about their program. Several needed editorial revisions to the draft were identified.

Dr. McNeil questioned why Health & Nursing Science was not included. The response rate from Health and Physical Education was very low, even after two requests for completion of the questionnaire. A discussion followed on ways to increase all programs' response rate.

The Program Review Policy UCTE approved calls for all programs to survey its graduates. Dean Rich suggested that an evaluation coordination group was needed and that a representative from the Research and Development Center be asked to serve on the committee. Since there was general agreement that such a group was needed, Chair Vukelich agreed to contact Audrey Noble for advice on membership for such a group. UCTE might commission the R&D Center to

regularly gather this data for programs. Ms. VanDornick was asked to identify those items in the report that need UCTE attention. Should programs be doing something differently because of these results? She will report at the next meeting.

*VI. Student Teaching Survey.*

UCTE examined the results of the recent survey of student teachers. Again, members commented on the length of the survey; it's too long. Members were asked to read the report in order to consider possible needed program revisions at the next UCTE meeting.

*VII. Undergraduate/Graduate Student Representation on UCTE.*

When the UCTE by-laws were written last year, members thought that student representation might be more meaningful on the Advisory Council on Teacher Education. However, membership on the ACTE has developed to include key professional educators around the state. The fear is that student voices would be lost in this powerful group. Hence, Chair Vukelich requested a motion to amend UCTE by-laws to include one undergraduate and one graduate professional education candidate.

Such a motion was presented, seconded and unanimously approved. Chair Vukelich is to meet with student groups to determine how to implement this by-law revision.

Meeting adjourned at 2:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:  
Marie Senff and Carol Vukelich