

UCOTE Minutes
November 6, 2006
2-3:30PM, 158 Norman Hall

Present: Tom Dana, Shannon Washburn (Ag Ed), Catherine Emihovich, Yumiko Hulvey (CLAS), Russell Robinson (Fine Arts), Mark Shermis, Fran Vandiver (PKY), Theresa Vernetson, Jeri Benson, Elayne Colon, Rosie Warner and Jim Brandenburg (principal Alachua Elementary School)

Meeting was called to order at 2:10 by Jeri Benson. Introductions were made around the table. Jim Brandenburg was welcomed as a representative of our school district partners. It was noted that additional school district personnel (beyond Fran Vandiver and Jim) need to be added to the UCOTE membership.

Update on New Standards

Theresa Vernetson talked about the history of the new state standards. She explained that 2 years ago, the leadership from Florida Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (FACTE) initiated the discussion with the Florida Department of Education, that has lead to a State Board of Education Rule change which essentially allows greater flexibility for colleges of education in preparing teachers. The rule change was passed out at the last UCOTE meeting. Because of the rule change, new standards and the criteria to assess the standards were revised.

There were five old continuing program approval standards Demonstration of Knowledge and Skills at the point of program completion, Performance on the Florida Teacher Certification Examination, Inclusion of the program components mandated by State Statute or Rule (relating to candidates, curriculum, field placements, and continuous improvement), Diversity of student population, and Satisfaction of Employing Districts. Each standard was assessed during an institutional site visit every five years.

Now for programs under continuing review approval, the new standards are streamlined to cover 3 major areas that address:

- How are we delivering the curriculum?
- How are we assessing our candidates?
- How are we using data for continuous program improvement?

Under each standard are 4 criteria to be assessed. Under the new Rule the State will review programs on a 7 year cycle to align with the changes at NCATE.

A key new feature of the Rule change is that we now need to assess how our candidates are impacting P-12 student learning. Possible sources of data can be: examples of candidates' assessments used in field experiences/student teaching, reflections on the impact of student assessment, data from the assessments etc.

In order to meet the new standards, the state requested that by August 2008 institutions submit revised program matrices reflecting how the Uniform Core Curriculum, the

relevant Reading Competencies for elementary, early childhood and special education must complete Reading Competencies 1-5. Reading Competencies 1 and 2 must be included in all other educator preparation programs (including administration, school counseling, and school psychology), and the ESOL competencies are ***demonstrated and assessed*** in each program. That is, the state is expecting to see how the above curriculum is covered, what activities a candidate does to meet the competencies, and how they are assessed.

It was suggested we prepare a matrix for one program, share this with the FLDOE to be sure we are on the right track, and if we are, then develop the remaining matrices. Our college would like to have this task completed by fall 2007.

Copies of the new standards for both initial and continuing program approvals were handed out. A more detailed set of standards, criteria, and data reporting was also handed out showing what data we will have to be gathering annually for continuing program approval.

In terms of reporting data to the state, it was made clear at a recent state meeting that we are expected to collect, analyze, and use data on our candidates/program annually, whether the state requests copies or not. However, the state is working on an electronic IPEP which should facilitate your reporting of data and program changes more easily. The electronic IPEP is promised for August 2008 (when we will report on data collected for 2007). Until it is available, we still need to complete annual reports. The state is also planning on developing and sending the employer survey out so each institution does not have to do this. However, the employer who has teachers trained by different institutions will still be completing separate surveys. This is part of a larger attempt by the state to be able to link different data in one master database. Right now the Florida DOE has the data, they send it to us, and we analyze it and send it back.

Affiliate Programs: Interest in joint Master's degree

Yumiko Hulvey mentioned CLAS has made some changes in their biology education program that may affect our science majors. It was noted that a meeting with Jeri, Tom, and Theresa was needed to look into this. This meeting has been set for December 5th at 2PM.

This general topic lead to a conversation about what UF was planning with respect to developing PTOs or EPIs. The new Rule allows us to offer Educator Preparation Institutes (EPI) and a Professional Training Option (PTO). With the completion of a PTO, the student is eligible for a temporary teaching certificate. They can then get a teaching certificate within 1 year of service. With an EPI, they will be eligible for a regular teaching certificate upon graduation if they have completed all FTCE exams.

A PTO (Professional Training Option) is for individuals who have a major in a content area and need to take some "professional education" courses (which could be a State-approved minor) which will lead to a temporary certificate. A PTO must have 15 hours as a minimum to include: classroom management, including safe learning environments;

human development and learning; educational assessment; effective instructional strategies, including the needs of diverse learners; curriculum and special methods of teaching in the content area for subject coverage; and foundation in research-based practices in teaching reading. A PTO does not include assessing the candidate in the FEAPs, only that they receive training.

An EPI (Educator Preparation Institute) is for students who already have a bachelor's degree and are seeking state certification. Tom mentioned that STL is working on a science and math EPI and that others could develop EPIs in their specific content areas. It was suggested we only create one (1) EPI in a generic form and use examples of how individuals with BA degrees in various content areas could complete an EPI. In this way we will have to seek EPI approval only once from the state. Jeri and Theresa will work with Tom to see how this will work. Catherine would like to see us with at least one approved EPI.

General Education Course Changes

STL group will be making a proposal by December to change General Education requirements for the Unified Elementary Education Program requirements. The new state rules allow the institution to use institutional requirements for their Gen Ed requirements. In addition to the General Education hours, all teacher education majors must complete 9 hours of preprofessional coursework in education —Introduction to Education, Teaching Diverse Populations, and Instructional Technology.

The affiliated programs in Art, Music and Agriculture have already adjusted their general education requirements for students who were admitted in the 2006 Fall semester. Art Education is considering the implementation of a master's degree EPI in art ed. The Agricultural Education program is also considering a state-approved program at the graduate level. Russ Robinson (Fine Arts) and Shannon Washburn each shared information about where they are in the process.

Employer/Graduate Satisfaction Survey Cover Letter

Elayne passed out the surveys that have gone to the employer and the graduate and an example of a letter that we might send to each with the surveys this year. It had been suggested that someone, possibly the chair or director of the program, sign the letters to the graduates, thus giving the letter a more personal touch. In that way we might get more graduate surveys returned. Likewise for the employer survey either the dean, chair or program coordinator might sign the letter to help increase our return rates. All agreed this would be worth a try. Elayne will prepare each set of letters using the relevant letter head and obtain the signatures. The surveys will be sent out by the dean's office and returned to the Office of Student Services as we have always done.

In the past, the graduate request was sent twice: to confirm the address and then the survey was mailed. This year we will send the survey to the address received from the Student Services office through the DOE report on public school employment of our graduates.

Jim Brandenburg mentioned that in terms of getting a greater return rate from graduates, many districts have a new teacher induction program where new teachers are provided with paperwork that must be completed during the year. At this meeting our graduate surveys could be handed out and we might get better return. Elayne will need to be in touch with district offices which employ the greater number of our students to see about using this option.

The conversation moved to seeing if the current survey needed revisions. It is based upon assessing satisfaction of mastering the 12 Accomplished Practices with some addition ESOL questions that the ESOL faculty have requested be included in the survey. It was suggested that question #2, in section #2, be broken into 2 parts. It states, “recognize signs of students’ difficulty with the reading and computational process and apply appropriate measures to improve students’ reading and computational performance? Catherine would like it to be broken up to have one part be the “recognize signs of” and the other part be the “and apply portion.” It was also suggested that on items number 4 and 5 of part 2, the word understand be removed.

Finger Printing Issues

Shannon spoke about the costs to students to get finger printed for each county they work in during their field/internship experiences. This becomes very costly. The state needs to change the language in the statute and share finger printing information through a common data base. A change was made to help coaches, referees and vendors. Fran suggested that Catherine talk to Joe Pickens, the representative from Putnam County, who is also active with the NEFEC organization, and other politicians to see how we can get this rule changed so that students only pay once for finger printing.

Future Meetings

Given the need to revise program matrices, we agreed to meet April 16th at 10AM to go over what each program has to do to revise their matrices. Jeri and Elayne will have a model to share.