

University Council On Teacher Education

April 23, 2010

Meeting Minutes

Welcome

Tom welcomed everyone to UCOTE. He reminded the group that the purpose of UCOTE is to be an advisory group that considers broad issues of education for the university and the community

Those in attendance were:

James Algina
Buffy Bondy
Jim Brandenburg
Jeff Charbonnet
Elayne Colón

Suzy Colvin
Tom Dana
Catherine Emihovich
Whitney Shadowens
Theresa Vernetson

Review Minutes from Previous Meeting

Tom passed out the minutes from the last meeting and asked members of the group to send any changes to Whitney (whit717@coe.ufl.edu).

Preliminary Results of NCATE/DOE Review and Site Visit (February 7-9, 2010)

Tom and Elayne described the successful NCATE/DOE site visit and thanked everyone for their contributions. Catherine announced that our NCATE Unit accreditation has been officially continued through the Unit Accreditation Board. Regarding NCATE feedback, no weaknesses were identified and strengths were noted in four of the six standards (Standards 1, 3, 4, and 5). The College has not yet received the final DOE report as it is still waiting for further review in Tallahassee. However, at the exit interview at the culmination of the site visit, the DOE team chair reported continued approval of all programs.

A handout was passed around that shows the DOE's feedback from their visit. DOE reviews each program area that leads to certification. Green represents that we met the standard. Yellow means that these areas need improvement. Five strengths were identified. Some of the areas marked as needing improvement are:

- Standard 1: ESOL placements which Tom, Elayne, and Theresa were aware of before the visit but did not have time to implement a full plan. Buffy explained that it was more of a record keeping issue as there was no one person monitoring it as well as should have been. However, since then, a system has been put in place to address this issue.
- Standard 2: There were not explicit procedures in place for providing assistance to students admitted under the 10% waiver provision in all programs. In Music Education there was a problem with the data that showed that their admissions waiver was over 10% because they were not requiring the General Knowledge Test for admission (but students had to take it in their first semester).

- All programs did receive full approval; these are just areas of improvement. Both standard 1 and 2 are more clerical issues than problems with how the programs are run.
- Standard 3: This is an area which will be part of a long term effort. How do we document our impact on students' learning? Standard 3.5 (to have in place an overarching approach for interconnecting the various assessment tools and processes used within and across programs to ensure continuous program improvement) is something that we have done well as a college (and NCATE thought that we had done well), but DOE saw some issues with it. We have Continuous Improvement Plans in place that allow each program to look at and analyze their data and create goals for the next year. The "across" programs part is where there are weaknesses. This is a way to look for Unit wide concerns to strengthen us as a college. What are some ways to work on interconnecting across processes? Standard 3.4 (to have a plan of action in place for how the Unit will collect direct measures of candidate impact on P-12 student learning during the first year of teaching) is the most challenging and we are still working on how to do this. There is a plan of action, but the plan of action did not appear sufficient for the DOE reviewers. This deals with how to determine if our graduates show impact in their first year of teaching. Some of our data that shows their impact starts now before they graduate. We need to identify some other forms of data that can be used to evaluate new teachers other than FCAT. FCAT scores come out after we complete the employer survey.

Measuring Graduates' Impact on P-12 Student Learning

FCAT Gains

Suzy Colvin reviewed a handout that explained how impact on student achievement is measured for the Elementary Education program and other programs in the college that produce graduates teaching Reading and Math in Florida public schools. The question that pushes this discussion is: "How do graduates of UF teacher preparation programs (K-12) impact student achievement during the 1st year of teaching?"

She explained how gains and value are determined. Additionally, she showed data from Elementary Education program completers in their first year of teaching. The system is flawed. We have to learn how to work on additional ways of evaluating how our teachers are working to increase student improvement.

Graduate/Employer Satisfaction Survey

Tom and Elayne provided a copy of a survey that we send out to evaluate our graduates. These are instruments we can use to capture some information about Impact on P-12 learning. We have had some committees of faculty looking at these surveys to create new or improved questions to address graduate Impact on P-12 learning.

The survey is sent to graduates and their respective employers in Florida public schools at the end of May during their first year in the field. One survey is completed by the employer and one is completed by the graduate. This is the latest draft (since changes have been implemented) and Tom and Elayne asked for thoughts and impressions. Some of the language has been infused to include evaluating Impact on P-12. The newest addition is section III which asks the employer to identify the kinds of

assessments he/she had in mind when he/she answered the other questions on the survey. What might be missing from this list that should be considered? Jeff mentioned that end of course exams and standardized test data would be difficult to monitor for first year students as these data have not come in yet. Buffy suggested clustering similar items to avoid confusion. There are new standards and assessments for “grading” high schools being implemented such as: Graduation Data, Participation and Performance on AP, IB, Charter; Performance on SAT and ACT; and others. These might be able to be implemented as part of understanding our graduates Impact on P-12 learning.

ACTION ITEM: As you reflect on today’s discussion, please share insights with us so that we can develop ways to work together to serve each other’s needs around this kind of data. We need to work together. How do we want to think about the way that we define data? We need suggestions that help us think about program improvement.

The next meeting will be late in the fall semester. Whitney will send out dates soon. Thank you for attending and for your assistance in continuing to improve our education program.

Submitted by Whitney Shadowens on April 26, 2010.