

**Education Department Meeting Workdays**  
**Model Classroom LBH 159**  
**May 17-18, 2011**  
**9 am to 3 pm**

Present: Dr. Peace, Dr. Worfel, Dr. Steury, Dr. Priddy, Dr. Burson, Kathy Rhodes, and Beth West

**Tuesday, May 17, 2011**

1. Dr. Peace began the meeting with prayer.
  
2. Dr. Peace went over the schedule for the workdays. He noted that there were some unavoidable conflicts for Dr. Steury today from 10 – 12 and tomorrow from 11 – 12. Dr. Priddy will need to leave on Wednesday at 1:45 and Dr. Burson also indicated that she has an appointment at 3 pm on Wednesday. Dr. Worfel indicated that the reports for multicultural, program, and biennial have not been processed yet and therefore can be removed from the agenda. Most of the time will be spent on TWS, Lesson Evaluation Form, portfolio, and checkpoints and assessments.
  
3. Dr. Peace received an email from Marg Mast on May 2, 2011 regarding faculty members involved with pre-service teacher reading preparation. We had talked about this at our last meeting but no decision was made. They are having a Webinar on September 14 and a workshop on October 21. Every school is required to send at least one person. Dr. Peace noted that it would be to our benefit to send more than one person. He indicated that this would primarily be for those who have input for elementary education reading and also RTI, and reading preparation for special needs students. Dr. Peace suggested that Dr.'s Priddy, Steury, and Burson attend. Dr. Burson shared her concern with being out of the classroom for several days since she will also have KDP convocation the next week. Dr. Peace will make 3 reservations for the seminar on Friday, October 21 and indicated that we could cancel, if needed.

Dr. Worfel indicated that we still need individual assignment grades for the junior methods courses (units and lesson plans for reading, science, language arts, and social studies). Dr. Burson asked if grades were needed for early childhood. Dr. Worfel indicated that we could use those as well. Dr. Priddy asked Dr. Worfel when this information was needed. His reply was, "as soon as possible" in order to get the grades recorded for the SPA.

4. Teacher Work Sample:
  - General Discussion on overall submissions
  - Specific critique and discussion
    - Initial guidebook and suggested improvements (i.e., timeline etc.)
    - Rubric and suggested improvements
    - Suggestions for and posting of exemplars (i.e. e-file and annotated)

Department members shared in discussion on the overall submission of the TWS. Dr. Burson reported that she thought it was difficult for students to get started, but once started, they found the process to be beneficial. Dr. Burson suggested having incremental instruction for different sections so that those students who are less independent would benefit. Kathy Rhodes reported that she had a student who thought the TWS was an awful lot of work. Dr. Worfel reported that five out of six of his TWS were excellent. He indicated that the student's reflections were very positive. Dr. Steury reported that her students did very well and she received positive comments from them. She stressed the point that even though the TWS is a lot of work, it will be viewed as an important piece of the student's portfolio when talking to an administrator. Dr. Steury thanked Dr. Worfel for all his work in putting the TWS together. Dr. Worfel asked for suggestions for posting exemplars and goals. Discussion ensued. Dr. Peace suggested that students make a mini portfolio to leave with administrators when interviewing for a teaching position. Dr. Steury suggested making this a topics and problems assignment. Dr. Worfel provided a handout for department members regarding Section 3, General Advice for Completing the TWS (attached). Suggestions for corrections were marked. Members looked at the Suggested Schedule for TWS. A suggestion that we include a paragraph for Special Education students at the bottom of the page as follows:

\*If you are starting your special education placement first, please complete the items in Week #1, prior to starting your second seven-week placement.

Dr. Worfel asked that members bring their TWS guidebook and rubrics to the meeting this afternoon.

5. Joni Schmalzried Update: Dr. Peace informed department members that Joni Schmalzried has agreed to join our staff on a part-time basis. Joni will have office hours and advise our Special Education students.
6. 2011-2012 Calendar Items: See attached. Dr. Peace will not be here for freshman orientation and asked that we have at least 3 faculty members here. Dr's. Worfel and Priddy will be here to help. He also asked Kathy Rhodes if she would be able to be here. Beth will follow-up with Dr. Steury to see if she is available as well.
7. Program Completer Survey: Beth reported that many students did not complete the online survey last year. A decision was made to provide a self addressed stamped envelope along with the hard-copy of the survey and the option of completing it online.
8. Criminal Background checks for Student Teachers: Beth has received information from Certified Background regarding the criminal history checks. Kathy reported that some of our students have had to register for an extended criminal history check depending on the school corporation where they are placed. Currently, Whitley County and Marion County schools require the extended version which costs students an additional \$40 - \$45. Dr. Worfel asked if our junior block students would need to have a criminal history check done. At this point, it's just required for student teaching. Beth will follow-up with Certified Background to see what the cost of a minimum package would be. Dr. Peace will check with Tom Ayers to see if part of the student teaching fee (which is paid in addition to tuition) could be applied towards the criminal background check. Beth indicated that the nursing program is using Certified Background for their checks.
9. ED 320: Kathy Rhodes questioned whether or not there should be a field experience description included in the catalog for ED320. Dr. Peace indicated that updates to the catalog have already been completed for this next academic year. Dr. Worfel and Kathy discussed the possibility of ED320 field placements at HNHS New Tech.
10. TEP Applicants: We had 5 students who received acceptance letters since they met the criteria for the new licensing rules that went into effect May 10, 2011. Sarah Stine, Audrey Trout, Lindsey Karst, Emilie Jamison, and Candice James were all accepted with cumulative PPST scores of 527 or above. Beth indicated that Nathan Dracht was also previously deferred because of PPST scores and now meets the new criteria with a cumulative score of 529. Dr. Worfel made a motion to accept Nathan and Dr. Burson seconded. Department members all agreed and the motion carried. Megan Piper (Chelsey Piper's older sister) will be transferring here in the fall. Megan has an ACT score of 24 which meets the new licensing criteria waiving the Praxis I tests. Dr. Peace motioned to accept Megan and noted that her registration for the courses assigned would depend on her successful completion of Educational Psychology and Introduction to Education this summer. Dr. Worfel seconded. Motion carried.
11. M. Ed. Applicant: Beth presented M. Ed. applicant, Matthew Stephenson, for acceptance into the M. Ed. program. Matt is a teacher at HNHS and is seeking his master's degree in adolescent and young adult education – mathematics. Matt's application is waiting a signature from Dr. Holtrop for the GRE waiver. Dr. Peace motioned to accept Matthew based upon Dr. Holtrop's signature. Dr. Worfel, seconded. Motion carried.
12. Lesson Evaluation Form: Dr. Worfel reported that our lesson evaluation form is not aligned with the new INTASC principles. Department members agreed to use the new INTASC principles and upgrade the lesson evaluation to include the change in language. Discussion ensued. Dr. Worfel will provide a draft form with the appropriate changes for Wednesday meeting.
13. Teacher Work Sample Con't: Dr. Worfel asked if we wanted to change the due date of the TWS. It is currently due the last day (Friday) of the semester. Discussion ensued and a decision was made to change the due date to the Friday before the last week of class.

Dr. Worfel asked for any changes to the format for the TWS. Suggestions were:

- No page protectors
- Use a 3-ring notebook
- 25 – 35 pages in length
- Should professional writing be a part of the TWS
- Follow the format for organization
- Presentation
- Standards

The TWS rubric was reviewed. Dr. Worfel indicated that he is looking for an elementary exemplar to put in the guidebook. Discussion ensued regarding the distribution of points. Dr. Worfel will make adjustments and upgrade the guidebook.

14. NCATE: Dr. Worfel gave a brief update on the time-line for the NCATE visit.

- Time-line update – SPA data input by end of June
- Electronic Exhibit Room – A priority for this summer
- Institutional Report – September 2012

#### **DEPARTMENT WORKDAY – WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 2011**

15. Lesson Evaluation Form Follow-up: Dr. Worfel handed out the lesson evaluation components (INTASC standards). The first standard indicated with a single number is the INTASC standard brief description. Each of the new standards has been revised, some more extensively than others and are indicated with a number followed by A (i.e., 1A, etc.). Components 4A, 10A, & 13 A are added to the INTASC standards. The candidate... is assumed for each component which starts with a verb. (attached)

Department members took the first 10 minutes to read through the standard and suggested the following changes.

1A: Okay as is

2A: Learning Differences: designs, adapts, and delivers instruction to address students' diverse learning strengths and needs.

3A: Learning Environments: Creates an environment that supports individual and collaborative learning, positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

4A: Classroom Management: communicates and maintains appropriate expectations for a variety of learning experiences.

5A: Content Knowledge and Skills: demonstrates understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches.

6A: Innovative Applications of Content: connects concepts and uses differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving.

7A: Assessment: uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, monitor progress, and guide instructional decision making.

8A: Planning for Instruction: organizes standards based learning experiences in a logical sequence designed to support students in rigorous learning goals.

9A: Okay as is

10A: Communication Skill: models and uses appropriate communication skills and presence (verbal, non-verbal, media) to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction.

11A: Reflection & Continuous Growth: uses evidence to evaluate instructional choices and adapts practice to meet the needs of learners.

12A: Collaboration: demonstrates respectful and productive relationships with supervising teachers and other colleagues.

13A: Okay as is

Qualifiers: Department members reviewed the rating qualifiers for the lesson evaluation and the following changes were made:

Exemplary = Demonstrates skills of beginning professional  
Commendable = Approaching skills of beginning professional  
Acceptable = Meets the expectations of this field experience  
Needs Improvement = Does not meet expectations  
Not Acceptable = Significant problems  
Not Observed

Dr. Worfel will put a rough draft together for the department's review (attached).

16. Dispositional Survey: Dr. Worfel discussed with department members, changes for the dispositional survey suggested by cooperating teachers during the Spring TEPAC brunch. The following changes were made to the descriptors:

Responsibility – The candidate arrives on time and is prepared. Any changes are mutually agreed upon ahead of time.

Communication – The candidate maintains ongoing communication that is productive and timely.

Responsiveness – The candidate is responsive to requests and suggestions from cooperating teacher and/or university supervisor.

Fairness – The candidate works with all students in a positive manner. There is no evidence of favoritism or bias.

Flexibility – The candidate adapts to the instructional needs of students and makes adjustments as necessary.

Professionalism – The candidate is professional in speech, dress, written communication, and deportment.

Initiative – The candidate takes advantage of opportunities to grow and participate.

The dispositional ratings were also discussed. We currently have the following rating scale:

1. Always
2. Most of the Time
3. Needs Improvement
4. Not Applicable

The following changes were suggested by department members:

1. Always
2. Usually
3. Sometimes
4. Rarely
5. Never
6. Not applicable

It was also suggested, rather than ratings, to set up a rubric for scoring using the criteria as the highest level in the rubric.

17. Addition to Teacher Education Candidate Handbook: Dr. Worfel presented an addition to the Teacher Education Candidate Handbook for a dispositional hearing.

Rationale: It is clear from cooperating schools that there is little to no patience for candidate dispositions that are not appropriate for early field experiences or student teaching. Early intervention regarding identification of and ongoing monitoring of dispositions requires specific policy that includes a paper trail which, in the end, will benefit the candidate, school of education and its partner schools.

The paragraph will be added to page 9 after "Advising" in the candidate handbook. It was also suggested to add this to the student teaching handbook, catalog, and all syllabi as well.

Dispositional Hearing:

Each candidate is subject to a dispositional hearing for any class or field placement. The purpose of this hearing is to share concerns that have been raised by feedback from the dispositional survey, university supervisor, cooperating teaching, or university faculty. This hearing will be conducted by the appropriate professional personnel. Specific dispositional concerns will be documented along with a plan to monitor these concerns.

18. Checkpoint & Assessment: Dr. Worfel presented the checkpoints as edited with the removal of checkpoint #4. He clarified some of the assignments that have been done in checkpoint #3. Dr. Priddy shared her concern regarding the reflective portfolio being out of the checkpoints until the final review. Discussion ensued regarding the checkpoint verification and what "adequate" means. Criteria options were reviewed by members of the department. Suggestions for checkpoint 1 were:

Resume\* - adequate writing skills, no more than 2 errors, appropriate information and format.

Autobiography – add good writing skills are displayed

Diversity Statement – add ethnic, racial, etc.

GPA – OK

Recommendations from Faculty or staff – Change INTASC principles to INTASC standards.

Pre-Professional Skills Tests – remove CBT, add (or equivalent score/SAT 1100/ACT 24 or cumulative 527); checkpoint verification – change to requirement met

Interview – need to indicate a passing score for the program interview. A Suggestion was made to add a numeric value to the rubric and a total column. Passing score of 15 was set for the interview rubric. The criteria wording was changed to a the word "at" before the word "dispositions".

Checkpoint #2:

Updated – Resume\* - add error-free to criteria

Autobiography\* - remove the asterisk

Philosophy Statement\* - remove the word adequate, add error-free to criteria

Spec. Ed. Phil. State.\* - add error-free to criteria

Application for Stud. Teach – remove this column

Program Good Standing – OK

Sophomore Practicum - add categories from dispositional survey

Dispositions – Add this event – criteria; appropriate responses to identified weakness; checkpoint verification; adequately responded, inadequately responded, failed to respond

Checkpoint #3: Suggested to put this form in student teaching supervisor folders

Student Teaching Journal – assumed adequate unless marked inadequate

Teaching of Lessons during student teaching – OK

Student Teaching mid-term evaluation – change criteria to read; Acceptable or above average in the evaluation components (INTASC aligned)

Student Teaching Final Evaluation – OK

Teacher Work Sample – Checkpoint verification, add C+ or above

Reflective Portfolio – Checkpoint verification, add C+ or above

Special Education – OK

Dispositions – Add this event; criteria to be; appropriate response to identified weakness. checkpoint verification; adequately responded, inadequately responded, failed to respond

19. Portfolio (Reflective)

- When and where is the portfolio in the overall “checkpoint” system
- Need for diversity reflection section
- Suggestions for and posting of exemplars (i.e., e-file and annotated)

Kathy Rhodes suggested that the Diversity reflection section should go in Section VII – Guidelines for Portfolio Construction and the reflective self evaluation under introduction (page 34 in Student Teaching Handbook).

- Resume
- Philosophy of Education
- Philosophy of Special Education
- Diversity Statement
- Classroom Management Plan

20. Reports:

- Multicultural
- Program
- Biennial

Not available at this time.

Meeting adjourned.

Beth West  
Secretary