

School of Education and Counseling
Teacher Preparation Assessment Committee Meeting

September 19, 2007

9:00-11:00 AM

Present: Tony Koyzis, Phyllis Spethman, Carolyn Linster, Bob Sweetland, Tim Sharer, Jim Curtiss, Sue Sydow

Review of Rule 24 Workshops

Tim said that he has been invited to some department meetings to explain the Rule 24 in more detail.

Tony said the secondary education faculty are asking for a prescription of how to complete the process—we should give it to them. For example: just narrow to 5 key assessments, stop making it so complicated and wasting so much time.

EDU 400/409 classes were discussed.

Tim has followed up with Todd Young. He will also email an offer to other departments to work w/ them.

There was too much discussion and massive confusion at the workshops.

There were approximately 10 people at the Friday workshop. Some departments were not represented at either workshops.

Teacher work samples were discussed. What is a teacher work sample?

One idea:

1. Unit plan/ unit plan assessment
2. Pre-assessment/post assessment
3. Narrative to explain experience (reflection)

Need to meet w/ content faculty to see what they are doing. Do they use teacher work samples?

Should the October workshop be by school rather than a big group?

We need a schedule w/ deadlines.

If a teacher sample is not available a summary could be used instead. A reflective narrative is a start. Eventually there could be more—a whole work sample.

Right now for student teaching only data has been added—no work samples. We need to have things created while student teaching. Phyllis has surveyed faculty and they reported back that students do not know how to do a teacher work sample.

A teacher work sample must be defined before faculty can be surveyed. Should it be a capstone work sample or do we want to show progression?

A work sample is like a “commercial” for the teacher. Showing an example of their work.

Where would a student learn how to do a teacher work sample? Where is it taught?

Bob suggested using samples from the Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality. Their website is www.uni.edu/itq. We need to be sure to allow for creativity. Unit plans are universal, maybe that is a good starting point.

Phyllis suggested doing a questionnaire to faculty teaching methods courses to see what they are currently doing. Tim will do this. It will be emailed to methods teachers across campus and possibly others who teach upper level education courses.

The 3rd column of the Rule 24 matrix (Assessment activities) should be the focus right now. Possibly use grades plus one other item.

Phyllis suggested that we ask Marge Harouff from NDE to visit with the group in October while she is on campus for other meetings. Maybe the process can be simplified. The group can ask her to clarify how the extra columns in the matrix relate to the folio and key assessments. Also, Midland has their review in October.

Tony spoke about how TEAC will change our key assessments. He appreciates that TEAC does not use disposition as an evaluation category.

There was discussion regarding the EECIA test and how it is used differently by other institutions.

Bob suggested at the next meeting the group work on the mapping of the key assessments.

Phyllis will contact Marge H. about meeting with the group. Tim will gather information in preparation of doing the survey to content methods faculty—but will not do the survey yet.

Respectfully submitted,
Tama Kastrup