

Education Department Winter Retreat Minutes
Thursday, December 20, 2012 @ 10:00am to 4:00pm

Kay's notes SHADED

Item	Discussion	Decision
1. Approval of Nov. 20 meeting minutes	November 20 and December 10 minutes are on the Shared Drive.	Both were approved this date.
2. Preparing for Jonathan's exit from the department.	<p>Division of tasks: Licensing: Kay Student Teaching Coordination: Kay Reporting: Kay PassPort - Kay Social Studies Methods: TBA (Jenny Nigg/Chris Johnson?) Courses: Joyce: EDÜ 230 WI/SP (Supervising Koon) and helping with 221 (Debbie) Spicer Phillips Coordinator: Laurie (via Jennifer Shelley) *can find balance/holds via M. Rubino Attending DoE/IACTE meetings and webinars: Kay Documents and Website: Joe Lackner/Cheryl</p>	<p>Jonathan reviewed his status report with us and prioritized tasks ahead. Cheryl has copy of Jonathan's electronic documents and also hard copy items are organized in his office.</p> <p>Kay had previously sent a timeline and assignments document (pink) that we worked through and updated. Also see agenda item 10.</p>
2. PassPort requirements (Kay/All)	<p>Kay had a document of items for PassPort questions that need answered.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Budget advance payment to begin agreement (cuts through two budget years??) Curriculum changed to include 221 prerequisite Assessment of fee of \$38 for all candidates in 2013-14 	<p>Assessed a fee of \$38 yearly beginning in Fall 2013</p> <p>*Will revisit at first department meeting in January to decide upon rubrics, and starting passport uploads)</p> <p>Kay will go back to Dana to ask,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Can seniors not be included in subscriptions? Their portfolios are too well developed at this point. Can junior or senior candidates upload all assignments after the fact? 60 candidate subscriptions will need to be changed to 40

		<p>as an estimate if seniors are not included.</p> <p>The Department prefers to work with EDU 201 Juniors in Winter, 2013 toward hard-copy portfolio. EDU 101 and 201 in the future would transition all others to PassPort. Can the Department ask Administration for a loan in the EDU budget to cover initial PassPort subscriptions in August, 2013? This would then be reimbursed from student fees.</p>
3. iPad/Building Policy Final Draft (Cheryl/All)	Security and protective cases	Tabled for today
4. PrePost Test (Jonathan)	<p>Per Jonathan's document (see attachment) 85% met target compared to last year's 63%</p> <p>Some did not stick to 1 page requirement...</p> <p>Need student objectives added to procedures as it is in rubric.</p> <p>Only had two that had to re-do this as directions were not followed. Debbie said that the lesson series analysis is being made a smaller document so may align better with the briefer analysis format.</p>	<p>For some secondary* there is a content specific format already in ST binder.</p> <p>*Health, PE, Social Studies,</p> <p>Recommendations included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Coach candidates to align with student objectives/standards 2) Take more time in training adjunct supervisors 3) Keep a record of seniors who were asked to re-do this assignment (1?) <p>Continue to reinforce assignment in student teaching seminar</p>
5. Diversity Update (Laurie)		Tabled
6. Decision Point 2 (Debbie)	Spring 2012 interview reviews (on screen)	<p>Recommendations included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) See if there are similar patterns between this data and student teaching evaluations <p>Address classroom management in EDU 201</p>
7. Practice Teaching (Kay)		Did not discuss further
8. Portfolio (Kay)		Did not discuss further

<p>9. ST Evaluations data (Jonathan)</p>	<p>Evaluations from principals, student teacher mentors, and from the student teachers themselves.</p> <p>Mentors would like to give the students a better solo experience in a co-teaching model. Longer segments of being solo...</p> <p>Would like to see an update/journal that is formally done besides the evaluation form. Narrative type feedback...but a score does</p> <p>Condensed packet for mentor teacher responsibilities. Cheat sheet/check list type... Cheryl suggested a rubric type document for mentors (Would also document planning time, etc. for getting their professional growth points)</p>	<p>All very positive!</p> <p>Kay asked if we could survey the current student teachers to determine if they felt they were lacking in experience with this model.</p>
<p>10. NCATE Accreditation Update</p>	<p>See attached timeline document emailed from Kay.</p>	<p>Jonathan had some corrections to the dates.</p>
<p>11. ST Seminars (dates)</p>	<p>1. Technology (January 14 @ 4:00-5:30pm) LB 2. Classroom Mgmt – may Skype (January 28) DH 3. Pre Post(February 18) KW 4. Share Fair (March 7th) CT (Thursday) 5. Career Panel – first year teachers – May Skype (March 18th)</p> <p>Urban Experience March 26, 27, 28 in Cincinnati. (Laurie)</p> <p>Possible later date for mock interviews/portfolios due dates?</p>	<p>No decisions</p>
<p>12. Miscellaneous</p>		<p>Department Meetings 11 on Mondays beginning Jan. 14 (alternate 1 hour/2 hour format)</p> <p>Work on pink list/assignments</p>

**Hanover College Department of Education
Criteria for Field Work Schools**

Date of Evaluation Fall 2012 Data Summary

Name of School: _____

Standards	4 Exceeds expectations	3 Meets expectations	2 Developing	1 Unacceptable
The school represents a <i>community of learners</i> with the principal as instructional leader and teachers working as a team.	6	7	1	
The school is enthusiastic about mentoring teacher candidates.	12	2		
The school has a positive atmosphere.	8	5	1	
The school encourages “best practices” and demonstrates student achievement related to academic standards.	10	4		
The school is responsive to student diversity and promotes inclusion.	12	2		
The school offers H.C. students a diverse fieldwork experience.	9	4	1	

2 developing = Pope John, Byck

**Hanover College Department of Education
Criteria for Mentoring Teachers**

Date of Evaluation: Fall 2012 Summary Data

Name of Teacher: _____

Standards	4 Exceeds expectations	3 Meets expectations	2 Developing	1 Unacceptable
The teacher is recommended by his/her principal.	14	2		
The teacher has at least three years of teaching experience in that building.	14	2		
The teacher collaborates effectively with teacher candidates.	13	2	1	
The teacher has a positive attitude about children, about teaching, and about mentoring H.C. students.	15		1	
The teacher uses "best practice" and differentiated instruction.	10	5	1	
The teacher is committed to academic standards and to on-going assessment of student learning.	11	4	1	
The teacher addresses cultural diversity issues in his/her teaching.	10	5	1	

2012-13 Fall Feedback to Mentors and H.C. Supervisors (from student teacher)

Intro: All feedback was extremely positive. Both student teachers and cooperating mentors had nothing, but positive feedback to give in terms of the experience. After surveying the six principals I worked with (New Wash Elem., New Wash MS/HS, MCHS, SCSD2, E.O. Muncie, Pope John) all were very happy with the experiences this term, and would gladly accept student teachers in the future. Several appreciated our adaptation to changes public school policies (RISE, accountability) and began using a co-teaching model.

General Comments:

- Mention of better communication between the candidate and the supervisor, if there was an issue. Instead of mainly between the mentor and supervisor.
- Some confusion on seminar start times and dates
- “Excellent experience with both the mentor and supervisor”
- “Super organized, strong communication, very helpful.”
- “Feedback was great, and I always knew what was expected of me.”
- “On top of requirements. Provided me with a lot of helpful information and tips.
- Directed at the mentor in terms of communication about performance in the classroom – “At times was helpful, yet sometimes tone was hurtful.”
- “Joan was fantastic.”
- It is important to know all requirements prior to the first day
- “Very open to communication and kept me on track.”

Journal entries –

- “I wish I had some more feedback on my journals at the beginning of my experience.”
- “Journals were helpful”
- “I enjoyed this because now I will always be able to look back on my experiences.”
- “The journals helped me to reflect over my teaching and experiences for the week.”

Videotaping –

- “nice to be able to see myself teaching and reflect”
- “this was one of my personal favorite and it helped me a lot.”
- “I enjoyed being able to watch myself teach.”

Student teaching Seminars –

Definitely helpful -111111

Somewhat helpful -111

Not helpful

Almost always-111111111

Sometimes

Seldom

2012-13 Fall Feedback to Supervisors (from cooperating mentors)

Organization and Information Provided:

Excellent- 11111111111

Satisfactory- 11

Needs Improvement

Other

Communication between Supervisor and Mentor Teacher

Excellent- 11111111111

Satisfactory -11

Needs Improvement

Other

General Comments:

- Appreciated a better understanding of the structure for “taking over classroom instruction.”
- Suggests having more strength and weakness categories instead of the long observational form
- ****Better understanding of how to incorporate more solo teaching in a co-teaching model (this was consistent across most mentors)****
- Observation form needs to be more teacher friendly and was lengthy
- Summer orientation should be held closer to school and the information sent out before so more questions can be asked (Louisville mentor)
 - Response: Information was sent out twice (May and July) as well as the orientation happening only 2 weeks before school began.
- Would like to see a journal on the student teacher kept by the mentor
- ALL would be willing to serve as a mentor again
- “Excellent experience for the student teacher and I.”
- “I would like to see the first formal observation moved later.”
- “The first formal observation was very early.”
- “Organized, on track”
- “Some parts of the evaluation seem repetitive.”

Pre and Post Test Assessment Summary Fall 2012 Student Teachers

Observations and items to highlight:

1. Some adhered to the one page requirement, others did not. It would appear that several found difficulty staying to one page.
2. A large majority met the target range of a (3) or better, in terms of total indicators
3. The met/not met percentage is very different comparing elementary and secondary
 - a. Secondary had 100% target met.
4. Alignment to student objectives appears to be the weaker area. Upon looking at the procedure, meeting objectives is not clearly stated. It only appears in the rubric.
5. A student teaching seminar was added, which specifically addressed the pre/post-test. This could help explain the large improvement across the board.

Addressing last year's changes for improvement

1. Sync language in the rubric to language in the procedure, and make it clearer.
 - a. From looking at the narrative of each assessment, it is clear that the language is understandable and translates well from the rubric to the assessment.
2. Help students understand procedure #8
 - a. There is definite progression with this improvement from last term, more notably in the elementary data.

Suggestions for improvement:

1. Better training and guidance with this assessment to adjunct instructors or outside EDU faculty who mentor student teachers.
2. We were unable to get to this during our summer retreat. It would be helpful to determine what is met target as an entire assessment. Do candidates need a (3) on all categories, only 4?
 - a. Under certain programs, such as P.E., Health, and Social Studies, it is a requirement to get at least a 3 in every category.
3. Determine how strict the Department will be on the "one page" rule. There were definitely two students who went over one page, which then helped their scores increase.

Elementary Student Teaching Totals				
Score of 1 or Incomplete	Score of 2 or Descriptive and Limited	Score of 3 or Plausible and Insightful	Score of 4 or In-depth and Sophisticated	
No alignment with 5-12 student objectives 2	Implicit alignment with student objectives 2	Evidence of alignment with student objectives 3	Explicit explanation of student objectives met or not met	
	Addresses patterns and differences between pre and post results	Addresses strengths and weaknesses in student learning 5	Addresses patterns in individual results and for students with special needs or cultural differences 2	
	Addresses validity of pre and post test results 1	Addresses validity of the pre-post test 1	Addresses adjustments to be made in the pre-post assessments 5	
	1	3	Addresses new strategies for improving student learning for individuals, subgroups, or whole class 3	

Elementary Totals: 2 = 7%

4 = 14%

12 = 43%

10 = 36%

Total Indicators = Met/Not Met	
Total Elementary Fall 2012	Met Target: 79% Target Not Met: 21%
Total Elementary Winter 2012	Met Target: 69.2% Target Not Met: 30.8%
Total Elementary Fall 2011	Met Target: 94% Target Not Met: 6%

Secondary Student Teaching Totals				
Score of 1 or Incomplete	Score of 2 or Descriptive and Limited	Score of 3 or Plausible and Insightful	Score of 4 or In-depth and Sophisticated	
No alignment with 5-12 student objectives	Implicit alignment with student objectives	Evidence of alignment with student objectives 3	Explicit explanation of student objectives met or not met	
	Addresses patterns and differences between pre and post results	Addresses strengths and weaknesses in student learning 1	Addresses patterns in individual results and for students with special needs or cultural differences 2	
	Addresses validity of pre and post test results	Addresses validity of the pre-post test 2	Addresses adjustments to be made in the pre-post assessments 1	
		Addresses ways to adjust test, instruction, or curriculum for poor performers 1	Addresses new strategies for improving student learning for individuals, subgroups, or whole class 2	

Secondary Totals:

7 = 58.33%

5 = 41.67%

Total indicators = Met/Not Met	
Total Secondary Fall 2012	Met Target: 100% Target Not Met: 0%
Total Secondary Winter 2012	Met Target: 66.66% Target Not Met: 33.34%
Total Secondary Fall 2011	Met Target: 100% Target Not Met: 0%

Combined Secondary and Elementary Student Teaching Totals:			
Score of 1 or Incomplete	Score of 2 or Descriptive and Limited	Score of 3 or Plausible and Insightful	Score of 4 or In-depth and Sophisticated
No alignment with 5-12 student objectives 2	Implicit alignment with student objectives 2	Evidence of alignment with student objectives 6	Explicit explanation of student objectives met or not met
	Addresses patterns and differences between pre and post results	Addresses strengths and weaknesses in student learning 6	Addresses patterns in individual results and for students with special needs or cultural differences 4
	Addresses validity of pre and post test results 1	Addresses validity of the pre-post test 3	Addresses adjustments to be made in the pre-post assessments 6
	1	4	Addresses new strategies for improving student learning for individuals, subgroups, or whole class 5

Overall Totals: 2=5% 4=10% 19=47.5% 15 = 37.5%

Overall Total Fall 2012	Met Target: 85%	Target Not Met: 15%
Overall Total Winter 2012	Met Target: 68%	Target Not Met: 32%

PassPort Conversation

December 20, 2012

- A. Can we pay in advance for subscription for 60 candidates through our 2013 budget @ \$2200?
- B. Can we get a curriculum proposal for EDU 230 approved before graduation?
- C. Can we arrange for all candidates and Fall, EDU 230 be assessed \$38 subscription in Fall, 2013?
- D. What are other questions that we have about PassPort?
- E. Can we standardize SPA assessment rubrics for scores of 1, 2, 3, or 4?

Assignments Candidates Would Submit into PassPort

Example for English Language Arts Candidate:

Decision Point 1

- Copy of unofficial transcript at time of candidacy
- Copy of teacher placement exam results
- ELL paper from EDU 230
- Kidwatching paper from EDU 230

Decision Point 2

- Practice teaching rubric from mentor
- Practice teaching rubric from methods course instructor
- Interview rubric (does not exist yet)
- Survey from teacher mentor(s)
- Cross-cultural paper (rubric does not exist yet)
- COM 240 oral presentation rubric
- ENG 220 assignment (not designated yet)
- Copy of unofficial transcript

Decision Point 3

- Urban experience paper (rubric does not exist yet)
- Interdisciplinary unit and analysis of teaching and learning (rubric does not exist yet)
- Pre/post assignment
- Final student teaching evaluation

Decision Point 4

- Copy of teacher placement exam results
- Copy of teacher license??

PORTFOLIO SCORING GUIDE
 TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM - HANOVER COLLEGE
 January 2010 Abbreviated
 I. Competence: Critical Thinking (INTASC Principle 4, 6 & 8)

Criteria	Notes from Scorer	Level 2	Notes from Scorers	Level 3
Type of Thinking		* Uses a variety of instructional strategies ✓✓ * Provides some support for student self-evaluation to help them become aware of their strengths and needs ✓✓✓✓	84% 50%	* Uses a variety of instructional strategies which promote higher level thinking and problem-solving ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ * Supports student self-evaluation to help them become aware of their strengths and needs and encourages learners to set educational goals ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓
Diverse Perspectives	✓✓	* Encourages critical thinking or problem-solving by generating more than one solution or response ✓✓✓✓ * Encourages student discussion ✓✓	77% 88%	* Encourages critical thinking and problem solving by presenting diverse perspectives and representations (authors, genres, posters, languages, models, media sources, countries, etc.) ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ * Encourages student discussion about the discipline and respect for student ideas and opinions. ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ * Varies the role of teacher to include instructor, coach, audience member, participant, etc. ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓
Role of Teacher	✓	* Conducts mostly teacher-directed lessons with some role variation ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓	64%	

Criteria	Notes from Scorer	Level 2	Notes from Scorers	Level 3
Analysis of Learning	<p>✓✓</p> <p>✓✓</p> <p>✓</p>	<p>*Assessments are used to assess learning and student strengths and weaknesses ✓✓✓✓</p> <p>* Describes some resources other than classroom assessment that could be used to understand learner needs and behavior ✓✓✓✓</p> <p>* Identifies criteria for assignments and assessment tasks; tasks are evaluated and graded ✓✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>*Has provided instructional and assessment opportunities that allow some students to demonstrate that they have met the learning goals ✓✓✓✓</p>	<p>80%</p> <p>50%</p> <p>33%</p> <p>77%</p>	<p>*Varied assessments are used to assess learning and modify instruction or learning goals (present or future) ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>* Uses multiple sources of information in order to understand learner needs and behavior ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>*Communicates criteria for assignments and assessment tasks; tasks are accurately evaluated and graded; students receive helpful feedback ✓✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>* Has provided instructional and assessment opportunities that allow most students to demonstrate that they have met the learning goals ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>*Assessments are evaluated with an understanding of validity, reliability, and bias ✓✓✓✓✓✓</p>
Analysis of Assessment	<p>✓✓✓</p>	<p>* Provides some discussion or analysis related to measurement issues ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓</p>	<p>36%</p>	<p>* Uses problem-solving strategies to improve teaching practice and student learning and makes timely adjustments ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓</p>
Analysis of Teaching	<p>✓✓</p> <p>✓✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>✓✓</p>	<p>* Attempts problem-solving strategies to improve teaching practice and student learning ✓✓</p> <p>*Suggests possible direct and/or indirect relationship between teaching decisions and student learning ✓✓</p> <p>*Identifies professional resources as a teacher and learner ✓✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>* Accepts feedback from supervisors and mentor teachers ✓✓✓✓✓✓</p>	<p>91%</p> <p>95%</p> <p>45%</p> <p>51%</p>	<p>* Documents direct and/or indirect relationships between teaching decisions and student learning ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>* Participates and documents professional development ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>*Consistently uses feedback from supervisors and mentor teachers ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓</p>

Portfolio Scoring Guide Categories

Categories in Bold are department goals (see ALT Report)
August, 2011

KD	Knowledge of the discipline
TD	Teaching of the discipline
DD	Discourse about the discipline
PS	Planning based on student
PA	Planning based on assessment
PD	Planning based on discipline
IG	Instructional groups
TS	Use of time and space
C	Communication
HOTS	Type of thinking
DP	Diverse perspectives
ROLE	Roles of teacher and student
ID	Individual differences
CD	Cultural differences
CMT	Commitment to positive interaction, involvement, laws and safety
AL	Analysis of learning
AA	Analysis of assessment
AT	Analysis of teaching

Goals as reported in ALT:

Title II #1: Recruit teacher candidates interested in teaching mathematics.

Title II #2: Recruit teacher candidates interested in teaching science.

Title II #3: Increase opportunities for teacher candidates interested in special education.

Title II #4: Increase professional development in teaching English language learners.

Goal #4: EDU candidates will design learning activities and use instructional materials that extend learning related to issues of diversity. Related to Title II #3 and 4 above!

Tools for assessing: final portfolio, student teaching evaluation, lesson series or practice teaching at junior or mid-level in each program

Goal #7: EDU candidates will use varied assessment tools, support K-12 students' self-evaluation and set high expectations for all learners.

Tools for assessing: final portfolio, student teaching evaluation, lesson series or practice teaching at junior or mid-level in each program

Education Department Retreat Notes
Assessment Discussion and Related Decisions
August 15, 2006

Decisions:

1. Student teaching conferences should include an emphasis on analyzing assessments.
2. Use the example of an analysis of student learning and assessment in instruction.
3. The example is a good enough example of what product we want to see.
4. Edit page 6 of the scoring guide and work to simplify and clarify scoring guide items.
5. Add portfolio scorer's stipend/gift to budget.

Analysis of portfolio scores for 16 teacher candidates:

- The diversity categories continue to be the lower scores (below "3").
- Diverse perspectives— to see content from different perspectives, from other groups or to choose literature from diverse perspectives—I have to constantly remind candidates.
- Portfolio scores are lower this year. This year professors were not assigned to score portfolios for candidates who professors had been working intensively.
- Scores are consistent with EDU 301 and 401 candidates who had difficulty with cultural diversity, assessment, critical thinking—there was a missing link
- We should revisit foundational thinking about assessment.
- Assessment is generally not reinforced by mentors in schools.
- Are we confusing students?
- Come up with a marketing campaign once we know what we want.
- Males have lower scores.
- 75% of the candidates had raw score averages at "3" or better.

Scoring of Artifact using pages 2 and 6 of the portfolio scoring guide:

- The four of us generally agree on scores between 2 and 3.
- This student is doing good thinking which seems contrary to a 2+ score.
- Is this good enough evidence? Yes.
- Do we have to use the words in the narrative? There are consequences if we do or do not require "validity", "reliability", and "bias".
- How do we relay to our scorers and mentors the meaning behind the words? Candidates should make it easy for the scorers: Be explicit.
- Edit page 6 of the scoring guide and minimize repetitions. We should simplify the scoring guide.
- Scorers need a tangible token of thanks and input into the scoring process and scoring guide. Build this into our EDU budget.