**Fall, 2012 Course Evaluation Summary**

**EDU 316: Required junior-level course**

Kay Williams, Associate Professor

Preface

Course sessions were observed by Jonathan Dee, Debbie Hanson, and Bill Bettler during the term as I prepared for an FEC review. At the end of this term, Jonathan decided to leave Hanover College, which then had me on special assignment to continue Jonathan’s administrative work. The student comments for this EDU 316 cohort were more negative than previous year, but tallies are more positive. I had determined that this cohort of juniors were the best, most responsive group that I can remember ever having. Given some serious negative feedback, I asked three department colleagues to interview candidates from this course. Three faculty each interviewed a candidate for more feedback.

Amount learned: exceptional 111

 a lot 1111

n=11 average 1111

 little

 nothing

Interest: decreased remains the same increased

 1111111 1111

Take a course from this professor again? Yes 111111111

In education there sometimes is no choice. No 1

Student Critique

Students wrote: balancing fieldwork and rubric/assignment requirements; was difficult at times to know what was expected; would have preferred more structure; did not like syllabus set up-confusing as far as when things were due; multiple versions of a unit plan was confusing; the notes were really confusing—not explained well; harsh email about being absent; there was a student who arrived later over an hour--viewed this as favoritism; needs to be more organized; convey her ideas better; better clarity on assignments; could be more organized; Marzano book assignments seemed repetitive; an absence or two from her class needs to be excused; scattered a lot; I never knew what to bring to class; little opportunity to take factual notes; one big opinion driven discussion; originally confusing; really complex and difficult to understand; I disliked how the notes were graded because some weeks there were less things for me to write about; confused about an assignment or what was expected of me; more explicit of expectations in the beginning would be more helpful; course was unorganized.

Most course activities were marked as effective. The pre/post assessment assignment seemed most ineffective. General concern about Marzano strategies.

Instructor Response

As with every EDU 316, there were attendance issues. Two candidates had course conflicts with other required courses in their majors. Therefore, one candidate cam to class one hour late and a second candidate left class an hour early (This course is split into two 2-hour sessions each week.) Both candidates made up the missing hour in a third session during the week. I will never agree to this arrangement again because of confusion it caused. I will offer a second session of EDU 316 for those who have schedule conflicts. I did not see it as any coursemate’s business that they should know why these two candidates arrived late or left early. I would imagine that these two candidates would have shared their dilemma with anyone who asked. Absences for any one 2-hour session is almost impossible to “make up.” I usually do not say anything about an absence; however, the person in question did not give me advanced or after-class notice about the absence. I save evidence of my actual email; it was standard and certainly not punitive in nature. And, there were no absences thereafter. Unexcused absences in community schools by teachers are not tolerated. This course is all about professional conduct. Factual notetaking was graded each week, based on reading or field experience. Student notes are a great way to catch misconceptions and confusions. I highlighted portions of their notes each week to share in large group. All notes were analytic or synthesis, rather than copying down recipes for teaching. Yes, this course is complex and teaching is complex!

Confusion about due dates for assignments results from half of the assignments being contingent upon the work candidates can do in the community school classroom. Therefore, the due dates on my syllabus are tentative, and we talk about this at the beginning of the class. I do not want to penalize candidates when there are snow days, fire drills, a substitute teacher, or testing days in the classrooms where my candidates had other plans.

It was explained in one-to-one interviews that have all assignment rubrics in the syllabus made the course overwhelming at the onset. Sorting through seven or eight assignments and rubrics was confusing. I think candidates do need more structure and control over material per session than what I provided. I placed their comprehensive syllabus in a small three-ring binder. For each reading or handout that I provided thereafter, I asked that that be placed in the binder. Weekly notes were electronic or handwritten and all in one record (spiral, electronic form). Each set of notes had to be dated.

The concepts that I teach are NOT based on a traditional way of organizing for teaching. Teaching experts, Wiggins and McTighe, assume that all content and learning tasks should be worthy, can be connected to a larger, more universal idea, and support understanding beyond rote memory and recitation. Therefore, I teach EDU 316 with the same assumption. I allow my candidates to critique tasks and reading for what makes sense to them and what does not. The big ideas and tasks we try to apply in a real classroom situation. One candidate noted that I needed to lecture more; I think I need to slow down and demonstrate and lecture more often. Colleagues who observed said that I was very organized; I think candidates did not like having so much material and field experience to think about all at once. Teaching requires organization that I am not sure my candidates understand. During my class, candidates sometimes need table space to spread their work out alongside supporting material. I personally find teaching very difficult to do in the way of compartments, chapters, discrete sets. I also think that I need more concrete examples for concepts or processes. For example, I begin the course with a story about a seeming expert archer. We can see that she is expert because her arrows are in the bulls-eye every time. From a passerby’s point of view, she understands and has mastered archery. However, upon asking her to show us her technique, she calmly shoots her arrow, takes a piece of chalk, and draws a circle around the point where arrow hits the fence. Asking her to perform was the best means to see what she really understands. I refer to this story and an illustration of the fence as we work through figuring out Wiggins and McTighe’s backward design for planning lessons.

The eleven candidates in EDU 316 were assigned to four different schools in the Fall term. They were preparing to teach mathematics, health and physical education, art, English language arts, biology, and Spanish. Therefore, not all material that they worked with looked the same. Not all classrooms they practice taught in looked or operated in the same way. Not all assignments were going to look the same. Preparing to teach art is somewhat different from preparing to teach Spanish. One candidate found this differentiation to be weird, stressful. However, all eleven candidates experienced each others’ perspectives about art, language arts, Spanish acquisition, physical education, and more. For example, our mathematician did not understand why he was asked to read and take notes so much—you presumably don’t have to read in mathematics? His English peers were pleased to see him eventually turn that attitude around. Each of eleven participants also set two personal goals for the term related to teaching. Their goals are attached. Obviously, not all goals are the same.

Below is a curriculum and assessment map for this course that I recently developed as part of the Fall 2013 course.

**EDU 316 Curriculum Map**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overview** | **Understanding by Design****Wiggins & McTighe** | **Tools for Teaching****Jones** | **The Art & Science of Teaching Marzano** | **Field Experience: Real Life Professional Development** |
| HC Decision Points | Planning lessons & units | Classroom management system | Researched teaching strategies; integrate technologies | Agreement about professional behavior |
| HC Portfolio Documents | Six principles of design | Creating independent learners | Choosing action steps | Records check |
| Circular Model | Three stages of design | Classroom structure | Pre & post assessment; track student progress | 30 hours of professional development |
| Accreditation and Conceptual Framework | Student standards/objectives; Common Core | Producing responsible behavior and setting limits | Annotated seating chart | Practice teaching feedback |
| Professor Search | Assessment Plan and data literacy | Teacher’s time management | Engaging students | Disposition feedback |
| Integrating technologies and Promethean Board |  |  | Procedures and rules toward classroom management | Connecting theory to practice and self-evaluation |
| Response to Intervention: Communication of high expectations for all students | Transfer of learning and understanding via facets of understanding |  | Communication of high expectations; celebrate success! | Setting goals for students and yourself |
| Differentiated Instruction, candidate choices |  |  |  |  |
| National teacher standards | Teacher competency |  |  |  |
| Professional dispositions |  |  |  | !!! |

**Candidate Assessment Plan**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment** | **Standards/Curriculum Portfolio Documentation** | **Weight** | **Due Date** |
| Annotated seating chart | Marzano, RTI, field experience INTASC #2 | x2 |  |
| One formal lesson plan, analysis, and response to feedback | Wiggins & McTighe, Jones, Marzano, field experience INTASC #7 or #9 | x3 |  |
| One unit plan | Wiggins & McTighe, Jones, Marzano, field experience INTASC #7 | x4 |  |
| Course attendance and weekly questions | Professional disposition, critical reflection INTASC #9 | 1 |  |
| Collaborative inquiry project | Marzano, Jones, field experience INTASC #4 | x2 |  |
| Pre/post assessment | Marzano, Wiggins & McTighe, field experience INTASC #8 | x2 |  |
| Completion of field experience (effort) | Marzano, field experience  | 1 |  |
| Oral response to essential questions | Wiggins & McTighe, Marzano, Jones, field experience INTASC #5 or #9 | 2 |  |
| **Course grade** | **Based on 8 assignments** | **17 scores** |  |
| **EXTRA CREDIT**  | Weekly one-page journal open response to any ofthe course essential questions INTASC #9 | 1 A |  |