CEAC MEETING
November 6, 2008
Minutes

The CEAC meeting was called to order at 10 AM on Nov. 6, 2008.

Attending were: Andrea Shearer, Becky Morsefield, Bette Brooks, Hilda Pettit, Janice Hutchison, Joann Smith, Karl Uhrig, Michael Mikusa, Nancy Barbour, Trish Koontz, Wendy Bedrosian, Vickie Ellison, Joanne Arhar and Sandy Rich.

Dr. Arhar shared with the committee that the Professional Education Coordinators meeting is scheduled for this Friday, Nov. 7, and she hoped to have the CEAC send forth recommendations for program improvements based on Standard 3. She said that the PEC is very interested in CEAC recommendations. She is also planning to take the CEAC recommendations to the Dean for further discussion.

The first agenda item was a review of questions likely to be raised by the visiting NCATE team.

1.   The first question, "Can you guarantee that every candidate has a diverse experience?" generated a discussion of what definition of diversity is used by the university and EHHS and how, or if, the ODE measures diversity in the same manner. (We use the ODE definition/categories in selecting field experiences.

The definition of diversity is stated in the Undergraduate Catalogue:

In accordance with the conceptual framework that explicitly values diversity in teacher preparation, teacher candidates are required to participate in field experiences and clinical practice within the partnership districts. These experiences include working with students with exceptionalities and students from diverse backgrounds, including, but not limited to, students with ethnic, racial, gender, linguistic and socioeconomic differences. Experiences with diversity are linked to course-related field experiences.

After much discussion, the consensus was that ODE measurements and EHHS definitions are not the same. The ODE categories are based more on SES and less on other categories from the EHHS definition. Sandy Rich said that she could almost guarantee that each candidate had experiences in diverse settings but that the system for providing evidence of this is not yet in place but plans include the creation of an on-line data base to track each student's experiences over the course of his/her program. Currently we rely on the student teaching card in which candidates list their field experiences and bring to the clinical field experience office when applying for student teaching. Another concern was summarized thus: candidates do have experiences in schools with a diversity of learners, but may not have specific experiences with a diversity of learners.

Recommendation 1: Develop a category system for rating schools that matches our definition of diversity.
Recommendation 2: Develop an on-line system to enter the school where field experiences and student teaching are located that takes into account the category system.

2.   The second question, "What evidence do you have that ___x____ assessment is used to improve the program generated the following list of changes that have resulted from review of data in the Disposition Assessment, Midterm Student Teaching Evaluation, and Summative Student Teaching Evaluation.

- Student teaching evaluation was changed to include a section on technology

- A change in mid-term evaluation date during student teaching from 10th week to 7th week to allow time for professional disposition plan and resulting improvement in candidate performance.
- Supervisors were told to do a disposition assessment as early as possible during student teaching as possible to give candidates more time for improvement.
- New eligibility checks notify candidates earlier to correct negative dispositions
- The format of student teaching meetings has changed and candidates receive information much earlier about the requirements to be eligible for student teaching.

There was discussion about whether the application for student teaching should be changed from one year prior to student teaching to one semester prior. The rationale for the change was that audits could be done closer to the student teaching, but the counter argument was that there would be less time for candidates to make needed changes. Further discussion is merited. The point was also raised of whether faculty members should have access to view dispositions and further discussion is needed because of privacy of student records. A request was also made to have the program coordinator notified each time a faculty members give a student a "needs improvement" grade.

Recommendation 3: An e-mail should be sent to the coordinator each time a candidate in her program receives a Needs Improvement.

Recommendation 4: Further discussion is needed about the question: "In order to maximize the potential for student success, who needs access to data ?"

3. Question three, "Qualifications? And who/how monitors the quality of clinical/field faculty was answered through a review of criteria for clinical faculty. (Handout labeled 3.3 Criteria for Clinical Faculty distributed at the meeting).

With regard to qualification of the **University Supervisor**, changes made based on analysis of data include: Working more closely with faculty to ensure that supervisors have experience in the area of supervision. It was estimated that less than 2% of supervisors do not have experience in their area of supervision and these must be approved by the program coordinator.

The group then discussed whether all supervisors should be required to have current certifications. Some supervisors certificates have expired because they are retired from teaching. A proposal was that:

Recommendation 5: Further discussion is needed about the professional development of university supervisors. We could require coursework/workshops but the cost may be prohibitive for those whose salaries are already low. Or we could require that applicants have a current certificate/license.

Recommendation 6: Faculty with support of Director actively recruit more supervisors for specific content areas to ensure close matches with areas of supervision. Creative solutions are needed to resolve the problem of lack of qualified supervisors for foreign languages and perhaps the ODE could be involved or fluent speakers of other languages could be paired with a pedagogy expert.

The discussion moved to the evaluation of supervisors. Both cooperating teachers and students evaluate supervisors, further ensuring a good match but this information is not yet shared with CEAC.

Recommendation 7: The director of Clinical Experiences needs a secretary to develop and monitor a database   with the results of these evaluations.

With regard to **Cooperating Teachers**, their experience and qualifications can be checked through school report cards. A committee discussion revealed that some teachers remain unqualified to teach in their specific areas (e.g. math) but that Kent State does not use them. Particularly challenging is finding cooperating teachers in the area of foreign languages.

Recommendation 8: Further discussion is needed about whether or not candidates should evaluate cooperating teachers.

4. With regard to question four, "What proficiencies do your students demonstrate with regard to diverse learners?" the following assessments look at diversity: TWS, Domain A, Student Teaching Assessment and Praxis III, TQP, Survey/Interviews with principals. Exhibit 1.4g shows the relationship between outcomes from the Conceptual Framework and candidate performance as measured in the unit assessments. Candidates perform well on the assessments, but principals indicate that while candidates have the foundational knowledge, they do not always know how to put their knowledge of diversity and differentiation into practice.

The following was recommended:

> **Look more carefully at field experiences and preparation for long range success**.

5. Question five, "How do you know that every candidate has the disposition that "all students can learn?" the responses included:

   Beginning this fall, dispositions will be more specific
   Same responses as for question 4, "
   Joanne's table – 1.4G in the NCATE report

6. Question six, "What happens when a student fails a key assessment?" was answered through the following:

   If student fails the Praxis II, a different program may be recommended
   The disposition gives students an opportunity to correct deficiencies
   Mid-term Student Teaching Evaluation offers an opportunity for improvement
   Students who are unsuccessful in the classroom may be successful in Educational Studies.

Nancy Barbour asked that the questions with a summary the notes be shared with the larger EHHS group.

Next, Dr. Arhar asked the committee to review exhibit 3.5 which lists the field/clinical hours for each program and to make some observations. The area that was noted by many was the differences in number of hours in the field, number of placements, and the differences in the number of weeks of student teaching. These differences have financial implications and equity implications. This is combination with the challenge of finding placements requires that something be done. When one program has a larger number of placements that detracts from the ability to use those placements for other programs. The consensus was that we need:

   Quality placements that provide candidates the opportunity to work with a diversity of learners
   Partnerships with schools
   Connections to KSU alumni in teaching positions
   Greater opportunities in diverse environments (urban areas)

Recommendation 9: Develop a plan to provide *all* candidates with high quality placements in a diversity of settings and with a diversity of learners. **The plan should take into consideration the financial consideration of the number of placements per program and equity of opportunities for all candidates.**

The meeting ended at 12:10 PM.

Notes by Hilda Pettit.