

Professional Development: Secondary and Special Areas Methods Retreat
February 23 and 24, 2004
2:00 – 5:00

In attendance:

Organizers: Cherin Lee, Chair of Teacher Education Faculty
John Swope, Chair of Council on Teacher Education

Presenters: Victoria Robinson, Teacher Work Sample
John Henning, Teacher Work Sample
Barry Wilson, Accountability System
Julie Hieple, Accountability System
Masa Noborikawa , Accountability System

Faculty: Mary Bozik Rip Marston
Dianna Briggs Cathy Miller
Bill Broz Carol Phillips
Chad Christopher Bill Shepherd
James Davis Pat Sitlington
Lawrence Escalada Cheryl Timion
Tammy Gregersen Kay Weller
Mary Herring Leigh Zeitz
Charles Johnston
Robert Lee

Guests: Reading in the Content Area Specialist, Holmes J.H
Merrie Schroeder, Interim Associate Director of Teacher Education

Major Topics/Activities:

1. Teacher Work Sample. Drs. Robinson and Henning presented faculty with an update on where the TWS is currently being used in the professional sequence. They provided clear examples of the differences between the use of TWS at Level II and in Student Teaching. Faculty were allowed to examine student teaching TWS from students in their own content areas. Q/A session followed.

By the end of this segment, faculty suggested that they also build a set of criteria and activities for using the TWS in the methods courses, bridging between Level II and Student Teaching. Several members volunteered their names for this activity.

Faculty gained an understanding of the power of the TWS in helping teacher candidates gain knowledge and skills in assessment strategies for their own students. The need for preservice teachers to identify the evidence of their own students' learning is a major focus, and the TWS holds promise for aiding in this.

2. Reading in the Content Area. Dr. Swope provided professional development on various frameworks for assisting students in any content area with strategies for reading for understanding. Suggestions were made for helping students begin to process strategies for teaching reading in the content area when they become teachers. Q/A session allowed specific guidance in content areas. John also volunteered to assist any professor personally with this task. Faculty were given the comments from the state regarding their suggestions for including reading-in-the-content-area in the course syllabi for state approval.
3. Teacher Preparation Assessment System. Dr. Wilson shared the web page that shows the directory for obtaining the existing surveys and data available to faculty to inform program development. He then briefly discussed the events leading to the current design of the Accountability System and turned the session over to Julie Heiple and Masa Noborikawa. Together, they demonstrated the status of how the new accountability system will enable faculty to record and monitor student progress, both as instructors and advisors.

Two performance rubrics, Level II and Student Teaching, were modeled. After seeing the status of these two rubrics, faculty indicated a desire to develop a Level III rubric to capture the essential common performances expected of methods students, and to continue the flow from Level II through Student Teaching. Several faculty volunteered their names to work on this task.

Note: All secondary and special areas faculty will be given an opportunity to volunteer to work on both the TWS and the performance rubric committees through an electronic invitation this spring.