

Minutes of meeting of Dispositions Working Committee – August 1, 2011

Present:

Wendy Storms
 Kim Livengood
 Deborah Anne Banker
 Amy Williamson
 Chris Purkiss

Meeting started at 1:30PM in CARR 112

- Reviewed the table below for clarity and amended various assessment points as follows. Points were amended because of the difficulty in administering surveys to candidates without TaskStream accounts and the ability to send out surveys. Original assessment points chosen, such as mandatory student teacher meetings, would not be class specific or program specific so the ease of the collection of data was questioned. The result of our discussions can be seen highlighted below. In the graduate program, assessment points that are course specific to a program were agreed to be the best place for dispositions.

<i>Program</i>	<i>Assessment Point</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Self Assessment Point</i>
EC-6 EC-6 SPED, 4-8 Generalist, ELA, Math, Social Studies	1. ED 2302 2. Science & Math Practicum 3. Student Teaching	Professor/Instructor of course Professor/Instructor of course University Supervisor	1. ED 2302 2. Science & Math Practicum
Secondary 4-8 Science	1. EPSY 3303 2. ED 4322 3. Student Teaching	Professor/Instructor of course Professor/Instructor of course University Supervisor	1. EPSY 3303 2. ED 4322
Graduate Programs	1. Course specific to program 2. Mid-point of program or program specific course 3. Student teaching/internship or CPR	Professor/Instructor of course Program Advisor/Professor Program Advisor/Supervisor/ Cooperating teacher	1. Course Specific to program 2. Course Specific to program

- We reviewed the template for the dispositions survey and how it would be built into a DRFT for any course or program. A copy of the dispositions survey should be placed in the Cybrary. The process will begin in Fall 2011. (After the meeting, it was discussed that assessment point 3 for the graduate program would not begin until the spring semester.)

- With regards to data collection and analysis, the committee agreed that the flow of data shows that the course professor should be the first person who deals with any noticeable low areas on the disposition survey for a candidate. If a pattern emerges regarding dispositions, or the candidate does not respond to the professors counseling, then the program manager would be included in the counseling/advising of the candidate. If the problem still remains, then the head of the department is asked to meet with the candidate and discuss the problems that have been documented. At this time the head of the department may refer the candidate to the ARD committee.
- We still need to work on an infraction-based protocol that can be used university or community wide for candidates who are in our undergraduate and graduate programs. It was discussed that we need a definition of "Infraction" and what levels of infractions would be considered. Any infraction-based process will need an appeal process. It was discussed that any procedure or protocol that is used must be passed through the university legal system. Chris will check on what the university does already for infractions that can lead to removal of a student. Wendy will check with Tech to see what procedures they have in place for removing candidates from their program. Chris will send out an email to the larger dispositions committee to start them thinking about what an infractions-based process would look like. We will plan a whole committee meeting in Early September to discuss this part of the dispositions process. Chris will also check with the Dean to make sure that this committee has the responsibility to come up with an infractions-based policy.
- Meeting ended at 3:15PM.