

**Teacher Education Advisory Council
October 29, 2004**

Members in attendance:

Diane DeNoon	KSU Instructor
Connie Foster	Teacher, Wichita, KS
Gary Herman	Principal, Holton, KS
Jim Medina	Teacher, Olathe, KS
Shelly Meier	Garden City Community College
Rick Pribyl	Teacher, Olathe, KS
Janet Stramel	Teacher, Wamego, KS
Kathy Wagoner	Teacher, Hays, KS
Randy Watson	Alumni Fellow, Assistant Superintendent, McPherson, KS
Jessica Wyrill	Undergraduate student, Elementary Education
Mandy Kern	Undergraduate student, Secondary Education
Fabiola Haux	Undergraduate student, Elementary Education
Victoria Luhrs	Undergraduate student, Secondary Education
Jonathan Rothwell	Undergraduate student, Secondary Education
Karen Pence	Faculty, Human Ecology
Larry Rodgers	Faculty, Arts and Sciences
Kevin Donnely	Faculty, Agriculture
Trudy Salsberry	Faculty, EDADL
Steve Benton	Faculty, CEEP
Sally Yahnke	Faculty, SECED
Mike Perl	Faculty, Office of Student and Professional Services
Paul Burden	Faculty, EIEd
Gail Shroyer	Faculty, EIEd
Di Murphy	Faculty, Licensing Officer
Tweed Ross	Faculty, Catalyst Director
Socorro Herrera	Faculty, ESL
Della Perez	CIMA
Larry Scharmann	Faculty, SECED
Warren White	Faculty, Director of Assessment
Janice Wissman	Associate Dean
Jean Kiekel	Graduate student, C&I

Meeting was called to order by Randy Watson, co-chair and Warren White, co-chair. Introductions were made.

Reports

Gail Shroyer introduced the Kansas Performance Assessment (KPA) portfolio that corresponds to the new Kansas licensure system. K-State has set up a portfolio so that our graduates will be prepared to do the KPA. Recent teacher education graduates are piloting the KPA, but starting next year, all new teachers will be required to complete this assessment in order to gain a professional license. If teachers do not adequately complete this process in their first two years of teaching, they will be given a second two year period to complete the process. If they do not successfully complete the KPA on the second attempt, they will be unable to get their professional license.

The KPA requires students to prepare a multi-day instructional plan. It is in narrative form. The following are the criterion:

- Criterion 1 requires new teachers to analyze the contextual elements of their classroom and explain how they will meet the needs of all learners in that classroom.
- Goal 2 centers around learning goals and objectives.
- Criterion 3 is information about the design of the instructional unit.
- Criterion 4 revolves around demonstration of integration skills.
- Criterion 5 is the analysis of learning environment where teachers talk about the classroom management plan, motivation, and communication.
- Criterion 6 centers around an analysis of assessment. In the KPA, new teachers must give examples of their pretest, two or more formative assessments, and a summative assessment. Teachers will be required to talk about growth of students through participation in the unit. Teachers will also be required to calculate gain scores for students.
- Criterion 7 requires teachers to reflect upon where students were successful, unsuccessful, and how the lesson plan will be changed in the future.

Currently the state is piloting the KPA so it is not known what the cut-off scores will be.

After introducing the KPA document, G. Shroyer introduced what KSU is doing with the student teaching portfolio, which will instruct our students as to what will be required of them for future licensure. The student teaching portfolio is based on our conceptual framework, Danielson's Framework for Teaching, and the KPA. Blocks have been realigned so that when our students do their portfolio during their student teaching, they will already have been exposed to everything required in the student teaching portfolio. If they can successfully complete the student teaching portfolio, they should be prepared to do what is necessary for the KPA.

Portfolio Alignment with KSU conceptual framework and the KPA: A handout was given to committee members to show how we have aligned our conceptual framework categories to the KPA criterion.

Question: What are the principal's role, K-State's role and the new graduate's role once he/she has been hired? During student teaching, students have a university supervisor and a cooperating teacher who will help them through the process. When students go out to interview, they can take their portfolio with them during the interview process. Once K-State College of Education graduates have been hired and are starting on the KPA, it is the responsibility of the administrators in that building to assist the student. It is hoped that the university can be involved in some way during the KPA process – either through a distance mentoring program or some sort of relationship with cooperating teachers, university supervisor; ultimately, however, the building staff will need to support new teachers so they can be successful on the KPA.

Question: Are other universities doing similar things? Wichita State is giving students the KPA document and making them do that in addition to their requirements. Some

states schools are not doing anything other than what they have been doing and are not introducing the KPA document at all.

K-State is putting the student teaching portfolio online for easier access for students.

Question: Will there be qualified mentors for these new teachers? Is the state doing anything to help prepare schools and administrators for this process? This is not known. Cooperating teachers in K-State's PDS schools are becoming familiar with the document and will be able to mentor new teachers.

Task for group: What information/assistance/skills can we give to K-State students so that new graduates can be successful in completing the KPA process?

Criterion 1

- How to identify what student differences mean in terms of contextual adaptations
- Being familiar with state standards and how they are assessed in good teacher practice
- Using KSDE web site for school report cards, ethnicity, demographic information
- Using positive language, and specific, even if experience wasn't

Criterion 2

- Using higher level goals and objectives – state document states that majority must be at higher level (or justify why not). Should we have a similar statement in our portfolio? In some contexts and with some students it is easier to address higher order thinking. It looks different at different levels and in different situations and we need to make sure students understand how to address that issue. In the student teaching portfolio, this is not an option because we want our students to work on developing higher order skills and did not want to give them the option of not doing this
- Use backward mapping as a curriculum model
- Assessment and having preassessment-postassessment and formative assessments – Are we preparing our students to do this level of assessment?
- Writing measurable objectives
- Attach Bloom's taxonomy to assist students in writing objectives that incorporate more higher-order thinking (Some groups are moving away from Bloom's taxonomy so we may want to include a couple of examples like NCTM)
- Having a consistent approach throughout the education program
- Use knowledge to teach concepts

Criterion 3

- Include the gifted as part of special ed when designing instruction
- Vary learning activities, especially for block schedule
- Learn to be flexible
- Review metacognition
- Learn to use concept maps to organize thinking
- Kagan's cooperative learning theory
- Different types of assessment technology and grading programs as types of technological managers
- Have students use technology in a wider scope

- Building on parents – use parents to bring in to classroom to share their expertise
- Provide a glossary that would define terminology, especially for different contexts, anything that might have multiple interpretations
- Provide a strong foundation in special courses, (multicultural, exceptional child, technology) that is brought up in other classes across the curriculum
- Toolbox of strategies for students – 12 ways to deal with kinesthetic learner, 12 ways to deal with student who is 2 years behind in reading level (for example)
- Opportunities to observe correct way to teach something

Criterion 4

- Ask students to plan interdisciplinary lessons
- Do a better job correlating/integrating what students learn in their blocks
- Address interdisciplinary units in a straightforward way
- Using one or two subjects for planning rather than overwhelming by trying to put in too much
- Define what is meant by thinking skills, methods of inquiry
- Students who are here today are able to see the “big picture” but perhaps some of this needs to be integrated into courses so general student population can see how everything fits together
- Perhaps faculty aren’t doing a good job sharing with students what it means to be integrative
- Methods of inquiry is not in our portfolio at all – perhaps it is a change that was missed
- Provide examples of integrative units – perhaps being able to pull good examples from portfolios this year
- Making sure students understand the actual teaching time available so they can understand the need for integration to make learning more meaningful

Because of a lack of time, Criterion 5 and 6 were not discussed. Members were asked to leave their notes with us so that we could get the information from those forms.

Members were asked to look to April 29 or 30 for spring meeting and get back with Jan Wissman or Kathy as to how these dates will work into their schedule.