

James I. Perkins College of Education

CAEP Unit Assessment Committee

November 17, 2014

Committee Members Present:

Lesa Beverly, Deborah Buswell, Cala Coats, Vicki DePountis, Frank Mullins, Jannah Nerren, Pauline Sampson, Chris Sams, Nancy Shepherd, Christina Sinclair, Scott Slough, Liz Vaughan

Committee Members Not Present:

Jared Barnes, Josephine Taylor, Marc Guidry, Mark Turner, Tracey Hasbun

Meeting Minutes:

Dr. Nerren called the meeting together with brief review of the previous meeting. A document with discussion questions was used to guide the discussion. These questions centered on the measurement of teacher candidate professional dispositions, the first unit assessment that the committee is reviewing (document attached).

There was discussion around the need for a different measurement of dispositions for initial versus advanced candidates. All agreed that this was a necessity.

There was discussion regarding the intent of measuring dispositions as an entry requirement into educator preparation. Is the purpose selectivity (CAEP standards emphasize selectivity of candidates) or is the purpose a formative assessment to guide candidate growth?

The current instrument (SFA-TDI) was reviewed and found to be lacking as an instrument for use by supervising teachers or faculty, but not entirely so with teacher candidates.

Dr. Vaughan brought up the program continuation policy, which is being considered as a component of the new dispositions assessment process (document attached).

There was much discussion regarding the merit of group or individual interviews as a means of assessing dispositions. It was determined that while it could be useful, it could also be time-consuming. However, the committee was reluctant to abandon this idea as a measure and will continue to explore it as an option, seeking more faculty input before moving forward.

The committee reviewed instruments and processes used at various CAEP accredited institutions. All agreed that the Professional Dispositions Statement from the University of Houston at Clear Lake was a model worth exploring.

Action Steps:

It was determined that the committee members would review the core values of the unit, review the example from the University of Houston Clear Lake as a model, and contribute to an initial draft of a PCOE Professional Dispositions Statement.

It was also decided that committee members would use the Discussion Questions document as a springboard for faculty input from each respective committee members' colleagues.

The committee members were thanked for their attendance and contributions during the discussions. Another meeting is planned for January, with email discussion in the interim.