

Title 11 TQE Grant Workgroup

Meeting Notes and Schedule - 06/12/02

Members present: Regina Miller, Joan Pedro, Kristl Davison, Janet Kremenitzer, Kim Pengel (UH) Lynn Gaumond, Steven Foresi, (Magnet School), Georgette Nemr (BOE).

There are two work groups

Group A

Joan Pedro

Kristl Davison

Tony Crespi

Frederick King

Janet Kremenitzer

Lynn Gaumond

Group B

Peter Oliver

Kim Pengel

Regina Miller

Steven Foresi

Each member received a package containing the Grant proposal and relevant documents. The roles of each group were outlined. Members developed a timeline for the groups work meetings.

Ms. Georgette Nemr of the CT State Department of Education gave many suggestions for the development of the project, and will provide a copy of her suggestions.

At the next meeting members of Group A and B will review UH program competencies and brainstorm for possible competencies that demonstrate dispositions for the development of the instrument. We will look at other similar instruments.

Dates of Meetings are outlined below. Rooms will be allocated before each meeting and you will be notified.

Group	DATE	Time	Room
A& B	June 24 th	1:00-3:00 p.m.	
A & B	July 8 th	1:00-: 3:00 p.m.	
A	July 22 nd	1:00-3:00 p.m.	
A & B	August 5 th	1:00-3:00 p.m.	
A	August 19 th	1:00-3:00 p.m.	
A & B	August 26	1:00-3:00 p.m.	
A	Sept. 10 th	1:00-3:00 p.m.	
A & B	Sept 24 th	1:00-3:00 p.m.	

Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant Workgroup Meeting

June 24, 2002

Members p: Kristl, Kim, Lynn, Rick, Janet, Joan, and Regina

This brainstorming session realized the following decisions:

The Instrument will follow the NCATE Framework, and will use INTASC and other state competencies to frame the dispositions that will be assessed.

The committee decided that the use of case studies would best assess dispositions and attitudes. Candidates will be required to interpret scenes and display dispositional attributes in their interpretations. A likert scale will be used for scoring the results.

A 16-factor test will be used to give further validity to our instrument.

The first draft of our test will be piloted on the Magnet School Teachers in the last week of August. This will allow for the norming of the test using expert responses from experienced teachers.

Possible research questions

- 2) Is there a correlation of posttest to the cooperating teacher's evaluation?
- 3) Is there a change in disposition in pre and posttests?
- 4) Is there a correlation between the 16-factor test and our test?
- 5) Is the questionnaire of early teaching success?

The instrument will be administered twice to maintain validity. The pre-test will be administered at the end of sophomore year and the post-test at the end of Junior Year.

The results of both pre and post-test will be used for identification of and support for change in candidate dispositions.

Assignment: Compile vignettes or case studies that can be used in the instrument. These case studies must lend themselves to identification of appropriate teacher dispositions and attitudes.

**Meeting of Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant Workgroup
July 8th, 2002**

Members present: Kristl, Regina, Rick, Kim, Joan

We looked at case studies/vignettes presented by members of the group.
We decided to go for short vignettes and short answers, to allow for scrolling on one page, equivalent to two full screens (instructional design criteria).

We discussed the possibility of incorporating both a Likert scale and multiple choice responses in the design of the instrument, based on the types of questions or responses we want the candidates to choose.

The committee decided to continue working on vignettes and develop responses for a Likert Scale. We will develop 4 responses per vignette.

For each of the NCATE Standards we will develop about 4 or 5 vignettes.

The instrument must be completed so that it can be field tested in the Magnet School and possibility Annie Fisher Elementary.

Assignment: Continue working on vignettes and responses and send to Joan to be compiled. Joan and Kristl will meet and format the document.

Meeting of Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant Workgroup

July 22, 2002

We want to frame our assessment using the NCATE standards. We would start looking at broad categories.

Some dispositions to consider

Valuing diversity

Curriculum

Expectations

Instruction

Learning community

Aspects of attitudes, habits of mind

Motivation

Risk taking

Differentiating of instruction.

We need to look at some research question

- 6) Will there be a correlation of posttest to co-operating teacher's evaluation?
- 7) Is there a change in pre/post dispositions?
- 8) Is the survey a predictor of early teaching success?

Procedures to administer the survey

Team members will take the survey to ensure agreement on responses.

We will administer survey with the Magnet School Teachers. For norming purposes. A select group of functioning teachers to get expert responses.

Then the first pilot will be the sophomore entering the professional program.

Notes on Meeting of TQE Workgroup

August 26, 2002

Members Present: Joan, Regina, Janet, Kim, and Rick.

Georgette Nemr from the Board of Education

The group reviewed and made corrections to the latest draft of the Teaching Survey's new vignettes.

We decided to go with only 4 responses for each vignette.

The timeline for the administration of the survey is tentatively as follows:

Final Draft - Tuesday Sept 3

Pilot Survey with Magnet School Teachers- September 9 - 15, 2002

First Administration - October, 2002

Georgette offered suggestion to consider in the final administration of the vignette.

- Consider that demographics may impact the responses of the survey.
- Members of the team should complete the survey to ensure consistency within the team.

There is still some editing to be done before we can go to the next phase of this project.

We will have a meeting on TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 3 at 3.00 p.m. in Hillyer 207, right after the Division Meeting to make any final changes to the survey before we go to print.

**Notes on Meeting with Project Director of TQE Grant Project
September 19th 2002.**

Members Present: Georgette Nemr (Project Director), Regina Miller, Krystl Davison, and Joan Pedro.

The project director met with this sub-group to discuss the thoughts and suggestions offered by the grant consultants.

It was felt by our group that evaluating the unfinished draft of the survey was premature, however, Georgette explained that it was done in good faith and that she wanted to assist groups before they were too far along with the products.

We went through the items discussed in the paper and felt that we agreed with some suggestions.

Georgette had a few questions regarding

- 9) Articulating the competencies
- 10) Aligning the competencies in our conceptual framework to the survey.
- 11) Developing a matrix displaying how the items relate to the dispositions being evaluated.

Georgette also inquired as to the judging of the responses.

She questioned our use of a Likert scale. Krystl suggested different ways of analyzing the data collected using the Likert Scale.

Georgette suggested that the work continue with a smaller sub-group.

We agreed to get feedback from the other members of the work group in our reworking of the survey.

We will review all the vignettes to determine the dispositions being evaluated in each and the responses.

We will look at each vignette to ensure that we are assessing dispositions and not pedagogical skills.

The sub-group will meet again to begin the final draft.

Meeting of Sub Committee for Title 11 Project
09/24/02

Present: Regina, Kristl and Joan

At this meeting the group discussed the feedback received from Georgette Nemr, the Title 11 Project Director and to develop the next steps for revision of the survey. We decided that we would return to the vignettes and rework them.

- We would create a matrix that aligned the vignettes to the Division of Education conceptual framework.
- We would create a linkage of each vignettes to a particular disposition
- We would get feedback from the other members of the committee and the faculty.
- Due to our NCATE visit at the end of October 2002, we had to concentrate on completing tasks for the visit.

Kristl and I decided would meet on November 5 to finalize the survey for submission to the Department of Education along with other paperwork.

Meeting of Sub Committee for Title 11 Project
10/04/02

Present : Kristl and Joan

At this meeting we created a matrix that aligned the vignettes to the Division of Education conceptual framework.

We would looked at each vignettes to a determine the particular dispositions assessed.

We then forwarded the completed matrix and survey to the other two members of the sub group for their review.

We decided that the work on the survey would resume in November as soon as the NCATE visit was completed.

Kristl and Joan would meet on November 4th to work on completion and submission of the survey , matrix and scoring plan to the Title 11 project Director Georgette Nemr.

**Meeting of Sub Committee for Title 11 Project
11/04/02**

Present: Joan and Kristl

At this meeting Kristl and I worked on the completion of the matrix and the vignettes in order to make our submission of the survey, the matrix of dispositions and the scoring plan. The INTASC dispositions were used to glean important dispositions we felt that the candidates should possess. This matrix will be forwarded to the faculty of the Division of Education for their input with regards to the appropriateness.

Meeting with Regina on Disposition Survey
02/20/03

At the meeting Regina and I identified the dispositions that we felt were clearly articulated in our conceptual framework

The Dispositions are:

Valuing the Learners

- 12) Learners as whole persons
- 13) Cultural Diversity

Professionalism

- Ethics
- Social context
- Human relations

Reflective practitioners

- 2) Values critical thinking
- 3) Self-directed learning
- 4) Committed to refining practice
- 5) Self-understanding

We now have to choose vignettes that will demonstrate each of these dispositions.

We need to develop a conceptual framework that will demonstrate where and how these dispositions are highlighted in the program. Regina and I have been collecting other examples of dispositions chosen by different teacher education programs and there is a wide array. We will share at the next meeting.

I have been looking at one of the two sources recommended by Irv. I am trying to locate the Intern case book by Judith Shulman that he suggested we can use to get vignettes.

Meeting of Sub Committee for Title 11 Project
02/25/03

Rick, Regina, Kristl and Joan

At this meeting the group discussed the dispositions we have targeted as the main dispositions we would like to foster in the Teacher Preparation program at the University of Hartford. We narrowed our choice to two major dispositions, Professionalism and Reflective Practice. We further outlined some sub categories that would further define each major disposition.

6) Professionalism

- Engages in ethical practices
- Values and collaborates with students, peers, families and other professionals
- Displays initiative, dependability and committed to life long learning

7) Reflective Practice

- Committed to continuous improvement in professional practice
- Values self-directed learning, critical thinking, and self-understanding
- Evaluates and modifies instruction based on feedback from students, peers, families and other professionals

Meeting of Sub Committee for Title 11 Project
03/04/03

Present: Rick, Regina, Krystl and Joan.

At this meeting we looked at the categories and changed some elements of the disposition of reflective practice. We then reviewed the vignettes to see which ones can be modified into appropriate case studies that would assess these two dispositions.

- **Professionalism**

- 8) Engages in ethical practices
- 9) Values and collaborates with students, peers, families, and other professionals
- 10) Displays initiative, dependability and commitment to life-long learning

- **Reflective Practice**

- Committed to continuous improvement in professional practice
- Values self- directed learning, critical thinking, and self-understanding
- Believes all students can learn and values multiple viewpoints and incorporates feedback from peers, families and other professionals.

Meeting with Title 11 Project Director
04/03/03

At this meeting Joan and Georgette reviewed the survey, looking at the vignettes and specific responses.

Georgette gave many suggestions and feedback with regards to the appropriateness of the responses.

Georgette suggested we go ahead and pre-pilot the survey with eight (8) experienced teachers from the University of Hartford Magnet School. She indicated that the incidental budget can be used to pay a stipend of \$100 to each teacher who completed the survey and gave feedback.

Feedback from the teachers will include:

- Do the vignettes and responses measure the dispositions of professionalism and practice?
- Do the responses target the dispositions we would like our candidates to possess exhibit?
- What suggestions do you have for improving any of the responses?

**Notes of meeting of Title 11 Grant Sub-Group
04/08/03**

Present : Regina, Rick, Krystl, and Joan.

The workgroup worked on the revision of the disposition matrix. We then went through each section of the survey to change items and remove others. The workgroup considered all the suggestions made by Georgette in her meeting with Joan, and felt that many of the suggestions improved the survey.

We removed the open-ended questions from the questionnaire. This will make scoring easier. A rationale is required after each choice is made in the survey.

The workgroup discussed the timeline for the administration of the survey. Krystl and I will complete the survey next week and send out to the project director, and other subgroup members for feedback.

In the week of 21-25 April, we will solicit feedback from the teachers at the Magnet School regarding the appropriateness of the responses, and any suggestions they may have regarding revisions. Subsequently we will make any revision and administer the survey to our sophomores before they leave in May 2003.

We have been given an extension to June 30, 2003 to submit the final report of the project. This will give the group enough time to tabulate the data and write report.

Dispositions

Professionalism	Conceptual Framework
Engages in ethical practices	Ethics
Values the collaboration and involvement with students, peers, families, and other professional	Social Context, cultural diversity, Human relations
displays initiative and dependability	Self-Understanding
Demonstrates commitment to continuous improvement in professional practice	Self-understanding, social context

Reflective Practice	Conceptual Framework
Demonstrates commitment to life-long learning	Self-understanding
Values self- directed learning, critical thinking, and self-understanding	Self-understanding, Pedagogy
Believes all students can learn	Learners as whole persons, Social Context, cultural diversity

Notes of meeting of Title 11 Grant Sub-Group

04/16/03

Present : Rick, Kristl and Joan

At this meeting the group decided that Joan would contact the principal of the University of Hartford Magnet School to get volunteers to pre-pilot the survey. The second part of the survey will be sent to the Title 11 Project Director, Georgette Nemr for her final feedback. It was decided that Kristl will complete the revision of the survey using the feedback. The information from the teachers will help to refine the surveys.

Joan would be out to a conference in the first week of May, Regina and Rick will pilot the survey with the sophomores entering the professional program in the Fall.

Notes of meeting of Title 11 Grant Sub-Group

05/ 13/03

Present :Joan and Kristl

At this meeting we reviewed the survey and the letter to the teachers of the Magnet School asking their assistance in completing the survey (Appendix C).

Joan had received permission from the principal and so would deliver the surveys to the teachers with a date for submitting feedback.