

Tracking of Use of Data for Improvement: Course level (Advanced)

Program: EDPC 501 Reflective Practice Portfolio

Primary Data Set(s): EDPC 501 course evaluations; further data from formal curricular evaluation (course completion trends; focus group studies)

This example of the unit's use of data for improvement represented a true case of the *continual cycle* of improvement. As early as 2005, the course instructor for the core course requirement, EDPC 501 Reflective Practice Portfolio, recognized a sense of concern among students that the course was somehow missing the mark in meeting candidates' developmental needs. Recommendations for improving the course were approved at the unit meeting in January 2005 (scroll down to pages 3-4 of Attachment A that follows).

The changes were implemented and progress was monitored through careful analysis of feedback on Course Evaluations from 2005-2007. The mean scores for items that evaluated the curricular design of the course remained at the 3 pt range which is below *Satisfactory level*, and even dipped to a 2.7 on one item. These means are low relative to other Advanced courses (scroll down to p. 6 for actual data). Data were disaggregated by main campus Harrisonburg and off-site @ Lancaster to ensure that program quality was monitored at both sites (scroll down to pages 9-10 for Analysis of the Data). An excerpt from the 2007 report to the unit summarized the data at that midpoint of the study:

The quantitative scores relating to the instructor, as well as the qualitative comments, both underscore the fact that the instructors have worked hard to support students. Despite this effort by the professors, the student satisfaction with the course (structure and curricular value) remains quite low when compared to all other courses in the M.A. Education program, both at Harrisonburg and Lancaster.

In addition, the completion rate remains of high concern, along with the incredible number of hours the professors have dedicated to supporting students. The writer of this summary would state that the number of hours spent supporting students via email and telephone far is incredibly out of balance with the 1sh value of the course.

The overall value of the course to students remains quite low, and issues of redundancy within the course itself as well as with other courses that require reflection, continue to surface.

The workload on the part of students and professors is of high concern.

The unit designed a set of questions for further research and commissioned 2 Focus Group Studies (main campus and off-site) to gain a sense of direction for revision of the course. The focus group studies focused on course purpose, skills/candidate performance, work load and value of course to advanced candidates. The groups targeted 8 items (see pp. 12-14 of Attachment B) that were then formalized into a recommendation for revision of the course:

Proposed Action: That the EDPC 501 syllabus be revised to emphasize the documentation of student learning and that individual reflection assignments be incorporated into a single Reflection Paper in which candidates address key elements of the course.

The professor of the course at both sites continued monitoring data for one year. Dissatisfaction with the course remained high and the unit felt that the concept of requiring a teacher work sample as separate from any other course content was a set-up for failure for the course (March 10, 2008 minutes). The concept of collecting a Teacher Work Sample, however, continued to be a high priority for the unit. A

review of the curriculum revealed a natural spot for the assignment, insertion into the 2 sh core course, EDCC 531 Social and Ethical Issues (scroll down to Attachment C, pp. 15-16). The assignment is housed currently in this course that then became a 3sh course. Course evaluation data do not reveal the earlier trends of dissatisfaction that the singular 1sh course of EDPC501 had.

The pages that follow are optional reading within this exhibit. The pages include Attachment(s) with full reports and/or data sets to provide the reader with further substantiation of the use of data, if so desired.

Attachment A: Final Report of the Task Force on EDPC 501 course study

An Evaluation of the Reflective Practice Portfolio,

M.A. Education: EDCP 501/2

Spring 2007

Submitted by Lori H. Leaman, Current Course Instructor

with Fall 2006 feedback from Cathy Smeltzer Erb, former course instructor

Part I: Background

I.A Introduction:

The course EDPC 501, Reflective Practice Portfolio, was constructed as a 1 sh course, and it is a core requirement of all MA students. “The leadership outcome of EMU’s M.A in Education program expects candidates to ‘act as social change agents...within educational contexts.’ To this end, the purpose of the reflective practice portfolio is to document how the candidate’s learning in the M.A. in Education program is making a difference in the candidate’s teaching practice” (EDCP501 syllabus, p. 1). The course is currently introduced in a one weekend, and the work is conducted independently by the student within Chalk and Wire, an electronic portfolio. Course support is offered through Blackboard postings, email, and telephone.

I. B Current assignments in the course:

The current version of the portfolio requires the submission of five assignments, also known as artifacts:

1. Context of Teaching: Writing of a paper in which the teacher analyzes the contextual data of his/her students, the learning environment, the school and community.
2. Planning for Instruction: Creation of five lesson plans that demonstrate the candidate’s ability to clearly align instructional strategies and assessments with the daily outcomes in order to gain daily “formative” data on student learning for the improvement of the next day’s teaching.
3. Documentation of Student Learning: Writing of an “analysis paper” in which the student demonstrates the evidence of student learning on each of the five days of the unit and provides evidence of how he/she as the teacher adjusted the teaching based on this formative data.
4. Systematic Thinking about Practice: Writing an analysis paper in which the student provides a critical examination of how he/she has deepened professional knowledge due to participation in the program and how this has inspired adaptations in his/her practice due to these new findings.
5. Learning Communities: Writing a descriptive analysis paper of how the teacher impacts student learning through his/her work with student’s families and community and through his/her development as a learner and leader/collaborator.

In addition, the M.A. student is required to write a reflection paper (see Appendix A for the rubric used to grade this assignment) on each of the five assignments above, in which he/she reflects on (a) which of the M.A. outcomes/course learning that the assignment (above) is linked to; (b) how his/her practice is affected, (c) and how it will be affected in the future.

6. Context of Teaching Reflection
7. Planning for Instruction Reflection
8. Documentation of Student Learning Reflection
9. Systematic Thinking Reflection
10. Learning Communities Reflection

I. C Update on prior improvements:

In January 2005, Cathy Smeltzer Erb presented the following recommendations for the improvement of the M.A. in Education program requirements and the course, EDPC 501.

Recommendations	Action
- completion of EDPC 501 is a prerequisite for registration in EDCC 551 (Action Research). - Admission to Candidacy procedures: 1. Completion of Core courses (EDCC 501, EDCC 521, EDCC 531, EDCC 551, EDPC 501), plus 6 SH of Specialty courses as evidenced by an unofficial transcript from Campus Web.	Recommendations were approved at the January 17, 2005 and became part of the Handbook the Fall 2005.
- A 3-hour introduction and orientation to EDPC 501 will occur every Sept. in a computer lab (preferably Mac). The date will be published in the M.A. brochure as a class meeting time.	Implemented Fall 2005 to present
The portfolio will align M.A. program outcomes, NBPTS (National Board of Professional Teaching Standards), and SPAs. Artifact requirements will be more fluid than in the previous EDPC 501 and will no longer consist of pre-identified M.A. course assignments. It would be expected that M.A. course work informs classroom practices that demonstrate how candidates “act as social change agents....within educational contexts.” For example, a candidate might elect to implement the Curriculum Development Project from EDCI 501 Curriculum & Instructional Strategies into the classroom and could collect student work samples from the newly implemented lesson/unit.	Implemented within the 2005-06 courses. M.A. students are asked to complete 2 of the 5 artifact assignments in this manner. The M.A. student is asked to identify specific learnings from within the core courses taken that have contributed to their “systematic thinking about their practice” (NBPTS 4) and their leadership in creating “learning communities” (NBPTS 5). The option exists for the M.A. student to even attach the actual assignments from prior M.A. coursework that provide evidence of these standards.
-Students were not finishing portfolio in one year and the it was recommended that the course be reduced to one semester in order to	Implementation began Fall 2006. The completion rate has improved. The instructor created deadlines for <i>each</i> assignment <i>within</i>

give students some type of mental deadline for completion.	that semester. However, some students are still not completing the course.
	In Fall 2006, the course instructor re-wrote the Click Guide and inserted “screen shots” of each step for using Chalk and Wire and wrote out each step in extended form. This document requires 11 pages of instructions with screen shots to provide support for the student to navigate the Chalk and Wire system. Verbal comments from students began to be more positive in this regard.
	In Fall 2006, the course instructor divided the 5 major assignments into “sections of the course” and inserted additional explanation regarding the expectations of each assignment.
	In Fall 2006, the course instructor provided in-class exercises during the training session in which students evaluated samples of assignments written by former students, using the rubrics that determine the grade in EDPC 501.
	In Fall 2006, the course instructor began phoning each student in the course in the evenings to offer additional support. This was not sustained as heavily during the second half of the Fall 2006 term, nor during the Spring 2007, as the instructor was attempting to provide support for 64 students in 06-07, plus the stragglers from 2005.

Part II: Data

II. A Course Completion Trends

DATA 1: Completion Rates as of 09/04/06 and 4/21/07

Section	As of 9/04/06		As of 4/07	
	Student Completers	Completion Rate	Student Completers	Completion Rate
Fall 05 501	8/17	47%	9/17	53%
Fall 05 501	8/9	89%	9/9	100%
Fall 05 501	10/15	67%	12/15	80%
Spring 06 502	1/12	8%	11/12	92%
Spring 06 502	0/12	0%	7/12	58%
Fall 06 501			15/15 but they did not complete until the end of the S 07	100% This is a cohort.
Fall 06 501			21/22 but about half completed in Spring, not fall.	95%
Fall 06 501			9/10	90%
Spring 07 502			11/17	65%
TOTAL	27/65	41.5%	104/129	80.6%

II. B Course Evaluation Data

5—STRONGLY AGREE 4—AGREE 3—NO OPINION 2—DISAGREE 1—STRONGLY DISAGREE

Course Evals from Harrisonburg: 2005-07										
Course eval Questions: Curric.					Course Eval Questions: Delivery/Methodology					
	1.a	1.b	1.c	1.d	2.a	2.b	2.c	2.d	2.e	
Fall 06- W Student 1	3	4	4	3	3	5	4	4	4	
2	2	2	4	1	2	5	4	4	5	
3	2	2	2	4	1	4	4	2	2	
Fall06H Student 1	5	3	4	4	2	4	4	4	5	
2	4	4	5	4	2	5	5	5	5	
3	4	4	4	4	3	5	5	5	5	
AVERA GE	3.33	3.16	3.83	3.33	2.16	4.6	4.3	4.0	4.33	

Course Evals From Lancaster: 2005-2007										
Course eval Questions: Curric					Course Eval Questions: Delivery/Methodology					TOT AL
	1.a	1.b	1.c	1.d	2.a	2.b	2.c	2.d	2.e	TOT AL
Spring 05	4.2	4.2	3.8	3.7	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.7	4.2	3.9
Fall 05	2.8	3.0	2.7	2.3	1.9	4.1	3.8	4.1	4.2	3.3
Spring 06	3.0	3.3	2.5	2.3	2.7	4.7	5.0	4.5	4.7	3.7
Fall 06	3.5	3.7	3.5	2.5	1.8	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2	3.6
										#DIV/ 0!
Averages	3.4	3.6	3.1	2.7	2.47	4.25	4.25	4.15	4.325	3.6

1a. The course provided opportunity to demonstrate the integration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions gained in the M.A. program with my professional practice. H=3.33 L=3.4

1b. The course provided opportunity to reflectively analyze my professional growth for the purpose of improved teaching practice. H=3.16 L=3.6

1c. The course provided an opportunity to enhance my technology skills. H=3.83 L=3.1

1d. The course assignments were meaningful and useful in furthering my development as a change agent within the context of my classroom. H=3.33 L=2.7

2a. The amount of time required to complete course assignments, in lieu of traditional class time, was appropriate. H=2.16 L=3.5

2b. The instructor of this course seemed knowledgeable of M.A. program outcomes and their link to effective teaching practice. H=4.6 L=4.0

2c. The instructor of this course seemed well prepared to provide assistance with course assignments. H=4.3 L=4.0

2d. The instructor of this course seemed well prepared to provide assistance with Chalk and Wire. H=4.0 L=3.7

2e. The instructor was approachable through electronic means for additional assistance, if needed. H=4.33 L=4.2

Qualitative Data Available:

<i>Comment Category n=102 comments</i>	<i>Total percentage of respondents stating this comment</i>
Negative comments	
WORK LOAD	
<i>Too many assignments; more than one credit hour</i>	24%
<i>Had to re-do assignments</i>	4%
<i>Needed more time to finish (this comment came after deadlines for individual assignments were put into the syllabus in F 06)</i>	1%
VALUE of COURSE CONTENT	
<i>I will not use this course; not applicable to teaching</i>	5%
<i>Redundancy; meaningless</i>	10%
<i>Busywork; waste of time and tuition</i>	7%
<i>Should be an UG course</i>	1%
STUDENT OPINIONS about the element of REFLECTION	
<i>Reflection on reflection</i>	3%
<i>Did not allow me to reflect on other coursework in a valuable way</i>	2%
<i>Reflection questions are a “set up” for “tell me what I want to hear and you’ll pass the course”</i>	2%
TECHNOLOGICAL aspect of the course	
<i>Not enough technology training provided; Chalk and Wire is poor system</i>	4%
<i>Tutoring in technology should be provided; need course to focus on technology training if this is what the course is about</i>	2%
INSTRUCTIONAL aspects	
<i>Delays in grading (this suggestion was taken into consideration beginning Fall 06 when due dates were given to individual assignments, rather than bulk-grading at the end)</i>	4%
<i>Need a sample product to view (this suggestion was implemented in Fall 06)</i>	1%
<i>Instructions for what is expected are not clear</i>	4%
<i>More time is needed to learn more about the goals of the MA program, in order to complete the assignments</i>	1%
Positive feedback	
<i>Instructor was knowledgeable/helpful</i>	7%
<i>Instructor provided “out of the way” assistance by calling students at home to offer support</i>	6%
<i>Beneficial way of reflecting on the effectiveness of my instruction</i>	4%
<i>Challenged me to look at outcomes in my lessons and what students learned</i>	1%
<i>Learned about technology/valuable tool</i>	2%

Comment Retrieved Most Frequently from the M.A. Students' Assignments: F 05 (H), F06 (L,W, H), S07 (L)

The comments most closely tied to a teacher's decision to modify or improve practice, based on an insight gained from an EDPC501/2 assignment, are those that relate to insights gained from writing the Context of Teaching paper, and the Documentation of Student Learning assignment (not the reflection paper).

Occasionally, a comment about "feeling proud of my accomplishments" is related to the Leaderships Communities paper (not the reflection). The paper prompts them to review their leadership and work with families, and they feel as sense of accomplishment; however, no new insights are revealed as a result of writing this paper.

Figure 1

Part III: Analysis of Data

III.A Trends in the Quantitative Data

When analyzing the quantitative scores on the course evaluations, the department would hope to move toward scores of a 4.0-5.0 (Agree to Strongly Agree) on all items of the survey, including both categories (Curriculum Satisfaction and Course Delivery by Instructor). The following trends are noted in the quantitative data:

Overall trends, across both categories (Curriculum, and Course Delivery by Instructor):

1. There were **no average ratings achieved at a high satisfaction level** (5=Strongly Agree) since the inception of the course, in either category (Curriculum or Course Delivery by Instructor).
2. **None of the Curriculum ratings (mean scores) reached a satisfactory level (4=Agree).**
3. **Only four sub-categories of the Course Delivery questions** reached the Satisfaction level (4=Agree).
 - a. Question 2b: Instructor Knowledge
 - b. Question 2c: Instructor Assistance to Students
 - c. Question 2d: Instructor ability to assist with C&W
 - d. Question 2e: Instructor Approachability through electronic means

Trends related to Curriculum:

4. **None** of the “curricular” categories **reached an “Agree”** level of satisfaction. All mean scores were a 3.0 or below.
5. The category of response receiving the **lowest level of satisfaction** regarding Curriculum was Question 1.d “**The course assignments were meaningful and useful** in furthering my development as a change agent within the context of my classroom”.
6. The curricular category (in Lancaster data)receiving the **highest level of satisfaction** was Question 1.b (course provides opportunity for reflection); however, the mean scores were still below the “Agree” score of a 4.0.

Trends related to Course Delivery by Instructor:

7. **Instructor Knowledge, Instructor Assistance, Instructor Assistance with C&W, and Instructor Approachability** all had mean scores at the “Agree” satisfaction level.
8. **“The amount of time taken to complete assignments” had the lowest mean of a 2.47 in Lancaster and a 2.16 in Harrisonburg** in the category of Course Delivery, with mean scores ranging from a 1.8 (Strongly Disagree) to a 3.5 (Uncertain).

III.B Trends in the Qualitative Data

Several trends were noted in the Comments made by students:

1. Approximately 20%% of the comments about the course were positive.
2. Approximately 80% of the comments about the course were negative.
3. The most common comment of concern made by students related to work load being too high (29% of the comments).
4. The second ranking comment of concern by students related to a lack of value in the course content (23% of the comments).
5. The third ranking comment of concern by students related to the instruction provided in the one day orientation requirement of the course (10%).
6. If embedded comments within the assignments themselves (from 5 of the groups who have

completed the assignments), it appears that the new insights are gained, and result in a change in teaching practice, from the Context of Teaching paper and the Documentation of Student Learning project.

Part IV: Summary

The quantitative scores relating to the instructor, as well as the qualitative comments, both underscore the fact that the instructors have worked hard to support students. Despite this effort by the professors, the student satisfaction with the course (structure and curricular value) remains quite low when compared to all other courses in the M.A. Education program, both at Harrisonburg and Lancaster.

In addition, the completion rate remains of high concern, along with the incredible number of hours the professors have dedicated to supporting students. The writer of this summary would state that the number of hours spent supporting students via email and telephone far is incredibly out of balance with the 1sh value of the course.

The overall value of the course to students remains quite low, and issues of redundancy within the course itself as well as with other courses that require reflection, continue to surface.

The workload on the part of students and professors is of high concern.

Questions for Consideration

1. Which assignments from the current portfolio align most directly with the Conceptual Framework of the MA program?

Scholarship: to acquire advanced knowledge through core curriculum and to organize and integrate that knowledge into professional practice.

- define and provide a rationale for constructivist practice from both professional and theoretical bases
- plan for learning environments, including the use of technology, using constructivist practice
- enact constructivist practice through plan-act-observe-evaluate cycle
- create centers of inquiry in the classroom that support reflective practice
- examine assumptions, purposes and the nature of schooling, recognizing the controlling personal and environmental factors involved
- define the difference between qualitative and quantitative research
- design and implement an action research project
- discover, create and use conflict resolution resources and skills informed by research and ecological assessment to effectively manage classroom environments
- develop an integrated peace curriculum appropriate for an identified socio-cultural context

Inquiry: to generate questions and to use critical thinking to self-assess, to view problems from multiple perspectives, to make informed decisions and to engage in action research for educational change.

Professional Knowledge: to acquire advanced pedagogical and specialty area knowledge in order to create cultures of change and manage environments conducive to learning, setting high expectations and implementing appropriate instructional and assessment practices.

Communication: to develop communication strategies (verbal, nonverbal, and technological) which support collaboration and resourcefulness to empower self and others.

Caring: to develop a nurturing spirit that advocates for students, encourages social and ethical responsibility, and promotes peacebuilding in diverse settings.

Leadership: to act as social change agents by working collaboratively to bring about fair and just systemic change within educational contexts.

2. Determine how much reflection, and reflection “about what”, should be included in EDPC 501/2 considering the following samples of reflective elements from other courses:
 - (CORE class) EDCC 501: Autobiographical Profile. Write an autobiographical profile which includes your personal journey as a teacher. Describe and explain your teaching beliefs, cite educational theorists and scholars you have read which help to define your own educational and professional persona and suggest an object or image which might serve as a personal symbol. Key Assignment: Constructivist Continuum Paper. This 1-2 page paper will be written in class during the final weekend. In the paper you should: 1) Articulate your present definition or understanding of the theory of constructivism; 2) Indicate, on a continuum of 1 to 5 from “1 - Not at all constructivist” to “5 - Extremely constructivist” where your present teaching philosophy lies. Give a rationale for why you place yourself at that point. Provide examples to support your position and cite sources where necessary. 3) Indicate what goals you have for future practice relative to that position.
 - (Literacy Core) EDLA 501: Assignment #3. There will be five class assignments based on assessment and teaching strategies discussed in class. You will be asked to complete **three** of the five assignments and report your findings in class. (see attached assignment sheet.) Each assignment is designed to engage you in the application of theory to practice. You are to observe the learning and reflect on the process as well as the product in a brief written discussion and description of what you did, how the student (s) responded, why that might be so, and what are the implications for further instruction. Assignment #4. In addition to the assignments, each class member will participate in a small group presentation and report on assigned reading from the class literacy lending library. The topics are noted on the syllabus and group members will select a topic of interest. Each person will present the research as well as activities to a small group. Each focus group will be allotted 30 minutes of class time to thoroughly teach the content and reflect on the relationship between theory and practice.
3. How can the Reflective Practice Portfolio be modified, in order to retain the components that are directly related to the purpose of the portfolio as stated in the syllabus: “making a difference in the candidate’s teaching practice” and to delete/modify other sections to make the portfolio meaningful for students? Which course objectives, or alternatively which course assignments, do teachers state make a difference in their practice.
4. How can we reduce the perception of redundancy within the EDCP 501 portfolio?
5. How can we reduce the workload of the EDCP 501 portfolio?
6. Which e-portfolio system (not Chalk and Wire) is more user-friendly? (The department is currently doing a study regarding this, for both the UG and MA programs).
7. Technological competence is not a stated purpose of EDPC 501/2, nor is it a course objective? Should the course continue to be delivered and achieved through an electronic portfolio or should some other means be considered?

ATTACHMENT B: FOCUS GROUP STUDIES

Proposal to Revise EDPC 501 Reflective Practice Portfolio 1 semester hour

Context and Need:

Given the importance of EDPC 501 as a core course in the MA program two focus groups were convened April 23 (Lancaster) and April 25 EMU-campus by Don and Lori. The purpose of the focus groups was to recommend ways to build on course strengths and to address any areas needing attention.

Focus Group Members:

EMU-Lancaster Focus Group: Laura Hess, Brenda Yoder, Beth Ann Lopez, Mike Young, Susan Finn Miller, Pam Rutt,

EMU-Campus Focus Group: Kristen Kaufman, Maury Smith, Lynne Dixon, Judy Wilfong,

Agenda and Time Spent on Agenda:

Both Focus Groups met from approximately 4:00-6:30 p.m. Approximately 2+ hours were spent on the following agenda items.

- Purpose of the course
- Review of the current course structure and syllabus
- Alignment of the course with the MA conceptual framework
- Alignment of course outcomes with course assignments
- Value of current assignments to teacher practitioners including strengths and weaknesses
- Work load proportion to 1sh granted
- Technology support and skills involved
- Organization of course e.g. orientation, units of study, completion in one semester
- Value of 'synthesizing' course content from previous courses
- Value of linking course to National Board of Professional Teaching Standards
- Review of data from course feedback—presented anonymously—not emphasized

Recommendations: These recommendations are designed to help us with our discussion and decision making. The actual raw data of anecdotal information will also be presented for our consideration and discussion.

1. Consider renaming the course to reflect the professional competence and student learning emphasis. This course may be helpful in addressing student learning AFI we received for Standard I.
2. Consider adding the following to the course description: *"An emphasis is placed on MA candidates' reflective and teaching capacities to impact K-12 student learning and to provide leadership within education contexts."* [edited based on notes]
3. Consider adding the following paragraph in an appropriate space in the introductory narrative to EDPC 501. *"The leadership outcome requires you to have a thorough understanding of professional and pedagogical knowledge as well as skills that enable you to create meaningful learning experiences based on your students' developmental levels and prior experience. Effective teachers understand the context of teaching, plan for instruction, differentiate instruction and accurately*

assess and analyze student learning using formative and summative assessments to impact student learning. They think systematically about their practice and interact with the student's families and local communities." [edited based on notes and to reflect standards within Standard I of NCATE]

4. Consider adding the following outcome to the course. *"Document and analyze student learning to improve instruction."*
5. Modify 'resource section' of the syllabus after a decision is made about how to best gather and analyze data based on the purpose of the course and course outcomes. [Task Stream or EXCEL or other way of handling data]]
6. Include the following revised paragraph in the syllabus: *Candidates are eligible to enroll in EDPC 501 after 10 semester hours of coursework has been completed and the candidate has been admitted to the M.A. in Education program. It is required that the candidate will have completed two of the following three courses EDCC 501 Creating Cultures of Change, EDCC 521 Peacebuilding and Conflict Resolution, EDCC 531 Social and Ethical Issues in Education. [edited to reflect policy]*
7. **Add the following to the syllabus: Use of Graduate Level Writing Standards and American Psychological Association (APA) Writing Style**
Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association 5th Edition is required for written assignments including annotated bibliographies and references. APA style should also be used for references cited in Power Point presentations. Instructors may exclude use of APA when short personal narratives, essays, lesson plans, or for project work if use of APA writing style is inappropriate. [Focus group encouraged all instructors to insist on APA use in all course work as appropriate and to apply the EMU Graduate Writing Standards to any written work submitted.]
8. While reflection is helpful, it is less helpful that the documentation of student learning. Therefore, consider eliminating the "reflections on reflections" of the syllabus and strive for a "futuristic thrust" with a view toward how the teacher practitioner will improve instruction based on analyses of student performance and work samples. This would help bring the course in line with actually being a 1sh hour course [estimates of time and effort were equated in a 2-3 semester course]
9. Keep the documentation of student learning section. Both focus groups concurred that this was the most valuable part of the course. Some discussion was held in the EMU focus group about requiring 3 instead of 5 lesson plans. Recommended that attention and instruction be provided in formative and summative assessment and the alignment of lesson plan elements.
10. Reconstitute the numerous reflection assignments into a 'synthesis' reflection. The assignment might look like the following: Write a ___page syntheisis reflection paper addressing the following

elements:[identify these]; and how your M.A. classes have impacted your current teaching and how you believe your instruction will be impacted in the future.

Proposed Action: That the EDPC 501 syllabus be revised to emphasize the documentation of student learning and that individual reflection assignments be incorporated into a single Reflection Paper in which candidates address key elements of the course.

ATTACHMENT C: Decision to discontinue course; keep the assignment
Transition Curriculum in MA in Education Program
March 10, 2008

1. How would the Program Core (12 hours) change if EDPC 501 were discontinued?

Answer: The number of hours would not change. The 1 semester hour would be added to EDCC 531 Social and Ethical Issues.

2. Will the current outcomes based on NBPTS for EDPC 501 be discontinued?

Answer: Essentially, No. These NBPTS outcomes will be managed (may be modified) within the key assignment of EDCC 531 Social and Ethical Issues.

3. How will the exceptions be handled?

A transition course entitled: EDPC 521 Teacher Work Samples (1sh) will be created for transition candidates and for non-completer candidates. All current candidates enrolled in EDPC 501 Reflective Practice Portfolio will have until December 31, 2008 to complete it. If the course is not completed by that deadline the candidate will receive a "W", then the candidate will need to enroll in the EDPC 521 Teacher Work Sample 1sh course. The transition course will run for 2 years and terminate December 31, 2010 at which time all MA in Education candidates will have been required to have transitioned.

There are at least 5 categories of candidates who will be exceptions.

Category 1. Those candidates who have already taken EDCC 531 Social and Ethical Issues for 2 sh, but have not taken EDPC 501.

Category 2. Those candidates who may have taken EDPC 501 Reflective Practice, but have not yet taken EDCC 531 Social and Ethical Issues.

Category 3. Those candidates who have taken EDCC 531 Social and Ethical for 3 sh, but have not taken EDPC 501.

Category 4. Those candidates who are enrolled in Reflective Practice but have incompletes.

Category 5. Those current candidates enrolled in the Waynesboro cohort.

4. Why initiate a new course entitled *EDPC 521 Teacher Work Samples* for transition candidates and Portfolio non-completers instead of requiring the current Reflective Teaching Practice Portfolio?

I believe 'transitional' candidates will more readily accept a re-titled course with modified outcomes derived from the NBPTS core propositions. Of course, the *EDPC 521 Teacher Work Samples* will require approval from the Education Department.

5. What are the recommended outcomes of EDPC 521?

The outcomes of *EDPC 521 Teacher Work Samples* will include the NBPTS core propositions, but some of the activities will be modified to eliminate redundancy. I envision a focus on a) Assessment for Contextual Factors—knowledge of community, school, classroom; characteristics of students; students' varied approaches to learning, etc. and b) Analysis of Student Learning.

Some candidates indicate that the current Reflective Practice Portfolio requires a heavier workload than 1 semester hour. This will also be taken into consideration with the EDPC 521 course.