

SPED Program Meeting

September 27, 2011

In attendance: Anderson (Kelly), Anderson (Mary Jo), Baxter, Beattie, Campbell-Whatley, Cooke, Flynn, Jordan, Lo, Matthews, O'Brien, Romanoff, Sherry, Spooner, Test, Wakeman, Wood, C., and Wood, W. (arrived at 12:41 and left at 1:14)

Meeting called to order at about 12:35.

1. Minutes for Approval (August 30, 2011): Vote postponed to next meeting.
2. AIG News (*Dr. Matthews*): They are working on the student learning outcomes. He met with Emily (Stephenson-Green) yesterday to get some clarification on things. It looks like they will not do an M.Ed. report separately.
3. Evidence 2 Revisit Committee (*Dr. Wood [Charlie]*): They met recently to look over where we are with Evidence 2. They are proposing doing something like a case study that could be used in the assessment course. They have run the idea by Vicki Jaus. Dr. Wood thinks we can meet the same objectives (going a different route). Dr. Baxter added that there will still need to be writing to meet the university requirements. Hopefully, by the next program meeting, we will have a draft out.
4. Admissions criteria for Grad Cert, M.A.T., M.Ed. (*Dr. Anderson[Kelly]*): We still have not finalized our policy on this matter. The faculty were given a document that discussed previously proposed entrance requirements for the M.A.T. as well as M.A.T. and Graduate Certificate admission requirements. They need to make a final decision on this. Discussion ensued, with it being brought up that we are giving them advanced licensure based on experience/work with colleagues, etc. Dr. Anderson said one of the questions that she gets is whether student teaching would count towards that. The question was then asked: If they enter the program and are required within a certain period of time to be employed, who is going to check that? Dr. Anderson told the group that we really don't get that many applications for the M.Ed. so are we making it even less applicants by requiring employment? Dr. Sherry brought up the ethical issue of recommending someone for advanced licensure if they haven't had any experience in the classroom. He would think we would want to have a requirement of employment. Dr. Anderson asked if we want to say that they must be employed as a special education teacher or have been successfully employed within the last two years? Dr. Jordan wondered what our sister universities are doing. Dr. Anderson replied that she did not know. Dr. Jordan will see if she can find out (for both the M.A.T.'s and the M.Ed's). Dr. Sherry added that he will investigate with the licensure program in DPI... and also with the Cooperative Planning Consortium in Chapel Hill... he will pose the question for the group. We should have more information to go on by our October 25th meeting. Dr. Baxter would like to have all of this feedback put into a document so that it can be reviewed by the program prior to our next meeting.
5. IEP Project: Student Teaching (*Mary Jo Anderson*): The faculty were given a handout (IEP Project for Special Education Candidates). The process was briefly reviewed. One thing that she is wondering is whether students could do the entire project in one semester. She would like faculty input on this. Dr. Cooke said that we had a history of doing it in one semester; she's not sure when that went away. Dr. Wakeman asked about changing it and putting it in the student teaching semester. Dr. Test said that if we are going to revisit this, he would like to ask that we look at Step 2 (Assessment Process). The suggestion was made about adding a transition piece. Dr. Wakeman asked if we could draft it out as a checklist. Drs. Wakeman and Romanoff (along with Sue Rebich) will work on a checklist and then we will discuss it at the next meeting. If we could come to a resolve on this, we could pilot it in the spring. If anyone has any suggestions on this, please contact Mary Jo or Drs. Romanoff or Wakeman.
6. Evidence 6: Directions (*Dr. Wakeman*): The faculty were given a handout (Completing EE6 – Special Education Assignment for Licensure Portfolio), which was then reviewed. Dr. Wakeman would like feedback from the faculty. She would like that feedback in the next week or so, rather than waiting until our next meeting in October.

7. Evidence 6: Proposal for 6A and 6B (*Dr. Wakeman*): The proposal for 6A and 6B was discussed (School Improvement Plan becoming 6A and 6B being Professional Development Plan and interactions with colleagues and parents). Dr. Test moves to go to 6A and 6B; Dr. Beattie seconded the motion. However, Dr. Campbell-Whatley would like to have a discussion with Dr. Wood (Wendy) about this. We will, therefore, table this decision until our next meeting.
8. Other business? The faculty discussed students who transfer credits but don't have evidences. Dr. Sherry stated that if the course in question doesn't have the evidences, then it would not satisfy our course. We would require the course to be retaken for the evidence.
 - a. SACS reports: We are working on them.

Dr. Wood (Charlie) told the group that the SCEC would be having a bake sale in front of the Student Union. He also noted that Lindsay Flynn would now be the faculty mentor.

Upcoming program meetings: October 25th, November 8th, and November 29th.

Meeting adjourned: 1:47.