


SPED Program Meeting

October 16, 2012

In attendance: Anderson, K., Baxter, Campbell-Whatley (arrived at 12:46), Cooke, Jordan, Lo, Matthews, O'Brien, Sherry, Spooner, Test, Wakeman, Wood, C., and Wood, W.

Meeting called to order at 12:39.

1. Minutes for Approval (September 25, 2012) – The minutes were emailed to the faculty prior to today’s meeting. Dr. Baxter asked the faculty if there was any discussion. Dr. Cooke referred to the Addendum to the minutes – on the last page, there is a schedule for Distance and Face-to-Face courses. 

	Fall	Spring	Summer
Distance Education	SPED 6503-080 (TBD) SPED 6691-080 (Lo)	SPED 6502-080 (Lo) SPED 6690-080 (Baxter) SPED 6691-080 (C Wood)	RSCH 7113-080/ Summer 1 (Lo)
Face to face	SPED 6502-090 (Lo) SPED 6690-090 (Baxter) SPED 6691-081 (Lo)	SPED 6503-090 (C Wood) RSCH 7113-090 (C Wood) SPED 6691-081 (C Wood)	

She would like that schedule to be marked as “Proposed Schedule.” She would also like for the faculty to vote on that schedule today. On page 3 of the minutes, Dr. Test would like to see the following paragraph put in bold type: “Dr. Anderson (Kelly) thinks that we should maintain both programs. Dr. Cooke seconded. The motion was approved by common consent with Dr. Baxter noting that it seemed to be unanimous.” Dr. Cooke believes that instead of the sentence saying “Dr. Anderson (Kelly) thinks,” it should say “Dr. Anderson (Kelly) moves.”

Dr. Sherry made a motion to approve the minutes as amended (3 amendments); Dr. Wood (Charlie) seconded the motion. The amended minutes were approved by common consent.

Before getting into the rest of the agenda, Dr. Cooke would like to vote on whether we want to approve the above “proposed schedule.” There was some discussion, with the faculty agreeing that the faculty names in parentheses should be removed.

	Fall	Spring	Summer
Distance Education	SPED 6503-080 (TBD) SPED 6691-080 (Lo)	SPED 6502-080 (Lo) SPED 6690-080 (Baxter) SPED 6691-080 (CWood)	RSCH 7113-080/ Summer 1 (Lo)
Face to face	SPED 6502-090 (Lo) SPED 6690-090 (Baxter) SPED 6691-081 (Lo)	SPED 6503-090 (CWood) RSCH 7113-090 (CWood) SPED 6691-081 (CWood)	

Dr. Cooke moves that the proposed schedule be approved as amended. Dr. Sherry seconded the motion. The amended proposed schedule was approved by common consent.

2. *AIG News (Dr. Matthews):* Dr. Matthews stated that there is nothing to report at this time.
3. *Procedures for E2 and E3: Revised (Dr. Baxter):*
 - a. Comparison procedures document
 - b. Changes to the plan of study to reflect possible 3 additional independent study credits (E2, E3, E6A)

This agenda item was to be covered at the last meeting. However, due to time constraints, it was bumped to today’s meeting. The faculty were asked to bring with them today the handouts that they received prior to our last meeting (“*Procedures for Development and Evaluation of Evidence 2 and Evidence 3 – Special Education*” and “*Evidence teams.F12*”). Dr. Baxter briefly reviewed the documents, focusing on the highlighted areas:

- Electronic Evidences 2 and 3 – information is available on the Department website and the plan of study form
- E2 and E3 faculty review – collection of inter-rater reliability data? E3 collection is done by the instructor. Discussion ensued about when data should be presented. It was decided that the end of semester program meeting would not work, so it would be presented at the beginning of the next semester instead. We will hold the discussion on E2 until the E2 meeting in two weeks.
- Data (Program Data) – E2 data is maintained through Taskstream; the Program Coordinator will maintain a database of instructor and E2 faculty ratings for each candidate, candidates who are required to take the Independent Studies, and a list of candidates who have achieved proficiency for their E2 paper. This database is in addition to the data maintained in Taskstream. Topics of using Taskstream and uploading → tweaked upload will be held until the E2 meeting. E3 data is also maintained through Taskstream... (by instructor). Is anyone keeping record of the number of students rated not proficient each semester, etc? (part of unit plan; semester to semester; draft → final; affects programmatic data decisions; need APA instruction... Dr. O'Brien said about 20% of his class was making APA errors.

The faculty discussed other reasons to report: Dr. Cooke thought we might report the parts that students are having the most difficulty with; Dr. Anderson thinks we should keep the scores/ratings just like we do grades in case there are ever any questions. Dr. Baxter then briefly reviewed the Evidence teams.

4. Procedures for Evidence 6A (*Dr. Wakeman*):
 - a. Discuss procedure if E6A is *not proficient*

This agenda item was to be covered at the last meeting. However, due to time constraints, it was bumped to today's meeting. The faculty were asked to bring with them today the handouts that they received prior to our last meeting ("*Procedures for Evidence 6A – draft 9/24/12*").

Under "Instructor Procedures" the faculty reviewed number "3" (Instructor Review of 6A Assignment), letter "c:" "If the student passes the course, but does not submit a proficient reflection for Evidence 6A while attending 4270/5270, the candidate will get a grade of zero for that assignment and the) grading points will be part of the final course grade. The final course grade should be either a D or F reflective of the instructor point system which emphasizes Evidence 6A as a high stakes evidence. The student will need to retake SPED 4270/5270 to complete a proficient Evidence 6A." Discussion ensued... do we want to separate this? Items noted: must be proficient to student teach... points for assignment reflect competency... reflect points in course grade weighted accordingly. It was decided that this topic would be moved to committee. The Evidence 6A in SPED 4270/5270 Committee consists of Dr. Wood (Wendy), Dr. Campbell-Whatley, Ms. Mary Jo Anderson, Dr. Wakeman (temporary), and Dr. Romanoff (temporary). Dr. Jordan will join them for this discussion.

5. NCATE Matrix: Conceptual Framework and CEC Alignment (*Drs. Baxter and Anderson [Kelly]*):
 - ✓ Alignment of CF National Standards Matrix for Adapted Curriculum
 - ✓ Alignment of CF National Standards Matrix for General Curriculum
 - ✓ Alignment of CF National Standards Matrix for Graduate Certificate Adapted Curriculum
 - ✓ Alignment of CF National Standards Matrix for Graduate Certificate General Curriculum
 - ✓ Alignment of CF National Standards Matrix for M.A.T.
 - ✓ Alignment of CF National Standards Matrix for M.Ed.

The following handouts were distributed:

- 1) CEC Standards, 2009
- 2) Initial Special Education Teachers of Individuals with Exceptional Learning Needs in Individualized General Education Curricula (IGC)
- 3) Initial Special Education Teachers of Individuals with Exceptional Learning Needs in Individualized Independence Curricula (IIC)
- 4) Alignment of CEC Standards and College of Education Conceptual Framework: Undergraduate Adapted Curriculum

- 5) Alignment of CEC Standards and College of Education Conceptual Framework: Undergraduate General Curriculum
- 6) Alignment of CEC Standards and College of Education Conceptual Framework: M.A.T. Graduate Certificate Adapted Curriculum
- 7) Alignment of CEC Standards and College of Education Conceptual Framework: M.A.T. Graduate Certificate General Curriculum
- 8) Alignment of CEC Standards and College of Education Conceptual Framework: M.A.T. General Curriculum
- 9) Alignment of CEC Standards and College of Education Conceptual Framework: M.Ed. in Special Education

Dr. Baxter asked the faculty to go through each matrix; if they think that they cover the areas that are currently missing, they should note it on the handout and then give it back to Dr. Baxter. Dr. Baxter said this would now become a working meeting, so that the faculty could review each matrix. However, it was suggested that it would be an easier task if the faculty could return to their offices so that they would have access to their syllabi. As such, the meeting was adjourned at 1:22 so that the faculty could return to their respective offices to complete this task.