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I. Introduction

The Continuous Assessment Report for the MIC Program (the common core) focuses on the students’ experiences in the Monday night seminar and the Monday and Wednesday afternoon seminars out in the schools. The Report consists of two sections: (1) student experiences in the 1999–2000 MIC Program that support the Continuous Assessment Plan and (2) highlights of changes and modification to the 2000-2001 MIC Program as a result of continuous assessment.

II. 1999-2000 MIC Program

The purpose of the Monday Night Seminar (EDU 645 & EDU 745) was to “make sense” of school observations and the student teaching experience. To that end, the Monday Night Seminar integrated the themes listed below in an attempt to challenge and reinforce school observations and to encourage students to see themselves as change agents. As reflective practitioners, the Seminar attempts to raise more questions than answers and challenges students to offer queries to simple and complex phenomena. The Seminar integrates the following themes in the form of lectures, field experiences, student led panel discussions, written assignments, examinations, and student exhibitions in an effort to contextualize teaching in the 21st century:

a. educational reform  
b. educational psychology  
c. special education  
d. technology  
e. multicultural education  
f. pedagogy  
g. classroom management  
h. foundations

A successful Monday Night Seminar, it was reasoned, leads to students gaining an understanding of their school experiences (i.e., observations and student teaching), appreciating the topics discussed in the Monday and Wednesday afternoon school-based seminars, and understanding the importance of the common core projects and assessments.

GREATER INTEGRATION

Last year, to bring about greater coordination among the faculty and better integration of the themes cited above, more time was devoted in MIC faculty meetings to discussing novel approaches to the integration of one or more themes (see MIC Faculty minutes, exhibit room). In addition, the Coordinator met with individuals and groups of faculty to discuss new ways of delivering instruction to the MIC students. As one faculty member put it, “Do we always need to have the students on campus and in the auditorium to have them experience experiences in one or more of the course themes?”

Efforts at “making greater sense” of the common core also led to greater coordination between the Monday Night Seminar and the Monday and Wednesday afternoon school-based seminars (see MIC Faculty minutes, exhibit room). That is, when Dr. Sandigde discussed classroom management in the Monday Night Seminar, the MIC students brought to the seminar specific and general questions they wished her to address. And, out in the schools, the cohort leaders devoted that week to discussing the issues and challenges specific to their school.
STRUCTURED FIELD EXPERIENCES
Input from teachers and administrators in the participating schools resulted in the cohort leaders coming together and reflecting on the quality of school observations for the MIC students. Discussions with cooperating teachers led to the cohort leaders developing a list of required, recommended, and optional school experiences. In addition, the cooperating teachers were asked to prioritize each group of experiences and provide the MIC students feedback as they moved from one experience to another (see feedback on journals and MIC Program and EDU 645 & EDU 745 course evaluations, exhibit room).

LECTURES, PANEL, DISCUSSIONS, SPEAKERS, AND MORE
The MIC faculty were in agreement that more than lectures would be the mode of instruction in the Monday Night Seminar (see MIC faculty minutes and EDU 645 & EDU 745 syllabi, exhibit room). In MIC faculty meetings, in small informal groups, and with the Coordinator the faculty developed programs (e.g., student panels, faculty and students panels) that invited student input and that was something different from the typical lecture.

ON DEMAND TASKS (COMMON CORE PROJECTS AND ASSESSMENTS)
As in past years, the common core faculty met and identified the projects and assessments for the 1999-2000 academic year (see MIC Faculty minutes, exhibit room). Typically, directions were clarified and projects were assigned to fit the Monday Night Seminar (see EDU 645 and EDU 745 syllabi, exhibit room). For example, the students were asked to address issues and challenges relating to the foundations in EDU 645 early in the semester when they put together their presentations on “school community;” technology was integrated into core projects after the students had matriculated through the technology workshops; and students were asked to submit their classroom management plan after the Monday Night Seminar on classroom management and after they had experiences out in the schools and discussed classroom management in their Monday and Wednesday school-based seminars.

PORTFOLIOS
The Portfolio represents the culmination of the students’ experiences in the common core, Monday and Wednesday afternoon school-based seminars, school observations, student teaching, and methods courses. The students are asked to include in the portfolio some of their common core projects and assessments and others materials they have collected over the academic year. To that end, in EDU 645, in the fall, the students participate in a common core requirement entitled “Poster Sessions: Project Sharing” (midpoint assessment). The Poster Sessions provide students the opportunity to identify and share a common core project or a project completed in methods with their peers and invited guests (cooperating teachers, principals, Dean Raines, department heads, subject area faculty, and other members of the education community. The purpose of the poster session is to have students make reference to the Kentucky New Teacher Standards and standards in their respective disciplines as they describe their project (see video on Poster Sessions, exhibit room). In EDU 745, at the end of the school year, the MIC students are required to share with a group of teachers a project from their portfolio that specifically addresses one or more of the Kentucky New Teacher Standards. The project is evaluated by a panel of peers, faculty, and classroom teachers and feedback is provided to the students (see EDU 745 syllabus, MIC student work, video, exhibit room). Some students also bring to the session their portfolios to share with principals and others who may be considering hiring new teachers for the coming academic year.
STUDENT ASSESSMENT
Student assessment is embedded in EDU 645 & EDU 645. For example, in EDU 645, after reading *Savage Inequalities*, and listening to a panel highlight the main themes of the book, the students were required to submit a short paper to the faculty member in charge of this experience (Dr. Clint Collins) elaborating on a particular theme; in EDU 745 students made use of on-line chat sessions to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of technology resources introduced in their workshops (see EDU 645 & EDU 745 syllabi and evaluations, exhibit room). Out in the schools the students kept a weekly journal describing their experiences observing and students teaching. The journals were assessed by the cohort leader (see EDU 645 syllabi and subject area faculty. In addition, cohort leaders met on a regular basis with cooperating teachers to assess students’ performances in observation and student teaching.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT
Program assessment was initiated in various ways. At an informal level, students were encouraged to relay constructive criticism and positive feedback to the cohort leaders and the coordinator of the program. This information was discussed at MIC Faculty meetings (see MIC Faculty minutes, exhibit room) and, in some instances, influenced program development. Other forms of assessment were course evaluations for EDU 645 & EDU 745 and program evaluations (see MIC Evaluations, exhibit room). At the end of the fall and spring semesters this information is distributed to the MIC Faculty and reviewed and discussed and is used by the MIC faculty when planning the next academic year.

III. 2000-2001 MIC Program
The 2000-2001 MIC Program was modified as a result of the EDU 645 & EDU 745 evaluations, MIC Program evaluations, informal comments from students, and after meeting with cooperating teachers, principals, and MIC Faculty. Late last spring and in the summer MIC Faculty, especially the cohort leaders and subject area faculty, met to discuss modifications to EDU 645 and EDU 745 (see 2000 EDU 645 syllabus). For example, this coming fall Drs. Mazur, Angelo, and Clements will have the students engaged on “on-line discussions” as they discuss issues relating to the foundations and technology; Dr. Brown will provide the students with an introductory lecture on “models of multicultural education” in the fall and in the spring the students will be introduced to approaches to multicultural education in the secondary classroom.

IV Continuous Assessment Plan
The Continuous Assessment Report was developed in early summer and shared with MIC faculty in late summer and early fall. Faculty who reviewed the Continuous Assessment Report and the Continuous Assessment Plan has suggested further deliberations on revising the latter by placing less emphasis on data collection and emphasis placed on curricular and pedagogical changes to the MIC program. This conversation will continue throughout the year as assessment takes place and faculty reflect on how best to address programmatic concerns, assessment, and modifications to the existing program.

IV. Summary
Assessment continues to be central to the MIC Program. The faculty continue to look for authentic ways of assessing student performance and program effectiveness and students challenge us as they matriculate through the program and identify areas they believe need improvement. This year, the faculty will respond to the assessment it receives and continue to meet the challenge of developing a creative program that prepares students
who are more than familiar with the Kentucky New Teachers Standards and standards in the professions.