Program Coordinating Council
December 17, 2003
Notes

Those in attendance:

EIEd Marjorie Hancock
SecEd Larry Scharmann
EdAdl Trudy Salsberry
SpecEd Mary Kay Zabel
FAE Frank Spikes
EdPsy Gerry Hanna
SCPS Steve Benton
C&I Paul Burden

Unit Subcommittee Chairs
Conceptual Framework
Standard 1 John Staver
Standard 2 Warren White
Standard 3 Larry Scharmann
Standard 4
Standard 5
Standard 6 Frank Spikes
TQG Rep Sally Yahnke
Dir. Lab Experiences Mike Perl
Coor. Teacher Ed Warren White
Certification Office
Technology Tweed Ross
Chair, Associate Dean Jan Wissman
Graduate Student Jean Kiekel

• PCC Subcommittees
A draft of new 2004-2007 PCC members was passed around for everyone’s perusal. (See attachment A.) An orientation for new subcommittee chairs will be held in January.

• Responses to Middle-Level Committee Interim Report - (See attachment B)
The responses represent discussions.

S. Benton – Brought up a concern with respect to adding on to an already crowded Block I semester for secondary education. Another concern was that as we had previously looked at the list of gaps identified, middle school preparation was not addressed as being a gap. (Note: “Gaps” focused on content with elementary and secondary education programs. Was there a group that focused specifically on content gaps for middle-level?) This previous week, a student in Block I came to S. Benton regarding a question on an assessment activity wanting to know if it was acceptable for the activity to address high school because the student felt Block I was directed to middle-level.

S. Yahnke mentioned an assignment she requires of the students in the middle-level class regarding a book selection (related to middle-level/young adolescents) that she has her students read. She shared several comments with the group that her students shared with her regarding how they felt about the possibility of teaching middle school after this reading assignment. They report that their middle-level experiences (including the reading assignments) are positive and leading them to consider this as a possible career. Also, several report that while they aren’t use to reading/don’t always like assignments such as this, they are placing the book on their Christmas list.

In addressing the proposal: The first 8 weeks could be spent in a general methods course and the second eight weeks in a middle-level content specific course. The proposal includes developing new specific methods courses (e.g. Middle-level Social Studies). According to L. Scharmann the committee did not address configuration of the courses in their proposal.
J. Wissman – How much of Block I addresses the middle-level learner? S. Benton responded that much of Block I is done in middle-level – they observe and teach at the middle-level. “When I look at everything we ask students to do during Block I, it is hard to imagine adding more to that experience.”

J. Staver – There have been discussions about adding middle-level specific courses to the methods. “I sense that we’re trying to make all these changes within the current structure and the current structure is causing the problems. Maybe we should think beyond the current structure and look at the kind of teachers we want to develop and then work backwards from there. I think we need to look at this more from that perspective. I think that we can do this without adding any hours, but we are going to have to take a harsh look at what we have now and then make some major changes.”

Copies of the current course catalog were distributed. (See attachment B.) It was noted that the elementary methods course titles and description do say they cover middle-level. The Response Hand Out (see attachment C.) was distributed and discussed. Also, the related cost estimates (see attachments D and E) were distributed for discussion.

1. **Resources** – “We have no new resources, and we must ensure that the number of credit hours required for graduation is reasonable. There is interest university-wide to not add credits to degree programs.”
   a. **$Cost:** In looking at the program as it is now, there are additional courses to offer. P. Burden discussed the handout he prepared. We could be looking at hiring adjunct (maybe active middle-level teachers) to teach the middle-level specific courses. If we have additional placements for middle-level teachers, secondary majors would have one half semester placement at middle school level and one at high school level and due to this, we will also need one additional clerical staff member. (Again, this relates to the proposal.) Initial figure is $72,000 additional cost to the college for one calendar year with the proposed changes. As the dean pointed out, we have no new resources so if we approve the proposal as it is, we would need to delete positions or programs (or increase faculty load) in order to fund this new program.

**Responses**

J. Staver – The basic question to ask ourselves: Why do we want to do this? Answer: Our customers are telling us (very clearly) this is what they want us to do. There is no unanimous agreement as to whether we are adequately preparing students out of the secondary program to teach grades 6-12. Dean Holen’s response is that they don’t want elementary teachers to teach 6th graders, they want someone with the dispositions of an elementary teacher to teach sixth graders. Schools want teachers who will teach students rather than be totally focused on content. We must attend to subject matter content as we prepare middle-level teachers as pointed out by J. Bay-Williams at the November meeting.

b. **$Cost:** M. Perl – Based on the assumption that last month’s presentation was how we would set it up and all secondary majors would have middle and high school placement, a proposed cost sheet was handed out to the committee. The information given assumes that if the school were willing to take one placement, they would take two. The half semester would be split (8 weeks and 8 weeks) for student teachers at the middle and high school levels. Another assumption is that students will have to be observed one additional time during each placement (based on comments from supervising teachers). The information M. Perl presented recalculated middle-level placements that would be needed for spring semester and the approximate cost associated with one additional placement each half semester of student teaching.

S. Yahnke teaches a middle-level course which enrolls mostly elementary education students wanting to add middle-level endorsement. She has had some science education and FACS students in the class. S. Benton teaches Block I which he feels emphasizes middle-level. Questions: Is there duplication? Should we tell the elementary majors that if they want to teach middle school, they should get a secondary certification?

M. K. Zabel – Are we making this tougher on ourselves by trying to accommodate both elementary and secondary education students to address the middle-level? Maybe this doesn’t fit into four years? Every argument we have been making for adding the middle-level, we can also say about K-3 or 9-12. In terms of consistency, how can we fit everybody, K-3, 3-6, 6-8, 9-12?
L. Scharmann – If you are looking at middle school like KU looks at middle school, then we are not meeting the needs because we do not have a stand-alone program like they do. We are currently preparing students for grades 7-12 and we are only talking about adding one earlier grade, grade 6. We could do a better program if we had a stand-alone program, but given what we have in terms of the resources available to us, we are doing a good job. We could continue to offer K-6 and 6-12 and students will know that when they come to KSU. We are not required to offer the 5-8 licensure program.

G. Hanna – Taking J. Staver’s suggestion, we should do backward planning. Assuming that all majors will be trained the same way, we should not assume that “one size fits all” when it comes to teacher preparedness. I think it needs to be considered major by major and realize that some disciplines should be exempt from the middle school student teaching requirement, in view of the current marketplace (e.g. physics, agriculture, etc.).

M. Perl – If we consciously do as John has said, is there much difference between teaching 5th and 6th graders? Since we offer a 5-8 licensure, why can’t the students seeking this licensure simply be required to take the test for middle-level?

Before the middle-level committee can meet again, we need more information. We already knew there would be no additional money, but now we have some cost information to work with.

If 6-12 is the licensure, and we do a good job preparing students for this level, then why don’t we just dispense with adding a middle-level licensure for elementary teachers? Should we forget about the middle-level add-on option for elementary education majors and concentrate on the 6-12 program to make sure that the secondary program adequately prepares teachers to teach 6th graders. It was pointed out that we currently have four middle-level programs (add-ons to Elementary Education).

Should we ask the students – Would you be in this program if you could not get the middle-level endorsement? Should we ask middle-level administrators if they would hire a teacher who has only a 6-12 license or a K-6 license?

Where do we go from here? Do we come back in January and continue this discussion? Should we ask the elementary and secondary instructors to discuss the implications for their respective programs?

F. Spikes – We should give this a rest at the moment to give people time to think about it unless we have a pressing deadline.

Consensus — We will send this to faculty in the elementary and secondary education programs and get feedback from them. The original proposal, the resource related information and the recognition that if faculty in both departments desire to prepare their students to work with middle-level students, creativity, revision of existing courses, flexibility (for different subject matter in programs), etc. will have to be considered. When we get back together in January, we would like to know if these respective faculty have had time to discuss and/or have made plans to discuss the middle-level proposal with information discussed today. The middle-level committee will not meet until this information has been gathered.

Next meeting:
January 21, 2004
Topics:
• Middle-level
• Common Foundation courses