Welcome to all new members of the PCC, J. Spears, J. Hughey and K. Murry. We are a subcommittee of Academic Affairs charged to:

1. Ensure that conceptual frameworks and related knowledge bases for programs are consistent with research, trends and best practice in education.
2. Serve as an arena for discussion and debate related to conceptual framework(s) and related knowledge bases.
3. Receive, discuss, and as appropriate provide feedback related to program review from each program area.
4. Coordinate all state and national accreditation and program review activities.

We have been informed that NCATE now has online training modules for all standards. Originally developed for BOE teams, now available to local NCATE institutions.

NCATE has gone from a 5 to 7 year cycles and the state board is in agreement. M. Perl stated that it is his understanding that we had our visit before the change so we could still be on the five year cycle. But, since we had such a good report last time, we can request that we be moved to the seven year cycle. J. Wissman will follow through.

A PCC Subcommittees list was distributed. Unit subcommittees are in left hand column while representatives are listed horizontally across the top. The Advance Team proposes that technology become a subcommittee. T. Ross has recently joined PCC and we are suggesting that he chair this subcommittee. Department committees need to be verified.
Middle Level Proposal Discussion update
P. Burden – Elementary Education Department meeting and departmental retreat both had this on their respective agenda, however, it didn’t receive much discussion during either the meeting or retreat. There was discussion of the features but no real closure as to whether we should accept the proposal as written or add to the response. M. Hancock said that we feel that elementary education has had some success in the middle level preparation of teachers so we feel we are doing a good job in these areas. We do have more middle level science and math students than social studies or language arts.

L. Scharmann said that secondary education took 45 minutes of one department meeting to discuss it then tabled. The discussion mimicked the PCC discussion at the last meeting. The one concern was over the large numbers since we are adding the entire secondary education students. There was a recommendation to petition for some exemptions, such as agriculture education, physics education, music education, etc.

G. Hanna said there is some justification for some area by area consideration for specific course work for secondary and elementary fields.

It was asked by J. Wissman if the committee could expect to get some conclusion to this issue at the next department meetings.

S. Yahnke said that at some point in time, we should sit down with only the people who are most affected by these changes. There was support for this suggestion.

J. Hughey wanted to know how much student input we have had regarding this issue. S. Yahnke says she has discussed with her students about whether or not there is overlap between field experiences in Block 1 and 2 and her students felt that there was enhancement, but not much overlap. We should be able to identify some of our graduates who have middle level certification but are not teaching in the middle level and some who do not have the middle school experience but are teaching in the middle school to give us some input. The report that we get from Career and Employment Services could give us some of this information.

L. Scharmann and P. Burden will identify faculty who will be most affected to discuss this proposal. M. Perl will help identify graduates teaching in middle level classrooms.

Proposal for Three Common Courses for Elementary and Secondary Students

There was a brief discussion regarding the three common courses proposed during 2002-2003. Although Dean Holen had first questioned the 0 credit hour associated with the Orientation course proposals, he supports the faculty who recognize this as an excellent and efficient way to advise/orient students. He agrees with the recommendation that student ambassadors be involved.

Should the orientation class be required for students who take orientation classes in other colleges (e.g. K-State or at a community college)? There was some discussion that students in these other programs don’t often feel that they know what is going on in the College of Education and this might make these groups feel like part of the college. After all, this course title is Orientation to Teacher Education at K.S.U. There was strong
sentiment expressed regarding this orientation class be required for all teacher education candidates new to KSU. It should not be an option.

Another issue that came up in a discussion with Dean Holen. He encourages us to be “open to working together” with community colleges. It was pointed out that we should work with the community college to ensure that “equivalent courses” address content unique to K-State’s teacher education program (e.g. K-State’s Conceptual Framework and related to portfolio assignments).

DED200 Teaching as a Career – 1 class hour credit plus 48 hours as an aid in a school. P. Burden questioned whether the objectives could be reached with 20-25 hours of experience. Also mentioned was variable quality as reported by students. G. Shroyer reminded the PCC that we have spent too much time to come up with the aiding program; to reduce the number of hours is to go backwards. Elementary education increased the hours of the early field experience and added the professional hours in response to a recommendation from the regents that all teacher education students receive 60 hours of formal and informal field experiences before entering into teacher education. We have teachers and schools that would be very upset with us if we cut back on the number of field experience hours. The question was asked, “Could this course be made a variable credit course with the understanding that you must do all the experience regardless of whether you pay for 1-2 hours?”

If DED 200 is a course that can be transferred in, how does the field experience at the previous school compare to our course. M. Perl says that we currently allow students to transfer the field experience but still require them to take the lecture course so they do get the framework information. If there are K-State portfolio requirements associated with the field experience, are there/will there be transfer problems with the field experience?

Another issue related to the field experience is the split between elementary and middle and middle and secondary. G. Hanna asked - Would you not want to give students information at all levels so that they can make an informed decision about which level they really wanted to teach? Currently students are assigned to a school for varied tasks. M. Perl pointed out that students currently request a level for their field experience. There was consensus that “dual placement” is very important if this course is designed to help candidates answer the question “What grade level is most appropriate for me?”…. as well as “Is teaching a career for me?”

Possible solutions: Explore possibility of variable credit for Teaching as a Career. We could cut the Foundations course to 2 hours and make the Teaching as a Career course a 2 hour course.

Other: J. Hughey brought up international experiences. As we look at international experiences, could students use these opportunities as part of their field experiences? There was some concern related to the portfolio requirement in an international setting. Would K-State students get the appropriate experience in international field experiences?

The College of Education student teaching policy regarding international experience was explained. Students must successfully complete one-half of their student teaching in Kansas before completing the rest abroad. (See 2003-2004 College of Education
Alumni newsletter for report by a K-State student – Jancy Davis – who student taught in England.) M. Perl pointed out that these programs are really expensive.

DED 300
There was a lot of agreement on this foundations course proposal for all teacher education students, including the need to add career and technical education awareness for all students. This is a course that a lot of community colleges do offer, and there seems to be very little variation in these courses and textbooks. (There are no field experiences or portfolio requirements for this course as proposed.) Oklahoma State does offer an online version of this course. There was much discussion again about making this a 2 hour course and moving that extra hour to the Teaching as a Career course. At the same time, is there enough content/work to justify this as a 3 hour course?

There was a brief discussion regarding policies and procedure for accepting courses from other institutions, including community colleges. These three courses will be on the February PCC agenda.

Meeting adjourned at 3 p.m.

Orientation for Subcommittee Chairs scheduled for Wednesday, February 11, 1:30-3:00 p.m.