Meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. by J. Wissman.

Subcommittee Reports
Conceptual Framework report was given by T. Salsberry. A meeting was held this morning (10/27), and the committee decided to make no formal changes at that meeting. In the future, Professional and Content Standards sections are going to be looked at extensively. The group has outlined major tasks for this year:

1. Revise first six pages of the conceptual framework and the graphic to show overlapping of goals with reference to narrative for each part of the conceptual framework.
2. Revise the conceptual framework booklet that includes the specific standards. The conceptual framework committee will clarify this document to eliminate questions that have come up.
3. Revision of conceptual framework brochure. We are going to rearrange the graphic to make it more clear. It is hoped that it will be ready for December PCC.
4. Where do we look for assessment of dispositions in the conceptual framework? We will highlight where we feel dispositions are being assessed. It is hoped that once this document is finished, we will see that we are assessing everything we need to be assessing and that we don’t need to create new assessments. In every category of student teaching evaluations we have standards that are probably better defined as dispositions. When we have problems with students it is in the area of dispositions. This is one area we really need to work on to make sure everything is properly defined and clarified.

Graduate programs are going to be a little different as we struggle with defining dispositions and related assessments.

PCC Subcommittees – an updated handout was distributed.

Assessment – W. White was unavailable. A discussion was held regarding SLOs.

L. Scharmann – expressed some concern regarding what and when assessment data are due.

T. Salsberry – Are we going to measure thematic issues (diversity, technology, etc) or just show evidence? Can we clarify the layers? Who will house the data? North Central only wants program and
NCATE/KSDE want different things and we need to integrate these so we are not overwhelmed with assessment. We need a comprehensive chart – with dates, glossary.

J. Spears – What the university is concerned about is faculty don't know what has been done. The university is sure that the university will be ready for a return accreditation visit, but that the entire faculty won't know what is going on.

S. Benton – I think it is evident that what we are doing for NCATE and KSDE is for program improvement. The College of Education is doing what we need to do. Will this collection of student learning outcomes data assist us with program improvement? What is the university going to do with it?

A: North Central will want to know how the data have helped us improve our program.

T. Salsberry – For us (Education Leadership), we are putting things in a different language for the university SLOs and North Central than what we have for NCATE/KSDE. It's like going from French to Spanish and translating everything.

J. Spears – The reason the Provost cannot be specific is that they want the departments to be responsible and know where they need to improve.

M. K. Zabel – (Who is serves on the UGE Task Force) reported that the group has completed a student survey and is starting to analyze the data. What the committee is finding is that students have no idea what UGE's are and where they fit in. A: NCA requires a core curriculum for the university so this is why we must have UGE requirements.

Standard 5 – J. Hughey – As we think about standards and collecting data from faculty – if we ask faculty to complete the vita, who do they send it to? Where is it kept? What is the best way to collect it from faculty? Whose position is it to ask faculty to collect data and where will it be sent? We do have a system that was set up by Chandima that is still available. How are adjunct faculty and instructors evaluated? Can we fold this information in with merit? Would it be appropriate to ask faculty to add this information? One person said vita should not be blended with merit due to the confidential nature of merit information. J. Hughey proposed this: Let us look at information we currently collect, look at information that W. White needs and she will report at the next meeting.

Campus Teacher Education lunch – There will be a meeting with university faculty who attended state department meetings to discuss findings from those meetings with faculty from the College of Education, College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business and the College of Agriculture. This meeting is scheduled for Dec 3.

L. Scharmann – If each department has to come up with student learning outcomes data, this could be information we could use for our accreditation. This is information that should be communicated to department heads across campus. This would be a good reason for inviting all those department heads to that luncheon.

Foundations Proposal – Three courses were proposed and one of those courses will be implemented in spring – Orientation. We will offer this for the first eight weeks of the spring 05 semester. The other two courses are still not solidified as yet.

PDS Grant – G. Shroyer reported that there will be four-week summer institutes using traditional and alternative delivery methods. Faculty meetings will be held and opportunities discussed so faculty can decide if they want to be involved. We are going to be involved with 3 community colleges and districts in western Kansas. We are putting together 2+2 programs – working on agreements between community colleges and KSU. We are also working on an alternative certification program in western Kansas with paraprofessionals. We are working on setting up distance courses and finding instructors at the schools. We are also looking at recertification programs for teachers who are teaching off field so they can become highly qualified. Existing partners will continue to be partners. We do need to decide if we invite Kansas City schools to be PDS schools. There is money in the grant for planning and piloting these programs; however, the university will have to pick up the costs after the funded project ends.
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