Those in attendance:

- EIEd: Marjorie Hancock
- SecEd: Larry Scharmann
- EdAdl: Trudy Salsberry
- SpecEd: Mary Kay Zabel
- FAE: Jerry Hanna
- EdPsy: Steve Benton
- SCPS: Paul Burden

Unit Subcommittee Chairs:

- Conceptual Framework: Trudy Salsberry
- Standard 1: Gail Shroyer
- Standard 2: Warren White
- Standard 3: Sally Yahnke
- Standard 4: Kevin Murry
- Standard 5: Judy Hughey
- Technology: Tweed Ross
- Asst. Dean, Student Prof Services: Mike Perl
- Director, Assessment: Warren White
- Licensing Officer: Jan Wissman
- Chair, Associate Dean: Jean Kiekel
- Graduate Student: Edward Kiebel

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 by J. Wissman.

Subcommittee Reports

T. Salsberry reported on the new conceptual framework brochure. Copies of two potential versions were handed out for review. Much of the original brochure information was not transferred to the new versions to make the brochure appear more focused. The information from the previous brochure will be available on the web for students wanting that information. Version B is more consistent with our current focus on showing the students the standards.

Discussion:

P. Burden – Whichever version we choose, will we leave the KSDE and INTASC standard in? It is nice to have them included.

M. Perl – Will we start each numbering sequence over for each new heading? It could be kind of confusing. In previous brochures, we have restarted numbers with each standard rather than go sequential. This version may be too complex.
for underclassmen. Version B would be better for our advanced classes and
Version A might be better for freshmen and sophomores.

S. Yahnke – part of the reason we are preparing a new brochure is because we
want our students to know how our conceptual framework fits state standards as
well as how our program fits those standards. We have aligned so much of our
program with the conceptual framework so the information is embedded and our
students are coming to know what the program is all about.

P. Burden - The purpose of our brochure is for all constituents to know what our
program is about. This was done before our last NCATE visit. For Orientation to
Elementary Education and Teaching as a Career classes, the broad brochure
would be good. As students move to the next level, having the standards would
be more appropriate.

T. Salsberry – In the past, our brochure was helpful for the population outside the
College of Education. Everything was included except the standards in past
brochures. Having a shorter version of our brochure and putting the rest of the
information on the web with a referral to it would be good to have. The new
brochure would be more compact. It would help professors set up syllabi and
remain focused on our program.

J. Wissman – our general brochure is a very helpful way to inform incoming
students about our program.

G. Hanna – Because the bullets make the information look like an exhaustive list
rather than just examples, we should somehow notate the brochure to make sure
that people understand that the bullets are only examples and not the standards.

A new version, version C was proposed that included cleaning up the original
brochure with an inclusion of the standards. Final samples of the new brochure
will be presented again at the January meeting for approval.

**Standard 5 Subcommittee Report**

J. Hughey – This standard has very specific information required. We must find
a way to make sure the required bulleted items of standard 5 are included in
faculty vita. J. Hughey presented a sample form and proposed that copies be
sent to faculty to be returned this year for baseline data (diversity data, research,
etc). Faculty would then be asked to update their vita every three years in either
the online or paper format for required NCATE data gathering. In addition, for
future NCATE visits, we need to find a way to show something other than paper
and pencil exhibits to prove faculty are meeting the standards. The information
has not yet been sent to department chairs, but department chairs have been
informed this is coming.
Questions:
T. Salsberry – On the sample, under number 1, what does year information on vita show? (eg. 2003-2004 Block I, 2006-2007 Block I) How helpful is it to know that a faculty has taught the same course but not in consecutive years? A: W. White explained, “At site reviews, the reviewers do look at faculty load and that is the reason we need this information.”

S. Yahnke – The information in red should remain in red on the form, but this information should be given to faculty at the beginning of the semester so they can be thinking about it as they set up their courses.

P. Burden – Can the information be encoded in such a way that we can click on one section (eg. Publications) and pull up information for every faculty member who fits that qualification?

G. Hanna – Much of the information in the vita does not change (eg. the first page) so finding a system that would maintain the information so it only had to be updated yearly as changes are made such as promotions, rather than enter all the information every year.

T. Ross - Setting up the relational database is the most important part of this system. We must think carefully about what information we will want to get out in the future when we set up the database or the system would be pointless. Another important point: Who will be the database manager so that reports will not take weeks to develop?

M.K. Zabel – As a chair, I don’t want some of the information required for Standard 5 to be submitted to me, because of the issue of confidentiality. However, if faculty want to submit the information for merit consideration, they should feel free to do so.

Timing – If Administrative Council thinks this is a good idea, what is the timeline for developing the information? When do we begin data collection on the form? How often do we this? For questions 5, 6 and 7 – do we want narrative? A: No, bullets would be sufficient.

J. Hughey – Once we get the baseline data, we should study them to see what sorts of artifacts we need to collect so we can start working on and planning what we want to collect. We need to make sure we disseminate the data collected so faculty will know how the information is being used. Are these questions that are appropriate? If we feel that these questions are appropriate, we can put samples into the form to clarify how to answer questions. The standard is asking how we use self-reflection data to improve instruction.
P. Burden – for items 3 through 7, we should clarify the formatting (by showing an example) so we can standardize the data we are collecting, and include information about the level of course being taught because course numbers are not often sufficient to know what level it is being taught.

J. Hughey will incorporate these suggestions and email to members for approval. We will present the information in the spring after we have our database in place. We will place this on the agenda for Jan 19 to re-present the information.

**Assessment Subcommittee Report**

W. White reported that this committee will meet on Monday (Dec 6). At this meeting we will consider assessment plans for our undergraduate programs.

**Other Business**

Teacher Education Luncheon – the College of Education is hosting faculty from across campus to a lunch on Friday, December 3, 2004 to discuss program changes. We have distributed information, but we have asked for information from related programs so faculty from outside the college can see how the information is used. We will have content matrices available, and we have asked faculty to bring their student learning outcomes to share.

Middle level 5-8 program – matrices are not yet ready to distribute. The purpose was to look at the program standards and to compare to the secondary education program to move forward so that students can apply for a middle level endorsement. M. Gage advised us to document how we have changed our program so we do not have to submit a proposal for program change to the state department.

**Teacher Quality Grant report**

S. Yahnke reported that they have visited with the community colleges and are waiting for the return of forms with information related to interest in participation. Meetings have not been held with Junction City or Manhattan.

Next meeting: January 19, 2005