Program Coordinating Committee
February 18, 2004

Notes

Those in attendance:
  EIEd Marjorie Hancock
  SecEd Larry Scharmann
  EdAdl Trudy Salsberry
  SpecEd Mary Kay Zabel
  FAE
  EdPsy Jerry Hanna
  SCPS
  C&I

Unit Subcommittee Chairs
  Conceptual Framework Trudy Salsberry
  Standard 1 Gail Shroyer
  Standard 2 Warren White
  Standard 3 Sally Yahnke
  Standard 4
  Standard 5
  Standard 6 Jackie Spears

Dir. Lab Experiences Warren White
Coor. Teacher Ed
Certification Office Candace Pannbacker
Technology Tweed Ross
Chair, Associate Dean Jan Wissman
Graduate Student Jean Kiekel

Syllabus Checklist
The syllabus checklist has not been revised for quite some time. We assume that department chairs share this with new faculty. The Office of Associate Dean has a very complete syllabi library for the three semesters around our last NCATE visit; the updating is inconsistent across departments.

Questions and Comments Related to the Checklist:

G. Hanna – Is it relevant to put meeting date, times and locations on syllabi (as shown in the example)? Within the context of a regular meeting time, this is probably not necessary.

This checklist is good as a new faculty resource. T. Salsberry would like to see us encouraging the use of this checklist for all faculty. Some concerns about the checklist:
- Some colleges have direct links on their department web pages, and to the honor code web page. It would be a good idea to put this on our web page as well.
- Do we need to have a statement about university policies on internet use?
- We need to have a uniform academic honesty statement for graduate students as well as the undergraduates.
- We should probably revisit the statement (On my honor….).
- Teaching academic honesty would be a good thing to be included in Block 1.
- We might want to add some sort of statement about how this connects to program assessment and how it relates to the conceptual framework, including the conceptual framework goals and outcomes related to technology, diversity, etc.
- A lot of syllabus requirements could make a syllabus really cumbersome. T. Salsberry thought it would be a good suggestion (but not a requirement) to explain how things relate to standards outside the College of Education’s own standards (e.g. national professional education and content specific standards). Also, should syllabi show how the course objectives meet KSU student learning outcomes?
- Copyright issue – J. Hanna asked about how we account for student copyrights because they do have copyright issues in their work? How much of the copyright issue do we want to spell out?
- Perhaps we should have a statement about “appropriate behavior” in the syllabus, especially when discussions can become personal or sensitive. (Is this information we could have in a home page and refer students to as needed?)

Expectations for faculty turning syllabi in to the Associate Dean’s office:
- Should we get back into a mode asking department chair’s to turn them in? Some departments make it a point to collect them for department offices so there is an issue of collection points and duplication.
- For people who teach the same course from semester to semester, do we need to duplicate unless significant changes have occurred? Do we really want a paper copy or would it be better to have these in an electronic database?
- The electronic database suggestion met enthusiastic approval by the group. As we get ready for the fall semester, we will request syllabi but request they be forwarded to the office of Associate Dean in an electronic format.

Change in NCATE and KSDE site visit
We are scheduled for a return site visit by NCATE in 2009. The state department will vote on changing the state site visit from 2007 to 2009 at their next meeting.

Subcommittee reports
Conceptual Framework - T. Salsberry reported the group is currently meeting as a small group. In our discussions, the plan is to meet as a smaller group and look at the alignment of the standards. The largest concern right now is alignment of standards with assessment. We need to look at how we collect program information for all those things we say that are part of our conceptual framework and document where this really occurs. At the present time, we will continue to meet in our small group and then gradually bring these issues to the full Conceptual Framework committee. One example of a concern relates to the first element identified in the students and learning section of the CF: Family Development Theory (see standard 2 related to student and learner and related knowledge, dispositions and performance outcomes related to this element.) We are currently not meeting this area. We will continue to work steadily on this. Another area we are addressing is the Danielson’s Framework and College of Education Conceptual Framework. (This is confusing to both students and faculty). Students become confused because they are being taught Danielson’s Framework for Teaching (which supports our Conceptual Framework). They don’t see how the
Framework for Teaching relates to the College of Education Conceptual Framework introduced in the Orientation classes. (There are six conceptual framework categories and four of them exactly match Danielson’s Framework for Teaching.)

Assessment – W. White reported. In the fall, packets of assessment data went to the departments with a request that departments review the data, take action on concerns, and respond back to the committee. Most of the responses are back. It was clear that the departments took the task seriously. In the future both current and previously collected data will be shared. W. White has met with OEIE. That office will compile data collected through the Quality Grant so that we have access for future site visits. They are also looking at portfolio information to see what kinds of data are compilable. The Survey Committee is creating an employer survey for future data collection. Historically, the return rate on employer surveys has been poor. R. Newhouse, a member of the assessment committee, polled the IRB regarding the survey to see if it was research or data collection. The IRB deemed it to be data collection. As such, we do not need permission from the candidate to get survey information from their employers. A question was raised regarding whether the return rate would be better if we used an online form? This needs to be researched more with regards to maintaining anonymity of respondents. The Technology Survey still needs to be perfected. The question was asked whether the commercial programs (e.g. Livetext, etc.) had been discussed by the assessment committee.

Other Issues
In March, we would like to have gathered information from graduates of our program who are teaching in middle schools. Career and Employment Services does record districts where graduates are placed but does not keep track of individual school placements, thus we have asked faculty to report knowledge of students teaching in middle schools.

Meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Next Meeting:
Reports
- Conceptual Framework
- Unit Assessment System
- Middle Level
- Common Orientation and Foundation Courses