Program Coordinating Committee  
April 21, 2004  
Notes

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
C&I                   Mike Perl

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
Standard 6            Jackie Spears
Technology            Tweed Ross

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

Conceptual Framework Subcommittee report
The committee asked for permission to change the assessment piece of the conceptual framework to reflect five different organizing categories than the ones we currently have. This change will maintain the majority of our framework but articulates it more clearly. The categories would be: Preparation and Planning (with Foundations, Content and Pedagogy, Students and Learning and Planning as subheadings), The Learning Environment, Professionalism and Instruction. The committee would also like an accelerated schedule for approving these recommendations regarding changes in the categories and all corresponding documents. The target date for approval is May 4, 2004. This would then be brought back PCC to be approved. The reason the accelerated time frame is so important is because of the changes we need to make to our program and that these changes need to begin with Fall 04 enrollment. The reason behind these changes is that we currently have our conceptual framework and we also have Danielson’s Framework for Teaching. The changes requested would integrate these two frameworks and make them easier to teach to our students.

P. Burden questioned whether we would need to reference the Framework for Teaching (after the change) because the proposed changes make it much
more our own. S. Yahnke stated that it might be possible for us to drop the Framework for Teaching if it were just internal faculty, but we also have cooperating teachers, clinical instructors and people involved in our program who are not university faculty. J. Hanna suggested the heading of Perspective and Preparation instead of Preparation and Planning as the first category which met approval. M. Hancock suggested that we might want to think about shifting some of the bullets under Foundations to other categories (e.g. Ethics might fit better under Professionalism category). S. Yahnke’s response was that we are trying to make better fits with the Framework for Teaching to our own Conceptual Framework without making things confusing for the people outside the college. There are some overriding themes that don’t fit the model, but should be addressed. M. Perl asked if the rubrics were incorporated into Blocks A and B and 1 and 2 and it was stated that it is difficult to integrate these rubrics into the Blocks at the current time. One consideration is that we should incorporate these rubrics earlier.

The timetable for approval is as follows: May 4 – revisions completed by CF Subcommittee and approved by full CF committee. May 5 – special PCC meeting to approve recommendations for changes. May 6-11 – departments meet to discuss/approve recommendations. May 12 – special PCC meeting to approve final documents based on department reviews. May 13-14 – special meeting of Academic Affairs to approve CF changes. May 15/16 – special meeting of the Executive Committee to approve placing CF changes on the next faculty assembly. May 18 – special meeting of the faculty assembly (to approve changes on CF and any other action items needed before Fall 2004).

Questions: Is it fair to move forward with this timetable? Would it be more fair to do this electronically? Will people respond over multiple deadlines? Another reason for pushing this forward so quickly is because we also have to have these items ready for the portfolio committee. Next year’s students will be the ones going through the state assessment so we have to push this through in order to begin getting ready for the state assessment.

In addition to the Conceptual Framework change, we also have a middle level proposal change that must get to faculty assembly this summer for incorporation this fall. J. Hanna felt the accelerated timeline might also work to get the Foundations sequenced rather than just floating out there.

A formal motion was made by T. Salsberry to change our conceptual framework and move forward on the accelerated schedule. J. Hanna seconded. Motion carried.

Assessment Subcommittee report
W. White reported for this committee. There is a subcommittee of the assessment committee which is the survey committee. The unit assessment subcommittee asked the survey committee to reinstate an employer survey
which had previously been discontinued because we felt we needed to talk to our graduates and get permission to do this survey which resulted in very poor response rates. 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 and therefore we are reinstituting the employer survey. A wonderful survey had previously been developed but the survey was never returned from respondents. This large survey has been pared down to a 9-item survey that is tied to our conceptual framework.

The subcommittee has looked at two commercial vendors for portfolio assessment since programs are starting to move to electronic portfolios. It was pointed out that one clinical instructor (Lahta Larson) is already having her students do an electronic portfolio that students can take to interviews. The reason we are looking at an outside vendor is because commercial products have already written the programs, have the infrastructure in place, are looking at improvements, and it was felt that it would be less expensive in the long run to have a commercial product. W. White has spoken with someone from Arizona State University which is using TaskStream. ASU implemented a pilot program two years ago and will be nearly fully implemented this year. The cost for these products is borne by students who pay a subscription; faculty would receive a free subscription. We will look at starting with the student teaching portfolio and then working backward to a program portfolio. These programs are very versatile; faculty can create a class portfolio. Students will be able to download their portfolio to a CD before they end their subscriptions as well as at any time during the creation process.

Status Reports
Middle Level Proposal – presentation made by L. Scharmann. The College of Education has never had a stand-alone middle level program and the dean is insistent that we prepare our secondary education candidates for middle level. Therefore, the secondary program is charged with preparing secondary students for middle level. A proposal was constructed, faculty looked at it in March, and they tabled it so they could go back and look at individual disciplines to see the impact of the change. Last week it was picked up again and passed. The major elements of this proposal: All 6-12 licensure programs would take the course that now exists as EDEL 405 and the number of hours be reduced to 2. The one hour taken out of that particular course would be given to EDSEC500/520 and it would be up to the individuals teaching those courses to ensure that middle level is addressed in methods course and each discipline area would have to demonstrate a meaningful middle level experience. As part of the portfolio, we want to make sure it will be demonstrated to the state that the candidate can successfully teach at the middle level. This recommendation will be given to the faculty senate for approval. The current 5-8 program will be dropped according to the dean's recommendation that we have a K-6 and 6-12 program. We know
that we will have questions from elementary education candidates who want to teach at the middle level and we should be prepared to answer those questions with a list of programs that offer endorsement for middle level. T. Salsberry shared research findings that might move us, at some future point in time, to add a stand-alone program. We are going to have to advise people really well to ensure that students understand the programs and requirements and support them so they can achieve their goal. Our current middle-level program expires in 2006. It was pointed out that administrators won’t hire candidates for middle level who don’t have the required hours in the content field (according to NCLB). All schools at middle level are requiring teachers to use cross-curricular strategies which students are resisting (teachers who teach math don’t want to have to teach reading) which means that we will have to incorporate more of that into our program.

*Common Orientation and Foundations Courses* – P. Burden reported that his group met last week and generally the reaction was supportive. Two points of discussion: 1. Field experience – currently N. Bradley’s class does include a field experience. Those field experiences provide a context for discussion in the foundations class as well as becoming a springboard for those discussions. It was suggested that we keep the field experience in the foundations class as well as Teaching as a Career. 2. Course prefix – why DED. Students are in an elementary or secondary program and shouldn’t students get credit in their program for taking the class. This will be taken up again at the next meeting, May 20. L. Scharmann reported that his group tabled the discussion until their next meeting, May 20. We want to move forward with the common Foundations proposal due to the retirement in December of E. Litz. In replacing her, we will look to hire someone specifically to teach these courses.

*Other*
M.K.Zabel brought up this point: Next Tuesday (4/27) in union 212, is an open forum for faculty to talk about general education requirements for the entire university.

The next meeting is scheduled for May 19, but we may be changing it to reflect the timetable. The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.