Those in attendance:

- EIEd: Marjorie Hancock
- SecEd: Larry Scharmann
- EdAdl: Trudy Salsberry
- SpecEd: Mary Kay Zabel
- FAE: Frank Spikes
- EdPsy: Jerry Hanna
- SCPS: Steve Benton
- C&I: 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
- Standard 6: Technology: Tweed Ross
- Dir. Lab Experiences: Mike Perl
- Coor. Teacher Ed: Warren White
- Certification Officer: Di Murphy
- Chair, Associate Dean: Jan Wissman
- Graduate Student: Jean Kiekel

J. Wissman, chair, welcomed Di Murphy who is the new licensing officer. She replaces Candace Pannbacker on the PCC.

Announcements

An addendum to the NCATE standards booklet for standard 6 was handed out. Information in boldface type is new.

KSDE Training for Program Evaluators on Friday, July 23, 2004. Please let J. Wissman know, as soon as possible, if you can attend this training. This training is very important. It will help us all see how institutions are expected to use performance assessment to meet accreditation standards.

Discuss/Approve

Revised Conceptual Framework – T. Salsberry explained the changes made to the Conceptual Framework. This is done so that we can align the components with assessment. It also helps to diminish confusion for students so they can prepare evidence of their achievements. The changes are modest with recognition that many of the standards could be placed in more than one category, but were placed where we felt they were most emphasized.

P. Burden expressed concern regarding a deleted item “governing, administering and financing education.” T. Salsberry explained that this was subsumed under legal and ethical foundations of education and educational policy. We eliminated this heading because undergraduate students are not expected to be assessed on some topics, such as financing. It does not mean that the topic cannot be taught, just that we are not holding ourselves accountable to having taught school finance to all students.

J. Hanna – is there some reason why we always start with the singular “The educator will...” In answer to this concern, G. Shroyer said that the only reason we stated it this way is because
this is how the state addresses the standards so we are consistent. The committee will go back through our framework and change pronouns as necessary for agreement.

If there is some agreement/consensus, we need to move this forward. Are you comfortable approving this document on behalf of your departments? If we are willing to approve it, Academic Affairs has agreed to meet tomorrow (5/13) so that the proposal can go to the College of Education Faculty Assembly next week.

T. Salsberry moved to approve the revised conceptual framework. W. White seconded this motion.

Continued Discussion
P. Burden – restated a comment regarding professional qualities. M. Perl and P. Burden recently spoke of problems with students in elementary education field experiences. A high percentage of students who have difficulty, do so in relation to attendance, professional behavior, completing lesson plans, etc, all of which will cause them to have problems in their future courses and field experiences, such as Blocks A and B. G. Shroyer pointed out that these topics are covered in the first domain as well as the professionalism domain (Domain 4) of the revised Conceptual Framework.

After further discussion, a vote was called to approve the revised Conceptual Framework.
The motion carried.
S. Yahnke asked about formatting the changes and it was decided to make the formatting changes until after the faculty vote. T. Salsberry will present this revised Conceptual Framework at the Academic Affairs committee meeting the following day. P. Burden - When we create the final document, please include the graphic representation of the domains to make it easier and more helpful for our students and faculty to understand.

Annual Program Assessment Data
W. White began by acknowledging that the Teacher Quality grant has given us the opportunity to work in the summer on program assessment. The field has continually emphasized program assessment and now we are at a point where we need to show specific data are being collected in relation to program standards. When we host our accreditation site visit in 2009, we will need to be able to show how we’ve used assessment data for program improvement. An example of a matrix with specific assessment instruments was handed out to members. (This is not the best example of a matrix but it gives us a place to start.) W. White and M. Perl reported that specific assessment instruments and criteria (e.g. rubrics) are now required for all state programs. The “examples” we identified in our “modified folios” in 2000-2001 should be useful in the development of the actual assessment instruments identified on the matrix. These examples serve as a starting point. We are expected to be beyond examples and at a point where we have specific instruments, specific criteria, and related evidence. We were cautioned not to identify an instrument for each indicator. The focus should be on the standard.

On page 5 of the example, there is a Results entry and that will be where we are expected to use aggregated data to show our results and plans for the future related to meeting the standards. Two institutions report they are creating their own content tests because the institution knows that they will not get the rubrics and data from the departments outside the College of Education that they will be required to show NCATE and KSDE.

T. Salsberry – The state has abandoned the dispositions that our program still uses. Will NCATE still want to see these dispositions? Yes!

On page 14 – we will be changing this to reflect the exact year in order to be more specific than year 1, 2, etc.
Q: Who houses current collected data at the program level? M. Perl keeps undergraduate data. In the past, no one central office has collected graduate level program data other than licensure results. Is every program supposed to keep and manage their data? Where does this responsibility lie? W. White will provide the leadership for the college. The assessment committee will be involved. Students are not required to take the licensure exam for completion of some graduate programs (e.g. MS and doctorate – Adult Education). If students are not getting the graduate degree for licensure, they will probably not spend the money to take the exam and therefore it will be difficult to assess programs. Are we going to have to collect and manage the data by program or unit? Should there be similar things across all programs for the unit but specifics for each individual program? We are going to need different types of data to represent each program that will adequately inform evaluators and ourselves. We are going to need good, credible, circumstantial evidence. We are going to need to make incredible effort to keep indicator numbers small – as few indicators as possible that will still show the quality of our programs. G. Shroyer commented if you give students advance notice of what you are going to evaluate, the information collected becomes invaluable.

Q: At what point are we going to be accountable? Today. We have PPST, PLT and student teaching data for 2002 but we do not have content test data. What seems like a reasonable date to get faculty to continue to try to come up with what will be the collection data? When our last visit was completed, a transition schedule began. Those transition points end this year. We need to have baseline data and be involved in collecting data now. As you recall, we proposed our plan during the 2002 visit. We need to look at the modified folio matrices and decide what we are going to use plus the criteria for assessing each program. We do not need to address each indicator.

T. Salsberry - What do we mean by program – do we go by licensure levels or program levels? We will go by certification or licensure area.

Once the data have been collected, aggregated and analyzed, it can be used to dictate program changes in the future.

KSU Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), NCATE and KSDE standards – can we have a summary of how these overlap? W. White as our assessment coordinator will develop this for the college.

Schedule to guide the data planning and collecting process: 1. J. Wissman reported that our reporting year is Summer, Fall, Spring. W. White will have existing data (test scores and student teaching data) to departments for distribution by September 1.

The schedule from last year was that data would be to departments by September 1 with responses by program areas on October 1 and then again November 1 (the data identified by KSU Planning and Analysis). Student learning outcomes (SLO) – we communicated with Planning and Analysis that for areas that have licensure standards, the standards are the same as SLOs. For programs without licensure standards, those program leaders came up with their own SLOs. The university requests that an assessment plan for all programs be on file with the Dean by November 1. The Dean, or Dean’s Designate, will have until December 1 to write a short report for programs.

It was agreed that by September 1, a letter from W. White will be sent to all departments identifying what data we currently have and what data is needed by October 1(?). By October 15, departments will have information back to W. White and by December 1, departments will have plans for future data collection outlined. Some standards are going to cross over several standards and we will have to make sure they are fused. Trying to collect the data in an aggregate way will be the primary challenge.
Program Status Report

Middle-Level

L. Scharmann reported that the work of the middle-level committee is not rejected, but suspended at this time until we can get back together and iron things out. The proposal sent to the Academic Affairs Committee only addresses changes to the secondary education program that ensure secondary education candidates are prepared for grades 6-12, including middle-level teaching.

At the May TEAC meeting, administrators applauded K-State for addressing middle-level in the secondary education program. They pointed out, however; if all programs in Kansas move to prepare middle-level teachers in the 6-12 programs, there would not be enough middle-level teachers for the demand in schools. Dr. Martha Gage reports the state department is going to address middle-level issues during the 2004-2005 year. Our existing middle-level program exists until students currently enrolled have an opportunity to graduate (2007).

G. Shroyer - If we are not going to do our elementary education students a disservice, do we tell elementary students that if they want to be a highly qualified teacher according to NCLB, and get a job in a middle school, they need to have 30 hours of content? As discovered during the TEAC meeting, not only do districts want the highly qualified candidate, they also want candidates with dual certifications. We should be informing our current students wanting this add-on program of this information.

We cannot go through the search process for an instructor for the Foundations courses until there is agreement in the departments regarding Foundations courses. The departments will be meeting next Thursday, May 20.

Next semester: Dates and meeting time to be determined. Suggestion: Third Wednesday, 2:30-4:00 p.m. (one hour later than the present time). Have a great summer!

NOTE: Next PCC meeting September 15, 2004 2:30 - 4:00 p.m. BH 106