Program Coordinating Committee  
September 15, 2004  
Notes

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  

Asst. Dean, Student Prof Services  Mike Perl  
Director, Assessment  Warren White  
Licensing Officer  Di Murphy  
Chair, Associate Dean  
Graduate Student  Jean Kiekel

M. Perl called the meeting to order in the absence of J. Wissman.

Subcommittee Reports

Conceptual Framework report was made by T. Salsberry. Currently she has information about the work done by the committee, but no final recommendation. Upon reviewing current syllabi from graduate programs, it was found that the faculty are using information from the old framework; work will need to be done to make sure that these get updated. G. Hanna talked about a graduate class taught by video. The syllabus for this course (and the references in the video) still make reference to the old framework and asked for a suggestion that would be more feasible than re-recording the videos for the entire course. T. Salsberry offered the suggestion that something be put into writing about the changes that have been made and sent with the videotapes. The revised conceptual framework brochure is being taken back to the conceptual framework committee for final approval.

Standard 2 Assessment report was made by W. White. Draft version 6 of the assessment model was given to committee members. The standards boxes (at the top – NCATE, KSDE Program Licensing Standards and KSU Student Learning Outcomes) are necessary for accreditation and program approval. They overlap because they are all interrelated. For example, we have chosen to use KSDE content standards for the university student learning outcomes. According to this model, evidence from each program will be analyzed in the spring with implementation of changes based on the analysis in the fall. This is part of our continuous improvement model. An annual progress report from each department is proposed.

S. Yahnke: Is the conceptual framework the overarching piece and then we have the standards related to that, or do the standards drive our conceptual framework? Does NCATE want our conceptual framework to be first? Discussion was held regarding how to show this in the matrix.
T. Salsberry: The Conceptual Framework should come first because that is how we derive our standards.

L. Scharmann suggested a circle format with the conceptual framework not being subordinate or superordinate to the standards. We build our program standards on our conceptual framework.

P. Burden suggested that our conceptual framework acts as a filter for our Standards, etc.

G. Hanna: Somehow the external evaluation needs to show that it goes back to everything.

S. Benton noted that there is at least one other accrediting agency that needs to be addressed, even though it only affects graduate programs (CACREP). There is some overlap with KSDE by CACREP. Perhaps making a box for other accrediting agencies (CACREP and North Central). Perhaps noting the first three boxes and the other in a circle and an arrow going to the program outcomes would be sufficient.

The following graphic was the suggestion for changing the top portion of the model. The circle shows that each of these items is equally important to each other and leads to the program outcomes and the rest of the model.

M. Perl suggested the addition of KSDE to the NCATE boxes on the second page of the handout.

More work will need to be done on this model before our next NCATE visit.

Topic 2 – All of the licensing programs that were involved in the five year teacher quality grant, developed standards matrices during the summer of 2003. We are now at a point where they need to be revised. The state department always uses middle level English as an example of what they expect to see in these standards, and this example was passed out to members. This is the level of specificity that the state wants for our next accreditation visit with supporting data.

S. Yanke shared information from State Department meetings last week. During a discussion at her table at that meeting it was noted that at smaller colleges, the information in column 4 is fairly easy to obtain. However, in a university like K-State, it is extremely difficult to gather due to the size of the programs and the number of departments involved in educating our students. For the standard, if a standard is assessed with a test, a copy of the test must be included. Everyone involved in our programs has to figure out how to gather the assessment data and the information must be collected. From this meeting, it was also stressed that you do not have to address all indicators.
W. White stated you don’t have to do any indicators at all and the state is considering doing away with the indicators on the document. The state is looking at the standard and that is what needs to be documented on multiple levels for accreditation purposes. For accreditation, the data have to be collected for all the years between each accreditation visit, however only the test items, etc., from the year prior to the state visit must be presented during the accreditation visit.

P. Burden – we may need to do something in the entire college to encourage participation and get everyone to help collect the data.

T. Salsberry – maybe we should go to broader statements instead of more specific information to demonstrate the standard only. There should be no problem showing multiple means of meeting the standard.

S. Yahnke made a recommendation that the members of the College of Education who went to the meetings get together to discuss how to bring the college together to be able to collect the standards and help groups come up with strategies to collect that data.

L. Scharmann shared information concerning what the ACCK Consortium is doing. This consortium consists of smaller colleges in southwest Kansas (Bethel, Bethany, McPherson, Sterling). These schools are using SAT-2 as a content evaluation. Some of the smaller schools in the consortium used final exams and final course grades at their last visit. Although the state felt that this was not adequate data, it accredited them. However, in the future, work will need to be done to move away from using this type of data.

T. Salsberry – In reference to graduate programs, she stated that we are pushing our students (and they are unhappy with the increased costs) to take all these tests and there is no evidence that any of these tests are beneficial to programs and evaluation. Portfolio, national exam and student teaching could possibly meet the criteria.

S. Yahnke – Since our programs are looked at by other universities and programs, the assessment data are important because we need to be be uniform in our measures.

M. Perl – if there was some sort of culminating project in methods classes, perhaps this could suffice.

G. Shroyer – You cannot demonstrate some content in portfolios. The reason the state always chooses English is because it is easy. Things like science which is extremely content driven are very difficult to form a matrix and therefore very difficult to come to agreement on how to assess these programs.

M. Perl and W. White will work on getting the group that went to Topeka together. It will take more than one luncheon meeting to get this done. In 2003, groups were told to pick one or two items that will measure the standard. Some groups filled in the entire matrix and were very superficial and did not result in what we need. More work needs to be done to make sure that everyone understands what we are looking for and how it needs to be presented. There are grant monies available to help groups meet and work these issues out. An agenda has to be sent to Topeka in order to get the money, but this grant money will assist in the process.

The Big Picture – A handout from the Provost’s office. Provost Coffman, before he left K-State, wanted university level student learning outcomes. The new provost wants each college to submit three year plans for how they will meet the university learning outcomes. Each program is to select 2-5 student learning outcomes and create matrices relating program outcomes to university outcomes and how these will be measured. The university wants to have a 50/50 split between direct and indirect measures. Items don’t have to be assessed every year, but at least once during the three year period. Point 4 (in the example) mirrors what we are doing anyway to
assess our programs. At this point, the university just wants a plan but eventually data will be needed. The student teaching assessment could be one way to meet the university’s goal. The PLT could be another. Even the portfolio could meet the requirement. Our Unit Assessment Committee is the College Assessment Review Committee. According to the schedule, in Dec-Jan the assessment will be reviewed using an established rubric.

T. Salsberry asked whether graduate programs are included in this university assessment program and they will also need student learning outcomes. Graduate programs are all different as we are not following a university-wide learning outcomes at present. According to W. White, graduate programs will need to complete these matrices.

W. White is going to meet with all the chairs for the NCATE standards to get input as to what data are being collecting so he can put together a database.

**Portfolio report** was given by S. Yahnke. The portfolio handbook is done. It is all based on the Kansas Performance Assessment and our standards. It has been handed out to all student teachers in partner schools and Friday (9/17) a meeting is being held for student teachers in nonpartner schools to explain the Kansas Performance Assessment and hand out copies of the handbook. Currently, S. Yahnke feels that our students are not prepared to do this assessment, nor are the schools prepared for this. We are definitely going to have to do work on this. If anyone wants a copy of the handbook, email S. Yahnke or G. Shroyer to request a copy. If student teachers are in a partnership school, student teachers need to work with clinical instructors. If not in a partnership school, students need to work with university supervisors.

**Standard 5 report** was given by J. Hughey. Department chairs and departments need to look at finding a way to get vitae information for NCATE visits. An electronic form has been produced by C. Cumaranatunge and is available online. Department chairs should urge faculty to update this form yearly when they update their vitae since most faculty does update their vitae periodically anyway for merit pay. The electronic format would be an easy way to keep track of this both for the faculty member and for our accreditation visits.

**Meeting time** J. Spears has a conflict with this meeting time because she is required to meet with the Board of Regents every third Wednesday. Suggestions for first or fourth Wednesday were made with preference for the first. Meeting time will be 2:30 to 4. J. Wissman will send out an email to confirm the new date.

The following dates and times have been set for PCC Meetings:

October 27, 2004  2:30-4 p.m.  BH106
December 1, 2004  2:30-4 p.m.  BH106