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Introductions- Introductions were held of returning members and new members. Brad Burenheide, graduate student in Curriculum and Instruction, was also in attendance.

Notes from April 20th Meeting-
The notes from the last meeting, dated April 20th, were discussed and additional information was noted in italics. J. Wissman asked that she be contacted if any other additions were noted.

The question which was raised in the notes regarding whether or not there is a system in place to penalize students who don’t complete the student intern portfolio has been addressed and it was determined by a vote of faculty at the special May 11, 2005 Assessment in Teacher Education Meeting that the portfolio must be successfully completed during the student internship as a requirement for completion of student teaching.

Report from NCATE/AACTE Institutional Orientation Meeting- P. Burden and M. Hancock reported on the NCATE/AACTE meeting which was held in Washington, D.C. on September 30 – October 3, 2005. Hand-outs were distributed which provided a summary of conference information (including general notes as well as summary information delineated by standard). A detailed schedule of the conference sessions was also provided. It was reported that new guidelines and interpretations were shared throughout the conference sessions. P. Burden provided a copy of the conference CD documenting the presentations given at the conference. The index found when viewing the CD is aligned with the schedule on the hand-out. (Additional CDs and hand-out materials are available in the Office of the Associate Dean.)
M. Hancock drew attention to the NCATE Scan, as noted on the green hand-out (a comprehensive analysis of every element within a standard). It was noted that G. Shroyer, Standard I Subcommittee Chair, has been working on this.

P. Burden commented on Electronic Exhibit Rooms and the encouragement given for institutions to use electronic portfolios. The University of Kentucky was an example given which has all of its documentation available on its web site. He also mentioned that there were to be no major changes in the Revision of Standards (released in 2008), but noted we are to infuse technology and diversity throughout all standards.

M. Hancock also spoke of the fact that a large percentage of BOE recommendations are being overturned by the UAB (Unit Assessment Board), stating weaknesses in areas of assessment, impact on student learning, and dispositions. Regarding Standard 1 she noted that it was stressed that candidates must be building lessons on the basis of knowledge of content. On the hand-out regarding Standard 2 it was noted that 1/3 of the sites didn’t meet one or more standards. Standard 2 is the most common area cited for improvement. “Includes fair, accurate, consistent assessments that are free of bias.” It was discussed that there is a need to gather useful data regarding predictors of candidate success at key transitions points in the program. W. White responded that OEIE was contracted to look at those types of indicators this year. They are looking at the kinds of students we are admitting, their success in our program and beyond.

M. Hancock also reported information regarding Standard 3 (Clinical and Field Experiences) and Standard 4 (Diversity). T. Salsberry asked for clarification regarding NCATE’s definition of diversity, and it was discussed that NCATE is looking at a broad definition beyond race, ethnicity, and gender. (See glossary in NCATE Standards Book.)

Information was given regarding preparation of the Institutional Report and the advantage of having a mock visit. The Institutional Report takes about a year to prepare and if we are scheduled for a spring visit the report should be completed by September, 2008. J. Wissman mentioned that because of revised standards and protocol we had participated in a mock visit during the 1992 cycle. The possible timeline would be having a mock visit in Fall of 2008 for a site visit during Spring 2009.

P. Burden mentioned the information provided at the conference regarding Assessment Handbooks. Kean University was noted as a resource in development of this. This would be developed around the Mission Statement and the Conceptual Framework, and would give detailed information regarding who was gathering what type of assessment information and when it might be gathered. W. White took the information P. Burden had from the Kean University web site. http://soe.kean.edu/~ncate/assessmentplan.htm.

NCATE recognizes that there has not been much direction given in advanced programs, but more information will be forthcoming. P. Burden explained that the university will be able to select which graduate programs are included for review by determining the setting the candidates will be involved with once the program has been completed. Another area which is being looked at carefully is field experiences in advanced programs. We need to show that our MS students are documenting their practices. Perhaps we can implement some of these programs through our PDS schools. We also need to document how we are assessing dispositions of students in the MS program. It perhaps could be monitored through reflections as part of core courses.
Both M. Hancock and P. Burden stated that they felt the conference was very valuable and brief discussion was given as to who may want to attend in the future, mentioning that it might be beneficial for all subcommittee members to attend before our next site visit. There is a conference available both in fall and spring. T. Salsberry requested information about being a state level reviewer. J. Wissman mentioned that there are no KSU faculty members serving as reviewers due to the fact that there are only two small institutions going through the review this year. It was mentioned that J. Duncan will be working on training for reviewers and we will all benefit from seeing this information. J. Wissman and P. Burden noted that there are training modules on the NCATE.org site.

Questions were posed for P. Burden and M. Hancock regarding the visit. T. Ross wanted clarification as to whether the portfolio is to be web-based or on fixed media. W. White noted that when the report is available online you still need to have a hard copy for parts of the interview process.

J. Wissman thanked P. Burden and M. Hancock for their detailed report as well as the CDs which were provided.

Subcommittees Reports: T. Salsberry reported that they are preparing for the revising of the narrative of the Institutional Report regarding the Conceptual Framework. They will also be assisting with assessments and disposition information. The Conceptual Framework will be reviewed and key ideas revisited. J. Wissman noted the new informational brochure regarding the program, pointing out program changes.

J. Wissman stated that Dr. David Griffin had sent a letter to Dean Holen suggesting that the Mission Statement be revisited, looking at increased emphasis on diversity. It was noted that the Mission Statement was affirmed by the faculty in 2001. It seems appropriate that the Conceptual Framework committee will look into this. Possibilities could be to add diversity to the three components in place, those being Teaching, Research, and Service; or perhaps adding a component of diversity to the vision statement which would then imply its impact on all three components already addressed. J. Wissman will send a copy of the letter from Dr. Griffin to the Conceptual Framework committee. T. Salsberry noted that we need to look at this through the Strategic Planning committee as well. J. Spears chairs the unit subcommittee.

Standard 1 Candidate Knowledge, skills, and Dispositions: G. Shroyer will give her report at the next meeting.

Standard 2 Assessment System and Unit Evaluation: J. Wissman thanked W. White for presenting the information at the meeting for faculty regarding the Kansas State Department of Education Program Report Form. W. White mentioned that Elementary faculty will possibly meet on October 18th to gain additional information as well. His committee has been meeting every two weeks. There may be a possibility of the Portfolio committee re-convening to discuss an electronic format of the portfolio. G. Shroyer and S. Yahnke are meeting as well, regarding content assessments, and progress is being made regarding the direction of those assessments,
and dispositions. Special Education will also be working on this in the upcoming weeks. There is a formal contract with OEIE regarding data collection and they are looking at transition data.

J. Wissman is meeting with Block A and Block B faculty as well as Secondary faculty regarding increased coordination of the portfolios and their development as an assessment tool.

**Standard 4 Diversity** - K. Murry provided a hand-out which identified progress of data collection for Standard 4. Goals set for the 2005-2006 year included a focus on collection of data, utilizing data which has been collected, and placing an emphasis on assignment identification and collection of non-transparent data listed in the matrix which was provided. J. Wissman mentioned the only area of improvement cited during the last review related to candidates having interaction with diverse candidates.

**Standard 5 Faculty** - J. Hughey provided an update regarding faculty information being placed online. A. Schroeder from OEIE is attempting to get this completed, but a programming change in language is causing delays. Hopefully faculty will be able to update vitae which will help address Standard 5. Once this is operational faculty will be notified. One change which has occurred is that faculty will no longer use their SS # to access their information, but rather their employee ID #.

K. Murry brought up that perhaps there could be a way to coordinate the vitae information with documentation of Standard 4. J. Hughey mentioned that perhaps this could be done with an addendum, but the purpose was to address Standard 5. It was mentioned that M. Perl had information regarding how another institution collected their information on diversity and S. Benton noted that Dr. Griffin is collecting information on diversity as well and that perhaps we could coordinate the gathering of this information to not be duplicating requests for faculty information. P. Burden mentioned that David Smith had addressed Standard 5 as well, at the NCATE meeting, and while gathering information about Standard 5 we needed to have information about individual people and we need to be able to aggregate that data. The plan would be for a database to be used which would allow for data management. J. Hughey stated that is what they have requested and it should not be a problem to have the data broken down as needed.

**Technology** - T. Ross reported that although technology is not really a standard, during their meeting they focused on data sources and what information they have regarding the NCATE document. They looked at the program evaluation report, the 2002 OEIE report, and the EBI data as well. What they are trying to determine is where we are assessing our student’s proficiency in technology. It appears difficult to see where it is being evaluated. They are using a scope and sequence chart to help with this determination.

**Standard 3 Clinical and Field Experiences** - S. Yahnke reported that they have worked on the undergraduate program and used backward design to move from the student intern experience back through Block B/2 and A/1. She might need to meet again with her group to look at assessment of field experiences. They are also looking into providing opportunities for assuring the students are working with diverse populations and technology in the advanced programs for the Curriculum and Instruction Program. She also reported that Special Education has a
portfolio which is aligned to the Conceptual Framework. T. Salsberry commented that her class, which each semester includes people of color, allows for interaction of students consistently as attendance is required, providing an opportunity for documentation of diversity within advanced programs.

S. Yahnke stated that they now need to demonstrate their measurements across Elementary and Secondary programs, looking at how they assess throughout/ across all programs. A portion of this information can be provided by Dr. Perl’s office; however, they are finding additional data are needed from Block 2.

**Other**- M. Perl has just returned from a Kansas Reading First meeting and this Friday will be attending the Unit Heads Meeting in Topeka.

**Meeting adjourned**