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Jan Wissman called the meeting to order at 1:30. Notes from the October 11th meeting were reviewed. An update was provided on S. Benton, who is recovering from cardiac surgery. It was noted that the Campus Teacher Education Meeting has been cancelled, but will be rescheduled in January/February.

Technology Subcommittee: T. Ross provided a handout entitled: Technology Proficiencies-Based on the National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers. This information was provided through a committee that included: D. Allen, F. Burrack, C. Harris, A. Knackendoffel, L. Larson, and T. Ross. Their focus was on the undergraduate programs, not the advanced programs. They worked to collapse some of this information to make it a manageable document. G. Shroyer asked if they had looked at the way technology was assessed through the student intern portfolio. It was noted that L. Larson was aware of that information while working on this document.

G. Shroyer suggested that be considered carefully, since all students complete the portfolio. M. Hancock noted that looking at the current hand-out, it would appear that we are in the basic category and there are certainly opportunities for growth. G. Shroyer asked when students would be assessed on this information. It was noted that all of these competencies would not be assessed during a specific course, but throughout the program. A. Knackendoffel noted that all courses would need to be looked at to see where students were exposed to this information, and then assessed. She also noted that there have been a lot of changes in courses and faculty. P. Burden acknowledged the valuable information this gives for continuous program improvement, but wonders if one or two lines on the Student Intern final evaluation is sufficient to address these six different categories. He suggested that the student intern evaluation should align with these technology proficiencies. G. Shroyer asked which committee would be working
on aligning the courses to the proficiencies. The need is for some committee to decide where and when these proficiencies are being assessed. She suggested that we might want to do more documentation in the ST final evaluation, but she felt we could not assess all of the proficiencies on that document. M. Perl suggested that there are classes where our students can demonstrate these proficiencies. A. Knackendoffel recommended that another column could be added to note what is already being done. G. Shroyer added that then gaps could be identified. J. Wissman suggested that it would be appropriate to ask this committee to now look at where we are teaching and assessing these proficiencies. A. Knackendoffel suggested that Mike Ribble should perhaps be included in this discussion as well.

P. Burden suggested that we should also be taking into consideration how this information aligns with our current Conceptual Framework. G. Shroyer agreed that these proficiencies could be tied in with the Conceptual Framework headings. M. Hancock noted that it will be important to check with others outside the committee to see what is occurring within classes. L. Scharmann suggested that there are people looking at the 318 course and trying to see what this course should look like. The same people should be working with this. He noted that Dean Holen had stated that only when we have identified the course/s to replace 318 (and clearly identified the outcomes for this course), will we search for the person to fill that position. J. Wissman asked that the Technology Subcommittee give a progress report at the December PCC meeting.

**Standard 2 Assessment:** W. White stated that he and several subcommittee members met with advanced program representatives regarding necessary assessments for advanced programs. He has also sent packets of data to the departments to be reviewed. It is evident we need a lot more information on the advanced programs. G. Shroyer, S. Yahnke, M. Perl, and W. White met with the advanced program representatives and they have asked them to complete matrices to provide information regarding evidence and data now collected and gaps. G. Shroyer noted that they have identified the gaps, but need to be working on more transition points and alignment of the assessments with the Conceptual Framework. She stated there are known needs in the area of diversity, technology, and documentation on the impact on student learning. Every program needs to think of ways of addressing these needs. Sometimes these are addressed and not assessed. Another thing to consider is that in the advanced programs, often different courses are taken by the candidates. We need to look for some common experiences. M. Hancock suggested that perhaps those in advanced programs can develop some common criteria and coordinate efforts, rather than developing these assessments separately. W. White agrees that there are some entry-level data that can be accessed for all students in advanced programs. G. Shroyer noted that those students in advanced programs have letters of references, test scores, and grades (evidence). She asked if we are collecting data related to this evidence to demonstrate that the candidates have the chance of being successful. There are other areas that we are not assessing, such as the dispositions. Perhaps we could be asking them to write to certain areas? J. Wissman reminded us that we should not overlook institutional evidence that supports our conceptual framework related dispositions. J. Wissman asked if all advanced programs were included in these conversations (yes). W. White suggested that perhaps we should meet with all faculty to inform them. J. Wissman asked about the ETS information distribution status that has just been received. M. Perl noted that information should be out tomorrow or Friday (November 10th). W. White will provide that information to the various department heads. J. Wissman asked if that data should be included for review at this time. M. Perl, yes, the Praxis information does not take long to review, yet provides a lot of information. L. Scharmann asked if anyone can look at the data and serve as a guest member on the committee. W. White noted that a subcommittee will look at the data; the department heads will have the information and can provide it to those that want to review it. G. Shroyer stated that she thought it was too much to review during a faculty meeting. M. Perl stated that this year the scores look better, but there are still areas of concern, where we are scoring in the bottom quartiles. He noted one change has been that if
only five students take a specific test, we are given data on that (in the past it had been a minimum of ten). J. Wissman also stated that the TEAC committee would like to see how their feedback has impacted our programs. She acknowledged that sometimes this information relates to courses in our department, but not always. W. White stated that he would like feedback on this information (assessment data) by Dec. 1st. G. Shroyer noted that Elementary faculty is meeting Monday, and she expressed her concern that there might not be enough time to look carefully at the data. She noted that we need the time to look at the problems we have with our content tests. P. Burden acknowledged that there are several pieces of information to review; content assessments, Praxis information, and student intern portfolio scores. P. Burden said we can get started on Monday with the ETS information and the OEIE information and then content assessments may need to be examined on another day. G. Shroyer stated that during her sessions at the NCATE meeting she saw the extent that some are analyzing their data; looking at correlations, looking at predictive value- do our assessments predict how our students do once they get out and teach in the school- looking at validity. There are all sorts of things we can, or perhaps should be doing with the data.

**Standard 4 Diversity:** Prior to K. Murry’s report, J. Wissman distributed copies of a portion of K-State’s 2006 NCATE (Part C) Annual Report (forwarded to NCATE, November 3. 2006).

**Heads-up to subcommittee chairs:** It noted that while narrative responses for evaluations of and changes to standards are optional, we will provide a short written response to each standard in the 2007 NCATE (Part C) Annual Report. (Reminder: The 2007 Annual Report is the last annual report to be filed before the March, 2008 state program review reports and the next to the last annual report to be filed with NCATE before the 2009 on-site review.) Attention was called to our (1) optional response to Section 3, Section A, evaluations of and changes to the Unit’s conceptual framework during the year; and (2) no response to areas for improvement related to Standard 4 cited in the last (2002) NCATE review. (K-State’s only area for improvement is: ”Teacher candidates do not have opportunities to work and interact with other candidates from diverse ethnic and racial backgrounds.”) Conclusion: We must address this “area for improvement” in Spring, 2007! K. Murry distributed two hand-outs (pink-Multiple Perspectives on Diversity/M-pod and Tan-reference to L. Delpit’s work, ”Other People’s Children.”) K. Murry stated that the most important thing to recognize is that differences in our own socialization, cause differences in the lens that we use to view the world. It is as important that the candidates, as well as faculty have buy in to this concept. We don’t just want to provide contact with diverse students in the schools, but we need contact with candidates that are diverse as well. We need to examine what diversity we already have (all nine levels). (Refer to pink handout: Seven Ways to Address NCATE Area for Improvement) Part 1 recommends that we survey our own candidates. This would be an anonymous survey. The timeline would be to implement this in Fall 2006 - Spring 2007. Some universities are using student autobiographies to provide this data. Part 2 recognizes that it is not enough to just be together in a class, but students need to be working together. Each department would decide what levels of the nine types of diversity are present, and then see how students might be able to interact. For example, students could review a case study with modern classic practice. They could determine what action they would take as teachers, and how their perspectives as diverse candidates are part of their decision making. Elementary Education and Secondary Education faculty need to identify the course(s) to provide these types of experiences, such as Core Teaching Skills, Foundations of Education, and the Multicultural Education course. D. Griffith shared that with this course meeting just a few hours, this would be very difficult. He noted that he and F. Bradley had combined time to get more contact time with the students. "This is a course which should be a three hour course to provide what our students need. At this time it is a one hour course for secondary majors and a two hour course for elementary majors.” L. Scharmann reminded all that if you seek to increase it you do so at the expense of other courses, because you can’t increase the total program hours. M. Perl asked if our students really understand what it is we want them to know, the concept. It was decided that we work to implement both Part 1 and Part 2 of Phase 1, during spring of 2007. (Refer to pink handout)
We need to be intentional about knowing more about our own candidates. J. Hughey asked if working within our own candidates is enough, or do we need to look for diversity beyond our institution. K. Murry noted that on the back of the handout are given 7 steps, several which will address that. Technology could be used. Some of these suggestions will take some time to establish, but some are already in place. G. Shroyer mentioned that we could already implement #4-5 at this time. We have the Synergy students, as well as our current work with the Community Colleges in place. T. Ross asked for clarification regarding the survey. Would the survey ask them about their own diversity or their experiences at K-State with diversity? It would ask about the student’s own diversity. (This is a method for establishing diversity among our candidates. It does not address the area for improvement cited in 2002.) T. Ross shared that some students are still more likely to answer honestly with a scantron form, rather than an online form, due to their worry of the results being tracked. M. Perl noted that we already have racial diversity information regarding our own students. K. Murry also stated that many institutions are using SES information as well. J. Wissman also noted that in the new standards, "linguistic diversity" is also to be considered. G. Shroyer stated that for NCATE racial and ethnic diversity have to be areas to look at. J. Wissman asked for suggestions for implementation. L. Scharmann suggested that it is taken to departments then K. Murry could present this information to all faculty. An important thing to consider is to clarify for all faculty what we mean by diversity. There is the potential to pilot elements of interaction with our students in western Kansas next semester. It was decided that Elementary and Secondary Departments would have this information presented at their upcoming meetings. K. Murry will attend those faculty meetings to explain the opportunity to implement some of these items (p. 1 of pink handout) during the Spring 07 semester. A status report on this process will be given on December 13th (the next PCC meeting). K. Murry, J. Hughey and W. White will begin to work on Part 1 (the survey) to be completed by students and faculty in Spring 07.

J. Wissman thanked all who provided committee reports. M. Perl noted that there would be visitors on campus from Hutchinson Community College on Thursday. Please see him if you would like to accompany them for lunch for the purpose of discussing our programs. P. Burden volunteered.

Meeting was adjourned.

**Dates:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 17</td>
<td>Enhancing Instruction for All Learners: Building Bridges (10:00-12:00pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 13</td>
<td>PCC (subcommittees present three-year goals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10</td>
<td>PCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan./Feb.</td>
<td>KSU Teacher Education Luncheon Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(select date &amp; identify assessment data to share)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14</td>
<td>PCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24-27</td>
<td>AACTE, New York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 14</td>
<td>PCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 29-April</td>
<td>NCATE Institutional Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11</td>
<td>PCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20</td>
<td>TEAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9</td>
<td>PCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>