The meeting was called to order at 2:30 by M. Perl.

**Subcommittee Reports:**

**Conceptual Framework:** T. Salsberry reported that the Conceptual Framework committee met on January 17, 2006 to address responses to questions regarding the next NCATE visit. She explained that the committee would like the wording of the mission/vision statement of the College of Education to include a new statement (in addition to the three which are already there) which would read “Promotion, understanding and celebration of diversity.” A call for a motion was made. W. White moved that the new statement be added to read “Promotion, understanding and celebration of diversity”, J. Hughey seconded, and it was approved by all in attendance. This additional statement would be reflected in the brochure and other materials which include the mission/vision statement. She mentioned that G. Shroyer and S. Yahnke will be working to streamline the goals/standards which appear in the brochure and the full Conceptual Framework notebook. S. Benton will be working on the updated narrative which will be merged into the full Conceptual Framework Notebook and appear in the NCATE report. Others who have volunteered to give input to this process include: P. Burden, B. Shoop, M. Kaff, and K. Hughey. It was mentioned that all must remember to continue to provide students and faculty with information about the Conceptual Framework at both the undergraduate and graduate level. (Please see Hand-out for details).
**Standard 1  Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions:** G. Shroyer provided a progress report which has been updated. She highlighted some of the work which has been done, such as approval of the dispositions, piloting of the content assessments, and work which is done to provide more consistent scoring of the performance assessments used with our students. In the case of the student intern portfolio assessments have been improved to provide more consistency in the expectations in each Block. Those changes were piloted during the fall 2005 semester and that is continuing this spring. Concerns which exist are listed on the hand-out, with updated information provided. It was mentioned that these items need to be addressed at both the undergraduate and graduate level. In discussing Standard 1, item D, M. Perl questioned the expectation regarding the term “laws”. G. Shroyer mentioned that she felt we did a very good job covering many of the mentioned items, but expressed that NCATE appears to want test data and “other” assessments, not just a reliance on grades. J. Hughey mentioned that in her Educational Psychology course, her comprehensive exam includes an essay question which may provide some of the needed documentation for assessment. G. Shroyer said that she is hoping that now they can locate and use items which are already embedded in course work. Accurate, credible, and consistent assessment is what is needed; scoring guides and rubrics are needed as well for these assessments. M. Perl stated that he felt it would be wise to document that we have attempted to help faculty become more consistent in scoring these assessments. L. Scharmann noted that we do have pertinent indirect evidence already, when we look at final evaluations of students and see the same information reported by various sources. G. Shroyer stated that she wanting to focus this now at the graduate level. M. Hancock added that is also difficult because of the unanswered questions regarding the NCATE expectations for graduate programs. T. Salsberry asked that be acknowledged that graduate courses are different in that respect. Some which do not require licensure may be held to different expectations than those that do. Question: if certification is not given through a program, are those programs held to the same standards? G. Shroyer noted that the wording of “initial” and “advanced” is relevant in this regard.

**Standard 2 Assessment System and Unit Evaluation:** W. White spoke to the fact that Standard 1 and Standard 2 are greatly intertwined. He provided an update on the Undergraduate Program Exit Survey. Members of the council had been given a draft of the survey prior to the meeting. The survey has been designed around the Conceptual Framework. He asked for any suggestions. T. Salsberry commented that it would be important that it not become too long. S. Yahnke mentioned that it might be valuable for students to see this early in the program so they had prior knowledge of what the expectations of the program were. M. Perl suggested that it could be presented during the orientation session. G. Shroyer made some suggestions regarding the wording which may need to be looked at which addressed category three “through the use of critical thinking”. She felt that perhaps the meaning was to “promote critical thinking”. She would pass her comments on to W. White. M. Perl said the next meeting of the Survey Committee is set for February 16th at 9:30 am. W. White said he could possibly meet with those having suggestions, but unable to make the meeting, beforehand. He also announced the employer survey last spring produced an 80% return rate from principals. He reported that the review of the dispositions was going before Academic Affairs tomorrow (February 9). G. Shroyer added that they were working on reliability of portfolio scoring, seeking inter-rater reliability between cooperating teachers and clinical instructors. That will be worked on this spring as well.

**Standard 3 Field Experience and Clinical Practice:** S. Yahnke reported that we know our students are struggling with diversity at the secondary level. She stated that she is setting up meetings to look at the advanced programs. She is also meeting with M. Hancock to look at the Curriculum and Instruction program. One item that needs to be addressed is what field experiences will look like at the advanced program level. At times that is dictated because it
leads to licensure, but not always. M. Perl mentioned that there will be a session on February 17th from 10:00 – 12:00 noon in room #21 on exceptionalities.

**Standard 4 Diversity:** K. Murry provided a hand-out which detailed the NCATE Standard # 4 on Diversity. He mentioned the recent KATESOL/BE conference which was highly attended. (600 registrants). He noted that faculty were encouraged to attend. He said they had received tremendous feedback regarding benefits perceived by participants. He is continuing to look at how faculty members can prepare candidates to work with students from diverse backgrounds, as well as looking at faculty diversity as well. He mentioned that he is very interested in how assessment data on diversity is used by candidates to improve practice. W. White mentioned that J. Wissman had spoken of an e-mail wondering if we could add an open ended element to the survey regarding working with diversity. T. Salsberry asked the question about how diversity might be defined in that instance and noted that if you wanted them to comment accurately you might need to define diversity in the context of the question. It was noted that perhaps the NCATE definition of diversity could be used in this type of question. S. Yahnke stated that often our students don’t recognize the diversity exists within their classrooms and deny that they need to use any accommodations for their lesson. K. Murry offered that students could use the information within the diversity standard as an advanced organizer in orientation. M. Zabel added that if they had seen it as an organizer, perhaps revisiting it in the survey might generate richer responses. M. Perl said we will be keeping data on who is being placed in diverse settings. G. Shroyer added that it is easier to do that in our elementary setting. S. Yahnke noted that we often use Junction City for a diverse setting and wondered if that could occur for secondary placements as well.

**Standard 5 Faculty:** J. Hughey reported that the vitae information is ready to be posted. The cover letter is ready and will go out tomorrow (February 9th). The deadline will be February 28th. When current faculty log-on, their previous information should come up. New faculty will be able to cut and paste their information from their vitae by responding to prompts. The link will be included with the cover letter.

**Technology:** T. Ross did not have any new information to report.

M. Perl reported that J. Wissman wanted to mention that the annual campus Teacher Education Luncheon meeting is scheduled for March or April. The focus will be on sharing content assessment information. Two dates were mentioned in March, the 17th and 31st, and the 31st seemed to be a better date for those in attendance.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:45.

**Please Note:**

Next PCC Meetings:

- March 3-5: Cracking the Code (NCATE STANDARDS 1 & 2) M. Hancock & W. White: Sponsored by AACTE, Washington DC
- March / April: Campus Teacher Education Luncheon Meetings Sharing Content Assessment Information
- April 28: TEAC meeting