The meeting was called to order at 2:30 by J. Wissman.

Notes from the previous meeting, held February 8\textsuperscript{th}, were reviewed. J. Wissman requested that the agendas and notes from subcommittee meetings be forwarded to the Office of the Associate Dean.

\textit{Conference Report:} A report was given by M. Hancock and W. White detailing their attendance at the conference in Washington, DC, March 3-5, 2006 entitled: \textit{Cracking the Code: Making Sense of NCATE Standards 1 & 2}.

M. Hancock said that there were some overarching issues regarding Standards 1 & 2. One concern is that the rubric used for evaluation does not (in all cases) align with the standards. They were told that this was being addressed. It was also stated that NCATE is a process, rather than a visit, and throughout this process all institutions would have areas that will be targeted for improvement. It was also stated that “one of three institutions are not meeting one or more standards.”

Standard 1 (See hand-out for details): M. Hancock and W. White attended a session in which Emporia State commented on their visit in 2003. Information was provided about what data may be used as documentation. It was mentioned that grades could be used, as long as faculty can build consensus as to what those grades mean. A book/CD and additional hand-outs were received at the conference and it was mentioned that all
subcommittees might benefit from having the information provided on the CD. J. Wissman said she would make sure committee chairs would get a copy of the CD.

**Standard 2** (see hand-out for details): This was reported to be the most frequent standard *not* met. Often this is because the data are not integrated. The documentation detailing how the data collected is being used to facilitate program improvement is often not adequate. NCATE would like institutions to provide a single document that describes the entire unit assessment. J. Hughey noted that for UGE courses there is already assessment documentation available. She said that information provided looks at writing, as well as the active learning component. This information is given to the department chair and the faculty member that teaches the course, but the information is not broken down by college.

A top ten list was provided relating what to avoid in preparation for an NCATE visit. J. Wissman reminded everyone that our next site visit is in 2009. M. Hancock noted that there is a DVD which will soon be available regarding Standards 1-4.

**Advanced Programs** (see hand-out for details): M. Hancock related that she tried on numerous occasions to find answers regarding the advanced programs, but minimal information was offered. She did state that we are beginning to collect data at that level.

**Things to Do** (see hand-out for details): W. White stated that using the IARM system may be very helpful. It is a computerized system that breaks down the standards element by element. It helps focus on where improvement is needed. It helps institutions keep track of where they are, as documented by the evidence. He reported that most of the assessment information he needed to collect this year has been received. The CD which they received at the conference included suggested tables (some relating to diversity) which might be helpful.

W. White noted that NCATE wants us to look at predictive studies. We are to look at students that barely got into the program, and note how they are doing at this time. They are also wanting to look at demographic information about where/whom our students are teaching. M. Perl stated that the contextual factors forms could be sent electronically to provide some of that information, but G. Shroyer noted that information included on those forms (such as SES) relates to information about the school- not individual classrooms. She noted that information relating to individual classrooms would be very difficult to get, due to privacy issues. J. Wissman thought that perhaps those going to Washington, DC in April could seek more information about this. W. White noted that we are doing well getting the information out regarding the dispositions and implementation into the classrooms will be the next step. He also mentioned the need for “crosswalking”, alignment regarding state standards, INTASC, and our program.

**Standard 4 Diversity:** J. Wissman mentioned the professional development session to be held for faculty on March 10, 2006, relating to students of poverty. S. Yahnke asked if we should be documenting how we are integrating this professional development information into our own classrooms. W. White agreed that would be a very good idea. S. Yahnke suggested that we let faculty know about that now, so they can begin
documenting this. K. Murry noted that the professional vita will help provide documentation. S. Yahnke also shared that perhaps the presenters at the earlier professional development session did not have enough time to get through their information, due to the amount of audience questioning/sharing. She suggested that perhaps if these sessions occurred over lunch, questions and comments could follow the lunch break. G. Shroyer offered that we could talk to the presenters to get a sense of whether they felt rushed. J. Hughey expressed that if it was too long, fewer people may attend. L. Scharmann mentioned that perhaps there could be a follow-up session if more dialogue was desired. J. Wissman said that the Professional Development Advisory Committee would be meeting again, and this would be discussed. (Meeting scheduled for March 30.)

**Technology:** T. Ross reported that he had been in contact with secondary education regarding their input to changes to be made to the technology courses, and thought that would continue as an online discussion. P. Burden stated that elementary education had a task force that provided information regarding hardware, software, and the maintenance involved to keep the technology current. G. Shroyer mentioned that it had been discussed at one of the elementary education retreats, that perhaps the technology could be integrated throughout the program as a series of one hour classes aligned with what they would be doing in the schools. She stated that when L. Larson spoke to the clinical instructors about this, it was received in a positive way.

T. Ross provided the syllabus for the EDETC 318 course. He stated what was required was generic, in that it was not connected to content. The course is aligned to ISTE standards, but is not aligned with the Conceptual Framework. J. Wissman stated that alignment to the Conceptual Framework is needed. K. Murry asked what competency levels are expected. T. Ross noted that at the end of each unit there are exams and skill demonstration required. It was suggested by G. Shroyer that we come up with a list of things we want them to know how do, and then incorporate them across the different field experiences. S. Yahnke added that then we could expect them to have this technology incorporated in their lesson plans by Block B/2. J. Wissman suggested that all suggestions be put in writing and sent to T. Ross. She suggested perhaps a matrix could be established that would identify where these items would be taught. It was noted that the non-traditional students often struggle more with the use of technology. K. Murry suggested picking 2-3 classes and attaching a one hour technology lab to it. Students could then relate content to their use of technology. T. Ross mentioned that he would also like to address the specific needs of our second language learners’ use of technology as well. G. Shroyer stated that as this course is aligned to the conceptual framework, the assessment piece must also be developed. Evidence will be needed to document that the standards are being met. M. Hancock noted that in advanced courses, a technology course is required, but students don’t take the same technology course. It was mentioned that the Catalyst can support faculty with their professional development needs.

**Standard 5 Faculty:** J. Hughey reported that the Faculty Vita website has been closed, unless an extension was requested by a faculty member. 96 faculty members have logged on at least once, 16 have requested an extension, and 19 have not logged on at all. It was suggested that this information be given to department heads, so they could encourage those who have not provided their information, to do so. It is expected that
there will be sections which will not be completed by everybody. T. Ross asked if there will be records kept at different intervals, so changes/improvement can be documented. She noted that at the intervals where the information is locked, documentation can be gathered. L. Scharmann asked if those inputting information are only to document their information for the current cycle. Are we to only put in information since the last visit? S. Yahnke stated if that is the case, we need to be clearer in our directions. W. White stated that the plan is to sort the information by year, so they could locate information pertaining to the current cycle. This will be looked at, in more detail, as we continue to utilize this new online vita.

**Please Note:**
Diversity Professional Development Session #2 Students of Poverty: March 10, 2006
Campus Teacher Education Luncheon Meeting: March 31, 2006
Future PCC meeting: April 12, 2006
Diversity Professional Development Session #3 English Language learners: April 14, 2006
TEAC: April 28, 2006

Meeting was adjourned at 3:45.