J. Wissman opened the meeting at 2:30.

Dates for upcoming training opportunities were discussed. On site visitation training will be held at Mid-America Nazarene on July 26-28. This program reviewer training will be limited to 30 individuals. There will also be an opportunity to receive information this fall from NCATE/AACTE conference September 16-19 in Arlington, VA. J. Wissman asked that she be forwarded the names of those interested in attending either one of these sessions.

The notes from the last meeting were reviewed.

**Report from NCATE/AACTE Institutional Meeting: Washington DC:** K. Murry and W. White reported on the meeting in Washington DC. (See detailed hand-out) The two overriding themes for the meeting were assessment and diversity. Questions that were asked at the conference were not always answered. Data from 2006 were limited. It was noted when looking at the materials provided that many institutions are struggling with Standard 2. K. Murry mentioned that more detailed information can be viewed on the State Board of Education website. S. Yahnke stated that due to the grant, information has been documented from our Professional Development Schools. M. Perl noted that Standard 4: Element 1, states the students must have interaction with diverse groups. He made the point that while every one of our students has experience with
diverse learners, they might not have experience with diverse peers. He also stated there can not only be a percentage reported, but rather acceptable proficiency levels must be stated as to who is working with diverse learners. D. Griffith stated that regardless of what the institution’s definition of diversity is, we must follow the NCATE definition of diversity, which includes all forms of diversity. K. Murry provided a hand-out showing Emporia State University’s Diversity Proficiencies Expectations (see hand-out). In all programs, elementary, secondary, and advanced programs an 80% pass rate is expected on the national tests given. We could perhaps use an anonymous survey to see what experiences with diversity our students have. We could also possibly expand some of our programs we have already in place, such as those in Paraguay or Chihuahua, Mexico. M. Perl stated that when looking at diversity, you can consider pre-candidates, which then would allow us to look at the diversity in Arts and Sciences. Another option might be looking at tech-based opportunities for diversity exchanges, or formal teacher exchange programs- perhaps in an area such as Chihuahua. It must be kept in mind that we are making a “good faith effort” and that is considered, but the unit can not rely upon that. Improvement will need to be documented.

Discussion was given regarding what types of experiences with diversity our students have at this time, as we need to be documenting this. S. Yahnke asked if this interaction needed to be long-term, or could it be as brief as a spring break opportunity for exchange. Many of our students have student exchange experiences. D. Griffin stated that the efforts needed to be systematic; everyone needs to be having this experience. P. Burden discussed the use of professional hours as a context for this experience. Students could be required to accrue their hours in specified diverse settings. K. Murry said the students in Chihuahua do a large number of service hours. Perhaps we could connect and communicate through the web regarding those hours. J. Wissman mentioned utilizing the K-State University Community Service Program. They provide an opportunity to go with a team and work in a developing area. They work in schools and hospitals. One way to get this information dispersed would be to include it in the initial information given when students enter the program.

L. Scharmann shared that K. Taylor and B. Stoney are establishing a list of places where community service hours could be gathered. These settings would allow for more experiences with diverse learners and diverse peers. T. Salsberry stated that these competencies will also need to be documented and assessed in advance studies. We need to determine a standard list across the college.

W. White said the College Assessment and Review Committee is going to be writing a report on the student learning outcome results. They are dealing with the undergraduates at this time. The report is due to the Provost on June 1, 2006. They are constructing the assessment manual, placing information on the Web, and working to provide Professional Development opportunities such as the ones that occurred this semester. Much of this may need to be summer work. J. Wissman reported that 40 members of the faculty reserved space for the Monday, May 15 th session (Enhancing Instruction of All Learners) work session.

**Conceptual Framework:** The revised version of the College of Education brochure was reviewed. The changes that had been addressed at the previous meetings have been made. S.
Benton is continuing to make the revisions to the larger document. Plans are for the brochure to be printed during this summer.

**Technology:** T. Ross stated that the technology class as a stand-alone course was not the direction to be taken at this time. He said the discussion of integration of the technology courses into the Block courses was at a departmental level and asked that the chairs of Elementary and Secondary Education report accordingly.

P. Burden reported they have a committee, made up of D. Allen and L. Larson, that have provided recommendations very similar to what secondary education has noted. The elementary committee had not visited much about the “testing out” of the EDETC 318, but had determined there should be a technology course blocked with both Block A and Block B that would provide a connection with the methodology coursework. Methods instructors would include course requirements that would use technology.

L. Scharmann reported that they were looking at EDETC 318 as a remedial course, especially one that would target non-traditional or other students that may not be able to demonstrate mastery of basic computer competencies. They would use those two credits as a stand alone course during Block 1 or Block 2. Or, because there are differences in the needs of different content areas, perhaps the technology component could be administered through a consultant model. The consultant would be seeking out the latest in technology that would benefit our students in their classrooms. They would then meet with the students to help them best utilize the technology for their lessons. S. Yahnke clarified that this can not be an added responsibility to those teaching Block 2. She stated that the technology component should not be the responsibility of the Block 2 teacher. J. Wissman asked for suggestions related to a timeline for when these changes can be implemented.

The question was raised as to how we decide upon these competencies. The standards (ISTE) are not presented in a developmental way, so perhaps a matrix or chart would help us build these into our classes in systematic way. S. Yahnke suggested that we get a group together that would include representatives from the elementary, secondary, and graduate program. T. Ross will organize this group to work on this during the summer. He will work with L. Scharmann and P. Burden to organize this group to keep the momentum going. By Fall of 2007 there should be a recommendation from this group. T. Ross suggested he attend the NCATE/AACTE training session in the Fall to gather additional information that may be helpful, as technology needs to be addressed in all of the standards.

**Standard 1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions:** No Report

**Standard 2 Assessment:** Report included above in conference report

**Standard 3 Clinical and Field Experiences:** S. Yahnke reported that she is collecting all the portfolio and field assessment information. J. Spears mentioned that in grading the portfolios, she would like there to be a way to document when students are not using the professional or scientific language required in their content area. With the rubrics taken from the KPA document, that was not incorporated, but may need to be considered to accurately assess
students. J. Wissman clarified this as specific pedagogical content knowledge. T. Salsberry suggested that perhaps we could find a way to add in an assessment for specific pedagogical content knowledge relevant to each discipline.

**Standard 4 Diversity:** Report included above in conference report.

**Standard 5 Faculty:** No report.

**Teacher Quality Grant:** S. Yahnke provided a tentative schedule for the 2006 Equity & Access Summer Institute. (See hand-out). They are striving to have the Community College Advisors represented in order to dialogue regarding classes that should articulate with our program. This is a very big challenge, especially in the secondary program. It was noted that often incoming athletes struggle with this. (J. Wissman mentioned that she also is aware that some community colleges don’t seem to be communicating PPST information to students.)

S. Yahnke also spoke of the Geary County Literacy Institute that will be opened to our Institute attendees. She mentioned that the ACUMEN project will be in session in June, as well as the "We the People" social studies development program. This schedule may remain tentative until June 1. During the Institute each team will get an Issue Sheet (see samples). The goal will be to identify individuals to be held accountable for these tasks. These forms are still in draft form, but the individual teams will be walked through this process.

**Other:** Names were discussed of who might be interested in attending the On-Site Training sessions. J. Wissman asked for suggestions of people. P. Burden mentioned that the one at Mid American Nazarene would be especially helpful for new faculty members. *(Note: We learned from KSDE personnel that this training is not for new faculty. L. Scharmann will represent K-State at this meeting.)*

K. Murry mentioned that it would be a good idea to do a post assessment during the professional development session on May 15, 2006.

**Future Meetings:**

- May 15, 2006  Enhancing Instruction for All Learners: Professional Development Session, 10:00 – 12:00 BH 021
- September 13, 2006  PCC Meeting
- September 17-20  NCATE/AACTE Arlington, VA