J. Wissman called the meeting to order at 1:30. J. Speers was welcomed back and it was noted that since L. Curtis had completed her degree a new graduate student should be invited to attend the council meetings. It was determined that Leah McKeeman will be invited to attend future meetings as the graduate student representative.

NCATE Standards and IR Guidelines (effective Fall 2008) were distributed to subcommittee chairs.

Notes from the April 25th meeting were reviewed. The statement from the notes regarding middle level program changes was discussed. It was clarified that we don’t offer this program within the elementary education program at this time; however it is embedded in the secondary program. D. Murphy provided documents dated June 13, 2007 that summarize the regulation changes which were adopted by the State Board of Education and became effective August 10, 2007. The document states that although Special Education endorsements are excluded from this option, teachers that have already completed their initial program can add an endorsement in middle level education by 1.) verification by a teacher education institution that they have 15 semester credit hours in the content area they are seeking endorsement in, 2.) verification that they have completed a middle level pedagogy course OR have recently had an accredited experience, one year or more, in grades 5-8; and 3.) verification of a passing score on the appropriate middle level content assessment.

It was stated that many will be able to meet the semester course requirement because general education courses can be counted in this model. It was also noted that there is not a requirement that student internship be completed at the middle level with this new endorsement.
plan. D. Murphy verifies that they have met these requirements, but we can not identify specific courses they must complete for this endorsement- we can **recommend** but not **require** specific courses. Several stated that the content test would hopefully determine those adequately prepared for the content understanding in the endorsement area. L Scharmann agreed and added that the reduced content course requirement would make it difficult to pass the content area tests and stated that it is very important that the passing score requirement not be relaxed. Although we have a 2.5GPA requirement of our students in their teaching field and overall, this endorsement can also be verified for those that did not complete our teacher education program. S. Yahnke asked if we can work to make decisions about what those 15 hours of content courses would look like- it was noted that while we can recommend those courses to our traditional students, we still can not require- but only verify courses. P. Burden suggested that we seek to have the students identify themselves as early in the program as possible so we can use opportunities for practicum experiences/student internships in the intermediate grades to better prepare them. D. Murphy clarified that the methods class will count as one of their content courses. It was also noted that elementary endorsed teachers can currently get a provisional endorsement at the secondary level- although secondary endorsed teachers can not get a provisional endorsement at the elementary level. It was also noted that you can not add a K-12 endorsement with only 50% of the content courses.

It was noted that this is one of the responses to the perceived teacher shortage. United States Senator Pat Robert’s legislative assistant, Allison Anway, has stated that there are 1100 teacher vacancies within the state. Some discussion was given regarding the date of collection of that information and questions of whether that number is still accurate. However, G. Shroyer stated that this is still the number that is being suggested from the governmental offices. Sue Peterson, Assistant to the President; Director of Governmental Relations is aware of this as is Melvin Neufeld, State Representative- District 115. (See document entitled Summary of Regulation Changes adopted by the State Board on June 13, 2007)

M. Perl stated that it is important that the focus on the endorsement still remains around those who have completed an education degree program- as opposed to endorsing a candidate from a content background with no teaching background. G. Shroyer discussed how this will affect currently licensed teachers who are working toward the 30 hours of required content courses- such as those participating in the Equity and Access Grant. She noted that an established teacher must use the rubric to determine if they are “highly qualified” at this time. This will be something to continue to check.

**Reports:**

J. Wissman stated that drafts of each report are due by October 1. When the Advanced Team meets October 3, a review process will be developed. M. Perl asked how many people have been trained as NCATE reviewers. T. Salsberry will soon be an NCATE trained reviewer. There are several faculty trained for state program reviews. M. Perl recommended that we invite a team to come prior to the 2008 visit to conduct a review for us as we have done in the past.

J. Wissman stated that the next meeting will be an NCATE Web Seminar held in Bluemont Hall #21 from 1:00 – 2:15 (note time change). Donna Gollnick will make a presentation with a focus on 2009 site visits- their timelines, institutional materials, third party testimony, the size of the BOE, interviews that may be conducted, and additional information the institution may need to provide for the visit. Requests for third party testimonies will be advertised in our alumni newsletter and other places in order to request feedback from patrons. Subcommittee chairs were provided with the final approved list of our standards and the IR directives (hand-out provided).
Subcommittee Reports/Questions:

Conceptual Framework: T. Salsberry reported that it was suggested that the graphic of the CF brochure be reviewed. It was the goal to highlight the four categories of the CF. Therefore, the new suggested graphic includes a visual representation of four pillars in support of our programs. After discussion regarding the amount of detail and design it was agreed that the design be updated, and that the simpler of the graphic proposal was a good choice since the narrative will explain the meaning behind the graphic in more detail. T. Salsberry stated that the four categories would be introduced early in the regular document. Also, the review of literature has been updated, and Initial Programs and Advanced Programs now have a brief description linked to the four categories. (It was noted that the three circles depicting general education, professional education, and content studies could be useful for introducing the big picture of the teacher education curriculum to new students, the CF focuses on professional education—one of the three circles.)

Standard 1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, & Dispositions: G. Shroyer has been reviewing varied institutional reports on Standard #1 and those reports include the data in the body of the report. There are sub-categories in this standard (knowledge, skills, and dispositions) and data that have been collected have been combined. In order to report the information by sub-category this data will need to be separated. She is hoping to have an outline of the report by October. She asked if we want to include all data presented within Standard 1 within the body of the document- due to the length. M. Perl stated that Phil Bennet (ESU and an NCATE trained review) said to make sure that the data are included in Standard 1. S. Yahnke asked if we are all going to follow the same format. J. Wissman stated that the format presented at the meeting today is the format that should be followed. S. Yahnke asked if transition points are to be described in her report or if there should be a link to W. White’s report to explain these points. She noted that is it difficult to write to this when it is unknown what other members are doing. M. Perl suggested putting in as much information as possible into the report and then it can be edited out at a later time. G. Shroyer added that what is included as content, pedagogy, and pedagogical content knowledge has been reported (in what she has reviewed) in different ways. She asked if she is to make her own interpretation regarding these areas. It was agreed that the definitions of these terms are very vague. J. Wissman noted the importance of our inclusion of a glossary of term with our report to help make these definitions relevant to our writings. Concern was voiced for providing all of this information in only 12 pages. It was noted that although pages are limited for the report there are no limits on appendices or links.

Standard 2 Assessment: W. White had no additional information to report or questions to bring before the council.

Standard 3 Clinical & Field Experiences: It was clarified that this report is to be six pages in length. Again, it is assumed there will be links and/or appendices.

Standard 5: Faculty: J. Hughey noted that the last time it was discussed, it was determined that we would not ask for specific evaluation data from our faculty (such as TEVAL information) due to confidentiality. She expressed her concern that other institutions are reporting such information. She stated that we do have good data for this standard. She asked for members’ suggestions in reporting data that would clearly answer the questions. It was suggested that we could report what percent of the faculty meets or exceeds 95% or the determined expectations. Each department could provide that information. Written policies for faculty evaluation are also on file and can be included with the report as related to teaching, research, and service. Vitae will provide additional information and rather than report specific TEVAL evaluations, it will be clear that TEVALs are a required component of faculty reviews.
Standard 6 Unit Governance: J. Spears has met with W. White and had no additional questions for the council.

J. Wissman asked for members to send to her any additional questions that may arise as members continue to work on their assigned reports and noted that all members would be involved in the review process.

Technology: T. Ross reported at the close of meeting that the technology audit of Advanced Programs identified that some candidates had experience with technology, but that those experiences are extremely varied.

Additional Information: J. Wissman informed members that Martha Gage is no longer with KSDE. It was also announced that Art Wise will be retiring at the end of the year from NCATE. Also please note that the state department has cancelled its scheduled orientation meeting for new faculty that was to be held on September 27, 2007.

PCC Fall and Spring Dates:
 October 10, 2007 — Note meeting location & time: 1:00 p.m. in BH 021
 November 14, 2007
 December 12, 2007
 January 16, 2008
 February 13, 2008
 March 12, 2008
 April 9, 2008
 May 14, 2008

Other Important Dates:
October 1, 2007 - Drafts of KSDE Program Review Reports and I. R. Reports Due
October 3, 2007 - Advanced Teams
October 10, 2007 – NCATE Web Seminar 1:00 BH-021
October 19, 2007 – Teacher Education Advisory Council
March 1, 2008 (or before) – Program Review Reports Due to KSDE