Meeting was called to order at 1:30 by J. Wissman. Agenda was reviewed. J. Wissman noted that there will be brief status reports from those members in charge of the writing of the IR and then members will be provided an opportunity to attend the archived WebSeminar from NCATE.

J. Wissman reported that NCATE has been responsive to our questions and as requested, she received a list of consultants to consider for a pre-visit review. Members were provided the list and T. Salsberry recommended Janet Stramel as an experienced reviewer who has expressed an interest in participating. Phil Bennett was also mentioned as someone who is familiar with our program and is within our state. J. Wissman suggested that we have three names to consider and asked members to contact her with any additional people they would recommend for this process. It was suggested that the consultants be provided the report and supporting evidence in advance- and then be asked how much on-campus time they might need to complete the review. Although in the past our college had participated in a mock visit, it was suggested that was not needed this time.

J. Wissman noted that there will be a luncheon meeting on May 1st with COE members and others from Arts and Sciences. It is hoped that the reviews from the State Department will be returned by that time and data from those reviews can be shared. During that meeting M. Perl will provide enrollment data.

Status Reports on IR:
Introduction: J. Wissman asked for feedback on the Introduction. She will need to be identifying changes that have occurred since the last visit and she is seeking information from others to assure no changes are overlooked.

Conceptual Framework: T. Salsberry stated that when visiting with the reviewers they discovered that we need to write our philosophy and note the articulation between our mission statement and our vision. She suggested that the PCC might act as a representative body of the College in completing this task. She requested that we generate some key concepts or key beliefs to write our philosophy- that leads to our mission statement- and then to our vision. J. Wissman noted that the University mission statement is being revised at this time and the University does not have a formal vision statement. A. Knackendoffel asked if we could be given samples of the mission/vision statements of other institutions to begin this task. T. Salsberry agreed that might be helpful. It was suggested that we completed this task at our May 14th meeting to share with faculty in the fall. One other item that needs to be completed is the information about how the graduate programs build from the undergraduate programs- in all areas. She stated that once those tasks have been accomplished she will complete the work on the brochure.

Standard 1: G. Shroyer reported that she has nearly completed the changes suggested by her team of reviewers. She is anticipating completion of her report prior to the Summer Institute. She does not have the data that she is needing to complete her work at this time and is needing specific help in identifying what elements of our assessments line up best with the NCATE definition of knowledge and skills. She has collaborated with M. Hancock to do this with the C & I program but additional help is now needed for other graduate programs as well. For example, decisions need to be made as to which elements are to be aligned under pedagogy or pedagogical content knowledge. Sample reports she has read approach this differently. It was suggested that G. Shroyer identify who should be helping her with the graduate program section and then she can request the Department Heads to appoint those necessary to help her with the undergraduate program alignment.

G. Shroyer also noted that she will need help gathering all the data and synthesizing them. W. White stated that OEIE can be used for this task. It might be necessary to state that we don’t have certain information related to specific questions. J. Wissman stated that when considering that part of this is the focus on self-study that perhaps this information will show us what might need to be included on future surveys. T. Salsberry suggested that we could look at more qualitative evidence such as awards that graduates have received how many are employed in the area of expertise, etc. It was discussed if surveying our graduates online would provide this information. There was mixed support of the benefit of an additional online survey. W. White stated that the survey committee is meeting tomorrow, April 10, 2008 and this will be discussed.

Standard 2: W. White stated that he is very close to having the next draft ready for the reviewers. He is still working on the “optional” questions. He is waiting to get the review back from the State Department as it will be helpful for the completion of his report. J. Wissman said that the reports have been delayed and it is hoped that they will be here by May 1st.

Standard 3: S. Yahnke stated that she should have her report completed by May 1st. She still has a question about one chart. M. Perl suggested that she collapse it and then include the additional information in the appendix. She stated that the Advanced Program information at the end will
be the most challenging task. She has collaborated with M. Hancock, J. Teagarden, T. Salsberry, and J. Hughey, and is continuing to work on this.

Standard 4: K. Murry reported that he is re-writing a lot of his review with a change in focus from persuasive to strictly factual which will decrease the length of the document.

Standard 5: J. Hughey (via J. Wissman) noted that she should be done in the next two weeks. She had gleaned information from the online faculty surveys that may be helpful for other sections of the report.

Standard 6: J. Spears reported that she is about halfway done reviewing the data and interviews. She noted that some of her information was overlapping with J. Hughey so they will meet to work on that. To complete her report, she plans to meet with M. Holen to make sure she is interpreting the information she has gathered accurately. She is planning to meet with the Catalyst staff to gain information about the use of technology. She will meet with W. White to complete the section about the resources for development and implementation of assessment. She asked who provides evidence that part-time faculty meets high standards and it was noted that there is an accepted practice in place—but not a written policy. P. Burden suggested that the Department Chairs would most likely be the one to follow up on this. They would have evidence such as completed TEVALs. They would know what type of supervision and guidance is given.

J. Spears noted that she is still working on the question that asks what we do particularly well. P. Burden suggested she might want to have a conversation with M. Holen in regards to that. T. Salsberry and W. White noted that our College has fulfilled many leadership positions across campus, such as Faculty Senate President. She is also working to identify research that is being completed related to Standard 6. She stated that her draft should be completed by June. She is concerned with the length, but most of her exhibits will be noted as web-addresses.

J. Wissman suggested using the same reviewers for the second draft, those present agreed. The suggested date for the second draft to be completed is May 2nd.

Meeting was adjourned with members invited to stay for the archived NCATE WebSeminar that provides information for preparation for the 2009 visit. Members not choosing to stay were encouraged to view this on their computers. J. Wissman encouraged anyone with questions from this viewing to contact her and she would contact NCATE to receive clarification.

Next Meeting:
May 14, 2008