Meeting was opened at 1:30 by J. Wissman. Notes from the April 9th meeting and the agenda were reviewed. An updated schedule for NCATE preparations was provided. It was noted that comments from the program reviews are being addressed. May 1st the Teacher Education Luncheon was held at the KSU Union. Information was shared, but attendance was lighter than usual, perhaps due to having it scheduled later in the semester. Although no mock interview will be held prior to our NCATE visit, Janet Stramel and Phil Bennett have been asked to be outside reviewers as we prepare. Members were told that James Cibulka, from the University of Kentucky, has been named as the new president of NCATE, to replace Art Wise.

Conceptual Framework: T. Salsberry facilitated a discussion to gain feedback for the Conceptual Framework committee. She reviewed definitions of relevant NCATE terms and stated that she has reviewed some of the Conceptual Framework documents from other institutions. Several of those documents were provided to members to review. Our college has not been clear in delineating between our mission statement and our vision statement. In reading the definitions and reviewing the documents from other institutions, it appears that a vision is broader- a more optimistic view of where the organization would like to be. The mission statement explains where the organization is going now- the purpose- and what they actually do. We also need to provide a philosophy or statement of our beliefs. Our statement of “preparing educators to be knowledgeable, ethical, caring decision makers” is our vision. T. Salsberry stated that it would also appear that our mission is articulated as we address the standards in our CF brochure (we deliver exemplary instruction...promote understanding and celebration of diversity, etc.). J. Wissman noted that the university is creating a new mission statement which should be approved by BOR this month. T. Salsberry asked for additional input that would distinguish Kansas State University from other institutions, such as noting we are a land-grant institution.
Perhaps we should note that we have a rural focus, or that we connect the state by all modes of delivery of instruction? S. Yahnke noted that the phrase "living in a diverse world" had been in our statement in the past and may need to be included. J. Spears stated that she feels that we should include the fact that being a land-grant institution we are more vested in equity - that it is a goal that the character of education be embraced by the diversity of the culture. S. Yahnke reminded members that we will need to provide evidence for anything added to the vision. P. Burden suggested we may not want to make major changes just prior to the NCATE review. G. Shroyer suggested we explicitly state that our mission is consistent with the mission of the university.

Our philosophy appears embedded in our disposition statements. T. Salsberry asked members if they felt these representations were sufficient and an accurate reflection of our vision, mission, and philosophy. Members agreed these were sufficient, with some minor adjustments. J. Spears noted that a statement regarding the content knowledge teachers should have is missing. G. Shroyer suggested the statements could be phrased as a "belief" statement, addressing all four categories of Danielson’s framework. (example: “the educator reflects on his/her content knowledge and develops goals to improve...stay abreast of...”) Other ideas that may want to be included in the philosophy include: belief in continuous program improvement, belief in data-driven decisions, and a belief in life-long learning. It was suggested that we use parallel structure to enhance the reading of the document. T. Salsberry requested members to send her additional information (bullets) that they felt might need to be added. She will synthesize them and put them in the rough draft for the IR.

J. Wissman inquired about any additional changes needing to be made to the CF brochure. It was suggested that the brochure be labeled Conceptual Framework. Also it was noted that more emphasis on the terms vision, mission, and philosophy within the brochure would be helpful. The use of the term “proficiencies” was also discussed. NCATE uses that term continuously when referring to knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Other universities use that term in their brochures. S. Yahnke suggested that it could be placed at the top of our brochure, at the beginning, as the over-arching term. G. Shroyer suggested we could phrase it as, “candidate proficiencies as expressed by standards and dispositions”. It was decided that the Venn diagram be taken off the front of the brochure, yet left inside the brochure. It was discussed that when proficiencies are the focus of the narrative- then the examples of relevant content do not belong in the brochure. Discussion was given about the removal of those examples. M. Perl stated that the relevant content examples provide a connection for the incoming freshman regarding what types of courses are needed, but agreed that they could be removed. Others agreed.

In summary:
Utilize the term proficiencies where appropriate and identify “proficiencies” as knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Remove the relevant content information, add the new mission statement (checking with the KSU mission statement), remove the Venn diagram from front-retaining the copy of it inside the brochure, and title the brochure with the term Conceptual Framework. (Note: After this meeting we learned that the proposed revised mission statement for KSU would not be approved before the brochure was printed.)

T. Salsberry shared her experience reviewing a program in Puerto Rico. Several members expressed that the focus of any visit can be influenced by the chair of the committee. G. Shroyer asked for any insight gained in regards to dividing knowledge (pedagogical and content) for review purposes. T. Salsberry suggested that if we have defined (in our reports) how we are using it for our purposes, there should not be a problem. It was stated that prior to the interviews conducted during the review, there would be opportunities to share information with faculty, staff, and students. J. Spears asked for clarification regarding the number of allowed exhibits. This list provided to us by NCATE is the required list of exhibits and more may be
added as needed. T. Salsberry commented that it is critical to clearly label all exhibits provided- so the reader understands why they were provided.

Information was shared on establishing a professional development committee that would be responsible for addressing the developing needs of the faculty. This committee would be a subcommittee of Faculty Affairs and would be responsible for providing a long-range vision for faculty development. It is hoped that this committee would interface with the committee that J. Hughey chairs. J. Spears suggested it would be valuable to have increased communication between Adult Education and the rest of the College of Education.

Members were told of an upcoming web seminar for those undergoing NCATE review in Spring 2009. Since many have already participated in this seminar it will not be necessary that we participate this time.

Meeting was adjourned.

Next meeting:
September 10, 3:00 pm