The meeting was called to order by W. White at 2:00 pm. Notes from the previous meeting were reviewed and no additions or corrections were made.

Standard 5: J. Hughey reported that her committee has met twice as a group. The online vita has been sent out with the deadline set for April 5th. After submissions have been completed the committee will meet to determine if any changes need to be made. It was noted that the data received is private and only aggregate data will be reported. Those who have reported can print off their vita although the format is not ideal. This information is used to provide information for NCATE.

Standard 6: T. Goodson reported that the committee met and discussed the elements. They went through each area that was not reported at “target” and when consulting the rubric it would appear that we should be close to target in the areas marked as acceptable. With the changes being made, such as the change in technology course, we should be improving. W. White noted that the process of answering questions, rather than writing to the rubric was also different than in the past. It was noted that the
model ECSC facility, which is infused with technology, would be a part of the report next time.

Standard 2: W. White reported that the Assessment committee is meeting monthly.

Standard 4: K. Staples will submit a report as she is teaching at this time and may not be able to attend today.

TEAC: W. White reported that TEAC will be meeting on April 23rd and the protocol has been that those attending are given three questions to consider for discussion during the on-campus interaction. He asked for any questions or issues that may be critically important for discussion at the next meeting. G. Shroyer shared that we should use caution about asking for input in areas that we are unable to truly address without necessary funding, etc. Ideas that were suggested included an update on technology, the Early Childhood Research Facility, the amount of research course work needed to support classroom teachers, class delivery that meets the needs of practitioners, and supervision of alternatively delivered classes.

In consideration of the need or availability of research courses that graduate students can access, it was discussed in what situations a student might move through our graduate programs without a research course. K. Hughey noted that he gets a lot of questions about online research courses that are offered- they are being offered by other institutions. It was noted that many universities (such as Ft. Hays) do offer these courses online- and they are less expensive than our offerings, especially with the fee schedule used by DCE. T. Salsberry stated that our students need to have the chance to look at large data sets and determine strategies that are effective based on the data sets. T. Goodson noted that it appears students rely on publishers for their data related to effective strategies/programs. G. Shroyer added that when they have explored if districts/teachers were researching the effectiveness of programs prior to adoption, they found out that teachers were not engaging in this research. She also reported that superintendents say that teachers need to know how to interpret data that they do get from assessments in order to make good instructional decisions.

Discussion was given about Professional Learning Communities in schools. Some schools are expecting teachers to conduct teacher research so we must make sure our students are prepared for this challenge. T. Goodson noted that he had seen districts considering cutting in-service days due to budge restraints. While the state requires teachers have their own professional development plans- requirements can be met in several ways.

Meeting was closed.

Future PCC Meeting Dates: April 14, 2010