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Meeting was held April 14, 2010 at 2:00 PM. Notes from the February meeting were reviewed. J. Wissman announced that TEAC will be meeting on April 23rd and information provided from PCC provides insight and guidance for the agenda for those meetings.

PCC Subcommittee Reports
Standard 2 Unit Assessment: W. White reported that the Unit Assessment Subcommittee has been meeting regularly and will be meeting on Monday, April 19th. He noted that elementary and secondary programs have each won an award. He has met with graduate program chairs to review program approval changes. He reminded those present that NCATE has changed the process for accreditation and additional information will be provided as it becomes available. He mentioned that conducting research about the changes seen with adding additional research courses may be something to consider.

Technology: C. Danner-Kuhn demonstrated the new Apple iPad. She shared some basic applications and discussed how this technology could be used in the classroom for regular or special education students. She has been selected to travel to Apple headquarters for professional development. Members were given a copy of the new ISTE standards. She shared a condensed version of the standards for administrators. She spoke about the new National
Technology Plan and noted that it speaks of all students having complete access to Internet technology every day. She reports that we are seeing more students bringing laptops to campus. It appears that 50 – 60% of our students in the COE have the Mac as suggested. She is working with classes integrating technology into course assignments. She shared examples of lesson plans and multimedia resources. J. Hughey inquired about students using an electronic portfolio to showcase skills and abilities when being interviewed - they could include a video of the teaching of a dynamic lesson. The current technology course has them develop a website and the website that our students develop could be a means of delivering portfolio artifacts. S. Yahnke shared that some students are frustrated by their lack of access to technology. C. Danner-Kuhn stated that the goal for the technology committee is to do more integration projects within courses to allow students to apply what they are learning. G. Shroyer cautioned about security issues and students’ rights related to videotaping in the schools, while the teacher being the focus of the videotaping is not usually problematic. C. Danner-Kuhn reported that the students in the new technology course are addressing an Internet safety unit, and are exploring the use of cell phones as an instructional tool — for example texting answers to a problem. She noted that while some Internet connection problems may need to be addressed it didn’t appear the students struggled with exceeding their texting limit on their cell phone plans. The Technology Subcommittee will be scheduled to report at an early Fall 2010 PCC meeting. The report will focus on “acceptable” to “target” technology related recommendations related to NCATE standards.

Standard 4 Diversity: K. Staples discussed the handout (provided last month) related to the work of the Diversity Subcommittee and the use of community service hours that would incorporate opportunities for students to interact with students with exceptionalities and diverse learners. Responses provided from Ed. Council were shared. The suggestions note that students would like instructors to facilitate these experiences. She suggested that having this experience aligned with course would work well and professionalism hours would allow for a systematic experience for all students. While there would be a minimum number of hours set, students could most certainly commit to more. She noted that J. Hortin has agreed to integrate this experience within his class. In the new Block B, K. Staples is developing a Science and Diversity Course Packet. J. Wissman suggested that this information should be shared with faculty in the fall after the Diversity Subcommittee has had the chance to meet again.

J. Wissman Notes: J. Wissman reflected on the work of the PCC that has a twenty-year history on the campus.

Background – the Beginning
• The PCC grew out of the 1990-95 COE Knowledge Base Committee (developed during the 1992 NCATE/KSDE accreditation self study), and out of discussions with members of the COE Administrative Team (a group that preceded the current COE Administrative Council) in Spring 1995.

• The PCC Advance Team, charged with responsibility for PCC organization and agenda development was formed as a result of discussions among members of the COE Administrative Team and Dean Holen.

• The PCC was officially institutionalized as a Subcommittee of COE Academic Affairs in 1996 with the Associate Dean identified as PCC chair.

Some highlights of early years
• Documentation of early formation meetings show Dean Holen gave the official charge related to the launching of a continuous improvement model where he emphasized that the PCC
would focus on continuous improvement of all licensure programs in the unit; however, non-licensure programs should not be ignored (reason for the inclusion of representatives from non-licensure programs such as adult education on the PCC).

- Provost Coffman supported the continuous improvement model in his meeting with the PCC and Administrative Council in February 1996.

- A two-year Eisenhower Grant was acquired to support the initial work of the continuous improvement model. (Ten $1,000 sub-grants were available to subcommittees for initial work, and more than 100 practitioners were involved in subcommittees in 1996.)

**Model and Work of PCC Replicated/Adapted at national, state, and campus level**

- The 1997 NCATE/KSDE accreditation team reviewers cited the PCC continuous improvement model as exemplary, and as a result the associate dean was one of three IHE representatives nation-wide to share the K-State model at a special national NCATE meeting— forerunner of NCATE national orientation meetings.

- National and state level site reviewers have consistently praised the PCC as a model for continuous improvement in subsequent reviews — 1997, 2002, 2009. K-State was one of the first IHEs to be used as a statewide training site for program and accreditation reviewers.

- Since 1992, the PCC has been responsible for the leadership associated with the development and refinement of the Unit Vision Statement, Mission Statement, and Conceptual Framework. This PCC work (e.g. caring, ethical, decision-making, diversity) is observed in other IHEs across the state and across the campus (e.g., Leadership Studies).

**Future of PCC**

- Dean Holen continues to support PCC as reflected in the job description for the new associate dean. Both Dean Holen and Associate Dean Wissman are in agreement that the Advance Team serves a useful function for organization and development for the PCC, and that future composition (reflecting COE restructuring) should include the associate dean, assistant dean for student and professional services, director of assessment, assistant dean of graduate studies, and department chair of Curriculum and Instruction.

**Some Recommendations Offered by Outgoing Associate Dean Wissman**

- Review Responsibilities of the PCC Subcommittees
  In addition to the obvious charge that subcommittees oversee the continuous improvement of the unit in relation to NCATE standards, it is recommended that the PCC review and where appropriate expand the charge to the subcommittees based upon perceived/identified college needs. (e.g. The Faculty Subcommittee could be charged with expanding their faculty data collection role to leadership for faculty development since the COE doesn’t have a college-wide committee responsible for faculty development.)

- Continue to interface with the TEAC, another subcommittee of the COE Academic Affairs Committee. Unlike the PCC, the TEAC has practitioner and student involvement. (The development and refinement of the Unit Conceptual Framework is an example of an outcome resulting from TEAC and PCC interfacing.) It is perceived that PCC subcommittees could be called upon to generate TEAC agenda items that in turn could inform the work of the subcommittees.

- While the PCC has been Task oriented (and probably always will be given the organization ties to accreditation standards), Wissman recommended increased emphasis on PCC providing unit-wide leadership for reviewing, reflecting, and sharing research in the field of education.
Organizing faculty discussions related to faculty research and/or research and practice in the field seems to fit the charge of the PCC. (e.g. The 18 month unit-wide professional development program focusing on diversity research and practice is one example of a program that had its origin in observations by members of the Assessment Subcommittee. A current observation related to both formal and informal assessments is the need for enhanced emphasis on preparing candidates to work with parents and families. This observation (related to NCATE standards and the COE Conceptual Framework) has implications for future professional development sessions for faculty.)

Based upon question raised by T. Salsberry at the close of the meeting and later reflections, the following additional recommendation is offered:

- Given NCATE’s decision to create two alternative pathways to accreditation (Continuous Improvement track raising the target level of performance beyond the “acceptable to the Target levels”; and the Transformation Initiative track), it is recommended that the PCC review requirements for both tracks and go on record (Fall 2010) as choosing one of the two tracks for ongoing accreditation related work in the Unit. Since the announcement of these two tracks, the PCC has operated on a group consensus that we identify standards for which we desire to move from acceptable to target (e.g. Assessment Standard #2).

Dean Wissman thanked the PCC members for their leadership and support, and invited members to forward thoughts relative to the recommendations as well as additional PCC related recommendations to her.

All in attendance thanked Dean Wissman for her leadership and service to PCC and for her guidance of this group throughout the years.

Meeting was closed.