NOTES

Program Representatives
Graduate Education Paul Burden
Educational Leadership Trudy Salsberry
Special Education Ann Knackendoffel
Adult Education
Counseling Education Ken Hughey
Curriculum & Instruction Gail Shroyer
Early Childhood Education Mary DeLuccie

Unit Subcommittee Chairs
Conceptual Framework Trudy Salsberry
Standard 1 Gail Shroyer
Standard 2 Warren White
Standard 3 Sally Yahnke
Standard 4
Standard 5 Judy Hughey
Standard 6 Todd Goodson
Technology

Office of the Dean
Chair, Associate Dean Debbie Mercer
Asst. Dean for Diversity
Asst. Dean, Student Prof Services Mike Perl
Director, Assessment Warren White
Licensing Officer Di Murphy
Graduate Student
Scribe

Meeting was held September 8, 2010 at 1:30 PM. Notes from the April 14, 2010 meeting were reviewed. W. White moved to accept the notes, P. Burden seconded, motion carried.

NCATE/TEAC...CAEP: W. White provided an update on the NCATE/TEAC merger to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, Inc. Many standards and policies will remain similar including the option of Transformation versus Continuous Improvement routes. Three overarching standards include: 1) Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills and professional dispositions for effective work in schools. 2) Data drive decisions about candidates and programs. 3) Resources and practices support candidate learning.

Following a lengthy discussion regarding the two available tracks – Continuous Improvement or Transformation Initiative, the group arrived at consensus. The decision was made to stay on the Continuous Improvement track. This track requires our unit to identify one standard to move to the target area of the rubric. T. Salsberry moved at this point in time to identify Standard 2 as the “targeted” standard, with discussion open regarding Standard 4 at our next meeting. (K. Staples was absent from the meeting and chairs the Standard 4 committee.) W. White seconded. Motion carried. It was noted that the unit is already very strong regarding this standard and that resources are in place to support the required assessment work.

PCC Subcommittee Reviews
Conceptual Framework: No revisions are anticipated at this time. Committee examination of the CF to ensure an up-to-date knowledge base and to ensure it will carry us past the next cycle will
be ongoing. P. Burden noted that InTASC has distributed a draft of professional standards for educators. Our CF goal alignment will need to be updated to reflect the final standards. Most likely KSDE Professional Education standards will be updated to align with these new standards, as well.

**Standard 1: Knowledge, Skills, & Dispositions:** G. Shroyer discussed the issues of candidates taking the test to add an endorsement. This skewed our content pass rate data as often non-majors were not passing the content test in another area. OEIE has prepared a report that added the candidate’s major so that we could determine whether or not the test taker was a program completer.

**Standard 2 Unit Assessment:** W. White reported that the Unit Assessment Subcommittee continues to meet regularly.

**Standard 3 Clinical Experiences:** S. Yahnke noted that Standard 3 was strong and that an emphasis on advanced programs was necessary, particularly in 3b and 3c.

**Standard 4 Diversity:** The subcommittee is working on integrating diversity experience requirements into the Professional/Volunteer Service hours. K. Staples will provide more information at the next meeting.

**Standard 5: Faculty:** No report – ongoing work regarding professional development opportunities. T. Goodson noted that the university was in the process of adopting an online vita software program that would allow colleges to add accreditation specific fields. This would replace the process the college currently has. More information will be forthcoming.

**Standard 6 Governance:** The group welcomed T. Goodson to a Standard 6 leadership role.

**Technology:** No report – ongoing work regarding moving technology issues to target across various standards.

A visual representation of the Conceptual Framework was discussed. Concerns regarding the amount of text on the poster, as well as whether the dispositions should continue to be listed under the CF goal were noted. It was decided that we did need a visual reminder of “who we are.” D. Mercer will request that M. Hammel design a couple options for us to consider.

The PCC committee structure was discussed. Strengths and challenges of the current structure were noted. Transfer of knowledge and expertise, the need for new perspectives, and the need for more knowledgeable involvement of faculty were key themes in the discussion. The structure will continue to be reviewed during the fall semester as we prepare for the next cycle. A co-chair system, perhaps focusing on initial and advanced programs, will be explored.

Meeting was closed.