

Program Coordinating Committee

November 16, 2005

NOTES

EIEd	Paul Burden
SecEd	Larry Scharmann
EdAdl	Trudy Salsberry
SpecEd	Mary Kay Zabel
Adult Ed	Frank Spikes
CSD	Steve Benton
C&I	Marjorie Hancock
Unit Subcommittee Chairs	
Conceptual Framework	Trudy Salsberry
Standard 1	
Standard 2	Warren White
Standard 3	Sally Yahnke
Standard 4	
Standard 5	Judy Hughey
Standard 6	
Technology	Tweed Ross
Asst. Dean, Student Prof Services	Mike Perl
Director, Assessment	Warren White
Licensing Officer	Di Murphy
Chair, Associate Dean	Jan Wissman
Graduate Student	Laurie Curtis

Notes from the October 12, 2005 meeting were reviewed and the name of the meeting M. Perl attended was corrected to read the Learning First Alliance meeting.

Those in attendance reviewed the roster stating titles of those comprising the committee and FAE was changed to read Adult Ed., and Ed Psy and SCPS was combined to become CSD.

Governance Handbook-editing

Members were given pages from the Handbook for Governance. S. Harbstreit, Chair of Academic Affairs, has asked members to review the section of the handbook dealing with Academic Affairs, including the section related to the PCC. W. White and J. Wissman have reviewed it to update the language. T. Salsberry mentioned that members are often not staggering their terms as once planned, so they are planning to let the individual committees determine who, and for how long, members serve on each committee. The wording from the past will be eliminated and new wording will reflect this change. Program representation will be for up to two people, but programs must send one. M. Perl asked for clarification that if two representatives are sent they each will have a counted vote. That was confirmed to be the case. It was noted that Tenure and Promotion must send two representatives. J. Wissman noted that continuity is extremely important. When the continuous improvement model was established all program areas were to be considered (even non-licensure programs). The Diversity Committee is looking at increasing the numbers of people involved to do the work of that committee. M. Perl mentioned that there is not an undergraduate student involved in the Program Coordinating Committee, and it was decided that since there is undergraduate representation on the Academic Affairs committee that the PCC would continue without an undergraduate representative. P. Burden noted that undergraduates are given other opportunities for representation and J. Wissman stated we should include undergraduates on other PCC groups. F. Spikes brought to discussion the Alumni Fellows, as co-chairs of the TEAC. J. Wissman stated that it depends on their geographic location and their professional

field, but that they are actively involved when appropriate. *(Please see attachment noting specific changes which were recommended for the Handbook)

Sub-Committee Reports:

Technology- T. Ross reported that R. Talab, D. Allen, met (with input from C. Harris), to attempt to fill out a scope and sequence of technology needs. The sub-committee then went to the individual departments to look at three basic components:

1. Where do the concepts related to general use of technology, such as technology's role, ethics, equity, and productivity belong in the program?
2. How do we tie in the specific skills respective to content and instructional practice which our students will need to implement instruction in the classroom?
3. How do we insure that all students are given the opportunity for use, and demonstration of appropriate technology? How do we address the needs of new faculty who may not have technology as an area of their expertise?

The goal is to fill out this scope and sequence to try to determine what this model should look like.

J. Wissman asked if this work focused on undergraduates, and T. Ross noted that at this time, that is the plan, but that is the starting point and then they would progress to the graduate program. P. Burden noted that L. Larson and D. Allen have gathered discussion information about competencies, budgets and personnel and reported that at the last Elementary Education retreat. They had identified software and hardware which would be needed, as well as personnel needed to deliver the instruction. The ongoing cost of updating current hardware and software was also mentioned.

Conceptual Framework: T. Salsberry provided a detailed hand-out of the summary of their last meeting held October 27, 2005. It addresses the request by D. Griffin to place a greater emphasis on diversity within the Mission Statement. Discussion was given to include the phrase "in a diverse society" or "in a diverse world" as well as including the outer part of the graphic.

P. Burden had some questions about the alignment of the standards with the goals on the Conceptual Framework document. He stated that the advanced team looked at the goal as an overarching goal and the standards aligned below them. W. White mentioned that he had noted questions regarding the standards not "summing" to the goal. T. Salsberry mentioned that perhaps G. Shroyer and S. Yahnke could add some clarity to this and asked that those who have specific concerns please send her those concerns in writing so they can deal with them in their committee.

Standard 2 Assessment System and Unit Evaluation:- W. White reported that his sub-committee is trying to re-do the exit survey for undergraduates. It is not clearly aligned at this time with the conceptual framework. They are trying to make it easier to interpret. The new format will be based on the Conceptual Framework and standards and they are trying to use a seven point scale to organize the scores by domain. This is given at the end of student teaching. M. Perl stated that those surveys already being used will be given after Thanksgiving to the Elementary student interns, and the Secondary interns will be given these during their last observation of their internship. M. Hancock stated that the graduate programs in Curriculum and Instruction had aligned their surveys with the Conceptual Framework and they are piloting those surveys at this time. M. Perl asked if the established survey would be replaced with this

new one, or will it be asking for different information? There was discussion that perhaps they could be combined.

W. White mentioned that the Conceptual Framework had 40 + dispositions listed and that number was too many to deal with. G. Shroyer and S. Yahnke have narrowed those down to 8, taken from the four domains. They include:

Perspectives and Preparation:

The educator consistently demonstrates a belief that all students can learn, has high expectations for all students, and persists in helping all students achieve success.

The educator consistently demonstrates a belief in the inherent dignity of all people, respects the customs and beliefs of diverse groups, and provides equitable opportunities for all students to learn.

Learning Environment:

The educator consistently takes responsibility to establish an environment of respect and rapport and a culture for learning to enhance social interactions, student motivation and responsibility, and active engagement in learning.

Instruction:

The educator is consistently flexible and responsive in seeking out and using a variety of strategies to meet the cognitive, physical, emotions, and social needs of all students.

Professionalism

The educator consistently seeks to keep abreast of new ideas and understandings in teaching and learning.

The educator consistently demonstrates collaboration and cooperation with students, families, community, and educational personnel to support student learning and contribute to school and district improvement efforts.

The educator consistently reflects on his/her professional strengths and weaknesses and develops goals and plans to improve professional practice.

The educator consistently accepts responsibility as a professional to maintain ethical standards.

L. Scharmann voiced concerns about having the students recite a list of dispositions, separate from the context of the classroom, but W. White mentioned how the students are often assessed, mentioning that they need awareness of the specifics of the dispositions. P. Burden noted that this does not involve changing our standards, but we must know to what degree we need to have college wide review of these changes. It needs to be known when these will be put into force, what implementation steps will need to be taken. L. Scharmann stated that secondary has already voted on, and approved, the new list of dispositions. Elementary had looked at the list at the last retreat. W. White said we would need to state in our document how we got from 46 to 8 dispositions. T. Salsberry stated that we would account for the process. This will help us have more meaningful measures and it can be shown how it connects with our assessment. J. Wissman mentioned that in the narrative we could clarify these changes, and remind the reader that the Conceptual Framework is a tool for planning our undergraduate classes. S. Yahnke stated that these assessments should work for all areas (special ed. Administrators, teachers) and noted that they tried to choose items (in the dispositions) which could be documented with evidence. M. Perl voiced his idea that we needed a more formal approval of the Conceptual Framework showing the reduction in number of dispositions. F. Spikes mentioned that it could be brought before the representatives of Academic Affairs. T. Salsberry stated that they have faithfully represented the process and had opportunities for discussion and confirmation and hopefully this could now move forward. J. Wissman

proposed after Elementary faculty approved the change in the number of dispositions, then it can go before Academic Affairs and the representatives can look at it and then move it along to Faculty Assembly.

J. Wissman has met with the portfolio committees for Block A, B, and Block 2 with a focus on the Student Intern Portfolio and working backward to look for gaps which need to be addressed to prepare our students for successfully completing it. P. Burden stated the Elementary Faculty has been very responsive to working toward continuity between the blocks. They are trying to use the same forms and assessments, when possible.

Standard 5 Faculty: J. Hughey reported that they are still in the process of placing the faculty information on –line, and hopefully this will be completed by the end of the year.

Ending Notes: J. Wissman suggested that we not meet on December 14th. The regularly scheduled meeting for January 11th has been moved to January 18th at 2:30 PM.

Meeting was adjourned.