

Program Coordinating Committee

April 20, 2005

NOTES

Those in attendance:

EIEd	Marjorie Hancock
SecEd	Larry Scharmann
EdAdl	Trudy Salsberry
SpecEd	Mary Kay Zabel
FAE	
EdPsy	Jerry Hanna
SCPS	Steve Benton
C&I	Paul Burden
Unit Subcommittee Chairs	
Conceptual Framework	Trudy Salsberry
Standard 1	Gail Shroyer
Standard 2	Warren White
Standard 3	Sally Yahnke
Standard 4	Kevin Murry
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	Jean Kiekel

Subcommittee Reports/Unit Status in Relation to NCATE Standards

Conceptual Framework – T. Salsberry would like to have the March minutes report to serve as the Conceptual Framework committee's response to the questions on the gray sheet.

Standard 1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions – G. Shroyer reported. This standard covers content and pedagogical knowledge. A Standard 1 summary was distributed. Items A through H give categories we need to assess within Standard 1. For each category, there is a series of questions (bulleted items on summary). The third bullet does not apply to KSU as our state approval serves in place of NPRR. Page two of the handout identifies our current progress toward Standard 1.

Dispositions – we are currently looking at the dispositions we have identified in our Conceptual Framework documents and ascertaining those for when we are able to collect evidence easily. Also, reviewing redundancies of dispositions.

We have a lot of information related to the observation process with our portfolios, student teaching observations, etc. We are also developing performance assessment in methods classes, some secondary, but most elementary students. We probably need to do a better job about collecting data on that. We have come up with plans and are piloting the plans.

The third page lists existing sources of data that are currently being collected. We do have PPST, PLT, content exam scores and portfolio scores. The portfolio scores have been compiled for last year and submitted to departments. We do have a lot of survey data: student teachers, exit interviews with student teachers, cooperating teachers, clinical instructors, faculty and administrators. We do have follow up data from our graduates but we probably need to look at this/survey more frequently.

Possible areas of concern: Example – for item D – Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills (initial and advanced) – see handout. G. Shroyer reports she is looking at the current survey data and doesn't feel that our surveys cover all the areas we need to cover. Initial and advanced outcomes are needed; we don't have a lot of advanced level data. Everyone needs to look at the programs to see what sort of advanced data we have and how to get more. Every standard asks for interview data and we don't have good interview data.

T. Salsberry – Is the interview a required data source or a recommended data source?
W. White – we are supposed to meet the standards but are not required to use evidence from interviews. There are different ways to get that data.

G. Shroyer – for most of our initial data we collect more survey than interview data. We need to do more about making sure we get this information. The specialized programs do have tests. We still haven't completely cleaned up the standards, but these are the things we have been working on.

We need to standardize some of our information. We know that all of our students completed the portfolio, however when we looked at the data, some scores were missing. Upon further review, the scores that were found to be missing were from students who were not at PDS schools.

Standard 2 Assessment System and Unit Evaluation – W. White reported, there are different types of assessment we are talking about. For program approval for the state department, we need a second content assessment that the university is responsible for. If there is an area of concern, it is that the programs are not looking back at the content matrices and this data are not being collected. This is an area that is going to be problematic for us during our next visit.

Standard 2 is related to what information is being collected in relation to the operation of our college. We are currently changing the way student teacher data are collected and reported to make it easier to see trends and patterns. We have asked all program faculty to identify how they monitor candidates. The employer survey was done this year after having been dropped for a number of years due to the poor response rate; we had a 77% response rate from this survey this time. One reason for the excellent response rate appears to be the ability to report anonymously. Advanced programs will be a problem because numbers are very small and confidentiality issues are harder to maintain. There may be a legal issue for districts, however with the anonymous nature of the survey, this issue would be a negligible effect. This survey was done by OEIE and they really did a good job.

As far as the assessment standards associated with NCATE, we are in pretty good shape. A concern relates to dispositions – dispositions are actually part of Standard 1. Dispositions are not directly assessed. A summary report developed by M. Gage (KSDE) was distributed to members. She reviewed the last three semesters' site visits to come up with the data on the report. From this data, one item that we are going to have to address is how program information is shared with candidates.

S. Yahnke asked that any data that are usually distributed to department offices be given directly to every faculty member to ensure that every faculty member sees the information and is able to respond to it.

Another concern is that we are rapidly approaching a point where there may be too much data. There has been an offer by the Department of Educational Administration and Leadership to do a pilot for collecting data for future assessment purposes.

We have had concerns about getting attainable, sustainable, meaningful assessments, especially for the secondary education program, so we have invited M. Gage to our campus to meet with faculty. She will be here on April 27, 2005 from 9-11.

Standard 3 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice –S. Yahnke reported. At least at the initial level, we pass this standard. We know that we have everyone out for significant field experiences which was a concern during the last visit. The standards committee still needs to work with M. Perl to find out how many candidates successfully complete student teaching. Advanced programs still need to be surveyed in relation to outcomes. The standard aligns with Standards 1 and 2; still needs to be aligned with Technology and Standard 4. One concern is related to standardizing observations to ensure that we get comparable data between the elementary and secondary programs. The Block faculty have worked to develop a portfolio that can be done and used for reporting purposes. We need to start building this into our program and push it backwards through the program. This also needs to be institutionalized in a way so that the numbers can be collected and compiled. We all complete observation forms during clinical experiences and these also need to be standardized. You can make changes to meet your own special needs, but if we are going to aggregate assessment data, the reports must look the same. We have students who have field experiences prior to entering our program and how do we count this? M. Perl – we do report it because students cannot be admitted to the program without previous field experience.

Should this be part of the assessment calendar? Probably.

We have tried to do this during the portfolio but there is a question related to use of technology by the candidates. We do ask students to show this, but getting students past using the overhead projector is not demonstration of meeting the standard.

We have to make sure that candidates have opportunities to work with students with exceptionalities. We don't have a specific field experience to introduce our students to these populations or working with paraprofessionals.

Question: Do we have a system in place to penalize students who don't complete the portfolio? M. Perl responded - the faculty have not decided that the portfolio is a graduation requirement. It is not a requirement for completion of student teaching.

(Faculty voted to affirm this as a requirement at the assessment meeting, May 11, 2005.)

We could say that it is a requirement for completing student teaching but we need the departments to set the policy requiring students to complete the portfolio. It would be a course requirement and only require a syllabus change without having to go through the Faculty Senate for approval. For advanced courses, Educational Administration and Leadership require the masters' students to complete a portfolio as their final examination.

P. Burden commented – we do have a final evaluation for student teaching. Is it your (S. Yahnke) thinking that that form would be used throughout the whole program for evaluation purposes? S. Yahnke – Maybe, if we can identify the pieces of the portfolio that align to the assessment information, it could be used to identify evidence that needs to be collected.

There has to be some commonalities across all field experiences for collection of assessment data for the Assessment Committee. Most of our conversation is about initial programs, but I don't think there are any commonalities across advanced programs. Are we comfortable with leaving the advanced programs for now?

What suggestions does this group have for discussions among departments? A meeting will be held on May 11, 2005 at 1 p.m. for faculty members to discuss this issue.

We cannot forget that we have to do something about diversity. We have to review our field experiences related to this expectation. We have a plan but now we have to start implementing it. P. Burden has Kansas information about diversity for each school. At least one elementary field experience places a student in a school that has a higher than state average diversity ratio.

Standard 4 Diversity – K. Murry reported. One of the things this committee has been doing is looking at templates that have been used for data collection in the past to determine which ones might contribute to a more universal template that can be used for formative data collection. We have also looked at the last NCATE report for the standard. We have asked members to go back to departments with this information to see what parts are no longer valid, what candidate activities have changed. With respect to courses, we have looked at what courses are still available, name changes, requirement changes, persuasive narratives; we have to argue that we meet the diversity standards. What actions/initiatives are going on in the College that might contribute to reporting on this standard? We are looking at ways to better coordinate with Diversity for Community Committee. We have a member on our committee who is also on that committee who will report and help coordinate actions between the two groups. We are looking at things we are currently doing through our Midwest Equity Center to document what we are doing. We are meeting with the Assessment Committee to talk about information needed for collection, how to document it and report it to show we are meeting the Standard. We are looking at what portions of this Standard apply to advanced programs. *(Diversity is the only standard that included an area for improvement in the 2002 review.)*

Technology – T. Ross reported. Technology is not really a standard. We don't have the data – we do not know how technology is being used across programs. There are concerns that there are some voids in what we are doing and where we are at right now.

Some of the questions will be answered in the faculty survey. Faculty will be able to begin filling out the surveys this summer (2005) and information can be collected from these surveys and analyzed by bulleted items.

Question: Our Block teams use PowerPoint to assist in their teaching. Could we collect these presentations to show range of quality? What are our expectations of initial students for technology use? We do a lot of technology training in 318, but is it ever stated what the expectations are for our students? Could this be added to the field experience assessment form? Perhaps committee could collect samples across a range, rubrics for assessment. T. Ross – The problem with technology is that we cannot make the rubrics prescriptive – due to the constantly changing nature of technology. Within the context of 318, to do the technology part of it, the rubric is not tied to content. Question: Is there some way that a rubric can be shared with faculty who ask students to show technology use in later classes? T. Ross – We have rubrics for 318 because we have four people grading, so we had to come up with some standards. We now need to look at state expectations and make recommendations for this area.

On May 11, each Standards committee's written reports are due. Advance team will review these reports and meet with chairs to discuss recommendations. There will be no PCC on May 11, so that we can have the assessment meeting with faculty representing Blocks I & A, Blocks II & B, and student teaching. J. Wissman, Associate Dean for Teacher Education, will chair the meeting.

Meeting adjourned.