

# Program Coordinating Council

September 13, 2006

## NOTES

EIEd	Paul Burden
SecEd	
EdAdl	Trudy Salsberry
SpecEd	Ann Knackendoffel
FAE	
EdPsy	Steve Benton
SCPS	Steve Benton
C&I	Marjorie Hancock
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
Assistant Dean for Diversity	David Griffin
Chair, Associate Dean	Jan Wissman
Graduate Student	Laurie Curtis

J. Wissman called the meeting to order at 2:30 PM. She welcomed everyone back for the new semester. Members reviewed the notes from the May 10, 2006 meeting.

S. Yahnke asked if we have received the list of available locations to be used for community service hours. K. Taylor was to be providing this and she will be contacted in order to update that information.

**Revised Conceptual Framework Brochure:** It was noted that a brief introduction, as well as the dispositions, have been added to the Conceptual Framework brochure. M. Perl provided this information to students during orientation. S. Yahnke stated this information was helpful as she constructed her syllabus. A. Knackendoffel asked if this information was being provided in other places, other than in orientation. It was suggested that perhaps we should survey faculty to see other ways this information is being shared, such as being placed in course syllabi. T. Salsberry asked if the graduate programs were to have a list of dispositions coded. S. Yahnke asked if graduate programs would focus on different dispositions. T. Salsberry stated that they would be identifying dispositions by standards, therefore, the wording would be different. She noted that the current Conceptual Framework was designed for the undergraduates. She further noted that every program should be able to keep the dispositions broad enough to meet the needs of their program.

J. Wissman shared an article that commented on a report by Arthur Levine, regarding NCATE. She also noted that late summer she was notified that the NCATE standards were being fine-

tuned. Changes being addressed include adding linguistic diversity, under diversity, as well as other minor changes. Those chairing the subcommittees will be given a copy of these changes.

**Standard 4 Diversity Subcommittee Report:** K. Murry had met with the advanced team and presented a Power Point highlighting work done over the summer. He commented that as they prepared this information they tried to work with assessments and procedures that were already in place. He provided a hand-out (*Appendix B of the Student Teaching Handbook- Coded for Alignment with Proposed Revisions for Alignment with the 16 Diversity Proficiencies*) which aligned the diversity proficiencies with the Student Teaching Portfolio. It was noted that the yellow and green highlighting demonstrated wording that has been changed or aligned, as well as documentation points, between the two documents. T. Salsberry asked if NCATE has a specified list of proficiencies that have to be used. It was stated that NCATE does not provide this. K. Murry stated that in order to determine these, they consulted information provided by the last NCATE meeting in Washington, as well as looking at reports of what other institutions have done, merging that with what we already have in place at K-State. Hand-outs were provided and the following comments were made:

- The “proficient” column was used for alignment, rather than the column noted as “distinguished”.
- There was a “re-coding” of the Conceptual Framework, moving the dispositions ahead to provide a mindset for skills and knowledge. This is consistent with the new Conceptual Framework brochure.
- NCATE has not stated that there needs to be a separate set of dispositions for undergraduate and advanced programs.
- We are already assessing in a variety of ways, it is now critical that we create effective feedback loops (K. Murry will work with W. White on this)
- The COE website will need to be updated to reflect these /any changes
- Faculty /staff will need to be informed with this information.

K. Murry then asked if these diversity proficiencies and parentheticals should be approved by the departments. He also asked if the 23 item checklist from the student intern matrix should be added to this information. He asked for information on how best to assess these points and what the criteria should be used for demonstrating proficiency. He asked if further re-coding is necessary. T. Salsberry stated that this information provided a wonderful documentation of what we have in place. She noted that this information is already imbedded within the materials we have in place, and did not feel that coding in this detail was needed. She noted that feedback is already in place through the current evaluations. M. Hancock agreed that much of this information is already integrated within the current information we collect. S. Benton stated that Block 1 could “tweak” what they are doing to document some of what we need to document, such as the self-reflections to see that they are thinking about diversity. S. Yahnke stated that all the Block courses would need to address this in order to give feedback. *(We need to agree upon shortened list of diversity proficiencies and tie to standards, then determine where and how they will be assessed.)*

G. Shroyer acknowledged that K. Murry devised this information based on our student intern observation instrument. She suggested that instead, it should originate with the standards. She suggested starting (in the first column) with the standards and then aligning the student intern portfolio and our observational assessments with the standards, noting the diversity proficiencies. By doing this, we would probably find that the diversity proficiencies would be combined into fewer than sixteen in number. The proficiencies could be operationally defined by referencing the standards. She stated that if we look at these proficiencies at such a minute level, we will need to document assessment for each one. T. Salsberry noted that if we approach this from the standards, we already have in place multiple assessments and multiple feedback opportunities per standard, as found in the current student teaching portfolio and the

observational rubric. This would allow us to utilize the information we are currently gathering. M. Perl asked if we were getting this specific information for Block B, but it was noted that OEIE isn't breaking the data down that way at this time. (*Assessment Director will direct OEIE to break out data according to Blocks after the above actions have been determined.*)

G. Shroyer said she would work through this process with K. Murry. The headings for the expanded rubric (as provided in the expanded hand-out) would help with this procedure. J. Wissman asked for terminology clarification, noting that the "proficiencies" are the knowledge, skills and dispositions we are expecting our students to master. She noted that the dispositions are included in the standards, yet not explicitly stated. A certain disposition can be seen across multiple standards. G. Shroyer emphasized that we don't want to assess at the indicator level, except for our internal use. J. Wissman commented that we want to be able to assure NCATE that all of our candidates have had experience with students of diversity. She noted that we look at this information for program development, not just for assessment.

J. Wissman and others thanked K. Murry for his work on this presentation. It was recommended that he proceeds by aligning the diversity proficiencies, beginning with the standard. Upon completion of that, the COE materials will be updated and distributed. T. Salsberry recommended waiting for distribution in order to check with any additional information provided by NCATE. She noted that it is unlikely that any of the information provided will be taken out of the document, just re-aligned under the standards. W. White added that this information will also include how / where this information is being documented. T. Salsberry suggested that when this process is completed, we can place in a user-friendly format, similar to the brochure.

**Standard 2 Assessment:** W. White reported on the revised *Undergraduate Program Exit Survey*. The revised survey provides alignment of the survey with the Conceptual Framework. He reported that they still might add two more items. One of the additional items may be a question to determine what opportunities our candidates have had to interact with other candidates that are diverse. Another item to possibly add might be a question to determine what international experiences our students have had. J. Wissman noted that Dean Holen mentioned that at least 10% of our students should have an international experience. She also stated that during student teacher orientation, approximately 10% raised their hands stating they had had an international experience. Discussion was given, however, as to what might constitute an international experience. The question arose if these experiences should be educationally based, or include any international travel experience, mission work, etc. M. Hancock stated that more information, such as this, could be requested on the STAR form that students fill out prior to student teaching. W. White stated that it is important to share the information that will be on the exit interview with students early in their program. P. Burden asked if a question should be provided to document student experiences with diverse faculty / staff. J. Wissman noted that some institutions are using virtual experiences to provide extended diversity experiences with candidates (peers). T. Ross asked if a question was needed regarding school law and ethics. M. Perl stated that the question regarding school law was removed because it does not reflect the COE Conceptual Framework. P. Burden commented that if this was addressed, it might be wise to do it in the context of teacher and student's rights and responsibilities. J. Hughey noted that possibly what we teach, they don't perceive of as school law. She also commented that more information regarding diversity could be included in the faculty information through faculty self-reporting. M. Perl stated that some institutions gather socio-economic background of faculty. (*M. Perl will follow up on STAR form suggestion.*)

S. Benton noted that the 1-7 scale appears to be a 1-6 scale on the survey. W. White stated that the *Undergraduate Program Exit Survey* will be administered at the end of the semester. J.

Wissman asked how these are administered within Elementary and Secondary programs. They are administered differently. Discussion was given and it was mentioned that consistency in exit data gathering may need to be a future agenda item. (*Ad hoc committee - P. Burden, L. Scharmann and M. Perl are addressing this observation.*)

*Other:* J. Wissman reminded all in attendance that PCC will be meeting on the second Wednesday of every month from 1:30 – 3:00 PM. Remaining dates for the year are included below. Members are encouraged to forward future agenda items to her office.

*Future Meetings at new time 1:30 pm:*

October 11  
November 8  
December 13  
January 10  
February 14  
March 14  
April 11  
May 9