

Program Coordinating Council

November 12, 2008

BH 021

NOTES

EIEd	Paul Burden
SecEd	Larry Scharmann
EdAdl	Trudy Salsberry
SpecEd	Ann Knackendoffel
FAE	
EdPsy	Kenneth Hughey
SCPS	Kenneth Hughey
ECE	Mary DeLuccie
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	Kimberly Staples
Standard 5	Judy Hughey
Standard 6	Jackie Speers
Technology	
Asst. Dean, Student Prof Services	Mike Perl
Director, Assessment	Warren White
Licensing Officer	
Assistant Dean for Diversity	David Griffin
Chair, Associate Dean	Jan Wissman
Graduate Student	Leah McKeeman
Scribe	Laurie Curtis
	Mary Hammel

Meeting was opened at 2:30 by J. Wissman. Agenda was reviewed and congratulations were extended to Dr. Lean McKeeman for completion of her dissertation. It was announced that our NCATE chair has been identified as Dr. Eileen Oliver. Members are to contact J. Wissman if there are any concerns regarding this appointment. If no concerns are expressed, she will contact NCATE to proceed.

External Review: J. Stramel has all sections of the IR for review. P. Bennett is out of town and will be returning November 14, 2008 to review the report at that time. Currently the report has more pages than allowed, but members were told to not worry about the length at this time.

Conceptual Framework: T. Salsberry provided the Table of Contents from the CF Handbook for review. The full document includes additional descriptions of what is included in the IR. The Professional Standards have been expanded from the brochure. The Handbook also includes a copy of the brochure, expanded information about Advanced Programs, an expanded bibliography, and an index of abbreviations used. Members were asked if relevant content information, that at one time was included in the brochure, should be placed in the Handbook. S. Yahnke noted ESOL was not included at this time. This information has not been separated from C & I, because many are just receiving the endorsement, but that needs to be addressed. It has been requested that the ELL program align their program with the framework. It was noted that consistency in wording should be checked- such as in the reference to Other School

Professionals. Although we do not have any data for Ed. D. candidates to report during this accreditation cycle, it was noted that we needed to clarify that it is an available option. J. Wissman asked that the professional dispositions be easily visible. Both General and Content Standards will also be referenced. T. Salsberry will be meeting with her committee to make final decisions and any questions or concerns regarding the Conceptual Framework should be directed to her.

Standard 2 Assessment: W. White reported that it is required that we have an assessment manual. There will be a Table of Contents provided with the final draft. OEIE has a very comprehensive website that will provide information to expand this report. The OEIE website is password protected, will be referenced in this report, and provides the link to all forms and data. S. Yahnke noted some changes that needed to be made in Secondary Education- and W. White noted that this has not been through a final check for accuracy at this time- and accuracy would be verified. J. Wissman suggested that when possible we should list the Advanced Programs first and then OSP- to remain consistent. M. Perl suggested that we should have a timeline which specifies what evaluations are occurring when and then that information needs to be shared. Discussion was given regarding the PhD in Counseling Ed. as it does not seem to fit in the OSP designation. It was stated that we need to maintain the direction that NCATE provides in defining how programs are noted- undergraduate teaching candidates, advanced teaching candidates, and other school professionals. It was suggested that in Table 1 we might want to code individuals accordingly. J. Wissman noted that the glossary that is provided is very helpful as it supports not only NCATE definitions, but KSU's definitions as well. G. Shroyer suggested that on Table 6, when looking at Clinical Practice, perhaps the exit from clinical practice can just be referred to as midpoint. A. Knackendoffel suggested that we call it - entry / admission point, transitions / midpoint, program completion. W. White noted that this was a required table for NCATE and he was not sure if we could differ from what was suggested- but he would check. This would bring the focus to the midpoint of the program- rather than the practicum- which is not applicable to all of our programs. J. Wissman reminded members that even though we have no data to share we need to include Early Childhood. W. White asked members to read the report and contact him with any changes and / or questions.

W. White provided data from a random sample of 20 syllabi to document how faculty report using diversity, technology, problem solving-critical thinking, reflection, and reference to the CF. He stated that he did not infer any information, but looked for explicit statements in syllabi. 19 of 20 reported referencing the CF. (See Handout). K. Hughey stated that information can be generalized from this information. T. Salsberry noted that this information may not be accurate, as instructors may attend to these elements- yet not place this in the syllabus explicitly. P. Burden stated that if this information is included- a narrative statement can provide that context for the data.

Standard 4 Diversity: K. Staples reported that we may have more diversity in our faculty than is now shown with current data, and provided members with a draft of a survey that could be conducted. (See Handout). Members discussed a previous discussion regarding gaining this information and it was determined that an open-ended format would be more acceptable. Question #11 appears to be the question that ties the information to student learning and would possibly provide more relevant information for our purposes in response to the NCATE prompt. Descriptors, based on the NCATE definition of diversity, could be provided to assist in the answering the prompt (through a drop-down format). This format would allow faculty to provide data that would not be captured by a survey requiring a single response per question. It was clarified that faculty, as well as Clinical Instructors, would be surveyed. Survey questions can be posed through Axio, delivered through an e-mail invitation with a link.

Exhibits: L Scharmann has met with the writers of the reports. He will be working with M. Hammel to link the exhibits shown on our website to the IR. If there is a hard-copy of a portfolio to be used as an exhibit, the hard copy will be showcased in the exhibit room. Borrow it, rather than copy it, whenever possible. Scanning will most likely not be done, due to loss of quality of the artifact. G. Shroyer is hopeful that we will just need one portfolio for the elementary program and one for secondary- and then one per Advanced Program. Rubrics used to acquire data- and newly revised rubrics- should be included. It was noted that blank rubrics could accompany the artifacts and all identifying information should be removed prior to placement in the exhibit room. G. Shroyer reported that many of the surveys and reports from employers are located on the assessment website. Reports will include summary tables and then link to the full report. M. Hammel suggested that the exhibit could be introduced with a description to help reviewers clearly identify context of shared information.

Closing Comments: J. Wissman will keep us informed regarding acceptance of the chair. She will inquire about portfolio exhibits and the use of a poster session for the first night of visit. Meeting was dismissed at 4:14

Future Meetings:

December 10

January 14

February 11

March 7-11 On-Site Visit