

Program Coordinating Council

November 11, 2009

BH 021 2:00 PM

Program Representatives

Elementary Education	Paul Burden
Secondary Education	Larry Scharmann
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 & Lotta Larson
Standard 2	Warren White
Standard 3	Sally Yahnke
Standard 4	Kimberly Staples
Standard 5	Judy Hughey
Standard 6	Todd Goodson
Technology	Cyndi Danner-Kuhn

Office of the Dean

Chair, Associate Dean	Jan Wissman
Asst. Dean for Diversity	David Griffin
Asst. Dean, Student Prof Services	Mike Perl
Director, Assessment	Warren White
Licensing Officer	Di Murphy
Graduate Student	Deb Abernathy
Scribe	Laurie Curtis

Welcome: Meeting was opened at 2:00. J. Wissman welcomed those in attendance. T. Goodson and L. Larson were introduced as new members and welcomed to the meeting. It was noted that Royce Ann Collins will be replacing J. Zacharakis as Adult Education representative on the PCC Subcommittees. A list of members was provided and may be subject to change.

Notes from September PCC meeting were reviewed. T. Salsberry reported that the on-site accreditation visit for the university in Puerto Rico was cancelled due to a strike and may be rescheduled at a later date.

KSDE Update: Dean Holen sent a note acknowledging the Accreditation Report and the letter that accompanied it stating that all standards were met. We have not heard officially about the KSDE approval. Information will be reviewed independently the end of November. Announcement cards have been sent out to our peers, superintendents, Kansas State Department of Education, administrators in the state, the Governor and a press release will be sent out to share our continued accreditation status.

M. Perl went to the Unit Head meeting and reported that the Leadership licensing exam was discussed and is to be piloted from Jan. 25 – April 30th. They are also piloting a mentoring program for administrators and teachers, one in western Kansas and one in eastern Kansas. G.

Shroyer is to be on the IHE commission to have input on the mentoring program. Federal monies and the Wallace Foundation are helping to fund pilots at this time as they hope this pilot will help to form a statewide model. Currently there is an informal mentoring program in our schools and no money for additional funding at the current time. M. Perl also reported that it was discussed that there may be a Higher Education Profile written for each institution related to tuition, graduation rates, length of program, how and when field experiences are addressed, etc. to allow consumers to compare programs. J. Hughey asked if this is related to concerns related to qualified admissions from the Board of Regents and M. Perl said that each institution should submit a plan, then institutions can set their own admission standards, which may vary. No update on revision of the standards was provided, but members should be thinking of individuals to recommend from our institution to serve on these committees is asked.

NCATE Update: A report from Rick Ginsburg addressed the possibility of blending TEAC and NCATE. There is a plan within the next year that both organizations would dissolve and rejoin as Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education. The plan is to blend these two organizations into one and operate out of Washington DC.

W. White and L. Curtis went to Topeka for an NCATE meeting. (See handout and copy of PowerPoint slides). There were two formats of accreditation, which were discussed for future accreditation cycles.

Continuous Improvement: This is similar to what we have done in the past, however the IR will be limited to 40 pages. In the IR you respond to the six standards by speaking to 3 prompts. Every institution then selects one standard in which they are striving to move to the Target Level. At the time of the visit the institution may not be at target yet, but it is important to show what is being done to achieve that goal through the use of data. There will be a list of required exhibits to be provided electronically. The IR will be provided a year in advance and six months prior to the on-site visit there will be an off-site review. Electronic exhibits and the IR will be reviewed during a 4-5 hour electronic collaborative meeting. Feedback will be provided so areas of concern can be addressed prior to the on-site visit. On-site visits should occur from Sunday afternoon through Tuesday at noon. For KSDE program improvements three years of data will be gathered. When we did our program improvements report in 2008 we had a minimum of 8 assessments, maximum of 12. We will now have minimum of 6 assessments and maximum of 8. We will all get together after the first of the year to make adjustments for this. Now we can use course grades as one assessment and Praxis scores - including the subscale scores. We can use our assessments to assess more than one standard. Ed. Admin. has already worked through this change.

Transformation Initiative: This type of accreditation process is being piloted for now. It relates to an identified research question or area of need to improve the Unit and as research data is collected it is to be reported to other institutions to provide valuable information to improve practice. (See handout)

PCC Subcommittee Reports:

Standard 1: G. Shroyer & L. Larson met with their subcommittee and determined that to work to move Standard 1 to target would be extremely difficult, due to the fact that the wording is for *all* candidates. (See handout). *All* programs need to have *all* expected data from undergraduate and graduate programs. We need to address missing data related to candidate's impact on student learning. We can review the data we have to see how to improve. All need to (1) continue to keep records and (2) examine the reliability and validity of our own assessments. J. Wissman asked about the inclusion for Early Childhood Ed candidates (for follow-up surveys, etc.) and they need to be included for the next cycle. M. DeLuccie is using many of the same

forms and now they will be using the same tables. M. Perl noted that their data should now be entered into our system.

Standard 2: W. White noted that the Assessment subcommittee will meet Monday, November 16th. Standard 2 could be identified for making the Target Level. The undergraduate system is outstanding, we just need to enhance the graduate program data collection and incorporate the Early Childhood Ed program. Data are systematically entered and reports generated. Advanced Programs are more challenging since they are all different, but OEIE has provided strong assessment management and maintenance for our data. He reported that 30% of institutions fail Standard 2.

Standard 3: S. Yahnke reported that Standard 3 subcommittee met on November 3, 2009 (see handout). Specific suggestions were noted for elements 3b and 3c for both the Initial and Advanced programs to move this standard to Target Level.

Standard 4: K. Staples reported that the Diversity subcommittee met on October 26, 2009 (see handout). It was suggested that a unit-wide repository for collecting data aligned with this standard be developed to receive both student and faculty input. Service hours could be used to specifically target interaction with exceptional students from diverse groups. Application of candidate information related to Contextual Factors and Student Learning Adaptations can be revisited, and documentation of course activities/ assignments focusing on diverse learners noted. D. Griffin shared that changes in a course syllabus informed by TEVAL comments shows that we are striving to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Standard 5: J. Hughey reported that the Standard 5 subcommittee will be meeting November 12, 2009. She is sending out an e-mail related to reviewing the faculty abbreviated vita in order to compare the new prompts with the information that is currently being submitted. Please submit any suggestions to her. She noted that the Early Childhood faculty would now be included. Standard 5 did meet Target in 3 areas, but there are other areas to target of improvement.

Standard 6: T. Goodson will be holding the Standard 6 subcommittee meeting in January, 2010.

Technology: C. Danner-Kuhn stated that the technology subcommittee met electronically and had questions about some discrepancies. G. Shroyer stated that those were at the graduate level (which relied on self-reporting) where evidence from their portfolios and from rubric scoring resulted in us scoring them higher than they score themselves. C. Danner-Kuhn did note the positive comments related to the responsive changes made in the technology courses provided.

J. Wissman stated that the advanced team will be meeting soon and asked members to be considering what type of professional development would meet our needs next year. She asked that any suggestions or additional comments related to the discussion today be forwarded on to her.

Meeting adjourned.

Next Meeting: February 17, 2010