

Kansas State University
College of Education
Teacher Education Advisory Council

Holiday Inn
October 24, 2008
9:00 AM– 2:00PM

Present:

Jan Wissman	Associate Dean for Teacher Education
Cindy Barta	Middle-Level Teacher, Bonner Springs
Warren White	Faculty, Director of Assessment
Jamie Bauerle	Student Outside COE
Molly Hamm	COE Honors Program
Pedro Miller	English as a Second Language
Emily Winter	Undergraduate Student, Secondary Education
Chelsey Skoch	Undergraduate Student, Elementary Education
Susan Gronquist	Elementary Teacher
Heather Caswell	Elementary Teacher
Jeanine Murphy	Elementary Teacher
Cindy Barta	Middle-Level Teacher
Kellie Puderbaugh	Middle-Level Teacher
Kristin Lee	Special Education
Terry Boyd	Secondary Teacher
Chele Behrens	Secondary Teacher
David Duran	Secondary Teacher
Kay Forsyth	Counselor
Bob Shannon	Superintendent, Manhattan, KS
Carolyn Scott	Clinical Instructor, USD 383
Paul Burden	Chair, Elementary Education
Larry Scharmann	Chair, Secondary Education
Brad Burenheide	COE Academic Affairs
Carol Franko	College of Arts and Sciences
Karen Pence	College of Human Ecology
Tweed Ross	Faculty, Technology
Mary Devin	Educational Administration and Leadership
Della Perez	Faculty, English as a Second Language
Tim Frey	Faculty, Special Education
Mary DeLuccie	Faculty, Early Childhood Education
Gail Shroyer	Faculty, Elementary Education
Sally Yahnke	Faculty, Secondary Education
Di Murphy	Faculty, Licensing Officer
Mike Perl	Assistant Dean, Student and Professional Services
Laura Needs	Career & Employment Services
Laurie Curtis	Faculty, Elementary Education

J. Wissman, Associate Dean of the College of Education welcomed those in attendance. She provided a brief explanation of the history and mission of the Teacher Education Advisory Council. This council is comprised of Kansas State University faculty, K-12

administrators, teachers, other school personnel, and students. This council provides input to the Professional Education Unit. A brief review of the KSU Conceptual Framework was provided. This document was revised summer (2008), and provides the foundation for the unit. It was noted that 23 program reports for the Professional Education Unit were submitted to the State Department of Education and all programs have been approved. It was announced that Kansas State University will be hosting their NCATE accreditation visit from March 7-11, 2008.

Introductions of co-chairs, W. White and C. Barta were made. An introductory activity was done to allow members to converse with on another. An article from the NCATE newsletter, The Societal Challenge, was shared. Small group discussions were held concerning perceived strengths and concerns regarding our teacher preparation program/ advanced programs/ COE Website.

Question #1:

“How are recent K-State professional education graduates and /or programs perceived by: you, colleagues at your school, and/or colleagues in your specific professional field? For all the concerns noted, what actions do you recommend for K-State?”

Group reporting the following strengths:

- Well regarded/ good reputation
- PDS model highly respected
- Breadth of field experiences is strong
- Graduates gain the confidence of their employers
- Graduates are provided good “coaching” and feedback from supervisors
- Graduates exhibit research-based practices
- Graduates are reflective of their teaching
- Graduates have had experience working with diverse populations
- Graduates are well prepared in:
 - Technology
 - Lesson planning
 - Professional image
 - Skills and pedagogy
 - Ability to differentiate instruction to meet student needs
 - Ability to express their ideas and thoughts
 - Understanding of theoretical foundations of education

Actions/ Recommendations for Improvement:

- Continue with even more reflection
- Make sure students focus on standards first/ “no fluff”
- Foster collaboration while maintaining individual accountability
- Help students with desire/skills for professional networking
- Provide more information regarding NCLB
- Provide even more depth in field experiences
- Encourage flexibility/adaptability
- Increase the amount of reading instruction

- Students need to know not just how to engage special needs students, but also those apathetic to learning
- Continue to stay current with field: MTSS, KPA changes, etc.
- Increase the teaching of information regarding assessment
- Instill in them the value of being mentored
- Continue to connect practice with the Conceptual Framework
- Promote additional educational opportunities/ graduate school
- Utilize use of scope and sequence for standards
- Helpful to check back with new teachers to help in retention/ questions answered
- Provide UG students with model of traditional and blocked classes
- Provide students with opportunity to utilize data for decision making: Assessment of learning/ Assessment for learning
- Caution students with sharing information on-line/ social networks
- Technology must be infused at “day 1” at the university level- students need to use technology during field experiences. KSU students need hands-on experience with technology such as smart boards, video streaming, podcasts, etc.

G. Shroyer explained the concept of the new technology course which will then provide skills to be integrated into the methods coursework. P. Miller noted that there is a problem between the Apple and PC platforms for those taking technology courses. This is causing students to be unable to work from their own homes, but from the Catalyst instead. C. Skoch reported that the use of Apple/ Mac computers caused the course to not be as applicable to her- since she did not have that technology outside the College of Education. She mentioned that using a smart board and podcasts at KSU would be important. She shared her opinion that the teaching of this past course on-line was not effective. G. Shroyer reported that the use of technology in the school setting has been addressed through the Clinical Instructor meetings and it is required that students document their ability to integrate the use of technology to enhance teaching and learning in their portfolio during Block classes and student teaching.

Question #2

K-State faculty who design and deliver advanced professional education courses and programs need your advice. As a practicing professional, what do you look for (or would you look for) when making decisions concerning graduates courses and programs, instructors, and /or the delivery of these courses and programs?

Small group discussion was conducted with the following thoughts shared with large group:

- Accessibility of course- both traditional courses and online courses. Hybrid courses appeal to some as well. Courses should be offered on a regular basis. Online, Multiple Sites, Live Streaming. Some students still require/desire face to face model.
- Courses must have a practical application to the work being done. They must have relevancy: current issues/ assessment/ interventions, etc.
- Courses should provide diversity of experience, professors, and student experiences

- Work experience credit
- Develop learning communities
- Courses should be rigorous- and based on the standards
- Courses should be “marketed”. What is our niche? Is it “face to face”?
- Provide Short Courses throughout the year (7weeks...)
- Provide all the materials- books, CDs, articles, technology at the course
- Provide weekend, topical course for IDP points. Credit/ No-Credit
- Courses delivered to the students “in the field”
- Students provided with information regarding how to transfer courses to advanced degree or new licensure
- Advisors must be carefully matched to students/ clear articulation with other classes/schools
- Cohort structure is attractive to some students- they like to develop working relationships with their classmates.
- Course developers must consider the cost and time involved in the courses
- Technology supplements should be available
- Grants/ stipends could provide support for costs- make it affordable- this also includes helping students navigate through financial aid eligibility applications
- Courses should be accessible for diverse teachers; non-traditional, ESL, etc.
- Students will want to know what support services might be available for them as needed (ESL teachers, etc.)
- Admission procedures and enrollment procedures should not be complicated – they must be streamlined with clear directions. Make it clear how many hours of MS program are honored in the Ph.D. program. Provide information to students about how/if their degree will transfer to another state.
- Provide programs in “high need” areas, such as ESOL, SPED, etc.
- Courses should be interest-based, context-based
- Make sure to have the name Kansas State University on facilities where off-campus classes meet
- Project-based courses appear to provide practical application of the learning
- Flexibility with coursework is important
- Length of commitment should be considered
- Encourage academic freedom/diverse discussions- Courses online- should be student discussion based

D. Perez shared that she has been invited to Garden City to find that other classes or programs are entirely on-line or much cheaper- for example in providing help for passing the Praxis. However, the KSU program, although more expensive or longer- provides greater results in preparing students to do well on the exam. K. Puderbaugh suggested that details such as that should be shared when marketing the courses, to help students be informed consumers. J. Wissman shared that during Fall 2008, we have over 1,099 students taking ESL courses. It was noted that online courses are resource-intensive for the university. M. Devin described the Leadership Academy model as a successful model to meet the need for expert leadership training on-site over a period of two years. Could this perhaps serve as a “project based” model of providing additional advanced program coursework? How might you work with a team of teachers and build other

graduate courses/programs around their concerns utilizing the different school personnel-creating MS programs that were more collaborative with the school?

LUNCH WAS SERVED- SESSION BEGAN AGAIN AT 1:00pm

Question #3:

What are your observations regarding the COE Homepage?

M. Hammel, Web Administrator, was present to gain feedback regarding the website. B. Shannon shared that he looked for a “person, place, and a thing” and could easily find all three. Positive comments shared include:

- Easy to navigate
- Contact information is easy to find
- Updated portfolio information is included
- Information for initial programs included- portfolios, etc.
- Easy to go from link to link
- Liked how the pictures change
- Calendar is helpful

Suggestions for the website include:

- Lack of diversity in the pictures
- Need pictures of KSU students working with children
- Place students working in other organizations- let them provide the pictures
- People don't look very happy
- Include multi-media of our students teaching
- Include student testimonials
- Could we place contact information by area of concentration?
- The graduate program needs to be “upfront” and as visible as undergraduates
- You have to read through a lot of information to find out about our programs. For example- the Reading Specialist program is buried in C & I
- Graduate school takes you to PDF files and then it is difficult to navigate back
- Can you put links above the PDF files to link to the department?
- On the main page- have direct links to the Elementary and Secondary Blocks
- Make it more friendly for people that know nothing about our programs
- Include resources for teachers- to cause “hired” teachers to look at our website- to hopefully encourage them to look into graduate school. Perhaps they could give feedback? Chat room? Link KNEA, KSDE, IRA...
- Link to job posting website- www.kansastechingjobs.com
- Blog of student- might intrigue students- but would have to be monitored
- Include teaching standards on website

W. White thanked those attending for their time and suggestions. He provided forms for reimbursement for substitute teachers and travel vouchers. Spring meeting date was set for April 24th.