8-30-11
Standard 6 Committee

First meeting of this committee - minutes by Marilyn Eisenwine

Present: John Miazga, Jim Summerlin, Marilyn Eisenwine, Richard Bain, Judy Hakes, Linda Lucksinger

Committee members:
Chair, John Miazga , dean of the College of Education
Jim Summerlin
Linda Lucksinger
Richard Bain
Judy Hakes
Brian May, dean of the College of Graduate Studies
Marilyn Eisenwine

This was an orientation meeting for the committee. The Agenda was emailed to all committee members. After John and Marilyn attend the NCATE conference next week, we will meet again with more information.

We met everything in our NCATE report except Standard 6. Now the NCATE model has changed again. John thinks that we had AFIs in other places that were grouped together under this standard, Governance. We are now aiming for Target level with Standard 6 for the new Continuous Improvement Model.

We have added an Advising Center which will help with this. We have councils where we meet with other groups, such as superintendents. We can have as a goal to reach out to other units.

The committee can view Standard 6 materials on the Everyone drive. John presented much of this information at the College of Education meeting on Aug. 17, 2011, before the semester began. Also, that afternoon, programs met to review data from the 09-10 school year for program improvement.

In May 2012, we have to say how we are addressing our AFIs. We also have to do an IR again, containing what they are asking for including exhibits.

AFI #1 related only to Advanced Programs - The first one relates to unit governance. It says we don't have a structure that facilitates unit planning. We have several new things in place

for this. John has listed these on an Action Report for Standard 6 presented to the Steering Committee. It can be accessed on the Everyone drive as well. These changes include shared decision making. Departments are meeting to discuss graduate program issues and program improvement issues. We are also having Program Manager meetings to talk about issues related to data collection in different programs.

Any other ideas? Judy said to add a communication strand where committee members report to departments and solicit suggestions from all faculty to take back to their committees.

Jim said his faculty also must tie into state standards and requirements so these issues are discussed at meetings. Another issue involves staffing, which is also discussed at meetings.

Richard said he had just spoken with supervisors for the superintendents' program to observe his candidates in the field. He will get with Lesley Casarez in the EPI Center on qualifications for these supervisors and write down what he does to train them. Later, he will include measures of effectiveness for these personnel. He also suggested we look at TExES scores for students not passing their certification tests on the first try. This information would also help with program improvement.

John showed the ETS website - he has access to look at students' scores by competency. Not everyone has access to the information on this website at this time. The dean said all program managers should have access. We will look into this access. Program managers could look at this data at the end of each semester. If we wanted to do remediation, we could look at scores and meet with students.

Concerning national data related to SPA standards and 8 points of data collection, the state test data is only the first element we need to analyze. Starting last month, program managers met with colleagues to consider data for program improvement from school year 09-10. Reports are due to the dean on Sept. 15. In Dec. this process will continue with the 10-11 academic year data.

AFI #2 - The second one relates to review and use of data to improve program quality, unit operations, and performance of candidates. This was for Initial and Advanced Programs.

Richard asked if adjunct faculty members teaching courses in his program should be involved in program analysis. He would like to

do vertical and horizontal alignment on the curriculum. The dean thought that was an excellent idea.

AFI #3 - The unit governance structure does not facilitate collaboration among unit faculty to plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs of study.

Policy development has begun and should be completed by Dec. 2012.

We are beginning to collaborate with Other School Personnel program faculty. A meeting of program managers was initiated in Aug., and will continue throughout the year. Data collection and TaskStream information was shared.

For online courses, the QM (Quality Matters) format is being employed. This involves and organization that ensures online courses meet a certain standard. The dean is chair of a university wide committee on this. He has asked our faculty who teach these courses to do an evaluation of their courses. Deborah Banker has been trained as a peer evaluator. She would like to go on for training to train others. John supports this.

Deborah also has expertise in Second Life. She will be leading an initiative to put this in place for meetings, course presentations, etc.

AFI #4 - Effective use of unit wide assessment data.
All data will now be housed in the EPI Center for all programs. Wendy Storms will be doing this for the unit. She has already met with program managers from EC_6 and Special Ed. and collected their data from the past few years.

John will reformat the AFIs in a chart form as an Action Plan. It will be in the Standard 6 folder on the Everyone drive. We will discuss this at the next meeting.

John also printed an exhibit list for Standard 6 with an extra column for notes of who is responsible or where data is located. The committee went through item by item to discuss the issues.

For the next meeting, the committee was asked to read Standard 6, including the 3 columns, because we are aiming at Target level for this standard. The meeting date will be set after John and Marilyn return from the NCATE conference with further information.