I. OLD BUSINESS

The minutes from January 29, 2003, were accepted, as amended.

Other - Dean Sternberg asked Department Chairs to encourage faculty to review these minutes, as they are provided in a timely manner and contain pertinent COE information.

II. NEW BUSINESS

Accreditation – Dr. Van Scoy outlined the need for additional and important accreditation information to be disseminated to all areas of the Professional Education Unit. She presented a handout that outlined the most pressing accreditation expectations in regard to NCATE and the State review during their visit in October 2003. The most pressing issues involve:

- Use of Praxis Scores – NCATE will be establishing “expected scores” for candidates and will probably use an 80% pass rate on Praxis II
- Standard 1. Evidence of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions – Advanced programs will be crucial here. Most institutions have not been understanding clearly enough that these programs are vital to the accreditation process. Careful attention should be paid to dispositions and P-12 learning as affected by candidates. Faculty have been alerted as program reviews have been returned and rejoinders are due to Ms. Connolly by March 17. The self studies that are being reviewed by the Commission and the State Department are still under review. Faculty should be collecting examples of sample work now. Surveys and analysis are being developed of graduates and employers and data for the graduate survey will be available for faculty Spring 2003. Faculty should be conscious of integrating diversity, technology, and school-to-work throughout their courses by including pertinent information throughout syllabi.
- Standard 2 – Criteria for assessment must be clearly defined and progress in the development of grading rubrics is necessary. A proposal has been initiated for an on-going system and will be introduced and reviewed by the PEPC on February 21.

Dr. Van Scoy distributed two examples of what an assessment plan could look like at an initial level and an advanced level. These plans include the faculty’s description of how data will be collected and stored, what data will be collected, and then finally a look at how the data will be stored and analyzed via electronic database. Faculty should be mindful of the choice of performance-based assessment measures that are currently in each plan.

The examples that were distributed helped illustrate the use of data in the assessment plan for program evaluation/changes/updates. These kinds of analysis should be available to all programs once they help Dr. Van Scoy and Ms. Connolly translate their paper plan to an electronic version. Dr. Van Scoy also introduced the Professional Education Unit Quality Assurance Committee (QComm) proposal that outlines the role of QComm as moving the PEU through a comprehensive assessment system on a five-year cycle.

As stated earlier, this proposal will be reviewed by the PEPC on February 21.

Standard 4 – Learning proficiencies related to diversity should be clearly defined

Standards 5 & 6 – Are faculty scholarship and professional development clear and what are load responsibilities?
Conceptual Framework – Posters are in and should be used! Everyone should take part in conveying this idea to all candidates.

Dr. Van Scoy asked Department Chairs how all this information might best be shared in a more comprehensive manner with program faculty. She emphasized the importance of faculty refining their plans for SACS and accreditation and the development of program assessment plans into an electronic version that will house data that faculty will then use for program modification and planning. She also introduced the Professional Education Unit Quality Assurance Committee (QComm) proposal that outlines the role of QComm as moving the PEU through a comprehensive assessment system on a five-year cycle. As stated earlier, this proposal will be reviewed by the PEPC on February 21. Dean Sterberg emphasized again how important this entire process is in relation to continuous renewal and quality assurance initiatives, to which the College of Education is dedicated.

Graduate Coordinator-Director – Dr. Van Scoy provided a handout that proposed an overview of this idea that would include some centralization in coordinating COE graduate programs with the flexibility to meet the needs of individual departments and their students. She expressed an interest in trying to involve more faculty in interactions with the Graduate School and providing input to Graduate School decisions. Drs. Kuhs and Welsh expressed concern from their departmental faculty regarding limitations on the authority of potential departmental graduate directors/coordinators. Dr. Van Scoy and Dean Sternberg outlined two major reasons for the current proposal: 1) cohesion of COE efforts and minimization of inconsistencies across the College and 2) providing a stronger voice from the COE in relation to the Graduate School. Dean Sternberg advocated that the COE try a Graduate Director-Coordinator configuration, but be open to modifying it as needed. Members engaged in discussion on the reasons for these positions, theoretical definitions of the roles, and some examples of how these positions might be used effectively. Dean Sternberg will take this issue under advisement and return a final recommendation to the Members.

Extended Graduate Campus Course Revenue – Dr. Van Scoy posed the question: Of the money sent to the College from our profit on EGC courses, how much should be retained in a central College account and how much should be distributed to the home department? Dr. French suggested that some of these extra monies be given as an incentive to the department that teaches the course. Dr. Seaman agreed with this idea and further explained how the COE’s internal budgeting process might fit this idea. Dr. Seaman requested that his office be able to establish clear policies and channels of where this money goes and how it is received from the EGC. Members unanimously agreed with this idea and Dr. Seaman agreed to write a draft of what these policies and channels might look like.

Spring Faculty Meeting - Dr. Carper suggested dates and times for the Spring Faculty Meeting. Members decided that Monday, April 28, 2003, at 2:00 p.m. will be the date for the meeting. The meeting will be held in Rm. 126 of Wardlaw.

Strategic Plan – Dr. Seaman decided to table his discussion of the Strategic Plan until the next Administrative Council. His discussion on March 19th will focus on the research side of his office and new initiatives that he has in mind. Dr. Seaman stressed the importance of hiring the best individuals during the current review of open positions.

Family Fund – Dean Sternberg announced that administrators of the Family Fund visited him to offer congratulations to the COE’s exemplary efforts in contributing to this Fund. The COE contributed at a 49% rate, as compared to the University’s overall rate of 29%.

III. REMINDERS
The next Administrative Council meeting will be held Wednesday, March 19, 2003, at 9:00 a.m.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements were made.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:39 a.m.