

**Education Standards and Practices Board
Program Approval Advisory Committee
Minutes**

January 11, 2016

The Education Standards and Practices Board (ESPB) Program Approval Advisory Committee (PAAC) meeting was called to order by Dr Gary Thompson at 10:30am.

PAAC members present were Dr. Gary Thompson, Kim Knodle, Penny Veit-Hetletved, Kim Belgarde, Karen Christensen, Brenda Seehafer, Ben Schafer and Dr. Rod Jonas . Also present were Dr. Janet Welk and Amy Folkestad from ESPB, Jim Boe from Valley City State University, and Turnar Kist from University of Mary. No PAAC members were absent.

There are no additions to the agenda.

A motion was made by Karen Christensen and seconded by Kim Knodle to approve the minutes from last meeting with one correction to a typing error. All voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Partnership Agreement: There was much discussion on data and other requirements that need to be documented as a part of the CAEP standards. Kim Knodle made a motion to recommend to ESPB to accept the CAEP Partnership Agreement, seconded by Rod Jonas. Those who voted in favor were Karen Christensen, Brenda Seehafer, Kim Belgarde, Rod Jonas, Ben Schafer, Kim Knodle, Penny Veit-Hetletved and Gary Thompson. None opposed. Motion carried.

Every Student Succeeds Act and ND Educator Licensure Changes: Because the Every Student Succeeds Act has changed, this opens the door for changes to North Dakota licensure requirements. For the next legislative session, new language will need to be ready regarding licensure laws. The agenda item has been tabled for the time being.

NDACTE Qualtrix Proposal: Spring 2015, the 12 teacher preparation programs in North Dakota have agreed to use three common surveys across all institutions to gather data for program improvement and to meet state and national accreditation requirements. The ND teacher preparation programs have the goal of using Qualtrix as the survey platform. There have been three proposals of how to administer the surveys: Education Standards and Practices Board Facilitation (ESPB), ESPB and North Dakota State University (NDSU) Collaborative Facilitation, or North Dakota University System (NDUS) Collaborative Facilitation. With NDUS Collaborative Facilitation, NDUS can add collaborators to their existing Qualtrix contract. North Dakota would be first state to do this. Rod Jonas made a motion to recommend to ESPB to approve model 3, the NDUS Collaborative Facilitation, seconded by Ben Schafer. All voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

DPI Recruitment and Retention Committee: ESPB hired Lou Aronson to complete research on North Dakota's current teacher shortage. She found that 49 states require a

bachelor's degree as a minimum requirement for a license. The Recruitment and Retention Committee has done surveys to try to see what will encourage people to go into teaching. The committee will try a marketing campaign and to generate legislative support for more loan forgiveness to encourage people to go into teaching. There have also been thoughts on implementing a student youth organization in high schools.

Testing into the Profession: As new language is drafted for licensure laws in response to the Every Student Succeeds Act, a discussion will need to take place regarding the option of testing into the profession of teaching. Presented at this time for information only.

Turtle Mountain Community College (TMCC) Program Review Report: Turtle Mountain Community College did not submit a rejoinder to the program review report. One INTASC standard that was not met was Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation. Early Childhood program had many areas that were met with weakness. Rod Jonas made a motion to recommend to ESPB to approve the team to report as written with focus visit in 3 years, Fall 2018, for areas that were not met and met with weakness. Seconded by Ben Schafer. Those who voted in favor were Karen Christensen, Brenda Seehafer, Kim Belgarde, Rod Jonas, Ben Schafer, Kim Knodle, Penny Veit-Hetletved and Gary Thompson. None opposed. Motion carried.

BOE Team Recommendations on Meeting Standards:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Met	NA
2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Not Met	NA
3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Met	NA
4. Diversity	Met	NA
5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Met	NA
6. Unit Governance and Resources	Met	NA

N/A = Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

BOE Team Recommendations on Movement Toward Target:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	NA	NA
2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	NA	NA
3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	NA	NA
4. Diversity	NA	NA
5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	NA	NA
6. Unit Governance and Resources	NA	NA

N/A = Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

Initial Teacher Preparation Programs:

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
1: Learner Development		x	
2: Learning Differences		x	
3: Learning Environments		x	
4: Content Knowledge	THIS STANDARD IS ASSESSED IN SEPARATE CONTENT AREA PROGRAM REPORTS AND A FINAL DETERMINATION IS MADE BY THE CONTENT		

	EXPERT REVIEWER		
5: Application of Content	x		
6: Assessment		X	
7: Planning for Instruction		X	
8: Instructional Strategies		X	
9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice	X		
10: Leadership and Collaboration			X
Human Relations and Cultural Diversity	X		

Early Childhood Education:

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
50037.1		X	
50037.2		X	
50037.3		X	
50037.4		X	
50037.5		X	
50037.6		X	
50037.7		X	
50037.8		X	
50037.9	X		
50037.10		X	

Elementary Education:

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
50015.1	x		
50015.2	X		
50015.2a	X		
50015.2b	X		
50015.2c	X		
50015.2d	X		
50015.2e	X		
50015.2f	X		
50015.2g	X		
50015.2h	X		
50015.2i	X		
Assessment Evidence (3 required)	X		

Composite Science/General Science Education:

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
13047.1	X		

13047.2	X		
13047.3	X		
13047.4	X		
13047.5	X		
13047.6		X	
13047.7	X		
13047.8	X		
13047.9	X		
13047.10	X		
Assessment Evidence (3 required)		X – data on student teacher performance evaluation was not provided	

Mayville State University CAEP Report: Accreditation is continued. Next visit will be Spring 2020. Rod Jonas made a motion to recommend to ESPB approve the report, seconded Kim Belgarde. All voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

University of North Dakota (UND) CAEP Report and ESPB Programs Report: Some areas were met with weakness. Of the INTASC standards, 8 of 10 were met with weakness. UND did not submit a rejoinder, meaning they have accepted what is in the report. Rod Jonas made a motion to recommend to ESPB to approve the INTASC team to report as written with visit in 7 years, seconded by Kim Knodle. Those who voted in favor were Karen Christensen, Brenda Seehafer, Kim Belgarde, Rod Jonas, Ben Schafer, Kim Knodle, Penny Veit-Hetletved and Gary Thompson. None opposed. Motion carried.

Rod Jonas also made a motion to recommend to ESPB to accept the NCATE report standards as met. Seconded by Karen Christensen. All voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

PAAC reviewed each content area to see if there were additional concerns. Ben Schafer made a motion to recommend to ESPB that for program areas that were not met or met with weakness, that UND provide a response for these areas. Motion seconded by Brenda Seehafer. Those who voted in favor were Karen Christensen, Brenda Seehafer, Kim Belgarde, Rod Jonas, Ben Schafer, Kim Knodle, Penny Veit-Hetletved and Gary Thompson. None opposed. Motion carried.

Initial Teacher Preparation Programs:

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
1: Learner Development		X	
2: Learning Differences		X	
3: Learning Environments		X	
4: Content Knowledge	THIS STANDARD IS ASSESSED IN SEPARATE CONTENT AREA PROGRAM REPORTS AND A FINAL DETERMINATION IS MADE BY THE CONTENT EXPERT REVIEWER		
5: Application of Content		X	
6: Assessment		X	
7: Planning for		X	

Instruction			
8: Instructional Strategies		X	
9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice	X		
10: Leadership and Collaboration		X	
Human Relations and Cultural Diversity	X		

Art Education.

This program is NASAD accredited. Letter only.

Biology Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
13010.1	X		
13010.2	X		
13010.3	X		
13010.4	X		
13010.5	X		
13010.6	X		
13010.7	X		
13010.8	X		
13010.9	X		
13010.10	X		

Chemistry Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
13020.1	X		
13020.2	X		
13020.3	X		
13020.4	X		
13020.5	X		
13020.6	X		
13020.7	X		
13020.8	X		
13020.9	X		
13020.10	X		

Chinese Education. -

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
06260.1		x	
06260.2			x
06260.3		x	
06260.4	x		
06260.5	x		

06260.1 Weaknesses: Lack of adequate course requirements for classes that build candidate's Chinese language proficiency. Rationale: As students of a Tier V language, Mandarin Chinese learners need much more intense language instruction for a longer period of time than students of many other languages. Even for a Tier I language, only four semesters of language acquisition is too short for mastery. It will be difficult for candidates to pass the content area PRAXIS exams with no upper-intermediate/advanced language preparation. The offering of literature, film and culture classes in translation only will not move intermediate-level students into the ease of language use needed for second-language instruction.

06260.2 Weaknesses: Lack of a specific course leading to linguistic analysis of the target language and comparative analysis of the morphology, syntax and pragmatics of Chinese and English. Rationale: No listed courses contain elements that would fulfill either 06260.2(b) or 06260.2(c).

06260.3 Weaknesses: Curriculum contains redundant options that could be taken simultaneously, thus reducing the scope of the student's education. Study of the language in the country is an option, but not a requirement. The lack of any upper-level culture, film, history or literature courses taught in Chinese is a point of concern. Rationale: All upper-level courses are offered in translation with English as the teaching language. This is not conducive to the development of language proficiency. An examination of the readings for the business and culture classes shows overlapping readings and foci of courses. It might be advisable to group like courses into menu choices rather than allowing any course from the entire block of 18 elective credits to count toward the major. Also, the inclusion of Western Civilization I and II and an upper-level English as requirements for the Chinese degree does not appear to further the purpose of the student's education in Chinese language, literature, culture or teaching.

Overall: The nature of the overseas immersion experience is unclear from the materials presented. The syllabi that pertain to study in China are geared to English-speaking business students traveling to China for cultural experience, which is not what language learners need to better their level of proficiency. If the immersion experience has a language acquisition component, this should be stated more directly in the submitted materials. If it does not have such a component, that would be a program weakness to address.

The rationale for the inclusion of Western Civilization I/II and an English literature course in the Chinese Teaching Specialty requirements is unclear. They could be listed as recommended co-requirements, but their inclusion in the Teaching Specialty core dilutes the language proficiency component. Without the required ten credits in these fields, the total program requirement is reduced to 27 credits, of which only 16 credits are dedicated to target language development.

In general, the program in the teaching specialty as presented looks more like a program in Chinese culture studies than in Chinese language acquisition.

State Team Recommends: No changes after reviewing rejoinder.

Composite Science Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
13047.1	X		
13047.2	X		
13047.3	X		
13047.4	X		
13047.5	X		
13047.6	X		
13047.7	X		
13047.8	X		
13047.9	X		
13047.10	X		

Overall: The following areas are in need of careful review in order to submit a complete report with all referenced pieces of evidence available to the reader:

Data Table II is referred to in EXH_Standard_13047.2 Nature of Science Narrative, yet is not provided as evidence. With reference to the content area Chemistry, this data table is intended to illustrate student competency on the ACS exam and is cited as assessment evidence which demonstrates that candidates have met the standard. This same table is mentioned as evidence in EXH_Standard_13047.4 Context of Science. As other sources of evidence for these standards were presented, the standards in both cases were deemed MET. However, inclusion of Table II in the narratives is recommended.

Also missing within the report is the Capstone Project Exhibit for Biology mentioned in EXH_Standard_13047.4_Context_of_Science_Narratives. The assignment and rubric are offered as evidence of student competence as well as student scores in this project. The scores are presented in a table but the assignment and rubric would have provided support and context for the scores reported. Finally, the narrative reports would be improved with pagination and accurate labeling of Tables. For example, Table VII is presented in the narrative report: EXH_Standard_13047.4_Context of Science Narratives, yet no other labels are ascribed to tables prior or following Table VII. The same may be said for EXH_Standard_13047.3_Inquiry_Narratives which offers Table V and Table VI. It is unclear to the reader if all of the Tables across the narratives are intended to be logically connected.

Composite Social Studies/Science Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
----------	-----	-------------------	---------

15035.1	X		
15035.2	X		
15035.3		X	
15035.4	X		
15035.5	X		

15035.3 Weaknesses: Insufficiently global. Rationale: Given Praxis II expectations along with this standard, the two western civilizations courses do not cover the breadth suggested by the terms "multi-cultural, cross-cultural, diversity, [and] global issues." World GEOG courses only nominally cover the issues listed above. Additionally, in reviewing the syllabus for the HIST 101 Western Civilization, it is hard to know just which aspects of history -- as opposed to archeology -- are covered. Praxis II content area test (0081) questions on world history constitute 22% of the total questions asked.

State Team Recommends: After reviewing the rejoinder, element 15035.3 is met.

Early Childhood Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
50037	X		
50037.1			
50037.2	X		
50037.3			
50037.4	X		
50037.5	X		
50037.6			
50037.7	X		
50037.8			
50037.9		X	
50037.10	X		

NOTE: The program area has been given the option to omit a response to standards 1, 3, 6 and 8 because information on these standards will appear in the ESPB/InTASC Unit report. Therefore if no information has been provided do not assume the standard is unmet; instead, check the item that states "No Information provided. See ESPB/InTASC CER Report." If related ESPB/InTASC Standards are met, program standards 1,3,6, and 8 will be met as well.

50037.9 Weaknesses: Only two supervised field experiences are listed. The requirement calls for three. It appears that only one of the two listed experiences is an actual experience. Rationale: T&L 333 is not a field experience. The 486 course taken along with 333 is a field experience, but 333 itself is not, unless it also has a separate, additional experience from 486. It should be noted that there are two full time student teaching experiences, surpassing the required minimum of 10 weeks, so students do complete significant student teaching experiences. Also, a number of additional field & clinical experiences are mentioned under 'changes to the program since the last review'. But the assessment evidence in the 'response to standards' does not demonstrate that candidates have fully met the standard because there are not 3 field experiences.

Overall: (1) T&L 486 is listed twice, once as a one credit class and as a two credit class (in Teaching Specialty) ? (2) It is commendable that students have two semesters of student teaching, but what other field experiences, before student teaching, are students getting? Are the experiences of significant quality and quantity to provide students with opportunities to apply course knowledge to actual teaching activities?

State Team Recommends: After reviewing the rejoinder, the State Team recommended no change.

Earth Science/ Geology Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
13035.1	X		
13035.2	X		
13035.3	X		
13035.4	X		
13035.5	X		
13035.6	X		
13035.7	X		
13035.8	X		
130035.9	X		
13035.10	X		

Elementary Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
50015.1	X		
50015.2	X		
50015.2a	X		
50015.2b	X		
50015.2c	X		
50015.2d	X		
50015.2e	X		
50015.2f	X		
50015.2g	X		
50015.2h	X		
50015.2i			x

50015.2i. Weaknesses: Presently the only course included for evidence is Social Studies for the Elementary Schools. This standard include other courses that connect across the curriculum: examples might include Teaching Reading & Writing, Teaching mathematics, and teaching Science. Rationale: presently, there is only a limited scope of cross curricular content.

State Team Recommends: 50015.2i has been met with rejoinder.

English Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
05020.1	X		
05020.2	X		
05020.3	X		
05020.4	X		
05020.5	X		
05020.6	X		
05020.7	X		
05020.8	X		

French Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
06010.1	X		
06010.2	X		
06010.3	X		
06010.4	X		
06010.5	X		

Overall: Only FREN 301. 302. 305 and 306 are listed as required. However, this is completely consistent with how most language departments work, since courses are often offered on a rotational basis. In addition, since students are encouraged to participate in study abroad, the courses they take while on these approved programs must be able to be included in their majors. They also list a requirement of a selection of "a minimum of 21 Upper-Division credits with at least 6 credits in each of the following areas". These areas (Grammar & Writing, Literature& Civilization and Culture & Conversation) all include the classes mentioned in the report as meeting the sub-standards. Thus, in order to complete the degree, the student will have a variety of the courses mentioned in the sub-standards. Listing all of these classes as "required" would not be in keeping with hos language departments operate and I am confident that students will receive a cross-section of the classes to sufficiently meet the sub-standards.

Since the FREN 304 (Phonetics and Pronunciation) was removed from the program requirements and placed in FREN 202 since the last visit, I would be interested to see if the department has any data or other information to see if 1) this has been successful and beneficial to students and 2) students (especially French Education majors) are as prepared as previously from a linguistic / pronunciation stand-point. Basically, how have they evaluated this change?

Geography Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
----------	-----	-------------------	---------

15015.1			X
15015.2		X	
15015.3		X	
15015.4		X	
15015.5	X		
15015.6	X		

15015.1 Weaknesses: There is no indication in the written text or on the curriculum exhibit that “the study of a second social science beyond the introductory level is also required.” Rationale: This may simply be a matter of documentation. If so, then the outcome should be met. If not, the outcome is clearly not met.

15015.2 Weaknesses: No connection to “professional standards and expectations for P-12 education.” Rationale: The assessment data and the two courses identified are methodology courses. These relate to standard 15015.5. It would appear that the standard is being met in T&L 432, T&L 433, T&L 487, and T&L 488; however, these courses are not provided in the text or assessment. Again, this may simply be a documentation issue which would mean the outcome is being met.

15015.3 Weaknesses: No connection of upper level coursework with this outcome. Rationale: While the department makes clear connections of this outcome to lower level required coursework in the curriculum area there is no offer of the connection of this outcome to any of the upper level courses in the curriculum area even though elective courses can be taken in Human and Regional Geography at the upper level. While not all students would take these courses the threading of this outcome through the curriculum could be identified to show how the program is designed to meet the outcome at a deeper level.

15015.4 Weaknesses: No connection of upper level coursework with this outcome. Rationale: While the department makes clear connections of this outcome to lower level required coursework in the curriculum area there is no offer of the connection of this outcome to any of the upper level courses in the curriculum area even though elective courses can be taken in Human and Regional Geography at the upper level. While not all students would take these courses the threading of this outcome through the curriculum could be identified to show how the program is designed to meet the outcome at a deeper level.

Overall: The team needs to identify if a second social science is required in the major. If not the program cannot be viewed as MET. Also, the heavy reliance on course grades from 100 level courses is insufficient to show that the outcomes for teacher education are being met in the program. It appears there is not enough connection between what is happening in Geography classes that education candidates take and what is happening in Education classes that prepare Geography teachers.

State Team Recommends: The State Team recommended no change after review of the rejoinder since these courses are only advised.

German Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
06015.1	X		
06015.2	X		
06015.3	X		
06015.4	X		
06015.5	X		

History Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
15020.1		X	
15020.2	X		
15020.3	X		
15020.4	X		
15020.5	X		
15020.6		X	

15020.1. Weakness. The program narrative (page 16) succinctly describes the rich range of courses students have available to them in this program, particularly in advanced areas. Expansion of faculty teaching into non-Western areas is well underway at UND and students should have ample opportunity to take courses that cover state history, U.S. history, European history, as well as other global /

nonwestern histories. This is a strength of the program. Rationale: The potential “weakness” identified here is that student selection of advanced courses does not appear to require any distribution among these areas. In the evidence (distribution of grades) it is clear that students do take a range of courses across areas, so perhaps all that is necessary here is to include the advising or planning documents demonstrating that all teacher education candidates take courses that include world / non-western themes.

15020.6. Weaknesses: The narrative (p.35, part a) discusses student use of an LMS system (such as Blackboard) and emphasizes Information Literacy as measure of study of appropriate instructional technology. Current practice for historians requires a high level of fluency with information technology in order to master informational literacy, but as a measure of instructional technology this serves mainly an indirect or complementary measure. Rationale:

It appears that the program is in transition regarding Instructional Technology, or at least how it is required and measured. Other sections of the narrative (p. 46) indicate that T&L 339 has recently been added as a required course for history education candidates. The other evidence provided for standard 15020.6 (class averages for all students in Social Studies Methods and the class average of history majors in Technology for Teachers T&L 339) indicate candidates are succeeding in courses that directly assign and assess fluency with instructional technology. Inclusion and evaluation of evidence from each history candidate (such as a media-rich public presentation in a course, a technology-driven lesson plan, an experience observed in student teaching, etc.) would also serve to show that candidates had mastered this standard. It seems this could be relatively easily incorporated into the department assessment plan that covers History 220 and 440.

State Team Recommends: After review of the rejoinders, the State Team recommends 15020.1 remain “met with weakness” and 15020.6 has been met.

Mathematics Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
11010.1	x		
11010.2	x		
11010.3	x		
11010.4		x	
11010.5	x		
11010.6	x		
11010.7	x		
11010.8	x		

Part I: Areas of Weakness from Prior Review ***

11010.4 Weakness Sited from previous visit: (Standard 4 with weakness) The content expert review of Standard 4 asked the state team to “Find out if elements of analysis are included as part of a required course.” The response from the mathematic department acknowledged that “Elements of analysis are not explicitly included as part of one required course.” X Weakness Should Be Retained. The report does a nice job of outlining three potential remedies to the weakness that was identified. In my opinion, any of these three remedies would suffice. However, there is no mention of which (if any) of these remedies has been put into place. Therefore, it is not clear if any action has been taken to assure the inclusion of analysis in the program. The report says, “We find that when they explicitly state which alternative will be implemented this weakness can be removed.” Has this “when” happened yet? The response DOES include a statement that says we should refer to the mathematics rejoinder to the content expert review, however this rejoinder was not made available for this review. It is possible that this rejoinder contains information regarding which of the three remedies was implemented, which would then mostly likely be sufficient evidence for removing the weakness. The review team should look into what (if any) action has been taken concerning this.

11010.4 Weaknesses: Still no evidence that analysis is explicitly included in the curriculum. See comments above concerning weakness cited in previous report. Rationale: Clarification is needed as to which of the three proposed remedies (if any) have been implemented to ensure that analysis is explicitly included in the curriculum.

State Team Recommends: The State Team recommended no change after review of the rejoinder.

Middle Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
50017.1	X		
50017.2	X		

50017.3	X		
50017.4	X		
50017.5	X		
50017.6	X		
50017.7	X		
50017.8	X		
50017.9	X		

Music Education.

This program is NASM accredited. Letter only.

Physics Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
13050.1		X	
13050.2	X		
13050.3	X		
13050.4	X		
13050.5	X		
13050.6	X		
13050.7	X		
13050.8	X		
13050.9	X		
13050.10	X		

13050.1 Weakness. Subsection 4 requires the students to complete a minimum of 4 semester hours in biology. There is no biology in the curriculum. Rationale: I was unable to find a required biology course in the curriculum.

State Team Recommends: The State Team recommended no change after review of the rejoinder.

Physical Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
08025.1	X		
08025.2		X	
08025.3	X		
08025.4	X		
08025.5	X		
08025.6	X		
08025.7	X		
08025.8	X		
08025.9	X		
08025.10	X		

08025.2 Weaknesses: Sexual Development Component. Rationale: There was not enough documented information that demonstrated that sexual development was being covered in the curriculum. The only class that mention anything to do with sexual development was KIN 402 & 402L Exercise Physiology, which in the course outline is mentioned "Reproductive System" however that would not be enough to cover Sexual Development.

Overall. If a course is missing or is not a required course, please list below:

Missing Requirement Courses:

KIN 207 Prevention & Care

KIN 390 & 390L Intro to Teaching PE & Sport Settings

KIN 400 & 400L Strategies for Teaching PE Elementary

KIN 420 Curriculum Development

KIN 410 & 410L Methods & Materials for Teaching Secondary PE

KIN 491 Senior Teaching Seminar

State Team Recommends: After review of the rejoinder, the State Team recommends 08025.2 has been met.

Spanish Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
06035.1	X		
06035.2	X		
06035.3	X		
06035.4	X		
06035.5	X		

Overall: The syllabi by Dr. Gene DuBois (viz., S420, Spanish 462, and S310) are particularly meagre, one-page documents with no information about assignments, grading procedures, etc.

SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVANCED PROGRAMS

SE Advanced Program for Teachers: Early Childhood Special Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
CEC 1	X		
CEC 2	X		
CEC 3		X	
CEC 4	X		
CEC 5		X	
CEC 6	X		
CEC 7	X		
CEC 8	X		
CEC 9		X	
CEC 10	X		
ESPB 19015.1	X		
ESPB 19015.2	DO NOT COMPLETE; ALREADY ADDRESSED IN CEC STANDARDS		
ESPB 19015.3	DO NOT COMPLETE; ALREADY ADDRESSED IN CEC STANDARDS		
ESPB 19015.4	X		
ESPB 19015.5	X		

CEC 3. Weaknesses: The program doesn't appear to provide enough information in-regards to developing deep understanding for how culture and family background interact with the individual's exceptional condition to impact the individual's academic and social abilities, attitudes, and values. Rationale: The students do not appear to be assessed on this in either Assessment 1 (Student Evaluation) or 8 (GPA). In looking through the syllabus, these topics are touch-on in SPED 510, 514 & T&L 553 & T&L 529, but it doesn't appear enough to create a deeper understanding of cultural backgrounds and the effects on student achievement.

CEC 5. Weaknesses: No strong cultural connection piece. See rational for CEC 3.

CEC 9. Weaknesses: Did not see much on how students will continue to develop professionally by actively planning and engaging in activities that will foster their professional growth. Rationale: Not much addressed on how students will continue to grow professionally – this standard has students viewing themselves as lifelong learners – but there is not much in the course addressing this. Assessment 4 (Scholarly Project) does have them address plans for professional development, but Assessment 4 is not one of the chosen assessments for this standard.

State Team Recommends: After review of the rejoinder, the State Team recommends CEC 3, CEC 5 and CEC 9 for ECSE have been met.

SE Advanced Program for Teachers: Emotional Disturbance.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
CEC 1	X		
CEC 2	x		
CEC 3	x		
CEC 4	x		
CEC 5	x		
CEC 6	x		
CEC 7	x		
CEC 8	x		

CEC 9	x		
CEC 10	x		
ESPB 19015.1	x		
ESPB 19015.2	DO NOT COMPLETE; ALREADY ADDRESSED IN CEC STANDARDS		
ESPB 19015.3	DO NOT COMPLETE; ALREADY ADDRESSED IN CEC STANDARDS		
ESPB 19015.4	x		
ESPB 19015.5	x		

SE Advanced Program for Teachers: Gifted and Talented

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
CEC 1		x	
CEC 2		x	
CEC 3	x		
CEC 4		x	
CEC 5		x	
CEC 6	x		
CEC 7		x	
CEC 8		x	
CEC 9	x		
CEC 10	x		
ESPB 19015.1		x	
ESPB 19015.2	DO NOT COMPLETE; ALREADY ADDRESSED IN CEC STANDARDS		
ESPB 19015.3	DO NOT COMPLETE; ALREADY ADDRESSED IN CEC STANDARDS		
ESPB 19015.4	x		
ESPB 19015.5	x		

CEC 1. Weaknesses: SPED 522 included a breakdown of standards and objectives and how they would be accomplished in this course. Of the syllabi reviewed, the syllabus for this course came closest providing evidence of alignment between objectives, learning activities, and assessment. This reviewer is not convinced, however, that an introduction to gifted education course (SPED 522) can adequately introduce students to gifted education with articles, websites, and movies alone. This reviewer did not find evidence that specific formal programming models (Renzulli Revolving Door, Betts' Autonomous Learner Model, Structure of Intellect Model, Parallel Curriculum Model, for example) are being introduced or discussed; rather, it appeared that most learning was exploratory in nature, and that what is explored is ultimately determined by the learner. It has been this reviewer's experience that if teachers lack the fundamental knowledge of the structure of several gifted programming models, they are unable to structure highly effective gifted program in their classrooms. Therefore, this reviewer suggests that efforts be made to assure that teachers are truly meeting objectives, rather than simply exploring concepts. The website hoagiesgifted.com could be added as a resource. In order to assure that all objectives listed in the syllabi are truly covered within the course, the addition of a comprehensive textbook. Adding both may better serve the part of the first objective for SPED 522 that states, "this includes major contributions to research and theories/models of G/T."

CEC 2. EDUC 523 included an excellent textbook on "diagnosis" of gifted children; however, there was no section in the syllabus to explain the breakdown of objectives/standards, how they would be accomplished, and how they would be measured. Without seeing evidence of what is assigned/assessed in this course, it was difficult for this reviewer to ascertain the difference between curriculum that would be covered by the course, how learning objectives would actually be met by the students, and how learning would be assessed. Evidence of learning, through defined assignments and rubrics (as opposed to scales) would give evidence that students are learning what you set out to teach in this course.

CEC 4. The syllabus for EDUC 524 included measurable objectives. Activities that students would complete to differentiate learning for gifted students were implied within the objectives, but no specific assignments/learning activities were listed. Once again, there was no section in the syllabus to align the breakdown of objectives/standards, how learning would be accomplished, and how learning would be measured. Within the syllabus, having descriptions of actual assignments and rubrics would be helpful. In this reviewer's opinion, rubrics (not scales) need to be included in order to demonstrate alignment. Additionally, rubrics are needed to provide students with formative feedback, long before the capstone project.

CEC 5. This reviewer remains unconvinced that students taking gifted and talented coursework would be introduced to the full continuum of services that, according to Renzulli, should be the learning environment available to gifted students. A full continuum would include introduction to the wide variety of placement options, including magnet programs, pull-out, Saturday, summer enrichment, grouping for social-emotional needs, cluster grouping in the general education classroom, grouping for enrichment as decided through RTI practices, etc. Additionally, learning environment for gifted students would include interest and passion exploration, career exploration, leadership opportunities, social skills training, etc. This reviewer did not see evidence of this in course syllabi. (The reviewer would, however, like to commend the use of Dabrowski's work in courses related to gifted education.) Specifically, this reviewer would like to see more definition of what students are asked to do for assignments in each course. The capstone is spelled out; in courses leading up to the capstone, the objectives are generally spelled out, but assignment descriptions, criteria, and assessments are not. Thus, evidence of a) what students do within the courses to learn the material and b) how instructors know the material has been learned is unclear.

CEC 7. Again, this reviewer is not convinced, based on evidence in syllabi and scaled assessments, that students would be able to justify instructional planning so that it is truly situated within the philosophies and formal programming practices of gifted education. More evidence of specific assignments (what students do to accomplish the course objectives) and rubrics used to evaluate assignments (to establish whether or not the objectives were met) is needed. The reviewer acknowledges that UND subscribes to a constructivist approach. The constructivist approach should not eliminate the need for specific learning activities and ongoing formative assessments; rather, it should help to responsibly design learning and define growth and achievement.

CEC 8. A capstone project was outlined, and assessment scales for the capstone project were provided. This reviewer was not clear on what the evaluation scales meant. Rubrics would be more definitive, and would provide more evidence for this reviewer that practices in gifted education are being understood and attained by the students. Additionally, formative assessments aligned to specific assignments and objectives in each course would provide ongoing evidence of student learning and continuous growth. The capstone is (and needs to be) open ended, but still needs more definition through the lens of gifted education.

ESPB 19015.1 Weaknesses: Syllabi and course requirements did spell out what was to be learned (objectives) but many times did not clearly define how the objectives would be met (learning activities—what the students would do to meet the objectives) or how learning would be assessed. Without a clear description of objectives, learning activities, and assessment on a course-by-course basis, academic rigor cannot be ascertained at this time.

ESPB 19015.2 The coursework in Gifted and Talented appeared to be more exploratory, rather than leading students towards the attainment of a specific skillset leading to success in working with gifted and talented students. Objectives were clear and reflected attainment of advanced knowledge and skills. Specific learning activities and assessments were lacking; therefore, this reviewer was mostly uncertain about the specifics as to how the courses were providing candidates with advanced knowledge and skills.

ESPB 19015.3 The coursework in Gifted and Talented appeared to be more exploratory, rather than leading students towards the attainment of a specific skillset leading to success in working with gifted and talented students. Objectives were clear and reflected attainment of advanced knowledge and skills. Specific learning activities and assessments were lacking; therefore, this reviewer was mostly uncertain about the specifics as to how the courses were providing candidates with advanced knowledge and skills.

State Team Recommends: After review of the rejoinder, the State Team recommends CEC 1, CEC2, CEC5, CEC7, CEC8, and ESPB 19015.2 are met. CEC 4 remains met with weakness for Gifted and Talented.

SE Advanced Program for Teachers: Intellectual Disabilities.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
CEC 1	X		
CEC 2	X		
CEC 3	X		
CEC 4	X		
CEC 5	X		
CEC 6	X		
CEC 7	X		
CEC 8	X		
CEC 9	X		

CEC 10	X		
ESPB 19015.1	X		
ESPB 19015.2	DO NOT COMPLETE; ALREADY ADDRESSED IN CEC STANDARDS		
ESPB 19015.3	DO NOT COMPLETE; ALREADY ADDRESSED IN CEC STANDARDS		
ESPB 19015.4	X		
ESPB 19015.5	X		

SE Advanced Program for Teachers: Learning Disabilities.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
CEC 1	X		
CEC 2	X		
CEC 3	X		
CEC 4	X		
CEC 5	X		
CEC 6	X		
CEC 7	X		
CEC 8	X		
CEC 9		X (possible lack of info)	
CEC 10	X		
ESPB 19015.1	X (w/considerations)		
ESPB 19015.2	DO NOT COMPLETE; ALREADY ADDRESSED IN CEC STANDARDS		
ESPB 19015.3	DO NOT COMPLETE; ALREADY ADDRESSED IN CEC STANDARDS		
ESPB 19015.4	X		
ESPB 19015.5	X		

CEC 9. Information on this standard is not readily available to review. However, it is stated on the UND Relationship of Assessments to Standards Table that this standard is assessed through “Student Evaluation”, “Progress Monitoring Case Study” and “GPA”. The particulars of this standard may be embedded in coursework – based on data given on page 51, students are performing with proficiency in this standard.

19015.1. This is not a weakness – but a consideration. Many of the truly important courses are in the electives list. Courses such as the development of an IEP, Inclusive methods, and SpEd Law should be required. As it is, students can choose not to take these courses.

State Team Recommends: After review of the rejoinder, the State Team recommends that CEC 9 has been met for LD.

SE Advanced Program for Teachers: Strategist.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
CEC 1	x		
CEC 2	x		
CEC 3	x		
CEC 4	x		
CEC 5	x		
CEC 6		x	
CEC 7	x		
CEC 8	x		
CEC 9	x		
CEC 10	x		
ESPB 19015.1	x		
ESPB 19015.2	DO NOT COMPLETE; ALREADY ADDRESSED IN CEC STANDARDS		
ESPB 19015.3	DO NOT COMPLETE; ALREADY ADDRESSED IN CEC STANDARDS		
ESPB 19015.4	x		
ESPB 19015.5	x		

CEC 6. I did not find reference in syllabi to language development and impact on learning, the use of assistive technologies or cultural and linguistic differences. Some reference to language in syllabi would be helpful if it is embedded in the curriculum.

Overall: When looking at methods/strategies being taught, verify that students' understanding of the use of "scientifically researched based" methods and materials, peer reviewed research, etc. Also, verify that students have the ability (knowledge base) to use such materials with fidelity.

State Team Recommends: After review of the rejoinder, the State Team recommends CEC 6 has been met for Strategist.

SE Advanced Program for Teachers: Visual Impairment.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
CEC 1	x		
CEC 2	x		
CEC 3	x		
CEC 4	x		
CEC 5	x		
CEC 6	x		
CEC 7	x		
CEC 8	x		
CEC 9	x		
CEC 10	x		
ESPB 19015.1	x		
ESPB 19015.2	DO NOT COMPLETE; ALREADY ADDRESSED IN CEC STANDARDS		
ESPB 19015.3	DO NOT COMPLETE; ALREADY ADDRESSED IN CEC STANDARDS		
ESPB 19015.4	x		
ESPB 19015.5	x		

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Advanced Program for Teachers: Curriculum and Instruction Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
50081.1	X		
50081.2	X		
50081.3	X		
50081.4	X		
50081.5	x		
50081.6	X		
50081.7A	X		
50081.7B	x		

Advanced Program for Teachers: Early Childhood Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
50081.1	✓		
50081.2	✓		
50081.3	✓		
50081.4	✓		
50081.5	✓		
50081.6	✓		
50081.7A	✓		
50081.7B	NA		

Advanced Program for Teachers: Elementary Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
50081.1	X		
50081.2	X		

50081.3		X	
50081.4		X	
50081.5	X		
50081.6	X		
50081.7A	X		
50081.7B	NA		

50081.3 Weaknesses: Not all courses listed as contributing to this standard seem to address the standard. however, there is good evidence in the syllabi of the presence of this standard throughout courses in the program. Rationale: The syllabus for T&L 518 does not explicitly require that the Discussion Leader assignment must focus on a topic related to the role of schools in society or the development of positive relationships with families and the larger community. The syllabus for T&L 519 does not list the assignment referred to in the Program Report (Final Project). The syllabus does list a five day integrated unit and several choice assignments but these are not referenced in the Program Report.

50081.4. Weaknesses: Not all courses listed as contributing to this standard require the assignment listed in the Program Report; however, there is good evidence in the syllabi for the presence of the standard throughout the courses. Rationale: T&L 519 is listed in the Program Report as requiring an assignment related to the construction of a social studies game; however, on the syllabus that assignment is a choice from other assignments.

Overall. If a course is missing or is not a required course, please list below: **My understanding after reviewing the program is that graduate students in the M.Ed. or M.S. degree in Elementary Education take EITHER T&L 580 OR T&L 581/582 depending on whether they are in the Resident Teacher program while working on their master's degree. T&L 581/582 are not listed on the Curriculum Exhibit, although they do show up throughout the rest of the Program Report.**

1. The team should seek clarification regarding the alignment of T&L 518 and T&L 519 to State Standard 050081.3 (as noted above under the standard).
2. The team should seek clarification regarding the presence of a required assignment related to standard 50081.4 in T&L 519 and the assessment of that assignment.

State Team Recommends: After review of the rejoinder, the State Team recommends 50081.3 be met and 50081.4 remain met with weakness for the Master's level Elementary Education program.

Advanced Program for Teachers: English Language Learners Education.

They will be submitting to the TESOL SPA.

Advanced Program for Teachers: Instructional Design & Technology Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
50081.1			X
50081.2	X		
50081.3	X		
50081.4	X		
50081.5	X		
50081.6	X		
50081.7A	X		
50081.7B			X

50081.1 Weaknesses: Content and Core courses do not address NBPTS or Advanced Teacher Education Standards. ACET standards were substituted for 50081.1. Rationale: Although this program does not have licensure available, content area standards were substituted for 50081.1 which includes National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and Standards for Advanced Study. Very detailed data has been gathered and presented with regard to the ACET standards, but they do not meet the required documentation for this standard.

Overall. This degree is designed for both Education and Non Education candidates. Courses within the core sequence and other required courses for all candidates should meet Standard 50081.1 and address the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

State Team Recommends: The State Team recommends 50081.1 and 50081.A are now met and 50081.7B does not apply to this program.

Advanced Program for Teachers: Mathematics Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
50081.1	X		
50081.2		X	
50081.3		X	
50081.4	X		
50081.5		X	
50081.6		X	
50081.7A	X		
50081.7B	N/A		

50081.2 Weaknesses: Candidates are not required to learn about qualitative or blended research methodologies. Rationale: Candidates are required to take EFR 516 Statistics II in which quantitative methods and statistical tests are learned and examined. While candidates may elect to do qualitative research or research utilizing both qualitative and quantitative methods in their Independent Study research project, there is no coursework that introduces them to qualitative methodologies or to blended approaches.

50081.3 Weaknesses: The program does not require study of the development of positive relationships with families. Rationale: TL 542 Models of Teaching and EFR 500 Foundations of Education are 2 of 3 courses that are listed as options for meeting the 6 credit Foundations of Education requirement. TL 542 requires candidates to examine the development of positive relationships between educators and students and learning communities, but does not include developing positive relationships with families. EFR 500 looks at the historic role of schools in society. The third course option is TL 539 College Teaching. It does not address any of the items germane to this standard. If candidates elect TL 539 in place of one of the other 2 courses, they would not be taking coursework for a significant piece of what this standard addresses.

50081.5 Weaknesses: Candidates' utilization of technologies for teaching mathematics is limited. Rationale: MyMathLab is used by students in College Algebra courses taught by the candidates as Graduate Teaching Assistants. While the candidates may need to explain and demonstrate to students how to use this program, there is little evidence that candidates actually use appropriate technologies such as graphing calculators (either virtual or physical) or software such as Geometer's Sketchpad or GeoGebra in their teaching of mathematics.

50081.6 Weaknesses: The required field experience is not explicitly linked to examination of potential impact on P-12 student learning. Rationale: While the field experience required in the program of study is at the university level in courses that address content that is also addressed in curriculum at the secondary level, there is no evidence that what is learned about teaching and learning in the field experience is tied to potential impact on students in grades 7-12 where student maturity level may be a factor.

Content Expert Response: The program requirements are outlined in the document provided by the institution. However, the only mathematics courses identified in the matrix and in the program of study form were those that have been offered during the 3 years the program has been offered. In looking at the graduate catalog, several other mathematics courses are options within the program. Neither course descriptions nor syllabi for those courses were supplied. Cognate options are not specified, but they would be helpful to provide to potential candidates.

State Team Recommends: The State Team recommends no change for 50081.2, 50081.3, 50081.5, and 50081.6 understanding the degree will be added to the educator's license as an "Approved Advanced Educational Program."

Advanced Program: School Counseling Education.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
50020.1		x	
50020.2	x		
50020.3	x		
50020.4		x	
50020.5		x	
50020.6	x		
50020.7	x		
50020.8	x		
50020.9	x		
50020.10	x		

50020.11	x		
----------	---	--	--

50020.1 Weaknesses: Identifying self-care strategies appropriate to the counselor’s role was found to not be covered in any part of the program. Rationale: Because of the multilayered demands of school counseling and the potentially devastating consequences of a school counselor’s impairment, the ASCA Ethical Standards for School Counselors address self-care as an ethical mandate.

50020.4 Weaknesses: School counselors assess and interpret students’ strengths and needs recognizing uniqueness in cultures, backgrounds and abilities and Interpretation of standardized assessments is made to teachers, parents, and students. There is no evidence these areas are covered in any of the coursework. Rationale: Competencies in collecting and interpreting information to make judgments about individuals, programs, or processes that lead to data-driven decision making are a big part of the school counseling program in ND schools. Because effectiveness in assessment and evaluation is critical to effective counseling, these competencies are important for school counselor education and practice.

5020.5 Weaknesses: Evidence of understanding statistical methods in conducting research and program evaluation was not evident. Students did not develop action plans to rectify deficits in groups of students. Rationale: Successful school counseling programs review school data, school counseling program assessment, and goals with an advisory council.

What additional information should the CAEP/ESPB Team research on-site during the visit? (1) Under Human Growth and Development, students should know the theories of individual and family development and transition across the life span. This could be addressed by students taking a human development course or be assured that birth to death is covered in another way. (2) With the diversity and energy development in the western section of North Dakota, career development should be further developed in the curriculum. Demonstrating the use of career counseling processes, techniques, and resources; including those applicable to specific populations in a global economy is somewhat lacking. (3) Students should have some kind of instruction on how to set up groups, so as to not interfere with academics in the school. (4) Comprehensive school counseling programs should conduct programs designed to enhance student academic development.

State Team Recommends: After reviewing the rejoinders, the State Team recommends 50020.1 is Met and 50020.4 and 50020.5 remain met with weakness.

Advanced Program: Educational Leadership (Building Level).

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
1	X		
2		X	
3	X		
4	X		
5	X		
6	X		
7.1			X
7.2			X
7.3	X		

Standard 2. Weaknesses: 2.2 Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program. Rationale: The report states 2.2 was to be assessed by the field experience. It seems unclear depending on the experience of the candidate, if this standard would certainly be met. It was mentioned in a syllabus as being discussed but then it was not marked as being assessed by the course embedded assessments.

Standard 7.1. Weaknesses: The program should provide significant field experience and clinical internship practice. Rationale: I may be missed something but I found the field study to be the only experience in a school setting.

Standard 7.2. Weaknesses: Candidates are provided a six-month, concentrated (9–12 hours per week) internship that includes field experiences within a school-based environment. Rationale: Again, I hope I missed something, but I only read the forty hour field study experience.

State Team Recommends: After reviewing the rejoinder, the State Team recommended no changes.

Advanced Program: Educational Leadership (District Level).

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
1.0	X		
2.0	X		
3.0	X		
4.0	X		

5.0	X		
6.0	X		
7.1	X		
7.2	X		
7.3	X		

What additional information should the CAEP/ESPB Team research on-site during the visit? The students in this program are usually practicing administrators, therefore, I would just inquire about who are their on-site mentors.

Advanced Program: Reading Specialist.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
05007.1	X		
05007.2	X		
05007.3	X		
05007.4	X		
05007.5	X		
05007.6	X		
05007.7	X		
05007.8	X		
05007.9	X		
05007.10	X		
05007.11	X		
05007.12	X		

During the Reading Clinic, the master's degree candidates are required to write a Case Study report to be disseminated to the child's home school and to the parent/parents. Please ask whether or not the master's candidates have a meeting with the child's parents to provide information about the child's progress. I could not find the answer in the course syllabus. If a meeting is not required, I would recommend that the instructor add the parental conference to the course requirements.

Advanced Program: Speech Language Pathology Education.

This program is ASHA accredited. Letter Only.

Valley City State University (VCSU) Master of Arts in Teaching Proposal: Rod Jonas was acting chair for this agenda item. A Master of Arts in Teaching degree from VCSU would be for those individuals who currently hold at least a bachelor's degree in a content area that was non-teaching. This degree would allow the person to complete the education sequence at the graduate level and would lead to licensure. Karen Christensen made a motion to recommend to ESPB to approve VCSU Master of Arts in Teaching proposal. Seconded by Kim Belgarde. Those who voted in favor were Karen Christensen, Brenda Seehafer, Kim Belgarde, Rod Jonas, Ben Schafer, and Penny Veit-Hetletved. None opposed. Motion carried., Gary Thompson and Kim Knodle abstained from voting due to conflict of interest.

Board of Higher Education Approvals: The board of Higher Education has approved Master of Arts in Teaching programs for Valley City State University, Dickinson State University, and Mayville State University. Presented at this time for information only.

Next meeting: The next PAAC meeting will be scheduled for June 2016.

Meeting was adjourned at 1:50pm.

Dr. Gary Thompson, Chair

Janet Welk, Secretary/Executive Director