

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

June 6, 2016

The Education Standards and Practices Board (ESPB) Program Approval Advisory Committee (PAAC) meeting was called to order by Chair Gary Thompson at 10:00am. Introductions were held.

PAAC members present were Kim Knodle, Gary Thompson, Penny Veit-Hetletved, Brenda Seehafer, Karen Christensen, Kim Belgarde, and Rod Jonas. Also present were Janet Welk and Amy Folkestad from ESPB and Sarah Sletten from Mayville State University.

PAAC member Ben Schafer was absent from the meeting.

A review of NDACTE's recommendations on ESSA was added to the agenda.

A motion was made by Karen Christensen and seconded by Brenda Seehafer to approve the minutes from last meeting. All voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Update on Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Partnership Agreement – CAEP agreement has been signed and 8 people from ND will be going to CAEP training this summer. The CAEP partnership agreement is for 7 years.

Sitting Bull College Evaluation Reports – The Sitting Bull College continuing visit was completed in April 2016. Five programs that are offered at Sitting Bull College were reviewed, including a new Advanced Program for Teachers.

Board of Examiners Report on NCATE Standards – Rod Jonas made motion for provisional approval of the unit standards with condition that Sitting Bull College submit an update in 2019 for standard 1d. Seconded by Kim Knodle. All voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teachers – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teachers – Advanced Teacher Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1c. Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge and Skills for Teachers – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
1c. Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge and Skills for Teachers – Advanced Teacher Preparation		x	

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1d. Student Learning for Teachers – Initial Teacher Preparation	x		
1d. Student Learning for Teachers – Advanced Teacher Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1e. Professional Knowledge for Other School Professionals			
<u>Summary of Findings:</u> The unit does not offer programs or degrees for other school professionals.			
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals			
<u>Summary of Findings:</u> The unit does not offer programs or degrees for other school professionals.			
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1g. Professional Dispositions		x	
2010 AFI Number & Text	2016 AFI Rationale		
2. Development of candidates' reading and writing skills so that candidates have the ability to pass the Praxis I tests with the required ESPB cut-off scores.	The Division of Education has made concerted efforts to implement programs/activities to ensure a higher pass rate. For example, the College has subscribed to Learning Express Library which is an online tutorial for the Core Academic Skills exam. Faculty also incorporate aspects (types of writing required, test taking strategies) of the test in various courses.		
AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale		
1. Candidates are not required to assess and analyze student learning in coursework or field experiences. (Initial and Advanced)	Evidence provided did not identify a course or clinical experience requirement for candidates to assess and analyze student learning data to make decisions regarding their choice and use of various instructional strategies and methods.		

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
2a. Assessment System – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
2a. Assessment System – Advanced Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
2b. Data Collection, Analysis, & Evaluation– Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
2b. Data Collection, Analysis, & Evaluation– Initial Teacher Preparation – Advanced Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement – Advanced Preparation		x	
2010 AFI Number & Text	2016 AFI Rationale		
2a. (Initial) The unit is encouraged to explore use of a comprehensive information technology system that allows for more efficient data collection, analysis, and aggregation.	(Initial) The 2016 BOE team was not able to view a comprehensive assessment technology system for the unit to more accurately and efficiently collect, analyze, and aggregate data for purposes of monitoring student performance and program improvement. The team's recommendation is to continue this area for improvement at the initial level.		
2b. (Initial) Provide evidence of data collection,	(Initial) The 2016 BOE team was not able to view		

analysis, and aggregation regarding surveys of graduates and employers.	survey data from recent graduates or employers. The unit did not have any 2015 teacher education graduates and data were not available to provide evidence that survey results have been gathered at any time since the last visit. The team's recommendation is to continue this area for improvement at the initial level.
---	--

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
3a. Collaboration between Unit & School Partners – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
3a. Collaboration between Unit & School Partners – Advanced Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
3b. Design, Implementation, & Evaluation of Field Experiences & Clinical Practices – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
3b. Design, Implementation, & Evaluation of Field Experiences & Clinical Practices – Advanced Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
3c. Candidates' Development & Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, & Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
3c. Candidates' Development & Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, & Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Advanced Preparation		x	

Standard 4: Diversity

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
4a. Design, Implementation, & Evaluation of Curriculum & Experiences – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
4a. Design, Implementation, & Evaluation of Curriculum & Experiences – Advanced Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Advanced Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Advanced Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students to P-12 Schools – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students to P-12 Schools – Advanced Preparation		x	
AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale		
1. (Initial and Advanced) Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse candidates.	Review of demographic data and interviews indicate candidates are limited in their opportunities to interact with diverse candidates. When opportunities are provided, candidates seldom take advantage of these opportunities due to other commitments.		

2. (Initial and Advanced) Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse learners.	Candidates are encouraged to conduct some of their field experiences outside the area to experience more diverse classrooms; however, because of other commitments candidates seldom do this.
--	---

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
5a. Qualified Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
5a. Qualified Faculty – Advanced Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Advanced Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Advanced Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Advanced Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Advanced Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Advanced Preparation		x	

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
6a. Unit Leadership & Authority – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
6a. Unit Leadership & Authority – Advanced Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
6b. Unit Budget – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
6b. Unit Budget – Advanced Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
6c. Personnel – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
6c. Personnel – Advanced Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
6d. Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
6d. Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation		x	
Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
6e. Unit Resources including Technology – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
6e. Unit Resources including Technology – Advanced Preparation		x	

Initial Teacher Preparation Programs (InTASC): Rod Jonas made motion to accept the unit report for Sitting Bull College. Seconded by Karen Christensen. All voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

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		

Standard #6: Assessment: The teacher candidate understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.

A. **Reviewer's Decision:** Is the sub-standard met, met with weakness, or not met?
 Met Met with Weakness Not Met

B. **For Decisions of "Met with Weakness" or "Not Met":** Describe the specific weakness identified and the rationale for the decision. This information will guide the institution to provide additional information in their rejoinder, or be used to determine stipulations for the institution to address by the time the next visit occurs. A rationale does not need to be provided for standards "met".

- i. **Weaknesses:** It is unclear whether candidates engage in coursework or activities where they must use assessment data to inform and guide their instructional practices.
- ii. **Rationale:** Evidence provided did not demonstrate that candidates receive instruction or engage in clinical experiences where they use assessments and resulting data to make decisions regarding their choice and use of various instructional strategies and methods.

C. **For Decisions of "Met with Weakness" or "Not Met" Within Particular Program Areas:**

Describe the specific weakness identified and the rationale for the decision. Please indicate which program area is being targeted. This information will guide the institution to provide additional information in their rejoinder, or be used to determine stipulations for the institution to address by the time the next visit occurs.

- i. **Weaknesses:**
- ii. **Rationale:**

Standard #8: Instructional Strategies: The teacher candidate understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

- A. **Reviewer’s Decision:** Is the sub-standard met, met with weakness, or not met?
 ___Met xMet with Weakness ___Not Met
- B. **For Decisions of “Met with Weakness” or “Not Met”:** Describe the specific weakness identified and the rationale for the decision. This information will guide the institution to provide additional information in their rejoinder, or be used to determine stipulations for the institution to address by the time the next visit occurs. A rationale does not need to be provided for standards “met”.
- i. **Weaknesses:**
 - ii. **Rationale:**
- C. **For Decisions of “Met with Weakness” or “Not Met” Within Particular Program Areas:** Describe the specific weakness identified and the rationale for the decision. Please indicate which program area is being targeted. This information will guide the institution to provide additional information in their rejoinder, or be used to determine stipulations for the institution to address by the time the next visit occurs.
- i. **Weaknesses:** It is unclear from the evidence provided whether candidates in the Bachelor of Science program in Secondary Science Education understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to teach science topics.
 - ii. **Rationale:** SED 390 School Science Safety was the only course required in the BS in Secondary Science Education that was submitted as evidence of meeting this standard. The course description and stated objectives in the course syllabus do not provide evidence that candidates learn about or use multiple instructional strategies for teaching science in this course.

Special Education: Rod Jonas made motion to accept the Special Education report as written. Seconded by Karen Christensen. All voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

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		

CEC 5: Learning Environments & Social Interactions Special educators actively create learning environments for individuals with exceptional learning needs that foster cultural understanding, safety and emotional well-being, positive social interactions, and active engagement of individuals with exceptional learning needs. In addition, special educators foster environments in which diversity is valued and individuals are taught to live harmoniously and productively in a culturally diverse world. Special educators shape environments to encourage the independence, self-motivation, self-direction, personal empowerment, and self-advocacy of individuals with exceptional learning needs. Special educators help their general education colleagues integrate individuals with exceptional learning needs in general education environments and engage them in meaningful learning activities and interactions. Special educators use direct motivational and instructional interventions with individuals with exceptional learning needs to teach them to respond effectively to current expectations. When necessary, special educators can safely intervene with individuals with exceptional learning needs in crisis. Special educators coordinate all these efforts and provide guidance and direction to paraeducators and others, such as classroom volunteers and tutors.

Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the program is preparing candidates

A. **Content Expert Decision:** Is the sub-standard met, met with weakness, or not met?

Met Met with Weakness Not Met

B. **For Decisions of “Met with Weakness” or “Not Met”:** Describe the specific weakness identified and the rationale for the decision. This information will guide the institution to provide additional information in their rejoinder, or be used to determine stipulations for the institution to address by the time the next visit occurs. A rationale does not need to be provided for standards “met”.

i. **Weaknesses:** Couldn't determine is courses addressed this part of the standard: Providing guidance and direction to paraeducators and others, such as classroom volunteers and tutors.

ii. **Rationale:** *Many courses address the development and implementation of strategies, resources, accommodations, modifications, etc. – but difficult to determine how candidates are taught how to guide others such as – paras, volunteers, tutors, etc.*

CEC 7 : Instructional Planning Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice. Special educators develop long-range individualized instructional plans anchored in both general and special education curricula. In addition, special educators systematically translate these individualized plans into carefully selected shorter-range goals and objectives taking into consideration an individual's abilities and needs, the learning environment, and a myriad of cultural and linguistic factors. Individualized instructional plans emphasize explicit modeling and efficient guided practice to assure acquisition and fluency through maintenance and generalization. Understanding of these factors as well as the implications of an individual's exceptional condition, guides the special educator's selection, adaptation, and creation of materials, and the use of powerful instructional variables. Instructional plans are modified based on ongoing analysis of the individual's learning progress. Moreover, special educators facilitate this instructional planning in a collaborative context including the individuals with exceptionalities, families, professional colleagues, and personnel from other agencies as appropriate. Special educators also develop a variety of individualized transition plans, such as transitions from preschool to elementary school and from secondary settings to a variety of postsecondary work and learning contexts. Special educators are comfortable using appropriate technologies to support instructional planning and individualized instruction.

Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the program is preparing candidates. II.

A. **Content Expert Decision:** Is the sub-standard met, met with weakness, or not met?

Met Met with Weakness Not Met

B. **For Decisions of “Met with Weakness” or “Not Met”:** Describe the specific weakness identified and the rationale for the decision. This information will guide the institution to provide additional information in their rejoinder, or be used to determine stipulations for the institution to address by the time the next visit occurs. A rationale does not need to be provided for standards “met”.

i. **Weaknesses:** *Couldn't identify in syllabi and exhibits transition from preK to elementary; from elementary to middle, and then from middle to high school.*

ii. **Rationale:** *Syllabi and exhibits appeared to be focused on secondary transition. Couldn't tell by syllabi if transition is addressed from pre to elementary and then to middle and high school.*

Elementary Education: Penny Veit-Hetletved made a motion to approve the elementary education report as written. Seconded by Kim Knodle. All voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

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		

Early Childhood Education: Rod Jonas made a motion to accept the early childhood education report with the condition that an updated syllabus be submitted for ECE 497. Seconded by Brenda Seehafer. All voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Standard	Met	Met With Weakness	Not Met
50037	X		
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		

50037.9 The program requires three supervised field experiences (one at a pre-kindergarten level) and two student teaching experiences for a minimum of ten weeks. One student teaching experience must be in an approved pre-kindergarten or kindergarten setting and the other in grades 1, 2, or 3, and include the opportunity to work with children with special needs.

- A. **Content Expert Decision:** Is the sub-standard met, met with weakness, or not met?
 ___Met ___Met with Weakness xNot Met
- B. **For Decisions of “Met with Weakness” or “Not Met”:** Describe the specific weakness identified and the rationale for the decision. This information will guide the institution to provide additional information in their rejoinder, or be used to determine stipulations for the institution to address by the time the next visit occurs. A rationale does not need to be provided for standards “met”.
- i. **Weaknesses:** The standard asks that students be placed in two setting pre-kindergarten or kindergarten is one setting the other setting is within grades 1, 2, or 3. Each of the syllabi provided ECE 297 and ECE 497 describe only daycare or pre-school settings.
 - ii. **Rationale:** There is a mismatch of documentation from the Initial Program Report and the syllabi provided as evidence.

Composite Science: Rod Jonas made motion to approve, seconded by Karen Christensen. All voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

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		

13047.7 Assessment The program prepares candidates to use a variety of performance assessment strategies to evaluate the intellectual, social, and personal development of the learner in all aspects of science.

- A. **Content Expert Decision:** Is the sub-standard met, met with weakness, or not met?
 ___Met xMet with Weakness ___Not Met
- B. **For Decisions of “Met with Weakness” or “Not Met”:** Describe the specific weakness identified and the rationale for the decision. This information will guide the institution to provide additional information in their rejoinder, or be used to determine stipulations for the institution to address by the time the next visit occurs. A rationale does not need to be provided for standards “met”.
- i. **Weaknesses:** Assessment of student learning in the classroom.
 - ii. **Rationale:** There was limiting evidence of the ability of pre-service teachers to assess their instructional effectiveness with students in their classrooms. Examples of pre-service teacher assessment strategies were not presented to determine the level of differentiation in assessment styles within the classroom. Lesson plans which provide evidence of assessment technique were not provided in order to determine if students had mastered skills in critical self-evaluation of their instructional performance. Granted, no students are currently enrolled in this program, however these criteria should be evident in course syllabi and programmatic assessment plan.

Advanced Programs for Teachers: Rod Jonas made a motion to provisionally approve the Advanced Programs for Teachers with an updated report due in 3 years that emphasizes the number of candidates enrolled in the program. Seconded by Kim Belgarde. All voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

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		

50081.7A . Advanced Study in Specialty Area Education 1) The program’s advanced content area specialization study is designed to reflect the standards of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and professional specialty association recommendations for advanced study. 2) The program’s advanced content area specialization study provides for breadth in the field or for detailed study of one or more specialized aspect of the field, and for access to new research and developments.

- A. **Content Expert Decision:** Is the sub-standard met, met with weakness, or not met?
 ___Met xMet with Weakness ___Not Met
- B. **For Decisions of “Met with Weakness” or “Not Met”:** Describe the specific weakness identified and the rationale for the decision. This information will guide the institution to provide additional information in their rejoinder, or be used to determine stipulations for the institution to address by the time the next visit occurs. A rationale does not need to be provided for standards “met”.

- i. **Weaknesses:** Assessments do not systematically align with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
- ii. **Rationale:** The pre-visit matrix aligned assessments from every course with each InTASC standard. The adjusted matrix aligned each assessment with all five National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. The alignment dilutes the specificity of each assessment and does not address which course best aligns with each NBPTS core proposition.

Minot State University: Update on Business Education Curriculum – Minot State University will no longer offer BIT 236 Business Design Tools and will be using ART 112 to meet part of standard 03020.2 for current technology applications. Brenda Seehafer made motion to accept the change, seconded by Kim Belgarde. All voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Mayville State University Master's Program – Mayville State has been approved by the Board of Higher Education to offer a Master of Arts in Teaching program. This program will allow candidates with non-teaching content area bachelor's degrees to complete a master's program that will then allow them to become licensed teachers. Mayville will be able to offer this program in areas where they have approved bachelor's level teacher education programs. Rod Jonas made a motion to recommend approval of Mayville State University's Master of Arts in Teaching program with the addition of a methods course in the specific content area being pursued OR a change to the syllabus for EDUC 540 so that it outlines that methods included are content specific. Seconded by Penny Veit-Hetletved. All voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried. Documentation of the addition of a content area methods course or change to the syllabus for EDUC 540 would be reviewed at the next PAAC meeting.

Annual Reports – The annual reports show a total of 716 graduates last year, which is up a little from last year. This number does include candidates who completed double majors. Rod Jonas would like to see data on program completers in North Dakota from the past 15 years. Rod Jonas made a motion to approve the annual report. Seconded by Kim Belgarde. All voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Kim Knodle made a motion to approve UND updates to areas that had been met with weakness or not met from the last PAAC meeting. Seconded by Kim Belgarde. All voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Marketing Endorsement Changes – Marketing minor equivalency endorsement is being reviewed and updated at the request of Kevin Reisenauer at CTE. Changes are minimal and primarily address a change in language. Penny Veit-Hetletved made a motion to approve changes to the minor equivalency endorsement. Seconded by Karen Christensen. All voted in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Licensure Laws Draft – NDACTE subcommittee met to review current licensure laws and developed recommendations to PAAC for ESSA. Recommendations were reviewed.

Next meeting – Next meeting will be tentatively scheduled for an August conference call, then December 8th for a regular meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:53am.

Dr. Gary Thompson, Chair

Janet Welk, Secretary/Executive Director