SUBJECT: Annual Discipline Council Reports

Discipline councils have provided their annual reports for information. The reports are attached and each discipline council chair is listed below.

- Arts and Science – Chair: Jerry Jorgensen (SDSU) – Attachment I
- Business – Chair: John Sondy (SDSU) – Attachment II
- Education – Chair: Howard Smith (SDSU) – Attachment III
- English – Chair: Patrick Whiteley (NSU) – Attachment IV
- Fine Arts – Chair: Janeen Larsen (BHSU) – Attachment V
- Health, Physical Education, & Recreation - Chair: Bernadette Olson (SDSU) – Attachment VI
- Humanities – Chair: Virginia Lewis (NSU) – Attachment VII
- Information Technology – Chair: Asai Asaithambi (USD) – Attachment VIII
- Math – Chair: Curtis Card (BHSU) – Attachment IX
The business discipline council membership included:

- John Sondey, Chair    SDSU
- Carol Cumber SDSU
- David Chown NSU
- Hillar Neumann NSU
- Phyliss Romkema BHSU
- Shelia Aaker   BHSU
- Jo Lee SDSMT
- Rick Puetz DSU
- Jack Walters DSU
- Mike Keller, USD
- Cathy Anderson, SDBOR

**Meeting Dates and Types:**

The BDC met three times, once in the fall and twice in the spring via phone conferencing.

**Work plan:**

The following issues were addressed:

- Mobile computing initiative and integration of technology in the classroom
- Common outcomes in general business education classes
- Inter institution collaboration
- Articulation with state technical institutes

A series of recommendations were drafted for each of the above and submitted, via the minutes to the committee to take back to their departments and the CAO of the SDBOR.

- The discipline council was asked to discuss the topic of mobile computing, to begin considering strategies for teaching in an environment where every student has a
mobile device, and to suggest ways to assist faculty to develop the skills and abilities needed if they are to function effectively in this type of setting.

- The Discipline Council should discuss the expected student learner outcomes for a set of entry level classes offered in business.

- Council members should support and be involved in cross institutional and interdisciplinary collaboration to advance the Board of Regents and public university research agenda.

Recommendations/discussions:

- In regards to the Mobile Computing Initiative the council found that … “that the incorporation of modern technology into business classes was essential but the means and extent to which it was incorporated should be at the discretion of the instructor/department. Most of the Council noted that they had already integrated personal computers/software into their courses…”

- In regards to common outcomes in general business education classes the council observed that all of the regental institutions which offer general business classes have the same basic learning outcomes. Students are able to successfully move throughout the system, taking courses at different universities, and able to transfer course from one university to the other, either internal to the system or to universities external to the system.

- It was observed that those in the business discipline are collaborate when and if the opportunity arises, however these opportunities in the business are limited as well as grant funding. Consensus is that the members are willing to facilitate and promote inter-institutional collaboration but the opportunities seem very sparse.

- The group discussed articulation agreements with the technical institutes. Many of the universities have such agreements in place; most of these are not specific to business. However, some universities, such as BHSU, do have a business agreement in place with Western Dakota Vo-Tech. It was decided by the council to not pursue this further.
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Education Discipline Council Membership
2008 - 2009

Black Hills State University
   Dr. Nancy Hall
   Dr. David Calhoun

Dakota State University
   Dr. Judy Dittman
   Ms. Crystal Pauli

Northern State University
   Dr. Tom Hawley
   Dr. Nancy Barondeau

South Dakota School of Mines and Technology (Liaison)
   Dr. Josephine (Jo) Lee

South Dakota State University
   Dr. Howard B. Smith, Chair
      Dr. Lon Moeller
      Dr. Andrew Stremmel

University of South Dakota
   Dr. Rick Melmer
   Dr. Linda Reetz

   BOR Liaison
   Dr. Sam Gingerich
   Dr. Paul Turman

Affiliates (SD-DOE)
   Dr. Melody Schopp
   Mr. Steve Feichtner
Education Discipline Council
Annual Report, 2008 - 2009

Leadership:
Chair - Dr. Howard B. Smith
South Dakota State University

Leadership
2009-2010:
Chair - Dr. Tom Hawley
Northern State University

Meeting Dates and Type:
October 30, 2008    Face to face Vermillion
January 30, 2009   Face to face Madison
March 26, 2009     Face to Face Pierre

Overview of Education Discipline Council Activities of the Year:
See Appendix A for Meeting Agendas.
See Appendix B for Meeting Minutes and details of actions taken.

Response to Initiatives for Council Consideration Suggested by the Executive Director:
Dr. Robert (Tad) Perry challenged us to continue to implement the inclusion/infusion of technological use in the pedagogical preparation of our candidates and to assist our faculty members in developing the skills and experiences needed to function effectively in this type of setting. This would include assisting other programs and faculties across campus in implementing mobile computing into their teaching/learning processes. We were also challenged to address other issues raised by the 2006 System-Wide Review of Teacher Education especially those that relate to high need areas in South Dakota K-12 Schools and to move forward with developing a tracking system on enrollments in those areas. And finally, we were to continue collaboration with the South Dakota Department of Education especially in the area of the new SD-DOE standards as they work toward compliance with the Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards.

Other Council Activities 2008 - 2009:
We were able to move forward with the Secondary Education Certification program that was developed during the 2007-2008 academic year in that both the SD-DOE and the BOR did press releases and the EDC further refined a uniform application process. (See Appendix C for example intake interview form developed by Dr. Linda Reetz at USD.)

We had been monitoring only four content areas which we had defined as "high needs" disciplines in SD. We expanded those to match the thirteen content areas issued by the US Department of Education as high needs areas. (See Appendix D for the list as published by the SD-DOE, January 6, 2009.)

We moved forward with developing a tracking system that identifies undergraduate candidates who have expressed an interest in teaching as they enter the University System rather than waiting until they are formally admitted to Teacher Education, usually the end of their sophomore year. This will be of great assistance to us in gathering data for NCATE and the Higher Education Reauthorization Act which
both require a tracking process. In addition, it will aid us in reaching out to these students earlier in their academic career to begin a mentoring process with them and building a critical mass of pre-service candidates as well. (See Appendix E for summary of Reauthorization of the Higher Education Opportunities Act prepared by Dr. Gingerich.)

**Recommendations for AAC Consideration:**

Given the BOR Mobile Computer Initiative was withdrawn, and local campuses have been asked to move the concept of addressing technology forward, it will be very important to gain the support of the AAC so the institutions stay fairly even in the preparation of teachers and other school professionals. If they have not already committed to the purchase of mobile computing devices, the EDC would strongly recommend this as a top priority for 2009 - 2010.

It would also be our recommendation that the Academic Affairs Council members discuss ways in which they could encourage the leadership (i.e. Deans and Department Heads) of other colleges across campus, especially including, but not limited to, the Colleges of Arts and Sciences to be supportive of the Teacher Education emphases in their units. The Education Discipline Council wants to work collaboratively with them in their respective content preparation of K-12 teachers from within their disciplines. The K-12 Teacher shortage is not the problem of only Colleges of Education across SD. The entire University system has a stake in K-12 education as this is the source of their incoming freshmen.

**Suggestions for Council Work Plan for 2009 - 2010:**

The EDC has struggled with the Mobile Computing Initiative as we discovered at our first meeting that Gateway was in the process of going out of business just as we were ordering our tablets. We should continue to strive toward a mobile computing environment that goes beyond laptop computers and includes appropriate training for faculty members, working in conjunction with the K - 12 Schools to stay in sync with them, seeking funding for faculty training, hardware, and software alike.

More refining of the Secondary Teacher Certification needs to be done. It is the details that seem to have caused us difficulty this year. Some of those are 1) ways to increase interest in the program, 2) come to an agreement on when enrollees must present evidence that they have passed the PPST or CAAP test, 3) find ways of increasing the clarity of what is involved in this program, and 4) finding a way to develop a common list of enrollees at each school.

The EDC needs to continue the discussion on critical data elements that each institution collects that will feed into a tracking system in collaboration with the SD-DOE. The data collected is critical and essential for us to gain a better understanding of the outcomes of our work as we prepare educators. This tracking needs to continue once the candidate has graduated to establish data on where they are being employed and how long they are staying in the profession. While there may not be a system on a nation-wide basis, we can certainly construct something that will serve in the interim so this valuable data is not lost.

While each BOR institution has strong relationships with some school districts, there are many more districts with which no BOR Teacher Education program has much contact. Those relationships need to be formalized and expanded to include other professionals in the schools such as the Administrators, Counselors, and support staff.
Appendix A
2009 Education Discipline Council
Meeting Agendas

South Dakota Board of Regents
Education Discipline Council Meeting
October 30, 2008
Agenda

Call to Order at 9:00 a.m. in the Delzell School of Education - Room 105, USD Campus

1. Approval of the Minutes of May 28th Meeting in Aberdeen
2. Planning for marketing the online secondary Certification Program to begin next summer
3. Completing criminal background checks on student teachers - Dr. Gingerich
4. Explore/set the agenda for the EDC for FY09
5. Scheduling of EDC meetings for FY09
6. Discussion of technology carry-over goal from FY08 in light of BOR Mobile Computing initiative
7. Report from Dr. Paul Turman, BOR Staff, regarding development of the South Dakota Education Data System (SD EDS) and implications for EDC members.
8. Report from Dr. Melody Schopp, SD DOE Staff, RE: first year teacher mentoring program and the establishment of a research agenda or mechanism for getting feedback on new Grads.
9. Discussion on Accreditation Visit Schedule (Ms. Jennifer Neuhauser)
10. Showcase of USD Education Programs
11. Other

South Dakota Board of Regents
Education Discipline Council Meeting
January 30, 2009
Agenda

Call to Order at 8:30 a.m.

1. Introduction of New Members of EDC and welcome
2. Approval of the Minutes of the October 30, 2008 meeting
3. Unfinished Business
   a. Update on the marketing of the Online Secondary Certification Program
   b. Dr. Gingerich's Report on Legal Opinion on Criminal Background checks
4. Discussion of bringing the Milken Teachers together to discuss Teacher Education Recruitment and Retention
5. Discussion of setting goals for numbers of candidates especially in high need disciplines and methodologies for accomplishing these goals
6. Developing ways to identify students at critical check points once they are admitted to our respective programs. This will assist us in being able to supply more accurate information to the Fact Book
8. Discussion on Critical Data Elements needed on Candidates from which we can compile a common list which can interface with the DOE (Note: Please bring what you are currently using plus what additional elements you would recommend.)

9. Discussion of strategies of ways to develop partnerships with
   i. Deans of the Content areas,
   ii. K-12 schools (administrators and faculty),
   iii. DOE,
   iv. Area Co-ops, and
   v. Educational Leadership Organizations within SD.

10. Discussion of "where do BOR Colleges of Education go from here relative to mobile computing and integration of technology into our curriculum

11. DSU Showcase

12. Other

13. Adjourn at 2:00 p.m.

South Dakota Board of Regents
Education Discipline Council Meeting
March 26, 2009
Agenda

Call to Order at 1:00 p.m. in the Conference Room, Board of Regents Office Building

1. Approval of the Minutes of the January 30, 2009 Meeting

2. Unfinished Business
   a. Publicity (See 01.30.09 Minutes, Item #4.)
   b. Online Certification
   c. Recruitment Efforts
   d. Progress on Requesting DOE to make some media spots
   e. Use of Teacher of the Year for media spots
   f. Other

3. Update from SD DOE

4. Discussion/Assessment of Efforts at meeting system-wide recruitment goals in high need disciplines (please bring your institutional data.) (See 01.30.09 Minutes, Item #5.)

5. Discussion of "high need" disciplines by SD DOE and US DOE

6. Progress on campus action that will ask all incoming students if they are interested in teacher education. (See 01.30.09 Minutes, item #6.)

7. Update on securing funding from stimulus monies for longitudinal study and a nationwide tracking system of high school students who might go into teaching. Dr. Paul Turman. (Drs. Hall and Reetz) (See 01.03.09 Minutes, Items #7 & 8.)

8. Legal Opinion on background checks for Student Teachers and other Field-based experiences in pK - 12 Schools (BOR General Counsel, Jim Shekleton)

9. Election of FY 2010 Chair

10. Discussion on System-wide ESL program - Jon Green

11. Other
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2009 Education Discipline Council
Meeting Minutes

South Dakota Board of Regents
Education Discipline Council Meeting
October 30, 2008
Minutes

The meeting was called to Order at 9:00 a.m. in the Delzell School of Education, room 105 on the University of South Dakota Campus with the following members present:

David Calhoun - BHSU
Judy Dittman - DSU
Connie Geier - NSU
Sam Gingerich - BOR
Nancy Hall - BHSU
Tom Hawley - NSU
Lon Moeller - SDSU
Crystal Pauli - DSU
Linda Reetz - USD
Howard Smith - SDSU
Paul Turman - BOR

Melody Schopp, SD DOE and Jennifer Neuhauser, SD DOE, joined us later in the meeting.

*RE: Item #1: Approval of the Minutes of May 28th meeting in Aberdeen*
Motion to approve Minutes of May 28th as distributed (Moeller/Dittman): passed.

*RE: Item #2: Planning for Marketing the Online Secondary Certification Program*
Dr. Gingerich noted that the BOR notification and acceptance of this program has not yet been acted upon. Therefore we have a bit of time. The program will be on the agenda at their December meeting and we can begin marketing after that occurs.

Suggestions for marketing were 1) a press release, 2) put it on the DOE Website, 3) EUC could place a link to "home" campuses that would take the prospective student to a page with the sequence of courses, 4) each campus website could have a listing of courses for summer of '09 (each campus must make sure they are offering the course they agreed to offer), 5) each campus could reserve space for these students in one distance delivery section of their respective course to assure that space is available, 6) the DOE or BOR could do a press release following the settlement of the DOE/Districts lawsuit as an example of our attempt to respond to the teacher shortage, and 7) a letter could go out to school administrators advertising the program.
Dr. Gingerich distributed copies of SL 13-10-12 which states clearly that each person over 18 years of age hired by a school district will submit a criminal background investigation, even for temporary employment. He went on to note that some Superintendants have stated that some student teachers have come to begin their experience and only then applied for the required background check. When this happens, the results are not received until near the end of the semester which renders them useless. Some candidates have complained that they need this report before they have any contact with K12 students and if they do their early field-based experience at one school and then do their student teaching at another school they need to get another report. Dr. Gingerich reminded us that South Dakota law says that these reports are considered valid and transferable for up to 5 years. DSU gets a packet from the Division of Criminal Investigation and gives them to candidates well in advance of any field-based experience and notifies them that the check must be completed prior to going into the schools.

Following discussion, Dr. Gingerich volunteered to ask legal counsel to provide a written opinion on this topic for all school personnel preparation programs. It was also noted that there were other questions that remain. This item will be carried forward to the agenda of the next EDC meeting.

**RE: Item #4: Explore/set the EDC agenda for FY 09B**
Following discussion we added the following items to our agenda for the year FY 09.

1. Dr. Hall reminded the group that we had discussed asking Dr. Rick Melmer to work with us to bring the Milken Teachers together to discuss ways to improve recruitment and retention numbers. It was agreed that this would be a worthwhile program that should be done during this year.

2. Dr. Gingerich suggested that we need to set goals for ourselves in terms of numbers of students entering, and completing Teacher preparation especially in high need disciplines. While most of us can produce the existing numbers, we need to set a definite goal to strive toward in our recruitment and retention efforts.

3. Dr. Turman encouraged us to continue to work on identifying students at critical check points once they enter and throughout their matriculation. The goal of the *Fact Book* and other reports throughout the year is to report the most accurate information possible. We can be of assistance in accomplishing that end.

4. We need to develop strategic partnerships with all Deans of the content areas, the K12 schools (these must be intentional and system-wide), the DOE, area Co-ops, and educational leadership organizations. A strategy to accomplish this will be on the agenda for our next meeting. In this regard, we will all meet with the faculty in our content areas on our campuses and generate a list of topics that the EDC and other Discipline Councils could discuss during a joint meeting.

**RE: Item #5: Scheduling of EDC Meetings for FY 09**
It was decided that we would schedule 2 more face-to-face meetings for FY 09. The first will be at DSU on January 30. One assignment in advance of this meeting will be for each campus to make a list of the critical data elements needed on their Teacher Education and Educational Leadership candidates from which we will compile a common list. This will facilitate the development of the South Dakota Education Data System. We will also be discussing those areas of the application of technology to teaching and learning that we can share between and among ourselves as Colleges of Education across the State. One suggestion that arose from the group was to offer "technology utilization" professional development via webinars to help control costs.
The second meeting will be held in Pierre on March 26. We will be discussing the results of the legislative session and the impact those will have on the education profession in SD. The BOR Building, lower level conference room has been reserved for the March meeting.

RE: Item #6: Discussion of technology carry-over goal from FY 08 in light of BOR Mobile Computing Initiative

Some members of the group expressed frustration with being unable to purchase the hardware from the designated vendor which has impeded their progress toward this goal. Others had moderate to good success in obtaining equipment and training that DSU provided as well as their own IT staff on campus. It was noted that with the current situation with Gateway not taking orders that we should expect to see some flexibility appearing in the BOR implementation plan.

We will also continue to work closely with K12 schools to increase the application of technology in the teaching learning process. (See also Item #5 above.)

RE: Item #7: Report from Dr. Paul Turman regarding development of the South Dakota Education Data System (SD EDS) and implications for EDC members

Dr. Turman distributed a handout which discussed the importance of following the guiding principle for teacher education programs of helping candidates facilitate student learning by developing the candidates' knowledge bases for analyzing student learning using a variety of assessment data, both formative and summative. He noted Louisiana State University's model and the contribution of George Noell in developing the Value-Added Teacher Preparation Program Assessment Model. This model suggests a data warehouse that feeds into the student's prior achievement, the student demographics, and the classroom content, all of which interact in the school environment under the tutelage of a specific teacher to yield the student performance.

From this model of student achievement, a model for performance-based teacher education program effectiveness has been developed which could in turn be attached to a teacher incentive fund. The question put before the EDC is, "How do we work within a system such as the South Dakota Education Data System (SD EDS), linking our data bases with Colleague and with the DOE to develop a cross-walk with student ID and later, Department of Labor?"

We also discussed an issue for a number of Teacher Education Majors in the Opportunity Scholarship program which requires a minimum load of 15 credits per semester who, while doing their student teaching, often drop below that number. There are waivers that can be applied which would exempt these students from this requirement.

RE: Item #8: Report from Dr. Melody Schopp on First Year Teacher Mentoring program and the establishment of a research agenda or mechanism for getting feedback on new Graduates

Dr. Schopp distributed handouts describing South Dakota Incentives Plus program which affords teachers and principals in high-need schools professional and financial incentives based on classroom and school wide gains in student achievement. There are currently 40 elementary and secondary schools in 10 districts participating in this program. Information describing the Teacher to Teacher Support Network was also distributed. This program pairs first year teachers with veteran teachers who provide mentoring through electronic means. The veterans offer advice and support on a variety of topics and the first-year are expected to develop a professional development plan that makes the mentoring they receive intentional and focused.
In reporting on the *South Dakota Virtual School*, Dr. Schopp noted that there are eight providers of courses, with 160 different courses for approximately 1,500 students who wish to complete their degree after having dropped out for a period of time as well as offering courses for students seeking Advanced Placement credit. The *2008 DOE Annual Report* was also distributed and discussed.

**RE: Item #9: Discussion on Accreditation Visit Schedule (Ms. Jennifer Neuhauser)**

Ms. Neuhauser shared with us the information about NCATE's willingness to postpone site visits for one year if the State DOE agreed to do so to ease the financial burden on the institutions with no penalty for doing so. The subsequent visits would be scheduled for 7 years from the deferred visit. She told us that we could expect to be hearing directly from NCATE within the next several days as the SD DOE has indicated to NCATE that they would have no objections.

**RE: Item #10: Showcase of USD Education Programs**

Dr. Gareth Zalud, director of USD's Reading Recovery Training Center met with the EDC and provided us an overview of the training and successes experienced with students in elementary schools. Dr. Janet Peterson then gave us a demonstration of a typical session with an elementary student as Dr. Zalud explained some of the principles as they were being applied. We were also given an overview of USD's PDC mentoring program and heard from a Secondary Math mentor and an Elementary Education mentor.

**RE: Item #11: Other**

There were no other items brought before the group at this time.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by:
Dr. Howard B. Smith, EDC Chair and Interim Dean
College of Education and Counseling at SDSU
The meeting was called to Order at 8:30 a.m. in room 116 of the Kennedy Center on the campus of Dakota State University with the following members and affiliates present:

Nancy Barondeau
David Calhoun
Judy Dittman
Steve Fiechtner
Sam Gingerich
Nancy Hall
Tom Hawley
Lon Moeller
Crystal Pauli
Linda Reetz
Howard Smith
Andy Stremmel

Item #1: Introduction of New Members and Affiliates

Steve Fiechtner, South Dakota Department of Education, and Andy Stremmel, Early Childhood Education Department Head, South Dakota State University, were introduced and welcomed to the Education Discipline Council.

Item #2: Approval of the Minutes of October 30, 2008 meeting

The Minutes were approved as distributed.

Item #3: Unfinished Business

a. Update on the marketing of the Online Secondary Certification program
   a. During the discussion it was noted that both BOR and DOE had done press releases and that each of the campuses had been contacted by individuals expressing an interest (n = 25). It was also decided that we needed to be sure that all BOR institutions were handling the inquiries the same way. Several topics were discussed.
      i. We should refer all inquiries to our undergraduate Admissions Office to check their GPA for their BA/BS to make sure they meet the minimum for being admitted to Teacher Education.
      ii. They need to pass the Praxis exam in their content area before they can be considered
      iii. (See Appendix B of the EDC Annual Report FY 2008 for requirements.)
      iv. Dr. Reetz offered to send to EDC members a scripted set of questions that she directs to all individuals expressing and interest.
      v. After discussion it was decided that we would treat this first time through as a cohort and people would need to begin in summer 09, take all required courses in the
sequence prescribed, in order to finish the program and be ready for teaching in fall 2010. If this model will not meet their needs, there may be a better way for them to go.

vi. We need to stress that we have designed this program as a curriculum, not a series of required courses that individuals can take whenever they want or in whatever order they want.

b. Dr. Gingerich's report on Legal Opinion on Criminal Background checks
   a. Dr. Gingerich reported that unfortunately, Jim Shekleton, BOR Legal Counsel, has not been able to prepare a written report due to the other pressures including the Legislative Session. However, we should be able to have a written report by our March 26th meeting. Initially, this legislation addressed Student Teaching. However, the issue now is that students are complaining that they have multiple field experiences in PK-12 schools, some were required to have a separate background check for each school in which they were to have these experiences.

**Item #4: Discussion on bringing the Milken teachers together to discuss Teacher Education Recruitment and Retention**

After discussion it was decided that we could invite the Teacher of the Year as opposed to the Milken teachers. Dr. Reetz stated that she would strongly recommend contacting the present Teacher of the Year, Mr. Paul Kuhlman on Yankton School District as he does an excellent job of exciting students about the profession. We could ask the DOE to make some media spots that could be used as part of a recruiting effort. We would want to get these into prime time viewing and may be able to get a price break from channels. Another idea is to ask TV and Radio stations to conduct interviews of Teacher(s) of the Year.

**Item #5: Setting Goals for numbers of candidates especially in high needs disciplines methods of accomplishing these goals**

Following discussion regarding whether we should establish institutional goals or system-wide goals it was decided that we should probably do both. Dr. Hall reminded the group that we had established system-wide targets for critical areas at our January 2008 meeting (see Minutes of January 8, 2008 EDC meeting at SDSU). The goals set for the identified disciplines for FY 09* are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: Numbers include both fall 08 and spring 09 graduates.

We will assess our success at meeting these goals at our March 26th meeting and set goals for FY2010. There was some discussion about which areas had been identified as "high need" disciplines by the SD DOE. Shortages listed by the US DOE for 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career &amp; technical Education</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a new Language</td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item #6: Developing ways to Identify Students at Critical Check Points once they are admitted to our Teacher Education programs

Discussion on this topic included the need to begin tracking students as early as possible. It was noted that this is causing education candidates to miss opportunities for scholarships in some cases and that this information is critical for accuracy in determining retention numbers. Some of us have been identifying interested students when we admitted them into the Teacher Education program which is typically near the end of their sophomore year. We need to identify them earlier in their matriculation.

We discussed ways in which our respective campuses were identifying students as early as possible (e.g. USD uses a "Pre-Ed" designation for the appropriate content areas, etc.). The accreditation bodies, specifically NCATE, require a tracking process and the Higher Education Reauthorization Act also dictates this early designation process. It was agreed that we must collect the information on the prospective student's first application form.

It was moved by Hawley, seconded by Hall, "At point of first admission every student should be asked if they are interested in teacher preparation and coded in a way that will easily identify him or her. The Higher Education Opportunity Act dictates this as part of our reporting requirements." The motion passed unanimously.

Item #7: Reauthorization of the Higher Education Opportunity Act Required Reporting

Dr. Gingerich distributed copies of a summary of the Higher Education Opportunity Act which was enacted by Congress in August of 2008. In his summary, he noted that, "the act requires that each institution of higher education set annual quantifiable goals for increasing the number of prospective teachers in teacher shortage areas designated by the Secretary or by the State educational agency." He went on to say that "These numbers must be accompanied by assurances that we are being responsive to the needs of school districts in which the institution's graduates will likely be placed as well as that special education candidates were adequately trained in core subjects and that all are trained to teach diverse populations.

Dr. Gingerich also distributed copies of a summary of the Teacher Quality Partnership Grants noting that the Higher Education Opportunity Act makes reference to these grants but with the financial crisis, that program is not yet funded and will not be funded unless Congress decides to provide the money.

It was suggested that we ask Dr. Paul Turman to help us write a grant in the event that the stimulus package funds this component. Drs. Hall and Reetz agreed to work together on this as we move forward. There was some discussion about inviting TIE to work with us as a cooperating partner. In the end, it was decided that we would go alone first and watch the US Senate's action and be ready to move quickly if needed.
Item #8: Discussion on Critical Data Elements needed on Candidates from which we can compile a Common List which can Interface with DOE data

Dr. Gingerich informed the group that there is talk of collecting longitudinal data for a nationwide tracking system on high school students who might go into Teacher Education Students that could be funded in the stimulus packages being discussed currently by Congress. However, this will take time. The objective of this is to prepare quality teachers. Since Dr. Turman has been working with the SD DOE on this it was decided to postpone discussion on the topic until the March 26th meeting so he can be involved and inform the EDC as to the current status of the project. The group generated several thought provoking questions on the definition of Critical Data Elements. As we think about teachers and the teaching/learning environment what do we need to know about the truly outstanding teachers and when can we know it? The current focus is in assessing their effectiveness in the classroom once they have graduated from Teacher Education programs. We need to back that down to finding what personal characteristics are good predictors of successful teaching.

Item #9: Discussion of ways to develop partnerships with Deans of Content Areas on Campus, K-12 School districts, SD DOE, Area Co-ops, and Educational Leadership Organizations in South Dakota

Discussion included statements that most dialogue and thus partnering between Deans of Teacher Education and Deans of Content areas takes place with the respective content area Department Heads and Program Coordinators rather than the Deans of the other content areas. DSU has paid for a Dean of the content area to attend NCATE Training. Another institution has paid Content area faculty to write Program Reports. Others reported having noon meetings and feeding pizza to content area faculty as helping build partnerships as well.

BHSU uses a Professional Development School (PDS) model which builds very strong relationships with local districts. They currently have 5 school districts with which they have this type of relationship. Their goal is to place 80-85% of their student teachers in these 5 districts. The districts were chosen based in part on the diversity of their students. They have identified roles of faculty members in these schools as PDS Coordinators, Field Experience Coordinators, etc. One criterion is that the faculty members must have a minimum of 5 years of successful student teacher supervision.

It was suggested that it may be possible to create different levels of partnerships with perhaps the PDS being a "Class A" partnership, a "Class B" partnership might be somewhat less precise and demanding in definition and a "Class C" partnership might be more suitable with smaller school districts that are of a geographic distance that would necessitate use of DDN contact. It was noted that we need to have a variety of types of partnerships/relationships to attract all school districts.

It was noted that we have a very positive relationship with the SD DOE and this has helped by making sure we work closely together. Further, it was suggested that we add an item to each EDC Agenda of providing SD DOE an opportunity to give us an update on what they have been doing and to discuss what they would like to bring to the table.

The Area COOPs may be dropped from funding due to the financial concerns facing State Government this year. It was decided to wait and see if they survive before discussing strengthening the Partnerships with them. Since our March 26th meeting is in Pierre, it was suggested that we might invite John Peterson, Executive Director of the State Administrators Association to lunch. Howard will extend an invitation to Mr. Peterson.
Item #10: Discussion of where BOR Colleges of Education go from here relative to the BOR deferring their Mobile Computer Initiative

Dr. Smith stated that he understood that when the BOR announced that they were deferring further action on the Mobile Computer Initiative, they still wanted to move forward with the idea and passed the task to the institutions telling them to do the best they could. Going back to the 2006 System-wide Review of Teacher Education and remembering that one of the findings was that Colleges of Education need to improve the integration of technology into the teaching and learning process so we could meet the demands created by the Governor's Mobile Computing program in the K - 12 schools. While all programs have made significant gains in that area all of us still have areas in which we can improve.

Discussion included that we are all very committed to bringing the BOR Teacher Education programs to a point where we can provide leadership to the pK - 12 schools and working within our own institutions to see how we can best make progress in this regard. Any request for funding will need to come through the respective President's office to the BOR and should focus on purchase of needed technology, faculty training, etc.

Item #11: DSU Showcase

Ms. Dawn Dittman gave us a demonstration on use of the Smart Board in the classroom at both the elementary and secondary level. While several institutions have Smart Boards, Ms. Dittman demonstrated some uses that would increase individual student participation and enhance the learning of K-12 students. All of us found this to be very innovative and helpful in terms of the software that comes with the device and some shareware. If anyone is interested in following up with her or perhaps inviting her to their campus to consult with their faculty, her email address is Dawn.Dittman@dsu.edu.

Item #12: Other

Dr. Moeller asked the group would consider changing the title of the course SEED 450: Reading in the Content Area. The suggested change would be "SEED 450: 7-12 Reading and Content Literacy" and the description could stay the same.

There were no other issues brought before the group at this time.

Dr. Smith expressed appreciation to Dr. Dittman for hosting our meeting and providing the refreshments in the morning and an excellent lunch. He also thanked her for the Showcase presentation. The next meeting will be held in Pierre on March 26th at the BOR Offices. Starting time will be announced as the date gets closer and will depend somewhat on how the agenda develops between now and then.

SDACTE will hold its spring meeting on March 27th.

The meeting was adjourned at 1: 10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:
Dr. Howard B. Smith, Chair
BOR Education Discipline Council FY 2009
South Dakota Board of Regents  
Education Discipline Council Meeting  
March 26, 2009, Pierre, SD  
Minutes

The meeting was called to Order at 1:05 p.m. in the Conference Room, BOR Office Building with the following members and affiliates present: Drs. Nancy Hall, and David Calhoun (BHSU), Drs. Sam Gingerich and Paul Turman (BOR), Dr. Crystal Pauli, DSU, Dr. Melody Schopp (SD DOE), Dr. Tam Hawley, (NSU), Drs. Lon Moeller and Howard Smith (SDSU) and Drs. Rick Melmer and Linda Reetz (USD).

**Item #1: Approval of the Minutes of the January 30, 2009 Meeting**

Moved by Reetz, &seconded by Moeller: "That the Minutes of the January 30 EDC Meeting be approved as distributed." Motion passed.

**Item #2: Unfinished Business**

a. Publicity - (See Item 2.d below.)

b. Online Certification - Some things have been done already to make the public aware of the online Alternate Certification. All agreed that there has been interest but not much commitment from potential enrollees. Several possible reasons for this were raised. The big one appears to be the lack of understanding some of the procedures and regulations that apply, such as needing a GPA of 2.5 overall and 2.6 in the content area. Others asked if they could teach in areas other than what their major had been for their degree. Some expressed a hesitancy to take the PPST or CAAP tests after being out of school for a relatively long period of time, and other admission requirements. Several EDC members expressed concern over the amount of time spent in counseling those individuals who expressed interest and helping them to understand the procedure and requirements.

Following this part of the discussion, we looked for ways we could modify or streamline admission. One suggestion was to let enrollees take the Praxis PPST or CAAP after the first summer term to allow these non-traditional students to get oriented to taking University courses. It was the consensus of the group that we take no action at this time but rather wait and see what actually happens. We still have a couple weeks before registration and we can accommodate those few applicants we have by allowing other students to enroll in the sections we set aside for the Alt. Cert. group. Once we get through this first rough period we can ask the students that do enroll and perhaps with their input and with our own investigating of any procedural changes we can make without altering the quality, we will be in a better place to make informed decisions.

It was agreed that this item will be put back on the agenda at our fall 09 meeting and in the meantime we can have a conference call to discuss ways in which we can improve our current process discussing ways to meet University, Teacher Education Program, and Department of Education requirements and present them in a less daunting manner. We will also need to discuss how these individuals can meet NCATE Standards 3 and 4 (Field Experience and Diversity).
c. Recruitment efforts - The discussion centered on our needing more connection with high school students collectively. It was suggested that EDC might be able to collectively develop a "Why Teach?" theme for a brochure that we could give to current teachers and/or the school counselors to encourage Jrs. and Srs. to consider teaching as a career. Also we may be able to secure funding from CTE or Dept. of Labor funds. The idea of one-day camps such as the "Scrub Camps" that the health care professions have done or perhaps design a camp focusing on Native American for High Achievers was discussed without drawing a conclusion.

d. Progress on requesting DOE to make some media spots (see 2.e below)

e. Use of Teacher of the Year - There was more discussion about asking the SD-DOE to make some media spots as suggested at the January 30 meeting and using the Teacher of the Year as the focus. To date we have not gotten far with that other than to agree that it is a good idea if the SD-DOE has the resources to produce these Public Service Announcements. It might also be possible to use some of the stipend that BOR sets aside for the Teacher of the Year to tape some of the sessions and use them on the Higher Education campuses to try to draw students in the content areas to considering teaching as a career path in their chosen discipline. The National Guard is also looking for programs that could prepare teachers for the military and may be a funding source.

f. Follow up on motion passed at 01.30.09 meeting - Paul Turman reported that he had written into the admissions sheet an item requesting students who were being admitted whether they would be interested in pursuing a career in teaching in their chosen field. This was done for fall of 2009 so the Admissions office on each campus should be able to share that information. The EDC was encouraged to check with our respective Admissions Offices for results.

Item #3: Update from South Dakota Department of Education

Dr. Smith reminded the group that we had decided to add a standing item to our agenda that would allow the SD-DOE to bring us up to date with their activities at each meeting to increase our awareness and to improve communication between the two entities. Dr. Schopp stated that since she had been asked to do this at tomorrow's SDACTE meeting as well, that it might be a better use of our time to skip this item if all EDC members were going to attend the SDACTE meeting tomorrow. All EDC members indicated they would be present at SDACTE.

Item #4: Discussion/Assessment Efforts at meeting system-wide recruitment goals in high need disciplines

The disciplines that had been named were Math, Science, SPED and Spanish. It was agreed that each institution will send their numbers to Dr. Smith early next week so we can discuss the results on our conference call.

Item #5: Discussion of "High Need' disciplines by SD-DOE and US-DOE

As noted in the Minutes of the January 30 Meeting, critical shortages of teachers in all areas and in order to generate interest and assistance in the TEACH Grants to address that shortage, the list has grown to include virtually all disciplines. This would make the TEACH Grants available to students in all areas.
Item #6: Progress on Campus action that will ask all incoming students if they are interested in teacher education

See Item 2.f above.

Item #7: Update on securing funding from Stimulus Package for longitudinal study on a nation-wide tracking system of high school students who are interested in teaching as a career

Dr. Turman told us that the goal of this effort is to merge the teacher database with the teacher education BOR database. There have been efforts to push along the school districts to develop a common course numbering system so high school students could be tracked and then to bring the BOR on board with that data for transferability. BIT says that a data warehouse is the only way to go but the Stimulus rules say "no warehouses" as there are too many risks relative to FERPA.

There is another meeting scheduled to address the different options and the problem is continuing to be worked on.

Dr. Gingerich suggested that we can continue to work on the DOE teacher tracking data and the BOR can check the list to see where our graduates are employed after graduation.

Item #8: Legal opinion on background checks for Student Teachers and other Field-based experiences in K-12 Schools

BOR General Counsel, Jim Shekleton reported that there have been no changes in legislation recently. He also pointed out that there are different rules for student teachers and school employees. It is the school district that is responsible for enforcing the rules. Employees who change districts must have a current background check (within 5 years) which can be transferred to the new district. Otherwise they must get a new one. Student teachers may have the results transferred if they are current.

Atty. Shekleton suggested that we ask the School Districts in which we place student teachers if they require background checks for the students we place with them and if they do, could it be transferred from another school for which the student had to have it earlier in their program. He added that it is up to the School District whether they choose to respond to the request. If they do require one it could perhaps be transferred if it is not older than 5 years just like the employees.

Further, Teacher Education Programs could have the practice of discussing with students the variation in policy likely to be found across districts.

Item #9: Election of the FY 2010 EDC Chair

Following an emotion-filled debate (it was a real dust-up) Dr. Tom Hawley, Dean of Education at NSU, won the election by the thinnest of margins over Dr. Judy Dittman, Dean of Education at DSU who unfortunately was not there to defend herself from the smear campaign launched against her by the Hawley machine. Congratulations Dr. Hawley.

Item #10: Discussion of ESL led by Dr. Jon Green (USD Med School)

Dr. Green presented a draft of a project he has been working on in which he encouraged us to see individuals who have partial or complete hearing losses as Second Language Learners. He noted that
without words used to construct thoughts and knowledge, we are at a distinct disadvantage as we must create our own meaning. For a person who is born deaf this is a real challenge as their language for thought is highly individualized. He asked the group to read the draft and offer any feedback to him we might have and then to consider developing a program of Deaf Education either as a system-wide program or on our respective campuses. It was agreed that we would read the document and put it on the next EDC agenda.

*Item #11: Other*

Dr. Smith shared with the group that SDSU is working on NASULGC’s Science and Mathematics Teacher Imperative (SMTI) and was selected to serve on the Leadership Collaborative in that project. The purpose is to construct a nation-wide system of collecting best practices in recruiting, retaining, and mentoring teachers in math and the sciences. For more information please contact Dr. Smith.

The Meeting was adjourned at 4:15, p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:
Howard B. Smith, Chair of Education Discipline Council FY09
Appendix C
2009 Education Discipline Council
Secondary Teacher Certification
Intake Interview

TEACHER EDUCATION, SECONDARY CERTIFICATION*
(K-12, 7-12 CONTENT AREAS)
COLLABORATIVE ONLINE PROGRAM
Board of Regents Institutions

Is this program right for you?

1. Did you complete a baccalaureate degree in a middle/high school teaching area? ________
   What was your major? ________________________

2. What was your overall GPA for your degree? ________ (Was it 2.5 or higher?)

3. What was your GPA for your major? ___________ (Was it 2.6 or higher?)

4. Do you like working with young people and adolescents? ______________________

5. Do you have access to a computer and the internet to allow you to complete your coursework online? __________

6. Are you willing and available to complete the early field experiences in a school near you in South Dakota where you will have a practicing teacher supervise you? ____________ (45 hours in the Fall of 2009 and 45 hours in January of 2010)

7. Do you work well independently in fulfilling responsibilities? ______________ In online learning, you need to have good self-management skills.

8. This is a one year cohort program. This means you must begin and end with the group in this program.

If so, this may be the program for you. Here is what you need to do...

1. Speak with or email Dr. Bosse to review your undergraduate degree to see if you would qualify for the program. (email and phone number)

2. Enroll as an undergraduate student through admissions at USD. You can do this by accessing the USD admissions website at (campus admissions email and completing the online application).

3. Complete and pass the ETS Praxis I: PPST reading, writing, and math exam and your Praxis Content Exam (This is a test of your teaching content area such as biology, art, music, math, etc.). To learn more about these exams you can go online to http://www.ets.org. If you would like to speak with someone at USD about the Praxis exams, where you can take the exams, fees, and which specific tests to take, you can email (Name of campus contact person). Since it takes 4-5 weeks to get these test results returned, it is important that you take the tests early. You
should register for these by the beginning of February for the March test. The cut-off scores required for the Praxis I: PPST test are 172 in each of the areas of reading, writing, and math. Each Praxis Content exam has a unique state cut-off score.

4. You can enroll in the online classes in April of 2009 and will begin the coursework in June of 2009.

5. Begin class in the summer of 2009 as a start to your new career as a school teacher.

6. *NOTE: This form was created and shared by Dr. Linda Reetz, USD School of Education
PIERRE, S.D.- Some South Dakota teachers who are paying off student loans may get a break from the federal government.

Loan relief available for teachers

The U.S. Department of Education recently identified 13 "teacher shortage areas" for the 2008-09 and 2009-10 school years. (See list below.) This federal designation may enable teachers within specific content areas to qualify for deferment or cancellation of some federally funded student loans.

"South Dakota, like the rest of the nation, struggles with teacher recruitment and retention," South Dakota Secretary of Education Tom Oster said. "This program recognizes the valuable role teachers play in our society and offers a reward for their service. The program has been around for a while, but it's especially helpful in tough economic times."

The federal designation of teacher shortage areas enables borrowers who had no outstanding Federal Family Education Loan on July 1, 1987, but who had an outstanding FFEL on July 1, 1993, to qualify for deferment of loan repayment under the Federal Stafford Program anytime within the life of the borrower's loans. Federal Perkins Loan borrowers who are full-time teachers in the designated shortage areas may qualify for cancellation of up to 100 percent of their Perkins loan.

U.S. Department of Education Teacher Shortage Areas
2008-09 and 2009-10

Art (K-12)
Career & Technical Education (7-12)
English as a New Language (K-12)
Health (K-12)
Language Arts (7-12)
Mathematics (7-12)
Music (K-12)
Physical Education (K-12)
Science (7-12)
Social Science (7-12)
Special Education (K-12)
Speech Pathologists
World Languages (K-12)

For further information, contact the South Dakota Department of Education at (605) 773-4669.
Appendix E
2009 Education Discipline Council
Reauthorization of the Higher Education Opportunities Act Required Reporting

Education Discipline Council
January, 2009

Reauthorization of the Higher Education Opportunity Act - Required Reporting

The Higher Education Opportunity Act was passed in August of 2008. In mid-December, the US Department of Education posted a 219 page "Dear Colleague" letter regarding this act on its website. (http://ifap.ed.gov/dpcletters/attachments/GEN0812FP0810AttachHEOADCL.pdf)

This document provides a summary of most of the provisions in the legislation. The body of the cover letter, which sets this in perspective, is attached. I have also copied in parts of the document which speaks specifically to TE programs.

We will talk through each of the primary changes. While actions taken by the System and this Council position the TE programs fairly well to respond, the USDOE will weigh in with some definitions that could require some revisions in current reporting.

ACCOUNTABILITY/REPORTING

The accountability section establishes that each program report a series of data elements many of which are included in the Accountability Report or other documents that are routinely provided to the Board and our many publics. This includes the requirement that institutions of higher education and States to report in a uniform and comprehensive manner conforming to definitions and methods that the Department establishes.

The required elements include:

- goals and assurances;
- pass rates and scaled scores on assessments used for teacher certification or licensure;
- program information, including criteria for admissions, the number of students in the program, the average number of hours of supervised clinical experience, the number of full-time equivalent faculty and students in the supervised clinical experience, and the total number of students who have been certified or licensed as teachers;
- in States that require approval or accreditation of teacher preparation programs, a statement of whether the institution's program is approved or accredited and by whom;
- whether the program has been designated as low-performing by the State;
- a description of the activities that prepare teachers to integrate technology effectively; and
- a description of the activities that prepare general education and special education teachers to teach students with disabilities effectively.

Each State that receives funds under the HEA will be required to prepare an annual State report card on the quality of teacher preparation programs and alternative routes to State certification or licensure programs.
TEACHER DEVELOPMENT
The act requires that each institution of higher education set annual quantifiable goals for increasing the number of prospective teachers trained in teacher shortage areas designated by the Secretary or by the State educational agency. This needs to be accompanied by assurances that they are being responsive to the needs of school districts in which the institution's graduates are likely to teach, that those training in special education receive adequate instruction in teaching core academic subjects, and that those training to be general education teachers receive training to teach to the needs of diverse populations.

Dear Colleague Letter
December 2008

Subject: The Higher Education Opportunity Act

Summary: This letter provides a summary of the Higher Education Opportunity Act.

Dear Colleague:

The Higher Education Opportunity Act (Public Law 110-315) (HEOA) was enacted on August 14, 2008, and reauthorizes the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (the HEA). The HEOA makes a number of changes to programs authorized under the HEA, authorizes new programs, and makes changes to other laws. The attachment to this letter provides a summary of most of the provisions of the HEOA, organized by subject area.

The provisions of the HEOA were effective upon enactment, August 14, 2008, unless otherwise noted in the law. Institutions should use these summaries in conjunction with reviewing the text of the HEOA itself. The summaries are provided to assist institutions to understand the changes to the HEA, and do not change any requirements in the law. Affected parties are responsible for taking the steps necessary to comply by the effective dates established by the HEOA, unless the HEOA specifies that regulations are necessary to implement certain provisions or, if so indicated by the Department, operational steps must be taken by the Department before parties may comply. Because this will require program participants to implement a large number of new provisions before receiving guidance from the Department, during subsequent reviews of compliance with the HEOA, we will take into account any written guidance that had been provided by the Department during the period under review or, as applicable, the absence of such guidance. For your convenience, we have included at the end of this letter a chart that groups the provisions by effective date.

As required by the HEA, the Department will issue regulations for some of the programs affected by the HEOA through the negotiated rulemaking process. For other programs, the necessary regulatory changes will be made either through notice and comment rulemaking or, where the new regulations will merely reflect the changes to the HEA and not expand upon those changes, without notice and comment. The Department may also offer further guidance through additional Dear Colleague Letters. For more information on the negotiated rulemaking process now under way, and to follow the Department's implementation of the HEOA, please refer to the Department's HEOA website at www.ed.gov/HEOA.

While the HEOA authorizes numerous new programs, only the following three are funded at this time: (1) Promoting Postbaccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans; (2) Master's Degree Programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities; and (3) Master's Degree Programs at Predominantly Black Institutions. The other new programs cannot be implemented until funding is provided.
We thank you for your continued cooperation as we work to implement these changes. If you have any questions on the issues discussed in this letter, please contact the appropriate office listed on the following pages.

Summary of Section Addressing TE Programs

TITLE II--TEACHER QUALITY ENHANCEMENT --- 44
Definitions ---------------------------------------------- 45
Teacher Quality Partnership Grants (Part A) ----------- 45
New Partnership Grants --------------------------------- 45
Administrative Provisions ----------------------------- 47
Accountability and Evaluation ------------------------- 47
Accountability for Programs That Prepare Teachers ---- 48

Section 205(a) of the HEA requires each institution of higher education that conducts a traditional teacher preparation program or alternative route to State certification and that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under the HEA to report annually to the State and the general public, the following: goals and assurances; pass rates and scaled scores on assessments used for teacher certification or licensure; program information, including criteria for admissions, the number of students in the program, the average number of hours of supervised clinical experience, the number of full-time equivalent faculty and students in the supervised clinical experience, and the total number of students who have been certified or licensed as teachers; in States that require approval or accreditation of teacher preparation programs, a statement of whether the institution's program is approved or accredited and by whom; whether the program has been designated as low-performing by the State; a description of the activities that prepare teachers to integrate technology effectively; and a description of the activities that prepare general education and special education teachers to teach students with disabilities effectively. Section 205(b) of the HEA requires each State that receives funds under the HEA to provide the Secretary and the general public an annual State report card on the quality of teacher preparation programs and alternative routes to State certification or licensure programs. Both sections 205(a) and (b) requires institutions of higher education and States to report in a uniform and comprehensive manner conforming to definitions and methods that the Department establishes. In addition, section 205(c) of the HEA requires the Secretary to develop regulations to ensure the reliability, validity, integrity, and accuracy of the data submitted under this section.

Section 205(d) of the HEA requires the Secretary to annually provide to Congress a report card on teacher qualifications and preparations in the United States, including all the information reported by institutions and States under this part.

Teacher Development ------------------------------- 48

The HEOA requires each institution of higher education that conducts a traditional teacher preparation program or alternative route to State certification or licensure, and that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under the HEA, to set annual quantifiable goals for increasing the number of prospective teachers trained in teacher shortage areas designated by the Secretary or by the State educational agency. Each institution that is required to set these annual goals also must provide specific assurances to the Secretary regarding the preparation including that they are being responsive to the needs of school districts in which the institution's graduates are likely to teach, that those training in
special education receive adequate instruction in teaching core academic subjects, and that those training
to be general education teachers receive training to teach to the needs of diverse populations.

State Functions ------------------------------------------------------ 49

The HEOA requires that, in order to receive funds under the HEA, a State must conduct an assessment
to identify low-performing traditional teacher preparation programs alternative routes to certification in
the State, provide technical assistance to such programs, and provide the Secretary with an annual list of
such programs. The HEOA, in section 207(b) of the HEA, provides that any teacher preparation
program from which the State has withdrawn the State's approval, or terminated the State's financial
support due to the low performance is ineligible for any funding for professional development activities
awarded by the Department; is not permitted to accept or enroll any student who receives aid under Title
IV of the HEA in the institution's teacher preparation program; must provide transitional support for
students enrolled at the time of termination of financial support or withdrawal of approval; and must be
reinstated upon demonstration of improved performance, as determined by the State.

General Provisions and Authorization for Appropriations --------- 49

The HEOA, in sections 208 and 209 of the HEA, sets forth the General Provisions and Authorization of
Appropriations, respectively. Among the general provisions is a requirement in section 208(c) that a
State receiving HEA funds or that participates in a partnership or consortium that does so must provide
to a teacher preparation program, upon request, any information (described in section 208(c) (2)) that (1)
will enable the program to evaluate the effectiveness of its graduates and the program itself, and (2) is
possessed, controlled, or accessible by the State.

Enhancing Teacher Education (Part B) -------------- 49

Preparing Teachers for Digital Age Learners ------ 49
Honorable Augustus F. Hawkins Centers of Excellence ----------------------------------------------- 50
Preparing General Education Teachers to More Effectively Educate Students with Disabilities ---- 50
Adjunct Teacher Corps --------------------------------- 51
Graduate Fellowships to Prepare Faculty in High-Need Areas at Colleges of Education -------------- 52
General Provisions (Part C) --------------------------- 53
Leadership: Chair: Patrick J. Whiteley (NSU)
Vice Chair: Lysbeth Benkert-Rasmussen (NSU)

If you have recommendations to make for Council leadership next year, please list the names below.

Chair: Emily Haddad (USD)
Vice Chair: Kathy Antonen and Sally Palmer (SDM&T)

Meeting Dates and Type

21 November 2008, face-to-face at NSU, Aberdeen.

Overview of Council Activities this year (e.g. meeting agendas and minutes/summaries):

- The English Council met once, with the following agenda:
  - Mobile computing
  - Appropriate uses of technology in the English classroom
  - Student learning outcomes for first-year composition (placement procedures)
  - NCTE standards
  - ENGL 101 as a prerequisite for other courses
  - Transfer credits for Dakota Wesleyan ENGL 170 (dual-credit course with area high schools)
- The English Council plans its next meeting for fall 2009 at SDM&T on 25 September, with Emily Haddad (USD) as chair.

Response to Initiatives for Council Consideration Suggested by the Executive Director:

1. Mobile computing
   EDC members offered several suggestions to help ensure faculty and administrators integrate new technologies successfully into their classrooms:
   - Remember that laptops should not replace other/earlier technologies that still work well
   - Training must be discipline specific and not just technological – the pedagogy must be supported by the technology, rather than the pedagogy forced into to the technology
   - Classrooms themselves must be wireless
   - Any plan must consider how TA’s and adjunct instructors will be trained and given access to the technology
   - It should be made clear what rights the faculty have in terms of controlling the technology in their classrooms (for instance, can faculty demand that students turn their computers off?)
**Action Item:** Drs. Haddad (USD) and Traywick (BHSU) will draft a “Bill of Student and Instructor Rights and Responsibilities”
- There must be enough bandwidth so that all of the students can log in to D2L and use Respondus Lockdown at the same time.

Several EDC members voiced concerns about the implementation of the initiative:
- Laptops are often a distraction in the classroom
- It is unclear how the initiative will affect faculty evaluations
- It is unclear why this initiative is being prioritized over many other pressing needs at the universities.

2. **Appropriate Uses of Technology in the English Classroom:**

   This discussion overlapped the discussion points listed in item 1, above.

   **Action Item:** EDC members will generate a list of ways technology can be used effectively in the English/Composition classroom.

3. **Student Learning Outcomes for First Year Composition/Placement Procedures:**

   Last year’s report addressed expectations for entering freshmen.

   Dr. Gingerich asked whether current placement procedures were appropriate. Members responded by pointing out that studies indicate ACT scores are not good predictors of student success in writing classes.

   Several EDC members noted that many students seem to need remediation in reading when they arrive at the university, and agreed that it should be given a higher priority. SDSU, NSU and DSU all have remedial reading courses. USD expressed a need for such a program.

   ESL students represent a separate problem since many remedial courses are not designed to address their specific needs.

4. **NCTE Standards:**

   Some frustration was expressed that all of the institutions seem to be graduating fewer education majors, while more time than ever is involved in ensuring NCATE standards are met.

   **Action Item:** Dr. Moose will send out copies of their NCATE report and their student evaluation sheets.
Other Council Activities 2008-2009:

1. **English 101 as a pre-requisite for other classes:**

   Dr. Cremean asked if her (BHSU's) department could list ENGL 101 or 201 as pre-requisites for classes in their department. There was no objection.

2. **Transfer credits for Dakota Wesleyan ENGL 170 (A dual-credit course with area high schools):**

   USD expressed concern that they could not verify whether DW’s course meets the criteria set out in the BOR agreement for dual-credit English courses. They would like to refuse to offer credit for DW’s courses. The EDC, agreeing that the course does *not* meet minimum BOR stipulations, gave its unanimous support for this refusal. See recommendation for AAC consideration below.

**Recommendations for AAC Consideration:**

- The EDC would like the system AAC to inform university provosts, admissions departments, and registrars that credits for Dakota Wesleyan's ENGL 170 will not transfer. *See item 2, immediately above, under Other Council Activities.*
- Members of the EDC have requested that the BOR offer a response to our annual report that acknowledges its receipt and explains any items with which the Board disagrees.

**Suggestions for Council Work Plan for 2009-2010:**

None.
Humanities Discipline Council Meeting
Minutes
Elluminate/Conference Call 4:00-6:00 p.m. CDT April 20, 2009

Attendance

Present: Virginia (Ginny) Lewis (NSU), chair; Kathleen Parrow (BHSU), secretary; Art Marmorstein (NSU); Maria Ramos (SDSU); Rod Rice (SDSMT); Susan Wolfe (USD)

Absent (schedule conflicts):
Sue Conover (DSU); Laurie Haleta (SDSU); Mary (Margee) Husemann (BHSU); Carolyn (Carrie) Prentice (USD); Mary Lynn Ryan (DSU); Jim Shekleton (BOR)

Meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. CDT

1) Greetings were made and roll was taken

2) Approval of Minutes
It was moved and seconded to approve the Minutes from the October 10, 2008 meeting. Motion carried.

3) Determination of officers for 2009-2010
Ginny as President; Kathleen as Vice President; Secretary open

4) Annual Report:
Material from fall meeting—including in process—language proposals
Ad hoc language committee—Spanish only is being addressed at this point. Adjustments in German and French may be addressed next year.

a. Recommendations for AAC Consideration
   a. Explore feasibility of Separate Foreign Language discipline council?

b. Suggestions for Council Work Plan for 2009-2010

Foreign Languages: Discussion was wide-ranging and included the following points:
- We need to strengthen the place of the humanities in the curriculum and offer more language study.
- Problems include getting enough students in language courses at the college level. High schools in Sioux Falls offer greater variety than any of the colleges can. Making foreign language a requirement in any field is a problem because the influx of students requires more faculty, and administrations do not want to hire new faculty for this. NSU is interested in starting a Critical Languages program, but as most students do better in a traditional classroom for language learning than they do via self-instructional language study, such a Critical Languages program will only supplement the offerings currently available.
- There is an even greater need for languages in today’s world; there is some evidence that Internet communication may erode the use of English.
- Question of whether someone could offer a language institute over the summer.
- Critical language programs—self instructional programs are available at some out-of-state universities (U of Arizona, especially)—it is possible to use their programs and make courses
• Discussion of revival of separate Foreign Language discipline council. Languages feel some
preference for this.
• Need to inform students early that languages are necessary for graduate school.

**Ethics:** Are the students getting enough in the way of course offerings in ethics? USD has been
working on ethics in other areas. There was further discussion but no particular resolution.

**Summary:**

**Goals:**
• Strengthen humanities and languages
• Discuss revival of Foreign Language discipline council

5) **The Value of the Humanities/Languages & History: Can we strengthen the voice of the
humanities in the BOR system?**

Discussion: The USD history chair teaches Latin and is an excellent advocate for languages. Sometimes
others are the best advocates for languages. Some administrators are supportive, but others lean more
toward being bean counters and languages do not always do well with these.

Discussion of two articles previously sent to HDC members: “The Humanities’ Value” (Consider This
column by Geoffrey Galt Harpham, in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*’s Chronicle Review section,
vol. 55, Issue 28, page B6), and “Languages and the Study of History: A Report from an Annual
Meeting Session” (Affiliated Societies column by Thomas Adams, in the American Historical
Association’s newsletter *Perspectives*, April 2009).

There are times when just looking at numbers is detrimental and dehumanizing. It is bad for mental
health and human development not to consider the whole human being. What is the purpose of
economic development? Presumably to benefit human beings. The humanities play a central role in
this area, as they ask: What is good for humans? What supports human self-realization and promotes a
good life or flourishing?

6) **Other business?**
Have everyone on the Elluminate mic by fall meeting, to allow for the possibility of recording the
meetings. (Webcams if possible.)

7) **Adjournment**

Submitted by Kathleen A. Parrow, HDC secretary
Minutes-Draft  
Humanities Discipline Council Meeting  
Elluminate/Conference Call 3:45-5:00 p.m. CDT October 8, 2008

Attendance

Present: Virginia (Ginny) Lewis (NSU), chair; Sue Conover (DSU); Mary (Margee) Husemann (BHSU); Art Marmorstein (NSU); Kathleen Parrow (BHSU), secretary; Rod Rice (SDSMT); Jim Shekleton (BOR); Laurie Haleta (SDSU)

Absent: Carolyn (Carrie) Prentice (USD), Maria Ramos (SDSU), Mary Lynn Ryan (DSU), Keith Robinson (USD)

Meeting was called to order at 3:45 p.m. CDT

1) Greetings were made and roll was taken

2) Approval of Minutes
It was moved and seconded to approve the Minutes from the March 11, 2008 meeting. Motion carried.

3) Determination of officers
Ginny Lewis of NSU assumed the presidency. (It was agreed last year that the vice president would succeed to the presidency.) The members agreed to delay the election of a vice president until the status of the HDC is determined. Kathleen Parrow of BHSU agreed to continue as secretary until the status of the HDC is determined.

Moved/seconded and approved

4) Spring meeting date and time
It was suggested that the Spring meeting time be done on Elluminate and that we schedule the day and time later. Moved/seconded and approved

5) Discipline Councils reorganization proposal
The Humanities Discipline Council has been asked by the Regents for our recommendations about whether to disband or reorganize. Members expressed concern about the ambiguity of our charge and the fact that we do not seem to be empowered to do anything. Dr. Shekleton provided some background on the creation and purpose of the discipline councils. Members asked about how the HDC fits in with the campus and other procedures for such HDC charges as curriculum change. Dr. Shekleton explained the Discipline Councils were established to provide a mechanism to respond to complaints about differences among institutions and their affects on students. These are BOR cross-institutional goals and the councils were seen as a method of providing direct state-wide faculty input without filtering through institutional bodies.

One of the problems the members discussed is that the HDC is so broad-based. Sometimes concerns of one group simply are very discipline specific. It was pointed out that we have dealt with that by appointing at least one discipline specific sub-group (foreign languages), which is directed to report back to the HDC.
There was further discussion about the need to be empowered. Members asked what the mechanism for making recommendations and changes. We put recommendations into reports and we never hear anything again.

Members discussed concerns with the way centralized general education changes had a negative effect on the Humanities and how the Humanities have had trouble in the academy articulating our value in today’s world, which is frequently dominated by a business school mentality. For the HDC to make changes, other factors must be considered, including the BOR requirement for accountability and consideration for fiscal issues, as well as the academic concerns which interest us. The question was raised whether our students’ learning how to make money is really enough; self-enrichment through the humanities is also necessary. More familiarity with the humanities could create better awareness of ethics in business, something that seems to have been lacking among those behind the current crisis in the banking and financial world.

6) Teaching and working effectively in a mobile computing environment
Members discussed whether mobile computing is suitable for all courses. SDSMT uses it, but not all faculty use it extensively in every class. It can be useful from time to time in certain situations. DSU uses it extensively. [Note: DSU’s mission is to be technologically “ahead of the curve”.

Members discussed the need for workshops for faculty to find out useful applications and how to mitigate some of the possible problems with using laptops in the classroom. This is especially important since there is a growing cohort of students who are very familiar with this technology and it shapes their expectations in the classroom.

The laptops in the high school project was mentioned and questions were asked about what the data is showing for those students relating to those students’ test scores. Further discussion ensued on the amount of time students spend with technology (computers, cell phones) and that they have fewer and fewer in-person human contacts.

7) University-level support in secondary school administration of graduation standards and assessment for University entrance
The members decided this was a complex issue and determined that our current HDC membership had not had anything to do with this, although members knew faculty who had. Discussion was dropped for lack of information.

8) Establishment of system-wide outcomes for common core courses, assessment of these
The discussion on this involved a number of issues, including why anyone wants it done; why “end-of-course” exams were supposed to be designed as multiple choice when that method does not test the main focus of what we teach in college; why other exams, such as the CAAP and AP aren’t used by the high schools, rather than developing their own “end-of-course-exams”.

A number of points were made addressing these:
One reason for doing this is to identify students who need help in high school to do well in college. High schools apparently want us to explain how what we do is different from what they do in courses with similar names. The fact that we have similarly named courses, but do not have a consensus of topics, it creates a rhetorical disadvantage in these discussions.
Some research shows that students need to be exposed to something about six times before it sticks. When they get to college the process should be more than just factual information. College students go through a process of questioning values and move through to the point where they can accept multiple points of view. Documenting what we do is the real issue. If exams are developed for the college courses, they need to test higher order thought.

Since only one discipline represented on the HDC is affected by these exams (history), discussion ended.

9) **Facilitating the application of professional standards in education programs involving humanities subject areas**
Foreign language representatives indicated that their field has a professional standard. Some others assumed their fields did too. The HDC questioned whether this is a real issue, since the application of these standards in education programs is done through Education colleges and in cooperation on teaching majors.

10) **Promoting research and collaboration across disciplines, campuses, and with K-12 schools**
Certain activities can promote this type of inter-disciplinary collaboration. Chautauqua, for example, works well in the humanities. The South Dakota state speech conference has been having students present research and meet each other.

   Technology may be a way for humanists to access grant money we have not had before.

11) **Final question**
In closing Dr. Shekleton asked if we had come to a resolution about whether we felt the HDC should continue to exist. VPAAs will probably discuss the issue this semester and maybe even this month. We agreed that we should continue, but we needed a greater degree of empowerment.

   Adjourned at 5:05 p.m. CDT/4:00 p.m. MDT

   Submitted by Kathleen Parrow, HDC secretary
REPORT ON THE SPANISH LANGUAGE GROUP

Under the leadership of Sam Gingerich, from the BOR, a group of representatives for the Spanish programs at the different BOR institutions have been meeting via conference call and had additional discussion over e-mail to work on common issues for the Spanish program.

The representatives are: Buckwalter, Peggy (BHSU); Ryan, Lynn (DSU); Mendez, Celestino (NSU); Garst-Santos, Christine (SDSU); Brunette, Danny (USD; Ramos, Maria (SDSU)

The first topic of discussion was the request of SDSU to eliminate SPAN 102 from the requirements for the major (101 was eliminated in 2002). The other universities accepted SDSU’s decision, and some are considering implementing the same change in their own programs.

The group has also discussed the different issues and policies regarding placement of students with previous knowledge, the common course numbering system and study abroad options for students across the system. No decisions in that regard have been made yet, but the group continues its work and it is schedule to have the next conference call in May.

Respectfully submitted,

Maria Ramos (SDSU)
Languages and the Study of History:
A Report from an Annual Meeting Session
By Thomas Adams

TA roundtable session entitled “Languages: Sine Qua Non for Globalizing Historiography,” drew timely inspiration from the 2009 AHA annual meeting theme. The German Historical Institute, the Conference Group on Central European History, and the World History Association co-sponsored the session.

Moderator Thomas M. Adams cited a recommendation from the “White Paper on the Role of the History Major in Liberal Education” (which had just been released by the National History Center with support from the Teagle Foundation): “When possible, foreign language competence and foreign study should be encouraged so that students can engage historical writing, primary sources, and historical subjects beyond the United States.” He noted a converging movement from the Modern Language Association for a “broad, intellectually driven approach to teaching language and culture in higher education.”

Volker Berghahn (Columbia Univ.), an expert on German-American relations, pointed out, with telling anecdotal illustrations, the dangers of conducting research in foreign archives with inadequate knowledge of the relevant languages. On the teaching side, he also testified to insufficient language preparation among many American undergraduates who took seminars taught in German as part of their Junior Year Abroad studies at the Free University in Berlin, where he also offered courses to them last academic year. By dint of great effort, most were able to produce a creditable research paper, but they were off to a slow start initially. He argued for in-country immersion experience as a pre-requisite for doctoral work in history.

Carol Klee (Univ. of Minnesota) brought to the session her experience as an applied linguist in programs that allowed students to use and develop their language skills in a wide range of subjects. Language enhancement sessions at the university have supplemented a variety of courses on German, Spanish, and Latin American history, on Europe in World War II (with French), on women in European history (with Italian) and on modern Scandinavian, Russian, and Chinese history. Klee detailed the pedagogical lessons learned, especially the need to match students’ skill levels with the challenges of the texts to be read, and to frame the reading assignments with background preparation (new technologies can aid here) and questions to be pursued in post-reading sections. Student and faculty responses to the program are by and large positive. Historians say it is essential to work closely with language colleagues, and to recruit a critical mass of willing students before offering a language enhancement section.

A historian of Brazil, Alida Metcalf, and her colleague from French literature, Nanette Le Coat, commented in turn on their experiences at Trinity University in San Antonio in overseeing a thriving Languages Across the Curriculum program.

From the historian’s point of view, Metcalf described the varying emphasis on primary sources and secondary interpretations in courses ranging from a religion course that examined the Spanish text of Las Casas’ La destrucción de las Indias to a course in French that examined the historiography of the French Revolution. A course on the U.S.-Mexican Border used Spanish and English on alternate days in order to compare cultural perspectives on issues of shared or special concern. A collaboration with Saint Mary’s University allows students to study Portuguese there and the history of Brazil at Trinity.
Nanette le Coat described how efforts to break down the “two-tier” hierarchy of language instruction at the lower level and literature at the higher level has led to a broader cultural conception of the teaching of language, including but not privileging literature. Students are increasingly aware of the demands and opportunities presented by globalization, and they see languages as a vital component of international and trans-cultural study. At Trinity, students have been intrigued by courses such as a history course with a language component on the pre-history of the European Union, or a course on Mexican history that uses songs and corridos. The program of languages across the curriculum is by its nature interdisciplinary, opening up a space for collaboration and experimentation.

Chinese language instruction in the United States is growing rapidly with Chinese government sponsorship of Confucius Institutes in 30 to 40 new locations, reported Jonathan Spence, former AHA president and historian of China at Yale. Spence emphasized the vast range of the Chinese historical record, first inscribed in ancient bronzes and in stone, on silk, on paper, and on bamboo strips recently recovered by archeologists, and a complementary richness of interpretive traditions—both Confucius and Mencius commented on earlier texts. Students and professional historians seeking to master Chinese face a problematic definition of literacy in a culture diverse in dialects, where a shopkeeper may know 500 characters for his trade, drawn from some 80,000 available to the literati. Two years of language study barely crosses an initial threshold, and the accomplished Sinologist may find a need to access other languages as well: Manchu, Arabic, Tibetan, and Sanskrit, for example.

High school teacher Ane Lintvedt (McDonogh School, Owings Mill, Maryland), a member of the executive council of the World History Association, asked the panel how a deep knowledge of any given culture or language squares with the broadly comparative—if not “antinational”—approach of teachers of world history. In reply, Jonathan Spence argued for a comprehensive range of language offerings. At Yale, native speakers from the university community are recruited to offer instruction in many less commonly taught languages. In another exchange, Nanette Le Coat suggested that a student applying to college could turn language skill to advantage by citing how it relates to his or her activities and accomplishments. Carol Klee responded to a question about the need for early language learning with reference to flagship programs (www.thelanguageflagship.org) in various languages, and Volker Berghahn called for the maintenance of heritage language proficiencies.

Further discussion at sessions sponsored by the National History Center raised the possibility that programs of professional collaboration between historians and foreign language scholars might build on the center’s project, just completed, to define the role of history in liberal education. Please send further suggestions to tadams@earthlink.net.

—Thomas Adams is an independent scholar who was formerly on the staff of the National Endowment for the Humanities.
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CONSIDER THIS
The Humanities' Value
By GEOFFREY GALT HARP AM

Why should society support the humanities when so many people are suffering from the effects of the economic crisis? What claim do the humanities, or scholarship generally, have on increasingly limited resources? Shouldn't such pursuits be considered luxuries at a time when we should be focusing on essentials?

I hear those questions all the time, in part because I ask them myself. When I bother to answer myself, I say that of course we should focus on the essentials. The alleviation of human suffering, the restoration of opportunity, and the resurrection of confidence must be our top priorities. But the present crisis must not be the horizon of our thinking; our most immediate concerns cannot be our only concerns. While we are struggling through the morass of the present, we must retain both our memory, which sustains us, and our imagination, which must light the way forward.

Memory and imagination place us in the general domain of the humanities. And that leads to my main argument: The humanities are, if not the top priority right now, at least one of the areas that must be recognized as crucial, and supported accordingly. The present crisis does not eclipse the humanities but rather reveals the need for the skills, dispositions, and resources that the humanities, and only the humanities, cultivate.

No need to shout. I can already hear you (indeed, I can hear myself) saying that we are dealing with money, not metaphors, and that we will not get out of this mess by entrusting our fate to English majors. True — but I am struck by the recurrence of two statements in the numerous analyses I've read: "It is all so obvious in retrospect," and "Our models failed to predict this." Put those two together, and it becomes clear that the most sophisticated tools developed to analyze and predict movements in the economy failed spectacularly to grasp some very large, crucial, and — in retrospect — fully visible facts.

How did that happen?

What was missing, some analysts have concluded, was a deeper understanding of the relationship between value and confidence. It was presumed that the value of, say, houses was always going to rise. Beneath that assumption was another, that the value had a certain solidity, like the house itself. However, as Paul S. Willen, a senior economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, recently noted, "The price of an asset, like a house or a stock, reflects not only your beliefs about the future, but you're also betting on other people's beliefs." He went on, "It's these hierarchies of beliefs — these behavioral factors — that are so hard to model."

The key factor, then, escapes abstract models because it is human and social, not mathematical — a vast imaginative construction composed of hopes, fears, illusions, calculations, judgments. Unlike the house, the imaginative construction that determines the house's value can be destroyed by a pinprick — hence the term bubble.

So our models failed not because they were imprecise but because they were too precise, too neat and crisp to take in the imaginative and social nature of value. Nor did they take in the fully human character of the behavior of lenders, borrowers, analysts, shareholders, or traders, all of whom were driven by largely unconscious and partly irrational beliefs, including the simple desire for social approval, even as they were persuaded of their own powers of analysis and of the underlying "rationality" or "efficiency" of the market.
It all seems so obvious in retrospect that retrospection itself can be dismissed as a worthless activity. The real gift is to see in advance the things that will, in retrospect, prove to have been obvious. Where is that apparently rare gift cultivated, developed, rewarded? How does society foster that valuable trait?

Well, consider this: When we read a novel, watch a play or a film, listen to a concerto, or read a historical narrative, we are not just attending to the moment but forming expectations about what will come next. Surprise endings surprise only because they do not conform to our expectations.

Comparing our anticipation with the actual unfurling of the work or the sequence of arguments is part of the distinctive pleasure we take in such activities, and that pleasure keeps us returning for more. Such anticipatory or projective retrospection always involves speculation or guesswork, for every piece is unique. But being able to engage in such anticipation is an essential part of general intelligence, and developing that ability is one of the primary goals of teaching in the humanities.

I would suggest that the reason that our models and modelers failed to predict the current economic crisis was that they did not engage in what I call "projective retrospection," nor did they try to anticipate the diffuse effects of nonquantifiable, shifting collective beliefs. They were, I presume, simply trying to be as rational as possible in plotting their moves. Their imaginations were constrained by their assumption that the economy was a kind of game with arcane rules rather than a human activity embedded in the general human scene.

In truth — as may perhaps by now be obvious — I have no understanding of the "dismal science" of economics. But I feel on firm ground in saying that any discipline that studies human behavior without taking human beings into account must be leaving something out. That something is the imaginative character of human society, which is supported only by collective confidence in its reality. As I write, many analysts are saying that the most urgent task is the restoration of confidence in "the system." If only people were confident that the system was sound, then banks would lend, people would spend, and the crisis would abate. The truth is that while cash infusions might produce local benefits, a general confidence cannot be bought, for it is a basic attitude about one's prospects in the world. Irreducible to formulae or algorithms, such confidence nevertheless stands at the top of that hierarchy of beliefs that determines value.

And here we come to the humanistic heart of the matter. The economy in which people do or do not have confidence can be understood as a persuasive fiction that is, in critical ways, not fully responsive to rational analysis. Indeed, the financial instruments whose implosion we've been watching — the notorious credit-default swaps and derivatives and securitized mortgages — were so complex and opaque that not even those who staked their fortunes on them understood what they were.

At the deepest level, money itself is a fiction. Money signifies value, which is, presumably, located elsewhere — in the basement, say, of Fort Knox. But gold is only valuable because of a collective belief in its value. Now, with the collapse of financial markets worldwide, we see that all value, everywhere, is a function of confidence, or a belief in fictions. The immense cash infusions on which we now pin our hopes are simply fictions that we hope will be more persuasive than others — not because they are real, but simply because a large power insists that they be taken for real: They are, as the phrase has it, "backed by the full faith and confidence of the federal government."

Our material lives are sustained by our belief in such fictions, and when we stop believing — as we now have, temporarily — we see revealed the immaterial foundations of the real world. When, a generation ago, a few "postmodern" theorists began to talk about the fictional character of reality, they were
laughed at by those who considered themselves hardheaded realists; nobody, not even the most doctrinaire postmodernist, is laughing now.

So why support the humanities? The answer is not just that the humanities deserve no less than Citigroup, AIG, or General Motors — in fact, the humanities do not need a huge bailout, only predictable support — but that the humanities elicit and exercise ways of thinking that help us navigate the world we live in. For my money, that's about as essential as it gets.

*Geoffrey Galt Harpham is president and director of the National Humanities Center. His books include Shadows of Ethics: Criticism and the Just Society (Duke University Press, 1999) and The Character of Criticism (Routledge, 2006).*
Leadership for 2008-2009: Chair: Dr. Curtis Card (BHSU)  
Vice Chair: Dr. Kyle Riley (SDSMT)

Leadership for 2009-2010: Chair: Dr. Kyle Riley (SDSMT)  
Vice Chair: Dr. Dan Van Peursem (USD)

Meeting Dates and Type: October 16, 2008 face-to-face in Chamberlain, and E-mail discussions throughout the year.

Work Plan: The following is the agenda of the Chamberlain meeting.
- Introductions
- Continue discussions on mobile computing initiative.
- Continue discussions on collaboration between SD Department of Education, school districts, and math departments.
- Continue discussion on Math placement.
- Continue discussions on common course exams.
- Board of Regents and public university research agenda.
- Collaboration activities with K-12 colleagues.
- Discuss USD’s proposal to include Math 103 Quantitative Literacy as an additional option to fulfill Goal 5 (mathematics) of the System General Education Requirements.
- Other issues

Initiatives for Council Consideration Suggested by the Executive Director: See work plan

Other Council Activities 2008-2009: See attached minutes.

Recommendations for AAC Consideration:
- To facilitate the mobile computing initiative, the MDC recommends that resources be set aside for infrastructure, faculty development, and software (Maple, Matlab, etc.).
- The MDC also recommends that individual campuses be allowed and encouraged to be innovative in their approach to implementation of mobile computing with no required mandatory statewide model.
- MDC members are willing to serve on an advisory committee and are willing to meet with representatives from secondary education to address the problem of students not being prepared for college level courses.
- The MDC recommends that Math 101 be moved to a remedial course and numbered 095.
- The MDC would like to see more flexibility in the placement process due to the different missions and needs of the individual institutions.
- The MDC believes that common course exams would not only be difficult to administer, they aren’t necessary as the CAAP exam is already in place for mathematics.
- The MDC recommends that USD’s Quantitative Literacy proposal be approved with the modification that the Math 103L co-requisite be removed.
Suggestions for Council Work Plan for 2008-2009:

Math Discipline Council Meeting  
October 16, 2008  
Chamberlain - 10 A.M.

Members present: Curtis Card (Chair); Daluss Siewert; Abid Elkhader; Kurt Cogswell, Daniel Kemp; Rich Avery, Jeff Palmer; Kyle Riley, Donald Teets; and Jose Flores, Dan Van Peursem.

Absent: Mike Melko.

1. Introduction of members

2. Elected next year’s chair: Kyle Riley  SDSM&T 2009-10

3. Mobile computing initiative.

DSU currently is using a Citrix sever to deliver software to the students. This allows their students to have access to the software from anywhere on the internet. This works for them, but other members of the MDC expressed concerns about this system working in larger settings. USD indicated that they had had problems when delivering software from their server.

The MDC members are unaware of studies that show that student learning is improved by the use of laptops in the classroom. The MDC is aware of research that shows student learning and student success is improved when online homework, tutorial, and course delivery software are used in remedial level course, but not necessarily for higher level courses. Members are interested in such research results if they do exist.

Recommendation: The MDC is concerned about the implementation of mobile computing without sufficient documentation that this improves student learning. This aside, the MDC recommend that:

- Resources be set aside for infrastructure, faculty development, and software (Maple, Matlab, etc.).
- Individual campus be allowed and encouraged to be innovative in their approach to implementation of mobile computing with no required mandatory statewide model.


Members are aware of difficult challenges secondary mathematics teachers face. Members are willing to serve on an advisory committee and are willing to meet with representatives from secondary education to address the problem of students not being prepared for college level courses. MDC recommends that such a meeting be structured to address the problem by starting from the desired end result and what needs to be accomplished at each level to allow that to happen. MDC members welcome the opportunity to work with staff from the Department of Education to review and approve both questions and locally developed exams.
5. Strategies used to deliver remedial and entry-level course offerings.

It was discussed that research shows that use of MyMathLab and other online course delivery, tutorial, and online homework programs do improve student learning and student success (retention) for remedial level courses. Not all campuses are seeing improved scores, as measured by final exam, when using such software.

Discussed making Math 101 a remedial math course. The MDC recommended that Math 101 be moved to a remedial math course and numbered 095.

6. Discussed Math placements scores.

Council members would like to see more flexibility in the placement process due to the different missions and needs of the individual institutions. Uniform placement scores do not serve each campus. It is unlikely that cut-scores that work well for placing engineering students would work equally well when placing music students. The MDC is aware of the “transferability issue” that may arise if placement scores differ significantly between the institutions.

7. Discussed common course exams.

MDC believe that these exams would not only be difficult to administer, they aren’t necessary as the CAAP exam is already in place for mathematics.

8. USD’s proposal to include Math 103 Quantitative Literacy as an additional option to fulfill Goal 5 (mathematics) of the System General Education Requirements.

The proposal was discussed and it was recommended that the Math 103L co-requisite be removed. Subject to this modification, the members unanimously supported the modified proposal.