

EVALUATION REVIEW COMMITTEE
OF THE TEACHING AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS ADVISORY BOARD
Kansas State Department of Education
KSDE Board Room

Official Minutes for April 24, 2009

Present: Mike Neal, Kathy Dale, Connie Ferree, Linda Alexander, David Hofmeister, Judy Johnson, Sherry Kinderknecht, Shirley Meissner, Greg Rasmussen, Sue Smith, Martin Straub

Absent: Rick Henry, Scott Myers

KSDE Staff: Jeanne Duncan, Jan Williams

Called meeting to order—Chair, Mike Neal

Mike Neal, chair, called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m.

Approval of Agenda for April 24, 2009

Motion: It was M/S (Johnson/Meissner) to approve the agenda.

Motion carried; 10 in favor and 0 opposed

Approval of January 23, 2009 Minutes

Motion: It was M/S (Ferree/Hofmeister) to approve the minutes.

Motion carried; 10 in favor and 0 opposed

Announcements

Teams were directed to their work area.

Meeting of Review Teams

Judy Johnson agreed to chair the team in place of Rick Henry who was absent.

Meeting of Review Teams:

The review teams met at 8:38 a.m.

Assignments:

Friends University Accreditation (rejoinder)
Fort Hays State University Progress Reports

Team:

Mike Neal, Chair
Sherry Kinderknecht
Connie Ferree
Scott Myers-absent
David Hofmeister
Shirley Meissner

Assignments:

Ottawa University Progress Reports
Wichita State University Programs

Team:

Rick Henry, Chair Absent
Judy Johnson, Chair
Kathy Dale
Linda Alexander
Greg Rasmussen
Sue Smith
Martin Straub

Recommendations for Friends University—Continuing Accreditation Visit

Motion: It was M/S (Ferree/Hofmeister) to remove the following areas for improvement:

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1, 5-6

None

Standard 2

2.1 The MAT assessments are not aligned with the 23 proficiencies identified in the program's conceptual framework.

Rationale 2.1 The MAT program utilizes the same conceptual framework as the initial undergraduate program. While the MAT assessments do reflect the four goals of the conceptual framework, the program's assessments have four unique outcomes that are different from the 23 proficiencies listed in the conceptual framework.

Standard 3

3.1 The field experience assessments listed for the MAT programs are not aligned with the conceptual framework.

Rationale 3.1 Although the IR states that the MAT program utilizes the same conceptual framework as the initial undergraduate program, the MAT program uses four outcomes that differ from the 23 proficiencies used in the conceptual framework.

Motion (cont'd): and to retain the following areas for improvement:

Standard2

2.2 The unit does not systematically collect and analyze assessment data in the graduate-level programs—MAT, MSL, and DLL.

Rationale 2.2 Data are collected by the respective program directors but are not systematically incorporated into the unit's data files.

2.3 The unit's file of formal student complaints does not document complaint resolutions

Rationale 2.3 While a file exists in the unit head's office for formal student complaints, this file does not include documentation of the resolutions of these complaints.

Standard 4

4.1 Initial candidates have limited opportunities to interact with faculty from diverse backgrounds.

Rationale 4.1 The demographics of faculty teaching initial candidates has limited diversity combined, the full time faculty in the unit and those part time in the unit are 89 % white. There is no opportunity for candidates to work with diverse adjunct faculty. The adjunct faculty in the initial program is 100 percent white. The unit does have a plan in place to recruit diverse faculty, but evidence was not provided that good-faith efforts have been made to recruit diverse initial program adjunct faculty.

4.2 The unit does not ensure all MSL and DLL candidates have an opportunity to work with diverse students.

Rationale 4.2 Candidates in the MSL and DLL programs complete their clinical experiences in the school where they are employed. If the demographics at a candidate's school do not include opportunities to work with diverse students in all categories expected in 4d, the candidate is encouraged to find ways to have the missing experience. However alternative experiences are not required in either program.

Motion carried; 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Meissner)

Standards 1-6

Motion: It was M/S (Ferree/Hofmeister) to retain the status of the standards as follows:

Motion carried; 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Meissner)

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

Unit Accreditation Status

Motion: It was M/S (Ferree/Hofmeister) to recommend the status of “Continuing Accreditation” through December 31, 2016.
Next visit: Fall 2016
Motion carried; 10 in favor, 0 opposed and 1 abstention (Meissner)

Recommendations for Fort Hays State University—Progress Report

Agriculture (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-2, 4-6

None

Standard 3

3.1 Several of the rubrics provided are not standard specific.

Rationale 3.1 Rubrics provided lack specificity to the standard.

Motion: It was M/S (Hofmeister/Kinderknecht) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016 and to remove the area for improvement.

Motion carried; 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Dale)

Recommendations for Ottawa University—Progress Reports

English Language Arts (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-4

None

Motion: It was M/S (Dale/Alexander) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2012.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

History and Government (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-9

None

Standard 10

3.1 Rubric is vague.

Rationale 3.1 The rubric describes the components that an A paper would have, but does not define any other grades. Even the A paper description says that each section is worth a set number of points, but does not state if all of the points must be awarded for the A or only a part of them. The rubric is not specific to the standard.

Motion: It was M/S (Dale/Alexander) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2012 and to remove the area for improvement.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Recommendations for Wichita State University—Program Review

Adaptive (A, PreK – 12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-8

None

Motion: It was M/S (Smith/Straub) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Art (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Smith/Straub) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Biology (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-6, 8-11, 13-18

None

Standard 7

7.1 The assessment does not align with the standard.

Rationale 7.1 The standard covers health issues (STDs, AIDS, vaccinations) which are not addressed in the assessment. The assessment covers more on developmental biology rather than health issues.

Standard 12

12.1 Assessment 11 does not align with the standard.

Rationale 12.1 The assessment lists the biology standard in the rating indicators, however criteria for judging the candidates ability to demonstrate an understanding of the concepts and processes unifying science domains are not given.

Motion: It was M/S (Smith/Straub) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016 and to remove the areas for improvement.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Building Leadership (A, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Smith/Straub) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Chemistry (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-13

None

Motion: It was M/S (Smith/Straub) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Ferree)

District Leadership (A, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-2, 4-7

None

Standard 3

3.1 Proficiency levels are not well-defined and appropriate for candidates in the program for Assessment #4

Rationale 3.1 Though the program rubrics for Assessment #4 distinguish between “Unacceptable,” “Acceptable,” and “Target” levels of achievement, the wording of the rubric does not address the level to which candidates are meeting the standard but the level of organization and number of artifacts in the portfolio.

Motion: It was M/S (Rasmussen/Dale) to recommend the status of “**Approved with Stipulation**” through December 31, 2016 and to retain the area for improvement.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Early Childhood Unified (I, A, Birth-Grade 3)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-13

None

Motion: It was M/S (Rasmussen/Dale) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Earth and Space Science (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-14

None

Motion: It was M/S (Rasmussen/Dale) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Elementary (I, K-6)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Rasmussen/Dale) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

English (I, 5-8)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-4

None

Motion: It was M/S (Alexander/Rasmussen) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

English (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-4

None

Motion: It was M/S (Alexander/Rasmussen) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

ESOL (A, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-10

None

Motion: It was M/S (Alexander/Rasmussen) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Foreign Language (I, PreK-12) Spanish, French, Latin

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-9

None

Motion: It was M/S (Alexander/Rasmussen) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Functional (A, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-8

None

Motion: It was M/S (Dale/Straub) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Gifted (A, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-8

None

Motion: It was M/S (Dale/Straub) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

History Comprehensive (I, 5-8)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-8

None

Motion: It was M/S (Dale/Straub) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

History and Government (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-10

None

Motion: It was M/S (Dale/Straub) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Journalism (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Dale/Straub) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Library Media Specialist (A, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1, 5-6, 8

None

Motion: It was M/S (Straub/Rasmussen) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016, to retain the following areas for improvement,

Standard 2

2.2 Assessment 3b rubric is not specific in defining the techniques specific to the standard.

Rationale 2.2 There is no description of the collaborative techniques in terms of student performance specific to the standard. The rubric is lacking the defined competencies specific to the standard. The competencies specific to the standard are not defined at each identified level of accomplishment.

Standard 7

7.1 Assessment 3 rubric is not specific in identifying each level of accomplishment specific to the standard.

Rationale 7.1 The differentiation of the quality of student knowledge and performance should be thoroughly described. The rubric is lacking the actual competencies specific to the standard. The competencies specific to the standard are not defined at each identified level of accomplishment. The competencies for each level of accomplishment or performance should be standard specific. Each level of accomplishment would state what the candidate would know or 'be able to demonstrate at that level.

Motion (cont'd) and to remove the following areas for improvement.

Standard 2

2.1 Assessment 3a rubric is not specific in defining each identified level of accomplishment specific to the standard.

Rationale 2.1 The differentiation of the quality of student knowledge and performance should be thoroughly described. The rubric is lacking the actual competencies specific to the standard. The competencies specific to the standard are not defined at each identified level of accomplishment. The competencies for each level of accomplishment or performance should be standard specific. Each level of accomplishment would state what the candidate would know or 'be able to demonstrate at that level.

Standard 3

3.1 Assessment 4 rubric is not specific in defining each identified level of accomplishment specific to the standard.

Rationale 3.1 The differentiation of the quality of student knowledge and performance should be thoroughly described. The rubric is missing actual competencies that are specific to the standard and listed at each level of accomplishment. Proficient competencies would be different from another level of accomplishment or performance.

Standard 4

4.1 Assessment 7 rubric is not specific in defining each identified level of accomplishment specific to the standard.

Rationale 4.1 The differentiation of the quality of student knowledge and performance should be thoroughly described. The competencies for each level of accomplishment or performance should be standard specific. Each level of accomplishment would state what the candidate would know or 'be able to demonstrate at that level.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Mathematics (I, 5-8)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-9

None

Motion: It was M/S (Straub/Rasmussen) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Mathematics (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-9

None

Motion: It was M/S (Straub/Rasmussen) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Music (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-9

None

Motion: It was M/S (Straub/Rasmussen) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Physical Education (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Straub/Rasmussen) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Physics (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-13

None

Motion: It was M/S (Smith/Alexander) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Reading Specialist (A, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-6

None

Motion: It was M/S (Smith/Alexander) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

School Counselor (A, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-11

None

Motion: It was M/S (Smith/Alexander) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

School Psychologist (A, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-12

None

Motion: It was M/S (Smith/Alexander) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Science (I, 5-8)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-14

None

Motion: It was M/S (Smith/Alexander) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Speech/Theatre (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-6

None

Motion: It was M/S (Smith/Alexander) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Committee Deliberations and Actions

Deliberations and actions began at 10:34 a.m.

Discussion

Sue Smith asked to make a comment and Mike Neal consented.

S. Smith's comment—I would just like to say that having just done this a short time, I have never seen science programs that came through so clearly as Wichita State's. There are usually all kinds of areas for improvement and debate and these were very good.

J Duncan asked Connie Ferree if she would like to speak to that.

C. Ferree's comment—The program review team did a lot of work on that and they did have a rejoinder that came back through and they did a lot of work on that. They made good corrections so by the time it got to ERC it was very clear.

J. Duncan's comment—I think the rejoinder is very helpful to the institutions. Before the new rejoinder process was in place, they really couldn't do a great deal and now they really can. It becomes a process that allows for the continuous improvement so I think that has proven to be a good thing.

M. Neal's comment—And as an addition to that, it may be because I am learning how to do this more but it seems in general the paperwork comes to us in a more orderly fashion, more detail. I think that one of our objectives was to help in coaching the preparation and support people preparing the programs through Jeanne's work and the people doing a good job and helping the institutions and also the institutions having some really good people out there. They made this a priority to be well-prepared for this high stakes part of the process. This process is getting more efficient and not so much as a "gotcha" but a more formal process. That is my observation.

Mike Neal and David Hofmeister announced they would not be attending the June meeting.

M Neal's comment—Thank you for your time and work to Jan and Jeanne. Thanks to all of you for your travel, your districts should be commended and appreciated because it is harder and harder to let you go do these sorts of things. So if there is ever anything we can do. I think a letter that we send that could be read at a Board of Education meeting, or something to demonstrate the importance of the work that these reviewers do and must be done to have great schools and teachers. Your work is greatly appreciated, very important and this is a really good review committee. I think that we have the right combination of experienced folks and that we help these institutions. That is good feedback for the institutions about how to do business and prepare good teachers.

J Duncan's comment—I like to think that the whole process really helps the institutions and it helps Kansas produce excellent teachers. We believe from the state assessments and student performance that the candidates prepared by institutions are wonderful teachers. When you look at the process, we involve so many people from the field and higher ed. These people are so important because they bring perspective expertise to the review teams. We are trying to pay for substitute teachers for the program review process. We won't know how this will impact the review process for next October and March reviews.

M Neal's comment—I didn't know until I was out of public schools and traveled around the country that Kansas was known for its teacher preparation. Others like hiring Kansas graduates. And I really didn't realize they talk about the professionalism of our preparation and the serious nature of how we accept and license people. I think that our work is well done. Have a good start to your summer.

Adjourn

It was decided by consensus to adjourn at 11:04 a.m.