

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

**Official Minutes** for November 20, 2009

**Present:** Linda Alexander, David Hofmeister, Judy Johnson, Sherry Kinderknecht, Martin Straub, Scott Myers, Rick Henry, Mike Neal, Connie Ferree

**Absent:** Kathy Dale, Greg Rasmussen, Sue Smith

**KSDE Staff:** Jeanne Duncan, Jan Williams

---

**Called meeting to order—Chair, David Hofmeister**

---

**David Hofmeister**, chair, called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

---

**Approval of Agenda for November 20, 2009**

---

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

Motion carried; 9 in favor and 0 opposed

---

**Approval of June 19, 2009 Minutes**

---

**Motion:** It was M/S (Straub/Henry) to approve the minutes.

Motion carried; 9 in favor and 0 opposed

---

**Announcements**

---

Sharon Klose is the new member at-large from the Professional Standards Board that will join ERC at the January meeting. There will be a short orientation for the committee and a discussion of the committee responsibilities.

Jeanne Duncan did a quick review of programs, progress reports, upgrade reports and decisions.

---

Teams were directed to their work area.

---

**Meeting of Review Teams**

---

Meeting of Review Teams:

The review teams met at 9:22 a.m.

<u>Assignments:</u>	<u>Team:</u>
Kansas State University Accreditation (No rejoinder)	Mike Neal, Chair
Wichita State University Restricted Program	Sherry Kinderknecht
Midwest Associated Colleges Consortium Restricted Program	Kathy Dale--Absent
Emporia State University New Program ECU	Sue Smith--Absent
Emporia State University Restricted Innovative Progress Rpt	Scott Myers
Newman University New Programs-Biology & Chemistry	David Hofmeister
MidAmerica Nazarene University Progress Reports-ESOL, School Counselor	
Pittsburg State University Progress Reports-Adaptive Adv, ECU, Innovative Adaptive	

<u>Assignments:</u>	<u>Team:</u>
Fort Hays State University Programs	Rick Henry, Chair
Friends University Speech/Theatre Progress Report	Connie Ferree
University of Kansas ECU, Innovative UKanTeach	Linda Alexander
Progress Reports	Greg Rasmussen--Absent
	Martin Straub
	Judy Johnson

---

**Recommendations for Kansas State University—Continuing Accreditation Visit**

---

KSDE/NCATE Continuing Accreditation Visit

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-6**

None

**Standards 1-6**

**Motion:** It was M/S (Myers/Kinderknecht) to retain the status of the standards as follows:

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstention

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

**Unit Accreditation Status**

---

**Motion:** It was M/S (Myers/Kinderknecht) to recommend the status of “Continuing Accreditation” through December 31, 2016.  
Next visit: Spring 2016  
Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

---

### Recommendations for Wichita State University—(Program Review)

---

#### Restricted Program (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

**Assessments 1-4**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

---

### Recommendations for Midwest Associated Colleges Consortium—(Program Review)

---

#### Restricted Program (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

**Assessments 3-4**

None

#### Assessment #1

**1.1** Description of Assessment #1 was not provided.

**Rationale 1.1** A description of the Praxis II and PLT is required demonstrating their use in the program. Note: A limited summary of the pass rate for PLT and Praxis II was provided, however there was still a lack of clarity in the Table and data summary including, but not limited to, the number of candidates who took the test.

#### Assessment #2

**2.1** There are no data provided for Assessment #2.

**Rationale 2.1** Although a timeline was given for course offerings, the rejoinder states that MACC began offering the course Introduction to Teaching in Fall 2006, and no data were provided for Fall 06 or Fall 07. Thus the absence of data was not clearly explained.

Note: An updated rationale for assessment number 2 was provided, but there was no connection made as to how the unit used the previous data to make the change.

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

---

**Recommendations for Emporia State University—(Program Review & Progress Report)**

---

**Early Childhood Unified (A, B-Kdg) (New Program, On-line program)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-8**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Kinderknecht/Myers) to recommend the status of “**New Program Approved with Stipulation**” through December 31, 2010.

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Innovative Program (Restricted) I, 6-12 Progress Report**

Areas for Concern:

1 Curricula Review:

**A plan to support candidates after their first year if they have successfully passed the PLT is unclear. Further, it is stated that “If a candidate does not possess appropriate breadth and depth in the content discipline in which initial licensure is sought additional content knowledge preparation will also be required,”** however it is unclear how this will be determined.

2 Evaluative Checkpoints:

**While the order of progression through these decision points is clear, it is unclear of the timeline for Decision Point 4 since candidate’s can progress through during multiple year timeframes.**

3 Comments

**The design of this program is still of concern to the reviewers, perhaps this is to be expected with an innovative program. Careful monitoring of candidate’s performance is essential. While it is stated that the program will follow the processes of the Teacher’s College, this program obviously is targeting an unique group of candidates. The unit is encouraged to provide more than one-year of support to all candidates**

**Motion:** It was M/S (Kinderknecht/Myers) to remove the areas for concern and recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2010.

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

---

**Recommendations for Newman University—(Program Review)**

---

---

## **Biology (I, 6-12) New Program**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-8, 12, 16-18**

None

### **Standard 9**

**9.1** Candidate proficiency can not be determined by assessment 8 (a two-page, 12 pt, double spaced paper).

**Rationale 9.1** The assessment does not demonstrate adequate proficiency to fulfill the content of the standard. The criteria and guidelines do not align with the standard.

Comment: It is unclear how the paper or the ETS test shows proficiency in teaching. The assessment shows understanding of the concept but not teaching it.

### **Standard 10**

**10.1** A rubric for assessment 7 is not provided.

**Rationale 10.1** It is not clear how points are awarded for the assessment.

Comment: A scoring sheet has been provided but it is unclear how points are earned. What determines marginal or extraordinary.

### **Standard 11**

**11.1** A rubric for assessment 7 is not provided.

**Rationale 11.1** It is not clear how points are awarded for the assessment.

Comment: A scoring sheet has been provided but it is unclear how points are earned. What determines marginal or extraordinary.

### **Standard 13**

**13.1** Proficiency can not be determined from assessment 2.

**Rationale 13.1** The assignment description and lesson plan template are not provided. It is unclear what candidates are required to include in the lesson plan that is specific to the standard.

Comment: AFI not addressed in rejoinder.

### **Standard 14**

**14.1** Proficiency can not be determined from assessment 2.

**Rationale 14.1** The assignment description and lesson plan template are not provided. It is unclear what candidates are required to include in the lesson plan that is specific to the standard.

Comment: AFI not addressed in rejoinder.

### **Standard 15**

**15.1** Proficiency can not be determined from assessment 2.

**Rationale 15.1** The assignment description and lesson plan template are not provided. It is unclear what candidates are required to include in the lesson plan that is specific to the standard.

Comment: AFI not addressed in rejoinder.

### **Motion:**

It was M/S (Myers/Kinderknecht) to retain the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of “**New Program Approved with Stipulation**” through December 31, 2012.

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Chemistry (I, 6-12) New Program**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-3, 5, 7-13**

None

**Standard 4**

**4.1** The assessments do not clearly state the candidate's "ability necessary to help students do scientific inquiry".

**Rationale 4.1** Assessment 5 refers to active inquiry and conducting investigations, but does not clearly include scientific inquiry.

**Standard 6**

**6.1** The rubric for assessment 7 is not clearly aligned with the description of the coursework for CHEM 3001.

**Rationale 6.1** The description in Section IV for assesement 7 meets Standard 6, but the rubric does not clearly indicate that Standard 6 is assessed.

**Motion:** It was M/S (Myers/Kinderknecht) to retain the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of “**New Program Approved with Stipulation**” through December 31, 2012.

Motion carried; 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstentions (Ferree)

\*\*\*\*\*

---

**Recommendations for MidAmerica Nazarene University—(Progress Report)**

---

**English for Speakers of Other Languages (I, PreK-12) New Program**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-10**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Kinderknecht/Myers) to recommend “**Approved**” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstentions (Alexander)

\*\*\*\*\*

**School Counselor (A, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-11**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Kinderknecht/Myers) to recommend “**Approved**” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstentions (Alexander)

\*\*\*\*\*

---

**Recommendations for Pittsburg State University—(Progress Report)**

---

**Adaptive (A, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-8**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Myers/Kinderknecht) to recommend “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Early Childhood Unified (I, B-Gr 3)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-6, 8-13**

None

**Standard 7**

**7.1** There is no assurance that all candidates have experience in inclusive settings.

**Rationale 7.1** Materials submitted indicate that most candidates have experience in inclusive settings.

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Adaptive (I, 6-12) Innovative program**

Areas for Concern:

**Sections 1-8, 10-18**

None

**Section 9. Review the program of study.**

**Comments and Areas for Concern:**

This is a graduate program consisting of 11 courses for a total of 33 hours of graduate credit. It is unclear how the program courses are delivered; online, face-to-face, or independent study.

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

---

**Recommendations for Fort Hays State University—(Program Review)**

---

**Adaptive (I, K-6)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-6, 8**

None

**7.1** Assessment #6 is included (marked) in the Section III Assessment Chart.

**Rationale 7.1** Assessments #3 and #5 adequately address this standard. Assessment #6 does not address the standard.

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Adaptive (A, PreK – 12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-8**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Art (I, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-7**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Biology (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-4, 7-8, 10-11**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Ferree/Johnson) to remove the following area for improvement,

## **Standard 12**

**12.1** There is lack of evidence assessment 1a covers the standard.

**Rationale 12.1** Praxis Subscore 1a does not align with the standard. It is not clear the basic principles of science covers the standard.

\*Note: The standard is assessed by the Praxis exam only.

Comment: PHYS 606 assessment covers the standard in its entirety.

**Motion:** It was M/S (Ferree/Johnson) to retain the following areas for improvement,

## **Standard 5**

**5.1** The scoring guides and evaluation for assessment 5 are not clear and specific to the standard.

**Rationale 5.1** There is not a specific description of how Principles of Biology covers the standard.

Comment: The rejoinder comments that BIOL 180 is not required, therefore to not use the assessment. However, it is a required course. Also, it is unclear if Human Anatomy and Physiology covers animal behavior.

## **Standard 6**

**6.1** There is lack of evidence candidates are proficient in standard #6.

**Rationale 6.1** Data from Praxis II, Subscore 4 indicates students are not meeting minimum set by University.

\*Note: Assessment 5A is based on one method of assessment (exams only).

Comment: The university acknowledges the problem, but improvements need to be shown.

## **Standard 9**

**9.1** A rubric was not provided for assessment 3.

**Rationale 9.1** It is unclear how candidate earn points. There is a lack of criteria for earning points.

Comment: The rejoinder address the program is revising the rubric in August of 2009.

## **Standard 12**

### **New AFI**

**12.2** The rubric for the added Assessment 7 (PHYS 606-Unit Plan Project Rubric) is unclear on how the student is awarded points.

**Rationale 12.2** The rubric for Assessment 7 does not include specific guidelines for awarding category point values. The rubric assigns both points and percentages for levels of performance. The percentages overlap from level to level making it unclear as to what level, for example, a 75% score would attain. Also, for example, the resources category has a point value of 10 points. If a student project is to be scored for resources, how many points would a student receive if they were in column 1 inadequate versus the column 2 acceptable? It is unclear as to why column 3 is not attainable in certain categories. It is also unclear how a student receives 110%. The rubric would be clearer if points or percentages were used with points being clearer. The four column rubric has points awarded from zero to three; therefore it is unnecessary to award percentages to the column as well. The rubric must also be directed specifically to the content area.

## **Standard 13**

**13.1** A rubric was not provided for assessment 3.

**Rationale 13.1** It is unclear how candidate earn points. There is a lack of criteria for earning points.

Comment: The rejoinder address the program is revising the rubric in August of 2009.

\*Note: Assessment 6 is needed to meet the standard in its entirety. Once data is available, it will help support the standard.

#### **New AFI**

**13.2** The rubric for the added Assessment 7 (PHYS 606-Unit Plan Project Rubric) is unclear on how the student is awarded points.

**Rationale 13.2** The rubric for Assessment 7 does not include specific guidelines for awarding category point values. The rubric assigns both points and percentages for levels of performance. The percentages overlap from level to level making it unclear as to what level, for example, a 75% score would attain. Also, for example, the resources category has a point value of 10 points. If a student project is to be scored for resources, how many points would a student receive if they were in column 1 inadequate versus the column 2 acceptable? It is unclear as to why column 3 is not attainable in certain categories. It is also unclear how a student receives 110%. The rubric would be clearer if points or percentages were used with points being clearer. The four column rubric has points awarded from zero to three; therefore it is unnecessary to award percentages to the column as well. The rubric must also be directed specifically to the content area.

#### **Standard 14**

**14.1** A rubric was not provided for assessment 3.

**Rationale 14.1** It is unclear how candidate earn points. There is a lack of criteria for earning points.  
Comment: The rejoinder address the program is revising the rubric in August of 2009.

**14.2** Assessment 3 does not align with the standard.

**Rationale 14.2** There is lack of evidence the teacher can integrate content within the sciences and among other disciplines.

Comment: PHYS 606 assessment covers the standard in its entirety.

#### **New AFI**

**14.3** The rubric for the added Assessment 7 (PHYS 606-Unit Plan Project Rubric) is unclear on how the student is awarded points.

**Rationale 14.3** The rubric for Assessment 7 does not include specific guidelines for awarding category point values. The rubric assigns both points and percentages for levels of performance. The percentages overlap from level to level making it unclear as to what level, for example, a 75% score would attain. Also, for example, the resources category has a point value of 10 points. If a student project is to be scored for resources, how many points would a student receive if they were in column 1 inadequate versus the column 2 acceptable? It is unclear as to why column 3 is not attainable in certain categories. It is also unclear how a student receives 110%. The rubric would be clearer if points or percentages were used with points being clearer. The four column rubric has points awarded from zero to three; therefore it is unnecessary to award percentages to the column as well. The rubric must also be directed specifically to the content area.

#### **Standard 15**

**15.1** A rubric was not provided for assessment 3.

**Rationale 15.1** It is unclear how candidate earn points. There is a lack of criteria for earning points.  
Comment: The rejoinder address the program is revising the rubric in August of 2009.

**15.2** Assessment 3 does not align with the standard.

**Rationale 15.2** There is lack of evidence the teacher can relate students to the daily lives and interests of students.

Comment: PHYS 606 assessment covers the standard in its entirety.

\*Note: Assessment 6 is needed to meet the standard in its entirety. Once data is available, it will help support the standard.

**New AFI**

**15.3** The rubric for the added Assessment 7 (PHYS 606-Unit Plan Project Rubric) is unclear on how the student is awarded points.

**Rationale 15.3** The rubric for Assessment 7 does not include specific guidelines for awarding category point values. The rubric assigns both points and percentages for levels of performance. The percentages overlap from level to level making it unclear as to what level, for example, a 75% score would attain. Also, for example, the resources category has a point value of 10 points. If a student project is to be scored for resources, how many points would a student receive if they were in column 1 inadequate versus the column 2 acceptable? It is unclear as to why column 3 is not attainable in certain categories. It is also unclear how a student receives 110%. The rubric would be clearer if points or percentages were used with points being clearer. The four column rubric has points awarded from zero to three; therefore it is unnecessary to award percentages to the column as well. The rubric must also be directed specifically to the content area.

**Standard 16**

**16.1** A rubric was not provided for assessment 3.

**Rationale 16.1** It is unclear how candidate earn points. There is a lack of criteria for earning points. Comment: The rejoinder address the program is revising the rubric in August of 2009.

**Standard 17**

**17.1** A rubric was not provided for assessment 3.

**Rationale 17.1** It is unclear how candidate earn points. There is a lack of criteria for earning points. Comment: The rejoinder address the program is revising the rubric in August of 2009.

**Standard 18**

**18.1** A rubric was not provided for assessment 3.

**Rationale 18.1** It is unclear how candidate earn points. There is a lack of criteria for earning points.

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Building Leadership (A, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-6**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Business (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-8**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Chemistry (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-3, 5-8, 10-13**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Straub/Alexander) to remove the following areas for improvement,

**Standard 4**

**4.1** Assessment 2 does not clearly state the candidate's "ability necessary to help students do scientific inquiry".

**Rationale 4.1** As assessment 2 refers to active inquiry and conducting investigations, but does not clearly include ability to help students to do scientific inquiry, consider removing assessment 2

**Standard 9**

**9.1** The assessments do not insure that all of standard 9 will be met.

**Rationale 9.1** The addition of assessment 6 is appropriate. However, assessment 2 suggests that the student may integrate the content within the sciences

OR among other disciplines instead of the stated "integrate the content within the sciences AND among disciplines".The change of the word "OR" to the word "AND" would correct this, or consider removing assessment 2.

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

**New AFI**

**4.2** The rubric for the added Assessment 6 (PHYS 606-Unit Plan Project Rubric) is unclear on how the student is awarded points.

**Rationale 4.2** The rubric for Assessment 6 does not include specific guidelines for awarding category point values. The rubric assigns both points and percentages for levels of performance. The percentages overlap from level to level making it unclear as to what level, for example, a 75% score would attain. Also, for example, the resources category has a point value of 10 points. If a student project is to be scored for resources, how many points would a student receive if they were in column 1 inadequate versus the column 2 acceptable? It is unclear as to why column 3 is not attainable in certain categories. It is also unclear how a student receives 110%. The rubric would be clearer if points or percentages were used with points being clearer. The four column rubric has points awarded from zero to three; therefore it is unnecessary to award percentages to the column as well. The rubric must also be directed specifically to the content area.

**New AFI**

**9.2** The rubric for the added Assessment 6 (PHYS 606-Unit Plan Project Rubric) is unclear on how the student is awarded points.

**Rationale 9.2** The rubric for Assessment 6 does not include specific guidelines for awarding category point values. The rubric assigns both points and percentages for levels of performance. The percentages overlap from level to level making it unclear as to what level, for example, a 75% score would attain. Also, for example, the resources category has a point value of 10 points. If a student project is to be scored for resources, how many points would a student receive if they were in column 1 inadequate

versus the column 2 acceptable? It is unclear as to why column 3 is not attainable in certain categories. It is also unclear how a student receives 110%. The rubric would be clearer if points or percentages were used with points being clearer. The four column rubric has points awarded from zero to three; therefore it is unnecessary to award percentages to the column as well. The rubric must also be directed specifically to the content area.

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

Motion carried; 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstentions (Ferree)

\*\*\*\*\*

**District Leadership (A, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-6**

**None**

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

Motion carried; 8 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 (Henry/Johnson) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Elementary (I, K-6)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-7**

**None**

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**English (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 2-4**

**None**

**Motion:** It was M/S (Henry/Johnson) to remove the following area for improvement,

**Standard 1**

**1.2** Assessment #7 does not guarantee knowledge of how learners create and discover meaning in a text.

**Rationale 1.2** The rubric for assessment #7 states that the candidate may design a lesson plan as part of the assignment but does not require it.

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

**Standard 1**

**1.1** Assessment #5 and its rubric do not indicate knowledge of how learners create and discover meaning in the text.

**Rationale 1.1** Though assessment #5 has the candidate creating and discovering meaning in the text, it does not assess whether the candidate knows how this occurs with learners.

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**ESOL (A, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-10**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Foreign Language (I, PreK-12) German and Spanish**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-9**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Gifted (A, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-8**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Health (I, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-4**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**History and Government (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1, 3-10**

None

**Standard 2**

**2.1** The criteria for candidate performance in Assessment #6 at the 70-79% level lacks sufficient rigor.

**Rationale 2.1** The rubric articulates opportunities for poor quality work and notes it as an acceptable level of performance.

**2.2** There is a lack of differentiation in the scoring criteria between a D and an F in assessment #6.

**Rationale 2.2** While there are two different scores noted on the scoring guide, the criteria for determining differences between a D and an F are not clearly defined. The rubric description of the criteria for a D and an F are identical.

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

Motion carried; 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstentions (Hofmeister)

\*\*\*\*\*

**Journalism (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-7**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Library Media Specialist (A, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-7**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mathematics (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-9**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Music (I, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-9**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Music-Instrumental (I, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-9**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Music-Vocal (I, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-9**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Physical Education (I, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1, 3-7**

None

**Standard 2**

**2.1** The data for assessments 2 & 7 are not presented in such a way to determine if standard is met.

**Rationale 2.1** Only the total score on assessments 2 & 7 are recorded on the data tables. It is not possible to determine passing score for standard two on those assessments since data was not disaggregated for this standard.

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Physics (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-13**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Psychology (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-3**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Reading Specialist (A, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-5**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**School Counselor (A, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-10**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**School Psychologist (A, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-12**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Communication Technology (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-3**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Technology Education (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-7**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Power/Energy/Transportation Technology (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-3**

None

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Production Technology (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-3**

**None**

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

---

**Recommendations for Friends University—(Progress Report)**

---

**Speech/Theatre (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1-6**

**None**

**Motion:** It was M/S (Kinderknecht/Myers) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2015.

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

---

**Recommendations for The University of Kansas—(Progress Reports)**

---

**Early Childhood Unified (I, Birth-Kdg)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-8**

**None**

**Motion:** It was M/S (Myers/Kinderknecht) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2013.

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

**Innovative Programs (Math/Biology/Chemistry/Physics/Earth & Space) (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Concern:

**Section 1-4, 6-10**

**None**

**Section 5**

**5.1** It is unclear if the Steering Committee assumes responsibility for admitting students and tracking them at each transition point.

**Motion:** It was M/S (Myers/Kinderknecht) to remove the area for concern and to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2013.

Motion carried; 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

\*\*\*\*\*

---

**Committee Deliberations and Actions**

---

Deliberations and actions began at 11:55 a.m.

---

---

**Adjourn**

---

It was decided by consensus to adjourn at 12:25 p.m.