

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 15, 2010

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

Absent: Kathy Dale, Greg Rasmussen

KSDE Staff: Jeanne Duncan, Jan Williams

Called meeting to order—Chair, David Hofmeister

David Hofmeister, chair, called the meeting to order at 8:38 a.m.

Approval of Agenda for April 15, 2010

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

Motion carried; 10 in favor and 0 opposed

Approval of January 22, 2010 Minutes

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

Motion carried; 10 in favor and 0 opposed

Announcements

Teams were directed to their work area.

Meeting of Review Teams

Meeting of Review Teams:

The review teams met at 8:43 a.m.

Assignments:

Baker University Accreditation (No Rejoinder)

Team:

Mike Neal, Chair
Sherry Kinderknecht
Kathy Dale--Absent
Sue Smith
Scott Myers
Sharon Klose
Rick Henry

Assignments:

Friends University New Program Biology

Team:

David Hofmeister, Chair
Connie Ferree
Linda Alexander
Greg Rasmussen--Absent
Martin Straub
Judy Johnson

Recommendations for Baker University—Continuing Accreditation Visit

AFIs

Motion: It was M/S (Henry/Myers) to retain the following areas for improvement:

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 2-3, 5

None

New AFIs

Standard 1

1.1 (Initial) Initial secondary education candidates have limited preparation in content-specific pedagogy.

Rationale 1.1 In interviews, candidates in secondary education noted deficits in their understanding of content-specific pedagogy due to the lack of classes or experiences specific to the pedagogy of their unique content area.

1.2 (Initial) Insufficient evidence exists to assure Restricted License candidates have developed satisfactory professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Rationale 1.2 Insufficient data exist on the assessment of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for initial Restricted License candidates. In a follow-up survey designed to evaluate course quality as well as in interviews, RL candidates reported concerns about their ability to integrate their learning into their teaching.

1.3 (Initial) Candidate dispositions are not assessed in the Restricted License program.

Rationale 1.3 There are no explicit and planned assessments of dispositions in the RL program.

Standard 4

Continuing and revised

4.1 The AFI now reflects both ITP and ADV where it previously related to ADV programs only. The unit does not provide adequate opportunities to interact and work with diverse faculty. (ITP and ADV)

Rationale 4.1 Candidates in the MAEd cohorts, the Restricted Licensure (initial teacher preparation) program, and the Wichita cohort of the MSSL program are not ensured experiences working with diverse higher education and P-12 school faculty.

New

4.2 (Initial, Advanced) The unit does not ensure all MAEd or RL candidates enrolled in conventional and distance learning programs have opportunities to engage with candidates from different socioeconomic groups and at least two racial/ethnic groups.

Rationale 4.2 The MAEd and RL programs have cohort and on-line experiences that do ensure the opportunity to interact with diverse groups of candidates

4.3 (Advanced) The unit does not ensure MAEd candidates have opportunities to interact and work with diverse P-12 students.

Rationale 4.3 The unit has no processes in place to ensure that Candidates in the MAEd program have experiences with P-12 students from different socioeconomic groups and at least two ethnic/racial groups, ELL’s and students with disabilities.

Standard 6

New

6.1 The unit does not provide adequate funds for professional development.

Rationale 6.1 The university has experienced significant budget shortfalls in FY 2009 and FY 2010. The unit has made a budget reduction as a result of the shortfall. While it has been able to preserve the current faculty to ensure quality program delivery, professional development funds for FY 2009 and 2010 were eliminated.

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstention

Standards 1-6

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

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstention

| 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 (Kinderknecht/Smith) to recommend the status of “Continuing Accreditation” through December 31, 2016.
Next visit: Fall 2016
Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstention

Recommendations for Friends University—Program Review

Biology (I, 6-12) New Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-18

None

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

Motion carried; 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstention

Committee Deliberations and Actions

Deliberations and actions began at 8:43 a.m.

Annual Report and Discussion

Jeanne--Asked the committee to review the annual goals’ task summary and see if there is anything they wish to add or change. The goals for 2010-2011 are printed in yellow for you to review. Sue Smith said to change the dates in the yellow section to reflect 2010-2011.

Linda—Asked if there were any decisions to explore the use of technology in future meetings so the members do not have to travel and have face to face meetings.

J Duncan—Responded that the only difficulty with is splitting into group meetings, one large meeting to start, then break up into two meetings and then come back together. She stated that her personal opinion is that the ERC process is really high stakes for institutions and the committee only meets four times a year. If I were an institution, I would want to know that as much conversation took place as possible about the deliberations for their accreditation. That could still take place with an electronic meeting.

Sherry—Asked if we could show the use of the document warehouse in the task summary.

Scott—Asked if there was any way to make this more idiot proof. I looked at the wrong materials for the meeting.

Jeanne—The problem with that is IT has set up an open role for ERC to see everything because you will look at items during a year long period and can see everything each IHE has on the document warehouse. Reviewers also see everything. Part of the difficulty is that resetting roles each time would be unwieldy. I try to be careful about telling you what you need to look at each time you review materials. Look at the correct year but you are reviewing materials that are at least 9 months old in the review process. For instance, an IHE may have items from 2008-2009 and also materials for 2009-2010 and look at the letter to see what your assignment is for the meeting. I am sorry for the confusion in the process but always check your letter. I will make it more evident in the letter that I email.

Jeanne—The goals do cover the tasks of the committee. We would want to keep the goal for clarity, consistency and historical perspective. We have not had ad hoc members at the last few meetings. I don't think that we have needed them. We are building enough history within the committee. If at any time you want to have someone come back because of questions, let me know ahead of time and I could probably get them to attend.

Mike—Could we have some commentary about how we should proceed to use the hard copies, the electronic copies and what to read first, second? I don't think this needs to be a goal but some discussion by others who have had some success. Here is how to look at what Jeanne has sent us; here is how to access the archived materials, and how we can proceed or experiment in how to do this personally.

Jeanne—I think it has to do with the learning style of each person. You find this when the reviewers are reviewing programs. When I have to look at a program, I print off the report and then pull up electronically everything else in the document warehouse that supports it. If you actually had dual screens, one could pull up two items. Some reviewers would never print off the report. This varies from person to person. I think this would be an interesting conversation to have. Some of the ad hoc members discussed at one meeting how they looked at the reports and materials. It would be helpful to have others discuss what they do. Accreditation reports have linked documents that you could review that the team members review on the visit. I have asked the IHEs to leave their linked documents and sites up so that ERC can see these on the active links. You could print off the team report. It is not as long as it used to be. You could look at the AFIs and begin looking at the supporting documents. It does vary how you want to do it. I would start with the report and then go back to look at the materials to see what you think about the AFI.

Mike—Some articulation about what went on and hearing you explain what goes on is helpful. If we have training in January, we need to hear a little about the process and the decisions.

Jeanne—If we have a new member on the committee, then we would have training in November or January, We could have discussion of what I do on an accreditation visit and what and my role is on a visit..

David---I would like to go back and pick up on Linda's comment about the utilization of technology for the meetings and that there be a consideration of the process. NCATE has put together a process with the team meeting during a conference call over a 4 hour duration, with findings of the report discussed. I tried to do this with the last program review but there was a challenge of trying to find a time 3 weeks in advance where everyone has the same opportunity to meet at the same time and it was impossible. I have already set aside time for the next ERC meeting but if we could look at piloting over the next year at least one time using technology for the smaller committees to deliberate over their assignment and perhaps a smaller caseload. We would find out what would be the threshold that we could communicate effectively as a committee and bring those findings forward without having to get together physically. I don't know how many want to do that but if we could at least experience it. We could do all the meeting in pilot form, then come together and deliberate about how it worked. Are there instances where we don't need to drive and see if this might work?

Jeanne—Depending on the work, we could perhaps look at the November 19 meeting. Prior to the 19th, set up 2 access conference calls so that the two committees could deliberate on their tasks and the committee members would set aside time for the phone call. The only thing I think you need to think about if we were to do this, as a building principal you have an office with a door but if you are a teacher, then it is time away from your room in a private place which may have to be at home, Or it may be an evening access call and the two chairs will be the leaders of the calls.

David—If you would just think about this before the June meeting? Jeanne outlined what we are doing for NCATE and it may not be what you want to do but today is 6 hours on the road for a meeting.

Jeanne—It may depend on the amount of materials to look at and that the number of IHEs with programs is minimal, then it may be something you want to consider. The chairs of the committees would have to see when their committee members could meet and whether it would be an evening call. I would hope your calls would not be more than two hours at a time, if we could limit them to that time. It certainly is something to look at and I understand the driving is not fun to experience for a short meeting. Is that something you would like to put to a vote?

Mike—is that something you want to pilot in June?

David—No it would be something to think about and be a subsequent activity. I am not making a motion but wanted to ask for consideration.

Mike—Is this to be a goal?

Jeanne—We will set our goals in June so that could be included if you desire that. We will try to incorporate technology as much as possible for our meetings.

Scott—I will be absent but I am in favor of this philosophy.

Jeanne—Several people will be gone, June 18th is the date and I believe it is a Friday. With all the discussion, are we saying that it needs to be a different date? I will look at the date and see if I can find a room for another date, during that week or the week after. I usually try to do a Friday or a Monday. I will try to change the date.

Connie—Just as a counterpoint to that, I think there is a lot of value to the face to face meetings. I understand the driving, and I do not drive that far and I am listening and understanding but it is a wonderful opportunity to meet and have the conversations that go on beyond just the programs that we are reviewing and we only meet 4 times a year and that is not a lot of times to meet. I do think that there is some value to meeting to a face to face and would offer that has a counterpoint to the other discussion. Not necessarily a disagreement but something to think about.

Jeanne—it would be my suggestion that we be flexible in that and not say every other meeting but look at the work load and try to do it based on the work load and the conference calls we do in addition to the meeting (which could also be a conference call), just be aware of the workload and amount of discussion necessary based on the workload and the number of AFIs to consider.

Mike—I think we will find that a hybrid is more successful as the process evolves. In the spirit of economy, we can see how this works

Jeanne—From my experience with NCATE and the two times of 4 hour conference calls, members must commit the time and treat it as if you are gone, and not have others knocking at your door. You must be able to devote your time, in the office, I have to let others in the office know that I am not available whether I am setting there or not. I have to attend to the call which is the business at hand, and commit to the time. I know that for teachers it would be difficult to do in your room, you would still have to schedule a substitute, or if it was an evening call. Also to consider confidentiality, the discussions that take place should not be privy to anyone else that is not on ERC.

Sue—in an elementary school, you just don't have that many phone lines that you could do the call at school and tie up one of two lines. You can't block access for 4 hours at a time.

Jeanne—That is why I am thinking it would have to be a go to home situation. We will try to see if we can change the date and find a room. The dates currently on the calendar are November 19 and January 24th.

David—So with 4 people gone on June 18th, that would be the perfect time to hold election for offices.

Please keep in mind election of officers in June and if you want to volunteer or keep the officers in place, we could ask them to serve again.

David—I want to thank you for your time to serve on the committee and to review and make recommendations for higher education. We appreciate your work in this endeavor.

Adjourn

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