Kansas State Board of Education

Kansas State Education Building
120 S.E. 10th Ave.
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1182

(785) 296-3203
FAX (785) 291-3791
www.ksde.org

Janet Waugh *District 1*	Sue Gamble *District 2*	John Bacon *District 3*	Bill Wagnon *District 4*	Sally Cauble *District 5*
Kathy Martin *District 6*	Kenneth Willard *District 7*	Carol Rupe *District 8*	Jana Shaver *District 9*	Steve Abrams *District 10*

CORRECTED AND REVISED ITEMS
Tuesday, March 13, 2007
MEETING AGENDA

3:15 p.m.
SYSTEM REDESIGN

(RI) 15. Receive recommendations of the Charter School Review Committee **page 3**
Original page 69

4:30 p.m. **GOVERNMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY**

17. CONSENT AGENDA

Learning Services

(AI) h. Act on recommendation from Evaluation Review Committee **page 31**
Original page 231

Agenda Number: **15**
Meeting Date: **3/13/2007**

CORRECTED

To: Interim Commissioner
From: Staci Warren, Jeannette Nobo, Larry Englebrick
Subject: New Charter School Petitions Scores and Recommendations
Date: 2/27/2007
Board Goals: Redesign the delivery system to meet our state's changing needs

Twenty–one approved charter school petitions were reviewed by a committee and scored according to the new rubric. The new rubric total score was established at 188 points. A Charter School Petition must receive a minimum score of 144 points for it to be recommended to the State Board. The current Charter Schools Project grant allows ten petitions to be funded for 07-08 school year.

Scores and Recommendations:

1. Kansas City Kansas School District submitted an approved petition for the establishment of Maurice R. Holman Academy of Excellence. This petition received an average score of 175.5. This public charter school will provide:
   • A self paced, performance based learning for elementary students (grades K-5);
   • An emphasis on core curriculum;
   • Government and entrepreneurship;
   • Character development; and
   • Educational enthusiasm in preparation for participation in a global economic society.

   Recommended funding for this public charter school is for a planning grant of $60,000.00. USD 500 wishes to take a full year in planning and not receive first year funding during the 2007-08 school year.

2. Newton Public School District submitted an approved petition for the establishment of Walton 21st Century Rural Life Learning Center public charter school. This petition received an average score of 174.2. This public charter school will provide:
   • A connection for elementary school children to the richness of rural life;
   • Opportunities in Project based learning;
   • Integration of 21st Century technology in all aspects of standards aligned curriculum; and
   • Emphasizes healthy lifestyles.

   Recommended funding for this public charter school is for a planning grant of $60,000.00 and first year funding of $155,000.00.

NEW

3. **Parsons District Schools submitted an approved petition for the establishment Parsons NEW Health Career Academy. This school received a score of 173.34. This public charter school will provide:**
   - **Increased learning opportunities for students in a special area of emphasis, specifically health careers.**
   - **Increase the percentage of student from low income families and students who are underrepresented minorities in choosing health careers.**

   Recommended funding for this public charter school is for a planning grant of $60,000 and first year funding of $155,000.

4. Hutchison Public School District submitted an approved petition for the establishment of Salthawk, a public charter school. This petition received an average score of 172.6. This public charter school will provide:
   - Additional educational options for students in grades nine – twelve;
   - Condensed classes for students that are focused on curriculum essentials, which are groupings of necessary skills derived from state standards;
   - Individual Learning Plans; and
   - Project centered learning in the afternoons.

   Recommended funding for this public charter school is for a planning grant of $60,000.00 and first year funding of $155,000.00.

5. Elkhart Public School District has submitted an approved petition for the establishment of Elkhart Charter, a public charter school. This petition received an average score of 169.8. This public charter school will provide:
   - At risk students experience in establishing and running an actual business while earning credits to complete high school;
   - A day care for students who currently can not consistently attend school because of childcare issues;
   - Improved pupil learning; and
   - Increased learning opportunities for pupils in the special area of business and economics, using unconventional instructional techniques.

   Recommended funding for this public charter school is for a planning grant of $60,000.00 and first year funding of $155,000.00.

6. Pratt Public School District submitted an approved petition for the establishment of Walden Center, a public charter school. This petition received an average score of 157.2. This public charter school will provide:
   - Career training and academic essentials in the interest areas of the arts and communication;
   - Business management and technology;
   - Health and human services; and
   - Technology rich curricula in an environment grounded by service learning.

   Recommended funding for this public charter school is for a planning grant of $60,000.00 and first year funding of $155,000.00.

7. Erie Public School District submitted an approved petition for the establishment of Project Based Charter School. This petition received an average score of 157.25. This public charter school will provide:
   - Increased learning opportunities for pupils using creative and unconventional instructional techniques and structures;
   - Authentic learning opportunities; and
   - Methodologies and structures that promote student learning, performance and achievement.

   Recommended funding for this public charter school is for a planning grant of $60,000.00 and first year funding of $155,000.00.

8. Renwick Public School District submitted an approved petition for the establishment of a charter school to replace St. Mark's School. This petition received a score of 157.1. This public charter school will provide:
   - A technology rich environment;
   - Individual learning plans;
   - Student leadership in technology newscasts, Gen Y Robotics; and
   - Project Based learning.

   Recommended funding for this public charter school is for a planning grant of $60,000.00 and first year funding of $155,000.00.

9. McPherson Public School District submitted an approved petition for the establishment of McPherson County Charter School, a public charter school. This petition received an average score of 156.625. This public charter school will provide:
   - Challenging, academic expectations that are blended with applied, high demand, vocational technical skills for students of McPherson County;
   - Students who are highly skilled, high wage employees to compete both locally and globally; and
   - Career awareness, assessment and experiences in the world of work, for each student.

   Recommended funding for this public charter school is for a planning grant of $60,000.00 and first year funding of $155,000.00.

10. Haysville Public School District submitted an approved petition for the establishment of Haysville Charter School. This petition received an average score of 154.2. This public charter school will provide:
    - Students the opportunity to identify their interests and abilities in possible career situations through the Cooter Assessment;
    - Teams for students to play key roles using Story Centered Curriculum;
    - Opportunity to design their own academic program; and
    - Use of technology to further integrate curriculum through pod casting, streaming video and video conferencing.

    Recommended funding for this public charter school is for a planning grant of $60,000.00 and first year funding of $155,000.00.

DELETED

~~10. Little River Public School District submitted an approved petition for the establishment of Kansas Career and Technical Virtual School. This petition received an average score of 153. This public charter school will provide:~~

- ~~An educational process in a manner that provides career based individualized, custom learning opportunities for all students in grades seven – twelve; and~~
- ~~Engage students in a career focused educational program.~~

~~Recommended funding for this public charter school is for a planning grant of $60,000.00 and first year funding of $129,480.00~~

Petitions for Turner Virtual School and Sterling Academy were approved by the Kansas State Board of Education during the spring of 2006. The Petition for Stafford High Charter School was approved by the Kansas State Board of Education during the spring of 2005. All three of these schools are eligible to receive funding under the current grant. Recommended funding for each of these public charter schools for the 2007-08 school year is in the amount of $155,000.00.

Professional Learning Communities
785-291-3791(Phone)
785-291-3791(Fax)
785-291-3791(TTY)

Charter School Petition Rubric
2006-2007
Review Committee Rating Form

Reader Code _____	
USD Number and Name _____	☐ **Year 1 Planning Grant** **$60, 000 award (maximum)**
Total Points Received _____**/188 possible** ☐ Petition meets minimum 75% of total points (141). No further documentation is required. ☐ Petition meets minimum 75% of total points (141). Further documentation is required for sections rated Level 1 or Level 2 ☐ Petition does not meet minimum 75% of total points (141).	

Directions for Completing Rubric

- To use the rubric, read each section within the petition and then review the ideal *Quality Criteria* that should be contained in each applicant's response.
- On a 4-point rubric:
  - Level 4 indicates that the ideal criteria has been addressed most rigorously, thoroughly and specifically in the response.
  - Level 3 indicates that the ideal criteria has been addressed rigorously but is not as thorough and specific in the response.
  - Level 2 indicates that an attempt was made to address the ideal criteria and there is minimal thoroughness and specificity in the response.
  - Level 1 indicates that there was basically very little attempt to address the ideal criteria.
- Please write comments to support the points awarded. The written comments can be very meaningful and helpful to the applicant and will be available to each applicant within a 14-day period following the announcement of grant recipients.
- After reviewing and rating each section, total the points awarded for that section in the space provided under the heading *Total.*
- To be considered for charter school status, a petition needs to receive a minimum 75% of the total points available (144/192 pts) and have provided requested documentation to support any quality indicators that were rated as Level 1 or Level 2.

Charter School Petition Rubric

Section		Quality Indicators	Rating				Total
I.	***Need***	▪ Identifies a compelling description of whom the charter school intends to reach and the accommodations that will be implemented to address the target student population's unique need.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Provides a clear demonstration, including use of staff, parent, district and community data, that there is a commitment and support structure provided by the district and community.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Provides a specific rationale for how this school will enhance or expand the educational options currently available to the target student population.	4	3	2	1	
Reader Comments:							
II.	***Mission***	▪ Provides a clear and compelling mission statement that is meaningful, manageable and measurable.	4	3	2	1	
Reader Comments:							
III.	***Purpose***	▪ Identifies one or more purposes for which the school intends to provide new opportunities.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Provides a thorough and comprehensive description of how the school's mission will provide new opportunities to address the purpose(s).	4	3	2	1	
Reader Comments:							
IV.	***Recruitment and Enrollment***	▪ Demonstrates a convincing plan for broad outreach, including outreach to families traditionally less informed about options.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Identifies a detailed rationale for the anticipated enrollment.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Demonstrates that admission policies at the proposed school will comply with applicable law.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Demonstrates an admission plan and a proposed lottery system, if necessary, that ensures adequate enrollment and full accessibility of the school to all eligible students.	4	3	2	1	
Reader Comments:							

Charter School Petition Rubric

Section		Quality Indicators	Rating				Total
V.	***Educational Philosophy and Utilization of Physical Facilities***	▪ Describes a framework for instructional design, methods and flexibility of scheduling that are aligned with the school's mission and responds to the needs of the student population.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Provides specific examples of school models, educationally sound web resources and/or research-based studies that support the success of the proposed approach **OR** if innovative, presents a reasonable likelihood for success.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Shows evidence that this approach will meet the diverse needs of individual students and lead to improved student performance.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Discusses how modifications to the current physical facilities will support the mission and to what degree students will be engaged in the design of the physical space.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ The Virtual Education Requirements Desktop Audit form has been completed attached and thoroughly addresses the required components.	YES		NO		N/A
		NOTE: If a Reader has marked NO in any of the sections requiring a YES or NO response, the documentation required will need to be collected from the applicant before a total score can be finalized and forwarded to the State Board of Education.					
Reader Comments:							
VI.	***Special Student Populations***	▪ Petition identifies the strength and capacity of the school that will provide support in implementing accommodations for special student populations.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Describes the support that will be provided in identifying children with special needs identification, developing individual educational plans and monitoring progress.	4	3	2	1	
Reader comments:							
VII.	***Support for Learning***	▪ Provides examples of student engagement strategies that will reduce student behavior and discipline problems.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Describes the procedures that will ensure the health and safety of students and staff.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Identifies the district resources that currently support family-school partnerships and how the school will gauge and disseminate parental satisfaction results.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Engages community partners in ways that elicit involvement in the school and contribution to student learning.	4	3	2	1	
Reader Comments:							

Charter School Petition Rubric

Section		Quality Indicators	Rating				Total
VIII.	***Staff***	▪ Presents a staffing plan that is aligned with the mission and educational philosophy of the school and includes the composition and responsibilities of the staff.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Describes how building level autonomy will be ensured in determining any school staff composition and assignment to the charter school.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Provides for an effective professional development program.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Describes the staff evaluation system and how it will support the mission and educational philosophy.	4	3	2	1	
Reader Comments:							
IX.	***Measurable Goals and Assessments***	▪ Defines clear, specific, understandable academic goals that will lead to improved educational results for students.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Defines clear, specific, understandable non-academic goals that are reflective of the school's unique mission, characteristics, targeted student population, etc.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Identifies specific skills, knowledge and attitudes that reflect the school's clearly measurable educational objectives.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Identifies how goals can be assessed by objective means that are frequent and sufficiently detailed enough to determine whether students are making satisfactory progress.	4	3	2	1	
Reader Comments:							
X.	***Use and Reporting of Data***	▪ Provides a thorough, clear, measurable, externally credible and conceptually sound design for measuring and reporting the academic, social and individual development of its students and the overall performance of the school.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Includes examples of proposed quantitative, qualitative and anecdotal collection methods.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Demonstrates how formative and summative performance data will be used to continuously improve educational services for all students, especially those working at levels above or below the school's performance standard.	4	3	2	1	
Reader Comments:							

Charter School Petition Rubric

Section		Quality Indicators	Rating				Total
XI.	***Governance***	▪ Articulates how decisions will be made and by whom during the pre-operational planning period and once operational.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Includes a description of management responsibilities in curriculum, staffing, special education, business and finance, reporting and school leadership.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Describes the plan to establish a charter school advisory board and describes the membership and its responsibilities.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Describes how the local school board will address contracts of employment if the charter school status is non-renewed or revoked or upon the decision of employees to discontinue participation in the operation of the school. Specifies terms/conditions of employment.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Reasons for waiver requests have been included, if applicable.	Yes		No		N/A
		NOTE: If a Reader has marked NO in any of the sections requiring a YES or NO response, the documentation required will need to be collected from the applicant before a total score can be finalized and forwarded to the State Board of Education.					
Reader Comments:							
XII.	***USD Sponsor Responsibilities***	▪ Describes the specific role and support the USD sponsor will provide during the development of the charter school petition.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Describes how the USD sponsor will demonstrate a commitment to ensuring building level autonomy and decision making during the pre-operational planning period and once the school is operational.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Clearly identifies how support will be extended to the charter school in implementing identified activities and evaluating progress towards identified goals.	4	3	2	1	
Reader Comments:							
XIII.	***Financial Management***	▪ Describes the fiscal controls and financial management policies the school will employ to track finances in its daily business operations.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Describes how the school will develop its annual budget and identifies the various funding streams that will support the proposed school.	4	3	2	1	
		▪ Describes the level of commitment and financial support of the USD sponsor during the grant funding period and how that will affect long-term sustainability once federal funds have been expended.	4	3	2	1	
Reader Comments:							

Charter School Petition Rubric							
Section		**Quality Indicators**	**Rating**				**Total**
XIV.	***Budget Narrative*** ***Year 1 Planning***	▪ **Year 1 Planning** – Provides a realistic and comprehensive budget plan that will be implemented during startup activities to support innovative educational practices consistent with the purpose, philosophy and goals of the application. (Refer to Sections II, V and IX.)	4	3	2	1	
		▪ **Year 1 Planning** - Includes additional information supporting each budget category (i.e. specific cost descriptions, breakdowns, calculations, rationale, etc.)	4	3	2	1	
		▪ **Year 1 Planning** – Details specifically how the minimum 10% set aside requirement will be expended in order to provide professional development and technical assistance.	4	3	2	1	
	Budget Narrative ***Year 2 and 3 Implementation***	▪ **Year 2/3 Implementation** – Provides a realistic and comprehensive budget plan that will be implemented during years 2 and 3 to support innovative educational practices consistent with the purpose, philosophy and goals of the application. (Refer to Sections II, V and IX.)	4	3	2	1	
		▪ **Year 2/3 Implementation** - Includes additional information supporting each budget category (i.e. specific cost descriptions, breakdowns, calculations, rationale, etc.)	4	3	2	1	
		▪ **Year 2/3 Implementation** – Details specifically how the minimum 5% set aside requirement will be expended in order to provide professional development and technical assistance.	4	3	2	1	
Reader Comments:							

Charter School Petition Rubric

Section		Quality Indicators	Rating		Total
XV.	***Contracts***	**EMO/ Educational Service Provider**			**N/A**
		▪ Draft of the proposed contract is attached.	Yes	No	
		▪ Explanation of choice of contracting entity is provided and includes a brief summary of the history, educational philosophy and past results.	Yes	No	
		▪ Describes how the charter school's advisory board's plans to oversee the contracting EMO/Educational Service Provider.	Yes	No	
		Non-Profit Entities (college, university, museum, educational institution, etc.)			
		▪ Explanation of choice of contracting with non-profit entity is provided and includes the following requirements: name o of the organization; a letter of intent or commitment from a bona fide representative of the partner organization; and personal contact information for the partner organization.	Yes	No	
		NOTE: If a Reader has marked NO in any of the sections requiring a YES or NO response, the documentation required will need to be collected from the applicant before a total score can be finalized and forwarded to the State Board of Education.			
Reader Comments:					
XVI.	***Assurances***	Acknowledgement of adherence to assurances has been referenced.	Yes	No	N/A
		NOTE: If a Reader has marked NO in any of the sections requiring a YES or NO response, the documentation required will need to be collected from the applicant before a total score can be finalized and forwarded to the State Board of Education.			
Reader Comments:					

Guidelines for 2006-2007 Petition to Establish a Charter School

Purpose

Charter schools must be designed to meet at least one of five purposes specified in Kansas charter school law, K.S.A. 72-1904 (but are not required to meet all of these purposes). Identify which of the following five purposes the charter school intends to meet and provide a thorough and comprehensive description of how the school's mission will meet the identified purpose(s).

- Improved pupil learning;
- Increased learning opportunities for pupils in special areas of emphasis;
- Creative and unconventional instructional techniques and structures;
- New professional vistas for teachers who operate such schools or who choose to work in them;
- Freedom from conventional program constraints and mandates.

Assurances

Petitioner(s) shall adhere to the following conditions:

- The proposed charter school is required to be individually accredited as a building within a district and needs to abide by the current *Quality Performance Accreditation Regulations*.
- The proposed school will comply with all state statutes impacting schools in Kansas
- The proposed school will complete a request for a *"School Building Number"* (under *Directory Updates).*
- The educational program and curriculum is planned/selected by properly licensed educators, employed by the sponsoring school district and/or under contract with an EMO/Education Service Provider.
- Properly licensed educators employed by the sponsoring district and/or under contract with an EMO/Education Service Provider will plan, deliver and evaluate instruction for each student enrolled in the school.
- All eligible students participate in State administered testing and local assessments required of the sponsoring district's schools.
- Daily attendance records are kept on a regular basis for each child enrolled in the school.

Eligibility

A petition for the establishment of a charter school may be prepared and submitted to the local board of education of a school district by or on behalf of a school building or school district employees group, an educational services contractor, or any other person or entity.

Awards

Grants will be awarded on the basis of the quality of the petitions submitted and the availability of funds. Continued funding for years two and three are contingent upon completion of approved grant activities, identified goals and expenditure of awarded funds.

- Year 1 Planning Grants - $60,000 (maximum and based on availability)
- Year 2/3 Implementation Grants - $195,000/year (maximum and based on availability)

Time Line for Petition Submittal

- **December 1** - submitted to local board no later than December 1 of the school year preceding the school year in which the charter school is proposed to be established.
- **February 1** - submitted to KSDE for review by February 1 of the school year preceding the school year in which the charter school is proposed to be established. Include public hearing notice and board minutes of approval.
- **March 1** - approval or disapproval by the Kansas State Board of Education no later than March 1 of the school year preceding the school year in which the charter school is proposed to be established.
- Charter status may be obtained independent of receiving federal grant funds.

Program Year

- **Year 1** - Planning grants operating period begins April 1, 2007 for FY 2007. All activities are to be completed and all funds received under this program must be expended by July 31, 2007.
- **Year 2** - Implementation grants operating period begins August 1, 2007 for FY 2008. All activities are to be completed and all funds received under this program must be expended by July 31, 2008.
- **Year 3** – Implementation grants operating period begins August 1, 2008 for FY 2009. All activities are to be completed and all funds received under this program must be expended by July 31, 2009.

Guidelines for 2006-2007 Petition to Establish a Charter School

Directions for Completing the Charter School Petition

Part I – Submittal Contact Information, District Information, Proposed Charter School Information

- Complete the contact information specific to the group/entity submitting the petition and check, if applicable, one of the two boxes indicating collaboration with an educational management organization or educational service center or collaboration with another non-profit organization.
- Complete the contact information specific to the district.
- Complete the contact information specific to the proposed charter school. Include anticipated numbers for the grade levels to be served and for the anticipated enrollment. Include the proposed opening date with enrolled students.
- Provide signatures for each section.

Part II - Opening, Converting, or Replacing

- Check Number 1 if the petition will open a new charter school within the district and provide the name.
- Check Number 2 if the petition will convert an existing public school into a charter school within the district. Complete the information for (a), (b), and (c).
- Check Number 3 if the petition will replace an existing public school within the district. Complete the information for (a), (b), and (c).

Part III – Narrative Outline

Format the charter school petition following the outline and provide comprehensive responses to each of the following outline components:

- Need
- Mission
- Purpose
- Recruitment/Enrollment
- Educational Philosophy/Utilization of Physical Space
- Special Student Populations
- Support for Learning
- Staff
- Measurable Goals/Assessment
- Use and Reporting of Data
- Governance
- USD Sponsor Responsibilities
- Financial Management
- Budget Narrative
- Contracting with EMO, Educational Service Provider or Other Non-Profit Organization
- Assurances

Contact Information

Please direct any questions concerning the Charter School Petition process to Linda Geiger (785)296-4933 or email lgeiger@ksde.org or Stacey Farrar (785)296-64401 or sfarrar@ksde.org

Petition to Establish a Charter School

(Pursuant to K.S.A. 72-1903 et seq.)

Contact Information: Group or Entity Submitting Petition			
Name of Group or Entity Submitting Petition:			
Contact Name:	**Telephone:**	**FAX:**	**Email:**
Address:			
City:	**State:**	**ZIP**	
Signature: *By placing your signature here, you acknowledge that you have reviewed this complete petition, including the statements of assurance, and agree to be responsible for fulfilling all the expectations contained herein.*			

(Check one of the boxes if applicable)

	We are planning to contract with an educational management organization (EMO) or a Kansas Educational Service Center.	**Name of Organization:**
	We are planning to contract with a non-profit organization other than a USD.	**Name of Organization:**

Contact Information: District			
USD #	**USD Name:**		
Superintendent Name:	**Telephone:**	**FAX:**	**Email:**
District Address:			
City:	**State:**	**ZIP**	
Signature: *By placing your signature here, you acknowledge that you have reviewed this complete petition, including the statements of assurance, and agree to be responsible for fulfilling all the expectations contained herein.*			

Contact Information: Proposed Charter			
Principal Name:	**Telephone:**	**FAX:**	**Email:**
School Name:			
School Address:			
City:	**State:**	**ZIP**	
Signature: *By placing your signature here, you acknowledge that you have reviewed this complete petition, including the statements of assurance, and agree to be responsible for fulfilling all the expectations contained herein.*			

	Year 1	Full Capacity
Anticipated Grade Levels Served		
Anticipated Enrollment		
Proposed Opening Date w/enrolled students:		

CHECK ONE OF THE THREE (3) BOXES BELOW
AND
COMPLETE THE INFORMATION.

1. OPENING A NEW SCHOOL

	This petition will open a new charter school within the district.

a. Name of new school:

2. CONVERTING AN EXISTING SCHOOL

	This petition will convert an existing public school into a charter school with the district. *(If you checked this box, please complete the information below)*

a. Building number and name of existing public school to be converted: *(Building name/ number remain the same.)*

b. Explain how the school will benefit from becoming a charter school.

c. How will the conversion address the needs of the community?

3. REPLACING AN EXISTING SCHOOL

	This petition will replace an existing public school within the district. *(If you checked this box, please complete the information below.)*

a. If the decision to reopen the existing school as a new charter school is providing a means to keep open a school that otherwise would be closed, why would the existing school be closed?

b. How have the students in the existing school been notified that if more students apply for admission than can be accommodated, they may or may not be able to enroll in the new charter school?

c. How have teachers in the existing school been notified that they may or may not be teachers in the new charter school?

CHARTER SCHOOL PETITION NARRATIVE OUTLINE
Instructions: Format the charter school petition following this outline. Provide comprehensive responses to each of the following outline components.

I. NEED
Please indicate the student population group(s) your new charter school would primarily target:

- ___ Economically disadvantaged populations
- ___ English Language Learners
- ___ Students with disabilities
- ___ Students at high risk of not meeting state academic standards
- ___ Students residing in geographic attendance areas with low performing public schools
- ___ Students with limited access to high quality public school choice options
- ___ Students currently home-schooled
- ___ Other (identify)

Explain the need for this particular school in the community it will serve and the target student population you have identified. Strong answers to this question will address why your school is needed beyond simply an analysis of school district statistics and a general discussion of school choice.

Discuss the compelling reason(s) for establishing this school and include identified student needs and accommodations that will be implemented to address those needs; evidence of staff and parent interest, district commitment, and other community support and how this will expand/enhance current educational options."

Quality Indicators - Need:
Identifies a compelling description of whom the charter school intends to reach and the accommodations that will be implemented to address the target student population's unique need; provides a clear demonstration, including use of staff, parent, district and community data, that there is a commitment and support structure provided by the district and community; and provides a specific rationale for how this school will enhance or expand the educational options currently available to the target student population.

II. MISSION
Provide a clear and concise statement that defines the purposes and nature of the school. Your mission statement should (in one or two sentences) indicate what the school intends to do, for whom, and to what degree. Some schools also use their mission statement to (briefly) address how they will accomplish these things if methodology is a particularly important part of their vision.

Your mission statement should be written for a general audience. Avoid jargon and technical terminology—parents and members of the community who wish to know more about the school should be able to read the mission statement and get a clear sense of your school and its vision.

A mission statement that focuses on core elements and sets broad priorities will remind readers that you are responsible for following through on a very specific set of promises and that some aspects of school performance are more important than others. In selecting your mission statement consideration should be given to Quality Performance and Accreditation requirements, No Child Left Behind Initiatives, and school goals.

Quality Indicators – Mission:
Petition provides a clear and compelling mission statement that is meaningful, manageable, and measurable.

III. PURPOSE
Charter schools must be designed to provide new opportunities to meet at least one of five purposes specified in Kansas charter school law, K.S.A. 72-1904 (but are not required to meet all of these purposes). Identify which of the following five purposes the charter school intends to meet and provide a thorough and comprehensive description of how the school's mission will provide new opportunities for

- Improved pupil learning;
- Increased learning opportunities for pupils in special areas of emphasis;
- Creative and unconventional instructional techniques and structures;
- New professional vistas for teachers who operate such schools or who choose to work in them;
- Freedom from conventional program constraints and mandates.

Quality Indicators - Purpose:
Identifies one or more purposes for which the school intends to provide new opportunities; and provides a thorough and comprehensive description of how the school's mission will provide new opportunities to address the purpose(s).

IV. RECRUITMENT/ENROLLMENT

Summarize the recruitment process and explain how the school and its program will be publicized and marketed throughout the community to a broad cross-section of prospective students as you seek to attract students to your school, including to families traditionally less informed about options. Pupils in attendance at the charter school must be reasonably reflective of the racial and socio-economic composition of the school district as a whole.

Indicate the anticipated enrollment number of students for each year and explain in detail your rationale for selecting this particular school size. Describe the policies and procedures the school will develop and implement for the admission and enrollment of students, including any proposed timetable or calendar and the school's implementation of the random lottery process as required by law.

Quality Indicators – Enrollment/Recruitment:
Petition demonstrates a convincing plan for broad outreach, including outreach to families traditionally less informed about options; identifies a detailed rationale for the anticipated enrollment; demonstrates that admission policies at the proposed school will comply with applicable law; and demonstrates an admission plan and a proposed lottery system, if necessary, that ensures adequate enrollment and full accessibility of the school to all eligible students.

V. EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY/UTILIZATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Describe the educational foundation of the proposed school that will ensure all students meet challenging State student academic content and achievement standards. Include in this description a framework for instructional design and methods, and flexibility of scheduling that are aligned with the needs of the pupils that the charter school has identified as its target student population.

Include which school models, educationally sound web resources and/or research-based studies can be relied upon to demonstrate your proposed approach will be successful with your anticipated student population.

Discuss how you intend to use the physical space in which the charter school will be housed and to what degree students will be engaged in the design of the physical space. How will modifications to the current physical facilities support your intended mission?

If this proposal includes an on-line learning component, the developers must also complete a *Virtual Education Requirements Desktop Audit form* to be eligible to claim FTE for enrolled and attending virtual students. Please review the documents at the following website:
http://www.ksde.org/outcomes/chartindex.html

Quality Indicators – Educational Philosophy:
Describes a framework for instructional design, methods and flexibility of scheduling that are aligned with the school's mission and responds to the needs of the student population; provides specific examples and evidence of school models, educationally sound web resources and/or research-based studies that support the success of the proposed approach ***OR*** *If innovative, presents a reasonable likelihood for success; shows evidence that this approach will meet the diverse needs of individual students and lead to improved student performance; discusses how modifications to the current physical facilities will support the mission and to what degree students will be engaged in the design of the physical space.*
If applicable, the Virtual Education Requirements Desktop Audit form has been completed attached and thoroughly addresses the required components.

VI. SPECIAL STUDENT POPULATIONS

Drawing upon the existing resources within the district, identify the strength and the capacity of your proposed school in providing support in implementing accommodations for special student populations including those with limited English proficiency and children with special needs, including those with exceptionally high needs.

Describe how the district or an outside provider will support the charter school in identifying children with special needs, developing plans for their education, and monitoring their progress.

Quality Indicators – Special Student Populations *:*
Petition identifies the strength and capacity of the school that will provide support in implementing accommodations for special student populations; and describes the support that will be provided in identifying children with special needs identification, developing individual educational plans and monitoring progress.

VII. SUPPORT FOR LEARNING

Describe the school's philosophy of student engagement strategies that will reduce student behavior and discipline problems for the general student population and special needs students. Summarize the school's discipline policy or code of conduct.

Describe the procedures that will ensure the health and safety of students and staff and the procedures to make available school health services and school security officers, as needed. Also describe the steps to ensure that criminal background checks and proof of an examination for tuberculosis are collected from all school personnel. (the full policy, if developed, can be included in the attachments).

Identify the resources the district currently provides in building and maintaining family-school partnerships that focus on strengthening support for student learning, improving communication, and encouraging parental involvement in school operations. Describe how parental satisfaction in your school will be gauged and the process for gathering and publicizing parental satisfaction results. Provide concrete examples of how community partners will play an integral part in the life of the school.

Quality Indicators – Support for Learning:
Provides examples of student engagement strategies that will reduce student behavior and discipline problems; describes the procedures that will ensure the health and safety of students and staff; identifies the district resources that currently support family-school partnerships and how the school will gauge and disseminate parental satisfaction results; identifies the district resources that will support family-school partnerships and how the school will gauge and disseminate parental satisfaction results; and engages community partners in ways that elicit involvement in the school and contribution to student learning.

VIII. STAFF

Quality instruction is one of the most important determinants of student achievement. Discuss how you will ensure that the quality of your staff is capable of meeting the mission and educational philosophy of the school. Define all roles within the school in operational terms and describe the district's support for staffing special education. In addition, indicate how you will collaborate with the USD sponsor to ensure building level autonomy in determining the school staff composition employed by the district for assignment to the charter school.

Also, describe plans for developing and implementing an effective professional development program and detail how the staff evaluation system will support the school's mission and educational philosophy.

Quality Indicators - Staff:
Presents a staffing plan that is aligned with the mission and educational philosophy of the school and includes the composition and responsibilities of the staff; describes how building level autonomy will be ensured in determining the school staff composition employed by the district for assignment to the charter school; provides for an effective professional development program; and describes the staff evaluation system and how it will support the mission and educational philosophy.

IX. MEASURABLE GOALS/ASSESSMENT

Charter schools are results-oriented educational institutions. This section of the petition must set standards for ambitious and attainable educational results. State at least three (3) but not more than six (6) measurable goals that are reflective of your school's unique mission, characteristics, targeted student population, etc. Include both academic and non-academic goals. Please use the following objective format outline and order when presenting each objective:

Goal Format Outline: Address all components for each goal before moving on to the next goal.

1. Identify the Goal

    a. Measurable indicator(s) of success
    b. Anticipated date(s) of completion.
2. Justification/Rationale for the Goal – How will the goal specifically contribute to the success of the school?
3. Assessing Annual Progress Towards the Goal
    a. What types of assessment will be used to assess progress?
    b. How will the school establish baseline measurement, including a description of pretests that will be used to establish the baseline data?

Quality Indicators - Measurable Goals/Assessment:
Petition defines a minimum of three (3) clear, specific, understandable academic and non academic goals that will lead to improved educational results for students; specifies skills, knowledge, and attitudes that reflect the school's clearly measurable educational objectives; and identifies how goals can be assessed by objective means that are frequent and sufficiently detailed enough to determine whether students are making satisfactory progress.

X. USE AND REPORTING OF DATA
Identify the academic, social and individual student data you will need to collect to support your mission, vision and goals. Outline the plan for collecting, analyzing, and reporting the data to KSDE, school staff, parents, and guardians on the progress of the charter school. Include examples of quantitative, qualitative and anecdotal collection methods.

Describe how formative and summative assessments will be used to continuously improve instruction, student learning and individual development and how the school will engage students who are working at levels that are either (a) above or (b) below the school's performance standard.

Quality Indicators – Use and Reporting of Data:
Provides a thorough, clear, measurable, externally credible and conceptually sound design for measuring and reporting the academic, social and individual development of its students and the overall performance of the school; includes examples of proposed quantitative, qualitative and anecdotal collection methods; and demonstrates how formative and summative performance data will be used to continuously improve educational services for all students, especially those working at levels above or below the school's performance standard.

XI. GOVERNANCE
Clearly articulate how decisions will be made and by whom during both the pre-operational planning period and once operational. Include in your description the management responsibilities in curriculum, staffing, special education, business and finance, reporting and school leadership.

Identify the plan to establish a Charter School Advisory Board that will be comprised of volunteers who will provide consultation, advocacy and support on behalf of the charter school in activities as approved in the original charter school petition.

Discuss how the local school board will address the manner in which contracts of employment and status of certified employees of the district who participate in the operation of the school will be dealt with upon non-renewal or revocation of the charter or upon a decision by any such employees to discontinue participation in the operation of the school. Specify the terms and conditions of employment in the charter school.

If a waiver is sought in order to facilitate operation of the school, include the school district policies and/or State Board of Education rules and regulations from which waiver is sought. Include the reasons such waivers are being requested.

Quality Indicators - Governance:
Articulates how decisions will be made and by whom during the pre-operational planning period and once operational; includes a description of management responsibilities in curriculum, staffing, special education, business and finance, reporting and school leadership; describes the plan to establish a charter school advisory board and describes the membership and its responsibilities; describes how the local school board will address contracts of employment if the charter school status is non-renewed or revoked or upon the decision of employees to discontinue participation in the operation of the school.; specifies the terms/conditions of employment; and reasons for waiver requests have been included if applicable.

XII. USD SPONSOR RESPONSIBILITIES

A healthy and active relationship with a sponsor can greatly contribute to the success of a charter school**.** Outline the specific role and support of the USD sponsor during the development of the charter school petition.

Describe how the USD sponsor will demonstrate a commitment to ensuring building level autonomy and decision making during the pre-operational planning period and once the school is operational. Clearly identify how support will be extended to the charter school in implementing identified activities and evaluating progress towards identified goals.

Quality Indicators – USD Sponsor Responsibilities:
Describes the specific role and support the USD sponsor will provide during the development of the charter school petition; describes how the USD sponsor will demonstrate a commitment to ensuring building level autonomy and decision making during the pre-operational planning period and once the school is operational; and clearly identifies how support will be extended to the charter school in implementing identified activities and evaluating progress towards identified goals.

XIII. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Describe the fiscal controls and financial management policies the school will employ to track finances in its daily business operations. Describe how the school will develop its annual budget and identify the various funding streams that will support the proposed school.

Describe the level of commitment and financial support of the USD sponsor in providing support for salaries and benefits, facilities and transportation during the grant funding period and how that will affect long-term sustainability once federal funds had been expended.

Quality Indicators – Financial Management:
Describes the fiscal controls and financial management policies the school will employ to track finances in its daily business operations; describes how the school will develop its annual budget and identifies the various funding streams that will support the proposed school; and describes the level of commitment and financial support of the USD sponsor during the grant funding period and how that will affect long-term sustainability once federal funds have been expended.

XIV. BUDGET NARRATIVE

Year 1 – Planning - The planning year maximum award is $60,000.
Address specifically how charter school funds will directly encourage and/or affect innovative educational practices in the school.

If your first year is a planning year, provide a clear and detailed timeline for getting the school into operation, from receipt of the charter to the opening of the school as well as a comprehensive budget narrative that details the resources you will use to support the startup activities which should be consistent with the petition's purpose, philosophy and goals. The budget narrative should follow the budget summary and provide additional information (specific cost descriptions, breakdowns, calculations, rationale, etc.) for each budget category.

It is expected that a minimum of 10% be set aside for professional development to include at a minimum, national and/or regional charter school conferences and technical assistance contracts.

Continued funding for years two and three are contingent upon completion of approved grant activities, identified goals and expenditure of awarded funds.

Quality Indicators – Budget Narrative for Year 1 Planning:
Provides a realistic and comprehensive budget plan that will be implemented during startup activities to support innovative educational practices consistent with the purpose, philosophy and goals of the application; Includes additional information supporting each budget category (i.e. specific cost descriptions, breakdowns, calculations, rationale, etc.); and details specifically how the minimum 10% set aside requirement will be expended in order to provide professional development and technical assistance.

Year 2 and Year 3 – Implementation - The implementation year maximum award is $195,000/year. Address specifically how charter school funds will continue to directly encourage and/or affect innovative educational practices in the school.

Provide a comprehensive budget narrative that details your projected revenue and expenditure projections during the first fiscal year of operation. Also, explain how the school will make certain that sufficient funds are available to cover a) any special education costs incurred and b) any transportation costs necessary to ensure the school will be both open and accessible. The budget narrative should follow the budget summary and provide additional information (specific cost descriptions, breakdowns, calculations, rationale, etc.) for each budget category.

It is expected that a minimum of 5% be set aside for professional development to include at a minimum, national and/or regional charter school conferences and technical assistance contracts.

Continued funding for years two and three are contingent upon completion of approved grant activities, identified goals and expenditure of awarded funds.

Quality Indicators – Budget Narrative for Year 2 and Year 3 Implementation:
Provides a realistic and comprehensive budget plan that will be implemented during Year 2 and Year 3 to support innovative educational practices consistent with the purpose, philosophy and goals of the application; Includes additional information supporting each budget category (i.e. specific cost descriptions, breakdowns, calculations, rationale, etc.); and details specifically how the minimum 5% set aside requirement will be expended in order to provide professional development and technical assistance.

XV. CONTRACTING WITH EMO, EDUCATIONAL SERVICE PROVIDER OR OTHER NON-PROFIT
If you intend to enter into a contract with an education management organization (EMO) or an educational service provider, attach a draft of the proposed contract.

Offer an explanation of why the EMO/Educational Service Provider was chosen and include the following information:

- Include a brief summary of the history, educational philosophy, and past results; and
- describe the charter school's advisory board's plans to oversee the contracting EMO/Educational Service Provider.

If you are filing the petition in conjunction with a college, university, museum, educational institution, another not-for-profit entity, or any other partner, please provide the information below for each such entity:

- Name of the organization;
- A letter of intent or commitment from a bona fide representative of the partner organization indicating that the organization is undertaking the partnership and the terms and extent of the undertaking;
- The name of a contact person for the partner organization;
- The address, phone number, facsimile number, and e-mail address of such contact person for the partner organization; and
- A description of the nature and purpose of the school's partnership with the organization.

Quality Indicators – Contracting with EMO, Educational Service Provider or other Non-Profit

EMO/ Educational Service Provider: *Draft of the proposed contract is attached; explanation of choice of contracting entity is provided and includes a brief summary of the history, educational philosophy and past results; and describes how the charter school's advisory board's plans to oversee the contracting EMO/Educational Service Provider.*

Non-Profit Entities (college, university, museum, educational institution, etc.): *Explanation of choice of contracting with non-profit entity is provided and includes the following requirements: name o of the organization; a letter of intent or commitment from a bona fide representative of the partner organization; and personal contact information for the partner organization.*

XVI. ASSURANCES

As a part of this Petition, State Board of Education is hereby assured that, if this Petition is granted, Petitioner(s) shall adhere to the following conditions:

- The proposed charter school is required to be individually accredited as a building within a district and needs to abide by the current *Quality Performance Accreditation Regulations*.
- The proposed school will comply with all state statutes impacting schools in Kansas
- The proposed school will complete a request for a *"School Building Number"* (under *Directory Updates).*
- The educational program and curriculum is planned/selected by properly licensed educators, employed by the sponsoring school district and/or under contract with an EMO/Education Service Provider.
- Properly licensed educators employed by the sponsoring district and/or under contract with an EMO/Education Service Provider will plan, deliver and evaluate instruction for each student enrolled in the school.
- All eligible students participate in State administered testing and local assessments required of the sponsoring district's schools.
- Daily attendance records are kept on a regular basis for each child enrolled in the school.
- The sponsoring school district has lived up to any previously approved charter school petitions and was in compliance with all previous KSDE requirements. (Applicable only for districts that have had previous charter petitions approved.)

Acknowledgement of adherence to assurances in this section has been referenced in the petition.

Charter School Year 1 Planning Budget
2006-2007

	1000 Instruction	2100 Support Services (Students)	2200 Support Services (Staff)	2300 Support Services (Gen. Admin.)	2400 Support Services (School Admin.)	2600 Operation of Building Services	2700 Vehicle Operations Services	3100 Food Services Operations	TOTAL
100 Salaries									
200 Employee Benefits									
300 Purchased Services									
400 Purchased Property									
500 Other Purchased services									
600 Supplies/ Materials									
700 Property									
800 Other									
TOTAL									
								GRAND TOTAL	

Charter School Year 2 Implementation Budget
2007-2008

	1000 Instruction	2100 Support Services (Students)	2200 Support Services (Staff)	2300 Support Services (Gen. Admin.)	2400 Support Services (School Admin.)	2600 Operation of Building Services	2700 Vehicle Operations Services	3100 Food Services Operations	TOTAL
100 Salaries									
200 Employee Benefits									
300 Purchased Services									
400 Purchased Property									
500 Other Purchased services									
600 Supplies/ Materials									
700 Property									
800 Other									
TOTAL									
								GRAND TOTAL	

Charter School Year 3 Implementation Budget
2008-2009

	1000 Instruction	2100 Support Services (Students)	2200 Support Services (Staff)	2300 Support Services (Gen. Admin.)	2400 Support Services (School Admin.)	2600 Operation of Building Services	2700 Vehicle Operations Services	3100 Food Services Operations	TOTAL
100 Salaries									
200 Employee Benefits									
300 Purchased Services									
400 Purchased Property									
500 Other Purchased services									
600 Supplies/ Materials									
700 Property									
800 Other									
TOTAL									
								GRAND TOTAL	

Budget Line Items
Refer to the following budget expenditure codes for further clarification of specific function definitions.
1000 Instruction
Includes the activities dealing directly with the interaction between teachers and students. Included here are the activities of aides or classroom assistants which assist in the instructional process.
2100 Support Services (Students)
Activities designed to assess and improve the well-being of students and to supplement the teaching process. Include only staff in attendance and social work services, substance abuse, guidance, and health services.
2200 Support Services (Instructional Staff)
Activities associated with assisting the instructional staff in planning, developing and evaluating the process of providing learning experiences for students. These activities include curriculum development, techniques of instruction, child development and understanding, staff training, etc.
2300 Support Services (General Administration)
Activities concerned with the overall general administration of the program. These include all personnel and materials required to support the program. If a federal program is audited by a state auditor, the CPA audit costs may not be charged to the federal program.
2400 Support Services (School Administration)
Activities that have been assigned in addition to the normal contract concerned with directing and managing the operation of a particular school. Examples would include extended days, Title I summer school or alternative high school.
2600 Operation and Maintenance of Plant Services
Activities concerned with keeping the physical plant open, comfortable and safe for use and keeping the grounds, buildings and equipment in effective working condition and state of repair. May be used only if space would not be maintained in absence of federal funds.
2700 Student Transportation Services
Activities concerned with conveying students to and from school, as provided by State and Federal law. This includes trips between home and school, and trips to and from school activities. Federal funds may not be used to supplant regular transportation costs.
3100 Food Services Operations
Activities concerned with providing food to students and staff in a school or LEA on an incidental basis during activities for Local Consolidated Plan programs.
Refer to the following budget expenditure codes for further clarification of specific object definitions.
100 **Personnel Services – Salaries** Instructional salaries for full and part time certified and non certified employees.
200 **Employee Benefit** F.I.C.A. – Group Insurance – Workman's Compensation, etc., for Personnel in 100 object above.
300 **Purchased Professional and Technical Services** Into District: Consultants, counseling, guidance, medical, and accounting services.
400 **Purchased Property Services** Lease, repair, maintain, and rent property and equipment owned or used by the district.
500 **Other Purchased Services** Out of District: Staff travel, staff development, registration fees.

600	**Supplies and Materials** Items that can be consumed, worn out, or deteriorated through use. This includes software that was purchased independently of a hardware package. For Title I, this may be no more than 10 percent of the total allocation.
700	**Property** Initial, additional, or replacement equipment. This includes software that was purchased as part of a hardware package. For Title I, this amount may be no more than 10 percent of the total allocation, or $2,000, whichever is more. For At-Risk programs, this amount can be no more than 25 percent of the At-Risk allocation.
800	**Other** Miscellaneous amount paid for goods and services not otherwise classified above.

AMENDED

Agenda Number: **17 j.**
Meeting Date: **3/13/2007**

REQUEST AND RECOMMENDATION FOR BOARD ACTION

Staff Initiating:	**Director:**	**Deputy Commissioner**	**Commissioner:**
Martha Gage	Martha Gage	Tom Foster	Interim Commissioner

Item Title:
Recommendations of the Evaluation Review Committee

Board Goals:
Providing a caring, competent teacher in every classroom

Recommended Motion:
It is moved that the Kansas State Board of Education accept the following recommendations of the Evaluation Review Committee for "Program Approval" for ACCK, Ft Hays State University, Ottawa University, and the University of Kansas.

Explanation of Situation Requiring Action *(including anticipated action if recommendation is approved):*
Following the institutional application and receipt of a complete institutional report, a review team of trained evaluators was appointed to review accreditation and/or program approval for the above institutions based on adopted State Board policies, procedures, and regulations. These are available for review by any member or members of the State Board. The review team's report and the institution's response to the report, along with the institutional report and/or institutional progress report, were submitted to the Evaluation Review Committee (ERC) of the Teaching and School Administration Professional Standards Advisory Board. The ERC, in accordance with procedures adopted by the State Board, prepared a written initial recommendation regarding the appropriate status to be assigned to the teacher education unit and/or program.

The initial recommendation was submitted to the teacher education institution and the institution was given 30 days to request a hearing to appeal the initial recommendation. If requested, the ERC conducted a hearing and prepared a written final recommendation regarding the appropriate status to be assigned to the teacher education unit and/or program. If a request for a hearing was not submitted, the initial recommendation became the final recommendation**. These final recommendations have been submitted to appropriate representatives of the teacher education institutions and are now submitted to the State Board, as attached,** for consideration and approval of the ERC recommendations for unit accreditation and/or program approval status.

A copy of the regulations covering this process is also attached. Staff will be on hand to answer any questions.

*If approved, new programs are always assigned the "new program approved with stipulation" status.

ADDED

February 7, 2007

To: Dale Dennis, Interim Commissioner

From: Evaluation Review Committee

Subject: Final Recommendation for program approval for Associated Colleges of Central Kansas

Introductory Statement:

On November 13, 2006, the Evaluation Review Committee reviewed the application for program approval for Associated Colleges of Central Kansas.

Documents that were received and considered include the program review documents, the initial KSDE Team Report, Institutional Rejoinders to the initial KSDE Team Report, and the final team report.

PROGRAM APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION

Recommend "Approved" status for the following program through December 31, 2013.
Adaptive (I, K-6, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:
Standards 1-3, 5-8—None

Standard 4

1. Implementing effective instruction based on the knowledge of the community is not specifically included.

Rationale: Skills in working effectively with parents and collaborating with staff are addressed; however, interacting with the larger community is not specifically identified in the assessment guidelines and the rubrics.

February 7, 2007

To: Dale Dennis, Interim Commissioner

From: Evaluation Review Committee

Subject: Final Recommendation for new program approval for Fort Hays State University

Introductory Statement:

On November 13, 2006 the Evaluation Review Committee reviewed the application for new program approval for Fort Hays State University.

Documents that were received and considered include the New Program Report, the initial KSDE Team Report, the Rejoinder to the initial KSDE Team Report and the final team report.

PROGRAM APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION
Recommend "New Program Approved with Stipulation" through December 31, 2008 with continuing areas of improvement in standard 7 and 8.
History Comprehensive (I, 5-8)

Areas for Improvement:
Standard 1-6-None

Standard 7

1. Proficiency levels are not well defined.

Rationale: The assessment as designed allows a candidate to fail all geography items on the assessment and still meet proficiency level.

Standard 8

1. Proficiency levels are not well defined.

Rationale: The assessment as designed allows a candidate to fail all social system items and still meet proficiency level.

February 7, 2007

To: Dale Dennis, Interim Commissioner

From: Evaluation Review Committee

Subject: Final Recommendation for new program approval for Ottawa University

Introductory Statement:

On November 13, 2006, the Evaluation Review Committee reviewed the application for new program approval for Ottawa University.

Documents that were received and considered include the New Program Report, the initial KSDE Team Report, Institutional Rejoinder to the initial KSDE Team Report and the final team report.

PROGRAM APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION
Recommend "New Program Approved with Stipulation" through December 31, 2011.

English Language Arts (I, 6-12)
Areas for Improvement--None

Recommend "Not Approved" status for the following programs:

Health (I, PreK-12)
Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1

1. Rubrics and scoring guides do not address context of the standards.

Rationale: Assessment #2 has an 80% proficiency assigned for the entire assessment, but the part associated with Standard #1 is never clearly identified and, as a result, no proficiency for this Standard is assigned. In Assessment #3, there is no indication on how the Pass, Incomplete and No credit values are compiled. Assessment #6 rubric or scoring guide is not present. There is no evidence of level of proficiency a candidate must reach on this exam. Assessment #8 no scoring rubric or guide for this assessment and no indication of level of proficiency that a candidate must reach. Assessment #9 there is no indication of level of proficiency that a candidate must reach on the final exam. Assessment #11 the criteria is confusing. This assessment is used for all 4 Standards, but the distinct parts for each standard for the assessment are never clearly articulated. The report indicates the assessment has 35 points assigned and 30 of the points directly associate to content selection and that the candidate must score a 28. It is unclear whether the 28 is out of 30 or 35 and which parts are not associated with Standard #1 and Standard #4. Assessment #2 and #11 need to be more clearly delineated by Standards

Standard 2

1. Assessments are not defined completely.

Rationale: Assessment #2 has been relabeled. A definition of the assessment exists, but no attempt to define the part of the assessment associated with Standard #2 has been made.

2. Assessments are not aligned to the standards.

Rationale: Assessment #2 is not aligned with the content standard. It is not apparent how the assessment meets the Standard #2. The Health Microteaching/Unit Plan is used to meet all 4 Health Standards, however, which parts of the assessment are associated with Standard #2 is never identifed. If an assessment is used for more than one standard, the assessment should clearly define the areas and criteria associated with each Standard. Assessment #11 is not aligned with the content standard. It is not apparent how the assessment meets the Standard #2. The Project-Based Portfolio - Part I Lesson Plan Design is used to meet all 4 Health Standards, however, which parts of the assessment are associated with Standard #2 is never identifed. If an assessment is used for more than one standard, the assessment should clearly define the areas and criteria associated with each standard. Two additional assessments (Resource List and Annotaed Bibliographies) were added, but no clear indication how these are aligned to Standard #2. Not quite sure why these were added.

3. Rubrics and scoring guides do not address context of the standards.

Rationale: Assessment #2 has an 80% proficiency assigned for the entire assessment, but the part associated with Standard #2 is never clearly identified and, as a result, no proficiency for this Standard is assigned. In Assessment #3, there is no indication on how the Pass, Incomplete and No credit values are assigned. Assessment #11 the criteria is confusing. The report indicates the assessment has two parts: Part I is worth 5 points 35 points assigned and 30 of the points directly associate to content selection and that the candidate must score a 28. It is unclear whether the 28 is out of 30 or 35 and which parts are not associated with standard #2.

Standard 3

1. Assessments are not defined completely.

Rationale: Assessment #2 has been relabeled. A definition of the assessment exists, but no attempt to define the part of the assessment associated with Standard #3 has been made.

2. Assessments are not aligned to the standards.

Rationale: Assessment #2 is not aligned with the content standard. It is not apparent how the assessment meets the Standard #3. The Health Microteaching/Unit Plan is used to meet all 4 Health Standards, however, which parts of the assessment are associated with Standard #3 is never identifed Assessment #11 is not aligned with the content standard. It is not apparent how the assessment meets the Standard #3. The Project-Based Portfolio - Part I Lesson Plan Design is used to meet all 4 Health Standards, however, which parts of the assessment are associated with Standard #3 is never identifed.

3. Rubrics and scoring guides do not address context of the standards.

Rationale:Assessment #2 has an 80% proficiency assigned for the entire assessment, but the part associated with Standard #3 is never clearly identified and, as a result, no proficiency for this Standard is assigned. In Assessment #3, there is no indication on how the Pass, Incomplete and No credit values are assigned. Assessment #11 the criteria is confusing. The report indicates the assessment has two parts: Part I is worth 5 points 35 points assigned and 30 of the points directly associate to content selection and that the candidate must score a 28. It is unclear whether the 28 is out of 30 or 35 and which parts are not associated with Standard #3.

Standard 4

1. Assessments are not defined completely.

Rationale: Assessment #2 has been relabeled. A definition of the assessment exists, but no attempt to define the part of the assessment associated with Standard #4 has been made (Standard 4) If an assessment is used for more than one standard, the assessment should clearly define the areas and criteria associated with each Standard. Assessment #11 is not aligned with the content standard. It is not apparent how the assessment meets the Standard #3. The Project-Based Portfolio - Part I Lesson Plan Design is used to meet all 4 Health Standards, however, which parts of the assessment are associated with Standard #3 is never identifed. If an assessment is used for more than one standard, the assessment should clearly define the areas and criteria associated with each standard.

2. Rubrics and scoring guides do not address context of the standards.

Rationale: Assessment #2 has an 80% proficiency assigned for the entire assessment, but the part associated with Standard #4 is never clearly identified and, as a result, no proficiency for this Standard is assigned. In Assessment #3, there is no indication on how the Pass, Incomplete and No credit values are assigned. Assessment #11 the criteria is confusing. The report indicates the assessment has two parts: Part I is worth 5 points 35 points assigned and 30 of the points directly associate to content selection and that the candidate must score a 28. It is unclear whether the 28 is out of 30 or 35 and which parts are not associated with standard #4.

Psychology (I, 6-12)

<u>Areas for Improvement:</u>

Standard 1

1. Assessment #4 does not assess content knowledge in psychology.

Rationale: The KPA rubric does not measure content knowledge.

2. There is no rubric or scoring guide for Assessment #5.

Rationale: Although Exam I content may measure this standard; the process for evaluating performance on Exam 1 is not specified.

3. There is no rubric or scoring guide for Assessment #6.

Rationale: Although Exam IV content may measure this standard; the process for evaluating performance on Exam IV is not specified

Standard 3

1. Assessment #2 does not measure application of major theoretical approaches in psychology.

Rationale: The rubric for evaluating the lesson plan does not indicate the discipline or any attempts to apply theoretical approaches of the discipline.

2. Assessment #3 does not assess application of major theoretical approaches in psychology.

Rationale: Stronge's Checklist does not assess application of major theoretical approaches in psychology.

3. Assessment #4 does not assess application of major theoretical approaches in psychology.

Rationale: The KPA rubric does not measure application of major theoretical approaches in psychology.

4. The expected level of performance for Assessment #9 is not specified.

Rationale: Although maximum point value for each part of the activity is listed, nothing is listed to define various levels of performance (e.g., minimal, target, exceptional with descriptors for performance levels).

5. There is no rubric or scoring guide for Assessment #10.

Rationale: Although the exam in Assessment #10 may measure in part the application of major theoretical approaches, there is no rubric or scoring guide to indicate various levels of performance.

February 1, 2007

To: Dale Dennis, Interim Commissioner

From: Evaluation Review Committee

Subject: Final Recommendation for program approval for The University of Kansas

Introductory Statement:

On November 13, 2006, and January 29, 2007, the Evaluation Review Committee reviewed the application for program approval for many preparation programs for The University of Kansas. A hearing was requested and held on January 29, 2007 relating to Building Leadership, District Leadership, and School Psychologist preparation programs.

Documents that were received and considered by the Evaluation Review Committee included the program review documents, the initial KSDE Team Reports, Institutional Rejoinders to the initial KSDE Team Reports, the final team reports and the hearing materials.

PROGRAM APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION

Recommend "Approved" status for the following programs through December 31, 2012.

Art (I, PreK-12)
Biology (I, 6-12)
Chemistry (I, 6-12)
Earth and Space Science (I, 6-12)
ESOL (A, PreK-12)
Functional (A, K-6, 5-8, 6-12, PreK-12)
Gifted (A, K-6, 5-8, 6-12, PreK-12)
History and Government (I, 6-12)
Journalism (I, 6-12)
Physics (I, 6-12)
Reading Specialist (A, PreK-12)
Science (I, 5-8)

Adaptive (A, K-6, 5-8, 6-12, PreK-12)
Area for Improvement:
Standards 1-7—None

Standard 8

1. No evidence of candidates' demonstrated ethical knowledge and professionalism.

Rationale: *The section "Alignment of Assessment with KSDE Standards" of assessment #10 states "Professional and ethical practices are addressed…"; however, the rubric submitted for assessment #10 does not specifically address professionalism and ethical practices. The rubric doesn't reflect self reflections as a means of demonstrating professionalism and ethical practice.*

Deaf or Hard-of-Hearing (A, PreK-12, Birth –Grade 3)

Areas for Improvement:
Standards 1-2, 4, 6-7—None

Standard 3

1. Assessments do not address overall assessment of students with special needs, only speech (Assessment #6). language assessment (Assessment #7), and aural rehabilitation (Assessment #4).

Rationale: *While candidates take the course Assessment in Early Intervention, skills in assessment of cognitive, motor, social, behaviors, and adaptive skills are not addressed in the assessments attached to this standard. The assessments checked for this standard only focus on assessment skills specific to deaf/hard of hearing students, while the standard reads "evaluation, knowledge, and skills related to students with special needs". Assessment #3 is more comprehensive, but was not checked for this standard.*

Standard 5

1. Assessments are based on case study (Assessment #2) with an individual or focus on speech and language.

Rationale: *Assessment #2 does not address standard 5. Assesment # 3 Summative Teaching Performance Assessment does address this standard but was not checked.*

English Language Arts (I, 5-8)

Areas for Improvement:
Standards 1, 3-4--None

Standard 2

1. Use of non-print texts is not assessed.

Rationale: *Evidence is not present to show that use of non-print texts are assessed.*

English Language Arts (I, 6-12)
Areas for Improvement:
Standards 2-4—None

Area for Improvement:

Standard 1

1. Use of non-print texts is not assessed.

Rationale: *Evidence is not present to show that use of non-print texts are assessed.*

Foreign Language (I, PreK-12)
Areas for Improvement:
Standards 1-3, 5-9—None

Standard 4

1. Section IV assessment description does not clearly demonstrate an adequate level of preparation for PreK-6.

Rationale: *There is absence of performance related to preparation for teaching PreK-6.*

School Psychologist (A, PreK-12)
Areas for Improvement:
Standards 1-11--None

Standard 12

4. No documentation of university faculty on-site supervision.

Rationale: Standard states university field supervisor visits twice each semester. No assessment description was provided for the on-site internship

Recommend "Approved with Stipulation" status for the following programs through December 31, 2008.

Elementary (I, K-6)
Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1

1. There is no assurance candidates will complete action research project in area of reading-language arts.

Rationale: "The data from Action Research Project is not separated by content specific area and this information is unavailable" (pg. 41 Original Report)

Standard 2

1. The assessments do not adequately measure the standard.

Rational: Assessment does not address all of the major processes of mathematics, problem solving and data management. The summative assessment for pre-service teachers also does not assure that these topics are addresses. Review could not consider assessment B – mathematics midterm exam (in excess of 12 assessments)

2. There is no assurance candidates will complete action research project in area of mathematics.

Rational: "The data from Action Research Project is not separated by content specific area and this information is unavailable." (pg. 41 Original Report)

Standard 3

1. There is no assurance candidates will complete action research project in area of science.

Rationale: "The data from Action Research Project is not separated by content specific area and this information is unavailable" (pg. 41 Original Report).

2. The assessments do not adequately measure the standard.

Rationale: Program Review is limited to 12 assessments.

Standard 4

1. There is no assurance candidates will complete action research project in area of social studies.

Rationale: "The data from Action Research Project is not separated by content specific area and this information is unavailable" (pg. 41 Original Report).

Standard 5

1. Not all candidates required to take course for which assessment is designed.

Rationale: *Students can select 2 of the following courses: MEMT 341, VAE 341, TH&F 400*

2. The number of assessments listed is excessive.

Rationale: Program Review is limited to 12 assessments.

Standard 6

1. There is no assurance candidates will complete action research project in area of health education and human movement.

Rationale: "The data from Action Research Project is not separated by content specific area and this information is unavailable" (pg. 41 Original Report).

Standard 7

1. No Rubric was provided.

Rationale: *Criteria of candidate performance not provided.*

Mathematics (I, 5-8)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 6-8 None

Standard 1

1. Assessment 6: Levels of mastery listed in the rubrics and data tables do not indicate what is required to be identified as exemplary mastery, satisfactory mastery, or no mastery.

Rationale 2: *Listing concepts covered, mean scores earned, and points encompassed by each rubric level do not clearly indicate what candidates know at each level*.

2. Assessment 8: Data table does not indicate the level of mastery related to each rating.

Rationale 3: *There is no indication of student mastery for each rubric category -- points earned on assignments and a percent of candidates scoring within each rubric category is presented.*

3. Assessment 9: Data table does not indicate the level of mastery related to each rating.

Rationale 4: *There is no indication of candidate mastery level for each rubric category -- points earned on assignments and a percent of candidates scoring within each rubric category is presented*.

Standard 2

1. Assessment 6: Levels of mastery listed in the rubrics and data tables do not indicate what is required to be identified as exemplary mastery, satisfactory mastery, or no mastery.

Rationale 2: *Listing concepts covered, mean scores earned, and points encompassed by each rubric level do not clearly indicate what candidates know at each level.*

2. Assessment 8: Data table does not indicate the level of mastery related to each rating.

Rationale 3: *There is no indication of candidate mastery for each rubric category -- points earned on assignments and a percent of candidates scoring within each rubric category is presented.*

Standard 3

1. Assessment 6: Levels of mastery listed in the rubrics and data tables do not indicate what is required to be identified as exemplary mastery, satisfactory mastery, or no mastery.

Rationale 2: *Listing concepts covered, mean scores earned, and points encompassed by each rubric level do not clearly indicate what candidates know at each level.*

2. Assessment 8: Data table does not indicate the level of mastery related to each rating.

Rationale 3: *There is no indication of candidate mastery for each rubric category -- points earned on assignments and a percent of candidates scoring within each rubric category is presented.*

Standard 4

1. Assessment 6: Levels of mastery listed in the rubrics and data tables do not indicate what is required to be identified as exemplary mastery, satisfactory mastery, or no mastery.

Rationale 2: *Listing concepts covered, mean scores earned, and points encompassed by each rubric level do not clearly indicate what candidates know at each level.*

2. Assessment 9: Data table does not indicate the level of mastery related to each rating.

Rationale 3: *There is no indication of candidate mastery for each rubric category -- points earned on assignments and a percent of candidates scoring within each rubric category is presented.*

Standard 5

1. Assessment 6: Levels of mastery listed in the rubrics and data tables do not indicate what is required to be identified as exemplary mastery, satisfactory mastery, or no mastery.

Rationale 2: *Listing concepts covered, mean scores earned, and points encompassed by each rubric level do not clearly indicate what candidates know at each level.*

2. Assessment 9: Data table does not indicate the level of mastery related to each rating.

Rationale 3: *There is no indication of candidate mastery for each rubric category -- points earned on assignments and a percent of candidates scoring within each rubric category is presented.*

Standard 9

1. Assessment 4: Rubric/Scoring Guide and Data Table do not indicate the level of mastery related to each rating.

Rationale 1: *There is no indication of candidate mastery level as equated with each rubric category.*

Mathematics (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 6-8 None

Standard 1-5

1. Assessment 6: Levels of mastery listed in the rubrics and data tables do not indicate what is required to be identified as exemplary mastery, satisfactory mastery, or no mastery.

Rationale 2: *Listing concepts covered, mean scores earned, and points encompassed by each rubric level do not clearly indicate what candidates know at each level.*

Standard 7

1. Assessment 6: Levels of mastery listed in the rubrics and data tables do not indicate what is required to be identified as exemplary mastery, satisfactory mastery, or no mastery.

Rationale 2: *Listing concepts covered, mean scores earned, and points encompassed by each rubric level do not clearly indicate what students know at each level.*

2. Assessment 8: There is no indication of candidate mastery level as equated with each rubric category.

Rationale 3: *There is no indication of candidate mastery level as equated with each rubric category.*

Standard 8

1. Assessment 9: Data table does not indicate the level of mastery related to each rating.

Rationale 1: *There is no indication of candidate mastery level for each rubric category -- points earned on assignments and a percent of candidates scoring within each rubric category is presented.*

Standard 9

1. Assessment 4: Rubric/Scoring Guide and Data Table do not indicate the level of mastery related to each rating.

Rationale 1: *There is no indication of candidate mastery level as equated with each rubric category*.

Building Leadership (A, PreK – 12)
Areas for Improvement:
Standards 3, 6, 7—None

Standard 1

1. Data does not provide sufficient evidence that candidates can develop and articulate a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school and community.

Rationale: Rubrics provided for assessments prior to program completion (not including Internship II which is not a program completion requirement) did not specify items relative to Standard #1, specifically the development and articulation of a vision of learning.

Standard 2

1. There is not sufficient evidence that candidates can advocate and nurture a building climate and instructional program that is conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Rationale: Assessments and data do not provide specific evidence that candidates achieve the knowledge and skills identified in Standard #2.

Standard 4

1. Data does not provide sufficient evidence that candidates can collaborate with families and community members, responding to diverse community needs and interests, and mobilizing community resources.

Rationale: Assessments provided do not include components that require candidates to collaborate with families and community members and respond to diverse community needs and interests.

Standard 5

1. Assessments and data provided do not provide sufficient evidence that candidates act with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Rationale: Rubrics provided for assessments prior to program completion (not including Internship II which is not a program completion requirement) did not specify items relative to Standard #5, specifically the ability of candidates to act with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner.

District Leadership (A, PreK-12)
Areas for Improvement:
Standards 2-4, 7—None

Standard 1

1. Data does not provide sufficient evidence that all candidates can develop and articulate a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school and community.

Rationale: Rubrics provided for assessments prior to program completion (not including Internship II which is not a program completion requirement) did not specify items relative to Standard #1, specifically the development and articulation of a vision of learning.

Standard 5

1. Assessments and data provided do not provide sufficient evidence that candidates learn to act with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Rationale: Rubrics provided for assessments prior to program completion (not including Internship II which is not a program completion requirement) do not specify items relative to Standard #5, specifically the ability of candidates to act with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner.

Standard 6

1. Data provides insufficient evidence that candidates respond to, and influence the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Rationale: Assessments do not ensure that candidates have achieved the knowledge and skills related to the components of Standard #6.

91-1-233 and 91-1-234 are reserved for possible future use.

91-1-235. Procedures for initial approval of teacher education programs.

(a) Application.
  (1) Each teacher education institution that desires to have any new program approved by the state board shall submit an application for program approval to the commissioner. The application shall be submitted at least 12 months before the date of implementation.
  (2) Each institution shall submit with its application a program report containing a detailed description of each proposed program, including program coursework based on standards approved by the state board, and the performance-based assessment system that will be utilized to collect performance data on candidates' knowledge and skills. Each program report shall be in the form and shall contain the information prescribed by the commissioner. The program report shall include confirmation that the candidates in the program will be required to complete the following:
    (A) Coursework that constitutes a major in the subject at the institution or that is equivalent to a major; and
    (B) a minimum of 12 weeks of student teaching.

(b) Review team. Upon receipt of a program report, a review team shall be appointed by the commissioner to analyze the program report. The chairperson of the review team shall be designated by the commissioner. The number of review team members shall be determined by the commissioner, based upon the scope of the program to be reviewed. An institution may challenge the appointment of a team member only on the basis of a conflict of interest.

(c) Program review process.
  (1) In accordance with procedures adopted by the state board, a review team shall examine and analyze the proposed program report and shall prepare a report expressing the findings and conclusions of the review team. The review team's report shall be submitted to the commissioner. The report shall be forwarded by the commissioner to an appropriate representative of the teacher education institution.
  (2) An institution may prepare a response to the review team's report. This response shall be prepared and submitted to the commissioner within 30 days of receipt of the review team's report. The review team's report, any response by the institution, and any other supporting documentation shall be forwarded to the evaluation review committee by the commissioner.

(d) Initial recommendation. The evaluation review committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the state board, shall prepare a written initial recommendation regarding the appropriate status to be assigned to the proposed program, which shall include a statement of the findings and conclusions of the evaluation review committee. The recommendation shall be submitted to an appropriate representative of the teacher education institution and to the commissioner.

(e) Request for hearing.
  (1) Within 30 days of the receipt of an initial recommendation of the evaluation review committee, the teacher education institution may submit a written request to the evaluation review committee for a hearing before the committee to appeal the initial recommendation. This request shall specify, in detail, the basis for the appeal, including an identification of each item disputed by the institution.
  (2) If a request for a hearing is submitted, the evaluation review committee shall conduct a hearing. The committee shall then prepare a written final recommendation regarding the appropriate status to be assigned to the proposed program, which shall include a statement of the findings and conclusions of the evaluation review committee. The final recommendation shall be submitted to an appropriate representative of the teacher education institution and to the commissioner. The final recommendation shall be submitted by the commissioner to the state board for its consideration and determination.
  (3) If a request for a hearing is not submitted within the time allowed under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the initial recommendation of the evaluation review committee shall become the final recommendation of the review committee. The committee's final recommendation shall be submitted by the commissioner to the state board for its consideration and determination.

(f) Approval status.
  (1) Each new program shall be approved with stipulation or not approved.
  (2) If a new program is approved with stipulation, that status shall be effective until the institution's next on-site visit.

(g) Annual report.
  (1) If a new program is approved with stipulation, the institution shall submit a progress report to the commissioner within 60 days after completion of the second semester of operation of the program, and thereafter in each of the institution's annual reports that are due on or before October 1, until the institution's next on-site visit.
  (2) Each progress report shall be submitted by the commissioner to the evaluation review committee for its examination and analysis.
(h) Change of approval status.
  (1) At any time, the approval status of a teacher education program may be changed by the state board if, after providing an opportunity for a hearing, the state board finds that the institution either has failed to meet substantially the program standards or has materially changed the program. For just cause, the duration of the approval status of a program may be extended by the state board. The duration of the current approval status of a program shall be extended automatically if the program is in the process of being reevaluated by the state board. This extension shall be counted as part of any subsequent approval period of a program.
  (2) At the time of an institution's next on-site visit, the new program shall be reviewed pursuant to K.A.R. 91-1-236.
  (3) For licensure purposes, each teacher education program that is approved with stipulation shall be considered to be approved. (Authorized by and implementing Article 6, Section 2(a) of the Kansas Constitution; effective Aug. 6, 2004.)

91-1-236. Procedures for renewing approval of teacher education program.

(a) Application for program renewal.
  (1) Each teacher education institution that desires to have the state board renew the approval status of one or more of its teacher education programs shall submit to the commissioner an application for program renewal. The application shall be submitted at least 12 months before the expiration of the current approval period of the program or programs.
  (2) Each institution shall also submit a program report, which shall be in the form and shall contain the information prescribed by the commissioner. The program report shall be submitted at least six months before the expiration of the current approval period of the program or programs. The program report shall include confirmation that the candidates in the program will be required to complete the following:
    (A) Coursework that constitutes a major in the subject at the institution or that is equivalent to a major; and
    (B) a minimum of 12 weeks of student teaching.
(b) Review team. Upon receipt of a complete program report, a review team shall be appointed by the commissioner to analyze the program report. The chairperson of the review team shall be designated by the commissioner. The number of review team members shall be determined by the commissioner, based upon the scope of the program or programs to be reviewed. An institution may challenge the appointment of a review team member only on the basis of a conflict of interest.
(c) Program review process.
  (1) In accordance with procedures adopted by the state board, each review team shall examine and analyze the program report and prepare a review report expressing the findings and conclusions of the review team. The review team's report shall be submitted to the commissioner. The report shall be forwarded by the commissioner to an appropriate representative of the teacher education institution.
  (2) Any institution may prepare a written response to the review team's report. Any response shall be prepared and submitted to the commissioner within 30 days of receipt of the review team's report. The review team's report, any response filed by the institution, and any other supporting documentation shall be forwarded by the commissioner to the evaluation review committee.
(d) Initial recommendation. The evaluation review committee, in accordance with procedures adopted by the state board, shall prepare a written initial recommendation regarding the appropriate status to be assigned to the program or programs, which shall include a statement of the findings and conclusions of the evaluation review committee. The recommendation shall be submitted to an appropriate representative of the teacher education institution and to the commissioner.

(e) Request for hearing.

(1) Within 30 days of the receipt of an initial recommendation of the evaluation review committee, the teacher education institution may submit a written request to the commissioner for a hearing before the evaluation review committee to appeal the initial recommendation of the committee. This request shall specify, in detail, the basis for the appeal, including an identification of each item disputed by the institution.

(2) If a request for a hearing is submitted, the evaluation review committee shall conduct a hearing. The committee shall then prepare a written final recommendation regarding the appropriate status to be assigned to the program or programs, which shall include a statement of the findings and conclusions of the evaluation review committee. The final recommendation shall be submitted to an appropriate representative of the teacher education institution and to the commissioner. The final recommendation shall be submitted by the commissioner to the state board for its consideration and determination of program approval status according to paragraph (f)(1) of this regulation.

(3) If a request for a hearing is not submitted within the time allowed under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the initial recommendation of the evaluation review committee shall become the final recommendation of the review committee. The committee's final recommendation shall be submitted by the commissioner to the state board for its consideration and determination.

(f) Approval status.

(1) The status assigned to any teacher education program specified in this regulation shall be approved, approved with stipulation, or not approved.

(2) Subject to subsequent action by the state board, the assignment of approved status to a teacher education program shall be effective for seven academic years. However, the state board, at any time, may change the approval status of a program if, after providing an opportunity for a hearing, the state board finds that the institution either has failed to meet substantially the program standards adopted by the state board or has made a material change in a program. For just cause, the duration of the approval status of a program may be extended by the state board. The duration of the approval status of a program shall be extended automatically if the program is in the process of being reevaluated by the state board.

(3) (A) If a program is approved with stipulation, that status shall be effective for the period of time specified by the state board, which shall not exceed seven years.

(B) If any program of a teacher education institution is approved with stipulation, the institution shall include in its upgrade report to the commissioner the steps that the institution has taken and the progress that the institution has made during the previous academic year to address the deficiencies that were identified in the initial program review.

(C) The upgrade report shall be submitted by the commissioner to the evaluation review committee for its examination and analysis. After this examination and analysis, the evaluation review committee shall prepare a written recommendation regarding the status to be assigned to the teacher education program for the succeeding academic years. The recommendation shall include a statement of the findings and conclusions of the evaluation review committee. The recommendation shall be submitted to an appropriate representative of the teacher education institution and to the commissioner. If the institution does not agree with this recommendation, the institution may request a hearing according to the provisions in subsection (e).

(D) For licensure purposes, each teacher education program that is approved with stipulation shall be considered to be approved.

(E) Students shall be allowed two full, consecutive, regular semesters following the notification of final action by the state board to complete a program that is not approved. Summers and interterms shall not be counted as part of the two regular semesters. Students who finish within these two regular semesters may be recommended for licensure by the college or university. (Authorized by and implementing Article 6, Section 2(a) of the Kansas Constitution; effective Aug. 6, 2004.)