

EVALUATION REVIEW COMMITTEE
OF THE TEACHING AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS ADVISORY BOARD
Kansas State Department of Education
Conference Call

Official Minutes for April 16, 2012

Present: Ralph Beacham, Connie Ferree, David Hofmeister, Judy Johnson, Sharon Klose, Michele Peres, Martin Stessman, Martin Straub, Ken Weaver, and Warren White

Absent: Linda Alexander, Sue Smith

KSDE Staff: Sungti Hsu,

Called meeting to order—Chair, David Hofmeister

David Hofmeister, chair, called the meeting to order 9:33 a.m.

Approval of Agenda for January 27, 2012

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

Motion carried; 10 in favor and 0 opposed

Approval of April 16, 2012 Minutes

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

Motion carried; 10 in favor and 0 opposed

Discussion

The Committee Chair requested to change the venue for the meeting from in Topeka to a phone conference. Of the items on the agenda, only the biology program upgrade report form FHSU seems complex.

Meeting of Review Teams

The Committee reviewed the agenda items as one team.

Assignments:

FHSU —Biology Upgrade Report
Ottawa University Programs
Ottawa University—Bldg Ldr Progress Report
Wichita State University—ECU Progress Report

Team:

David Hofmeister, Chair
Linda Alexander—absent
Ralph Beacham
Connie Ferree
Judy Johnson
Sharon Klose
Michele Peres
Sue Smith—absent
Martin Stessman
Martin Straub
Warren White
Ken Weaver

Recommendations for Fort Hays State University—(Upgrade Report)

Biology (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

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

None

Standard 5

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

Rationale 5.1 There is not a specific description of how Principles of Biology covers the standard. Comment: The rejoinder comments that BIOL 180 is not required, therefore to not use the assessment. However, it is a required course. Also, it is unclear if Human Anatomy and Physiology covers animal behavior.

Standard 6

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

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

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

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

Standard 9

9.1 A rubric was not provided for assessment 3.

Rationale 9.1 It is unclear how candidate earn points. There is a lack of criteria for earning points. Comment: The rejoinder address the program is revising the rubric in August of 2009.

Standard 12

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

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

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

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

Standard 13

13.1 A rubric was not provided for assessment 3.

Rationale 13.1 It is unclear how candidate earn points. There is a lack of criteria for earning points.
Comment: The rejoinder address the program is revising the rubric in August of 2009.
*Note: Assessment 6 is needed to meet the standard in its entirety. Once data is available, it will help support the standard.

Standard 14

14.1 A rubric was not provided for assessment 3.

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

14.2 Assessment 3 does not align with the standard.

Rationale 14.2 There is lack of evidence the teacher can integrate content within the sciences and among other disciplines.
Comment: PHYS 606 assessment covers the standard in its entirety.

Standard 15

15.1 A rubric was not provided for assessment 3.

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

15.2 Assessment 3 does not align with the standard.

Rationale 15.2 There is lack of evidence the teacher can relate students to the daily lives and interests of students.
Comment: PHYS 606 assessment covers the standard in its entirety.
*Note: Assessment 6 is needed to meet the standard in its entirety. Once data is available, it will help support the standard.

Standard 16

16.1 A rubric was not provided for assessment 3.

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

Standard 17

17.1 A rubric was not provided for assessment 3.

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

Standard 18

18.1 A rubric was not provided for assessment 3.

Rationale 18.1 It is unclear how candidate earn points. There is a lack of criteria for earning points.
Comment: The rejoinder address the program is revising the rubric in August of 2009.

Motion: It was M/S (Ferree/Johnson) to forward the upgrade report to the biology program review team for examining the evidence contained in the report and submit to the ERC a final report of recommendation at the June 18, 2012 meeting.

Motion carried; 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Recommendations for Ottawa University programs

Art (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Ferree/White) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Biology (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-18

None

Motion: It was M/S (Ferree/White) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Early-Late Childhood (I, K-6)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Ferree/White) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

English (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1, 3-4

None

Standard 2

AFI 2.1 No guarantee that the entire standard will be met by all candidates

Rational 2.1 Development of the English language could be met by Assessment 7. The report notes that the candidates must write a paper. It lists possible options for the paper. Only two of those options would meet the needs of the standard.

Motion: It was M/S (Ferree/White) to retain the area of improvement and to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

History, Government, and Social Studies (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-10

None

Motion: It was M/S (Ferree/White) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Mathematics (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-9

None

Motion: It was M/S (Ferree/White) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Physical Education (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Ferree/White) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Recommendations for Ottawa University—(Progress Report)

Building Leadership (A, PreK-12) (New Program)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-6

None

Motion: It was M/S (Ferree/Johnson) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Recommendations for Wichita State University—(Progress Report)

Early Childhood Unified (I, Birth – Grade 3) (New Program)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-13

None

Motion: It was M/S (Straub/Beachem) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2014.

Motion carried; 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Committee Deliberations and Actions

Deliberations and actions began at 9:40 a.m.

Discussion

The committee members request Sungti to provide some options for the meeting dates for the academic year 2012-2013. The meetings will be held in November, 2012, January, April, and June 2013.

Before the meeting concluded, Sungti reminded the committee members that the next ERC meeting will be held on 06/18/2012 at KSDE boardroom in Topeka. It is agreed that the meeting will begin at 10:00 a.m.. It is expected that there will be from up to five institutions to review. Due to the number of programs, lunch will be provided.

The Chair invited committee members who may be interested in running for the posts of committee chair and vice chair to contact him.

The Chair also reminded the committee member that the agenda will include 2011-2012 goal review and goal setting for 2012-2013 academic year. It is also requested that Sungti will review the Institutional Handbook for Program Approval with the committee members.

The accreditation decision for Tabor College will be review during the June 2012 meeting. The Chair refreshed the committee members’ memory regarding the decision postponement during the November, 2011 meeting. Sungti reported to the committee that the supplemental rejoinder has been submitted and uploaded on the Document Warehouse.

Adjourn

It was decided by consensus to adjourn at 10:22a.m.