

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

Official Minutes for November 9, 2012

Present: Ralph Beacham, Linda Becker, James Carnes, David Hofmeister, Greg Mann, Michele Peres, Martin Stessman, and Warren White

Absent: Becky Cheney and Ken Weaver

KSDE Staff: Sungti Hsu, Janet Williams

Called meeting to order—Chair, David Hofmeister

David Hofmeister, chair, called the meeting to order 10:07 a.m.

Approval of Agenda for November 9, 2012

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor and 0 opposed

Approval of September 14, 2012 Minutes

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor and 0 opposed

Meeting of Review Teams

The Committee reviewed the agenda items as one team.

Assignments:

Newman University Upgrade Reports
Newman University Hearing

Team:

David Hofmeister
Warren White
Ralph Beacham
Linda Becker
James Carnes
Greg Mann
Michele Peres
Martin Stessman

Newman University Hearing

ERC Hearing Notes
November 9, 2012

ERC Members in attendance:

David Hofmeister
Greg Mann
Warren White
Linda Becker-Willie
Martin Stessman
James Carnes
Michele Peres

Newman University staff in attendance:

Steven E. Dunn, Unit Head for School of Education
Max Fraizer, Program Director of Secondary Education
Karen Rogers, Program Director of Elementary Education
Sandra Bequette, Program director of Early Childhood Unified
Gina Marx, Program Director of Graduate Education

The hearing began promptly at 10:11 a.m. with Chairman David Hofmeister reviewing the hearing procedures to the group followed by introductions of committee members and KSDE staff.

10:17 am

Dr. Steve Dunn

Introductory remarks were made by Steve Dunn, Unit Head for School of Education at Newman University as well as introductions of his staff. He began by explaining how they arrived at this point. The staff members are dedicated professionals who take their work seriously and care deeply for their students. They began with a visit from KSDE's Jeanne Duncan who met with their program chairs and they took her suggestions forward as they began writing their program review submissions. When the programs came back as not approved they began to work on their rejoinders. Once again they thought they understood the process.

On March 1, 2012 they submitted the programs for review and they were notified on April 4, 2012 that only one of their six programs was approved. Unfortunately as Unit Head he was unaware of the invitation he had to meet with the program review committees during the program review process in Topeka. Had he attended he could have responded to concerns, listened to suggestions and provided clear guidance to his faculty. This was the first big mistake.

A second mistake they made was to decide against contacting the program review chairs. They did not want to frustrate the chairs by contacting them to enlist their help while crafting the rejoinders.

The NU faculty discussed the idea of working with the program review committee chairs to craft the first rejoinders but decided they did not want to frustrate the chairs by contacting them. As a result, most of

their responses to the AFIs were inadequate and the programs still did not meet the standards. Dunn immediately contacted Sungti who met with them and helped answer their questions.

Then the ERC ruled not to approve their programs again. They were stunned and embarrassed. They contacted David Hofmeister who told them they had to work closely with the committee chairs to write their second rejoinders. The committee chairs were contacted and they were wonderful to work with and it made all of the difference in their rejoinders. The entire process changed due to their assistance and clear directions. The experience has been painful but it was a learning experience.

They now know appropriate program review protocol and procedure. The university is developing a data management system that will improve their ability to gather, enter and analyze their data.

10:21 am

Elementary Program

Dr. Karen Rogers

The goal has been to meet the standards. They are excited about the revisions of their program and feel it now aligns with the KSDE program standards. They looked at the program and realized they had great things to bring out of the program. Their close work with the program review team chair, Jerri Brooks, was helpful and enthusiastic. They looked at each element of the program and this made it easy to work with. New eyes made a difference and helped inform their practice. They used sub scores from the Praxis II exams and compared them to their exams. Data was not collected as needed. They developed a comprehensive content exam that addresses each element of the standard. They redid their rubrics to address the problems with not aligning to the standards. They also changed their assessments to address the standards. They have added excitement to their own program as they looked at it with different eyes to see each element. Questions from the committee were addressed by Dr. Rogers.

10:36 am

Secondary Education Programs

English Language Arts

Dr. Max Frazier

Our goal was to effectively meet the standards set by the State of Kansas and to create good programs that will produce good quality teachers for our communities, schools and students. The second rejoinder was produced after spending time with the team chair talking about the AFIs for each of the standards. The AFIs all revolved upon the lack of data. They had new assessments and rubrics that had not been put into place yet; therefore they had no data to report. This resulted AFIs and the programs not being approved. The program met the standards but lacked data. The help they received from the team chair was invaluable. Questions from the committee were addressed by Dr. Frazier including information about when the new assessments and rubrics would be put into place which will be Fall of 2013.

10:44 am

History and Government

Dr. Max Frazier

Following the first rejoinder they were able to meet seven of the ten program standards and then they contacted the team chair for guidance. They received great feedback on how to meet the remaining three standards. Got clarification on content for the standards, worked with the content faculty rather than the education faculty. He worked with them to beef up the rubric for the assessment and identify the weaknesses in the program. They were able to provide additional information, a more specific rubric, and clarify some expectations for a project. The team chair wrote a letter stating they were able to meet two of the three remaining unmet standards. They are still working on meeting the remaining AFI.

10:46 am

Graduate Programs
Building Leadership
Dr. Gina Marx

This process provided opportunity for change and they were thankful they could speak with the team chair. There were leadership gaps involved with this program, had a change in directors. Their program was aligned to ISLLC standards and now they have aligned to the program standards as needed. The provost is onboard and they are creating a customized database so they can collect and use the correct data.

10:52 am
Graduate Programs
ESOL
Dr. Gina Marx

This is their largest program. Initially nine of ten standards were met but they began to revamp the program totally integrating the correct standards. They poured hours of works into this program and are proud of the results. The collaborative efforts with the team chair really paid off. Questions from the committee were addressed by Dr. Marx.

10:59 am
Motion to close the open meeting by Warren White; seconded by Michele Peres; approved unanimously.

11:00 am
Motion to move into executive session for 15 minutes by Greg Mann; seconded by Martin Stessman; approved unanimously.

11:15 am
Motion to extend executive session for 30 minutes by Warren White; seconded by Linda Becker-Wille; approved unanimously.

11:35 am
Motion to end executive session by Warren White; seconded by Ralph Beacham; approved unanimously.

Committee Deliberations and Actions

Deliberations and actions began at 11:46 a.m.

Recommendations for Newman University (Progress Report)

Early Childhood Unified (I, Birth-Grade 3)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-4, 6, 8-13

None

Standard 5

AFI 5.1 Assessments do not meet Standard 5 entirely.

Rationale 5.1 Assessments and field experiences do not indicate candidates establish, maintain and promote learning in all natural environments--specifically home.

Standard 7

AFI 7.1 Assessments do not indicate all settings.

Rationale 7.1 Assessments and field experiences reference accredited preschool settings which may not include all natural settings, specifically the home.

Motion: It was M/S (Beacham/Peres) to retain the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of “Approved with Stipulation” through December 31, 2014.

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

Reading Specialist (A, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1, 4-5

None

Standard 2

AFI 2.1 Assessment 2 also provides verification for standard 2.

Rationale: 2.1 Within the narrative of assessment 2, references to standard 2 meeting requirements are provided. However it is not identified on the Standards Assessment Chart.

Standard 3

AFI: 3.1 Assessment 2 also provides verification for standard 3.

Rationale: 3.1 Within the narrative of assessment 2, references to standard 3 meeting requirements are provided. However it is not identified on the Standards Assessment Chart.

Motion: It was M/S (Hofmeister/White) to table the item and request additional information and data from the institution.

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

Recommendations for Newman University (Program Review)

Building Leadership (A, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1

AFI 1.1 Narratives provide limited data analysis as well as an interpretation of how that data provides evidence that candidates are meeting the standard.

Rationale 1.1 Data analysis is lacking describing candidate performance and evidence of mastery of the standard.

Standard 2

AFI 2.1 Narratives provide limited data analysis as well as an interpretation of how that data provides evidence that candidates are meeting the standard.

Rationale 2.1 Data analysis is lacking describing candidate performance and evidence of mastery of the standard.

Standard 3

AFI 3.2 Narratives provide limited data analysis as well as an interpretation of how that data provides evidence that candidates are meeting the standard.

Rationale 3.2 Data analysis is lacking describing candidate performance and evidence of mastery of the standard.

Standard 4

AFI 4.2 Narratives provide limited data analysis as well as an interpretation of how that data provides evidence that candidates are meeting the standard.

Rationale 4.2 Data analysis is lacking describing candidate performance and evidence of mastery of the standard.

Standard 5

AFI 5.2 Narratives provide limited data analysis as well as an interpretation of how that data provides evidence that candidates are meeting the standard.

Rationale 5.2 Data analysis is lacking describing candidate performance and evidence of mastery of the standard.

Standard 6

AFI 6.2 Narratives provide limited data analysis as well as an interpretation of how that data provides evidence that candidates are meeting the standard.

Rationale 6.2 Data analysis is lacking describing candidate performance and evidence of mastery of the standard.

Motion: It was M/S (Stessman/Peres) to remove the areas for improvement and

AFI 3.1 Alignment of assessment 4 to standard 3 is not apparent.

Rationale 3.1 It is unclear that the activity explained as managing a one-year budget in the School Development Project is sufficient to address the standard. The rubric does not provide assurance that the standard will be met in full.

Standard 4

AFI 4.1 Alignment of assessment 4 to standards 4 is not apparent.

Rationale 4.1 It is not apparent that the scoring rubric for the School Development Project ensures sufficient experience in mobilizing the community resources to promote the success of all students.

Standard 5

AFI 5.1 Alignment of assessment 5 to standard 5 is not apparent.

Rationale 5.1 The rubric does not assure that the educational leader will act with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner.

Standard 6

AFI 6.1 Alignment of assessment 5 to standard 6 is not apparent.

Rationale 6.1 It is unclear how educational leaders understand, respond to, and influence the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Motion (cont.): It was M/S (Stessman/Peres) to modify the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of “Approved with Stipulation” through December 31, 2014.

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

Elementary (I, K-6)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 2

None

Standard 1

AFI 1.1 Pass rate criterion for Assessment 1a subscores are not identified nor included.

Rationale 1.1 Assessment 1a program subscore cut scores are not included in the report. The score range for proficient is omitted from the tables and narrative.

Standard 3

AFI 3.1 Pass rate criterion for Assessment 1a subscores are not identified nor included.

Rationale 3.1 Assessment 1a program subscore cut scores are not included in the report. The score range for proficient is omitted from the tables and narrative.

Standard 4

AFI 4.1 Pass rate criterion for Assessment 1a subscores are not identified nor included.

Rationale 4.1 Assessment 1a program subscore cut scores are not included in the report. The score range for proficient is omitted from the tables and narrative.

Standard 5

AFI 5.1 Pass rate criterion for Assessment 1a subscores are not identified nor included.

Rationale 5.1 Assessment 1a program subscore cut scores are not included in the report. The score range for proficient is omitted from the tables and narrative.

Standard 6

AFI 6.1 Pass rate criterion for Assessment 1a subscores are not identified nor included.

Rationale 6.1 Assessment 1a program subscore cut scores are not included in the report. The score range for proficient is omitted from the tables and narrative.

Standard 7

AFI 7.1 Pass rate criterion for Assessment 1a subscores are not identified nor included.

Rationale 7.1 Assessment 1a program subscore cut scores are not included in the report. The score range for proficient is omitted from the tables and narrative.

Motion: It was M/S (Mann/White) to remove the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of “Approved with Stipulation” through December 31, 2014.

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

English (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1

AFI 1.1 Data are missing.

Rationale 1.1 Assessment 2 has been revised with an addendum. This change is so recent that there are no scores for this addendum.

Standard 2

AFI 2.1 Data are missing.

Rationale 2.1 Assessment 2 has been revised with an addendum. This change is so recent that there are no scores for this addendum.

Standard 3

AFI 3.1 Data are missing.

Rationale 3.1 Assessment 2 has been revised with an addendum. This change is so recent that there are no scores for this addendum.

Standard 4

AFI 4.1 Data are missing.

Rationale 4.1 Assessment 2 has been revised with an addendum. This change is so recent that there are no scores for this addendum.

Motion: It was M/S (White/Peres) to remove the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

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

English for Speakers of Other Languages (A, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1 and 7

None

Standard 2

AFI 2.1 The modifications made on Assessment 8 do not verify candidate understanding of the standard.

Rationale 2.1 There is no reference made in the rubric which is used to assess candidate understanding of the fundamentals, similarities, and differences of first- and second-language acquisition. The "Creativity" criterion that specifies "evidence the student included an additional element(s) to demonstrate understanding of the standard" does not specifically require candidate understanding of this standard.

Standard 3

AFI 3.1 The modifications made on Assessment 7, namely 7a, 7b, and 7c, do not meet all the components of the standard.

Rationale 3.1 Candidate acknowledgement of the role that language plays in the development of cultural identities and of the diverse historical tapestry of cultures that make up the U. S. is not specifically addressed in:

3.1.1. 7a (Multi-Cultural Action Plan Report, Options 1 and 2, and the Rubric).

3.1.2. 7b (Service Learning Report). The identification of an accommodation problem/issue with regard to a different culture is a valuable expectation, but does not meet the standard. The rubric Creativity criterion of "evidence the student included an additional element(s) to demonstrate understanding of this standard" lacks specificity.

3.1.3. 7c (Personal Ethnicity Statement / content analysis). While one of the expectations asks, "How is your view of ethnicity related to diversity factors with an emphasis on language development as part of our ethnicity," is sufficient, the specification of "your view of sameness or difference with majority culture" does not specify diverse, non-majority cultures in the U. S. The rubric used for this component only assesses personal cultural identity and does not measure candidate acknowledge of the role of language or the historical tapestry of U. S. cultures.

Standard 4

AFI 4.1 The modifications made on Assessment 6 do not measure the effectiveness of candidate communication with students, parents, and community cultural groups.

Rationale 4.1.1 The rubric criterion of "Review of the activity" only assesses a candidate's review of communication with these groups in terms of the written review of the activity being clear and identifying three or more examples and the impact of the activity. Candidate effectiveness in communication with the three groups is not measured.

Rationale 4.1.2 The "Creativity" criterion does not specify the evaluation of candidate effectiveness in communication with all three groups. It only provides written evidence of what "the student included as an additional element(s) to demonstrate understanding of the standard."

Standard 5

AFI 5.1 While the modifications made on Assessment 2 meet the standard, those made on Assessment 5 do not.

Rationale 5.1 The rubric on Assessment 5 used to gauge candidate understanding of this standard targets candidate collaborative supports. The "Creativity" criterion of "evidence the student include an additional element(s) to demonstrate understanding of this standard" lacks specificity in terms of using language and developing communication skills in multiple domains.

Standard 6

AFI 6.1 The modified rubric on Assessment 3 does not measure all components of the standard.

Rationale 6.1. The rubric on Assessment 3 does not measure candidate understanding of formal and informal first- and second-language assessment techniques.

AFI 6.2 The modified rubric on Assessment 4 does not measure all components of the standard.

Rationale 6.2 There is no indication on Assessment 4 of how candidate understanding of formal and informal first- and second-language assessment techniques will be measured. Neither the rubric criteria for "Participate in and/or observe the process of an individual student's language program document" nor the "Flow chart of entrance/Exit/Placement Processes for both school/school district" measure candidate awareness of formal and informal first- and second-language assessment techniques. The criterion for "Creating" lacks specificity to determine candidate awareness and use of assessment tools.

Standard 8

AFI 8.1 Assessment 7 does not address or measure all components of the standard.

Rationale 8.1 While the revised rubric for Assessment 7d does specifically measure candidate proficiency in written English commensurate with the role of an instructional model, it neither addresses nor measures oral and visual English proficiency commensurate with this role. It is noteworthy, however, that all assessment rubrics (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7a, 7b, 7c, and 8) provide a measure of candidate proficiency in writing. With such emphases on English proficiency, albeit solely targeting the written domain, a rationale for meeting the standard is justified.

Standard 9

AFI 9.1 The modified rubric for Assessment 3 does not meet the standard.

Rationale 9.1 Although Assessment 3 targets the adaptation of assessments for ESL students with special needs, neither candidate understanding and use of a variety of methods for ESL students with special needs nor the ability to adapt existing materials for instruction is measured by the rubric on Assessment 3.

Standard 10

AFI 10.1 Assessment 3 is not aligned with the standard.

Rationale 10.1 The modified rubric for Assessment 3 does not measure candidate understanding of a broad range of literacy methodologies for English language learners or the acknowledgement of the important role of family literacy in second language acquisition.

AFI 10.2 Assessment 6 is not aligned with the standard.

Rationale 10.2 The rubric for Assessment 6 measures the ability of a candidate to identify, describe, and provide examples of communication or involvement activities. However, there is neither documentation of candidate understanding and use of a broad range of literacy methodologies, programs, and assessment tools, nor documentation of the important role of family literacy in second language acquisition.

Motion: It was M/S (Mann/Beacham) to remove the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of "Approved with Stipulation" through December 31, 2014.

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

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

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8

None

Standard 9

AFI 9.1 Information explaining Assessment 5 is incomplete.

Rationale 9.1 The report guidelines indicate that course grades used in Assessment 5 must include key activities, projects, and assessments that are aligned to each standard. The following information from the rejoinder indicates two assignments from the course assessing this standard, "...Reading Reflections: 20% - The purpose of the assignment is to boost student participation and engage the class in exciting dialogue regarding course content. Research Paper: 40%." Sixty percent of the course grade is determined through the two activities without explanations as to what expectations are associated with the activities or how either activity is graded.

Motion: It was M/S (White/Mann) to retain the areas for improvement and

Standard 2

AFI 2.1 Assessment six is not fully aligned with the scoring rubric.

Rationale 2.1 While Assessment six is identified to assess candidate learning, the clarity between the guidelines for Assessment six and the scoring rubric for assessment lack alignment. For example, the Document Analysis Activity for Assessment six has four parts to it. Are the questions associated with groups 1-3 in the Assessment six scoring rubric pertinent to the paper on Pearl Harbor or Title IX? There is insufficient information to fully determine how the assignment and scoring rubric are aligned to assess the standard.

AFI 2.2 Assessment six does not include world history.

Rationale 2.2 Standard two addresses world history but the assessment of standard two appears to align only with U.S. history.

Standard 4

AFI 4.1 The course based grade does not evaluate the entire standard.

Rationale 4.1 The grade does not clearly indicate how essential analytical skills are evaluated.

Standard 7

AFI 7.1 Information explaining Assessment 5 is incomplete.

Rationale 7.1 The report guidelines indicate that course grades used in Assessment 5 must include key activities, projects, and assessments that are aligned to each standard. The case study as well as the report/presentation represent 20% and 15% of the grade, respectively. Neither is explained so alignment with the standard is not evident. There is no information on how either project is scored.

Standard 10

AFI 10.1 Information explaining Assessment 5 is incomplete.

Rationale 10.1 The report guidelines indicate that course grades used in Assessment 5 must include key activities, projects, and assessments that are aligned to each standard. The Code of the Streets activities lack clarity relative to the standard. The written activities are not explained. Approximately 33% of the grade for the course come from these two activities. While it is clear both are associated with the standard, alignment is not clearly developed.

Motion: It was M/S (White/Mann) to remove the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

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

Discussion

Sungti tells the committee members that the opportunities to observe accreditation and program review processes will be available in the near future and please let him know if interested in taking advantage of the opportunities.

Adjourn

It was decided by consensus to adjourn at 12:10 pm.