

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

Official Minutes for June 18, 2012

Present: Ralph Beacham, Connie Ferree, David Hofmeister, Michele Peres, Sue Smith, Martin Stessman, Martin Straub, and Warren White

Absent: Linda Alexander, Judy Johnson, and Ken Weaver.

Resigned: Sharon Klose

Observer: Becky Cheney and Linda Becker-Wille

KSDE Staff: Sungti Hsu,

Called meeting to order—Chair, David Hofmeister

David Hofmeister, chair, called the meeting to order 9:44 a.m.

Approval of Agenda for June 18, 2012

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor and 0 opposed

Approval of April 16, 2012 Minutes

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

Motion carried; 8 in favor and 0 opposed

Discussion

The committee will deliberate their decision concern the accreditation status of Tabor College as a whole committee. Sungti was asked by the chair to remind the members of the committee of the reason for postponement. Sungti briefly explained the accreditation process for the observers and reminded the members that although the accreditation visits are conducted by the KSDE and NCATE joined team, ERC will make the accreditation recommendation for KSBE independent from NCATE. Sungti also reminded the members the three possible accreditation options (accredited for 2 year with a focused visit, accredited

for 2 years with a full visit, and revoke accreditation.) There will be only two options (accredited for 5 years or revoke accreditation) for the institution at its next accreditation visit.

Meeting of Review Teams

The Committee reviewed the agenda items as one team.

Assignments:

Tabor College Accreditation

Donnelly College Accreditation

Emporia State University Accreditation

University of Saint University Accreditation

Donnelly College Programs

Fort Hays State University Biology Upgrade Rpt

Bethany College Programs

Sterling College Programs

Team:

Full committee

David Hofmeister, Chair

Martin Stessman

Sue Smith

Warren White

Becky Cheney, Observer

Connie Ferree, Chair

Ralph Beacham

Michele Peres

Martin Straub

Linda Becker-Wille, Observer

Recommendations for Tabor College (On-Site Accreditation Visit)

KSDE/NCATE Continuing Accreditation Visit

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 3

None

Standard 1

New AFIs

AFI 1.1 **Candidates are not prepared to effectively use a broad range of technology in their instruction to enhance student learning.**

Rationale 1.1 Candidates have limited access to up-to-date technology and do not have the opportunity to learn the skills needed to be able to use technology to teach students in their P-12 classrooms.

Standard 2

Continued Revised AFIs

AFI 2.1 **(Revised) Unit assessment data are neither collected nor analyzed to inform unit operations.**

Rationale 2.1 The unit does not regularly nor systematically collect data on unit operations such as advising, field placement procedures, governance procedures, and facilities.

New AFIs

AFI 2.2 **The unit does not gather data from recent graduates and employers for assessment of programs and unit operations.**

Rationale 2.2 Although unit faculty indicated surveys had been mailed within the past several years and the response rate was low, no data were provided.

AFI 2.3 **Procedures used by the unit in state program reports did not validate all standards are met for all programs.**

Rationale 2.3 Several rubrics and assessment instruments were not aligned with state program standards.

Standard 4

Continued Revised AFIs

AFI 4.1 **(Revised) Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.**

Rationale 4.1 The full time faculty in the unit is 100% Caucasian. The unit invites a school principal, who is of African American heritage, to talk to students enrolled in ED 100. He also teaches ED 318 and ED 319 courses. While most candidates have to complete one of the two courses, candidates who are seeking special education endorsement do not. While this is an improvement, this does not ensure that all candidates will interact with diverse faculty.

New AFIs

AFI 4.2 **Candidates have limited opportunities to work with diverse peers.**

Rationale 4.2 The unit reports 5.36% minority enrollment. Tabor College has 24% minority enrollment. According to the 2009 Kansas Census report, Marion County, Kansas has av5.4% minority population and approximately 20.83% of the population of the State of Kansas is comprised of minority groups.

Standard 5

Continued Revised AFIs

AFI 5.1 **(Revised) There is a lack of evidence of faculty scholarly activities.**

Rationale 5.1 Among the three full-time faculty, there is only one example of faculty scholarly activity.

New AFIs

AFI 5.2 **Not all faculty model best professional practices in teaching.**

Rationale 5.2 Faculty evaluations and candidate and graduate interviews indicate that not all faculty demonstrate effective methods of teaching, including the use of technology.

Standard 6

Continued Revised AFIs

AFI 6.1 **(Revised) The unit does not have adequate support for its administrative operations and assessment system.**

Rationale 6.1 An inadequate number of support personnel limit unit effectiveness to fully implement the assessment system and maintain administrative operations.

New AFIs

AFI 6.2 **Unit administration and full-time faculty have excessive loads.**

Rationale 6.2 When unit full-time faculty responsibilities and candidate supervision are considered, members of the education administration and faculty have excessive loads.

AFI 6.3 **There is insufficient access to up-to-date technology on campus by education candidates.**

Rationale 6.3 Candidates do not have access to up-to-date technologies such as Interactive white boards, document cameras and interactive response systems.

Motion: It was M/S (White/Smith) to retain the areas of improvement

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

Standards 1-6

Motion:

It was M/S (White/Smith) to retain the status of the standards 1 and 3-5 but to modify the status of the standards 2 and 6 as follows:

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

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

Next visit—Spring 2013

Unit Accreditation Status

Motion:

It was M/S (Ferree/White) to recommend the status of “Accreditation for 2 years with a focus visit” through December 31, 2013.

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

Recommendations for Donnelly College (On-Site Accreditation Visit)

KSDE Limited Accreditation Visit

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1, 3-4, and 6

None

Standard 2

New AFI

AFI 2.1 Information is not tagged such that it can be disaggregated in a manner to address the KSDE elementary education or KSDE ESOL standards (not the TESOL Domains), nor the type of NCATE knowledge.

Rationale 2.1 As the data management system is created, in order to gather data specific to the elements of NCATE Standard 1 and to the standards in the program documents, a mechanism to report the data by the standard(s) will be needed.

Standard 5

New AFI

AFI 5.1 **Limited evidence exists to show faculty involvement in scholarship.**

Rationale 5.1 Current Donnelly expectations for scholarship may be a mismatch to the expectations of the state standards. Donnelly faculty do not have a clear expectation in the area of scholarship.

Motion: It was M/S (Smith/White) to retain the areas of improvement

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions

Standards 1-6

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

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions

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

Next visit—Spring 2015

Unit Accreditation Status

Motion: It was M/S (Smith/White) to recommend the status of “Limited Accreditation” through December 31, 2015.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 2 abstention

Recommendations for Emporia State University (On-Site Accreditation Visit)

KSDE/NCATE Continuing Accreditation Visit

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-3 and 5-6

None

Standard 4

New AFI

AFI 4.1 **Candidates have limited/no opportunities to interact with diverse faculty members.**

Rationale 4.1 Based on the data in the 2011-2012 Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty Demographics, three of the 79 full-time and none of the four part time unit faculty represent diversity. Many candidates could complete their entire programs without having significant interactions with diverse faculty.

Motion: It was M/S (White/Stessman) to retain the areas of improvement

Motion carried; 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstentions

Standards 1-6

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

Motion carried; 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstentions

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

Next visit—Fall 2018

Unit Accreditation Status

Motion: It was M/S (White/Stessman) to recommend the status of “Accreditation for 7 years” through December 31, 2018.

Motion carried; 7 in favor, 0 opposed and 1 abstention

Recommendations for University of Saint Mary (On-Site Accreditation Visit)

KSDE/NCATE Continuing Accreditation Visit

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-3 and 5

None

Standard 4

Corrected

AFI 4.1 **Candidates in the M.A. and M.A.T. programs have limited opportunities to interact with diverse peers.**

Rationale 4.1 Recruitment efforts of the university and the unit resulted in steady increases of diverse candidates. At the previous NCATE/KSDE team visit four percent of candidates represented racial diversity. Diverse candidates now are twelve percent of the M.A. and thirteen percent of the M.A.T. program, respectively.

Continued

AFI 4.2 **The M.A.T. faculty is not racially diverse.**

Rationale 4.2 Although diversity has not been achieved, in 2010-2011 searches for three vacancies resulted in no increase of diversity among M.A.T. faculty. Applicants were screened for a doctorate first and minority representation or minority experience and expertise second. The position for Associate Chair of Education was published twice, once in August 2010 and again in January 2011. Vacancies were published in appropriate print and internet sites: Insight to Diversity, Chronicle of Higher Education, and the Kansas City Star (a metropolitan Kansas City newspaper within 30 miles of the unit). Good faith efforts have been shown to recruit diverse faculty.

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

New AFI

AFI 4.3 **Candidates in the initial program and candidates in advanced programs, M.A. and M.A.T., have limited opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.**

Rationale 4.3 Although diversity has not been achieved, in 2010-2011 searches for three vacancies resulted in no increase of diversity among M.A.T. faculty. Applicants were screened for a doctorate first and minority representation or minority experience and expertise second. The position for Associate Chair of Education was published twice, once in August 2010 and again in January 2011. Vacancies were published in appropriate print and internet sites: Insight to Diversity, Chronicle of Higher Education, and the Kansas City Star (a metropolitan Kansas City newspaper within 30 miles of the unit). Good faith efforts have been shown to recruit diverse faculty.

Standard 6

New AFI

AFI 6.1 **The unit lacks an adequate number of support personnel.**

Rationale 6.1 An inadequate number of support personnel limits faculty and administrator effectiveness in providing quality programs.

Motion cont: It was M/S (White/Stessman) to retain the areas of improvement

Motion carried; 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstentions

Standards 1-6

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

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

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

Next visit—Fall 2018

Unit Accreditation Status

Motion: It was M/S (White/Smith) to recommend the status of “Accreditation for 7 years” through December 31, 2018.

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

Recommendations for Donnelly College (New Program Review)

Early-Late Childhood (I, K-6) (New Program)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Smith/White) to recommend the status of “Approved with Stipulation” through December 31, 2014.

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

English for Speaker of Other Languages (A, K-6) (New Program)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7 and 9

None

Standards 8

AFI 8.1 Assessment 2 (Professional Academic Journal for ESL Literacy Unit Plan in ED 315) is not specifically aligned with the standard.

Rationale 8.1 There is no specific reference in Assessment 2 that indicates how candidates will be evaluated in terms of demonstrating "a high level of proficiency in English commensurate with the role of

an instructional model." It is important to note, however, that the rubric (p. 13 of ED 315) and criteria (p. 14) for the ESOL unit and lesson plans do measure candidate understanding and application of linguistic elements both in the writing development and the presentation of a lesson for ESOL students. One additional criterion that specifically addresses candidate writing and speaking English proficiency would provide the necessary specificity for full alignment with the standard.

AFI 8.2 Assessment 5 (Professional Academic Journal in ED 415) is not specifically aligned with the standard.

Rationale 8.2 There is no specific reference in Assessment 5 that indicates how candidates will be evaluated in terms of demonstrating "a high level of proficiency in English commensurate with the role of an instructional model." However, there are several areas in Assessment 5 that provide the necessary specificity for full alignment with the standard. With an additional criterion for measuring candidate writing and speaking proficiency, areas for measuring such proficiency, per se, include the Weekly Reflections (p. 5 of ED 415), the letter to parents (p. 6), the brief summary of the assessment process (p. 6), and the record of notes home (p. 17).

Motion: It was M/S (White/Smith) 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

Recommendations for Fort Hays State University (Upgrade Report)

Biology (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-8 and 10-15

None

Standard 9

AFI 9.1 There is not a description of the level of proficiency candidate needs to score for assessment 3.

Rationale 9.1 It is unclear what candidate needs to score on the assessment to pass. Also, since the instrument is used for multiple standards, the data needs to be disaggregated for each standard. There needs to be a description of which part of the assessment covers which standard.

Note: Revised assessment 3-Under level of performance, the advanced and proficient could possibly be switched in the column.

Standard 16

AFI 16.1 There is not a description of the level of proficiency candidate needs to score for assessment 3.

Rationale 16.1 It is unclear what candidate needs to score on the assessment to pass. Also, since the instrument is used for multiple standards, the data needs to be disaggregated for each standard. There needs to be a description of which part of the assessment covers which standard.

Note: Revised assessment 3-Under level of performance, the advanced and proficient could possibly be switched in the column.

Standard 17

AFI 17.1 **There is not a description of the level of proficiency candidate needs to score for assessment 3.**

Rationale 17.1 It is unclear what candidate needs to score on the assessment to pass. Also, since the instrument is used for multiple standards, the data needs to be disaggregated for each standard. There needs to be a description of which part of the assessment covers which standard.

Note: Revised assessment 3-Under level of performance, the advanced and proficient could possibly be switched in the column.

Standard 18

AFI 18.1 **There is not a description of the level of proficiency candidate needs to score for assessment 3.**

Rationale 18.1 It is unclear what candidate needs to score on the assessment to pass. Also, since the instrument is used for multiple standards, the data needs to be disaggregated for each standard. There needs to be a description of which part of the assessment covers which standard.

Note: Revised assessment 3-Under level of performance, the advanced and proficient could possibly be switched in the column.

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

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

Recommendations for Bethany College (Program Review)

Art (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

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

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

Biology (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-5 and 7-18

None

Standard 6

AFI 6.1 **Assessment 1a cannot be used as a stand-alone assessment.**

Rationale 6.1 The Praxis does not provide specific data for the standard.

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

AFI 6.2 **Assessment 1a cannot be disaggregated for standard 6.**

Rationale 6.2 Two categories of assessment 1a are used to assess standard 6.

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

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

Business (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 2, 4, and 6-8

None

Standard 1

AFI 1.1 The assessments/rubrics do not indicate content knowledge of current technology.

Rationale 1.1 Candidates would have a comprehensive grasp of Standard 1 if they were exposed to Desktop Publishing, Programing, and Web Design. These topics/technology are not addressed by the program assessments

Standard 3

AFI 3.1 There is no evidence that all candidates are required to demonstrate knowledge of curricular trends and issues related to computers and business education before they student teach.

Rationale 3.1 The content knowledge needed to address this standard should be assessed prior to the student teaching experience. The candidates must demonstrate content knowledge prior to comprehensive access to students.

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

Standard 5

AFI 5.1 Standard 5 is not assessed to its entirety.

Rationale 5.1 The program did not present evidence of assessing all components of the standard. The teacher demonstrating an understanding of international business environments was not assessed.

Motion cont.: It was M/S (Perez/Beacham) 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

Chemistry (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-3, 7-9, and 11

None

Standard 4

AFI 4.1 Assessment 3 is not specific to the standard.

Rationale 4.1 Assessment 3 Domain 2 Task 3, the instructional strategy of inquiry is not assessed separately from the instruction strategies.

Note: While the response in the rejoinder presented the intent of using Assessment 3 for this standard, the rubric for the assessment is not specific to the purpose of assessing the candidate's "understanding of the nature of inquiry" and the ability necessary to help students do scientific inquiry.

Standard 5

AFI 5.1 Assessments 3 and 4 do not fully assess the standard.

Rationale 5.1 The assessments for this standard address the instructional use of technology rather than relationship between science and technology in practice.

Note: While the response in the rejoinder presented the intent of using Assessment 3 for this standard, the rubric for the assessment is not specific to the purpose of assessing the candidate's "understanding of the basic relationships between science and technology".

Standard 6

AFI 6.1 Assessments 3 and 4 do not fully assess the standard.

Rationale 6.1 The assessments for this standard do not address the candidate's "understanding of science as a human endeavor".

AFI 6.2 Assessment 2 is not specific to the standard.

Rationale 6.2 Assessment 2 does not specifically assess the candidate's ability to "demonstrate an understanding of science as a human endeavor, of the nature of science, and of science from historical perspectives."

Standard 10

AFI 10.1 Assessment 3 is not specific to the standard.

Rationale 10.1 Assessment 3 does not specifically address the candidate's ability to "relate science to the daily lives and interests of students."

Standard 12

AFI 12.1 Assessment 2 is not aligned to the standard.

Rationale 12.1 In Section IV it is not clearly stated which component of Assessment 2 will be used to assess the candidate's performance on this standard.

Note: The response to previous AFI 12.3 in the rejoinder appeared to be incomplete.

Note: Assessment of a safe laboratory class environment would be appropriate for chemistry.

Standard 13

AFI 13.1 Assessment 3 is not specific to the standard.

Rationale 13.1 The sub-categories identified to be used to assess this standard are embedded into categories with single scores.

Motion cont.: It was M/S (Straub/Peres) to retain the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of "Approved" through December 31, 2017.

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

Early-Late Childhood (I, K-6)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

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

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

English (I, 6-12)
Areas for Improvement:
Standards 1 and 3
None

Standard 2

AFI 2.1 Assessments used to address Standard 2 are unclear.

Rationale 2.1 The grid and the report note the tie of Assessment 7 to the standard. This is clear; however, the description of Assessment 7 says that part of this standard is met by Assessment 6. Neither the grid nor the description of Assessment 6 mentions this.

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

Standard 4

AFI 4.1 Assessment 8 rubric does not ensure candidates will meet this standard.

Rationale 4.1 The assessment contains 7 sections, but only one of the sections speaks to this standard. All other sections speak to general pedagogy. Each section is worth 5 points. Because of this, it is possible for a candidate to receive the lowest score (2 or weak, which is not a passing score) on the section that addresses this standard and still have an overall score of 32 out of 35 on the assessment which is defined as superior. The rejoinder adds to the definition of the terms “competent,” “excellent,” and “superior” to state that the candidate is meeting the standard; however, the points for the scoring still do not guarantee it will be correct.

Motion cont.: It was M/S (Beacham/Peres) to retain 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 1-3, and 5-10
None

Standard 4

AFI 4.1. Assessment 7 (Attachment #11, Integrated Unit Instructions for Methods Courses, and Rubric) does not address all components of the standard.

Rationale 4.1. There is insufficient information of how candidate performance on Assessment 7 will measure the effectiveness of communication with parents and members of various cultural groups in the community.

Note: The rejoinder indicates that Assessment 7 will replace Assessment 4 as one of the two assessments for this standard.

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

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

Health (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-4

None

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

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

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

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-2 and 4-10

None

Standard 3

AFI 3.1 Course expectations for HI102 are not clearly aligned to the standard.

Rationale 3.1 Course expectations include eight quizzes and three research papers with no topical information provided.

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

Motion carried; 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention

Mathematics (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 2, 3, 5, and 7-9

None

Standard 1

AFI 1.1 Proficiency levels for assessments are not clearly defined and/or do not match data provided.

Rationale 1.1 Assessment 6--The rejoinder states 70% (C) is the passing score for all math courses. This percentage/grade is not specifically connected to Assessment 6, but review team assumes that it provides the proficiency standard since assessment 6 is an end of course exam and the grading scale for the course likely applies to the exams too. Not clear how exam score is determined from the exam problems and proofs rubrics. Candidate score is reported as “exemplary” in initial documents (not listed in Standard 1 section of rejoinder), not as a letter grade, so the score reported still doesn’t match the explanation. Assessment 7 – This assessment is a portfolio and none of the documents, including the rejoinder, provide an explanation of how the project and exam problems grading rubrics are applied to the portfolio or how a percentage for the portfolio is determined. The reported score of “exemplary” does not match the percentage scores given on the rejoinder nor does it match rubric descriptions. Assessment 3 – The data table for this assessment provides aggregate scores for each domain, but does not disaggregate scores for the sub-domains aligned to Standard 1 in the rejoinder. Because disaggregated domain scores are not provided, there is no way to verify that the specific sub-domains were met at the proficiency level (which is not specified).

Standard 6

AFI 6.1 Proficiency level stated and data reported do not match.

Rationale 6.1 A grade of C is given as proficiency level, yet assessment description does not state how portfolio grade is determined. (How many work samples from each course? How many tests and how many projects (separate rubrics for each are included)? Are all scored equally for portfolio grade? Etc.) Furthermore, rejoinder gives candidate course grades as evidence, not portfolio score.

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

Standard 4

AFI 4.1 Assessments do not fully cover standard.

Rationale 4.1 Spatial visualization component of standard is not included in descriptions of assessments.

AFI 4.2 Assessment 6 grading criteria not clear and data reported isn't for assessment.

Rationale 4.2 Scoring rubric for assessment 6 is not at all clear. No information on how many "problems" and how many "proofs" (separate rubric for each) are included or how final grade on the test is determined. 70%, C is the level of proficiency for the exam; candidate score is reported as "A for the course" rather than a score for Assessment 6 – Final Exam.

Motion cont.: It was M/S (Straub/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

Music, Instrumental (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1- 3, 6, and 8

None

Standard 4

AFI 4.1 Assessment does not include a rubric.

Rationale 4.1 Insufficient information is included indicating how the data was collected and varified.

Note: This AFI was not addressed in the submitted rejoinder.

Standard 5

AFI 5.1 Assessment does not include a rubric.

Rationale 5.1 Insufficient information is included indicating how the data was collected and varified.

Note: This AFI was not addressed in the submitted rejoinder.

Standard 7

AFI 7.1 Assessment does not include a rubric.

Rationale 7.1 Insufficient information is included indicating how the data was collected and varified.

Note: The committee questions whether data from Assessment 1a may be used in meeting Standard 7

Note: This AFI was not addressed in the submitted rejoinder.

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

Standard 9

AFI 9.1 Inadequate information is provided regarding the candidate's abilitiy to demonstrate advocacy.

Rational 9.1 The institution addresses advocacy in the report but they do not indicate how the advocacy is measured or demonstrated during the process.

Note: This AFI was not addressed in the submitted rejoinder.

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

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

Music, Vocal (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1- 3, 6, and 8

None

Standard 4

AFI 4.1 Assessment does not include a rubric.

Rationale 4.1 Insufficient information is included indicating how the data was collected and varified.

Note: This AFI was not addressed in the submitted rejoinder.

Standard 5

AFI 5.1 Assessment does not include a rubric.

Rationale 5.1 Insufficient information is included indicating how the data was collected and varified.

Note: This AFI was not addressed in the submitted rejoinder.

Standard 7

AFI 7.1 Assessment does not include a rubric.

Rationale 7.1 Insufficient information is included indicating how the data was collected and varified.

Note: The committee questions whether data from Assessment 1a may be used in meeting Standard 7

Note: This AFI was not addressed in the submitted rejoinder.

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

Standard 9

AFI 9.1 Inadequate information is provided regarding the candidate's ablility to demonstrate advocacy.

Rational 9.1 The institution addresses advocacy in the report but they do not indicate how the advocacy is measured or demonstrated during the process.

Note: This AFI was not addressed in the submitted rejoinder.

Motion cont.: It was M/S (Smith/Stessman) to retain the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

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

Physical Education (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1, 3-4, and 6-7

None

Standard 2

AFI 2.1 **Assessment #1 is not aligned to the standard.**

Rationale 2.1 Although the unit did align sub-scores with standards, the unit has identified the category of "Planning, Instruction, and Student Assessment" as meeting both Standard 2 and Standard 5. Sub score data cannot be disaggregated further to align to more than one standard, so this AFI remains.

Note: Assessments 2 and 5 address the standard fully - Standard 2 is MET.

Standard 5

AFI 5.1 **Assessment #1 is not aligned to the standard.**

Rationale 5.1 Although the unit did align sub-scores with standards, the unit has identified the category of "Planning, Instruction, and Student Assessment" as meeting both Standard 2 and Standard 5. Sub score data cannot be disaggregated further to align to more than one standard, so this AFI remains.

Note: The unit has submitted additional information to clarify assessment 6 to show alignment with standards 5 and 6, and submitted data to indicate candidate performance on each standard. The description and data indicate that Assessment 6 addresses Standard 5 well.

Motion: It was M/S (White/Smith) to retain the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of "Approved" through December 31, 2017.

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

Physics (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-13

None

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

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

Speech and Theatre (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 3-6

None

Standard 1

AFI 1.1 **Standard 1 is not addressed in its entirety.**

Rationale 1.1.1 Assessment 3 evaluates candidates teaching performance in general but does not address practical knowledge and skills in teaching and critically evaluating intrapersonal, small group communication, public speaking, listening, and communication theory.

Rationale 1.1.2 Assessment 5 does not address intrapersonal, interpersonal, small group communication, and communication theory.

Standard 2

AFI 2.1 **The team can find no evidence that Assessment 5 measures Standard 2**

Rationale 2.1.1 There are no courses in Assessment 5 that address the evaluation of both debate and forensic co-curricular activities.

Rationale 2.1.2 The Coaching Forensics Practicum (CM 193) measures participation in forensics coaching activity but does not measure the candidate's ability to evaluate debate or forensic co-curricular activities. No data are included for this assessment.

Motion: It was M/S (White/Smith) to retain the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of "Approved" through December 31, 2017.

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

Recommendations for Sterling College (Program Review)

Art (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-6

None

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

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

Biology (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-18

None

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

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

Chemistry (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-3, 6-11, and 13

None

Standard 4

AFI 4.1 Revised Assessment 6 is not clearly aligned with Standard 4.

Rationale 4.1 The rubric for Assessment 6 does not address the candidates' "understanding of the nature of inquiry and the ability to help students do scientific inquiry"

Note: None of the four portions of the rubric for assessment 6 specifically address the inquiry that may be required in the project. Data specific to this standard cannot be collected from this rubric. The addendum that was added to Assessment 3 (goal 6) does assess the standard.

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

Standard 5

AFI 5.1 ED406 Natural Science Methods course does not clearly assess the standard.

Rationale 5.1 ED406 Natural Science Methods course does not include a rubric to assess the required technology plan that will address this standard.

Standard 12

AFI 12.1 ED406 Natural Science Methods course does not clearly assess the standard.

Rationale 12.1 ED406 Natural Science Methods course does not include a rubric to assess the required safety plan that will address this standard.

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

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

Elementary (I, K-6)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

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

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

English (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-3

None

Standard 4

AFI 4.1 The alignment between assessment 2 and the entire standards is unclear.

Rationale 4.1 The description of Assessment 2 indicates that “The candidate will show the use of...reading strategies...” No other part of the standard is mentioned.

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

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

Health (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-4

None

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

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

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

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-10

None

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

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

Mathematics (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-5, 7, and 9

None

Standard 6

AFI 6.1 **Determination of course grades (Asmt 5) is not clearly stated.**

Rationale 6.1 Need to explicitly state how grade is determined (tests, homework, projects, etc. and weighting of each). Syllabus is referenced but not included.

Note: No response or supporting documents for this standard were provided in the rejoinder.

Standard 8

AFI 8.1 **Determination of course grades (Asmt 5) is not clearly stated.**

Rationale 8.1 Need to explicitly state how grade is determined (tests, homework, projects, etc. and weighting of each). Syllabus is referenced but not included.

Note: No response or supporting documents for this standard were provided in the rejoinder.

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

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

Music (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-8

None

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

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

Physical Education (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

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

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

Speech Theatre (I, 6-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-3 and 5-6

None

Standard 4

AFI 4.1 Assessment 5D does not measure all components of Standard 4.

Rationale 4.1 Assessment 5D does measure practical content knowledge of Directing, but does not measure skills in teaching and critically evaluating technical theatre, design, history, dramatic literature, or performance techniques.

Note: Assessment 6, not listed as an assessment for this standard, does measure all these additional components thoroughly and completely.

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

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

Committee Deliberations and Actions

Deliberations and actions began at 1:32 p.m.

Discussion

The committee voted for the office of committee chair and vice chair for the 2012-2013 academic year. Dr. David Hofmeister was elected as the chair (7 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention) and Dr. Warren White was elected as the vice chair (7 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention).

The committee members thanked the out-going members Connie Ferree and Judy Johnson for their contribution, expertise, and service for the past 6 years. The commit members also thanked Sue Smith for her work and wished her good will for her retirement.

The committee also scheduled the committee meeting dates for the 12-13 academic year. The committee will be meeting on November 12, 2012; January 14, 2013; April 8, 2013; and June 10, 2013. The committee also agreed on holding an additional meeting in September, 2012 if it is necessary. Sungti will contact the members to set a date when the need arises.

Adjourn

It was decided by consensus to adjourn at 1:54 p.m.