

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

Official Minutes for June 05, 2019
Hybrid meeting in-person in Topeka and online via Zoom

Present: Jean Dockers, Beverly Furlong, Allen Jantz, Stephanie McNemar, Daniel Minde, Steve Noble, Leticia Porter, Cheryl Reding, Kathleen Sanders, Shauna Tinich, Brent Wolf [11]

Absent: Brian Gee, Neely Gower

KSDE Staff: Catherine Chmidling

Guest: Idalia Shuman, KNEA

Called meeting to order - Cheryl Reding, Chair
Kathleen Sanders, Vice-Chair

Cheryl Reding, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:03 am.

Approval of Agenda for June 05, 2019

Motion: It was M/S (Minde / Sanders) to approve the agenda.

Motion carried: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained

Approval of Minutes for April 03, 2019

Tinich corrected that she was not present at the April 03, 2019 meeting. The minutes were revised accordingly.

Motion: It was M/S (Sanders / Tinich) to approve the Minutes as revised.

Motion carried: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained

Approval of ERC Annual Report for 2018-2019

The annual report will be updated to include attendance and actions from the June 05, 2019 meeting.

Motion: It was M/S (Dockers / McNemar) to approve the annual report.

Motion carried: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained

Election of Officers for 2019-2020

Reding nominated Kathi Sanders and Jean Dockers to serve as co-chairs.

Jantz seconded.
There were no other nominations.

Election: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstaining

Meeting of the Committee

Committee	Institution Being Reviewed: Review Purpose
Dr. Cheryl Reding, Chair Dr. Kathleen Sanders, Vice Chair Dr. Jean Dockers Ms. Beverly Furlong Mr. Brian Gee (absent) Ms. Neely Gower (absent) Dr. Allen Jantz Dr. Stephanie McNemar Mr. Daniel Minde Dr. Steve Noble Dr. Leticia Porter Ms. Shauna Tinich Dr. Brent Wolf	Emporia State University – Accreditation University of Saint Mary – Accreditation Bethany College – Programs – Art, Business, Elementary, ESOL, History-Government-SocialStudies Fort Hays State University – Program – Elementary (New) Friends University – Program – Biology new program progress report Newman University – Programs – Building Leadership, District Leadership, English for Speakers of Other Languages Ottawa University – Programs – Elementary, Mathematics 6-12 Pittsburg State University – Programs – Early Childhood Unified B-K (New); High Incidence K-6 MAT (New) Sterling College – Programs – History, Government, Social Science; Music; Speech/Theatre

Chmidling noted that program expiration dates were set to June or December to better reflect the two-year approval timeframe of new programs and seven-year approval timeframe of continuing programs.

Recommendations for Emporia State University – Onsite Accreditation Visit

KSDE/CAEP Accreditation Visit – Initial Teacher Preparation

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-5

None

Stipulations:

Standards 1-5

None

Standards	Team Findings	
	Initial	Advanced

1	Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	Met	NA
2	Clinical Partnerships and Practice	Met	NA
3	Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity	Met	NA
4	Program Impact	Met	NA
5	Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement	Met	NA

Standards 1-5 Status

Motion It was M/S (Sanders / Dockers) to recommend the status of **Met** for **Standards 1-5**.

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Furlong)

Unit Accreditation Status

Motion It was M/S (Jantz / Reding) to recommend the status of **Accredited** through **June 30, 2026** [next visit Fall 2025].

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Furlong)

Previous Areas for Improvement (AFI):

Areas for Improvement (AFI):

Standard 1-6

None

Standard 4

~~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.

2018 visit team recommendation for AFI 4.1: The review team recommends that the NCATE/KSDE Standard 4 Diversity AFI be **removed** for the following two reasons: 1. The EPP has made progress in providing opportunities for candidates to interact with diverse faculty and in developing candidates who embrace the differences that exist in schools and communities; and 2. CAEP [KSDE] does not have an independent, standalone diversity standard.

Motion It was M/S (Dockers / McNemar) to remove previous AFI 4.1.

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Furlong)

Recommendations for University of Saint Mary – Onsite Accreditation Visit

KSDE/CAEP Accreditation Visit – Initial Teacher Preparation

Reding abstained from chairing and from committee discussion during review of University of Saint Mary. Sanders chaired the USM review discussions and votes.

Reding summarized the special circumstances of the visit from the final onsite team visit report for University of Saint Mary.

Sanders asked about the EPP’s assessment system. Reding confirmed the system exists and is functioning, but had missing/incomplete data due to 100% faculty turn-over in summer 2018.

Dockers asked whether the EPP has an employer survey. Reding confirmed they do. It will be administered for the first time in Fall 2019.

Reding left the room during deliberations.

Sanders asked about the CAEP phase-in timeline in relation to the visit - January 2019 labeled by CAEP as Fall 2018. Chmidling provided the CAEP phase-in timeline which states:

CAEP Initial Level Handbook, 2018, Appendix B

<p>The Phase-in (accreditation policy 1.02(a) on Initial Teacher Licensure) indicated in subsequent columns of this chart may be used for the below components of the CAEP standards, according to the timing of the EPP’s site visit.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Site Visit</u> Fall 2018 or Spring 2019</p>
<p>4 College and Career Ready Preparation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.4 College- and Career- Ready Preparation • 2.1 Clinical Partnerships • 2.2 Clinical Faculty • 2.3 Clinical Experiences; Associating Completer Outcome with Clinical Experiences • 3.1 Recruitment • 3.2 Academic Achievement* • 3.3 Use of Non-Academic Measures for Candidate Selectivity and Development • 3.4 Candidate Progress During Preparation • 3.6 Professional and Ethical Preparation • 4.1 P-12 Student Learning and Development Data; Alternative where no state P-12 Student Growth Data are Available • 4.2 Teacher Observation Evaluations and Student Perception Surveys 	<p style="text-align: center;">Self-study report includes plans and progress steps (including evidence/data, if any)</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.3 Employer Satisfaction with Preparation and Employment Persistence of Completers • 4.4 Completer Satisfaction with Preparation • 5.3 Continuous Improvement; Testing Innovations as Part of Standard 5 Continuous Improvement • 5.4 CAEP Outcome Measures: Licensure, Completion, Placement, Consumer Information 	
---	--

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-5

None

Standard 3

~~AFI 3.1: The reliability and validity of the selection criteria has not been established to predict candidate performance. (Component 3.3)~~

~~Rationale 3.1:~~ The EPP does not present evidence for the reliability and validity and the ability of EPP-created assessments to predict candidate performance.

Motion It was M/S (Sanders / Dockers) to **remove** AFI 3.1.

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions (Reding absent)

Reding returned during public voting.

Committee members discussed the EPP's disposition form and committee members' consensus that the form covered ethics and professional practice.

~~AFI 3.2: A standard for mastery of knowledge of professional ethical standards has not been established. (Component 3.6)~~

~~Rationale 3.2:~~ EPP does not present evidence candidates understand professional codes of ethics and professional standards of practice.

Motion It was M/S (Dockers / Jantz) to **remove** AFI 3.2.

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Reding)

Committee members discussed phase-in coverage of components 4.1 and 4.2.

Standard 4

Reding stated that before the currently planned tool, the EPP had tested three earlier Standard 4 relevant survey tools which had response rates too low to provide useful data.

Committee members discussed that the EPP has a plan in place and has made efforts to collect and analyze data.

~~AFI 4.1: The EPP does not provide measures which evaluate whether program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. (Component 4.1)~~

~~Rationale 4.1:~~ The components of the case study plan are identified. Tools for the observation and follow-up interviews have not been adopted at the time of the onsite visit.

Motion It was M/S (Dockers / Sanders) to remove AFI 4.1.

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Reding)

Committee members discussed that the EPP has an assessment that will be implemented in Fall 2019. Previous assessments had low response rates.

~~AFI 4.2: The EPP has not adopted an assessment of employer satisfaction with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students. (Component 4.2)~~

~~Rationale 4.2:~~ The EPP does not have an identified assessment for employer satisfaction at the time of the onsite visit.

Motion It was M/S (Sanders / McNemar) to remove AFI 4.2.

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Reding)

Standard 5

Committee members discussed that the rejoinder makes plain that the EPP has a quality assurance system and that the EPP's new personnel have been looking for previously collecting data.

~~AFI 5.1: The EPP has not implemented a system that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. (Component 5.1)~~

~~Rationale 5.1:~~ While the EPP provided a plan for assessment, the plan has not been operationalized.

~~AFI 5.2: The EPP has not implemented a quality assurance system. (Component 5.2)~~

~~Rationale 5.2: A QAS has not been operationalized; the EPP has not identified all elements of a QAS and has not analyzed their assessment process to ensure assessments are verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures.~~

~~AFI 5.3: The EPP does not summarize, benchmark, analyze, share, or act upon completer impact measures. (Component 5.3)~~

~~Rationale 5.3: A QAS does not have the capability to analyze the assessment nor completer impact on P-12 students and make program decisions, because the planned case study has not been operationalized.~~

Motion It was M/S (Minde / Dockers) to remove AFIs 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3.

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Reding)

Stipulations:
Standards 1-5

None

Standards		Team Findings	
		Initial	Advanced
1	Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	Met	NA
2	Clinical Partnerships and Practice	Met	NA
3	Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity	Met	NA
4	Program Impact	Met	NA
5	Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement	Met	NA

Standards 1-5 Status

Motion It was M/S (Dockers / Jantz) to recommend the status of **Met** for **Standards 1-5**.

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Reding)

Unit Accreditation Status

Motion It was M/S (Dockers / Furlong) to recommend the status of **Accredited** through **June 30, 2026** [next visit Fall 2025].

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Furlong)

Previous Areas for Improvement (AFI):

Areas for Improvement (AFI):

Standard 1-6

None

Standard 4

~~AFI 4.1 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 4.1** 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.~~

2019 Onsite Visit Team recommendations: Faculty diversity was present at the time of the offsite visit. Candidates in the initial programs have opportunities of engagement with both faculty and candidate diversity.

Standard 6

~~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.~~

2019 Onsite Visit Team recommendations: Support personnel was deemed adequate based upon interviews of university administrators and EPP faculty.

Motion It was M/S (Sanders / Jantz) to **remove** previous AFIs 4.1 and 6.1.

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

Recommendations for Bethany College - Program Reviews

Art, I, PreK-12, continued

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Furlong / McNemar) to **recommend** “**Approved**” status through **June 30, 2026.**

Motion carried: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Business Education, I, 6-12, continued

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-8

None

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz / Sanders) to recommend “**Approved**” status through **June 30, 2026**.

Motion carried: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Elementary Education, I, K-6, continued

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Dockers / Jantz) to recommend “**Approved**” status through **June 30, 2026**.

Motion carried: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), A, K-6, 6-12, continued

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Sanders / Tinich) to recommend “**Approved**” status through **June 30, 2026**.

Motion carried: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

History, Government, Social Studies I, 6-12, continued

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-10

None

Motion: It was M/S (Dockers / McNemar) to recommend “**Approved**” status through **June 30, 2026**.

Motion carried: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Recommendations for Fort Hays State University (Program Review)

Elementary Education (M.Ed.), I, K-6, new

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Furlong / Reding) to recommend “**New Program Approved with Stipulation**” status through **June 30, 2021**.

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Sanders)

New programs may be given the status of 'New program approved with stipulation,' or 'Not approved.' New programs may be approved-with-stipulation for 2 years during which they are operationalized. A progress report is due after the second semester of operation to address the new program stipulation.

Recommendations for Friends University (New Program Progress Report)

Biology, I, 6-12, new program progress report

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-11

None

Motion: It was M/S (Sanders / Minde) to remove the New Program Stipulation and assign "**Approved**" status through **June 30, 2022**.

Motion carried: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Recommendations for Newman University (Program Reviews)

Building Leadership, A, PreK-12, continued

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-6

None

Motion: It was M/S (McNemar / Tinich) to recommend "**Approved**" status through **June 30, 2026**.

Motion carried: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

District Leadership, A, PreK-12, continued

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-6

None

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz / Wolf) to recommend "**Approved**" status through **June 30, 2026**.

Motion carried: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

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

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Furlong / Tinich) to recommend "**Approved**" status through **June 30, 2026**.

Motion carried: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Recommendations for Ottawa University (Program Reviews)

Elementary Education, I, K-6, continued

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Sanders / McNemar) to recommend “**Approved**” status through **June 30, 2026**.

Motion carried: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Mathematics, I 6-12, continued

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S Jantz / Furlong) to recommend “**Approved**” status through **June 30, 2026**.

Motion carried: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Recommendations for Pittsburg State University (New Program Reviews)

Early Childhood Unified, I, B-K, New

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-8

None

Program Approval Status

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz / McNemar) to recommend “**New Program Approved with Stipulation**” status through **June 30, 2021**.

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Dockers)

New programs may be given the status of ‘New program approved with stipulation,’ or ‘Not approved.’ New programs may be approved-with-stipulation for 2 years during which they are operationalized. A progress report is due after the second semester of operation to address the new program stipulation.

High Incidence, A, K-6 MAT, New

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-5, 8

None

Committee members observed that multiple AFIs were recommended by the review team based on Assessments 3, 6, and 7.

Dockers reported that the EPP is working on the rubrics for Assessments 3 and 6.

Reding proposed that the committee review and vote on AFIs by assessment rather than standard.

AFIs:

~~2.1, 2.2~~

~~3.1, 3.2, 3.3~~

~~4.1~~

~~6.1, 6.2, 6.3~~

~~7.1, 7.2~~

Assessment 3

~~AFI 3.1 [Standard 3 – Met]: Assessment 3 elements contain multiple criteria and scoring is unclear.~~

~~Rationale 3.1: It is unclear which criteria within each rubric element have been met. (It is unclear if each of the multiple items within each rubric line item are scored.) Response to rejoinder: Assessment 3 rubric does not include areas for scores.~~

~~AFI 4.1 [Standard 4 – Met]: Assessment 3 elements contain multiple criteria and scoring is unclear.~~

~~Rationale 4.1: It is unclear which criteria within each rubric element have been met. (It is unclear if each of the multiple items within each rubric line item are scored.) Response to rejoinder: Assessment 3 rubric does not include areas for scores.~~

~~AFI 7.1 [Standard 7 – (Met): Assessment 3 elements contain multiple criteria and scoring is unclear.~~

~~Rationale 7.1: It is unclear which criteria within each rubric element have been met. (It is unclear if each of the multiple items within each rubric line item are scored.) Response to rejoinder: Assessment 3 rubric does not include areas for scores.~~

Motion: It was M/S (Sanders / Minde) to remove AFIs 3.1, 4.1 and 7.1.

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Dockers)

Assessment 6

~~AFI 2.1 [Standard 2 (Met)]: Assessment 6 rubric scoring does not ensure candidate minimum competency for each element of the standard.~~

~~Rationale 2.1: Assessment 6 rubric scoring system allows candidates to achieve the assessment minimum passing score while scoring zero on at least two rubric items. Response to rejoinder: Assessment 6 rubric indicates 50 points possible in bottom left corner, right column points are 200 points. With 200 points possible from the right column, candidates could earn scores of 1 and still maintain a passing score.~~

~~AFI 3.2 [Standard 3 (Met)]: Assessment 6 rubric scoring does not ensure candidate minimum competency for each element of the standard.~~

~~Rationale 3.2:~~ Assessment 6 rubric scoring system allows candidates to achieve the assessment minimum passing score while scoring zero on at least two rubric items. Response to rejoinder: Assessment 6 rubric indicates 50 points possible in bottom left corner, right column points are 200 points. With 200 points possible from the right column, candidates could earn scores of 1 and still maintain a passing score.

~~AFI 6.2 [Standard 6 – Met]: Assessment 6 rubric scoring does not ensure candidate minimum competency for each element of the standard.~~

~~Rationale 6.2:~~ Assessment 6 rubric scoring system allows candidates to achieve the assessment minimum passing score while scoring zero on at least two rubric items. Response to rejoinder: Assessment 6 rubric indicates 50 points possible. With 200 points possible from the right column, candidates could earn scores of 1 and still maintain a passing score.

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz / Sanders) to remove AFIs 2.1, 3.2, and 6.2.

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Dockers)

~~AFI 2.2 [Standard 2 (Met)]: Assessment 6 rubric scoring is unclear.~~

~~Rationale 2.2:~~ Assessment 6 rubric scoring system seems to allow candidates to score 3.1 to 5.0 in the left column, 0.1 to 3.0 in the middle column. It is unclear how the range for each column is scored. The scoring parameters are confusing. Response to rejoinder: Assessment 6 rubric indicates a possible score of 50 on the bottom left, when points from the right column are added, it is over 50 points. The scoring remains unclear. Rejoinder indicates candidates must earn 80%. (Is it 80% of the 50 from bottom left or 80% of right column of 200 points?).

~~AFI 3.3 [Standard 3 – Met]: Assessment 6 rubric scoring is unclear.~~

~~Rationale 3.3:~~ Assessment 6 rubric scoring system seems to allow candidates to score 3.1 to 5.0 in the left column, 0.1 to 3.0 in the middle column. It is unclear how the range for each column is scored. The scoring parameters are confusing. Response to rejoinder: Assessment 6 rubric indicates a possible score of 50 on the bottom left, when points from the right column are added, it is over 50 points. The scoring remains unclear. Rejoinder indicates candidates must earn 80%. (Is it 80% of the 50 from bottom left or 80% of right column of 200 points?).

~~AFI 6.3 [Standard 6 – Met]: Assessment 6 rubric scoring is unclear.~~

~~Rationale 6.3:~~ Assessment 6 rubric scoring system seems to allow candidates to score 3.1 to 5.0 in the left column, 0.1 to 3.0 in the middle column. It is unclear how the range for each column is scored. The scoring parameters are confusing. Response to rejoinder: Assessment 6 rubric indicates a possible score of 50 on the bottom left, when points from the right column are added, it is over 50 points. The scoring remains unclear.

Rejoinder indicates candidates must earn 80%. (Is it 80% of the 50 from bottom left or 80% of right column of 200 points?).

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz / McNemar) to remove AFIs 2.2, 3.3, and 6.3.

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Dockers)

Assessment 7

AFI ~~7.2~~ 7.1 [Standard 7 – Met]: Assessment 7 rubric is not clear.

Rationale ~~7.2~~ 7.1: It is not clear how candidates are assessed using the assessment 7 rubric. The point system on the rubric is unclear. Response to rejoinder: Numbers were adjusted on the revised rubric, but scoring is not clear on the assessment 7 rubric. Descriptions of the scoring guide are not clear.

Motion: It was M/S (Minde / Reding) to continue AFI 7.2, renumber it as 7.1, and revise the rationale as above.

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Dockers)

Assessment 2

AFI 6.1 [Standard 6 - Met]: It is unclear how the assessment [Assessment 2] is scored to produce the minimum 80% to pass.

Rationale 6.1: Assessment 2 does not have a scoring guide. Response to rejoinder: Rejoinder addresses Assessment #6, not Assessment #2.

Motion: It was M/S (Sanders / Minde) to continue AFI 6.1.

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Dockers)

Program Approval Status

Motion: It was M/S (Reding / Sanders) to recommend “New Program Approved with Stipulation” status through **June 30, 2021**.

Motion carried: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Dockers)

New programs may be given the status of ‘New program approved with stipulation,’ or ‘Not approved.’ New programs may be approved-with-stipulation for 2 years during which they are operationalized. A progress report is due after the second semester of operation to address the new program stipulation.

Recommendations for Sterling College (Program Reviews)

**History, Government, Social Science, I, 6-12, continuing
Areas for Improvement:**

Standards 1-10

None

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz / Tinich) to recommend “**Approved**” status through **December 31, 2025**.

Motion carried: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Music, I, PreK-12, continuing

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-9

None

Motion: It was M/S (Sanders / Tinich) to recommend “**Approved**” status through **December 31, 2025**.

Motion carried: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Speech/Theatre, I, 6-12, continuing

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-6

None

Motion: It was M/S (Noble / Wolf) to recommend “**Approved**” status through **December 31, 2025**.

Motion carried: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by group consensus at 11:45am.
