Present: Jean Dockers, Brian Gee, Allen Jantz, Stephanie McNemar, Daniel Minde, Leticia Porter, Cheryl Reding, Kathleen Sanders, Brent Wolf [9]

Absent: Beverly Furlong, Neely Gower, Steve Noble, Shauna Tinich

KSDE Staff: Catherine Chmidling, Mischel Miller

Guests: Cheryl Couch, Barclay College; Ashlie Jack, Wichita State University

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

Cheryl Reding, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:20 pm.

Approval of Agenda for September 06, 2018

Motion: It was M/S (Dockers / Jantz) to amend the agenda to begin with the Barclay College hearing and the Wichita State University accreditation and program reviews, before the June 4, 2018 Minutes and University of Saint Mary’s item, then other agenda items, and to approve the amended agenda.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained

Meeting of the Committee

Rather than dividing into teams, the whole committee deliberated on the agenda items. Cheryl Reding served as the chair except when abstaining, during which time Kathi Sanders served as chair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whole Committee</th>
<th>University Being Reviewed: Review Purpose (amended order)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Cheryl Reding, Chair</td>
<td><strong>Barclay College</strong> – Accreditation – Hearing on ERC Initial Recommendations from June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kathleen Sanders, Vice Chair</td>
<td><strong>Wichita State University</strong> – Program Progress Report – Innovative Elementary/Early Childhood Unified Teacher Apprentice Program (TAP), Tabled from June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jean Dockers</td>
<td><strong>Wichita State University</strong> – Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Beverly Furlong (absent)</td>
<td><strong>University of Saint Mary</strong> – Program – Speech/Theatre 6-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brian Gee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Neely Gower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Allen Jantz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Stephanie McNemar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Daniel Minde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Steve Noble (absent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cheryl Reding abstained from chairing the meeting on Barclay College’s accreditation and University of Saint Mary’s program review. Kathi Sanders chaired the meeting during these times.

Barclay College – Hearing regarding ERC Initial recommendations on Accreditation (April 26, 2018)

The public presentation of evidence and argument for Barclay College’s contesting of the April 26, 2018 ERC initial recommendations for accreditation were recorded. The ERC then moved to executive session for discussion. The ERC’s questions and votes regarding Barclay College’s accreditation recommendation were made in public, recorded session.

Barclay Presentation:

Barclay College unit head Cheryl Couch provided a summary of the institution’s accreditation timeline. The educator preparation unit’s initial accreditation and was in December 2014, with program approval in October 2014. The first candidates were admitted the next semester. The first cohort completed from the program in May 2017. The 2017 visit team’s onsite exit interview did not indicate any recommended stipulations or not-met standards.

Regarding Stipulations 4.3 and 4.4, the EPP received a 100% response on their completer survey, using Westat’s perception survey; two of four employers responded. The unit does not yet have completers who have been out of the program for three years. The EPP has analyzed the survey data but does not have trends but they have had only one year of completers. The unit requests that Stipulations 4.3 and 4.4 be removed or changed to Areas for Improvement (AFIs) and Standard 4 be recommended as Met.

Regarding Stipulation 5.4, the EPP’s first completers were in May 2017, who were then surveyed at one year post completion in May 2018. KSDE requires use of the KEEP in hardcopy, and the hardcopy nature of the survey doesn’t impact reliability and validity of the instrument. The EPP feels there was confusion on evidence for Component 5.4: the EPP is/was not using USD building level report cards from the KEP. They are/were using the building grade level measures only when there is a single grade per building with a Barclay completer as the teacher. The EPP has decided not to use the measures of Component 5.4 which the visit team deemed lacking validity and reliability. The unit requests that Stipulation 5.4 be removed or changed to an AFI.
Regarding Area for Improvement (AFI) 5.1, the AFI cites lack of targeted change but the EPP is too new, at three years of existence, to have made targeted change. They have set internal SMART goals for every ACSI and KSDE AFI, as well as two-year and five-year plans. As of April 2018 the EPP has targeted change for specific data. The EPP requests the AFI be removed.

Regarding AFI 5.2, the AFI addresses “relevant, verifiable, representative, and cumulative data.” The EPP’s assessments are aligned to the CAEP Evaluation Tool, CAEP, InTASC, and Kansas Professional Educator Standards. The EPP has three cycles of data which are disaggregateable by standard but are provided in aggregate due to low cohort sizes. The EPP now has data for Standard 4, now that completers are employed in the field. Data is managed in an Excel spreadsheet on the EPP’s server. The unit requests that AFI 5.2 be removed.

**end of presentation**

Public question and answer session:

ERC members asked for more information on multiple measures used to document completer impact on P12 learning, specifically, how the KEEP is administered to Barclay completers in the field.

Couch reported that Barclay has offered to administer the KEEP to completers, but both completers and employers have declined due to comfort and familiarity with the tool.

ERC members asked about the multiple measures used to examine completer impact on P12 learning.

Couch reported that the EPP uses the five sections of the KEEP: self-evaluation, supervisor’s evaluation, goals, student performance indicators, and KEEP index score.

ERC members asked how the KEEP is being administered.

Couch reported that it is administered by a completer’s building leadership and/or Barclay staff; observations are done in the same manner. The pre- and post-conference is administered by the building leader. Based on data thus far, the EPP has determined that completers need training in September on KEEP student performance indicators before beginning the semester’s pre- and post- measures with P12 students.

ERC members asked how completer impact is measured if a completer’s employment district does not use the KEEP.

Couch reported that the completer fills out a hardcopy of the KEEP tool and sends it to Barclay.

Revised Recommendations for Barclay College – Accreditation

KSDE Accreditation Visit (First Full Accreditation) – Initial Teacher Preparation

Stipulations:
Standards 1-3
None

Standard 4
4.3: 
Motion It was M/S (Jantz / MacNemar) to remove Stipulation 4.3.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Reding)

4.4: 
Motion It was M/S (Jantz / Dockers) to remove Stipulation 4.4.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Reding)

Standard 5
5.4: 
Motion It was M/S (MacNemar / Wolf / Dockers) to remove Stipulation 5.4.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Reding)

Areas for Improvement:
Standards 1-4
None

Standard 5
5.1: 
Motion It was M/S (Jantz / Dockers) to remove AFI 5.1.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Reding)

5.2: 
Motion It was M/S (Minde / Jantz) to remove AFI 5.2.1.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Reding)

AFI 2 Data from multiple different measures that, taken together, comprise a coherent quality assurance system to assess program/candidate performance are not clear. [renumbered to AFI 1]

Rationale 2 The EPP is in the process of creating a systemized method for tracking and housing data that results in evidence to support claims of meeting standard subcomponents using multiple measures. [renumbered to Rationale 1]

Motion It was M/S (Dockers / Wolf) to modify AFI 5.2.2.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Reding)

Standards 1-5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Team Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Initial and Advanced Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Content and Pedagogical Knowledge</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clinical Partnerships and Practice</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program Impact</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next visit Fall 2022**

**Motion** It was M/S (Jantz / Dockers) to recommend Standards 1-5 as MET.

**Motion carried:** 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Reding)

### Previous AFIs & Stipulations

- Standards 1-6
- None

### Unit Accreditation Status

**Motion:** It was M/S (Jantz / Sanders) to recommend “Accreditation” status through **December 31, 2022**.

**Motion carried:** 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Reding)

### Recommendations for Wichita State University (New Program Progress Report)

**Innovative/Experimental I, Elementary and Early Childhood Unified Teacher Apprentice Program (TAP) Birth-Grade 3, K-6**

New Program Progress Report

Tabled at April 26, 2018 and June 06, 2018 ERC meetings to allow more time for analysis of any changes from the approved proposal and to receive WSU response to June ERC questions.

**Areas for Improvement:**

Innovative Criteria 1-15

- None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Minde / Reding) to recommend “Approved” status through **December 31, 2024**.

**Motion carried:** 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Wolf)

### Recommendations for Wichita State University (Onsite Accreditation Visit)

**KSDE/CAEP Accreditation Visit – Initial Teacher Preparation**
Areas for Improvement:
Standards 3-4
None

Standard 1
AFI 1

Motion It was M/S (Dockers / Minde) to remove the AFI.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Jantz)

Standard 2
AFI 1

Motion It was M/S (Reding / Dockers) to remove AFI 1.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Jantz)

AFI 2 Student teachers do not systematically evaluate university supervisors or cooperating teachers (clinical educators); further, university supervisors and cooperating teachers do not systematically evaluate each other.

[renamed AFI 1]

Rationale 2: There is no systematic survey or assessment of university supervisors and cooperating teachers by candidates and between university supervisors and cooperating teachers to guarantee the continuous improvement of clinical educators and candidates.
[renamed Rationale 1]

Motion It was M/S (Minde / MacNemar) to continue AFI 2.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Jantz)

Standard 5
AFI 1

Motion It was M/S (Reding / Wolf) to remove AFI 1.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Jantz)

Stipulations
Standards 1-5
None

Standards 1-5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Team Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provider Quality Asssurance and Continuous Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next visit Spring 2024

Motion It was M/S (Dockers / Reding) to recommend Standards 1-5 as MET.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Jantz)

Previous AFIs & Stipulations
Standards 1-6
None

Unit Accreditation Status

Motion: It was M/S (Minde / Dockers) to recommend “Accreditation” status through December 31, 2024.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Jantz)

Approval of Minutes for June 04, 2018

Motion: It was M/S (Dockers / Jantz) to approve the Minutes.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained

Recommendation for University of Saint Mary (Program Review)

Speech/Theatre 6-12 continuing program
Areas for Improvement:
Standards 1-6
None

Program Approval Status

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz / Dockers) to recommend “Approved” status through December 31, 2024.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Reding)

Recommendations for Pittsburg 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 1-5:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Team Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Content and Pedagogical Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clinical Partnerships and Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next visit Fall 2024

**Motion** It was M/S (Jantz / MacNemar) to **recommend** Standards 1-5 as MET.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Dockers)

**Previous AFIs & Stipulations**
Standards 5-6
None

**Standard 1-4**
AFIs 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1

**Motion** It was M/S (Jantz / Sanders) to **remove** previous AFIs 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Dockers)

**Unit Accreditation Status**

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

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Dockers)

**Recommendation for Emporia State University (Program Reviews)**

**Biology 6-12 continuing program**

**Areas for Improvement:**
Standards 1-10
None

**Program Approval Status**
Motion: It was M/S (Sanders / MacNemar) to recommend “Approved” status through December 31, 2024.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

High Incidence Special Education K-6, 6-12 continuing program
Areas for Improvement:
Standards 1-5, 7
None

Motion: It was M/S (Minde / Dockers) to accept the review team’s recommendation of no AFIs on Standards 1-5, 7.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

Standard 6 (Met)
AFI 6.1: Assessment 4: DI/UDL Literacy Lesson Plan Project: The rubric rating is not clear.
Rationale 6.1: Assessment 4 Rubric for Direct Instruction/Universal Design for Learning (DI/UDL) Literacy Lesson Plan Project (revised) does not include a description of what constitutes each descriptor.

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz / Sanders) to continue the AFI.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

Program Approval Status

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz / MacNemar) to recommend “Approved” status through December 31, 2024.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

Journalism 6-12 continuing program
Areas for Improvement:
Standards 1-7
None

Program Approval Status
Motion: It was M/S (Dockers / Wolf) to recommend “Approved” status through December 31, 2024.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

Library Media Specialist PreK-12 continuing program
Areas for Improvement:
Standards 1-6
None

Program Approval Status

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz / Reding) to recommend “Approved” status through December 31, 2024.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

Science 5-8 continuing program
Areas for Improvement:
Standards 1-14
None

Program Approval Status

Motion: It was M/S (Minde / Dockers) to recommend “Approved” status through December 31, 2024.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

Recommendations for Friends University (New Program Progress Report)

Innovative/Experimental Elementary K-6 New Program Progress Report

Areas for Improvement:
Innovative Criteria 1-15
None

Program Approval Status

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz / Sanders) to recommend “Approved” status through December 31, 2024.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

Recommendations for Kansas State University (New Program Review)
Foreign Language PreK-12 New Program

Areas for Improvement:
Standards 1-5, 7-8
None

Motion: It was M/S (Sanders / Wolf) to accept the review team’s recommendation of Met for Standards 1-5, 7-8.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

Standard 6 (Met)
AFI 6.1: The descriptor for Assessment 6, item 1 “Meets Standard” lacks specificity.

Rationale 6.1: Although the descriptor is aligned to the standard, words like “demonstrates how” do not provide specific observable behaviors that would more clearly determine the true abilities of the candidate. Candidates or evaluators would not have clear target performance indicators to inform their evaluation of the teaching practice.

Motion: It was M/S (MacNemar / Sanders) to continue the AFI.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

Program Approval Status

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz / Sanders) to recommend “New Program Approved with Stipulation” status through December 31, 2020.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

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 and submit a Progress report to address the new program stipulation.

Recommendations for MidAmerica Nazarene University (Program Review)

Biology 6-12 continuing program
Areas for Improvement:
Standards 1-7, 10-18
None

Motion: It was M/S (Sanders / Dockers) to accept the review team’s recommendation of Met for Standards 1-7, 10-18.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Porter)

Standard 8 (Not Met)
AFI 8.1 and Rationale: Praxis, Biology Content Knowledge Exam (5235), Category V is acceptable as an assessment for this standard, but according to state rules, not as a standalone assessment.

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz / MacNemar) to modify AFI 8.1.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Porter)

Standard 9 (Met)
AFI 9.1 and Rationale: The assessment meets the part of the standard dealing with candidate ability to understand the nature of inquiry, but may not fully satisfy the part requiring them to have the “ability to help students do scientific inquiry.”

Motion: It was M/S (Sanders / Dockers) to modify AFI 9.1,

And to recommend the status of “Met” for Standard 9.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Porter)

Program Approval Status

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz / Dockers) to recommend “Approved” status through December 31, 2024.

Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention (Porter)

Recommendations for Washburn University (Program Review)

English Language Arts 5-8 continuing program
Areas for Improvement:
Standards 1-2, 4
None

Motion: It was M/S (Sanders / Reding) to accept the review team’s recommendation of Met for Standards 1, 2, 4.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

Standard 3 (Met)
AFI 3.1: Assessment 5 or Assessment 6 do not completely align with standard.
Rationale 3.1: The assessments do not address the part of the standard that states how people use language to influence the thinking and action of others.

Motion: It was M/S (Sanders / Jantz) to modify AFI 3.1.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

Program Approval Status
Motion: It was M/S (Dockers / Wolf) to recommend “Approved” status through December 31, 2024.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Committee Chair Cheryl Reding at 3:45pm