

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

**Official Minutes for November 27, 2018**  
**Hybrid meeting in-person in Topeka and online via Zoom**

**Present:** Jean Dockers, Brian Gee, Daniel Minde, Steve Noble, Leticia Porter, Cheryl Reding, Kathleen Sanders, Shauna Tinich, Brent Wolf [9]

**Absent:** Beverly Furlong, Neely Gower, Allen Jantz, Stephanie McNemar

**KSDE Staff:** Catherine Chmidling

**Guest:** Frank Johnson, Tabor College

---

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

---

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

---

**Approval of Agenda for November 27, 2018**

---

**Motion:** It was M/S (Sanders / Dockers) to amend the agenda to begin with the Tabor College accreditation,

and to approve the amended agenda.

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

---

**Approval of Minutes for September 06, 2018**

---

**Motion:** It was M/S (Gee / Sanders) to approve the Minutes.

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 Kathleen Sanders served as chair.

<b>Whole Committee</b>	<b>Institution Being Reviewed: Review Purpose</b>
Dr. Cheryl Reding, Chair Dr. Kathleen Sanders, Vice Chair Dr. Jean Dockers Ms. Beverly Furlong (absent) Mr. Brian Gee Ms. Neely Gower (absent)	<b>Tabor College – Accreditation</b> <b>MidAmerica Nazarene University – Accreditation</b> <b>Washburn University – Accreditation</b> <b>Kansas State University – Program – History</b> Government Social Studies 6-12 MAT (NEW)

Dr. Allen Jantz (absent) Dr. Stephanie McNemar (absent) Mr. Daniel Minde Dr. Steve Noble Dr. Leticia Porter Ms. Shauna Tinich Dr. Brent Wolf	<b>University of Saint Mary</b> – Program – School Counselor PreK-12 (NEW) <b>FHSU</b> – High Incidence PreK-12 <b>KICA</b> – High Incidence K-6, 6-12, PreK-12 NEW undergraduate; High Incidence K-6, 6-12, PreK-12 NEW graduate <b>PSU</b> – Elementary K-6 MAT NEW; Library Media Specialist PreK-12
--	--

## Recommendations for Tabor College – Onsite Accreditation Visit

### KSDE/CAEP Accreditation Visit – Initial Teacher Preparation

#### Areas for Improvement:

Standard 2

None

#### Standard 1:

**AFI 1: The process for measuring dispositions is inconsistent across instrumentation, administration, and analysis.**

**Rationale 1:** Instrumentation is inconsistent between the teacher candidate self-assessment and components of the three-way conference among the university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and teacher candidate. At this time, there is only the administration of a candidate self-assessment instrument. No other independent rating of the candidate dispositions is conducted. The data provided match neither the indicators on the self-assessment nor on the matrix used in the three-way conference. Additionally, the dispositions conferences between candidates and EPP faculty does not result in valid and reliable data.

**Motion** It was M/S (Minde / Dockers) to **continue** AFI 1.1.

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

~~**AFI 2: EPP-created assessments are inconsistently aligned to InTASC/KSDE Professional Education and CAEP/KSDE Accreditation standards.**~~

~~**Rationale 2:** Although two aligned assessments was available prior to the visit, others were never fully aligned or the alignment was received during the visit and the quality was inconsistent. Alignment of the other assessments was received during the visit; however, the quality of the alignments was inconsistent.~~

~~**Motion** It was M/S (Dockers / Minde) to **remove** AFI 1.2.~~

~~**Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions**~~

#### Standard 3

~~**AFI 1: There is no evidence of a formalized plan or defined goals to recruit and retain diverse candidates (such as race, ethnicity, national origin, age, gender, socioeconomic status, religion, geographical location, sexual orientation, veteran's status, (dis) ability).**~~

~~**Rationale 1:** The EPP does not have a formalized recruitment plan. Additionally, targeted events and initiatives where there is a high probability of reaching high quality, diverse candidates with a broad range of backgrounds to meet the employment needs of the state are missing.~~

**Discussion:** Committee members asked the Tabor representative how the EPP recruits candidates. Per Dr. Frank Johnson, Tabor VPAA, the college has centralized recruiting. The recruiting office has diverse staff and targets both high need content areas and under-represented populations, with an overarching focus on faith-based recruiting.

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

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

**AFI 2 1: There is limited evidence that the EPP is systematically working to address state or regional needs for hard to staff locations or fields where staffing is challenging.**

**Rationale 2 1:** There do not appear to be enrollment goals articulated and plans to specify and support the trends in employment vacancies identified in the region, such attending to such hard to staff urban or rural areas or fields such as STEM or special education.

**Discussion:** It is important for EPPs to have an intentional recruitment plan and/or enrollment goals.

**Motion** It was M/S (Reding / Wolf) to continue AFI 3.2, and rename as AFI 3.1.

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

~~**AFI 3: The EPP has no nonacademic measure for its admission requirements to the Education program.**~~

~~**Rationale 3:** The EPP's admission requirements to the education programs does not include a nonacademic measure. The current assessments either lack rubrics or have academic rubrics.~~

**Discussion:** The Committee members asked the Tabor representative about the EPP's admissions requirements and nonacademic measures. Per Frank Johnson, the EPP uses the 3-way conference during student teaching. At admission, there is an interview by an EPP committee and an essay submitted by the applicant. The EPP acknowledges the need for better rubrics for admission materials, and their rejoinder to the onsite report includes a planned December 3, 2018 EPP meeting to revise the rubrics.

**Motion** It was M/S (Dockers / Tinich) to remove AFI 3.3.

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

**Standard 4**

**AFI 1: The EPP does not collect valid and reliable data on program completers' employment milestones such as promotion and retention.**

**Rationale 1:** Information about program completers' employment milestones consists of anecdotal statements made primarily by completers and school administrators who are locally situated. The EPP stated that it does not have a process or the instrumentation to collect valid and reliable data on its completers.

**Discussion:** Following completers is a key aspect of Standard 4 and the eight annual measures. In-state information on completer employment and promotion with public school districts is available.

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

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

**Standard 5**

**AFI 1: The EPP did not provide evidence of systematic review of assessment data.**

**Rationale 1:** Although the EPP provided two flowcharts representing the process of data review, minutes and interviews with the decision-making committees did not demonstrate a systematic approach to analysis of data. Data are reviewed when deemed convenient and/or timely, but the analysis is not systematic.

**Discussion:** Systematic data review is a key aspect of Standard 5. The Committee members asked for clarification of the assessment tool edits. Johnson confirmed that the edits were due to his office by October.

**Motion** It was M/S (Dockers / Tinich) to **continue** AFI 5.1.

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

**Discussion:** As a reminder, Stipulations are more severe than AFIs, and must be resolved with a focused visit [may be electronic] within two years.

**Stipulations:**

**Standards 1-4**

**None**

**Standard 2**

**[AFI 5.2] ~~Stipulation~~ 4: The EPP provides insufficient documentation to support collaborative public school partnerships.**

**Rationale 4 5.2:** The only evidence presented was informal.

**Discussion:** The Committee asked how Tabor College partnered with P-12 districts. Johnson stated the EPP has an advisory board with cooperating partners in the EPP's service area, which meets twice a year. EPP staff visit school district buildings as part of supervising student teachers, and there is a strong partnership. Committee member Steve Noble confirmed previous interaction with Tabor personnel in his position as a P12 administrator.

Committee members commented that visit evidence and interviews suggest there may be a need to better document P-12 partners' involvement with the EPP. Committee members asked if the EPP's P-12 partnerships include opportunities to exchange feedback. Per Johnson there is a 3-way meeting between the cooperating teacher, college supervisor, and student teacher.

Committee members asked if the advisory board solely receives information or also makes recommendations. Johnson replied that the advisory board does both. The EPP gives the board data and receives input on collaborative work. There are not minutes available for the board meetings.

**Motion** It was M/S (Dockers / Sanders) to **modify** Stipulation 2.1, and **rename** as AFI 2 under Standard 5 (5.2).

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

#### **Standard 4**

**[AFI 4.2] Stipulation 4: The EPP does not have structured and validated observation instruments and/or student surveys that measure completers' ability to apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that their preparation experiences were designed to achieve.**

**Rationale 4 4.2:** The EPP stated that aside from anecdotal comments and comments made in the Graduate Survey, no other instrumentation and approaches to measure completers' teaching effectiveness, have been developed or implemented at this time.

**Discussion:** The stipulation refers to component 4.1. the Standard 4 AFI refers to component 4.3. Observation instruments are not required for Standard 4.

The Committee asked the Tabor representative how the EPP collects information from completers. Per Johnson, the EPP sends requests for voluntary information to first-year and third-year completers. They have difficulty with data analysis because of small cohort sizes.

The Committee discussed the problems of informality and related lack of documentation. Per CAEP component 4.2, EPPs need "structured validated instruments and/or surveys." There is already a Stipulation on Standard 5 for materials.

**Motion** It was M/S (Sanders / Dockers) to **modify** Stipulation 4.1, and **rename** as AFI 2 under Standard 4 (4.2).

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

#### **Standard 5**

**Stipulation 1: The reliability and validity of EPP-created assessment instruments is unknown.**

**Rationale 1:** No evidence has been provided that reliability and validity studies have been conducted or are planned for key assessments. The EPP has not provided evidence of systematic training or calibration on the use of assessment tools.

**Motion** It was M/S (Dockers / Sanders) to modify Stipulation 5.1.

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

**Stipulation 2: There is no evidence of inter-rater reliability on key assessments.**

**Rationale 2:** Evidence and interviews provided indicate a misconception of the definition of inter-rater reliability. The EPP has not provided evidence of systematic training or calibration on the use of assessment tools.

**Motion** It was M/S (Reding / Sanders) to remove Stipulation 5.2.

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

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	Not Met	NA

**Targeted visit on Standard 5 only – Spring 2021**

### Standards 1-5 Status

#### Standard 1

**Motion** It was M/S (Dockers / Sanders) to recommend the status of Met.

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

#### Standard 2

**Motion** It was M/S (Dockers / Wolf) to recommend the status of Met.

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

#### Standard 3

**Motion** It was M/S (Sanders / Reding) to recommend the status of Met.

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

#### **Standard 4**

**Motion** It was M/S (Minde / Dockers) to recommend the status of **Met**.

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

#### **Standard 5**

**Motion** It was M/S (Dockers / Sanders) to recommend the status of **Not Met**.

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

#### **Unit Accreditation Status**

**Motion:** It was M/S (Wolf / Dockers) to recommend “**Accreditation with Stipulation for two years with a targeted visit**” status through **December 31, 2021**. Targeted visit on Standard 5 in Spring 2021.

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

#### **Previous AFIs & Stipulations (2014)**

##### **Areas for Improvement:**

##### **Standards 1-6**

None

#### **Standard 2**

**~~AFI 2.1~~ ~~There are limited data from recent graduates.~~**

**~~Rationale 2.1~~** The system to collect data about recent graduates yields little information. The return rate is too low to utilize the data for program and unit improvement.

**Discussion:** Committee members discussed that this concern is addressed by the new AFIs and Stipulation.

**Motion** It was M/S (Sanders / Reding) to remove AFI 2.1.

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

#### **Standard 5**

**~~AFI 5.1~~ ~~The unit lacks sufficient evidence that professional education faculty members are actively engaged in scholarship.~~**

**~~Rationale 5.1:~~** The unit lacks sufficient evidence that professional education faculty members are actively engaged in scholarship that is appropriate for professionals preparing educators to work in schools and mission of the unit. The unit has plans to participate in scholarly work, but they have not been implemented.

**Discussion:** Committee members discussed that this topic is not part of the new CAEP/KSDE standards.

**Motion** It was M/S (Reding / Dockers) to remove AFI 5.1.

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

## **Standard 6**

### **Revised AFIs**

**AFI 6.1:** ~~Faculty workloads do not allow professional education faculty members to be effectively engaged in teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, P-12 collaboration, and service.~~

**Rationale 6.1:** ~~Faculty workloads with the inclusion of interterm responsibilities yield faculty overloads, which do not allow for full engagement in their multiple professional responsibilities.~~

**Discussion:** Committee members discussed that this topic is not part of the new CAEP/KSDE standards.

**Motion** It was M/S (Dockers / Sanders) to remove AFI 6.1.

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

---

**Frank Johnson of Tabor College left the meeting.**

---

## **Recommendations for MidAmerica Nazarene University – Onsite Accreditation Visit**

---

**Discussion:** Reding served as the state lead for the visit. She provided background on the Inquiry Brief (IB) pathway and special circumstances of the onsite visit. She abstained from chairing the discussion and from votes.

The IB pathway is rare in Kansas, as it is a descendant of TEAC accreditation rather than NCATE accreditation. There were multiple issues of concern with the visit. The visit used a template created by former CAEP staffer Glenda Breaux, which contained multiple notes and proscriptive directions on circumstances in which to assign AFIs and Stipulations. This is counter to CAEP's training for team members' writing and recommendations. There was also repeated personality conflict between the CAEP lead and EPP unit head. The IB pathway is being phased out and Glenda Breaux' template is no longer being used at more recent IB visits. Inexperienced team members were instructed to assign stipulations for issues that they felt did not rise to the severity of stipulations, based on Breaux' directions in the template and the CAEP lead's instructions. One of the CAEP visitors had not served on an IB visit before and wrote their section under the specific directions of the CAEP lead. CAEP editing staff, no longer at CAEP, supported the proscription in Breaux' template, which is counter to CAEP's expectations for staff.

Chmidling served as the state consultant for the visit and stated that IB guidance was extremely difficult to locate in CAEP's resources. She confirmed hostility from the CAEP lead toward the EPP unit head, as well as proscriptive directions in the IB template, and proscriptive direction from the CAEP lead to the inexperienced CAEP team member. Chmidling has notified CAEP not to send the CAEP lead to any future Kansas accreditation visits.

Sanders chaired the discussion and votes.

Porter abstained from votes because she has been a P-12 partner with MNU.

---

## KSDE/CAEP Accreditation Visit – Initial Teacher Preparation; Inquiry Brief pathway

### Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-3

None

### Standard 2

**AFI 1:** The EPP does not have a system in place for mutual evaluation of university supervisors and school-based clinical educators and to share results.

**Rationale 1:** The Cooperating Teacher Program Evaluation Survey Form does not include questions to provide data on the university supervisors. No evidence was provided on how university supervisors evaluate school-based clinical educators. No evidence was provided on how the EPP shares survey results with school-based clinical educators and university supervisors.

**Discussion:** The committee was briefed on the visit team's debate about the need for a tool to survey cooperating teachers and college supervisors. Committee members discussed that it was common practice not to give negative feedback directly to a cooperating teacher but to instead inform district administration of the EPP's desire not to use a negatively evaluated individual again. The committee also discussed whether there is a requirement to provide cooperating teachers and college supervisors with their evaluations.

**Motion** It was M/S (Sanders / Dockers) to **remove** AFI 2.1.

**Motion carried: 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions (Porter & Reding)**

### Stipulations:

Standards 1-5

None

### Standard 3

**Stipulation 1:** ~~The provider does not set admissions requirements, including CAEP minimum criteria or the state's minimum criteria, whichever are higher, and gathers data to monitor applicants and the selected pool of candidates.~~

**Rationale 1:** ~~Admissions requirements include the College Basic Academics Subjects Exam (CBASE) and the EPP has not been able to demonstrate candidates score in the top 50%.~~

**Motion** It was M/S (Sanders / Minde) to **remove** Stipulation 3.1.

**Motion carried: 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions (Porter & Reding)**

### Standard 4

**Stipulation 1:** ~~The provider does not demonstrate, through structured and validated observation instruments and/or student surveys that completers perceive their~~

~~preparation as effective and relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that completers apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve. The provider does not demonstrate through employment milestones such as promotion and retention, that employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.~~

~~**Rationale 1:** The employer and alumni surveys are not aligned with InTASC or state standards by item. These instruments were in use for over seven years. The surveys offer five Likert scale responses and a N/A option; CAEP criteria require an even number to avoid a neutral response. Employment milestones listed on the alumni survey include options that would not be possible for completers one or three years from graduation, e.g. National Board certification or graduate degree completion. Results were not disaggregated by number of years from completion, making the alumni survey not a valid measure of employment milestones. The LAC reported that all alumni survey results were included even if the completer was not employed in education. Observation instruments were included in the Case Study Plan but had not yet implemented.~~

**Discussion:** The committee was briefed regarding CAEP's ongoing examination of the CBASE exam for use as evidence toward component 3.2.

Committee members discussed the EEP's evidence of a plan for a case study applicable to components 4.1 and 4.2.

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

**Motion carried: 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions (Porter & Reding)**

**[AFI 4.1] ~~Stipulation 2:~~ The provider does not document, using multiple measures that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth.**

**Rationale 2 4.1:** The provider submitted a Case Study Plan (Appendix H). Observation instruments were included in the Case Study Plan but had not yet implemented. The plan does not meet CAEP requirements for plans regarding "phasing in accreditation evidence."

**Motion** It was M/S (Minde / Dockers) to modify Stipulation 4.2 and rename as AFI 4.1.

**Motion carried: 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions (Porter & Reding)**

## Standard 5

**~~Stipulation 1: The EPP does not provide measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth that are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.~~**

**~~Rationale 1:~~** The EPP presented a plan for a case study that had not yet been approved by IRB so no data collection had begun. The case study plan did not meet the CAEP criteria for plans. External benchmarks were not provided. Interviews with content area faculty rely on teacher education committee and the LAC to inform them of concerning trends.

~~Decision-making recorded in the IB related to programs was focused on rubric or assessment revision rather than performance or impact data. The EPP did not provide evidence of resource allocation based on data.~~

**Discussion:** The committee discussed the EPP's data review cycle. Evidence suggests the EPP didn't close the review cycle loop for data relevant to standards 1 and 4. The proposed standard 5 stipulation 1 references standard 4.

**Motion** It was M/S (Dockers / Minde) to **remove** Stipulation 5.1.

**Motion carried: 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions (Porter & Reding)**

**[AFI 5.1] Stipulation 2: Evidence did not show that the EPP systematically used data analysis results for continuous improvement.**

**Rationale 2 5.1:** The EPP holds regular meetings with teacher education faculty, content faculty, and the advisory board. Suggestions from these groups are documented, but not systematically tracked. Program modifications listed were vague or not attributed to specific data from assessments. Data from assessments are presented in isolation to faculty and advisory board and not summarized or grouped.

**Discussion:** Committee members discussed that the concern noted in the proposed stipulation 5.2 doesn't seem to rise to the severity of a stipulation. The EPP's rejoinder indicates there have been scheduled meetings and data to address the issue. The committee discussed converting the stipulation to an AFI regarding systematic application of data analysis results for EPP continuous improvement.

**Motion** It was M/S (Dockers / Minde) to **modify** Stipulation 5.2 and **rename** as AFI 5.1.

**Motion carried: 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions (Porter & Reding)**

Standards		Recommendations	
		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

**Next visit Spring 2025**

### **Standards 1-5 Status**

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

**Motion carried: 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions (Porter & Reding)**

## Unit Accreditation Status

**Motion:** It was M/S (Minde / Sanders) to recommend “Accreditation” status through **December 31, 2025** [next visit Spring 2025].

**Motion carried: 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions (Porter & Reding)**

## Previous AFIs & Stipulations (2012)

### Areas for Improvement (AFI):

#### **Standard 1-3**

None

#### **Standard 4**

~~**AFI 4.1 The Professional Teacher and Technology-Enhanced Teacher programs do not ensure that all advanced candidates have an opportunity to complete field experiences in diverse settings. (Advanced)**~~

~~**Rationale 4.1** The PT and TET programs allow advanced candidates to complete field experiences in the schools where they are employed without ensuring there are opportunities to work with ELL, students with disabilities, male and female students from different socio-economic groups and at least two ethnic or racial groups.~~

**Discussion:** Committee members discussed that advanced programs were not included in Spring 2018 accreditation visits.

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

**Motion carried: 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions (Porter & Reding)**

#### **Standard 5**

~~**AFI 5.1: The unit does not have sufficient data to verify the qualifications of cooperating teachers for field and clinical experiences. (Initial, Advanced)**~~

~~**Rationale 5.1** The unit has specified qualifications for cooperating teachers for field and clinical experiences. No data were provided to verify that cooperating teachers have the specified qualifications.~~

**Motion** It was M/S (Dockers / Sanders) to remove previous AFI 5.1.

**Motion carried: 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions (Porter & Reding)**

#### **Standard 6**

~~**AFI 6.1: The unit does not adhere to the articulated structure for the management of its programs. (Initial, Advanced)**~~

~~**Rationale 6.1** Decision-making does not follow the articulated structure.~~

**AFI 6.2** ~~University financial support does not adequately sustain the unit over time.~~

**Rationale 6.2** ~~The university provides less than 50 percent of the unit's current operating budget, raising concerns about sustainability over time.~~

**Motion** It was M/S (Minde / Wolf) to **remove** previous AFIs 6.1 and 6.2.

**Motion carried: 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions (Porter & Reding)**

---

Steve Noble left the meeting.

Cheryl Reding resumed chairing the meeting.

---

## **Recommendations for Washburn University – Onsite Accreditation Visit**

---

### **KSDE/CAEP Accreditation Visit – Initial Teacher Preparation**

#### **Areas for Improvement:**

#### **Standards 1-3**

None

#### **Standard 1**

**AFI 1: ~~The EPP does not use multiple indicators to evaluate proficiencies for college- and career-ready standards.~~**

**Rationale 1:** ~~Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate candidates' abilities to differentiate instruction and to provide opportunities for P-12 students to apply problem-solving, critical thinking, and collaboration skills using multiple indicators.~~

**Discussion:** Committee members discussed the EPP's rejoinder and use of KPTP data.

**Motion** It was M/S (Sanders / Wolf) to **remove** AFI 1.1.

**Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions**

#### **Standard 4**

**AFI 1: ~~It is not clear how the EPP documents, using multiple measures, that program completers contribute to expected levels of P-12 student learning growth.~~**

**Rationale 1:** Insufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate how the EPP collects, analyzes, and disseminates completer impact on P-12 student learning and growth.

**Discussion:** Committee members discussed the EPP's use of a case study and surveys for components 4.3 and 4.4. The AFI focuses on components 4.1 and/or 4.2. Some documentation was provided but was insufficient.

**Motion** It was M/S (Docker / Sanders) to **modify** AFI 4.1.

**Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions**

**Standard 5**

**AFI 1: The EPP does not systematically engage in continuous improvement processes**

**Rationale 1:** The EPP did not provide evidence of systematic and regular reviews of program data and use of data-driven decision making. There was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that program modifications are linked back to evidence and data. Limited evidence was provided to demonstrate that the EPP regularly shares data with stakeholders. There was insufficient documentation of decision-making and implementation that resulted from stakeholder input.

**Motion** It was M/S (Minde / Gee) to **modify** AFI 5.1.

**Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions**

~~**AFI 2: The EPP does not document that changes are linked to data analyses.**~~

~~**Rationale 2:** There was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that program modifications are linked back to evidence and data.~~

~~**AFI 3: The EPP does not involve stakeholders in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.**~~

~~**Rationale 3:** Limited evidence was provided to demonstrate that the EPP regularly shares data with stakeholders. There was insufficient documentation of decision-making and implementation that resulted from stakeholder input.~~

**Motion** It was M/S (Reding / Sanders) to **remove** AFIs 5.2 and 5.3.

**Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions**

**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 / Gee) to recommend **Standards 1-5** as **Met**.

**Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions**

### Unit Accreditation Status

**Motion:** It was M/S (Dockers / Reding) to recommend “**Accreditation**” status through **December 31, 2025** [next visit Spring 2025].

**Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions**

### Previous Areas for Improvement (AFI):

#### **Standard 1- 6**

None

#### Standard 1

~~AFI 1.1 The unit does not ensure that all candidates for advanced programs demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills, professional dispositions, and the ability to create positive environments for student learning. (Advanced)~~

~~**Rationale 1.1** Though assessments and rubrics are in place for the administration programs (Building Leadership and District Leadership) and Curriculum and Instruction master's program, the unit could not provide systematic data for quality assurance of these programs.~~

#### Standard 2

~~AFI 2.1 There is limited data collected from external sources for advanced programs.~~

~~**Rationale 2.1** The unit has conducted surveys of graduates and employers. However, the unit had few responses and did not disaggregate surveys by program.~~

**Discussion:** Committee members discussed removing previous AFIs 1.1 and 2.1 because they focus on advanced programs which were not included in Spring 2018 accreditation visits.

**Motion** It was M/S (Sanders / Wolf) to remove previous AFIs 1.1 and 2.1.

**Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions**

#### Standard 4

~~AFI 4.3 The unit does not ensure that all candidates have field and clinical experiences in settings with students with disabilities or students from diverse ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic groups. (Advance)~~

~~**Rationale 4.3** The unit does not collect evidence or compile data associated with clinical practice or capstone projects in regards to settings well-grounded in diversity within the administration programs and the Curriculum and Instruction master's program.~~

**Discussion:** Committee members discussed the EPP's rejoinder regarding previous AFIs.

**Motion** It was M/S (Dockers / Tinich) to remove previous AFI 4.3.

**Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions**

### **Standard 5**

~~AFI 5.1 The unit does not ensure that school faculty are licensed in the field in which they teach. (Initial, Advanced)~~

~~Rationale 5.1 Documentation of cooperating teachers did not include licensure information.~~

**Discussion:** The committee discussed that the topic of previous AFI 5.1 is not part of the current standards.

**Motion** It was M/S (Dockers / Minde) to remove previous AFI 5.1.

**Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions**

---

## **Recommendations for Kansas State University - Program Review**

---

### **History Government Social Studies 6-12 MAT New Program**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-10**

None

### **Program Approval Status**

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

**Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 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 University of Saint Mary - Program Review**

---

Kathleen Sanders chaired discussion of University of Saint Mary. Reding abstained from discussion and votes.

---

### **School Counselor PreK-12 New Program**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-8**

None

### **Program Approval Status**

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

**Motion carried: 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Reding)**

**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.**

---

Reding resumed chairing the meeting.

Sanders abstained from discussion and voting regarding Fort Hays State University.

---

### **Recommendations for Fort Hays State University - Program Review**

---

#### **High Incidence K-6, 6-12, PreK-12 Program NEW graduate**

Areas for Improvement:

#### **Standards 1-8**

None

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

**Motion carried: 7 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 and submit a Progress report to address the new program stipulation.**

---

### **Recommendations for Kansas Independent College Association [KICA] - Program Review**

Due to time constraints before members had to leave, the committee TABLED discussion and votes on the KICA programs.

---

#### **High Incidence K-6, 6-12, PreK-12 Program NEW undergraduate**

Areas for Improvement:

#### **Standards 1-3, 7-8**

None

#### **Standard 4 (Met)**

**AFI 4.1 Assessment 2 does not ensure candidates are proficient in all elements of the standard.**

**Rationale 4.1** Candidates could possibly not pass all parts of Assessment 2, therefore not meeting the entire standard and still be considered proficient.

**Standard 5 (Met)**

**AFI 5.1 Assessment 2 does not ensure candidates are proficient in all elements of the standard.**

**Rationale 5.1** Candidates could possibly not pass all parts of Assessment 2, therefore not meeting the entire standard and still be considered proficient.

**Standard 6 (Met)**

**AFI 6.1 Assessment 6 does not ensure candidates are proficient in all elements of the standard.**

**Rationale 6.1** Candidates could possibly not pass all parts of Assessment 6, therefore not meeting the entire standard and still be considered proficient.

**Program Approval Status**

**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.**

**High Incidence K-6, 6-12, PreK-12 Program NEW graduate**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-3, 7-8**

None

**Standard 4 (Met)**

**AFI 4.1 Assessment 2 does not ensure candidates are proficient in all elements of the standard.**

**Rationale 4.1** Candidates could possibly not pass all parts of Assessment 2, therefore not meeting the entire standard and still be considered proficient.

**Standard 5 (Met)**

**AFI 5.1 Assessment 2 does not ensure candidates are proficient in all elements of the standard.**

**Rationale 5.1** Candidates could possibly not pass all parts of Assessment 2, therefore not meeting the entire standard and still be considered proficient.

**Standard 6 (Met)**

**AFI 6.1 Assessment 6 does not ensure candidates are proficient in all elements of the standard.**

**Rationale 6.1** Candidates could possibly not pass all parts of Assessment 6, therefore not meeting the entire standard and still be considered proficient.

**Program Approval Status**

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.

**Motion:** It was M/S (Reding / Sanders) to table discussion and votes regarding KICA's programs until the ERC's next meeting.

**Motion carried: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions**

---

### Recommendations for Pittsburg State University - Program Review

---

Dockers abstained from discussion and votes regarding Pittsburg State University

---

#### **Elementary K-6 MAT NEW**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-7**

None

#### **Program Approval Status**

**Motion:** It was M/S (Minde / Wolf) to recommend "New Program Approved with Stipulation" status through **December 31, 2020**.

**Motion carried: 7 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 and submit a Progress report to address the new program stipulation.

---

#### **Library Media Specialist PreK-12 NEW**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-6**

None

#### **Program Approval Status**

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

**Motion carried: 7 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 and submit a Progress report to address the new program stipulation.

---

#### **Adjourn**

---

The meeting was adjourned by group consensus at 12:05pm.