

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

Official Minutes for Survey open from 2-7-14 to 3-12-14

Participated in Survey: Lorie Cook-Benjamin, Warren White, Cheryl Reding, Martin Stessman, Ralph Beacham, James Carnes, Becky Cheney, Allen Jantz, Kathy Wagoner, Beverly Furlong and Linda Springer

Absent: Michele Peres

Meeting of Review Teams

The Committee reviewed the agenda items individually via survey tool.

Assignments:

Barclay College Preconditions
Benedictine College, Progress Report, TchLder, Art

Team:

Warren White, Chair
Allen Jantz, Vice Chair
Ralph Beacham
James Carnes
Lorie Cook-Benjamin
Beverly Furlong
Becky Cheney
Michele Peres
Cheryl Reding
Linda Springer
Martin Stessman
Kathy Wagoner

Committee Deliberations and Actions

The Committee deliberated and took action on agenda items individually via survey tool.

Recommendations for Barclay College (Preconditions)

KSDE Accreditation candidacy

Preconditions	Team Findings
	Initial

1	The institution recognizes a professional education unit that has responsibility and authority for the preparation of teachers and other school professionals, and identifies a unit head such as a dean, director, or chair.	Met
2	Written policies and procedures guide the operations of the unit and include published criteria for admission to and exit from all initial teacher preparation and advanced programs.	Met
3	A list of programs indicates those that will be submitted to KSDE for review one year prior to the visit.	NA
4	The unit has a well developed conceptual framework that establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work in P-12 schools and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability.	Met
5	The unit's programs are approved by the appropriate state agency or agencies, and, in states with educator licensing examinations and required pass rates, the unit's summary pass rate meets or exceeds the required state pass rate.	NA
6	Institutions eligible for institutional or regional accreditation are accredited without probation or an equivalent status by the appropriate institutional accrediting agency recognized by the KSDE. Institutions not eligible for accreditation have a clean audit, appropriate business plan, and effective organizational practices similar to an accredited institution.	Met

Preconditions 1, 2, 4 and 6 Status

Motion: It was M/S (Cook-Benjamin/White) to retain the status of preconditions 1, 2, 4 and 6.

Motion carried; 9 in favor, 0 opposed and 1 abstention

Unit Accreditation Status

Motion: It was M/S (Cook-Benjamin/White) to recommend the status of “KSDE Accreditation Candidacy” through December 31, 2015.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

Recommendations for Benedictine College (Progress Report)

Art, (I, PreK-12)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Cook-Benjamin/White) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2020.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

Teacher Leader (A, PreK-12) (New Program)

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-8

AFIs

Standard 1

AFI 1.1 The Rubric for Assessments E and H lack specificity.

Rationale 1.1 The language in the rubric does not explicitly define what constitutes "minimal", "acceptable", and "deep understanding and application."

Standard 2

AFI 2.1 The alignment between Standard 2 and Assessment D is unclear.

Rationale 2.1 Improving curriculum, instruction, and assessment is not reflected in the rubric terminology or in the assignment description.

AFI 2.2 The rubric for Assessments D and E lack specificity.

Rationale 2.2 The language in the rubric does not explicitly define what constitutes "minimal", "acceptable", and "exemplary."

Standard 3

AFI 3.1 The rubric for Assessments B and F lack specificity.

Rationale 3.1 The language in the rubric does not explicitly define what constitutes "minimal", "acceptable", and "exemplary."

Standard 4

AFI 4.1 The rubric for Assessments C and G lack specificity.

Rationale 4.1 The language in the rubric does not explicitly define what constitutes "minimal", "acceptable", and "exemplary/deep understanding and application."

Standard 5

AFI 5.1 **The rubric for Assessments B, C and D lack specificity.**

Rationale 5.1 The language in the rubric does not explicitly define what constitutes "minimal", "acceptable", and "exemplary."

Standard 6

AFI 6.1 **Assessment D is not aligned with Standard 6.**

Rationale 6.1 Standard 6 is not listed/defined in the rubric for Assessment D or in the syllabus for ED 515.

AFI 6.2 The rubric for Assessments D and F lack specificity.

Rationale 6.2 The language in the rubric does not explicitly define what constitutes "minimal", "acceptable", and "exemplary."

Standard 7

AFI 7.1 **The rubric for Assessments C, D and G lack specificity.**

Rationale 7.1 The language in the rubric does not explicitly define what constitutes "minimal", "acceptable", and "exemplary."

Standard 8

AFI 8.1 **The rubric for Assessments E and H lack specificity.**

Rationale 8.1 The language in the rubric does not explicitly define what constitutes "minimal", "acceptable", and "exemplary."

Motion: It was M/S (Cook-Benjamin/White) to remove the areas for improvement.

Motion carried: 7 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention.

Motion: It was M/S (Cook-Benjamin/White) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2020.

Motion carried: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

The committee’s next meeting will be held on April 2014 at 11:30am via conference call.

Adjourn

The survey was closed on March 12, 2014.