

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

OFFICIAL Minutes for September 4, 2014

Present: Lorie Cook-Benjamin, Beverly Furlong, Allen Jantz, Michele Peres, Cheryl Reding, Linda Springer, Martin Stessman, Kathy Wagoner, Warren White

Absent: James Carnes, Becky Cheney, Rudy Perez

KSDE Staff: Catherine Chmidling, Jeanne Duncan, Jessica Noble, Jan Williams

**Called meeting to order – Chair, Warren White
Allen Jantz, Vice-Chair**

Warren White, chair, called the meeting to order at 10:05 AM.

Approval of Agenda for September 4, 2014

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz/Peres) to approve the agenda.
Motion carried; 8 in favor and 0 opposed

Approval of December 6, 2013 Minutes

Motion: It was M/S (Peres/Cook-Benjamin) to approve the agenda.
Motion carried; 8 in favor and 0 opposed

Approval of March 2014 Minutes

Motion: It was M/S (White/Wagoner) to approve the minutes.
Motion carried; 8 in favor and 0 opposed

Training for New Members

Not all members were present. A review of the ERC Handbook and a discussion of the need for training were presented. The decision was made by committee request to schedule training for the November meeting. All members need to be present for the training.

Election of Officers

Motion: it was M/S (Stessman/Peres) to retain the current officers (White: Chair; Jantz:Vice-Chair) for a second term.
Motion carried; 7 in favor and 2 abstaining (White; Jantz)

Meeting of Review Teams

Warren White served as the Team One chair; Cheryl Reding served as the Team Two chair. The review teams met at 10:42AM.

<p align="center">Team One Members</p> <p>Dr. Warren White, Team Chair Ms. Linda Springer Dr. Lorie Cook-Benjamin Ms. Kathy Wagoner Mr. James Carnes, absent Mr. Rudy Perez, absent</p>	<p align="center">University Being Reviewed: Review Purpose</p> <p>Benedictine College: Accreditation Newman University: Accreditation MidAmerica Nazarene University: New Program, Reading Specialist Washburn University: New Program, ESOL</p>
---	---

<p align="center">Team Two Members</p> <p>Dr. Cheryl Reding, Team Chair Ms. Beverly Furlong Ms. Michele Peres Dr. Becky Cheney, absent Dr. Allen Jantz Dr. Martin Stessman</p>	<p align="center">University Being Reviewed: Review Purpose</p> <p>Ottawa University: Accreditation Bethany College: Accreditation Barclay College: Program Review, Elementary Education Central Christian College: New Program, Music</p>
--	--

Recommendations for Benedictine College (On-Site Accreditation Visit)

KSDE/NCATE Continuing Accreditation Visit – Initial Teacher Preparation, Advanced Preparation

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1-5

None

Standard 6

AFI 6.1 Faculty loads generally exceed 12 hours for undergraduate teaching and nine hours for graduate teaching per semester.

Rationale 6.1 The workload data presented by the unit show that average workloads across the unit full time faculty members consistently exceed the "acceptable" guidelines provided in the standards. The current workload for unit faculty challenges the promotion of intellectual vitality, best teaching practices, and scholarship.

Motion: It was M/S (White/Wagoner) to retain the area for improvement.

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

Standards 1-6 Status

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

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

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

Standard 2-Moving toward target (developing/emerging)

Next visit: Fall 2020

Standards		Team Findings on Movement Toward Target	
		Initial	Advanced
1	Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	NA	NA
2	Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Emerging or Developing	Emerging or Developing
3	Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	NA	NA
4	Diversity	NA	NA
5	Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	NA	NA
6	Unit Governance and Resources	NA	NA

Unit accreditation Status

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

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

Recommendations for Newman University (On-Site Accreditation Visit)

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1, 3, 5

None

New AFI

Standard 2

AFI 2.1(Initial/Advanced) The unit's assessment system is neither consistent nor comprehensive in collecting and analyzing data to improve the performance of the unit.

Rationale 2.1 The unit has an assessment system that collects data on applicant qualifications, candidate performance and program standards; limited data are collected on other unit operations such as performance of graduates. Some important data are collected outside of the School of Education and are not easily accessible. Available data are neither analyzed nor results used toward improvement of candidate performance, the unit, and its programs.

Continuing AFI

Standard 4

AFI 4.1(Initial/Advanced) Candidates have limited opportunities to work with faculty from diverse groups.

Rationale 4.1 The unit did not provide evidence that all candidates work with diverse professional education faculty, faculty from other units, and/or P-12 school faculty.

Motion: it was M/S (Jantz/White) to table discussion until the Committee members had reviewed the Institution’s Rejoinder.

Motion carried; in favor 9; opposed 0 and abstentions 0

Standards 1-6 Status

Motion: it was M/S (Jantz/White) to table discussion until the Committee members had reviewed the Institution’s Rejoinder.

Motion carried; in favor 9; opposed 0 and abstentions 0

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

Standard 3-Moving toward target (developing/emerging)

Next visit—Fall 2020

Standards		Team Findings on Movement Toward Target	
		Initial	Advanced
1	Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	NA	NA
2	Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	NA	NA
3	Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Emerging or Developing	Emerging or Developing
4	Diversity	NA	NA
5	Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	NA	NA
6	Unit Governance and Resources	NA	NA

Unit Accreditation Status

Motion: it was M/S (Jantz/White) to table discussion until the Committee members had reviewed the Institution's Rejoinder.

Motion carried; in favor 9; opposed 0 and abstentions 0

Recommendations for Ottawa University (On-Site Accreditation Visit)

KSDE/NCATE Continuing Accreditation Visit – Initial Teacher Preparation, Advanced Preparation

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 5

None

Standard 1

New AFI

AFI 1.1(Advanced) The unit does not ensure that advanced candidates are able to create positive environments for student learning and understand and build upon the developmental levels of P-12 students with whom they work; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work.

Rationale 1.1 The unit did not provide sufficient data indicating all program outcomes are being met.

Standard 2

New AFI

AFI 2.1(Initial/Advanced) The unit does not regularly aggregate assessment and evaluation data on the unit's operations, programs, or candidates.

Rationale 2.1 All components of the assessment system are not fully operationalized and are being modified continuously. The systematic aggregation of data, processes, schedule, and accessibility are not fully structured to optimize system capacity and inform stakeholders to make data-driven decisions to improve candidate, program, and unit operations.

Standard 3

New AFI

AFI 3.1(Initial/Advanced) The unit does not systematically ensure that all candidates are placed in diverse settings at both the initial and advanced levels.

Rationale 3.1 At both the initial and advanced level, the unit uses the Diversity Form to collect demographic information for placement during field experiences and student teaching. There is no evidence that the information from the Diversity Form is used to systematically ensure that all candidates are placed in diverse settings. Some candidates indicate that they complete all field experiences and practicums in the same school and/or district.

Standard 4

New AFI

AFI 4.1Not all candidates are prepared to work effectively with racially and ethnically diverse student populations, including English language learners.

Rationale 4.1 Opportunities for initial candidates to understand the importance of ethnic and racial diversity in teaching and learning are limited, with many candidates viewing students from diverse ethnic and racial backgrounds from a deficit model.

New AFI

AFI 4.2 Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with ethnically and racially diverse student populations including English language learners.

Rationale 4.2 Some candidates only spent one day in a school with a ethnically/racially diverse student population during their program, while many other candidates complete all their early field, practicums, or student teaching in schools with little or no student ethnic or racial diversity. Most candidates have little or no opportunity to work with ELL students.

Standard 6

New AFI

AFI 6.1 Not all candidates are given the opportunity to learn how to use current instructional technology to facilitate student learning.

Rationale 6.1 Candidates shared that they are not instructed in how to use up-to date instructional technology during program courses. Candidates reported that they learn how to use these new technologies at cooperative sites.

New AFI

AFI 6.2 The unit has an inadequate number of full-time teaching faculty to insure program coherence and integrity.

Rationale 6.2 The unit is currently offering four graduate-level degree programs with only .75 FTE dedicated full-time teaching faculty.

Motion: it was M/S (Jantz/White) to table discussion until the Committee members had reviewed the Institution’s Rejoinder.

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

Standards 1-6

Motion: it was M/S (Jantz/White) to table discussion until the Committee members had reviewed the Institution’s Rejoinder.

Motion carried; in favor 9; opposed 0 and abstentions 0

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

Standard 5-Moving toward target (developing/emerging)

Next visit—Fall 2020

	Team Findings on Movement Toward
--	---

Standards		Target	
		Initial	Advanced
1	Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	NA	NA
2	Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	NA	NA
3	Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	NA	NA
4	Diversity	NA	NA
5	Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Emerging or Developing	Emerging or Developing
6	Unit Governance and Resources	NA	NA

Unit Accreditation Status

Motion: it was M/S (Jantz/White) to table discussion until the Committee members had reviewed the Institution’s Rejoinder.

Motion carried; in favor 9; opposed 0 and abstentions 0

Recommendations for Bethany College (On-Site Accreditation Visit)

KSDE/NCATE Continuing Accreditation Visit – Initial Teacher Preparation

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 3, 5-6

None

Standard 1

New AFI

AFI 1.1(Initial) Not all unit candidates are integrating technology in teaching and learning.

Rationale 1.1 Music education candidates are not required to take the Instructional Technology course that focuses on integrating technology in teaching and learning.

Standard 2

New AFI

AFI 2.1(Initial) The unit does not systematically aggregate, summarize, and share data from all key assessments.

Rationale 2.1 Although data are collected and discussed, the unit did not provide evidence of aggregated, summarized data from key assessments at program transition points.

Standard 4

New AFIs

AFI 4.1(Initial) Candidates have limited opportunity to work with diverse clinical faculty in school-based settings and diverse professional education faculty in the unit.

Rationale 4.1 No evidence was provided concerning the racial/ethnic characteristics of the school-based clinical faculty.

_____ Continue the Area for Improvement _____ Remove the Area for Improvement _____ Modify the Area for Improvement

AFI 4.2(Initial) Candidates have limited opportunity to work with diverse professional education faculty in the unit.

Rationale 4.2 Professional education faculty in the unit are not from two or more ethnic/racial groups.

_____ Continue the Area for Improvement _____ Remove the Area for Improvement _____ Modify the Area for Improvement

Motion: it was M/S (Jantz/White) to table discussion until the Committee members had reviewed the Institution’s Rejoinder.

Motion carried; in favor 9; opposed 0 and abstentions 0

Standards 1-6 Status

Motion: it was M/S (Jantz/White) to table discussion until the Committee members had reviewed the Institution’s Rejoinder.

Motion carried; in favor 9; opposed 0 and abstentions 0

Standards		Team Findings	
		Initial	Advanced
1	Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	Met	NA
2	Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Met	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	Met	NA

Standard 2-Moving toward target (developing/emerging)

Next visit—Fall 2020

Standards		Team Findings on Movement Toward Target	
		Initial	Advanced
1	Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	NA	NA
2	Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Emerging or Developing	NA
3	Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	NA	NA

4	Diversity	NA	NA
5	Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	NA	NA
6	Unit Governance and Resources	NA	NA

Unit Accreditation Status

Motion: it was M/S (Jantz/White) to table discussion until the Committee members had reviewed the Institution’s Rejoinder.

Motion carried; in favor 9; opposed 0 and abstentions 0

Recommendations for MidAmerica Nazarene University (New Program Review)

Reading Specialist (A, PreK-12) New Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-5

None

Motion: it was M/S (White/Wagoner) to recommend the status of “**New Program Approved with Stipulation**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Recommendations for Washburn University (New Program Review)

ESOL (A, PreK-12) New Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-3, 7-10

None

Standard 4

AFI 4.1 Assessment 6 (Appendix 1, p. 6) is not completely aligned with the standard.

Rationale 4.1 While the Communication category in Appendix I requires the demonstration of effective communication with "members of the community," it does not specifically delineate the evaluation of candidate communication with "members of various cultural groups in the community."

Standard 5

AFI 5.1. The rubric for Assessment 3 (Appendix II, p. 9) lacks specificity as to the descriptive levels of candidate accomplishment.

Rationale 5.1. The distinctions between "little" meaningful activities, "some" meaningful activities, and "multiple" meaningful activities are not specified, and consequently, are not reliably measureable as to what candidates are expected to understand by the development of communication skills across the six communicative domains.

Standard 6

AFI 6.1. The differences between the two category levels (U and D) in the rubric for the case study (Appendix IV, p. 15) are not measureable.

Rationale 6.1. Level U specifies the use of assessment tools as "only formal or informal," while Level D states the use of assessment tools that "are not both formal and informal." Both are the same. In the second part of the rubric description, both Levels U and D specify the use of assessment tools that "are not in both the first and second language of the student." The inclusion of "and/or" between these two parts in Level U vs the inclusion of only "or" between these two parts in Level D makes the distinction between these two levels inconclusive.

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

AFI 5.2. Assessment 3 (Appendix II, p. 9, 11) does not address the standard in its entirety.

Rationale 5.2. Although the rubric identifies communication skills in speaking, listening, reading, and writing, there is no indication that the communication skills of "viewing and representing visually across the curriculum" will be measured.

AFI 5.3. The course grade for ED 450 (Appendix III, p. 13) does not address the standard in its entirety.

Rationale 5.3. There is no specific reference in the Course Description or the Course Objectives about candidate understanding of "the importance of using language in socially and culturally appropriate ways by developing communication skills [across the six communication domains]."

Motion cont.: to continue the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of "New Program Approved with Stipulation" through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Recommendations for Barclay College (New Program Review)

Elementary Education (I, K-6) New Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: it was M/S (Stessman/Jantz) to recommend the status of "New Program Approved with Stipulation" through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Recommendations for Central Christian College (New Program Review)

Music (I, PreK-12) New Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-9

None

Motion: it was M/S (Peres/Furlong) to recommend the status of “**New Program Approved with Stipulation**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried; 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions