

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

OFFICIAL Minutes for November 14, 2014

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

Absent: James Carnes, Rudy Perez

KSDE Staff: Catherine Chmidling, Jeanne Duncan, Jan Williams

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

Warren White, chair, called the meeting to order at 10:28AM.

Training: Jeanne Duncan conducted training on the ERC review process for all members.

Meeting Dates for 2015: The committee set following meeting dates: January 29, April 23 and June 19, 2015 in Room 254 at Landon State Office Building.

Approval of Agenda for November 14, 2014

Motion: It was M/S (Wagoner/Peres) to approve the agenda.
Motion carried; 9 in favor and 0 opposed

Approval of September 4, 2014 Minutes

Motion: It was M/S (Peres/Stessman) to approve the Minutes.
Motion carried; 9 in favor and 0 opposed

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 11:20AM.

Team One Members	University Being Reviewed: Review Purpose
Dr. Warren White, Team Chair	Newman University: Accreditation
Ms. Linda Springer	Barclay College: Limited Accreditation
Dr. Lorie Cook-Benjamin	Benedictine College: Program Upgrade - Math
Ms. Kathy Wagoner	ACCK: New Program Review - Adaptive
Mr. James Carnes, absent	MidAmerica Nazarene University: New Program Review – School Counseling
Mr. Rudy Perez, absent	Ottawa University: New Program Progress Reports - Music, Music-Vocal, Music-Instrumental, and Speech/Theatre
	University of Saint Mary: New Program Progress Reports - Adaptive and Elementary
	Newman University: New Program Review – District Leadership

Team Two Members	University Being Reviewed: Review Purpose
Dr. Cheryl Reding, Team Chair Ms. Beverly Furlong Ms. Michele Peres Dr. Allen Jantz Dr. Martin Stessman	Ottawa University: Accreditation Bethany College: Accreditation Southwestern College: Program Reviews - Biology, Chemistry, ECU, Elementary, English, History/Government/Social Studies, Math 5-8, Math 6-12, Music, PE, Speech/Theatre Washburn University: Program Upgrades – Mathematics 5-8, Mathematics 6- 12, Biology, Chemistry

Recommendations for Newman University (On-Site Accreditation Visit)

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

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1, 3, 5, 6

None

Standard 2

New AFI

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.

Standard 4

Continuing AFI

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 (White/Wagoner) to retain the areas for improvement.

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

Standards 1-6 Status

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

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

Standards		Team Findings	
		Initial	Advanced
1		Met	Met

	Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions		
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 (Springer/Jantz) to recommend the status of “**Accreditation**” through December 31, 2020.

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

Recommendations for Barclay College (On-Site KSDE Candidacy Accreditation Visit)

KSDE Candidacy Accreditation Visit – Initial Teacher Preparation

Areas for Improvement:

Standard 3, 4

None

Standard 1

New AFI

AFI 1.1 (Initial) Follow-up surveys have not been developed.

Rationale 1.1 The institution recognizes the need for follow-up surveys of graduates, but the surveys were not available in the documents.

Standard 2

New AFI

AFI 2.1 (Initial) The transition points lack consistency throughout the institutional report.

Rationale 2.1 Throughout the visit, the transitions points were revisited and revised; however, the transition points now have not been updated throughout the rest of the documents.

AFI 2.2 (Initial) Data related to diversity are not used to improve candidate performance and unit operations.

Rationale 2.2 Although data related to diversity of curriculum, faculty, candidates, and work with diverse students in P-12 schools are collected, there is not yet a plan for how these data are to be compiled, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance and unit operations.

AFI 2.3 (Initial) The assessment review cycle is incomplete.

Rationale 2.3 There is no plan for when and how data will be shared with key stakeholders for review and input.

Standard 5

New AFIs

AFI 5.1 (Initial) Faculty are not actively engaged in scholarly endeavors.

Rationale 5.1 Little evidence exists that faculty are encouraged to be active in scholarly activities.

Standard 6

New AFIs

AFI 6.1 (Initial) There is lack of evidence of broad participation in process of implementation and evaluation of the unit and its program.

Rationale 6.1 A flow chart was not available related to design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its program(s) to assure consistency in the analysis of acceptance, data evaluation, and program/unit design.

AFI 6.3 (Initial) The unit does not currently provide adequate support staff to support the unit in its design and implementation of the new program.

Rationale 6.3 It is not clear how current support staff and faculty will be able to (1) ensure the program can prepare candidates to meet the standards, and (2) to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize and analyze to improve candidate performance, program quality and unit operations.

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

Standard 5

New AFIs

AFI 5.2 (Initial) Load requirements exceed the 12-hour expectation.

Rationale 5.2 Most faculty teach 12-hour loads, but also can teach additional courses for additional pay. It appears that the teaching load does not allow time for scholarship.

Standard 6

New AFIs

AFI 6.2 (Initial) Unit faculty exceed the workload noted in NCATE Standard 6.

Rationale 6.2 Faculty loads are 12-15 hours, exceeding the 12 hour suggested load from the NCATE Standards. Additional pay is provided for teaching more classes, which appears to encourage overloads.

Motion cont.: and to remove the areas for improvement.

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

Standards 1-6 Status

Motion: It was M/S (Wagoner/Springer) to retain the status of the standards as follows:

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

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

Next visit—Fall 2017

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	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/Springer) to recommend the status of “**Limited Accreditation**” through December 31, 2017.

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

Recommendations for Benedictine College (Program Upgrade)

Mathematics (I, 6-12) Upgrade

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-9

None

Motion: It was M/S (White/Cook-Benjamin) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2019.

Motion carried; 8 in favor; 0 opposed and 1 abstention

Recommendations for Associated Colleges of Central Kansas (New Program Review)

Adaptive Special Education (I, PreK-12) New Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-8

None

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

Motion carried; 7 in favor; 0 opposed; and 2 abstentions

Recommendations for MidAmerica Nazarene University (New Program Reviews)

School Counseling (A, PreK-12) New Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-4, 6-10

None

Standard 5

AFI 5.1: **There is no evidence of assessing understanding and demonstrating knowledge of assessment and research procedures.**

Rationale 5.1: Section 1 of the Program Development Project does not clearly assess standard 5, "The school counselor understands and demonstrates knowledge of assessment and research procedures and instruments needed to assist all students." The project did not appear to address the concepts and procedures of qualitative and quantitative research, creating sample designs, statistical reporting and techniques and other concepts in research procedures that are generally addressed in a research methods course.

Motion: It was M/S (White/Cook-Benjamin) to remove the area for improvement and to recommend the status of “**Approved with Stipulation**” through December 31, 2016.

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

Recommendations for Ottawa University (New Program Progress Reports)

Music (I, PreK-12) New Program Progress Report

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-9

None

Motion: It was M/S (Springer/Cook-Benjamin) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2019.

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

Music – Instrumental (I, PreK-12) New Program Progress Report

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-9

None

Motion: It was M/S (Springer/Cook-Benjamin) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2019.

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

Music – Vocal (I, PreK-12) New Program Progress Report

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-9

None

Motion: It was M/S (Springer/Cook-Benjamin) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2019.

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

Speech/Theatre (I, 6-12) New Program Progress Report

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-6

None

Motion: It was M/S (Springer/Cook-Benjamin) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2019.

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

Recommendations for University of Saint Mary (New Program Progress Reports)

Adaptive Special Education (A, K-6, 5-8, 6-12) New Program Progress Report

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1, 3-8

None

Standard 2

AFI 2.1 **Assessment 4 Action Research Project is not specific to this standard.**

Rationale 2.1 This project is dependent on the individual candidate's choice and would only be applicable if the topic chosen is related to the elements of the standard.

Motion: It was M/S (White/Cook-Benjamin to continue the Area for Improvement, and to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2017.

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

Elementary Education (I, K-6, Accelerated) New Program Progress Report

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (White/Springer to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2017.

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

Recommendations for Newman University (New Program Review)

District Leadership (A, P-12) New Program Review

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-6

None

Motion: It was M/S (White/Springer to recommend the status of “**Approved with Stipulation**” through December 31, 2016.

Motion carried: 8 in favor; 0 opposed, and 1 abstention

Recommendations for Ottawa University (Onsite 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 4

New AFI

AFI 4.1 Not 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.

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz/Peres) to remove the Areas for Improvement,

Standard 3

New AFI

AFI 3.1 (Advanced) The unit does not systematically ensure that all candidates are placed in diverse settings at the advanced level.

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.

Motion cont.: to modify the Areas for Improvement,

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 cont.: and to continue the Areas for Improvement.

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

Standards 1-6 Status

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

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

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

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	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/Peres) to recommend the status of “**Accreditation**” through December 31, 2020.

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

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.

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.

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz/Stessman) to continue the Areas for Improvement.

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

Standards 1-6 Status

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz/Stessman) to retain the status of the Standards as follows:

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

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/Peres) to recommend the status of “**Accreditation**” through December 31, 2020.

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

Recommendations for Southwestern College (Program Reviews)

Biology (I, 6-12) Continuing Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-18

None

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz/Peres) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2021.

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

Chemistry (I, 6-12) Dormant Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-13

None

Motion: It was M/S (Stessman/Peres) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2021.

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

Early Childhood Unified (I, B-Gr3) Continuing Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-13

None

Motion: It was M/S (Stessman/Reding) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2021.

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

Elementary (I, K-6) Continuing Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Peres/Furlong) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2021.

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

English (I, 6-12) Continuing Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-2, 4

None

Standard 3

New AFI

AFI 3.1: Assessment 6 disaggregated data are not provided.

Rationale 3.2: Data from Assessment 6, divided between the scores which apply to this standard and those which apply to standard 3, are not provided.

Motion: It was M/S (Jantz/Stessman) to continue the Area for Improvement, and to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2021.

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

History, Government, and Social Studies (I, 6-12) Continuing Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-10

None

Motion: It was M/S (Reding/Peres) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2021.

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

Mathematics (I, 5-8) Continuing Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-9

None

Motion: It was M/S (Peres/Stessman) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2021.

Motion carried: 8 in favor; 0 opposed, and 1 abstention

Mathematics (I, 6-12) Continuing Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-9

None

Motion: It was M/S (Reding/Peres) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2021.

Motion carried: 8 in favor; 0 opposed, and 1 abstention

Music (I, PreK-12) Continuing Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7, 9

None

Standard 8

AFI 8.1 It is unclear how Assessment 6 addresses the standard.

Rationale 8.1 Neither the rubric nor the narrative provide sufficient evidence that Assessment 6 is aligned with the standard.

Motion: It was M/S (Stessman/Furlong) to continue the Area for Improvement, and to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2021.

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

Physical Education (I, PreK-12) Continuing Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-7

None

Motion: It was M/S (Reding/Furlong) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2021.

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

Speech/Theatre (I, 6-12) Continuing Program

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-6

None

Motion: It was M/S (Peres/Jantz) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2021.

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

Recommendations for Washburn University (Program Upgrade Reports)

Mathematics (I, 5-8) Upgrade

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-9

None

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

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

Mathematics (I, 6-12) Upgrade

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 9

None

Motion: It was M/S (Peres/Stessman) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

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

Biology (I, 6-12) Upgrade

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-18

None

Motion: It was M/S (Stessman/Peres) to recommend the status of “**Approved**” through December 31, 2016.

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

Chemistry (I, 6-12) Upgrade

Areas for Improvement:

Standards 1-13

None

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

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