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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Team Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Team Findings on Movement Toward Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assessment System and Unit Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Field Experiences and Clinical Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unit Governance and Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard 3-Moving toward target (developing/emerging)**

Next visit—Fall 2020

**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 AFI
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 AFI
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 AFI
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 AFI
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Team Findings</th>
<th>Team Findings on Movement Toward Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assessment System and Unit Evaluation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Field Experiences and Clinical Practice</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unit Governance and Resources</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next visit—Fall 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Team Findings on Movement Toward Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assessment System and Unit Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Field Experiences and Clinical Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unit Governance and Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit Accreditation Status

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Team Findings</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Assessment System and Unit Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Unit Governance and Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard 5-Moving toward target (developing/emerging)
Next visit—Fall 2020

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

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Team Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

- Met
- NA

### Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

- Met
- NA

### Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

- Met
- NA

### Diversity

- Met
- NA

### Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

- Met
- NA

### Unit Governance and Resources

- Met
- NA

#### Standard 2-Moving toward target (developing/emerging)

**Next visit—Fall 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Team Findings on Movement Toward Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Assessment System and Unit Evaluation</td>
<td>Emerging or Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Diversity</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Unit Governance and Resources</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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.
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