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Introduction
The preparation of teachers, counselors, administrators, and other school personnel is a major priority at Wichita State University. The College of Applied Studies and its dean have been designated by the University as holding primary authority and responsibility for such preparation. Authority and responsibility for advanced programs are exercised through appropriate academic departments in the College of Applied Studies (and Graduate School as relevant), whereas authority and responsibility for initial teacher preparation are exercised through collaborative mechanisms and efforts among the Colleges of Applied Studies, Liberal Arts and Sciences, and Fine Arts. Regardless of the type of school personnel being prepared through WSU programs, there is considerable need and value for consulting with professional practitioners in the design, assessment and future directions of these programs.

This document describes those aspects of university decision-making that are unique to the preparation of teachers and other school personnel. It describes the components, responsibilities and operations of governance that supplement, but do not supplant, university decision-making processes. Relevant decisions addressed by these governance mechanisms include overall program admission requirements, program design and courses of study, program assessment and related criteria, adherence to state/national standards (including program approval and unit accreditation), and any special considerations that supplement other academic program policies (e.g., field placements, instructor qualifications, dispositions for candidates).

Components and Responsibilities
Along with teaching, curriculum design, development and assessment are among the primary responsibilities of the university faculty. The participation and influence of faculty are fundamental to decision-making relevant to programs for the preparation of teachers and other school personnel. A basic premise of the Unit’s governance is central involvement of faculty closest to the implementation or impact of decisions. In addition to curricular and program issues, governance addresses a variety of related policy issues. While faculty are closely involved in those matters, such policy issues tend to arise from administrative elements of the governance system.

There are four components of Unit governance. Three—the program committees, unit head, and program advisory councils—are common to both initial and advanced programs, while the fourth is unique for each—an initial programs committee and an advanced programs committee. Figure 1 provides an organizational chart that includes each of the four components.

---

1 This governance applies only to programs that prepare school personnel. Other programs (e.g., sport management, exercise science, educational psychology) follow procedures established in respective college and university governance.
I. Program Committees. The most basic component of Unit governance is the Program Committee. It is through the Program Committees that most program changes are initiated, implemented, assessed, and then reaffirmed or redesigned. There is generally one program committee for each program or cross-program component (e.g., Professional Education). However, some programs are so closely aligned that it is more efficient to address these through a combined Program Committee (e.g., science education).

Composed of faculty actively engaged in each program or cross-program component, Program committees are responsible for:

1) providing overall program curricular leadership – including curriculum, assessments and related criteria/coursework, and transition point criteria;
2) reviewing aggregate program candidate and related unit operations assessment data (at least annually) and any special data on assessment properties (e.g., reliability and validity) (a) to address fundamental program questions, and (b) to prepare a report on the results of that
review, including recommendations for any program/assessment changes deemed appropriate;
3) establishing and convening (at least annually) a program advisory council to consult on data summaries and preliminary conclusions and recommendations derived from the program reviews;
4) working with relevant faculties/departments to discuss and implement suggested program changes;
5) considering/responding to matters referred to it for consideration/input from the Unit’s Assessment Committee, the Initial Licensure Teacher Education Program Committee (ILTPC--initial programs) or Advanced Program Committee (APC--advanced programs) or the Unit Head;
6) gathering information/writing reports/responding to special requests for accrediting bodies (KSDE/CAEP); and
7) maintaining minutes of committee meetings, submitted to the College of Applied Studies’ Unit Head’s office and maintained on the Unit’s server.

II. Unit Head. The primary administrative authority and responsibility for the preparation of school personnel at WSU has been assigned to the Dean of the College of Applied Studies as Unit Head. As such, the Unit Head is the final approval/recommending entity in all matters of school personnel preparation, and carries a special responsibility for overall policy and for providing leadership in maintaining KSDE/CAEP accreditation. Because of its cross-college nature, the Unit Head collaborates with the Deans of Liberal Arts and Sciences and Fine Arts on matters of initial teacher preparation and with the Graduate Dean on matters of advanced school personnel preparation, as relevant.

III. Program Advisory Councils. Associated with each Program Committee is a Program Advisory Council. Convened by their respective Program Committees, Advisory Councils are responsible for:
1) providing input and advice on programs, including need, curricula, assessments, related criteria, and the Guiding Program Document (if any);
2) providing input and advice on tentative program review results/recommendations from Program Committee based upon program data summaries;
3) providing input/feedback on matters of general concern to school personnel preparation programs (e.g., Conceptual Framework); and
4) serving as program advocates.

Advisory Council membership is established by the Program Committee and consists of at least five individuals representing the program’s various constituents, especially area practitioners. At least one member will be a current candidate in the program and at least one member will be a graduate from the program. Members are appointed by the Program Committee for 3-year terms, except for the current candidate, which will be for a one-year term.

IV. Initial Licensure Teacher Education Program Committee (Initial Only). Unique to initial preparation programs is the Initial Licensure Teacher Education Program Committee (ILTPC).²

Purpose and Authority. The ILTPC is responsible for:
1) providing overall program curricular leadership – including curriculum, assessments and related criteria/coursework, transition point criteria, and any supplemental guiding program documents developed for the program;

² Revised ILTPC description approved Nov. 1, 2012.
a. reviewing proposed program changes in the areas of curriculum (including program checksheets), assessments and related criteria, and program transition point elements and related criteria to (a) ensure adequate consultation with relevant academic departments and programs, and (b) making recommendations to the Unit Head and/or provide feedback to initiating Program Committees;

2) examining input from the Unit Head (or representative) or Assessment Committee on matters derived from Unit assessments in order to provide input or make relevant recommendations;

3) reviewing aggregate program candidate and related unit operations assessment data (at least annually) and any special data from the Unit Assessment Coordinator on assessment properties (e.g., reliability and validity) (a) to address fundamental program questions, and (b) to prepare a report on the results of that review, including recommendations for any program/assessment changes deemed appropriate;

4) establishing and convening (at least annually) program advisory councils to consult on data summaries and preliminary conclusions and recommendations derived from the program reviews;

5) distributing a Professional Education annual report to all initial program committees for review at the respective program advisory council meetings.

6) ensuring that initial preparation programs, especially proposed changes in programs, are consistent with state and national accreditation standards.

7) gathering information/writing reports/responding to special requests for accrediting bodies (KSDE/CAEP); and

8) maintaining minutes of committee meetings, submitted to the Unit Head’s office and maintained on the Unit’s server.

Composition. ILTPC membership consists of the chairs of Program Committees for initial programs plus a representative of the Counseling, Educational Leadership, Educational and School Psychology faculty (CLES department). The Faculty Senate has established a University General Education Committee made up of collegiate representatives. The ILTPC also appoints one of those representatives (from Applied Studies, Liberal Arts and Sciences or Fine Arts) to the serve also as a member of the ILTPC. Ex officio (non-voting) members include a representative of CAS Advising Center (field placement/advisement/licensure), as appointed by the Unit Head, and Assistant Dean/Accreditation Officer for Applied Studies and an associate or assistant dean from both Liberal Arts and Sciences and Fine Arts. The Applied Studies Assistant Dean sets the agenda and serves as chair/convener of the Committee.

Meetings. The ILTPC meets at least once per academic semester. Special meetings of the ILTPC may be called by the Unit Head (or representative), or by any three ILTPC members.

IV. Advanced Program Committee (Advanced Only). Unique to advanced preparation programs is the Advanced Program Committee (APC). The APC is responsible for:

1) reviewing proposed advanced program changes in the areas of curriculum (including program checksheets), assessments and related criteria, and program transition point elements and related criteria to (a) ensure adequate consultation with relevant academic departments and programs, and (b) to make recommendations to the Unit Head and/or provide feedback to initiating Program Committees;

2) examining input from the Unit Head (or representative) or Assessment Committee on matters derived from Unit assessments in order to provide input or make relevant recommendations;

3) initiating concerns or recommendations relevant to advanced preparation programs and
communicating such to relevant programs or the Unit Head;
4) convening and consulting with a larger cross-program group of faculty on matters of critical importance to advanced preparation; and
5) reviewing all proposed advanced program changes to ensure these are consistent with state and national accreditation standards

APC membership consists of the program chairs of all advanced unit programs and the Associate Dean (who serves ex officio non-voting). The Committee is chaired by an elected member, who serves a three-year term. The APC meets at least once per academic semester; special meetings may be called by the Unit Head, the APC Chair or by formal request to the APC Chair from three APC members.

**Governance Process**

As indicated above, Unit governance is focused on those areas of decision-making that address WSU programs preparing teachers and other school personnel and that supplement other university decision-making. Relevant decision-making areas include overall program design and courses of study, program assessment and related criteria, adherence to state/national standards (including accreditation), and any special general/policy matters that broadly relate to program implementation (e.g., instructor qualifications).

Figure 1 outlines major components of Unit governance as they interact with traditional governance elements of Wichita State University. As may be inferred from Figure 1, *Initial Program* issues generally are expected to arise from Program Committees, perhaps based upon program assessment reviews or input from program faculty. Impetus for program changes may come from a variety of other sources as well (e.g., ILTPC or other Program Committees), but the Program Committee is the basic deliberative and implementation group for program-specific change. In consultation with Program Advisory Councils and relevant Program Committees and academic departments, Program Committees propose course and program changes and submit these to the ILTPC for consideration. The ILTPC reviews proposed changes, considering any broad issues involved and ensuring interactions with other program elements or curricula have been adequately addressed, and ordinarily either (a) returns the proposal to the Program Committee with concerns/questions, or (b) reviews and votes on the matter. If the proposal is approved, the ILTPC forwards the proposed change and recommendation(s) to the Unit Head with copies to the Program Committee. The ILTPC may choose to convene and consult with all teacher education faculty as a group as part of its deliberations.

The Unit Head considers the proposed change and related ILTPC recommendation and either (a) returns the proposal and recommendation to the ILTPC with questions or concerns or (b) approves the change with copies of that approval sent to the Program Committee, ILTPC and relevant Department/College Curriculum Committee, if appropriate. Ordinarily, the Unit Head will consult with the Deans of Liberal Arts and Sciences and Fine Arts on initial program matters impacting programs housed in those other colleges.

Where proposed changes require broader institutional approval (e.g., new course or course title change), Program Committees also work through the relevant academic departments to submit changes to the appropriate department and college curriculum committees. Such committees inspect for approval from the ILTPC before proceeding on matters relevant to preparation programs for teacher or other school personnel. Assuming endorsement by appropriate curriculum committees, proposed changes are forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs for consideration/approval.
Advanced Program issues also are expected generally to arise from Program Committees, perhaps based upon program assessment reviews or input from program faculty/other sources. In consultation with Program Advisory Councils and relevant Program Committees and academic departments, Program Committees propose program changes and submit these to the APC for consideration. The APC reviews proposed changes, considering any broad issues involved and ensuring interaction with other program areas have been adequately addressed, and ordinarily either (a) returns the proposal to the Program Committee with concerns/questions or (b) reviews and votes on the matter. If the proposal is approved, the APC forwards the proposed change and recommendation/s to the Unit Head with copies to the Program Committee. The APC may choose to convene and consult with a cross-program faculty group as part of its deliberations.

The Unit Head considers the proposed changes and APC recommendations and either (a) returns the proposal and recommendations to the APC with questions or concerns or (b) approves the change with copies of that approval sent to the Program Committee, the APC and relevant Department/College Curriculum Committee, if appropriate. When necessary, the Unit Head will consult with the Dean of the Graduate School on advanced program matters.

Where proposed changes require broader institutional approval (e.g., new course or course title change), Program Committees also work through the relevant academic departments to submit changes to the appropriate department and college curriculum committees. Such committees inspect for approval from the Unit Head before proceeding on matters relevant to preparation programs for teachers or other school personnel. Assuming endorsement by appropriate curriculum committees, proposed changes are forwarded to the Graduate Dean and Council for consideration and approval.

Policy issues relative to the Unit and preparation programs generally arise from the Unit Head or from the ILTPC.

Unit Committees

In order to affect the business of the Unit, standing and ad hoc committees may be established. Standing committees handle on-going business of the Unit that require on-going or periodic tasks or that require specialized expertise or that would be inefficiently handled by the ILTPC and APC. Ad hoc committees are those established to provide special input to Unit governance components that are expected not to be ongoing in nature. Standing committees are established by joint action of the APC and ILTPC, with approval of the Unit Head, whereas ad hoc committees may be appointed by another component of governance. Membership of standing committees is established as part of such committee’s charter; ad hoc committees report to the entity establishing its creation, unless directed to do otherwise in its charge. The following are the Unit’s standing committees:

I. Unit Assessment Committee. The Unit Assessment Committee is a duly authorized committee of the Unit (and the College of Applied Studies) with the following purpose and authority, composition and responsibilities.

a. Purpose and Authority. The Unit Assessment Committee is responsible for providing faculty leadership and making recommendations on assessment matters for the Professional Education Unit (and the College of Applied Studies).
b. **Composition.** The Unit Assessment Committee includes one representative from each College of Applied Studies department, a representative from the College of Fine Arts (FA) or Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS), and the associate dean and assistant dean/accreditation officer, both ex officio (with votes only in the case of a tie). College of Applied Studies members are elected by the faculty of respective departments in such a way as to have three-year staggered terms. The representative of Fine Arts or Liberal Arts and Sciences is appointed by the Unit Head, in consultation with the Deans of LAS and FA, and serves a 2-year term. The Chair of the Committee is elected annually from among the membership of the committee. Ordinarily, committee members are elected/appointed in the spring.

c. **Responsibility.** The Committee has broad responsibility for assessment in the Unit/College of Applied Studies, including the following specific responsibilities:

1. providing broad faculty oversight in implementing the Unit Assessment System and associated program assessment plans,
2. reviewing/monitoring specific program assessment plans and annual reports to provide constructive feedback for Program Committees (each program reviewed at least every 5 years),
3. recommending/developing and reviewing assessment policies,
4. reviewing aggregated unit assessment data, especially related to unit operations, to make recommendations in accordance with the Unit Assessment System,
5. conducting periodic reviews of the Unit Assessment System, recommending modifications as appropriate, and
6. periodically reviewing the Unit Assessment Committee’s responsibilities to update as needed.

d. **Meetings.** The Unit Assessment Committee meets during the academic year at times deemed reasonable in terms of meeting the Committee’s responsibilities.

e. **Committee Actions.** The Committee shall work closely with the Associate Dean and Assistant Dean/Accreditation Officer in carrying out its responsibilities, making periodic reports and relevant recommendations to Unit/College of Applied Studies leadership, committees or other Unit/College of Applied Studies entity as relevant.

II. **Field Experience Committee.** The Field Experience Committee is a duly authorized academic committee of the Professional Education unit with the following purposes, authority, composition and responsibilities.

a. **Purpose and Authority.** The Field Experience Committee works closely with the Assistant Dean/Associate Dean of the College of Applied Studies and is responsible for the reviewing of and making recommendations on field placement matters for the Professional Education Unit.

Exception applications pertaining to field experiences rest with the appropriate department head. In making such applications, candidates are to first seek advisor review, then submit their request to the Office of CAS Advising Center to be forwarded to the appropriate
department head for final decision.\(^3\) If an application for field placement exception is approved, a fee of $500 may be added to the candidate’s tuition and fees account to cover the cost of additional supervision outside of the partnership.

b. **Composition.** The Field Experience Committee includes: (a) three faculty members from a minimum of two colleges/schools nominated by the ILTPC, (b) one faculty member selected by the Advanced Program Committee (APC), (c) two representatives from participating school district selected by the Field Experience Committee, (d) the Field Placement Coordinator, who acts as chair of the committee, (e) one representative from CAS Advising Center, and (f) Assistant Dean/Associate Dean and the Chair/Department Heads of School of Education and CLES serve as ex officio members with tie-breaking votes.

c. **Term.** Committee members serve three-year, staggered terms. Committee members for the committee are elected in the spring.

d. **Responsibility.** The committee has broad responsibility for field experience in Professional Education academic programs, with the following specific responsibilities:
   1. Coordinate broad policy governing field experiences in the areas of program requirements, placement and supervision;
   2. Provide faculty review and oversight for candidate placement and supervision in field experience procedures;
   3. Maintain communication between faculty/programs and field experience support functions in the Office of CAS Advising Center;
   4. Shall work closely with the Assistant Dean/Associate Dean and make periodic reports and recommendations to the College’s Leadership Team, ILPTC, APC and faculty, as relevant.

e. **Meetings.** The Field Experience Committee meets during academic year at times deemed reasonable to meet the Committee’s responsibilities.

III. **Unit Undergraduate/Graduate Exceptions Committee.** The Unit Undergraduate/Graduate Exceptions Committee is a duly authorized committee of the Unit with the following purpose and authority, composition and responsibilities:

a. **Purpose and Authority.** The Unit Exceptions Committee considers candidate petitions for exceptions related to curriculum in all undergraduate programs as well as initial teacher education programs at the graduate level. The Unit Exceptions Committee committee functions within the broad framework of University policy as formulated by the Faculty Senate, administration and the Kansas Board of Regents.

b. **Composition.** This committee includes representation from\(^4\) the four licensure levels – early childhood unified, elementary, middle/secondary, and PK-12 (as voting members), and the Director of CAS Advising Center (as a non-voting member). Members represent

\(^3\) Approved by ILTPC Feb. 5, 2016

\(^4\) Approved by ILTPC Feb. 5, 2016
colleges with initial licensure programs – Applied Studies, Liberal Arts and Sciences, and Fine Arts.

Members are appointed by the Unit Head, based upon recommendations from the ILTPC and Assistant Dean/Accreditation Officer, serve for a term of three academic years, and are appointed in the spring. Upon approval, members can serve for more than three academic years if desired and if no other faculty member is requesting to serve.

c. **Responsibility.** The committee has broad responsibility for addressing exception requests related to initial teacher preparation at Wichita State University. These exceptions include unit, program, and course policies and standards.

d. **Meetings.** The Unit Undergraduate Exceptions Committee meets usually twice a month or as-needed basis. Action for the committee may be assigned to the Assistant Dean in cases where the committee has established clear guidelines for exceptions or non-exceptions.

e. **Committee Actions.** The Committee shall work closely with the Assistant Dean/Accreditation Officer and take such actions as reasonable and within broad institutional policy on exceptions. All actions taken should be reported to the Assistant Dean/Accreditation Officer. The Committee may also make policy recommendations to the ILTPC on general classes of exceptions for which broader Unit consensus is desired.

IV. **Accreditation Steering Committee.** The Accreditation Steering Committee is an accreditation coordinating unit in the college with the following purposes, composition and responsibilities:

a. **Purpose and Authority.** The Accreditation Steering Committee shall provide broad leadership and coordination for accreditation compliance and preparations in the college.

b. **Composition.** The Accreditation Steering Committee shall be comprised of the Unit Head (dean), assistant dean/accreditation officer, associate dean, department chairs in CLES and School of Education, director of CASA, licensure officer, program chairs from all Unit programs, assistant to the dean for operations, scholarships coordinator, data management specialist, and an associate or assistant dean from both Liberal Arts and Sciences and Fine Arts. The CAS Assistant Dean sets the agenda and serves as chair/convener of the Committee.

c. **Responsibility.** The Accreditation Steering Committee shall be responsible for:
   (1) addressing all matters related to continuing or new accreditation within the college, especially KSDE/CAEP, that (i) are not logically addressed by other groups or (ii) have a broad impact on accreditation readiness, and
   (2) serve as the leadership core for collegewide accreditation review preparations.
d. An Accreditation Leadership Group comprised of the comprised of the Unit Head (dean), assistant dean/accreditation officer, associate dean, department chairs in CLES and School of Education, director of CASAC, licensure officer, assistant to the dean for operations, scholarships coordinator, and data management specialist will meet as needed to facilitate the broader work of the Accreditation Steering Committee. The leadership group will meet at the discretion of the dean.

e. **Meetings.** The Accreditation Steering Committee shall meet at least one time per year at the discretion of the dean. At times, particularly as the next round of accreditation reviews approach, the committee will meet with greater frequency.

e. **Committee Actions.** The Committee shall work with appropriate individuals or groups to meet its purposes.

### 1.2 - Unit Conceptual Framework

The Professional Education Unit’s Conceptual Framework for the preparation of educational professionals is built upon the mission statement of the university supported by the missions of the colleges represented in the unit: the College of Applied Studies, College of Fine Arts, Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the Graduate School. The Conceptual Framework informs governance, curriculum design, and learning activities at both the undergraduate and graduate level.

#### University Mission and Vision

The mission of WSU is to be an essential educational, cultural and economic driver for Kansas and the greater public good. The university’s vision is to be internationally recognized as the model for applied learning and research.

#### Unit Vision and Core Values

The vision of the Professional Unit Conceptual Framework is to prepare teachers and other school personnel who exemplify the core values of —Highly Competent, Collaborative, and Reflective Professionals. To fulfill this vision, the unit produces completers who identify, understand and demonstrate the following six core values/guiding principles: 1) Professionalism and Reflection on the Vocation (PR); 2) Human Development and respect for Diversity (HDD); 3) the Connection of Teaching and Assessment (CTA); 4) Technology Integration (T); 5) Understanding of Content Knowledge, Pedagogical Content Knowledge and their alignment with Standards (CKS); and 6) Collaboration with Stakeholders (C).

#### Unit Vision Linked to Guiding Principles

The vision is directly connected to the guiding principles (core values): The Highly Competent Professional is reflected through the explication of the guiding principles two through four: Human development and respect for diversity, the connection of teaching and assessment, technology integration, and understanding content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and their alignment with Standards. The vision of a collaborative professional is reflected in the guiding principle of collaboration with stakeholders. The vision of a reflective professional is shown in the guiding principle of professionalism and reflection on the vocation.
The Unit Vision/Guiding Principles Graphic

The unit’s philosophy for the preparation of education professionals and other school personnel is presented visually in a series of elliptical strands (values) that wrap around the vision (see Figure 2). The entwined strands illustrate how the six guiding principles (values) working together create highly competent, collaborative, and reflective professionals. Together the unit vision and six guiding principles reflect a visual representation of commonly agreed upon ideas and commitments and provide direction for individual and corporate efforts. The intertwining of the strands, or guiding principles around the —core vision, creates one powerful conceptual framework.
Figure 2. Unit Vision: The Development of Highly Competent, Collaborative, and Reflective Professionals

**Guiding Principles:**

Professionalism and Reflection on the Vocation

Human Development and Respect for Diversity

The Connection of Teaching and Assessment

Technology Integration

Understanding Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Content Knowledge and their Alignment with Standards

Collaboration with Stakeholders

**Guiding Principles Defined**

The Professional Education Unit at Wichita State University focuses on preparing candidates who identify, understand, and practice the six guiding principles which in turn, lead to internalization of the core values of highly competent, collaborative and reflective professionals thus fulfilling the unit’s vision. The Guiding Principles include proficiencies and dispositions.

(1) **Professionalism and reflection on the vocation (PR):** The WSU teacher preparation program uses a reflective model to develop professional dispositions in candidates for the improvement of professional practice. Candidates are expected to value knowledge and continuous learning to improve professional practice*. Candidates understand and implement the legal and ethical practices of the profession. Candidates are familiar with major learning theories and strategies to enhance educational knowledge and are able to evaluate instructional decisions for their impact on students/clients.

(2) **Human development and respect for diversity (HDD):** Candidates demonstrate a commitment to the basic principles and theories of human development, learning, and diversity and apply this knowledge to their own learning, teaching, guiding, and clinical situations which includes a commitment to—fairness in all aspects of their work and the expectation that all students/clients can learn*. Candidates consider family, community, and school in advocating for students and clients* and have knowledge of relevant historical, philosophical, social and cultural factors.

(3) **The connection of teaching and assessment (CTA):** Candidates know and understand current theory, research and practice that inform the cyclical and interactive processes of good teaching (e.g., analysis, preparation, instruction, assessment [qualitative and quantitative], and decision making based on assessment...
results). The candidates apply this knowledge across all facets of their work. The candidates develop skills to plan, implement, and evaluate developmental, cultural, and ethically appropriate techniques and strategies for addressing student and client needs. Respects and holds high expectations and fairness for all learners*.

(4) **Technology integration (T):** Candidates can demonstrate skills in the use of technology appropriate to the respective disciplines. Technology is used to enhance professional productivity in planning, teaching, student learning, and assessment. The candidates seek opportunities to continually learn and improve professional practice*.

(5) **Understanding content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge and their alignment with standards (CKS):** Candidates identify, understand, and use and continue to build knowledge in the disciplinary field(s). Candidates apply this knowledge to teaching within the structure of the standards and seek opportunities to continually learn and improve professional practice*.

(6) **Collaboration with stakeholders (C):** Candidates identify, understand, and use processes to work, and advocate cooperatively and professionally, with students/clients, colleagues, parents and community to move toward mutual goals. Candidates collectively plan, gather, and build resources to create innovative solutions to existing problems. Candidates demonstrate effective communication and interpersonal skills and attitudes. The candidates plan, implement and sustain an appropriate environment that promotes effective professional practices. Candidates value working cooperatively with colleagues and others to advance best interest of students and clients*.

*Underlined portions designate dispositions*
1.3 - Unit Assessment

The Unit Assessment System (UAS) is designed to facilitate judgments about and guide candidates, programs, and the Professional Education Unit. Separate but interrelated subsystems exist as part of the UAS that address program and unit level assessments. Unit level assessment specifically examines aggregate data on unit operations as well as aggregate data on candidate, completer and program performance to improve unit effectiveness.

As described earlier unit level assessment involves nearly every component of the UAS. Information/data on unit operations, assessment instruments and candidate performance resulting from program level assessments (in the aggregate by unit) are reviewed in accordance with a set of guiding Core Review Questions (see Appendix 1).

Organizationally, the Unit Assessment Committee (UAC) examines data from unit operations assessments and program assessments of candidate performance (in the aggregate) the previous academic year for trends and other possible observations about the unit and considers possible recommendations for improving the overall effectiveness of the unit. Besides examining data specific to unit operations, data on candidate performance from program assessments is aggregated across programs and disaggregated to address unit-wide candidate attainment of knowledge/skills/dispositions and conceptual framework principles and proficiencies and other relevant Core Review Questions (figure 2).

Whereas program level assessment, for example, examines data relative to candidate mastery of pedagogical knowledge within a particular program, unit level assessment examines data relative to candidate pedagogical knowledge across programs. The UAC makes data-based summary observations about candidate pedagogical knowledge and shares any relevant recommendations.

Resulting reports and recommendations from unit assessment are shared with the Unit Head. The Unit Head reviews these and may refer them to relevant leadership or faculty for possible action.

System Overview

Wichita State’s UAS is diagrammatically presented in Figure 3. Operationally, data from unit assessments, as facilitated through the Data Management System (DMS), are examined by Program Committees and the Unit Assessment Committee. These committees review aggregated candidate performance data as well as data on unit operations to make judgments about program and unit effectiveness. Program Committees each create a Program Assessment Plan which specifies assessments for examining individual performance at various transition points across each program to make judgments about candidate progress through programs. Reviews focusing on program and unit effectiveness are guided by a common set of Core Review Questions (see Appendix 1). At least once each year, the Program Advisory Councils examine program data to ascertain program effectiveness. The program Advisory Councils are groups made up of various program constituents, but predominately practitioners, responsible for providing advice, input and assistance to Program Committees or the Unit.

Although conceptualized as a single assessment system, program and unit level assessments exist as interrelated subsystems that share data on candidate performance and unit operations.
The results of program level assessments serve also as input for unit level assessment, and the results of unit level assessment may be directed toward individual programs. The Assistant Dean/Accreditation Officer and Associate Dean (in concert with the Unit Assessment Committee) review/monitor program assessments to ensure program assessment quality, to provide constructive feedback, and to ensure key assessments and operations are fair, accurate, consistent and free of bias. Besides facilitating program and unit level assessments, the Assistant Dean/Accreditation Officer’s and Associate Dean’s responsibilities include coordinating follow-up surveys, training and facilitating reliable and valid data.

**System Components**

Figure 3 identifies the major components of the UAS. These include data derived from program and unit assessments, a data management system, unit and program assessment committees, program advisory councils, and the unit head.

The Unit Data Management System (DMS) is the central database and report generator for data from the various program and unit operations assessments. The Unit DMS includes data generated from the university’s central DMS, a supplemental system to house data pertaining to candidate performance on unit and program assessments, and additional data generated from other sources (e.g., state administered surveys of completers and their employers). In all, the Unit DMS provides comprehensive data pertaining to candidates and completer performance and other relevant characteristics (e.g., dispositions, demographics).

**Unit Operations and Program Assessments** are intended to systematically collect information/data useful in reviewing unit operations and/or programs. In the case of unit operations assessments, this includes data on such factors as

1. Advisement – e.g., program, career
2. Instruction – e.g., teaching, evaluation, clinical experiences, course logistics
3. Records – e.g., programs of study, checksheets, licensure
4. Resources – e.g., facilities, personnel, equipment/technology, funding
5. Faculty Matters—e.g., workload, evaluation/performance reviews, diversity, development, voice
6. Candidate Matters – e.g., diversity, complaints, candidate performance, communications
7. Staff Matters – e.g., diversity, workload, evaluation/performance reviews, development, voice
8. Organization—e.g., governance, management, climate

In the case of program assessment, this includes candidate performance data relative to the following:

1. Learning Products—institutional, state and professional society standards, professional knowledge/skills/dispositions and impact on student learning, and specified proficiencies.
2. Transition Points – pre-specified program transition points (e.g., program admission or exit)
3. Program Components – learning products aggregated by courses, field experiences, and other such curricular elements
4. Post-Program Assessments – follow-up surveys of program completers and their employers as well as results from state licensure tests and external reviews (e.g.,
state licensure reviews).
Figure 3. Unit Assessment System
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2.1 – Program Committees

Program Committees are the primary faculty entities responsible for specific programs and examining their effectiveness (at least annually) in accordance with the Core Review Questions (see Appendix 1) and in consultation with program-specific advisory councils. Program Committees include:

**Initial Programs**
- Art Education
- Early Childhood Unified (B.A. – committee combined with M.Ed.-ECU)
- Early Childhood Unified - Residency (M.A.T.)
- Elementary Education
- English Education (secondary and middle school)
- Foreign Language
- History (middle school) and History/Government (secondary)
- Journalism
- Mathematic Education (secondary and middle school)
- Music Education
- Physical Education
- Science Education (secondary biology, chemistry, physics, earth & space science, and middle school science)
- Speech & Theatre
- Teacher Apprentice Program
- Transition to Teaching / M.A.T. / M.A.T.-Middle/Secondary Residency

**Advanced Programs**
- Early Childhood Unified (M.Ed. – committee combined with B.A.-ECU)
- Educational Leadership – Building (M.Ed.), District, Ed.D.
- Educational Psychology (M.Ed.)
- ESOL
- Learning and Instructional Design (M.Ed.)
- Library Media Specialist
- Reading Specialist
- School Counselor (M.Ed)
- School Psychologist (Ed.S.)
- Special Education: Low Incidence, High Incidence, and Gifted (M.Ed.)

The responsibilities of the various Program Committees are detailed in Section 1.1. Membership of Program Committees consists of at least three faculty who are active in the respective programs. In consultation with relevant department chairs, members are appointed by the Deans of Applied Studies and Liberal Arts and Sciences or Fine Arts (jointly as appropriate) for three-year terms. *(Note: Members of Program Committees for advanced programs that are part of a graduate degree must hold GF-1, GF-2, or GF-3 membership on programs to be effective.)*

5 Dormant
6 Id.
7 Id.
the Graduate Faculty.)
2.2 – Program Assessment

Besides unit level assessment, the UAS is also designed to facilitate program level assessment. Program level assessment examines program specific data on the performance of candidates and completers, as well as unit operations relevant to that program. In program level assessment, data relevant to individual candidates are reviewed in order (a) to make decisions and provide feedback to candidates on their program progress as well as (b) in the aggregate, to judge the efficacy of specific programs and guide program improvement.

In program level assessment, data on program candidate and completer performance (in the aggregate by program) and relevant unit operations (disaggregated by program) are examined in accordance with the set of guiding Core Review Questions (see Appendix 1). At least once each year, relevant data on each program is reviewed by its Program Committee for trends or other possible observations and (in consultation with its advisory council) for possible recommendations for program improvement. As part of its program assessment and based upon mechanisms of its own choosing, each program inspects candidate performance for adequate progress at the various program transition points.

In addition to components identified as part of the overall UAS, program level assessment involves several other components. These are:

1. Transition Points: designated points in the curriculum where candidate progress is reviewed by applying adopted criteria to information from identified assessments/data sources to arrive at a decision as to whether a candidate may proceed to the next program component or complete/exit the program. Each program specifies four transition points as a minimum: program admission, admission to clinical practice (e.g., student teaching, practicum, or internship), exit from clinical practice, and program exit. Associated with each transition point are potential program options (or mechanism to establish options) for candidates who fail to meet established criteria. In some advanced programs (e.g., where clinical practice occurs throughout the program), some of these four transition points may be merged.

2. Assessments and Criteria/Rubrics: specific assessments/performance data and related criteria/rubrics on which to base candidate program progress decisions, especially as related to program standards.

3. Progress Review Mechanisms: a process and/or organizational entity for reviewing candidate performance at transition points and for making associated program progress decisions about each candidate. Such mechanism (a) is well-defined and consistent across program candidates, (b) includes maintaining records of candidate reviews and the resulting decisions, and (c) provides for candidate appeals and options for candidates who fail to make adequate progress.

Relevant to an undergirding program level assessment is the unit’s Conceptual Framework. The unit’s Conceptual Framework spells out the general vision, philosophy, and knowledge base collectively for unit programs as well as defines general proficiencies that unit programs seek for their candidates to attain.

Figure 4 illustrates how components for program level assessment interrelate. As candidates transition through the program’s curriculum, data on their performance is examined at
predetermined points to make decisions about individuals’ program progress through the Progress Review Mechanism. Candidates receiving positive decisions at each transition point progress through and complete the program. Aggregated and disaggregated data from these transition points plus aggregated and disaggregated data from follow-up assessments of program completers and their employers, from any external reviews, and from state required licensure testing are examined annually by the Program Committee to review program effectiveness and (in consultation with the program’s advisory council) make relevant recommendations, where appropriate. [Note: These reviews and recommendations also serve as data/input for Unit Assessment Committee deliberations concerning overall unit effectiveness.]
Figure 4. Program Assessment Model

- **INTERNAL REVIEWS**
  - Program Annual Review
  - Program 5-Year Review
  - Graduate School Review
  - Undergraduate Review

- **EXTERNAL REVIEWS**
  - KSDE/CAEP Review
  - HLC Review
  - KBOR Review
  - Professional Review

- **Program Assessments**
  - Transition Point I
    - <Name of the transition point>
    - Assessment: 1.
  - Transition Point II
    - <Name of the transition point>
    - Assessment: 1.
  - Transition Point III
    - <Name of the transition point>
    - Assessment: 1.
  - Additional Transition Points
    - <Name of the transition point>
    - Assessment: 1.
  - Follow-Up Surveys
  - Program Operational Data

- **Unit Conceptual Framework**
  - Program Standards
  - Accreditation Standards
  - Professional Standards

- **Program Operations**
  - Unit Assessment Committee
  - Program Committee

- **Unit Operations**
  - Unit Head

- **<title> Advisory Council**
Program Assessment Plans

To guide and structure program level assessment, each program in the unit established and maintains a Program Assessment Plan (see Appendix 2 for a template). Program Assessment Plans include as a minimum:

1. A Narrative Describing the Operation of the Program Assessment Plan
2. An Assessment Alignment Table (Table 1)
3. A Master Program Standards Alignment Table (Table 2)

The following sections describe the plan elements:

Program Assessment Plan Figure and Attachment.

Each program’s assessment plan, comprised of a Narrative Describing the Operation of the Program Assessment Plan and related Tables 1 and 2, details how program assessment is conducted in that program. The plan outlines what, when, how and by whom assessment information is collected and examined. It also demonstrates how a program insures its completers meet program standards/outcomes, and how candidates’ progress toward program completion is reviewed.

Information on candidate performance is examined at major transition points across a program. The major transition points in an initial program generally include:

I: Admission to Teacher Education
II: Admission to Teaching Internship
III: Exit from Teaching Internship
IV: Degree Completion
V: Program Completion and Conditional Licensure Recommendation

Elementary, middle level, PK-12 and secondary teacher education programs include those transition points identified for the Professional Education component. However, these programs supplement Professional Education transition point information with assessments and related criteria/rubrics that are specific to these fields (especially for admission to student teaching and program exit transition points). A program may also identify other transition points (and relevant assessments/rubrics) where decisions are routinely made about a candidates’ program progress. In some advanced programs (for example, where clinical practice occurs throughout a program), some of these five transition points may be merged and others created.

Information about candidate performance associated with each transition point is examined through a defined Progress Review Mechanism to decide whether a candidate continues/completes the program. This mechanism may be an individual (e.g., program coordinator), a specified group (e.g., program review or special advancement committee), or some automated mechanism (e.g., a score above an established cutoff). Progress Review Mechanisms, the identification of who makes the decisions, who informs the candidates of the
decisions, the nature of the appeals process, and the process for suggesting remedial options are part of the Program Assessment Plan and are described in the Narrative Describing the Operation of the Program Assessment Plan.

Information used for deciding whether individual candidates may continue in the program is aggregated and used to assess program effectiveness in helping all candidates meet Conceptual Framework proficiencies as well as standards and knowledge/skills/dispositions adopted for the program. These aggregated data are examined by the Program Committee to investigate program effectiveness as well as identify any concerns with the Conceptual Framework, or assessments. In consultation with the program advisory council, the Program Committee considers potential changes and pursues wider faculty approval for such changes, as appropriate. Data collected after the changes are implemented are later examined by the Committee to see if the changes did indeed produce improved results.

To assess program effectiveness, data are examined in the aggregate across individuals. This may require summarizing data from parts of evaluation instruments (e.g., subsets of items within one assessment instrument) or from several assessment instruments. Table 2, described below, in the Program Assessment Plan identifies which proficiencies, types of knowledge and professional society standards (if any) are associated with each standard associated assessment/s, thereby guiding relevant data aggregation to assess program effectiveness in helping program candidates attain target knowledge and proficiencies and meet professional standards.

In addition to information about the effectiveness of a program collected from program candidates, information is also gathered from sources outside the program. As indicated in Figure 4, these include information from Program Follow-Up (completers, employers of completers), from External Reviews (e.g., Kansas State Department of Education licensure reviews, program reviews conducted by professional organizations), and from State Required Assessments (e.g., Praxis II — content tests). Such aggregated data are also used to assess program effectiveness (again note the lines in Figure 4 leading back to the Program Committee).

Appendix 2 provides a template for a program assessment plan, including an attachment that details the relevant assessments for each transition point. The information for the boxes down the left hand side of Figure 4 lists assessments, factors or artifacts being examined at each transition point. The attachment also identifies the criteria used to decide whether a candidate may continue in the program or has successfully completed the program. Transition-point criteria (for example, for student teaching/internship admission or program completion) indicate among other things whether mastery of all or only some of the program standards and their indicators is necessary.

**Narrative Describing the Operation of the Program Assessment Plan**

Included with each Program Assessment Plan is a Narrative describing how the plan is being implemented by the program. It includes descriptions of (a) how assessment of individual candidates’ progress is conducted including a description of the Progress Review Mechanism and (b) how program assessment is accomplished. Additionally it provides the timeline or schedule followed by the Program Committee. It includes any other information program faculty believe help explain the operation of the Program Assessment Plan.

**A Master Program Standards Alignment Table (Table 2)**
Information included in specific columns of Table 2 shows the alignment of program standards with (a) KSDE standards, (b) the Unit’s Conceptual Framework Proficiencies, (c) —content, pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary for all students to learn—CAEP Standard 1—and (d) the standards of relevant professional organizations (if further addressed), as follows:

Table 2 is organized based on the program’s KSDE standards, or in the case of programs that do not have KSDE standards, the standards specified by the program committee. Beneath each standard listed in the table are the program’s common assessments. The first column of Table 2 lists the number assigned to the assessment based on KSDE guidelines. The second column specifies the name of the assessment. The third column indicates passing criteria for the assessment. The fourth column indicates the course where the assessment is administered. The fifth column indicates the transition point where used, The sixth column lists the predominant proficiency/disposition identified in the Unit’s Conceptual Framework that are addressed by the listed assessment. The seventh column specifies the type of knowledge (per CAEP Standard 1) reflected by the assessments. Options for these are as follows:

For Initial and Advanced Preparation of Teachers: Content Knowledge, Dispositions, Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills, Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills, and Student Learning.

For Other Professional School Personnel: Dispositions, Professional Knowledge and Skills, and Student Learning.

Subsequent columns in Table 2 may list the standards of professional societies that are relevant to the program (e.g., NASP).
2.3 –*Programs’ Adherence to the Unit Conceptual Framework*

All unit programs at WSU are aligned to the Guiding Principles of the Conceptual Framework as evidenced in each Program Table 2 document. As such, there is a commitment to adhere to common curricular themes and instructional practices articulated therein. Specifically, all programs have a responsibility to include requirements and assessments to reinforce the development of the following knowledge, skills and dispositions in course work and field experiences:

(a) inquiry processes  
(b) current research in the field  
(c) professional dispositions listed in the Conceptual Framework  
(d) professional standards  
(e) expertise in working with diverse populations
2.4 – Field Experiences

General

Field experiences are defined as experiential learning opportunities for undergraduate and graduate candidates enrolled in the Professional Education Unit. These experiences encompass development of the application process through the final evaluation for the placement of candidates in campus-based and/or professional workplace venues. Placements can include local, regional and international locations and are identified individually (i.e. practicum, cooperative, student teaching, transition to teaching, field/clinical experiences, etc.) by each program in the Unit.

Procedures for the application of field experiences, the actual selection of a location and placement of the candidate, expectations of supervision and evaluation will be the responsibility of each program. It will be the responsibility of each program’s faculty and relevant advisory council(s) to develop a document for distribution to the candidate and supervisory personnel that contains criteria that addresses field experience protocol.

The following criteria should be included in each programs’ field experience documents.

• Application Process (Candidate or Teacher Internship)
• Placement Policies and Procedures
• Diversity of Field Placement
• Guidelines for Professional Performance
• Grounds for Dismissal from Field Experiences
• Procedures for Change of Placement or Field Experience Concerns
• Criteria for Selecting Field Placements
• University Supervisor’s Role and Supervision Guidelines
• Seminar Requirements
• Field Placement Evaluation Forms/Procedures and Reporting of Performance
• Licensure Requirements and Procedures

Diversity in Field/Clinical Work

Diversity is a critical principle for WSU programs that prepare teachers and other school personnel, including diversity associated with the practical applications of professional knowledge and skills taught in those programs. In the context of such practical work, diversity refers to both variety among the recipients of professional practice (i.e., students or clients) as well as variety in the settings which professional knowledge and skills are being practiced. All WSU professional education programs provide and ensure that candidates systematically reflect upon and engage in professional practice with diverse students/clients and in a variety of settings, as relevant to the specific areas of professional expertise.

---

8 Endorsed by COE Faculty 1/14/04. Approved by UTPC (now ILTPC) 1/23/04.
2.5 – Program Change Process

Figure 4 depicts the program change process. The striped areas represent non curricular program changes such as admissions, assessments, transition points or field experiences. The white areas represent the change process for curricular changes.
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3/3 / Other Relevant Policies
3.1 / Lecturers and School/Field Based Personnel – Qualifications

Qualifications for Hiring Lecturers

Please see College of Applied Studies Policy 2.017.

Qualifications for Selecting School/Field Based Clinical Faculty, Mentors and Supervisors

Initial Programs

Criteria for the selection of clinical faculty, mentors and supervisors vary slightly based on the level of field experience. However, for the culminating experience—student teaching/internship—the following criteria apply.

1. Completion of Cooperating Teacher Mentor Training Modules
2. Principal recommendation based on the following criteria:
   a. a degree in the field for which they are supervising from an accredited institution, and/or certification/license in the area they serve as supervisor
   b. a minimum of three years successful classroom practice as a licensed educator
   c. recognized as an exemplary teacher who practices and implements best practices in her/his classroom teaching
   d. one year documented experience in current building, and in the field in which they are serving as mentors and/or clinical faculty
   e. models and encourages technology within the curriculum
   f. models and encourages effective instructional practices for diverse student populations
   g. commitment to the time and effort needed to supervise the candidate
   h. willingness to provide the candidate with appropriate practicum experience
   i. willingness to work collaboratively with a WSU faculty supervisor to support candidate completion of all program requirements
   j. willingness to provide feedback related to the clinical experience to WSU.

Persons responsible for ensuring qualifications are met include either the Field Experience Coordinator, program chair or department chair/head depending on the program. This process may occur through contact with building administrators and/or employers to seek recommendations and/or confirmation of the credentials, experience, and expertise of the cooperating teachers/mentors/field supervisors.

Advanced Programs

Mentors/site supervisors for candidates in all advanced programs must be approved by the
appropriate program chair per program guidelines.
3.2 / Professional Development for School-Based Personnel

The preparation of both clinical supervisors for field placements and school-based faculty serving as supervisors is a highly valued aspect of unit operations and is a priority in the unit in order to maintain high quality programs and field experiences for candidates. Professional development is addressed primarily through:

(1) participation in Cooperating Teacher Mentor Training Modules\(^9\)

(2) the use of clinical experience handbooks, practicum guides, and /or manuals and mentor agreements that provide program specific information and tools to inform the work of school-based faculty.

(3) Participation in regularly scheduled meetings and/or conferences with school-based faculty regarding their roles, responsibilities and expectations for candidates. Specifically, school-based faculty are expected to be knowledgeable of and participate in:

a. the unit’s conceptual framework and governance structures
b. program assessments and evaluation forms and procedures
c. program and/or unit committees relevant to their assignment
d. advocating/supporting unit programs to outside constituents

\(^9\) Pilot in 2015 fall semester
3.3 / Other Relevant Policies

Faculty Rank and Titles: See WSU Policies and Procedures 4.03

Types of Appointments: See WSU Policies and Procedures 4.04

Teaching Evaluations: See WSU Policies and Procedures 4.22 and College of Applied Studies Policy 2.018

Evaluation of Lecturers: See College of Applied Studies Policy 2.017
Appendix 1 / Core Questions from Program Assessment Committees

Core Questions for Program Assessment Committees
Revised October 9, 2014

1. Is the program overall effective in preparing candidates to meet the expected outcomes:
   a. program standards and, if an initial program, professional education standards (refer to KSDE Template);
   b. Unit Conceptual Framework Guiding Principles; and,
   c. CAEP knowledge standards (for education personnel programs only)

2. Is the program effective in preparing completers for state licensure exams (if required) in both total scores and the category scores?

3. Are the assessments in Table 2 administered by faculty in every section and every semester the course is taught?

4. Has the program committee reviewed data provided by the following key constituents?
   a. Program completers?
   b. Alumni?
   c. Employers?

5. Is the program successful in preparing candidates for effective practice?

6. How are data used by candidates and faculty to improve candidate performance? Have changes made by the Program Committee in prior years led to desired improvements?

7. What changes, if any, do data and/or information suggest for (a) the program, (b) the assessments and/or criteria/rubrics, and/or (c) operational elements-- advisement, instruction, assessments, faculty, field/clinical placements, field/clinical supervision, record keeping, or resource?
Appendix 2 / Template - Program Assessment Plan

Wichita State University
(Program Name), Narrative

Describing the Operation of the Program Assessment Plan
Approved (Date), Last Revised (Date)

Program evaluation in the (Program Name) Education Program occurs both to make decisions about (a) individual candidates’ progress through the program and (b) the program’s effectiveness in preparing candidates to meet the program standards, types of knowledge as defined by CAEP, and the Unit’s Conceptual Framework Guiding Principles. This document describes the operation of the (Program Name) Program Assessment Plan. It first describes how decisions are made regarding individual candidates’ progress and then describes how decisions are made regarding program effectiveness.

Decisions about Individual Candidate Progress

Decisions are made regarding candidates’ readiness to progress to the next phase of the (Program Name) Program at five transition points. These are identified pictorially in the (Program Name) Assessment Plan Figure 1. The Attachment to Figure 1 identifies the criteria for each transition point, and the section below describes how decisions are made at each of them.

Transition Point I: Admission to Teacher Education

Applicants to the (Program Name) Education Program must submit the application materials to the Office of CAS Advising Center (CASAC). Admission requirements that applicants must fulfill are identified in the attachment to Figure 1 for the (Program Name) Program Assessment Plan. Applications are reviewed each semester using established assessments and criteria (see Attachment to the (Program Name) Figure 1). The CAS Advising Center office notifies the candidates in writing of either their teacher education acceptance or denial. Teacher education applicants who are denied admission are informed of the unmet criteria and are encouraged to contact their academic advisors who can provide suggestions and/or options (if any) for them to pursue if they desire to remediate failed criteria and resubmit their applications. Unsuccessful applicants may petition to have any of the criteria waived or lowered, or provide alternative evidence to show eligibility. The Unit’s Undergraduate/Graduate Exceptions Committee discusses the petition and notifies the CASAC office which notifies the candidate of the Committee’s decision. A copy of the petition and the Committee’s decision is placed in the candidate’s official file, located in the CAS Advising Center office. The candidate’s academic advisor also receives a copy of this decision.

Transition Point II: Admission to Student Teaching

Candidates applying to (student teaching course) must meet the Transition Point II criteria for admission (see [Program Name] Figure 1 and Attachment), prior to enrolling in student teaching courses. Candidates submit their completed Student Teaching Application to the Field Placement Coordinator. These applications are reviewed by the Field Placement Coordinator in coordination with the CASAC staff who provide verification as to whether Transition Point II criteria (listed in the Attachment to [Program Name] Figure 1) have been met.

All decisions are based upon established criteria, and applicants who meet the criteria are eligible for student teaching. All applicants receive a letter from the Placement Coordinator who informs them of their student teaching eligibility status. Letters to unsuccessful applicants identify the
failed criteria and recommend that the applicants contact their academic advisor for guidance in how to remediate the Transition Point II failed criteria. Unsuccessful applicants may petition to have any of the criteria waived or lowered, or provide alternative evidence to show eligibility. The Unit’s Undergraduate/Graduate Exceptions Committee discusses the petition and notifies the CASAC office, which notifies the candidate of the Committee’s decision. A copy of the petition and the Committee’s decision is placed in the candidate’s official file, located in the CASAC office. The candidate’s academic advisor also receives a copy of this decision.

Transition Point III: Exit from Student Teaching

The CASAC office monitors the successful completion of student teaching for all teacher education candidates. En-route success is monitored by the university supervisor and cooperating teacher who alert the program chair if success seems unlikely. Program faculty members work with candidates who do not reach a passing criterion, offering suggestions for remediation. Remediation most often includes a student action plan that specifies the steps that must be taken to reach acceptable performance. An unsuccessful candidate may petition for an exception to the Unit’s exceptions committee. The chair of the Committee notifies the CASAC office, which sends a letter to the candidate with an explanation of the Committee’s decision. A copy of the petition and the Committee’s decision is placed in the candidate’s official file, located in the CASAC office. The candidate’s academic advisor also receives a copy of this decision.

Transition Point IV: Degree Completion

Candidates applying to complete their BA in (Program Name) Education must submit an application for degree one year prior to the time of expected graduation. Applications are reviewed by the CASAC office, which reviews all requirements for graduation (see [Program Name] Figure 1 and Attachment) through the data management system and notifies the candidates by letter of their deficiencies. A candidate who has not successfully completed any specific requirement may work to complete it successfully or petition for an exception to the Unit’s exceptions committee. The chair of the committee notifies the CASAC office, which sends a letter to the candidate with an explanation of the committee’s decision. The Records Specialist informs candidates of their degree completion status. After all degree requirements have been met, the Records Specialist notifies the WSU Registrar’s office that the candidate has met all degree requirements and is eligible for graduation. Candidates must complete Transition Point V criteria (see below) to be recommended for licensure.

Transition Point V: Program Completion and Conditional Licensure Recommendation

The Licensure Specialist is notified of those candidates successfully meeting all Transition Point IV criteria. The Licensure Specialist checks to ensure that candidates have successfully met the criteria for licensure recommendation, as detailed in the Attachment to the [Program Name] Figure 1. The Licensure Specialist notifies candidates of their success or deficiencies, with suggestions for future corrective action. Trained assessors evaluate candidates’ KPTPs. Candidates who fail to meet the KPTP criteria are required to complete assigned remediation successfully. Remediation for content standards varies depending upon the nature of the content.

Other Review Data

Follow-Up Assessments. The Completer Follow-up Survey is sent annually to candidates in their first year after graduation. Returned surveys are analyzed. The data are aggregated and submitted to the Unit Assessment Committee and ILTPC for review. Disaggregated data are sent to the appropriate program committees and advisory councils for their review. An employer survey is sent annually to employers of our graduates. Similar to the Follow-up Survey, data are aggregated across programs and disaggregated by program for consideration by the Unit Assessment Committee and relevant program committees and their advisory councils. The program committees and advisory groups review all data from the programs and make needed revisions and adjustments to courses and
the program. A report from the program committee is submitted annually to the Unit Assessment Committee.

**External Reviews.** Program Committees consider the results of KSDE reviews, especially areas identified for potential improvement.

**State Licensure Assessments.** The CASAC office receives reports from PRAXIS exams (PLT and Content). These data are annually disaggregated by program for distribution to the (Program Name) Program Committee and aggregated with assessment results from other programs for distribution to the Unit Assessment Committee for review and potential action if appropriate. Program Committees also receive candidate performance results on the KPTP, which is conducted by trained assessors selected by KSDE.

**Decisions about the Effectiveness of the Program**

Decisions about the effectiveness of the (Program Name) Education program are made by the (Program Name) Education Program Committee, in consultation with the (Program Name) Education Advisory Council, utilizing aggregated data from transition points, program follow-up surveys, external reviews, state required licensure tests (if any), and relevant unit operations (e.g., advisement). This section describes how decisions are made about the program’s effectiveness at preparing candidates to meet the standards adopted for the program.

**Who Reviews the Data**

The (Program Name) Education Program Committee is the primary group responsible for reviewing the data and for making decisions about the effectiveness of the program. As part of the routine deliberations, the (Program Name) Education Program Committee obtains advice from the (Program Name) Education Advisory Council. Membership in these groups and the terms in office are consistent with the Professional Education Unit Manual.

**Frequency and Nature of Reviews**

At least once a year, the (Program Name) Education Program Committee examines program data to ascertain program effectiveness. After making tentative conclusions about the program and any recommended changes, it forwards to the Advisory Council the aggregated data that have led it to believe changes are or are not needed, along with any proposed changes. The Committee may also make recommendations about possible changes in the Conceptual Framework. The Council examines this information and offers advice on the following: (a) whether the decision(s) about the need for changes is/are consistent with what the data show, (b) whether any proposed changes will reasonably address the problem(s) that have been detected, and (c) any additional suggestions members may have for improving the program. After receiving the recommendations of the Advisory Council, the Program Committee makes final decisions about program changes to be recommended, if any, and forwards those to the appropriate University groups according to Unit and University policy.

**Questions for Consideration by the (Program Name) Education Program Committee**

At a minimum, the annual review by the (Program Name) Education Program Committee considers the Core Questions in Appendix 1 of the Unit’s “Program Assessment” document. In addition, it considers whatever additional questions the Committee has decided to address. These will become part of the review process as they are defined—or the Initial Licensure Teacher Education Program Committee (ILTPC) may generate some. The Committee identifies the data that will be used in the following year(s) to examine the effectiveness of any changes recommended for the program, for common assessments and their rubrics, or for criteria to be used.

If changes were made as a result of prior reviews of program data, the Committee also examines
the data to determine the success of those changes or any collateral adverse results from the changes.

Data to be Examined at Yearly Reviews

For the yearly reviews, the (Program Name) Education Program Committee examines aggregated candidate data from the preceding year. This includes, but is not limited to, aggregated data from the following: (a) decisions made about individual candidates at transition points, (b) the (Program Name) Education advising survey, (c) candidate exit surveys, (d) surveys of completers, (e) surveys of employers of completers, (f) any external reviews that occurred in the past year, and (g) completers’ results on the state licensure exams in (Program Name) Education. In addition, the Committee examines aggregated data on clinical placements to determine if they meet program requirements for student/client and institutional (e.g., elementary, middle, high school) diversity.

Review of the Work of the (Program Name) Education Program Committee

Each year, the (Program Name) Education Program Committee submits the annual report of its program review to the Unit Head’s office. Each annual report summarizes its conclusions and recommendations, and describes program changes undertaken, the problem each program change was designed to address, and how the data should change if the revision is successful. Additionally, it summarizes how effective prior program revisions were at addressing the problem(s) they were designed to solve and any unexpected outcomes thought to be due to program revisions.

Once every five years, the work of (Program Name) Education Program Committee is reviewed by the Unit Assessment Committee. Materials reviewed include, but are not limited to the following:

1. (Program Name) Education Program Assessment Plan.
2. Minutes of the (Program Name) Education Advisory Council meetings.
3. Annual reports, including aggregated and disaggregated data, developed by the (Program Name) Education Program Committee for the last three years.
4. Copy of the recommendations given to the (Program Name) Education Program Committee by the Unit Assessment Committee as a result of its last review of the (Program Name) Education Program Committee’s work.

In addition, the (Program Name) Education Program Committee provides other information requested by the Unit Assessment Committee to assist in this review.
Figure 1. Program Assessment Model
Note: Detailed transition point criteria may be found on the Attachment to Figure 1 (see following page).
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Attachment to Figure 1

I. Transition Point: Program Admission

A. Assessments/Factors: Criteria
   1. Cumulative GPA: 2.75 (for example)
   2. Standardized exam: Required score - XXX (for example)
   3. Pass a criminal background check
   4. XXXXX

B. Related Progress Review Mechanism. The decision is made by XXXX and the candidate is informed of the decision by XXXX.

II. Transition Point: Admission to Student Teaching/Internship

A. Assessments/Factors: Criteria
   1. Assessment X – XXXXX: Acceptable or Target performance based on rubric (specify).
   3. XXXX

B. Related Progress Review Mechanism. The decision is made by XXXX and the candidate is informed of the decision by XXXX.

III. Transition Point: Completion of Student Teaching/Internship

A. Assessments/Factors: Criteria
   1. Assessment X – XXXXX: Acceptable or Target performance based on rubric (specify).
   3. XXXX

B. Related Progress Review Mechanism. The decision is made by XXXX and the candidate is informed of the decision by XXXX.

IV. Transition Point: Degree Completion

A. Assessments/Factors: Criteria
   1. Praxis II Content Test: Specify exam and required score (if applicable)
   2. PLT: Specify required score (if applicable)
   3. XXXX

B. Related Progress Review Mechanism. The decision is made by XXXX and the candidate is informed of the decision by XXXX.

V. Transition Point: Program Completion and Conditional Licensure Recommendation

A. Assessments/Factors: Criteria
1. Assessment X – XXXXX: Acceptable or Target performance based on rubric (specify).
3. XXXX

B. Related Progress Review Mechanism. The decision is made by XXXX and the candidate is informed of the decision by XXXX.

VI. Other Review Data: Program Follow-Up

A. Assessments/Factors
   1. Survey of Completers one year after graduation
   2. Survey of Employers of Completers one year after graduation

VII. Other Review Data: External Reviews

A. Assessments/Factors
   1. Kansas State Department of Education
   2. Specialized Professional Accreditation (if applicable)

VIII. Other Review Data: (If Applicable)

A. Assessments/Factors
Table 1. Assessment Alignment Table  
(Date Approved/Revised)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Assessments (Refer to Table 2 and/or KSDE template section II)</th>
<th>KSDE Standard(s) Assessed</th>
<th>Transition Point Where Used</th>
<th>Conceptual Framework/Disposition</th>
<th>CAEP Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE: If program standards have been adopted that are not KSDE standards, they are preceded by an asterisk (*).
NOTE: Summary assessments that are reported to KSDE are preceded by a number listed in the first column.

**Transition Points in this Program:**
I: Admission to Teacher Education
II: Admission to Teaching Internship
III: Exit from Teaching Internship
IV: Degree Completion
V: Program Completion and Conditional Licensure Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KSDE Assessment #</th>
<th>Common Assessment</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Course Where Assessment is Administered</th>
<th>Transition Point Where Used</th>
<th>Conceptual Framework Predominant Proficiency/Disposition</th>
<th>Predominant Type of Knowledge (Per CAEP Standard 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KSDE Standard 1:</td>
<td>XXXXXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSDE Standard 2:</td>
<td>XXXXXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSDE Standard 3:</td>
<td>XXXXXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSDE Standard 4:</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSDE Standard 5:</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSDE Standard 6:</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSDE Standard 7:</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conceptual Framework Proficiency Coding**
- Professionalism and reflection on the vocation (PR)
- Human Development and respect for diversity (HDD)
- Connection of teaching and assessment (CTA)
- Technology integration (T)
- Understanding content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge and their alignment with standards (CKS)
- Collaboration with stakeholders (C)
- Values knowledge and continuous learning to improve professional practice (dl)
Respects and holds high expectations and fairness of all learners (df)
Considers family, community and school in advocating for students/clients (da)
Values working cooperatively with colleagues and others to advance the best interests of students/clients (dc)