

**KANSAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
FINAL DECISION FOR  
PROGRAM APPROVAL FOR  
FRIENDS UNIVERSITY**

**Introductory Statement:**

On May 17, 2016, the Kansas State Board of Education reviewed and acted upon the final recommendation of the Evaluation Review Committee of the Teaching and School Administration Professional Standards Advisory Board regarding program approvals for Friends University. The final decision of the Kansas State Board of Education is identified as follows:

**PROGRAM APPROVAL DECISION**

**Recommend “Approved” for the following programs through December 31, 2023.**

**Elementary (I, K-6) (Continuing program)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-7**

None

**English Language Arts (I, 6-12) (Continuing program)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-3**

None

**Standard 4**

**Modified AFI 4.1**

**Modified Rationale 4.1**

**Assessments do not clearly address all parts of the standard.**

The rubric for Assessment 8 mentions reading, writing, speaking, listening, and viewing, but the revised rubric does not clearly address how each area is assessed.

**Foreign Language (I, PreK-12) (Continuing program)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-9**

None

**Music (I, PreK-12) (Continuing program)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-9**

None

**Music-Instrumental (I, PreK-12) (Continuing program)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-9**

None

**Music-Vocal (I, PreK-12) (Continuing program)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-9**

None

**ESOL (A, K-6, 6-12, PreK-12) (Continuing program)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-10**

None

**High Incidence Special Education (A, PreK-12) (New program)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-10**

None

**All New Programs may only be assigned the status of “New Program Approved with Stipulation” or “Not Approved.”  
(New programs must be operationalized within two years of KSBE approval.)**

June 20, 2016

To: Dr. Randy Watson, Commissioner

From: Evaluation Review Committee

Subject: Final Recommendation for program approvals for Friends University

**Introductory Statement:**

On June 10, 2016, the Evaluation Review Committee reviewed the application for program approvals for Friends University.

Documents that were received and considered include the Institutional Program Reports, KSDE Team Reports, and Institutional Rejoinders to the KSDE Team Reports.

**PROGRAM APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION**

**Recommend “Approved” for the following programs through December 31, 2023.**

**Art (I, PreK-12) continuing program**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-6**

None

**Mathematics (I, 6-12) continuing program**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-9**

None

**Physical Education (I, PreK-12) continuing program**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-7**

None

**Speech/Theatre (I, PreK-12) continuing program**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-6**

None

**All New Programs may only be assigned the status of “New Program Approved with Stipulation” or “Not Approved.”**

**(New programs must be operationalized within two years of KSBE approval.)**

**KANSAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
FINAL DECISION FOR  
ACCREDITATION FOR  
FRIENDS UNIVERSITY**

**Introductory Statement:**

On June 12, 2018, the Kansas State Board of Education reviewed and acted upon the final recommendation of the Evaluation Review Committee of the Teaching and School Administration Professional Standards Advisory Board regarding accreditation for Friends University. The final decision of the Kansas State Board of Education is identified as follows:

**ACCREDITATION DECISION**

**“Accreditation” through December 31, 2024.**

**KSDE/CAEP Accreditation Visit – Initial Teacher Preparation**

**Areas for Improvement:**

**Standards 1, 3, 4**

**None**

**Standard 2:**

**AFI 1:** The EPP does not have a comprehensive procedure for evaluating school-based clinical educators or EPP-based clinical educators.

**Rationale 1:** Evidence was presented on how school-based clinical educators evaluate candidates and how candidates evaluate school-based clinical educators. Processes for EPP-based clinical educators to evaluate school-based clinical educators have not been established. Likewise, processes for school-based clinical educators to evaluate EPP-based clinical educators have not been developed.

**AFI 2:** All clinical educators do not receive professional development and are not involved in creating professional development opportunities for the use of evaluation instruments, evaluating professional dispositions of candidates, setting specific goals/objectives of the clinical experience, and providing feedback.

**Rationale 2:** Evidence was provided indicating that the EPP does host a cooperating teacher/student teacher meeting at which supervisory forms, policies, and procedures are shared. No evidence was available indicating that clinical educators are trained to use evaluation instruments and dispositional assessments developed by the EPP. While the PEBCAC does use data to adjust clinical experiences, cooperating teachers do not appear to have a formal method for providing feedback or on setting specific goals/objectives of the clinical experience.

**Standard 5**

**AFI 1:** The EPP has not taken steps to establish measures of validity and reliability for assessments that are not surveys, including assessment of dispositions.

**Rationale 1:** While local assessments (STAR rubric, unit plan, lesson plan and dispositions) have been developed, implemented, and refined, there have been no systems in place nor plans to establish content validity including validation from external constituents, nor specific plans to establish reliability (including inter-rater reliability). The SIP does not explicate processes to be used in future determinations.

**AFI 2:** The EPP does not systemically utilize aggregated data to inform key decisions.

**Rationale 2:** The EPP is in the initial stages of aligning expectations to new rubrics and templates. Data are not presented uniformly in a consistent aggregate so that the EPP can examine potential trend data. Data-informed decision-making occurs at the individual level to track and show individual candidate progression within the program. Individual program data were prepared for the state program approval process. Not all data are summarized, externally benchmarked, and analyzed. The SIP outlines processes to be implemented for survey data.

**AFI 3:** The EPP does not make completer information publicly available.

**Rationale 3:** Data on the website that were found were not current nor complete.

**Stipulations:**

**Standards 1-5**

**None**

<b>Standards</b>		<b>Recommendations</b>	
		<b>Initial</b>	<b>Advanced</b>
1	Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	Met	NA
2	Clinical Partnerships and Practice	Met	NA
3	Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity	Met	NA
4	Program Impact	Met	NA
5	Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement	Met	NA

**Next visit – Fall 2023**

**Previous AFIs and Stipulations**

**Standards 1-6 (NCATE)**

**None**

June 14, 2018

Dr. Jan Wilson, Chair,  
and Dr. John Rhodes, Assessment & Title II Coordinator  
Division of Education  
Friends University  
2100 W. University Ave.  
Wichita, KS 67213

Dear Drs. Wilson and Rhodes,

This letter is to serve as official notification of final action taken at the June 12, 2018 meeting of the Kansas State Board of Education regarding Accreditation for Friends University. The decision of the State Board is enclosed.

SBR 91-1-70a and 91-1-230 through 91-1-236 include information regarding the process for accreditation and approval of programs for institutions. These regulations can be found in the current Teacher Education and Licensure Regulations and Standards for Kansas Educators.

If you have any questions or need assistance, please contact Catherine Chmidling, Education Program Consultant in Teacher Licensure and Accreditation at (785) 291-3573.

Sincerely,

Dr. Randy Watson  
Commissioner of Education

Enclosure: Final Action

CC: Mischel Miller; Susan Helbert  
Catherine Chmidling

# Site Visit Report

**CAEP Site Visit Team:**

Dr. Katharine D. Rasch  
Dr. Catherine M. O'Callaghan  
Dr. Christopher S. Boe  
Dr. Alan Sebel

**State Team:**

Dr. Cameron B. Carlson  
Dr. Cherry O. Steffen  
Dr. Gwen Landever  
Dr. Ramona Stowe

**State Consultant:**

Dr. Catherine Chmidling

**NEA or AFT Representative:**

N/A

**Selected Improvement Pathway**

## FRIENDS UNIVERSITY

Professional Education Unit  
2100 West University Avenue  
Wichita, KS 67213  
March 5-7, 2017

**CONFIDENTIAL**

# CAEP Site Visit Report Selected Improvement Pathway

## Section I Introduction

Overview of the EPP and program offerings: (focus on differences between what was stated in the Formative Feedback Report and what was verified onsite.)

"Throughout its history, Friends University has remained committed to its central core: the arts and sciences. A broad-based education - one that truly expands the horizons and frees the mind - is our purpose for every student. This is expressed in our commitment to teaching and the personal growth of every Friends University student."

Friends University is a private university in Wichita, Kansas founded in 1898. In its initial meeting, the president highlighted an institution that gave the country loyal citizens, capable of developing mature, moral men. The institution was founded as a Quaker institution and remained that way until the 1930s. At that point, an independent board of trustees assumed responsibility for the institution, maintaining an amicable, but independent, relationship with the Society of Friends.

Currently, Friends University is organized into two colleges: College of Business, Arts, Sciences, and Education (CBASE), and the College of Graduate and Professional Studies that includes graduate programs. All initial teacher preparation programs are offered through the Division of Education in CBASE. The Masters of Education program is an in-service master's program offered on-ground and on-line.

The education program, "seeks to provide all candidates in education with the knowledge, theory and practice to enable them to become reflective educators and to exhibit professional teaching behaviors supporting diverse communities of learners."

Capacity tables show stable undergraduate enrollment, qualified faculty, clear organizational charts, regional accreditation and positive trends in operating budgets. In the 5 years before the visit, there had been significant central administration turnover. The institution has stabilized its budget and consolidated positions, particularly in Graduate and Professional Studies. Four new faculty were hired last year at the institution; more will be hired this year.

Ten initial teacher preparation programs are offered on the Friends University campus. They include: Art (P-12), Elementary (K-6), English/Language Arts (6-12), Foreign Language Spanish (P-12), Mathematics (6-12), Music General (P-12), Instrumental Music (P-12), Music Vocal (P-12), Physical Education (P-12), and Speech/Theatre (6-12). The Biology and History Education (6-12) programs have been discontinued by the time of the visit. The programs are approved by the Kansas Department of Education. Program reports, KSDE Feedback, and rejoinders were available to the team.



The Addendum and onsite exhibits provided required data presented in clear and accurate ways. The university has had significant changes in upper administration; stabilization efforts have affirmed the importance of the undergraduate, on-site programs and the university's capacity to plan and focus on program improvement has been enhanced. For this site visit specifically, the reestablishment of an Office of Institutional Research (subsequently Office of Institutional Research and Accreditation) has increased capacity for the EPP to track and analyze its data.

Summary of state partnership that guided the visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or a CAEP-only visit)

The visit to Friends University was a joint visit, guided by the Kansas partnership agreement. Four national site visitors, three in-state site visitors, a KSDE Representative and an observer from higher education were present for the visit and the deliberations.

Special circumstances of the onsite review, if any. (Example: No unusual circumstances affected the visit.)

Due to delays in CAEP training for the Kansas team members, the visit was postponed from Fall 2016 until Spring 2017. The formative feedback report was sent to Friends U. in December 2016.

As a result, the site visitor team took great care to ensure that expectations for the self-study report and analysis were consistent with guidelines available in Fall 2015. The off-site review was completed in late November 2016. The institution responded and provided additional data and plans after the formative review in a compressed timeline. Three years of data were provided for unit-level assessments. Several exhibits were available onsite only, and the SIP was revised and expanded a second time as the team arrived onsite. The institution continued to refine and pilot assessments that were tagged and more closely aligned to the CAEP and InTASC standards.

## Section II CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence

### Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

#### 1. Tasks completed by the team:

##### Task(s)

Data from AY 2015-2016 and Fall 2016 data	
1.	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews (1) Interview appropriate faculty and staff regarding access to most recent data. Verify data collected on key assessments since the SSR was submitted.

Use of methods and unit plan assessments	
2.	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration (1) Because there is no SSR report for Standard 1, further clarification for locally developed assessments for methods rubric and unit plan rubric are needed. B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews (1) Interview faculty and candidates to see how these data are collected, analyzed, benchmarked and used for program improvement. (2) How are data collected and shared for these instruments?

Ongoing program data analysis	
3.	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration (1) Program assessment data analysis and monitoring in between the times when program reports are submitted to KSDE B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews (1) What is the process for collecting, storing, analyzing and using program level data between the times that KSDE program reports are due? (2) How are program level data analyzed, benchmarked and used on a systematic basis?

Candidates model and apply technology standards	
4.	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration (1) Without a narrative for standard 1, it is not clear how candidates model and apply technology standards. B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews (1) How is evidence gathered, analyzed and shared across EPP's programs regarding candidates ability to address technology standards? (2) Interview candidates regarding expectations regarding technology across and throughout the programs. (3) Determine how candidates assess student learning experiences throughout their programs, including the use of technology.

#### Action:

- The team reviewed the self study addendum and exhibits and participated in onsite interviews to verify information provided by EPP.
- Interviewed Full and Part Time Faculty, University Supervisor (student teaching), Professional Education Board (PEB) partner members and PEB advisory council (PEBAC) members regarding their role in the development and revision of the lesson plan rubric, cooperating and mentor teacher evaluation form, and the use of data to inform program

improvement.

3. Interviewed candidates regarding feedback they get from faculty, their preparation to integrate technology as a teaching tool, and their preparation to ensure that their students will be college and career ready.
4. Interviewed faculty regarding the adequacy, analysis, and use of data collected to make improvements and changes in programs.
5. Interviewed University Supervisors (student teaching) regarding the student teaching and pre-student teaching process and candidate experience including assignments, preparation of mentor and cooperating teachers and the diversity of placements.

2. Analysis regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 1 :

a. Narrative analysis of findings

Standard 1 requires the EPP provider to demonstrate that candidates develop a deep knowledge and understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their disciplines. The EPP must demonstrate that completers are able to use discipline-specific practices to advance the learning of all their students and be prepared to integrate college and career ready standards into their practice.

The team reviewed the self-study addendum and exhibits and participated in onsite interviews to verify information provided by EPP.

In addition to the state program reports, the EPP presented sources of evidence including 5 Assessments: Lesson Plan Rubric, Unit Assessment Plan Rubric, Student Teaching Assessment Report (STAR), Disposition Survey, and the Completer Survey. Additionally, state report information was provided about KPTP performance, Praxis testing data, and program-specific assessments. Per the requests in the Formative Review, three cycles of data were presented for dispositions, student teaching assessments (STAR), KPTP (Kansas' standardized Teacher Work Sample), exit surveys, lesson plan and unit plan assessments, and alumni and employer surveys. Pilot reports on feedback for mentor teachers by candidates were also presented. In the past year, alumni and employer surveys have been modified to assess candidate performance on the InTASC standards specifically. Revised lesson plan and unit plan assessments that address the use of technology more specifically are being piloted by elementary education this semester.

The addendum also reported on new policies for any candidate who scores at an unsatisfactory level on performance rubrics that will require them to resubmit or be reassessed until they reach a satisfactory level of performance. It also presented a preliminary analysis of the GPA and ACT data since raising the overall GPA admission and admission to student teaching requirements from 2.75 to 3.0.

Interviews with faculty, candidates, alumni, and school-based partners verified data collected and analyzed from the lesson plan rubric, unit rubric, and STAR rubric. These provide evidence that candidates have knowledge and understanding of each of the 10 InTASC standards and apply the standards in their planning for instruction. This is further evidenced by the candidates pass rates on Kansas State Assessments and the Praxis.

Candidates are required to use research and evidence to develop an

understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their professional practice. Data presented in the SIP and the exhibits provided from the EPP assessments including the STAR rubric and KPTP data were analyzed. These data and interviews with candidates, cooperating teachers, and alumni provide evidence that the candidates have the ability to use research and data to modify and adapt instruction and improve their practice.

Confirmation of approved state reports indicates that candidates meet the KSDE content standards.

Evidence provided in the SSR and the Addendum through the Lesson Plan Rubric, STAR (student teaching evaluation based upon Danielson) rubric, Lesson Plan and Unit Plan Assessments, Exit Surveys, Completer Surveys and State Reports were analyzed. The review of the data and interviews with candidates, faculty, cooperating teachers, and student teaching supervisors verify that candidates are prepared to integrate college and career readiness skills, differentiate instruction, apply accommodations as needed, and integrate technology into their teaching.

Evidence from the data collected from STAR, the Lesson Plan Rubric, and the Unit Plan Assessment was analyzed and indicate that candidates are being prepared to integrate technology into their lesson planning. This was further confirmed through interviews with current candidates who provided specific examples of how they integrate technology into lesson planning. It was evident from the interviews with current candidates and the alumni that this has been addressed through the addition of EDUC 335 to the sequence of courses. Concerns about preparation to use technology that surfaced in exit surveys and lesson and unit planning assessments have been addressed not only by the addition of EDUC 335 but a change instructors and expectations when data indicated that the preparation needed to be enhanced and modified. Current modifications in the unit plan and lesson plan rubrics will continue to hold candidates accountable more explicitly for meeting initial ISTE expectations regarding the use of technology.

b. Analysis of Program-Level data

Kansas is a SPA-like state. All programs, except high incidence special education, were reviewed by the KSDE and received approval by the state in June 2016; the high incidence special education program was approved in August 2016. In each of the program reports, the program reported on the content specific assessments used to determine candidate competence, as well as three administrations of data and analysis of how data are used for program improvement.

The five EPP designed assessments used as evidence for Standard 1 were reviewed using the CAEP Evaluation Tool for EPP-Created Assessments. The review determined that the Lesson Plan Rubric has been tagged to InTASC standards and partially to the CAEP standards, though not all tagging in LiveText is complete. Plans to do the same for other unit assessments calls for the tagging process to be completed by the end of Summer 2017. Access to administrative rights to LiveText in Fall 2016 allows the EPP to be able to tag and analyze data

by standards in a much more expansive and enhanced manner.

The EPP has three disposition survey instruments with increasing professional expectations for candidates as they progress through the program. The surveys are used throughout the program by faculty, mentor and cooperating teachers and were developed with expectations aligned with InTASC. There are no directions for its administration, categories for evaluation do not have descriptors, and data are only shared with candidates if dispositions are rated unacceptable. Candidates are aware that they are being evaluated and that they are informed if dispositional issues are identified with this assessment.

Interviews with faculty, the program coordinators, the EPP chair, the Assessment Coordinator and the newly hired Director of the Office Institutional Research and Accreditation (OIRA) indicated that all the instruments being used as evidence of addressing standard 1 are under review and are being revised to enhance their alignment with CAEP standards. This is consistent with the information in the SIP.

c. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. Review of data from the following provided evidence consistent with Standard 1:  
Pass rate for Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (KPTP)  
Praxis pass rate  
4/5 Key assessments (with the exception of the Disposition Survey)  
Interviews with stakeholders, including candidates and alumni provided additional evidence consistent with Standard 1.
2. EDUC 335 was added to the sequence of instruction to address the preparation of candidates to use technology in their practice and as an assessment of student (P-12) learning.
3. Candidates from the EPP are sought after and hired by local administrators from partner schools as evidenced during interviews with the PEB and PEAC committee members.
4. Current candidates confirmed that they are well trained in using technology in their instruction.

d. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. Interviews with candidates and program completer surveys indicate that pedagogical and methods courses do not sufficiently prepare candidates to implement classroom management strategies in their practice.
2. Interviews with candidates and faculty indicate that it is unclear how the disposition survey is used to inform candidates about professional areas related to Standard 1, other than unacceptable ratings.
3. The task of refining and tagging assessments to the InTASC and CAEP

standards has commenced this year with increased aspects of capability for reporting in LiveText. These tasks, while on a schedule, were incomplete at the time of the visit.

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement

Area for Improvement	Rationale
None	NA

Stipulation:

Stipulation	Rationale
None	NA

## Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.

1. Findings for each offsite report task to be verified onsite:

Task(s)

Co-construction of mutually beneficial p-12 school and community arrangements	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
1.	(1) Evidence is provided in the SSR related to early field experiences. This, however, does not adequately represent the breadth and depth of the candidate's entire program. Similarly, there may be differences in the licensure programs needs and abilities to support the partnership sites.
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed	
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews	
(1)	Are there additional partnership agreements that can be reviewed? Is there a progression of field experiences that is required in the licensure programs? What have been the benefits for the P-12 partners as the partnerships have been developed? What are the goals for impending partnerships for both the EPP and the partners? How are plans in the selective improvement plan progressing?

Partners share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
2.	(1) Evidence is provided of annual meetings of the Advisory Council. There is no evidence of the group's membership. There is limited evidence of follow-through or follow-up from the annual meetings in the annual reports. It is unclear how the PEAB this year has addressed concerns and has plans for meeting more frequently in the future.
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed	
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews	
(1)	Who participates in the Advisory Council? What role do these individuals play in the ongoing, continuous improvement of the EPP's licensure programs? Have minutes been taken for these meetings? Have action steps or plans been developed? Have the recommendations from this group been implemented? Have they been evaluated? Have any other adjustments been made based on the initial implementation?

Selection of clinical educators	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
3.	(1) Evidence is provided on selection of content-specific clinical educators. There is no evidence of a system or set of standards that extends EPP-wide.
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed	
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews	
(1)	What standards have been established for the selection of clinical faculty? What EPP-wide criteria do these individuals need to meet? What content-specific or program standards do they need to meet? How do the partner sites engage with the EPP in the selection of these clinical educators?

Preparation, evaluation, support, and retention of clinical educators	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
(1)	Evidence is provided related to the selection of clinical educators. There is some evidence of clinical educator evaluation, but additional evidence is needed to affirm compliance with this component of the standard. There is no specific

	evidence of the preparation, support, and retention of clinical educators.
	B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
4.	(1) How are clinical educators trained for work with the EPP's candidates? Is there training specific to the differing levels of field experience? What professional development is provided for clinical educators? Is there a retention plan for clinical educators? What is the entire evaluation process for clinical educators? Are the data collected on clinical educators shared with them?
	Works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration
	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
5.	(1) The SSR narrative indicates that partners have been engaged in clinical experience design. This is evidenced through the Advisory Council meeting materials provided. There is a lack of evidence showcasing how partners have been involved in the design of the totality of the clinical experience for candidates. Data have been provided showing that candidates have opportunities to complete field work in multiple partner sites.
	B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
	(1) Has a progression of clinical experiences been developed? Have clinical experiences been linked to the various courses in the sequence? Are there any special placements that need to be included for specific licensure programs? Is there a chart or matrix that showcases how these experiences work? What evidence is available to show that partners are actively engaged in the design of these experiences? How do you ensure that candidates achieve similar outcomes across placements?

Action:

1. Onsite actions associated with the noted tasks to be verified included: - reviewing the addendum to the formative feedback report, - examining exhibits submitted with the addendum to the formative feedback report, - examining exhibits provided onsite;
2. -interviewing representatives from pertinent groups including supervising faculty, cooperating teachers, student teachers, Professional Education Board (PEB) members, Professional Education Board Advisory Council (PEBAC) members, program coordinators, Educator Preparation Program (EPP) faculty, and assessment team members,
3. - visiting a Dual Language Magnet School (K-8) and a Cultural and Fine Arts Magnet Middle School (6-8), partner schools with the EPP.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 2 :

a. Summary of findings

Standard 2.1 requires Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) to establish mutually beneficial partner relationships with P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. EPPs are expected to establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit, ensure that theory and practice are linked, maintain coherence and share accountability for candidate outcomes.

The EPP provided evidence that partnership agreements have been developed with sites where candidates not yet admitted to teacher education engage in exploratory field experiences, clinical experiences connected to methods courses, and student teaching. These agreements indicate the purpose of the agreement and the benefits to EPP candidates and P-12 school students. A new, more robust professional development partner agreement with a large, urban district was presented delineating specific avenues for engagement in the exhibits for the



addendum. Ongoing relationships with two local schools in the Wichita (USD 259) district seem to address the needs for diverse placements directly. All of the agreements appear to be negotiated on a site-by-site basis. Artifacts reviewed as part of the site visit show that the EPP and its partners have a collaborative process in place. The evidence is limited that this collaborative agreement process is reviewed annually.

The Excel data file of field experience diversity indicated that candidates have multiple field placements in the programs of study and are assured that they have diverse placements.

The EPP has constituted a Professional Education Board Advisory Committee (PEBAC) that includes representatives from the EPP and its school partners. According to the evidence presented, the PEBAC is comprised of teachers, principals, central office staff, and students and meets two times each year. These meetings allow for the analysis of candidate and program data, review of assessment measures and tools, and recommendations for programmatic adjustments. It is evident that the PEBAC is a meaningful component of the EPP focused on continuous improvement.

Assessment tools are presented to and discussed with candidates. Interviews with members of the PEBAC, cooperating teachers, EPP faculty, and teacher education candidates indicate that summative disposition and STAR ratings of candidates are not shared unless there is a problem. Student teachers do receive formative feedback from university supervisors and cooperating teachers.

By the EPP's admission, partnerships have been informally configured. As a result, the selective improvement plan includes goals regarding redeveloping collaboration within P-12 school partnerships that have more formal agreements and expectations. The plan highlights involving partners in reexamining performance-based assessment at transitions to better reflect the impact on P-12 student performance. In addition, the EPP set goals to ensure co-construction of additional partnerships that involve schools that hire completers to facilitate the study of the influence of program completers on K-12 learning. Timelines for completion and measurable goals are under development.

With a focus on clinical educators, Standard 2.2 requires EPPs and their partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider, and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 students' learning and development. Similarly, the standard mandates that, in collaboration with their partners, EPPs use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placements.

The EPP provided evidence through exhibits and interviews that program faculty and coordinators work collaboratively with P-12 educators and administrators to

co-construct criteria for selection of clinical educators and make co-selections. While formal procedures have not been established, informal processes appear to be adequate for successful implementation.

An evaluation tool has been developed for school-based clinical educators to evaluate EPP candidates. Data from these evaluations are only shared within the EPP. No evidence was presented to show that school-based clinical educators evaluate EPP-based clinical educators.

Program candidates in elementary education evaluate school-based clinical educators using a tool provided in the self-study report as part of a pilot. Based on interviews, the EPP is working through the PEB and PEBAC to advance the pilot to other programs of study. These bodies are also discussing the feasibility of sharing results when there are so few candidates producing evaluations. There is no evidence that EPP-based clinical educators evaluate school-based clinical educators. Data from the evaluations are only shared within the EPP, as small numbers make confidential feedback difficult.

Data from the candidate exit survey of mentor teachers and interviews with candidates and alumni denote that candidates have had more positive experiences than negative ones.

Interviews with site-based administrators indicate that a recent partnership that requires field experience tied to a particular course was co-constructed. Limited evidence was provided to indicate that EPP and P-12 clinical educators use data collected to modify selection criteria and determine future assignments of candidates. Evidence of the use of demographic data was showcased as were data sets and PEB/PEBAC minutes that indicate that some changes in clinical experiences have been made. The previously mentioned pilot begins to address this issue.

At the start of the student teaching experience, supervisory resources and initial professional development are provided to cooperating teachers. The evidence is limited to prove that early field experience mentor teachers receive anything more than an e-mail and, for clinical experiences connected to methods courses, supervisory forms. Some supervisory resources are available electronically. Online professional development experiences have not been developed specific to this standard. The EPP does, however, provide professional development for in-service teachers; cooperating and mentor teachers can elect to take part in these endeavors.

Evidence was not provided to indicate that all clinical educators receive professional development or are involved in creating professional development opportunities for the use of evaluation instruments, evaluating professional dispositions of candidates, setting specific goals/objectives of the clinical experience and providing feedback.

Clinical experiences are addressed in Standard 2.3. This standard requires the

EPP to work with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. Further, clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program regarding candidates' development of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.

Annual reports from 2011-2016 reflect the refinement and development of early field experiences and a senior experience, with input from the Professional Education Board Advisory Council in their meetings. The EPP provided evidence that all candidates have active clinical experiences in diverse settings. Field experience outcomes and requirements charts were provided showcasing the breadth and depth of the field experiences for programs leading to licensure. Interviews with faculty, cooperating teachers, and program candidates indicate that clinical experiences are scaffolded and tie theory to practice.

The survey responses from methods course instructors and the email communications that support those responses indicate that methods instructors communicate with partners for recommendations for clinical faculty. There are some similarities in selection criteria, but each methods faculty member has his/her own, composite set of criteria. It remains unclear how the EPP and clinical educators use data collected to modify selection criteria, determine future assignments of candidates and make changes in clinical experiences.

Interviews with students and cooperating teachers support that candidates and students have appropriately used technology to enhance learning and track student progress and growth. Expectations that candidates use technology to enhance instructional opportunities are outlined in the technology lesson plan rubric, STAR, and the KPTP performance assessments.

Artifacts presented in the self-study report and the addendum indicates that the EPP assesses students in clinical experiences using performance-based criteria. The EPP does evaluate candidates in clinical experiences throughout the program, but it is not evident that the levels of candidate competency increase. Interviews with faculty and program candidates indicate that candidates receive feedback from formative assessments during the clinical experiences, but do not receive feedback from the final, formal clinical evaluations or dispositional assessments unless they score below proficient levels.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. Partnership agreements for field experiences noted benefits to the partner sites' students and the EPP's candidates. These have been developed on a site-by-site basis. Work to formalize partnership agreements is underway and has been included in the Selected Improvement Plan.

2. Multiple performance-based assessments have been developed and implemented for use in candidates' clinical experiences to demonstrate the

development of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.

3. Informal processes are used across the EPP with school-based clinical educators to select cooperating teachers to work with candidates in clinical experiences.

4. Clinical experiences have been developed considering P-12 student diversity and school-based clinical educator diversity.

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. Data are not available showcasing processes for school-based clinical educators to evaluate EPP-based clinical educators and vice versa.

2. While evidence was provided that the EPP holds a cooperating teacher/student teacher meeting prior to the commencement of the student teaching experience, evidence of -opportunities for professional development of clinical educators on the use of assessment tools were not provided.

3. Procedures for clinical educators, as a group, to provide feedback on clinical experiences other than evaluating candidate performance and dispositions in methods courses and student teaching were not provided.

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale
The EPP does not have a comprehensive procedure for evaluating school-based clinical educators or EPP-based clinical educators.	Evidence was presented on how school-based clinical educators evaluate candidates and how candidates evaluate school-based clinical educators. Processes for EPP-based clinical educators to evaluate school-based clinical educators have not been established. Likewise, processes for school-based clinical educators to evaluate EPP-based clinical educators have not been developed.
All clinical educators do not receive professional development and are not involved in creating professional development opportunities for the use of evaluation instruments, evaluating professional dispositions of candidates, setting specific goals/objectives of the clinical experience, and providing feedback.	Evidence was provided indicating that the EPP does host a cooperating teacher/student teacher meeting at which supervisory forms, policies, and procedures are shared. No evidence was available indicating that clinical educators are trained to use evaluation instruments and dispositional assessments developed by the EPP. While the PEBAC does use data to adjust clinical experiences, cooperating teachers do not appear to have a formal method for providing feedback or on setting specific goals/objectives of the clinical experience.

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale
None	NA

### Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program’s meeting of Standard 4.

1. Findings for each offsite report task to be verified onsite:

Task(s)

Evidence for Component 3.5.	
1.	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed (1) Clarify assessments and data specifically meeting Component 3.5. C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

Disposition Data	
2.	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews (1) How do candidates receive disposition feedback and act upon it? (2) How are disposition data collected and disaggregated by program and cycle? Obtain disaggregated disposition data from 2015-2016 and Fall 2016. (3) What is a sample of a progress report when there are identified disposition issues?

Transitions Points	
3.	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration (1) Verify the monitoring of candidates at transition points B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews (1) How do candidates know about and receive feedback at transition points?

Plan for recruiting diverse candidates	
4.	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed (1) The EPP has set an objective in the Selected Improvement Plan to achieve equivalent diversity measures...." C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews (1) What at the specific of the plan to increase diversity? How will effort be tracked and monitored?

Action:

- The team reviewed the self-study addendum and exhibits and participated in onsite interviews to verify information provided by EPP: KPTP scores, Elementary Education Reading Practicum, Reflection; Praxis scores were verified with data from the addendum.
- Verified that Mid-term disposition forms are completed in EDUC 110, EDUC 251 and EDUC 229. Any 2 or more Unacceptable ratings are tracked, counseled and reassessed at the end of the semester, an intervention plan is written when a disposition concern is reported. This plan outlines a timeline for student success and is signed by the candidate.
- Reported in the SIP narrative that dispositions are tracked by candidate rather than program. Examined Addendum exhibits that displayed both candidate dispositions and data by program. Wrote that Addendum Exhibit 3/10 Disposition Report had 6 semesters of data included, but found these data in Addendum Exhibit 1.4.

4. Examined sample Referral Form for Teacher Education Candidate Intervention that included the summary of the Intervention Plan and the Response to Concerns by the student teacher. Examined specific referrals and actions.
5. Transition Points (TP) verified and record of candidates passing through transition points was confirmed. They are TP #1 monitored via TE Program admissions standards; TP #2-Admit into Prof. semester (semester prior to Student Teaching); TP #3-Intent to Graduate; TP #4-Licensure requirements. Notification of Transition Points verified in student files.
6. Verified plans that education faculty will reach out to various cultural groups as per the SIP, supported by the Admissions Office and the Spanish Department. A Latino Leadership Program being piloted Fall 2017. HALO was mentioned several times as a possible source of recruitment. New scholarships incentives were announced for Hispanic students while the team was on campus.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 3:

a. Summary of findings

Evidence reviewed for meeting standard three includes the Self-Study and exhibits, Self-Study Addendum and exhibits, onsite interviews, and artifacts. Component 3.1 asks the EPP to present the plan to recruit and support diverse candidates. According to the Addendum, beginning summer and fall, 2017, the plan is to contact new students with undeclared majors in athletic programs and all males already coming to campus and provide programming to make them aware of teaching careers. Contact lists and recruitment outcomes from the Admissions Office will be used to develop spreadsheets to document contacts and responses. The success rates of contacted undecided majors transferring to educator preparation programs will be monitored; as well as the diversity of candidates contacted and enrolled. The EPP is planning on contacting Wichita Public School's Advanced Via Individual Determination (AVID) program to reach potential minority candidates. Visits with Hispanic groups (i.e. HALO) are occurring. In meeting with the admissions and Spanish departments, a new Latino Leadership program has been marketed and will begin as a pilot program in Fall 2017. However, no specific 5-year recruiting plan targeting diverse students was noted for the EPP. Because of the need communicated by local partner schools, the EPP is now offering TESOL certification for English education and elementary education majors. STEM opportunities are not addressed in the EPP's analysis of shortage area employment needs.

Before spring 2016, the admission requirements into the Teacher Education Program included a 2.75 GPA in all areas (overall, professional education courses, and content courses), with no grade lower than a "C" in professional education courses. There was no ACT or SAT requirement. However, data reported in the SSR indicated that of the Pre-transition 1 students who submitted ACT scores in Fall 2015 averaged 21.94. The EPP implemented new requirements for full admission that requires a minimum GPA of 3.0 overall with no less than a 2.75 GPA in the Content and Professional Education areas and an ACT of 18 or higher. This began in Spring 2016, and the EPP is carefully tracking the actual ACT and GPAs for each candidate. The EPP has received approval (Spring 2016) of new admission requirements to meet to CAEP guidelines from the university governing councils. The EPP will monitor spring 2016 admissions and revisit with Professional Education Board (PEB) discussion in spring 2017. They will examine the impact on leads and applications, acceptances, and success rates at each transition point as cohorts proceed through the program through fall 2019, when the first full cohort using new requirements graduates. During first looks at the

data, it appears that the cohort GPA is considerably higher than 3.0. The EPP plans to increase cultural diversity of candidates by admitting candidates with GPAs slightly below 3.0 shows promise to be successful.

The non-academic criteria, professional dispositions, were collaboratively developed with P-12 partner schools and the Professional Education Board Advisory Committee (PEBAC). The majority of the dispositions are based on InTASC Standards, others are related to characteristics the EPP deems important. Dispositions are measured at mid-term of the first three education courses. If there are two or more "unacceptable" ratings, the course instructor counsels the candidate, and the Chair is notified. The course instructor can request an additional rating be completed at the end of the semester if there are concerns. Cooperating teachers also measure dispositions during each practicum experience. Documentation was submitted in the Addendum that showed course instructors sent a link to cooperating teachers to fill out the disposition form. The EPP stated that any candidate failing to meet expectations is counseled and goals are established to be met before being allowed to enroll in student teaching. Two Candidate Intervention Forms were shared as documentation in the Addendum. Dispositions are then measured at the end of student teaching; failure may require extended time in the placement, additional placements or a change of major. Addendum Exhibit 1.4 showed Acceptable performance on each disposition ranging from 87.4% to 98.3%. For Disposition #2, Cooperating teachers rated teacher candidates Acceptable 93.5% to 100% of the time, and for Disposition #3 92% to 100% of student teachers were rated Acceptable on the dispositions.

Interviews confirmed that every candidate is assigned an advisor who keeps track of progression within the program and receives a progress report on each candidate at the end of the semester. To indicate candidates were developing content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge and skills and the integration of technology, Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (KPTP) scores and Praxis Content Test scores were included from Fall 2013 to Fall 2015. The EPP also included scores from the Technology Integration Lesson Plans 1 and 2. Key program assessments are embedded throughout the courses to additionally monitor the candidates. Transition Point #1 is monitored via TE Program admissions standards; Transition Point #2 is required before admittance into the professional semester (semester prior to ST); Transition Point #3 is monitored by the licensure officer and registrar with the Intent to Graduate Form; and Transition Point #4 is monitored by the licensure officer based on licensure requirements.

The EPP named several assessments showing candidates have a high content knowledge level and can positively impact student learning. Candidates' GPAs were the first mentioned. Analysis of 2014-15 Transition point data indicates candidates' content knowledge is developing appropriately for program cohorts admitted into the program and approaching T2. All cohorts remained above the 3.0 level. Transition 3 GPAs were all above the minimum, and the cohort means content GPA was 3.438. In addendum 3.6, the KPTP showed all but one candidate passing from fall 2013-fall 2015 with an average score of 23.7 (passing score is

20). The Student Teaching Assessment Rubric, Lesson Plan Technology Integration (only one year of data) and the Praxis Content Exams were all included as evidence of candidate performance. Faculty, candidate and alumni interviews confirmed the breadth of expectations and assessments, including the use of college and career ready standards in planning instruction.

The KSDE Code of Ethics for Professional Educators is presented to candidates in the following courses; EDUC 110 Introduction to Teaching, EDUC 299 Cornerstone for Teacher Education, and EDUC 499 Capstone for Teacher Education. On the applications for admissions into the Teacher Education Program and the Professional Semester application, the candidate acknowledges a list of behaviors that could result in the loss of licensure or licensure eligibility. EDUC 110 introduces basic education laws and ethics as a part of philosophical underpinnings in education and requires each candidate to develop a personal philosophy of education to guide future classroom decisions and planning.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

Evidence confirms candidate GPAs are above the required 3.0.

Disposition data is reported at 3 transition points, and specific personalized actions occur if dispositions are unacceptable.

A strong, personalized advising program ensures that candidates perform at required levels throughout the program,

5 cycles of KPTP data showing an average score of 23.7.

Data from assessments confirm high levels of performance in the areas of content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills and the integration of technology.

Candidates are prepared to teach with college and career-ready standards for students as verified in interviews.

The addendum and interviews confirmed documented use of the Kansas Code of Conduct throughout the program

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

The EPP did not submit a comprehensive recurring plan for recruiting diverse candidates. They have plans for specific targeted improved recruiting, but those plans in the SIP do not yet have specific, targeted goals.

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale
The recruitment plan submitted is not specifically aligned to the	The goals and methods reported as the EPP's recruitment plan are vague and not specifically connected to Friends University-wide plan.



mission of the EPP and Friends University.	There is no specific EPP involvement in larger University initiatives (i.e. Latino Leaders Program).
--	--

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale
N/A	

## Standard 4: Program Impact

The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

1. Findings for each offsite report task to be verified onsite:

Task(s)

1. Confirm and Clarify components of Self-Improvement Plan that address standard 4.
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
<p>Page 36 of SSR: "C.2.2. Minutes will reflect participation by Friends University and exploratory procedures will be outlined by end of fall 2016. Action follow up</p> <p>(1) will be determined by spring 2017 for implementation fall 2018. C.3.1. Forms will be accessed, catalogued, and analyzed with plans of additional supplements as needed by end fall 2016. Aggregate data tables and analysis."</p>
1. C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
<p>(1) What processes did the EPP have in place to improve response rate for employer/alumni data?</p>
<p>(2) How does the EPP plan to work with the proposed collaborative organizations to collect Standard 4 case study data related to completer's impact on student learning and other components of the standards.?</p>
<p>(3) What are the plans to determine validity of processes and assessments identified in Standard 4 that are not currently addressed in the Self-Improvement Plan?</p>
<p>(4) Update progress on the plan from Spring and Fall 2016.</p>

Action:

- The team reviewed the self-study addendum and exhibits and participated in onsite interviews to verify information provided by EPP: Self-study addendum exhibits included a revised Selected Improvement Plan with specific goals and strategies for collecting data across Standard 4. Addendum exhibits and interviews clarified the process the EPP is using to obtain Standard 4 data. A further revised Selected Improvement Plan with more documentation was available in the on-site exhibits. Reviewed self-study addendum and onsite exhibits, including revised alumni and employer survey instruments and 2016 results.
- Interviewed alumni, Assessment Committee, cooperating teachers, and employers.
- Reviewed the syllabus for the new graduate course for program completers.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 4 :

a. Summary of findings

Standard 4 requires the EPP demonstrate the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation. The EPP presented five sources of evidence in the Self-Study to demonstrate it meets Standard 4: Program Impact; TEP Alumni Follow-up Survey 2014, Alumni-Employer Survey Data Spring 2014, Alumni-Employer Follow-up Survey Data Spring 2015, and Student Teacher End of Program Surveys. Evidence reviewed for meeting Standard Four includes the Self-Study and exhibits, Self-Study Addendum and exhibits, onsite interviews, and artifacts. Component 4.1 requires the provider use multiple measures to report on program completers' impact on student learning. Kansas does not currently collect P-12 impact measures. The EPP has selected Standard 4 as one of the foci in the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP), which was revised in the

addendum and revised again at the time of the visit. The goals of the Selected Improvement Plan pertaining to Component 4.1 include 1) investigate P-12 impact of instruction by Friends University program completers on student learning for CAEP Standard 4.1.; 2) develop or acquire access to data observations of teachers prepared within the past three years by the EPP and develop benchmarks for comparison (CAEP 4.2.); 3) redevelop employer surveys and improve return rates to effectively assess satisfaction of employers of EPP completers (CAEP 4.3); 4) redevelop completer surveys and improve return rates to effectively assess satisfaction of practicing teachers prepared by the EPP (CAEP 4.4). The Self-Study Addendum provided a revised Selected Improvement Plan (SIP, Feb. 2017) that included outcomes and evaluation measures for collecting program impact data. The Self-Study Addendum reported that the collaborative regional effort did not materialize and, therefore, the EPP has decided to collect Standard 4 data independently of peer institutions. The EPP has obtained approval for a two-credit graduate course for ten program completers to obtain teacher work sample data as evidence of program impact on the student learning of completers. The assessment coordinator has agreed to use his release time to accomplish this task; however, it is unclear if this is sustainable across terms after the first year, given the many responsibilities of this position. Review of the proposed course syllabus indicates that program completers would complete again the Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (KPTP) which has established validity/reliability.

The Revised SIP indicates that observations will be collected from program completers to meet CAEP 4.2. Strategy C.3.2 of the SIP reports that observation data will be obtained commencing in spring 2017 with agreements from volunteer program completers. In the revised Self-Improvement Plan, the EPP included the percentage of program completers that achieve professional licensure as evidence of 4.3. Review of Exhibit 4.4.2 Professional Licensure Rates of 2012-2015 completers indicate that 68% of completers received their professional license within three years. Nine of the 11 completers that did not receive professional licensure chose to leave the profession due to personal reasons. In the Self-Study Addendum, the EPP provided three years of data for employer and alumni surveys, with revised surveys tagged to InTASC standards. Review of Exhibit 4.31 Employer Survey Responses 2014-2016 and Exhibit 4.4.1 Alumni Survey Responses 2014-2016 indicates that overall alumni ratings of the program were 3.083 on a four point scale with employers' ratings higher at 3.43 overall. Return rates for both employer and completer surveys were better than 50% in spring 2017. New processes were used to increase returns with direct calls to employers and alumni to respond. Analysis indicates that both employers and alumni reported that differentiation and classroom management were areas in need of improvement. Interviews onsite confirmed that classroom management and designing interventions for students with special needs were areas for improvement across programs.

Analysis of the employer and alumni surveys according to the CAEP Assessment Rubric indicates that instruments were rated at Level 2 on Survey Content and Data Quality. Survey content and performance indicators were not clearly defined.

For example, indicators include terms such as 'teacher is very good' or 'was prepared' which did not clearly distinguish and describe performance levels. The instruments were rated at Level 1 for validity and reliability processes using the CAEP Assessment rubric as there was no stated research methodology or validity/reliability data for both surveys.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. The EPP collected and analyzed three applications of employer and completer survey data.
2. The EPP has revised employer and alumni surveys to use the InTASC standards specifically, though levels of performance are not well defined.
3. Return rates for both employer and completer surveys increased and were better than 50% in spring 2017.

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. Validity and reliability descriptions in the SIP were not aligned with research-based methods, nor were they specifically outlined by the criteria in the CAEP assessment rubric for surveys.

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale
The EPP has not established plans to ensure that scaled choices are qualitatively defined using specific criteria aligned with key attributes identified in the items of survey instruments to validate the survey's data nor determine its reliability (CAEP Assessment Rubric).	The Revised SIP did not include plans for assessing the evidence for analysis from revised survey instruments. There was no process reported or planned to pilot questions to determine that alumni and employers interpreted them as intended and/or that modification would be necessary. There were plans to compare successive administrations to assess evidence of reliability.

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale
N/A	

## Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

1. Findings for each offsite report task to be verified onsite:

Task(s)

1.	<p>Examination of 2015-2016 Data from Measures for Programs and Across Programs</p> <p>A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration</p> <p>(1) Extension of data collection and processes to analyze data by PEB and program faculty.</p> <p>B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed</p> <p>(1) Confirmation of processes reported and quality assurance system sustainability</p> <p>C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews</p> <p>(1) How does the education program utilize data to inform decisions?</p> <p>(2) What data are important?</p> <p>(3) Who makes the final decisions regarding program or systems improvement?</p> <p>(4) Who serves on the PEAB? How is this determined?</p> <p>(5) How are data from the KPTP and STAR instruments used to inform programmatic changes and adjustments?</p>
2.	<p>Expansion of Quality Assurance System with new personnel</p> <p>A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration</p> <p>(1) Scope of responsibilities and role of Director of Institutional Research and Coordinator of Accreditation in the ongoing quality assurance system and the selective improvement plan</p> <p>B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed</p> <p>(1) SSR indicates that these new roles will provide additional capacity; what are the specifics of their responsibilities?</p> <p>C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews</p> <p>(1) How does this role (mentioned in the Selective Improvement) fit into the ongoing quality assurance plan?</p>
3.	<p>Reliability and Validity of Locally Developed Instruments</p> <p>A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration</p> <p>(1) Process for determining reliability and validity of locally developed instruments</p> <p>B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed</p> <p>(1) Clarification beyond the short discussion of reliability and validity in Standard 3. Processes to be used.</p> <p>C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews</p> <p>(1) The SSR is silent on this topic, including the validity of the STAR. What processes are in place/will be in place to establish reliability and validity of locally developed instruments?</p>
	<p>How data analysis is used for program modification</p> <p>A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration</p>

- |    |  |
|----|--|
|    | (1) Specificity beyond the Annual Reports as to how data are used to make program improvements |
|    | B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed   |
|    | C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews                   |
| 4. | (1) Interview faculty to corroborate the process for examining data.                           |
|    | (2) How are goals identified?  |
|    | (3) How does the unit know when it achieves its goals?   |
|    | (4) How does the EPP use data from the MAT program to make program adjustments/improvements?   |

Action:

1. The team reviewed the self-study addendum and exhibits and participated in onsite interviews to verify information provided by EPP: Assessment data for 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016 disaggregated by program
2. Interviews with EPP faculty, PEB and PEBAC regarding participation in data review, analysis and program improvement
3. Interview with Assessment Team regarding participation of the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment planned processes for determining reliability and validity of locally developed assessments
4. Review of SIP to determine adequacy of plans for Standard 5

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 5:

a. Summary of findings

The addendum and interviews confirmed further details regarding the nature of all assessments used, the purpose for their use, the reviewers, cycle for administration, and the cycle for review. The EPP has an increasing capacity for a quality assurance system to enable continuous improvement. The system continues to expand its ability to monitor candidate progress, to plan for expanded ability to assess completer achievements and assess provider operational effectiveness. The addendum outlined the system's key assessments, data type, responsibility and cycles for administration, purpose and review cycles. The EPP is in the process of tagging its assessments to InTASC and CAEP Standards (see feedback on SIP). Program disaggregated addendum data for the past 3 years and presented with an analysis. Faculty, the Professional Education Board (PEB) and the Professional Education Board Advisory Committee (PEBAC) interviews confirmed that data were shared and analyzed. The system supports setting program priorities and tracks data for program faculty, administrators and teachers on the advisory council, and representatives of alumni and the candidates. Many refinements in the system have occurred in the last 6 months.

The quality assurance system has recently been expanded with additional technological and personnel resources. While LiveText had been used by the EPP for course-based assessments, administrative rights and capacity have been added to the EPP's capabilities, and the Assessment Coordinator is now migrating additional program-wide assessments and candidate tracking to LiveText from both Banner and the Access file that has warehoused candidate data. In addition, Friends has hired a Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Accreditation (OIRA) in March 2016. This office assumed direct support for CAEP accreditation in December 2016 and is assisting the EPP's assessment team in carrying forward plans for establishing reliability and validity of assessments, ensuring that Banner data can be smoothly merged into LiveText data and reports and providing technical support and advice. Dashboard data and

additional technical reports from this office generated since submission of the addendum have expanded the EPP's available data. While this recent hire has created a very recent capacity to manage the quality assurance system, the EPP has had limited capacity to do so up to this point with the Assessment Coordinator having one-course release per semester to coordinate all activities.

Measures presented in the SSR continue to be refined and further aligned with standards based on relevant criteria for programs based on KSDE, InTASC, and CAEP standards; assessments with the standards of the profession. The EPP continues to refine the ways in which assessments respond to various aspects of standards, including InTASC standards and candidates' use of technology. The EPP generated reports to track 3 years of data for current and previous iterations of assessments and data from candidate transition points in the addendum. The addendum and examples from the site visit provided evidence of actionable refinements in assessments and program operations that were the result of data analysis. There are currently no processes that have been used to provide evidence of reliability and validity for locally developed, key assessments used by all programs. The EPP suggests that content validity for program specific data comes from the state program approval process. However, in its plans for the future, the EPP has confirmed plans to ensure both validity and reliability of program assessments delineated in Standard 1, though it is not clear what methods will be used. No process to study reliability has been implemented. Initial evaluation using the CAEP locally developed assessment rubric has been completed by the Director of the OIRA, but it has not been triangulated through external evaluation of assessments for content validity. There are general plans for this type of validation for some of the assessments, but in interviews, the unit did not yet have plans to do so for dispositions assessments.

Alumni and employer surveys have been refined to ensure that they are aligned and tagged with InTASC standards and data are disaggregated to analyze performance by standards. These surveys have been piloted in 2016, and the EPP is awaiting a second administration to study reliability.

Annual reports for the EPP have been filed and, for the most part, reflect the ongoing shifts in priorities for the EPP. They indicate ongoing changes and refinement in preparation programs, though it is not always clear that those changes emanate from data.

The provider regularly collects data regarding broad system goals and has plans to collect data related to goals within the Selected Improvement Plan. Interviews with program faculty and senior administration revealed that Friends University has not had an institutional research department head for three years until it hired a Director of Institutional Research in March 2016. In December 2016, his title changed and responsibilities expanded to Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Accreditation (OIRA). The Director of the OIRA assists the EPP in developing data dashboards, with current examples showing the

targets of increasing Hispanic enrollment. The University is in the initial stages of reporting tracked results over AQIP goals. The Director of the OIRA has assisted the EPP to remove obstacles in aligning the university's student management system with LiveText, and the EPP is in the process of identifying which assessments will be imported into LiveText. Interviews with program chairs revealed that innovations occur through a series of piloting, through the elementary education coordinator then, moved to full scale if the pilot is successful. Recent formatting and piloting of a common lesson planning template is an example of how this process is in use. Interviews with candidates confirmed that the EPP now utilizes a common lesson planning template and common rubric. When everything is successfully imported into LiveText, the EPP will have an increased ability to utilize and track data at an aggregated level. Holistically, when changes occur in the program, unit faculty present a suggestion to the Assessment Coordinator, and the topic is placed on the agenda for PEB. Proposals are discussed, decisions are made, and timelines are established. While students are assessed, final results may or may not be shared with the candidates for methods and student teaching.

The EPP provides measures of completer impact through alumni and employer surveys at this time, with plans for future data collection in a graduate course. Usage of collected data to inform decisions is somewhat evident in artifacts. In the SSR evidence, the EPP tags a technology rubric for Fall 2014 and Spring 2015. Data from both rubrics indicate that many students performed at the lowest area. Interviews with faculty, the unit head, and students revealed that the technology course changed significantly during the past few years after analyzing these data. After a change in instructor, the technology course now provides broad exposure to software and specific requirements for technology integration. Current candidates reported they are much better prepared than alumni interviewed. Candidates reported that course evaluations provide instructors and program administrators feedback, and they have noticed changes as a result of their input on these evaluations.

Aggregated data are summarized and reviewed by the PEBAC and PEB and are used to make program decisions. The Praxis and KTP are externally benchmarked. Other assessments are not. In the most recent annual report, the EPP states that publicly available data of CAEP's outcomes and measures are only linked to the AQIP portfolio. However, the link opens a 2013 portfolio. Nothing more recent was provided. The EPP presented 3 forms of an emerging SIP. In its most recent form, the plan includes how resources are allocated toward achieving specific goals. Goals seem to align with university priorities as indicated by the Interim VPAA.

The EPP has processes in place to ensure that representative employers, alumni, practitioners, and school and community partners are involved in program evaluation. Data provided in the addendum indicate that these stakeholders have regular access to admissions, assessment, and follow-up survey data for review. Data in the addendum and interviews confirmed responsible sharing of data for program evaluation and program improvement with key partners on campus and



members of the PEBAC. Numerous specific examples of ongoing program improvement and assessment refinement were provided. There was no evidence that the current systems are moving toward identifying models of excellence at this time.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. Assessment data for all EPP assessments for 3 years were available.
2. Interviews and minutes confirmed that data were shared and analyzed with the PEB and PEBAC.
3. Refined alumni and employer surveys are now aligned with the InTASC standards.
4. Refined rubrics are being piloted in the elementary education program.
5. The SIP outlines further refinements in assessments.
6. Migration to LiveText has commenced.
7. Assessments are being reviewed on a planned cycle.

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. The SIP does not outline timelines and processes specifically for determining reliability and validity of instruments.
2. The March 7 version of the SIP contained more detail than the Feb. 11th version.
3. While the process is ongoing, not all assessments are tagged to appropriate standards and easily disaggregated for analysis.

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement

Area for Improvement	Rationale
The EPP has not taken steps to establish measures of validity and reliability for assessments that are not surveys, including assessment of dispositions.	While local assessments (STAR rubric, unit plan, lesson plan and dispositions) have been developed, implemented, and refined, there have been no systems in place nor plans to establish content validity including validation from external constituents, nor specific plans to establish reliability (including inter-rater reliability). The SIP does not explicate processes to be used in future determinations.
The EPP does not systemically utilize aggregated data to inform key decisions.	The EPP is in the initial stages of aligning expectations to new rubrics and templates. Data are not presented uniformly in a consistent aggregate so that the EPP can examine potential trend data. Data-informed decision-making occurs at the individual level to track and show individual candidate progression within the program. Individual program data were prepared for the state program approval process. Not all data are summarized, externally benchmarked, and analyzed. The SIP outlines processes to be implemented for survey data.
The EPP has limited capacity to collect, analyze and monitor data for candidate progress, completer achievements and operational effectiveness.	While the new Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Accreditation (OIRA) has begun to provide support for the Quality Assurance System, the EPP has not had the capacity to implement comprehensive systems to meet all aspects of the CAEP standards, particularly related to reliability and validity. The SIP does not spell out the specifics of plans in this area.
The EPP does not make completer information publicly available.	Data on the website that were found were not current nor complete.

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale
N/A	

### Section 3: Cross-cutting Themes of Diversity and Technology

#### 1. DIVERSITY

##### a. Summary regarding adequacy and accuracy of evidence related to diversity

An AFI from the prior on-site review, regarding limited faculty diversity, remains a concern. Most candidates in the initial programs have access to one faculty member from a diverse background. Interviews with senior administration indicate a desire to seek additional diverse faculty, though there are no formal plans to do so. Friends has adopted an AQIP goal to increase recruitment efforts in the Hispanic community and hope that will spur further interest from qualified Hispanic community leaders who might serve as adjunct faculty.

Friends University prepares teacher candidates to serve students from diverse backgrounds in methods coursework including targeted assessments in student teaching. No formal model for considering diversity was present. Employer and alumni survey data confirm candidate preparation. Constructed field experiences support intentional focus on diversity. As candidates enter the program, they are intentionally placed in a dual-language school that serves a diverse student body. This immersion experience considers culture and language. Placements require exposure to special students with exceptionalities, diverse races/ethnicities. The AQIP goal for increasing Hispanic populations on campus includes support for students to be retained. The EPP provided data dashboards indicating an increased number of candidates in the past 3 years. There were limited linkages among the EPP's plans to address recruitment efforts beyond the university's AQIP goal.

##### b. Evidence that adequately and accurately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of diversity

1. Charts and table and newly developed dashboard data (in on-site exhibits) indicating the diversity of teacher candidates over the last 5 years
2. Interviews with EPP and campus leadership regarding recruitment of Hispanic students through HALO
3. Interviews with candidates and alumni that confirmed preparation to teach diverse student bodies and field placements that were diverse
4. Review of data from STAR, KPTP, and field placements addressing how candidates address meeting the needs of diverse learners.

##### c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of diversity

Interviews with Admissions did not reveal specific plans to target recruiting for Hispanic students interested in becoming teachers.

Note: Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each are cited under the relevant standard(s)

#### 2. TECHNOLOGY

##### a. Summary regarding adequacy and accuracy of evidence related to technology

Candidates and faculty confirmed that candidates are prepared to use technology in their teaching. After alumni had provided feedback that the preparation was insufficient, changes in course requirements were made. EDUC

335: Technology in the Classroom was added to the program. Current candidates are enthusiastic about what they learn in that course, citing numerous examples of public domain and content specific software and applications to which they were exposed. The music, Spanish, physical education, and art faculty provided rich examples of technology available to candidates. Candidates were able to make use of these applications in their teaching.

On campus, classrooms are equipped with Smartboards and labs and library facilities had many locations where candidates and classes could use technology. Interviews indicated that clinical sites were varied in the available technology and candidates adjusted their instruction accordingly. Migration to LiveText is ongoing. Assessment team faculty now have administrative access to LiveText and are migrating more assessments and data to that platform from Banner and Access spreadsheets.

The EPP lesson plan rubric used in methods classes has been further revised to assess the more specific use of technology. The current revision of alumni and employer surveys (first implemented in Spring 2016) have limited references to technology in single levels of response on the rubric related to InTASC standards 7, 8, and 9.

b. Evidence that adequately and accurately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of technology.

1. Syllabus for Education 335: Technology in the Classroom
2. Revised rubrics emphasizing technology were provided at the time of the onsite visit.
3. Classrooms contain technology stations and Smart Boards.
4. Interviews with candidates and cooperating teachers confirm candidates' ability to use technology with P-12 students.
5. Candidates use LiveText and Moodle to manage their own professional coursework and field experiences.

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of technology.

None.

Note: Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each are cited under the relevant standard(s)

## Section 4: Area(s) for Improvement cited from previous accreditation review, if any

Area(s) for Improvement cited from previous accreditation review, if any

Area for Improvement:	Rationale:
The key assessments in the Master of Arts in Teaching program are not aligned with all 23 proficiencies identified in the program's conceptual framework.	Recommend for Removal. The MAT has been revised and is now an M.Ed. program. Several tracks of the old MAT program have been removed (see next AFI response). Each of the six assessments is aligned with the conceptual framework, based upon Charlotte Danielson's model. Each course has an embedded assessment aligned to goals and indicators of the conceptual framework. Currently, the data is further disaggregated by delivery model (online or face-to-face). The data reporting will likely undergo another iteration as the partner schools (within the Wichita Public Schools district) are moving to Marzano model, from the Danielson framework. Currently, the EPP is working through the issues of moving from a 3-scale reporting system to a 4-scale reporting system; this transition is incomplete and has created some reporting anomalies. After an onsite review of documents and interviews with graduate faculty, it remains unclear how the data are reported to the conceptual framework; however, the AFI may not be applicable to the new set of standards and may limit the EPP's approach moving forward to adopt the CAEP Standards for Advanced Programs.
The unit does not systematically collect and analyze assessment data in the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT), the Master of School Leadership (MSL), and the District Level Leadership (DLL) Programs.	Recommend for Continuance and change the AFI to read "M.Ed. Program". All programs listed above have either been discontinued or have taken a new form. The MAT program is now a Master of Education degree. Interviews with program adjunct faculty revealed some familiarity with the movement from a cohort model to a more open enrollment approach, though the special education program remains as a cohort. As such, data were presented by combined academic year, rather than by cohort. An interview with the program coordinator revealed data are pulled from each of the course-based rubrics and populated into a chart, presented by goal and indicator as prescribed by the AFI. Key assessments for the six required classes and course syllabi were requested and reviewed on-site. A coversheet, referred to as AddendumExhibit_AF_2.1 refers to course-based assessments with rubrics were reported to align. Four rubrics were provided. All four rubrics were scaled to four performance levels. The coversheet reports progress toward 3 performance levels. After a second interview with the coordinator, the team remained unclear how the data were moved from a four-point scale to a three-point scale. Two sets of data were reported on the Addendum; the top data was reported to be from the online program and the bottom set of data was reported to be from the "f2f" iteration. The data were identical; the program director indicated in the second interview that this was in error.
The field experience assessments listed for the MAT programs are not aligned with the conceptual framework.	Recommend for Removal. Each of the six assessments is aligned with the conceptual framework, based upon Charlotte Danielson's model. Each course has an embedded assessment aligned to goals and indicators of the conceptual framework. Currently, the data are further disaggregated by delivery model (online or face-to-face). The data will likely undergo another iteration as the local schools are moving to Marzano model.
Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with faculty from diverse groups.	Recommend for Continuance. Interviews with faculty, students, and senior administration reveal a continued awareness of limited diversity among the full-time faculty. Plans to increase additional access to diverse adjunct and full time faculty are being considered, but plans have not been formalized. A new emphasis regarding the recruitment of Hispanic students is hoped to achieve access to more diverse community members as potential adjuncts and/or field placements. At this time, M.Ed. candidates have no opportunities to work with faculty from diverse groups.
The unit does not ensure that all MAT, MSL, and DLL candidates have an opportunity to work with P12 students from diverse groups.	Recommend for Removal. Though the three programs listed above do not currently exist in their formats under which the AFI was originally intended, all field placements are tied to enhancing the classroom experience of a practicing educator. The Director of the M.Ed. program loads candidate-reported data about their classroom composites into an Excel spreadsheet, reporting 3 types of diversity: special education, SES, and racial diversity. If candidates do not have an appropriate mix of diversity in their own classes, they must secure

	<p>two days of release time and work with another student in a class that has an appropriate distribution. At the time of the visit, two candidates had to have supplemental field experiences because their home institution was not sufficiently diverse.</p>
--	---

## Section 5: Response to the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP)

(Use the Rubric for Evaluating the Capacity and Potential in the SIP)

### 1. Summary of findings and overall evaluation of Selected Improvement Plan

The selected improvement plan dated 3/5/2017 was used for the basis of this report. It contained revisions and additions to the report submitted in the 2/11/2017 addendum, which was also revised from the original SIP reported in the SSR. The plan focuses on recruitment of diverse candidates (2 objectives), clinical partnerships and practices (3 objectives), and impact on P-12 learners (5 objectives). Objectives are at varying levels of specificity. There are specific strategies listed for each of the objectives. Most are designed to enhance the EPP's capacity to sustain programs that meet CAEP standards.

The recruitment of diverse candidates focuses heavily on the institutions AQIP goals of increasing the Hispanic population in the on-campus traditional aged programs. The goals are to have the EPP programs reflect the same diversity as that of the student body at Friends University. The Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Accreditation has provided comprehensive dashboard data to track progress. The EPP has plans to tap into this initiative, but the EPP is not specifically mentioned in the AQIP update. Faculty have initiated careful tracking of admission and transition point data for each cohort, finding that cohort performance is well above CAEP guidelines and there is room to work with candidates who show potential but do not meet the requirements for admission to the teacher education programs.

Clinical partnerships have been highly personal and informal until recently. The SIP seeks to formalize partnerships with schools that complement the program and prepare candidates to teach diverse learners and has begun to revise and sign MOUs that outline partner responsibilities. The EPP plans to develop additional partnerships where graduates are hired to enhance access to documenting completer effectiveness and impact upon P-12 learning. It is unclear at this point whether those districts have been identified. In addition, the development of a 2 credit graduate course to be offered at no cost to completers has become the primary strategy for addressing Standard 4. Another strategy proposed is to gain access to supervisors' evaluation of completers. Strategies for those are not as well developed.

In addition, the SIP focuses on revision and strengthening of assessment instruments used in field experiences and student teaching. Revisions include additional emphasis on the use of technology and enhanced reflection upon teaching. The EPP plans to transition from pilot to full-scale use of these assessments in Fall 2017.

Finally, there has been ongoing efforts (with success) to refine the completer and employer surveys and enhance the response rates on those surveys. The second year of data will be available in Spring 2017 and analysis will commence. It is hoped that these revised instruments will provide evidence for

Standard 4 highlighting the preparation of candidates for their employment.

a. The EPP's capacity for initiating, implementing and complete the SIP.

With a full-time faculty of 4, responsibility for much of the Selected Improvement plan falls to the program chair and the assessment coordinator. The Professional Education Board faculty take an active part in the design, review, and evaluation of program assessments and aspects of the Selected Improvement Plan. This group will provide support in monitoring and focus the team on implementation of the plan. The site visitors probed extensively regarding elements of the plan.

The level of specificity regarding strategies and timelines varied across the goals; much is outlined to occur in the next 2 years. The OIRA has been charged to provide increased capacity for data access and analysis. Ongoing refinement of assessments and surveys is well underway; faculty are highly invested and involved in that process.

Technological support has improved, and the tagging and migration to LiveText will enhance the ability to complete parts of the SIP.

Strategies to diversify the candidate pool are less well conceived and rely heavily on access to the university's HALO program. Responsibility for recruitment is not well conceived for the EPP. It relies on efforts of faculty and EPP leadership who are already stretched quite thin. Commitment to carefully support and monitor identified candidates who may not meet all admissions requirements is more carefully conceived. The strong relationship building for which the EPP's faculty are known will be a decided advantage to supporting these efforts.

Faculty are committed to their teaching and are reluctant to consider reassigned time in their loads. Many efforts outlined in the SIP will take considerable time and building of capacity. It remains a concern that, given the already extensive faculty responsibilities, that the EPP will have the capacity to complete all of their assessment goals, recruiting goals, and cultivation of partners to provide enhanced capacity for Standard 4.

b. The potential of the SIP to have a positive impact on the EPP and its candidates.

Friends University's EPP is committed to the quality preparation and extremely dedicated to providing the best experiences for its candidates. Each of the outlined areas for improvement outlines multiple objectives and strategies tied clearly to its goals. Focus on candidates, assessments and the pool of candidates will have a significant impact on program improvement.

Enhanced assessments will better delineate expectations for candidates leading up to student teaching. Performance on the KPTP has been consistently high. Employer and alumni surveys have been carefully studied to date; tying them more closely to the InTASC standards should provide more specific feedback, provided that the EPP continues to analyze the instruments and ensure candidates and employers fully understand what is being evaluated.

Enhanced clinical partnerships have already provided rich new opportunities for the EPP's candidates to work with diverse student bodies. Because of a group of already dedicated partners on the Advisory board and in the Wichita Public Schools (USD 259), further enhancements of partnerships can provide opportunities for stronger connections to practitioners, including the EPP's recently hired alumni.

Finally, the graduate course to track completer effectiveness has the potential to provide valuable data for program improvement since Kansas provides no VAM data.

c. The proposed use of data and evidence.

The plans for use of data has been enhanced with each iteration of the SIP.

Data will provide evidence of candidate success in careful tracking of candidates through transition points. Less clear is how data will be used to track the recruitment process from Friends University Admissions office, though the HALO and AVID programs, and results for the EPP.

The SIP was accompanied by a comprehensive listing of assessments, who is responsible for them, what their purpose is, who reviews them and when they are reviewed. This additional document clarified much of how data from refined assessments will be used and analyzed.

Data from many of the assessments will rely on continued refinements of the data systems used to tag and report data.

Data from the graduate course designed to meet components of Standard 4 will need to be carefully monitored to investigate if it will bring the valid and reliable information needed for standard 4.

d. The potential of the EPP to demonstrate a higher level of excellence beyond what is required in the standards

This was not an area addressed by the EPP. Certainly, the EPP has approached the development of the SIP with careful attention to the new CAEP standards. As such, in the implementation of the plan in the next few years, there should be opportunities to explore new assessments, particularly related to standard 4.

Evaluation of the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP)

This rubric is intended to be used as a tool by the site visit team to provide feedback to an EPP on the Selected Improvement plan and its progress, including (a) its capacity for initiating, implementing, and completing a Selected Improvement Plan (SIP); (b) the potential of the SIP to have a positive impact on the EPP and its candidates; (c) the proposed use of data and evidence; (d) the potential of the EPP to demonstrate a higher level of excellence beyond what is required in the standards. An overall evaluation of the SIP is also provided.

Click [here](#) to open the rubric in a new window.



## Sources of Evidence

List of interviews and participants

--

List of exhibits reviewed /List additional sources consulted (website, etc.)

All exhibits in AIMS All Annual reports in AIMS Kansas state program reports and feedback Friends University website
---

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

List of interviewees
List of Exhibits

See Attachment panel below.