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Introduction

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

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

Components and Responsibilities

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

There are 4 components of Unit governance. Three of these are common to both initial and advanced programs, while the fourth is unique for each.

Program Committees. The most basic component of Unit governance is the Program Committee. It is through the Program Committees that most program changes are initiated, implemented, assessed, and then reaffirmed or redesigned. There is generally one program committee for each program or cross-program component (e.g., Professional Education). However, some programs are so closely aligned that it is more efficient to address these through a combined Program Committee (e.g., science education). Program Committees include:

- Initial Program
- Art Education
- Early Childhood Unified
- Elementary Education
- English Education (secondary and middle school)

*This governance applies only to programs that prepare school personnel. Other programs (e.g., sport administration, exercise science, educational psychology) follow established in respective college and university governance.
Foreign Language
Journalism
Mathematics Education (secondary and middle school)
Music Education
Physical Education
Professional Education (undergraduate and alternative certification)
Science Education (secondary biology, chemistry, physics, earth & space science, and middle school science)
Speech & Theatre
History and Related Disciplines (secondary and middle school)

Advanced Programs

Curriculum & Instruction
M. Ed Educational Leadership & Licensure
District Leadership
Ed. D. in Educational Leadership
Educational Psychology
ESOL
Library Media Specialist
Reading Specialist
School Counselor Education
School Psychologist
Special Education: Adaptive, Early Childhood Unified, Functional, and Gifted

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

1) providing overall program curricular leadership – including curriculum, assessments and related criteria/coursework, transition point criteria, and any supplemental Guiding Program Documents developed for the program;

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

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

4) working with relevant faculties/departments to discuss and implement suggested program changes;

5) considering/responding to matters referred to it for consideration/input from the Unit’s Assessment Committee, the University Teacher Program Committee (UTPC--initial programs) or Advanced Program Committee (APC--advanced programs) or the Unit Head;

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

7) maintaining minutes of committee meetings, submitted to the College of Education’s Assistant Dean for Teacher Education and maintained on the Unit’s server.
Membership of Program Committees consists of at least three faculty who are active in the respective programs. In consultation with relevant department chairs, members are appointed by the Deans of Education and Liberal Arts and Sciences or Fine Arts (jointly as appropriate) for three-year terms. *(Note: Members of Program Committees for advanced programs that are part of a graduate degree must hold full or associate membership on the Graduate Faculty.)* Program Committee chairs for initial programs are appointed by the relevant deans; Program Committee chairs for advanced programs are elected by Committees from among their members.

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

**Program Advisory Council.** Associated with each Program Committee is a Program Advisory Council. Convened by their respective Program Committees, Advisory Councils are responsible for:

1. providing input and advice on programs, including need, curricula, assessments, related criteria, and the Guiding Program Document (if any);
2. providing input and advice on tentative program review results/recommendations from Program Committee based upon program data summaries;
3. providing input/feedback on matters of general concern to school personnel preparation programs (e.g., Conceptual Framework); and
4. serving as program advocates.

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

**Undergraduate Teaching Program Committee (Initial Only).** Unique to initial preparation programs is the Undergraduate Teaching Program Committee (UTPC). The UTPC is responsible for:

1. reviewing proposed program changes in the areas of curriculum (including program checksheets), assessments and related criteria, and program transition point elements and related criteria to (a) ensure adequate consultation with relevant academic departments and programs, and (b) make recommendations to the Unit Head and/or provide feedback to initiating Program Committees;
2. examining input from the Unit Head (or representative) or Assessment Committee on matters derived from Unit assessments in order to provide input or make relevant recommendations;
3. initiating concerns or recommendations relevant to initial preparation programs;
4. convening and consulting with a larger cross-program group of faculty on matters of critical importance to initial preparation programs; and
5. ensuring that initial preparation programs, especially proposed changes in programs, are consistent with state and national accreditation standards.

UTPC membership consists of the chairs of Program Committees for initial programs plus a representative of the educational psychology/human development faculty (ACES department). The Faculty Senate has established a University General Education Committee made up of collegiate representatives. The UTPC
also appoints one of those representatives (from Education, Liberal Arts and Sciences or Fine Arts representatives) to serve also as a member of the UTPC. Ex officio (non-voting) members include a representative of Education Support Services (field placement/advisement/licensure), as appointed by the Unit Head, and Assistant/Associate Deans for Education, Liberal Arts and Sciences, and Fine Arts. The Assistant/Associate Deans jointly set the agenda and annually rotate service as chair/convener of the Committee.

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

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

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

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

3) initiating concerns or recommendations relevant to advanced preparation programs and communicating such to relevant programs or the Unit Head;

4) convening and consulting with a larger cross-program group of faculty on matters of critical importance to advanced preparation; and

5) reviewing all proposed advanced program changes to ensure these are consistent with state and national accreditation standards

APC membership consists of five representatives of advanced programs elected at large from members of advanced program committees for staggered three-year terms. The Committee is chaired by the College of Education’s Associate Dean for Advanced Programs (who serves ex officio non-voting). The APC meets at least once per academic semester; special meetings may be called by the Unit Head, the APC Chair or by formal request to the APC Chair from three APCs.

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

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

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

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

Advanced Program issues also are expected generally to arise from Program Committees, perhaps based upon program assessment reviews or input from program faculty/other sources. In consultation with Program Advisory Councils and relevant Program Committees and academic departments, Program Committees propose program changes and submit these to the APC for consideration. The APC reviews proposed changes, considering any broad issues involved and ensuring interaction with other program areas have been adequately addressed, and ordinarily either (a) returns the proposal to the Program Committee with concerns/questions or (b) forwards the proposed change and recommendation/s to the Unit Head with copies to the Program Committee. The APC may choose to convene and consult with a cross-program faculty group as part of its deliberations.

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

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

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

Unit Committees

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

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

a. **Purpose and Authority.** The Unit Assessment Committee works closely with the Unit Assessment Coordinator and is responsible for providing faculty leadership and making recommendations on assessment matters for the Professional Education Unit (and the College of Education).

b. **Composition.** The Unit Assessment Committee includes one representative from each College of Education department, a representative from the College of Fine Arts (FA) or Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS), and the Unit’s Assessment Coordinator, ex officio (with vote only in the case of a tie). College of Education members are elected by the faculty of respective departments in such a way as to have three-year staggered terms. The representative of Fine Arts or Liberal Arts and Sciences is appointed by the Unit Head, in consultation with the Deans of LAS and FA, and serves a 2-year term. The Chair of the Committee is elected annually from among the membership of the committee. Ordinarily, committee members are elected/appointed in the spring.

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

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

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

e. **Committee Actions.** The Committee shall work closely with the Unit Assessment Coordinator in carrying out its responsibilities, making periodic reports and relevant recommendations to Unit/College of Education leadership, committees or other Unit/College of Education entity as relevant.

**Field Experience Committee.** The Field Experience Committee is a duly authorized academic committee of the University with the following purposes and authority, composition and responsibilities.
a. **Purpose and Authority.** The Field Experience Committee works closely with the Assistant Dean for Teacher Education and NCATE and is responsible for reviewing and making recommendations on –field placement matters for initial programs in the College of Education.

b. **Composition.** The Field Experience Committee includes: (a) three faculty members from a minimum of two colleges/schools (e.g., LAS, COE, FA) nominated by the UTPC, (b) three faculty members selected by the APC, and (c) the Placement Coordinator, and (d) two school/agency practitioners appointed by the Unit Head. The Assistant Dean for Teacher Education and NCATE serves ex officio (with tie-breaking vote). Faculty members serve three-year terms in such a way overall to have staggered terms. Faculty members of the committee are elected in the spring.

c. **Responsibility.** The committee has broad responsibility for field experience in College of Education academic programs, with the following specific responsibilities:
   (1) Recommend to the faculty broad policy governing field experiences in the areas of program requirements, placement and supervision, assuring placements in diverse settings (race/ethnicity, second language, and SES)
   (2) Provide faculty review and oversight for candidate placement and supervision in field experiences;
   (3) Provide liaison between faculty/programs and field experience support functions in the Office of Student Support Services, and
   (4) Consult with a field experience advisory council (made up of clinical partners) on matters of field experience policy and placement.

The committee works closely with the Assistant Dean for Teacher Education and NCATE in carrying out these responsibilities.

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

e. **Committee Actions.** The Committee shall work closely with the Assistant Dean for Teacher Education and NCATE and make periodic reports and recommendations to the College’s Leadership Team and Faculty as relevant.

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

a. **Purpose and Authority.** The Unit Undergraduate Exceptions Committee considers candidate petitions for exceptions related to initial teacher education. The committee functions within the broad framework of University policy as formulated by the Faculty Senate, administration and the Kansas Board of Regents.

b. **Composition.** This committee includes one representative from four licensure levels – early childhood unified, elementary, middle/secondary, and PK-12 (as voting members), and the Assistant Dean for Teacher Education (as a non-voting member). Members represent colleges with initial licensure programs – Liberal Arts and Sciences, Education and Fine Arts.
Members are appointed by the Unit Head, based upon recommendations from the UTPC and Assistant Dean for Teacher Education, serve for a term of three academic years, and are appointed in the spring.

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

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

e. **Committee Actions.** The Committee shall work closely with the Assistant Dean for Teacher Education and take such actions as reasonable and within broad institutional policy on exceptions. The Committee may also make policy recommendations to the UTPC on general classes of exceptions for which broader Unit consensus is desired.

Program change process

a. The striped areas represent non curricular program changes such as admissions, transition points or field experiences. The white areas represent the change process for curricular changes.
Chapter 2/Personnel
COE Teacher Education Unit Policies
Regarding Lecturers and School/Field Based Personnel
(See related COE and WSU policies at the links provided)

Qualifications for hiring lecturers:

The initial appointment of part-time faculty (adjuncts/lecturers) is based on a review of the applicant’s vitae/resume and appropriate references. WSU Policies require all lecturers and part-time faculty hold a master’s degree and/or appropriate experience in their field and are licensed when appropriate. Generally, expertise is garnered through educational attainment and contemporary professional experiences in educational settings. (COE Policy 2.017)

Qualifications for selecting school/field based clinical faculty, mentors and supervisors:
(a) a degree in the field for which they are supervising from an accredited institution, and/or certification/license in the area they serve as supervisor
(b) a minimum of three years experience as an educator
(c) one year documented experience in current building, and in the field in which they are serving as mentors and/or clinical faculty
(d) willingness to model and encourage technology within the curriculum
(e) commitment to the time and effort needed to supervise the candidate
(f) willingness to provide the candidate with appropriate practicum experiences
(g) willingness to work collaboratively with a WSU faculty supervisor to support candidate completion of all program requirements
(h) willingness to provide feedback related to the clinical experience to WSU.

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

Professional Development for School-based Personnel.

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

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

(2) Participation in regularly scheduled meetings and/or conferences with school-based faculty regarding their roles, responsibilities and expectations for candidates. Specifically, school-based faculty are expected to be knowledgeable of and participate in:
   a. the unit’s conceptual framework and governance structures
   b. program assessments and evaluation forms and procedures
   c. program and/or unit committees relevant to their assignment
   d. advocating/supporting unit programs to outside constituents
Evaluation of Lecturers. (See COE policy 2.017 below)

Consistent with the COE policy 2.017, evaluation of lecturers are completed annually by department chairs. Data used to inform evaluations consist of the Student Perception of Teaching Effectiveness II (SPTE II) or an approved normed survey instrument. In addition, a review of student complaint forms and candidate performance on licensure exams when appropriate can be considered. Any school/field-based personnel who receives negative feedback meets with the program coordinator and/or department chair to discuss further action. A repeated pattern of negative feedback may result in a decision not to rehire the lecturer.

Relevant Policies

COE 2.018/Policy on Teaching Evaluations
In accordance with WSU policy on faculty evaluation (WSU Policies & Procedures Handbook, 4.22), all faculty with at least half-time appointments (and unclassified professionals with at least 50 percent teaching workload) are to be evaluated at least once a year. By WSU policy, formal evaluation of teaching is required as part of the annual review, shall include multiple sources of data - including at least student survey instrument results, and shall be based upon departmental criteria statements. Evaluation of teaching for lecturers, graduate teaching assistants and temporary faculty is also required, which departments utilize for rehire/reappointment decisions.

WSU Policy 4.03 [http://webs.wichita.edu/inaudit/ch4_03.htm](http://webs.wichita.edu/inaudit/ch4_03.htm)
The principal titles and ranks granted by the University to academic faculty are those normally bestowed by institutions of higher education: professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor. Full-time faculty holding less than the minimum credentials for instructor rank are occasionally appointed as assistant instructors. Titles used to designate part-time instructional personnel include lecturer and adjunct/faculty associate. The term visiting is used in conjunction with the basic academic titles for individuals who join the faculty for a short period of time, usually with the intent of returning to a position at another academic institution.

4.04 [http://webs.wichita.edu/inaudit/ch4_04.htm](http://webs.wichita.edu/inaudit/ch4_04.htm)
Types of Appointments
Faculty appointments are of three basic types: temporary, probationary, and with tenure. Temporary appointments are for a specified period only, and carry no expectation of reappointment. Adjunct/faculty associates and lecturers have temporary appointments for one semester, subject to renewal on the basis of need for instruction. Individuals with a temporary appointment may not be moved to a probationary appointment without review and specific authorization by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research.

WSU Policy 4.22 ([http://webs.wichita.edu/inaudit/ch4_22.htm](http://webs.wichita.edu/inaudit/ch4_22.htm)) relates to faculty evaluation. All faculty, with half-time or more appointments, and those unclassified professionals who have teaching responsibilities amounting to 50 percent or more of their workload are to be evaluated at least once a year regardless of whether or not they are in the Academic Affairs division of the University.
3.001/Policy on Diversity in Field/Clinical Work
3.001/Policy on Diversity in Field/Clinical Work

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

Endorsed by COE Faculty 1/14/04
Approved by UTPC 1/23/04

3. 002 Unit Programs’ adherence to Unit Conceptual Framework

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

(a) inquiry processes
(b) current research in the field
(c) professional dispositions listed in the Conceptual Framework
(d) professional standards
(e) expertise in working with diverse populations
Professional Education Unit Documents

1. Conceptual Framework
2. FA/LA/COE Joint Statement of Commitment to Teacher Education.
3. Program/Major Codes
4. Assessment System
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Role and Mission
Wichita State University is a regional university serving the state of Kansas and primarily a seven-county area that includes Wichita, the largest urban area in Kansas. WSU’s role is that of an urban-serving research university. Through teaching, research, and public service, the university seeks in its mission “to equip both students and the larger community with the educational and cultural tools they need to thrive in a complex world, and to achieve both individual responsibility in their own lives and effective citizenship in the local, national, and global community.”

University Scope
WSU’s approximately 15,000 students enjoy a broad scope of academic opportunities including study in colleges of Education, Engineering, Fine Arts, Health Sciences, and Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, as well as the Barton School of Business and Graduate School. The scope of the university also encompasses external funding of more than $40 million university-wide each year, the discoveries made and contracts performed at the National Institute of Aviation Research, and the largest work-study cooperative education program in the state.

College Scope and Mission
Each year, the college recommends approximately 180 students for initial licensure among 240 students recommended for baccalaureate degrees. Approximately 140 master’s degrees, four specialists and five doctorate of education degrees are awarded. There are 48 full-time faculty and approximately 100 lecturers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors. The college offices are housed in one of the last buildings designed by the famed American architect, Frank Lloyd Wright. The College of Education is an integrated college that focuses on human development and emphasizes academic innovation in living and learning. There are five departments in the College of Education: Curriculum and Instruction; Counseling, Education and School Psychology; Educational Leadership; Human Performance Studies; and Sport Management. The college houses two centers: The Center for Research and Educational Services and The Center for Physical Activity and Aging, which includes a research laboratory and community activity program. The college also supports innovative programs in Engineering Education and bio-engineering research for aging populations. There are two identifying characteristics of the college—the hands-on, site-based learning that is present across each program in the college, and the strongly held belief of students and faculty in the “power of education to change the world. The Mission of the College of Education is to “prepare education and other professionals to benefit society and its institutions through the understanding, the facilitation, and the illumination of the learning process and the application of knowledge in their disciplines.”

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

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

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

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

Guiding Principles:

Professionalism and Reflection on the Vocation

Human Development and Respect for Diversity

The Connection of Teaching and Assessment

Technology Integration

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

Collaboration with Stakeholders

Guiding Principles Defined

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Underlined portions designate dispositions
Wichita State University
Professional Education Unit/College of Education

Revised Program/Major/Teaching Field Codes (June 5, 2006)

*New codes are for programs revised in accord with 10/02 KSDE licensure standards (effective July 2003); old codes are for programs in place before July 2003 under different KSDE standards.

(XXX) = code currently inactive
The Unit Assessment System (UAS) for the Professional Education Unit at Wichita State University consists of a review cycle and implementation mechanisms for the collection and examination of data/information about program candidate performance and unit operations to make judgments about and guide candidates, programs and the Professional Education Unit. The Professional Education Unit includes programs and faculty in the College of Education, the College of Fine Arts and the Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Data and related data reviews in the UAS have two foci – one on program, the other on the Unit. In program level assessment, data relevant to individual candidates are reviewed in order (a) to make decisions and provide feedback to candidates on their program progress as well as (b) in the aggregate, to judge the efficacy of specific programs and guide program improvement. Unit level assessment utilizes data on overall unit operations and aggregate candidate performance to examine overall unit effectiveness and guide unit improvement.

System Overview

Wichita State’s UAS is diagrammatically presented in Figure 3. Operationally, data from candidate and graduate assessments and on unit operations, as facilitated through the Data Management System, are examined by Program Committees and the Unit Assessment Committee. These committees review aggregated candidate performance data as well as data on unit operations to make judgments about program and unit effectiveness. Program Committees each create a Program Assessment Plan which specifies assessments for examining individual performance at various transition points across each program to make judgments about candidate progress through programs. Reviews focusing on program and unit effectiveness are guided by a common set of Core Review Questions (see Figure 2). At least once each year, the Program Committee examines program data to ascertain program effectiveness. The program Advisory Councils are groups made up of various program constituents, but predominately practitioners, responsible for providing advice, input and assistance to Program Committees or the Unit.

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

System Components

Figure 3 identifies the major components of the UAS. These include data derived from program and unit assessments, a data management system, unit and program assessment committees, program and unit advisory councils, an assessment coordinator and the unit head.
Unit Operations and Program Assessments are intended to systematically collect information/data useful in reviewing unit operations and/or programs. In the case of unit operations assessments, this includes data on such factors as:

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

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

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

The Data Management System is the central database and report generator for data from the various program and unit operations assessments. Maintained in the College of Education, this database is electronic and data entry automated, where possible. This data management system is intended ultimately to connect to the university student information/records system to ensure the most up-to-date candidate information available to the university.

The Assessment Coordinator is the designated unit administrator providing overall leadership and support for unit and program assessments. Specifically, the Assessment Coordinator is responsible for:

1. ensuring that unit and program assessments are in place and operational.
2. providing support in the development, maintenance and redevelopment of Program Assessment Plans,
3. providing assessment related technical support for program, faculty and unit leadership, including conducting studies of assessment instruments -- e.g., validity, reliability, and assisting programs with inter-rater reliability studies,
4. facilitating input/reports from the Data Management System for program and unit operations assessments,
5. supporting and facilitating the work of the Unit Assessment Committee, including monitoring/conducting reviews of program assessment plans and reports,
6. organizing or working with relevant committees or individuals to provide needed professional development related to assessment,
7. housing official records of assessment plans and assessment-related minutes and reports,
8. representing the unit on the university’s assessment committee.

**Program Committees** are the primary faculty entities responsible for specific programs and examining their effectiveness (at least annually) in accordance with the Core Review Questions (see Figure 2) and in consultation with program-specific advisory councils.

**The Unit Assessment Committee** is the primary unit entity designated for
1. providing faculty oversight in implementing the Unit Assessment System and associated plans.
2. reviewing/monitoring program assessment plans and annual reports to advise the Assessment Coordinator about quality and to provide constructive feedback for Program Committees (each program reviewed at least every 5 years),
3. recommending and reviewing assessment policies (on-going),
4. reviewing aggregated unit assessment data, especially on Unit operations, to make recommendations in accordance with Core Review Questions (see Figure 2) defined in then Unit Assessment System,
5. conducting periodic reviews of the Unit Assessment System, recommending modifications as appropriate (on-going, but at least once every 3 years), and
6. periodically reviewing the Unit Assessment Committee’s responsibilities to update as needed.

**The Advisory Councils** are groups made up of various program constituents, but predominately relevant practitioners, responsible for providing advice, input and assistance to Program Committees or the Unit Head.

**Governance**

The overall purpose of the Unit Assessment System is to improve program and unit effectiveness. If the system is effective, assessment committees will at least occasionally recommend various changes in programs or unit operations. To review and potentially implement these recommendations requires that the UAS connect with unit and college governance/curriculum approval processes.

For all programs, proposed changes in courses (number, title, credit hours, prerequisites, description), course additions/deletions and degree/major changes are recommended through the appropriate academic department and college curriculum committees. Some recommendations (e.g., deleting a course or adding new courses to meet an additional program standard) require processing through both the Undergraduate Teaching Programs Committee (UTPC) and Advance Program Committee (APC) and relevant academic departments/curriculum committees.

Recommendations for change resulting from unit level assessments are directed to the Unit Head, who will consider their recommendations, may confer with the unit’s advisory council and/or refer these through appropriate administrative or governance channels, depending upon the issue.

For more details on unit governance, see the document “Professional Education Unit Governance”.

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

As described earlier unit level assessment involves nearly every component of the UAS. Information/data on unit operations, assessment instruments and candidate performance resulting from program level assessments (in the aggregate by unit) are reviewed in accordance with a set of guiding Core Review Questions (see Figure 2).

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

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

The UAC and Assessment Coordinator also periodically examine the characteristics of assessment instruments and other elements of the UAS for evidence of bias and reliability/validity problems.

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

Program Assessment

Besides unit level assessment, the UAS is also designed to facilitate program level assessment. Program level assessment examines program specific data on the performance of candidates and graduates, as well as unit operations relevant to that program.

In program level assessment, data on program candidate and graduate performance (in the aggregate by program) and relevant unit operations (disaggregated by program) are examined in accordance with the set of guiding Core Review Questions (see Figure 2). At least once each year, relevant data on each program is reviewed by its Program Committee for trends or other possible observations and (in consultation with its advisory council) for possible recommendations for program improvement. As part of its program assessment and based upon mechanisms of its own choosing, each program inspects candidate performance for adequate progress at the various program transition points.

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

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

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

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

Figure 1 illustrates how components for program level assessment interrelate. As candidates transition through the program’s curriculum, data on their performance is examined at predetermined points to make decisions about individuals’ program progress through the Progress Review Mechanism. Candidates receiving positive decisions at each transition point progress through and complete the program. Aggregated and disaggregated data from these transition points plus aggregated and disaggregated data from follow-up assessments of program graduates and their employers, from any external reviews, and from state required licensure testing are examined annually by the Program Committee to review program effectiveness and (in consultation with the program’s advisory council) make relevant recommendations, where appropriate. [Note: These reviews and recommendations also serve as data/input for Unit Assessment Committee deliberations concerning overall unit effectiveness.]

**Program Assessment Plan**

To guide and structure program level assessment, each Wichita State University program in the unit established and maintains a Program Assessment Plan. Program Assessment Plans include as a minimum:

1. A Program Assessment Plan Figure (Figure 1) plus Attachment detailed specific to the program,
2. A Narrative Describing the Operation of the Program Assessment Plan
3. A Master Program Standards Alignment Table (Table 2).

The following sections describe the plan elements:
Program Assessment Plan Figure and Attachment. Figure 1 serves as the master document/template for defining program assessment. Each program provides a copy of Figure 1 with details unique to that program specified and an attachment expanding upon the information in Figure 1 (see Figure 4 for an example). Together with the Narrative Describing the Operation of the Program Assessment Plan, it details how program assessment is conducted in that program.

Figure 1 and its attachment outline what, when, how and by whom assessment information is collected and examined. It also demonstrates how a program insures its graduates meet program standards/outcomes, and how candidates’ progress toward program completion is reviewed. Information on candidate performance is examined at major transition points across a program. The major transition points in a program generally include:

1. Program Admission,
2. Admission to Clinical Practice,
3. Completion of Clinical Practice, and
4. Program Completion.

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

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

Information used for deciding whether individual candidates may continue in the program is aggregated and used to assess program effectiveness in helping all candidates meet Conceptual Framework proficiencies as well as standards and knowledge/skills/dispositions adopted for the program. The lines in Figure 1 leading from the “Criteria” boxes (with “Results” written on them) to the Program Committee indicate that these aggregated data are examined by the Committee to investigate program effectiveness as well as identify any concerns with the Conceptual Framework, or assessments. In consultation with the program advisory council, the Committee considers potential changes and pursues wider faculty approval for such changes, as appropriate. Data collected after the changes are implemented are later examined by the Committee to see if the changes did indeed produce improved results.

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

In addition to information about the effectiveness of a program collected from program candidates, information is also gathered from sources outside the program. As indicated in Figure 1, these include information from Program Follow-Up (graduates, employers of graduates), from External Reviews (e.g., Kansas State Department of Education licensure reviews, program reviews conducted by professional organizations), and from State Required Assessments (e.g., Praxis II “content” tests). Such aggregated data are also used to assess program effectiveness (again note the lines in Figure 1 leading back to the Program Committee).

The information for the boxes down the left hand side of Figure 1 (provided in the attachment to the figure) lists assessments, factors or artifacts being examined at each transition point. In the information for the corresponding center box (also provided in an attachment), the criteria used to decide whether a candidate may continue in the program or has successfully completed the program are identified. Figure 4 provides an example of the attachment for the Program Assessment Plan figure. Transition-point criteria (for example, for clinical practice admission or completion) indicate among other things whether mastery of all or only some of the program standards and their indicators is necessary. In the Figure 4 example, the Practicum Skills Rating Scale is listed as requiring knowledge, performance, and disposition indicator mastery (rating of 3 or higher) for some standards to be admitted to clinical practice, but requires mastery for all standards to complete clinical practice.

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

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

The *first column* of Table 2 lists Common Assessments adopted for each program standard. The second column indicates passing criteria for the assessment. The third column indicates Course Where Assessment is administered. The fourth column indicates Transition Point Where Used. The fifth column lists guiding principles and proficiencies identified in the Unit’s Conceptual Framework that are addressed by the listed assessment. The *sixth column* specifies the type of knowledge (per NCATE Standard 1) reflected by the assessments. Options for these are as follows:

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

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

Any subsequent columns in Table 2 list the standards of professional societies that are relevant to the program (e.g., ASHA, NASP, CACREP). While a given Program Assessment Plan may choose to list these, it should be noted that, as an NCATE “partner state,” professional society standards are already integrated into state (KSDE) standards.
Figure 1
Program Assessment Plans

<Program Title>

<insert date last changed entries>
Approved 11-19-2009

Unit Conceptual Framework
Program Standards
Accreditation Standards
Professional Standards

Program Assessments

Transition Point I
<Name of the transition point>
Assessment:
1. 2.

Transition Point II
<Name of the transition point>
Assessment:
1. 2.

Transition Point III
<Name of the transition point>
Assessment:
1. 2.

Additional Transition Points
<Name of the transition point>
Assessment:
1. 2.

Follow-Up Surveys
Program Operational Surveys

Unit Head
Education Advisory Council

Unit Assessment Committee

<title>
Program Committee

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

EXTERNAL REVIEWS
KSDE/NCATE Review
HLC Review
KBOR Review
Professional Review

Program Review Mechanism

Core Review Questions
Annual Report
Core Questions for Program Assessment Committees
Approved by Unit Assessment Committee 5-4-07, Revised 1-18-08, Revised, 9-10-09

1. Is the program overall effective in preparing candidates to meet the expected outcomes:
   a. program standards and, if an initial program, professional education standards (refer to KSDE Template);
   b. Unit Conceptual Framework Guiding Principles; and,
   c. if an education personnel program, types of NCATE Knowledge as set forth in Standard 1?

2. Are candidates’ performances at transition points predictive of their ultimate success/exit performance (i.e., predictive validity)?

3. What conclusions do data at transition points lead to concerning program effectiveness?

4. What differential program performance is there, if any, for candidates from different backgrounds (e.g., ethnicity, gender)?

5. Is the program effective in preparing graduates for state licensure exams (if required) in both the total scores and the category scores? (KSDE Template IV)

6. What changes, if any, do the results of assessments suggest for the Conceptual Framework (if any)?

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

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

9. During their program do all candidates have experiences (e.g., student/client, setting) in settings that meet the Unit’s diversity requirements?

10. Is the program successful in preparing candidates for effective practice? (KSDE Template IV)

11. How are data used by candidates and faculty to improve candidate performance? Have changes made by the Program Committee in prior years led to desired improvements? (KSDE Template Section V)

12. How are assessment data shared with candidates (individual and/or aggregated), faculty, and other stakeholders?

13. Is the Program Committee consulting with the Advisory Council in appropriate ways?

14. Is the Program Committee following Unit and/or WSU procedures for making changes in the Program’s Approved Assessment Plan?

15. Are any faculty development needs apparent from faculty performance assessments (e.g., from SPTE reports, advisement evaluations, faculty technology use surveys, student technology use surveys)? (Unit Assessment Committee only—faculty development activities are undertaken by departments and/or a college, not individual program faculty groups.)

16. Are there similarities among program-level reviews/recommendations that suggest issues or factors that maybe generalized to the Unit? (Unit Assessment Committee only—a single program committee sees results for one program only so cannot detect this.)
Figure 3
WSU Unit Assessment System
10/27/03

Data Sources | Assessment Support | Program Assessment | Unit Assessment

36
A. OUTLINE FORMAT

I. Transition Point: Program Admission

A. Assessments/Factors: Criteria
   1. Undergraduate GPA: 3.0 for last 60 hours
   2. GRE General Tests: 460 or higher on both Verbal and Quantitative Scores plus an 3.5 or higher on Writing Score
   3. Letters of Reference: Absence of “red flags” as indicated by the rubric used by members of the Admissions Committee

B. Related Progress Review Mechanism. The decision is made by the Program Admissions Committee and the candidate is informed of the decision by a letter from the Department Chair.

II. Transition Point: Admission to Clinical Practice

A. Assessments/Factors: Criteria
   1. Graduate GPA (assesses all knowledge and performance indicators for KSDE Standards 1-3): Minimum of 3.0 in all program courses
   2. CESP 824 Counseling Skills Rating Scale (assesses all performance indicators for KSDE Standards 1-7 and all dispositions): Minimum of 2.0 for all dimensions
   3. Program Standards Rating Scale (assesses all knowledge and performance indicators for KSDE Standards 1-5, and all dispositions): Minimum of 2.0 for all dimensions specified for pre-practicum accomplishment

B. Related Progress Review Mechanism. The decision is made by the Practicum coordinator and candidates are informed of the decision by a letter from the Program Coordinator.

III. Transition Point: Completion of Clinical Practice (CESP 856)

A. Assessments/Factors: Criteria
   1. Practicum Skills Rating Scale completed by WSU faculty member (assesses all performance indicators for KSDE Standards 1-7 and all dispositions): Minimum of 3.0 for all dimensions
   2. Practicum Skills Rating Scale completed by field supervisor (assesses all performance indicators for KSD Standards 1-7 and all dispositions): Minimum of 3.0 for all dimensions
   3. Reports from field supervisor (assesses all knowledge and performance indicators for KSDE Standards 1-7, and all dispositions): No requests that candidate be withdrawn from placement
B. Related Progress Review Mechanism. The decision is made by the faculty member teaching the practicum and the candidate is informed of the decision by the letter grade assigned for the practicum.

IV. Transition Point: Program Completion

A. Assessments/Factors: Criteria
1. Overall program GPA (assesses all knowledge and performance indicators for KSDE Standards 1-7 and all dispositions): Minimum of 3.0
2. GPA in CESP 802 and 824 (assesses all performance indicators for KSDE Standards 107 and all dispositions): Minimum of 2.0
3. CESP 856 Practicum (assesses all knowledge and performance indicators for KSDE Standards 1-7 and all dispositions): See “End of Practicum (CESP 856) Criteria listed for Clinical Practice Completion)
4. Comprehensive Exams (assesses all knowledge indicators for KSDE Standards 1-7): Correctly answer 80% of the multiple-choice items and pass all essay items as judged by two program faculty
5. Program Standards Rating Scale (assesses all knowledge and performance indicators for KSDE Standards 1-7 and all dispositions): Minimum of 3.0 on all dimensions

B. Related Progress Review Mechanism. The decision is made by the Committee of Program Faculty and the candidate is informed of the decision in a letter from the Department Chair.

V. Other Review Data: Program Follow-Up

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

VI. Other Review Data: External Reviews

A. Assessments/Factors
1. Kansas Department of Education
2. National Association of School Psychologists

VII. Other Review Data: State Required Licensure Tests

A. Assessments/Factors
1. School Psychology Content Test

B. COLUMN FORMAT

Transition Point: Program Admission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments/Factors</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Undergraduate GPA</td>
<td>1. 3.0 for last 60 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GRE General Tests</td>
<td>2. 460 or higher on both Verbal &amp; Quantitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 or higher on Writing
3. Absence of “red flags” as indicated by the rubric used by members of the Program Admissions Committee

Related Progress Review Mechanism
Decision made by Program Admissions Committee
Candidate informed of decision by letter from Department Chair

Transition Point: Admission to Clinical Practice (CESP 856)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments/Factors</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduate GPA (assesses all knowledge and performance indicators for KSD Standards 1-3)</td>
<td>1. Minimum of 3.0 in all program courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CESP 824 Counseling Skills Rating Scale (assesses all performance indicators for KSDE Standards 1-7 and all dispositions)</td>
<td>2. Minimum of 2.0 for all dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Standards Rating Scale (assesses all knowledge and performance indicators specified for pre-practicum accomplishment for KSDE Standards 1-5, and all dispositions)</td>
<td>3. Minimum of 2.0 for all dimensions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related Progress Review Mechanism
Decision made by Practicum Coordinator
Candidate informed of decision by letter from Program Coordinator

Transition Point: Completion of Clinical Practice (CESP 856)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments/Factors</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Practicum Skills Rating Scale completed by WSU faculty member (assesses all performance for KSDE Standards 1-7 and all dispositions)</td>
<td>1. Minimum of 3.0 for all dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Practicum Skills Rating Scale completed by field supervisor (assesses all performance for KSDE Standards 1-7 and all dispositions)</td>
<td>2. Minimum of 3.0 for all dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reports from field supervisor (assesses all knowledge and performance indicators for KSDE Standards 1-7 and all dispositions)</td>
<td>3. No requests that candidate be withdrawn from placement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related Progress Review Mechanism
Decision made by faculty member teaching practicum
Candidate informed of decision by letter grade assigned for the practicum

Transition Point: Program Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments/Factors</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. Overall program GPA (assesses all knowledge and performance indicators for KSDE Standards 1-7 and all dispositions) 1. Minimum of 3.0
2. GPA in CESP 802 and 824 (assesses all knowledge and performance indicators for KSDE Standards 1-7 and all dispositions) 2. Minimum of 3.5
3. CESP 856 Practicum (assesses all knowledge and performance indicators for KSDE Standards 1-7 and all dispositions) 3. See Completion of Clinical Practice Criteria listed above
4. Comprehensive Exams (assesses all knowledge indicators for KSDE Standards 1-7) 4. Correctly answer 80% of the multiple-choice items and pass all essay items as judged by two program faculty
5. Program Standards Rating Scale (assesses all knowledge and performance indicators for KSDE Standards 1-7 and all dispositions) 5. Minimum of 3.0 on all dimensions

Related Progress Review Mechanism
Decision made by committee of program faculty
Candidate informed of decision by Department Chair

Other Review Data: Program Follow-Up

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

Other Review Data: External Reviews

Assessments/Factors
1. Kansas Board of Education
2. National Association of School Psychologists

Other Review Data: State Required Licensure Tests

Assessments/Factors
1. School Psychology Content Test
NOTE: The Attachment to Figure 1 lists additional assessments used to evaluate this program.
NOTE: If program standards have been adopted that are not KSDE standards, they are preceded by an asterisk (*).
NOTE: Summary assessments that are reported to KSDE are preceded by a number listed in the first column.

**Transition Points in this Program:**
I: <list the name of the first transition point>
II: <list the name of the second transition point>
III: <list the name of the third transition point>
IV: <list the name of the fourth transition point>
V: <IF there is a fifth transition point, list its name>

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

**Standard 6:**

| 1. |               |
| 2. |               |
| 3. |               |
| 4. |               |

**Standard 7:**

| 1. |               |
| 2. |               |
| 3. |               |
| 4. |               |

**Standard 8:**

| 1. |               |
| 2. |               |
| 3. |               |
| 4. |               |

**Standard 9:**

| 1. |               |
| 2. |               |
| 3. |               |
| 4. |               |

**Standard 10:**

| 1. |               |
| 2. |               |
| 3. |               |
| 4. |               |

**Standard 11:**

| 1. |               |
| 2. |               |
| 3. |               |
| 4. |               |

**Standard 12:**

<p>| |
|               |
|               |
|               |
|               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KSDE Assessment #</th>
<th>Common Assessment</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Course Where Assessment is Administered</th>
<th>Transition Point Where Used</th>
<th>Conceptual Framework Predominant Proficiency/Disposition</th>
<th>Predominant Type of Knowledge (Per NCATE Standard 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 13:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 14:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

UNIT COMMITTEES MEMBER ROSTERS
AY 2009 - 2010

UNIT ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Joseph Mau, Assess. Coord., Chair DO #131 [Ex-Officio]
Kim McDowell CI #28 [Fall 09 - Spring 12]
Johnnie Thompson CI #28 [Fall 08 – Spring 11]
Randy Ellsworth CESP #123 [Spring 08 - Fall 10]
Marat Sanatullov LAS/FA # 53 [Fall 08 - Spring 10]
Craig Elliott EL #142 [Fall 09 - Spring 12]
Marla Lindemeyer HPS #16 [Fall 08 – Spring 11]
Jeff Noble SMGT #127 [Spring 09 – Fall 12]

EXCEPTIONS COMMITTEE (Committee needs to establish three year terms)

Sheril Logan – Chair DO #131
Linda Mitchell, ECU CI # 28 Ad-Hoc
Fuchang Liu, Elem CI # 28 [Fall 09 – Spring12]
Sandi Peer, Middle Level/Secondary CI # 28 [Fall 07 – Spring 10]
Steve Orr, PK-12 FA #153 [Fall 09 – Spring 12]
Marla Lindemeyer SMGT #127 [Fall 09 – Spring 12]

FIELD EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE

Sonja Seemann - Chair ESS #131 [Ex-Officio]
Steve Oare FA/LAS # 53
Janet Jump School/Agency Rep
Ruth Hitchcock, APC Rep CESP #123
Peggy Jewell, UTPC Rep CI # 28
Sheril Logan, Assistant Dean DO #131 [Ex-Officio]
Mary Schumaker CI #28
APPENDIX B

INITIAL PROGRAM ROSTER
AY 2009 - 2010

UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING PROGRAMS  (UPTC)

Mary Sue Foster  Art Education  # 67
Marlo Schommer-Aikins  Educational Psychology/Human Development  #123
Linda Mitchell  Early Childhood Education  # 28
Jeri Carroll  Elementary Education/Professional Education  # 28
Peggy Jewell  English Education  # 28
Marat Sanatullov  Foreign Language  # 11
Jeri Carroll  General Education  # 28
Peer Moore-Jansen  General Education  # 68
Candace Wells  History & Related Disciplines  # 28
Pat Dooley  Journalism  # 31
Sandi Peer  Mathematics Education  # 28
Tom Wine  Music Education  # 53
Marla Lindenmeyer  Physical Education  # 16
Daniel Bergman  Science Education  # 28
Tom Frye  Speech/Theater  #153
Mark Vermillion  Sport Management  #127
Justin Rorobaugh  Grant Development Specialist  Ex-Officio
Eunice Myers  Assoc Dean for LAS  Ex-Officio
Sheril Logan - Chair  Asst Dean for Ed  Ex-Officio
Sherena Langley  ESS Rep  Ex-Officio

Art Education
Mary Sue Foster, Chair - FA
Wyatt McCrea - FA
Pat Cord - FA
Peggy Furan – FA
Kathleen McCrea (retired art teacher USD 259)

Early Childhood Unified
Linda Mitchell, Chair - ED
Jeri Carroll - ED
Kim McDowell - ED
Elementary Education
Mara Alagic - ED
Penny Longhofer, Chair – ED
Fuchang Liu – ED
Kim McDowell – ED
Linda Mitchell – ED
Gwendolyn Mukes – ED
Jeri Carroll – Ad Hoc

English Education (secondary and middle school)
Don Wineke - LAS
Peggy Jewell, Chair - ED

Foreign Language
Jeri Carroll - ED
Peggy Jewell - ED
Rose Marie Estill – LAS
Yumi Foster – LAS
Marat Sanatullov, Chair – LAS/ED

History & Related Disciplines (secondary and middle school)
Candace Wells, Chair - ED
Craig Torbenson – LAS
John Stanga – LAS
Jan Wollcott – BUS

Mathematics Education (secondary and middle school)
Buma Fridman – LAS
Bill Richardson - LAS
Paul Scheuerman - LAS
Hari Mukerjee – LAS
Steve Brady – LAS
Sandra Peer, Chair – LAS/ED
Mara Alagic - ED

Music Education
Jacqueline Dillon - FA
Tom Fowler - FA
Tom Wine, Chair - FA
Pat Bowen - FA
Trudy Burkolder - FA
Steve Oare - FA
**Physical Education**
Marla Lindenmeyer, Chair - ED
Frank Rokosz – ED

**Professional Education (undergraduate and alternative certification)**
Candace Wells - ED
Johnnie Thompson, Chair - ED
Linda Mitchell - ED
Mary Sue Foster - FA
Jeri Carroll - ED
Mara Alagic - ED
Alan Aagaard - ED
Judie Hayes, Co-Chair – ED
Elaine Bernstorf - FA
(Note: Associate Deans serve ex officio)

**Science Education (secondary biology, chemistry, physics, earth & space science, and middle school science)**
Daniel Bergman, Chair - ED
Mary Jane Keith (representing biology) - LAS
Will Parcell (representing geology) - LAS
Elizabeth Behrman (representing physics) - LAS
Michael VanStipdonk (representing chemistry) - LAS

**Speech & Theatre**
Tom Frye, Chair- FA
Pat Dooley - LAS
Judy Ruder – ED
APPENDIX C

ADVANCED PROGRAM ROSTER
AY 2009 - 2010

ADVANCE PROGRAM COMMITTEE
Shirley Lefever-Davis - Chair DO #131
Jeri Carroll MEd/CI # 28
Jo Bennett EL #142
Marlo Schommer-Aikins Ed Psychology #123
Anh Tran ESOL # 28
Patti Ashley Library Specialist
Sheri Roberts Library Specialist
Kim McDowell Reading Specialist # 28
Ruth Hitchcock Counseling #123
Nancy McKellar School Psychology #123
Linda Mitchell Special Ed #28
Judie Hayes MAT #28

Restricted Program (Alternative Certification)
Judie Hayes, Chair - ED

Curriculum & Instruction
Jeri Carroll - ED
Johnnie Thompson - ED
Kay Gibson, Chair (sabbatical Fall 09) - ED
Peggy Anderson – ED

Early Childhood Education
Linda Mitchell, Chair – ED

Educational Leadership Building Level
Jo Bennett - ED
Craig Elliott - ED
Jean Patterson – ED
Pat Terry, Chair - ED

Educational Leadership District Level
Craig Elliott - Chair – ED
Jo Bennett - ED
Jean Patterson – ED
Pat Terry – ED
Educational Leadership Ed. D.
Jo Bennett - ED
Craig Elliott - ED
Jean Patterson, Chair – ED
Pat Terry - ED

Educational Psychology
Randy Ellsworth, Chair – ED

ESOL
Anh Tran, Chair - ED
Peggy Anderson (Sabbatical Fall 08) - ED
Johnnie Thompson - ED

Library Media Specialist
Patti Ashley, Chair - ED
Sheri Roberts - ED

Reading Specialist
Peggy Jewell - ED
Kim McDowell, Chair - ED
Shirley Lefever-Davis - ED

School Counselor Education
Ruth Hitchcock, Chair - ED

School Psychologist
Nancy McKellar, Chair - ED

Special Education
Kay Gibson – ED (sabbatical Fall 09)
Linda Mitchell, Chair - ED
Judy Ruder - ED

Functional Special Education
Linda Mitchell, Chair – ED

Gifted Special Education
Kay Gibson, Chair – ED (sabbatical Fall 09)