

# REVIEW GUIDANCE



## Program Review Guidance

### 2024 TEMPLATE

1. Prior work before the review day is necessary for the review to work well. Your review is to be as equitable as possible.
2. Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) representatives are available for team questions. The question/concern and EPP response may be written as a NOTE under the standard.
3. EPPs have academic freedom to determine how to assess their programs and the standards.
4. Assessments
  - Assessments must be required of all candidates.
  - Assessments/rubrics/scoring guides should align with the standards.
  - Praxis II Content overall test or subtests cannot be used as stand-alone assessments of a standard (even in conjunction with each other).
  - Individual key-assessments included within a key-assessment course, may be used separately from the course grade.
  - If used as a key assessment, intentionally generic cross-program assessments such as clinical observation tools and the student teacher work sample do not need to include the language of the content area standard(s). Programs are expected to provide a thorough explanation of how an intentionally generic tool is used to assess candidate performance toward specific license/endorsement standards.
5. Course grades-based Assessments
  - A standard may be assessed by more than one course.
  - The program must specify in the alignment explanation which part of the standard is addressed by which course.
  - A single course may be used to address multiple standards.
    - Individual key-assessments included within a key-assessment course, may be used separately from the course grade.
  - Courses used as standards-evidence must be required courses.
  - It is not necessary to know what percentage of the course grade is aligned to a standard.
  - Course alignments must identify the minimum proficiency level.

## 6. Rubrics

- Rubric style can vary. A checklist is not a rubric.
- Look for alignment.
- Does the rubric assess a standard element or elements?
- EPPs train their evaluators in the use of rubrics and evaluation instruments. It is not the teams' purview to redesign the rubric. Alignment to the CAEP assessment rubric is not required during program review. A factual observation regarding CAEP alignment may be made as a NOTE.
- Rubrics/scoring guides need to identify the minimum acceptable performance level or score per standard/element(s).
- It is acceptable for rubrics to contain the language of the standard.

## 7. New programs

- Proposed new programs will submit syllabi.
- Reviewers should review and evaluate syllabi for learning outcomes, program objectives, and alignment to program standards.

## 8. Continuing programs

- Programs must be reviewed for renewal regardless of whether they have had candidates since the previous review.

## 9. Data

- Data is not required in the program review process. *(Three cycles of data are required for educator preparation providers [EPP] accreditation Standard R1.2/RA1.2.)*

## 10. Writing the report

- The report template is provided to the review team; see example below. Save the report template with the institution name and content area using 'Save As.'
- Respond to each prompt. Please do not change the field titles or prompts.

## 11. Writing Areas for Improvement (AFIs)

- Do not make recommendations.
- Every AFI must have an explanatory Rationale.
- Please use NOTES in the text box under the standard to make factual statements for clarity.
- Write AFIs that are specific to the issue/concern. Elaborate with the rationale. The IHE should not need to guess why the program has an AFI under a standard. The rationale is the road map for the IHE to use to address the concern.

- Examples of AFIs and Notes

### **STANDARD 1**

AFI 1.1: Assessment B Standard 1 rubric does not align to Standard 1.

Rationale 1.1: The rubric does not specifically refer/align to any components of the standard and alignment is not explained in the narrative.

AFI 1.2: Standard 1 is not addressed to its entirety.

Rationale 1.2: The Standard 1 assessments address most components of the standard but do not address technology.

## STANDARD 2

No AFIs

## STANDARD 3

No AFIs

NOTE: Standard 3 is assessed by Assessment H, J, and K. Standard 3 is assessed to its entirety by Assessments H and K.

12. Standards define the knowledge and skills of the just-qualified completer. Programs are expected to fully prepare candidates to fully meet the program standards.

13. All reports must be read by the Higher Ed Consultant before the team leaves the meeting. Please keep your materials/notes for the rejoinder process. After the rejoinder is reviewed and the final report is completed, please shred your notes and materials.

### Team report example:

Institution:					
Initial Review				Final Report	
Program:				Level(s):	
Program Status:		Continued		New	
Standard # 1		MET		NOT MET	
				Present	Not Present
Course syllabi (new programs only)					
Assessment Description					
Scoring guides, rubrics, evaluation criterion					
Areas for Improvement and Rationale (Please number the AFI and write the corresponding rationale directly below the AFI.)					

For more information, contact:

Catherine Chmidling, Ph.D.  
 Assistant Director  
 Teacher Licensure  
 785-291-3573  
 Catherine.chmidling@ksde.gov



Kansas State Department of Education  
 900 S.W. Jackson Street, Suite 102  
 Topeka, Kansas 66612-1212  
[www.ksde.gov](http://www.ksde.gov)

## HIGHER ED PROGRAM REVIEWING GUIDANCE 2024

The Kansas State Department of Education does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, disability or age in its programs and activities and provides equal access to the Boy Scouts and other designated youth groups. The following person has been designated to handle inquiries regarding the nondiscrimination policies: KSDE General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, KSDE, Landon State Office Building, 900 S.W. Jackson, Suite 102, Topeka, KS 66612, (785) 296-3201.