



**MURRAY STATE**  
UNIVERSITY

College of Education and Human Services

**Murray State University**  
**CAEP Formative Feedback Report Addendum**

**Table of Contents**

**Overview**

**Standard 1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge**

**Standard 2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice**

**Standard 3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity**

**Standard 4 Program Impact**

**Standard 5 Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement and Capacity**

**Diversity**

**Technology**

**Revised Selected Improvement Plan**

## Overview

Murray State University has organized this response to formative feedback presented in the off-site report by standard or theme. Responses to examiners' requests for clarification of SSR excerpts and for additional evidence and/or data are categorized by "tasks." EPP responses to areas for improvement are at the end of each section. Concerns were addressed through new data, a more complete explanation of existing data, and/or reference to the Revised Selected Improvement Plan. When possible, evidence is grouped into a combined document by topic. Evidence supporting the original SSR submission is indicated by *bold italicized font* and posted on the AIMS Self-Study Evidence Site. Evidence supporting the Addendum is indicated by *bold italicized font (new)*.

## STANDARD ONE: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

### Standard One, Task 1 *SSR Excerpt Clarifications*

1. **CAEP Feedback:** “Content and pedagogical knowledge are demonstrated through varied measures. In compliance with Kentucky regulation the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) requires teacher candidates to pass the Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) examination to gain admittance to teacher education” (SSR, p. 21). The state does not require passing scores on the PLT for program admission. Is this an EPP requirement?

**EPP Clarification:** This was a typo in the SSR. The state requires candidates to pass the Praxis CORE exam to demonstrate a strong foundation of reading, mathematics and writing content knowledge before gaining admission to the teacher education program. Completers must pass a program-related PRAXIS II Content examination and the Principles of Learning and Teaching examination to qualify for initial teacher certification.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** “The Kentucky Teacher Internship Program provides evidence that first-year teachers complete a rigorous performance measure where they are assessed by the school principal, a mentor school-based teacher, and a university coordinator in all aspects of teaching effectiveness, including their ability to design and implement standards-aligned instruction” (SSR, p. 22). Are candidate performance data related to content knowledge available from principals, resource teachers, and teacher educators who serve on internship committees?

**EPP Clarification:** As part of the Kentucky Teacher Intern Program, internship committees (University Supervisors, Resource Teachers, Principals, and Interns) assess interns’ pedagogical knowledge. EPSB does not share committee members’ individual intern ratings with EPPs. They do, however, share aggregated data for each performance item. Of the 289 interns reflected in this report, only one intern was rated less than *Accomplished* in the ability to *Apply Content Knowledge* (*KTIP Report- new*).

### Standard One, Task 1 *Additional Questions*

1. **CAEP Feedback: Are the PRAXIS Core and PRAXIS II content exam pass rates based on first-time test takers?**

The original SSR evidence was a five-year summary inclusive of all test takers. Data did not reflect the first-time pass rates for PRAXIS CORE and PRAXIS II content exams. Below is a summary of the first-time test takers for the PRAXIS CORE and PRAXIS II for tests with low pass rates on the previous report. When only first-year pass rates are considered, a more accurate picture of candidates’ content knowledge emerges. A complete report of first-year pass rates is included as *PRAXIS Pass Rates (new)*.

Test	First-Time Test Takers 2013-2014	First-Time Test Takers 2014-2015	First-Time Test Takers 2015-2016
<b>5732 CORE Math</b>	100% (N=11)	89.24% (N=223)	85.36% (N=239)
<b>5712 CORE Reading</b>	100% (N=13)	95.67% (N=300)	95.7% (N=279)
<b>5722 CORE Writing</b>	100% (N=9)	87.45% (N=231)	88.33% (N=257)
<b>5003 Elem Educ. Mathematics</b>	89.13% (N=46)	84.29% (N=70)	92% (N=100)
<b>5002 Elem Educ. Lang Arts</b>	96.2% (N=79)	93.75% (N=96)	91.86% (N=86)
<b>5005 Elem Educ. Science</b>	87.9% (N=58)	82.72% (N=81)	87.8% (N=82)
<b>5004 Elem Educ. Social Studies</b>	92.7% (N=69)	83.56% (N=73)	83.8% (N=68)
<b>5161 Mathematics</b>	85.7% (N=7)	80% (N=5)	NR (N=4)*
<b>5235 Biology</b>	NR	NR (N=1)	NR (N=3)*

\*Adjusted to reflect MSU Completers only

Closer examination of the 2014-2015 Mathematics (5161) and Biology (5235) rosters revealed that some test takers were not candidates in the EPP pre-service program; rather, they were practicing teachers seeking to become highly qualified to teach in Kentucky. At least one of these candidates who enrolled in the Option 6 Alternative Certification program with a degree in mathematics from another accredited institution, therefore his mathematics preparation was not a reflection of our program. These scores have been removed from the pass rate calculation. In both instances, the removal of those candidates dropped the number of test takers below 5. No data were reported per standards of confidentiality as the candidates may be identifiable.

## **2. CAEP Feedback: How is the EPP addressing the low pass rates in some programs on the PRAXIS core and PRAXIS II content exams?**

The EPP uses multiple strategies to ensure curricular alignment with PRAXIS topics and to address PRAXIS readiness. The university studies portion of candidates' programs reinforces content knowledge. Pedagogical knowledge is taught through EPP-designed foundation courses and program-specific method courses. As per Intervention 1, Objective 1.2 in the *Revised SIP (new)*, EPP faculty will revisit and redesign the foundation courses to align with PRAXIS/PLT topics, state/national initiatives, and best professional practice.

The EPP uses universal, targeted, and intensive interventions to support candidates' Praxis CORE and PRAXIS II preparation. These interventions are coordinated through the Teacher Quality Institute, Recruitment and Retention Center, and the Curriculum Materials Center.

Universal interventions include educating candidates about testing requirements, registration procedures, and available resources. EPP personnel address testing requirements and orient candidates to testing resources in introductory program courses (e.g., EDU 100T, EDU 103) and at information sessions. Candidates may enroll in *Canvas* online review courses to study for the Praxis CORE, Principles of Learning and Teaching, and Elementary Multiple Subjects examinations. All incoming freshmen in EDU 100T and transfer students are automatically enrolled in the *Canvas* Praxis CORE review course. General PRAXIS II support for all other areas is provided through study materials housed in the Curriculum Materials Center and Teacher Quality Institute Praxis support services. Monthly Praxis CORE group review sessions are publicized in print throughout the building and through social media (*Praxis Support-new*).

Curriculum alignment is also a universal intervention. As an extension of Objective I.2 of the *Revised SIP (new)*, the EPP will collaborate with content area faculty to ensure alignment of curriculum with expectations on the PRAXIS CORE and PRAXIS II exams. This will occur through meetings with content area coordinators each semester.

Targeted interventions include the work of the Recruitment and Retention Center Coordinator, who reviews the EPP PRAXIS Core results on a bimonthly basis as a standard operating procedure. Candidates who have not yet attempted the PRAXIS Core, or who have been unsuccessful in passing a part of the CORE, are contacted via email or telephone. The Recruitment and Retention Center Coordinator reminds candidates about testing requirements and initiates dialogue to support candidates' needs. Candidates have access to individual tutoring as well as tutoring offered by the Teacher Quality Institute, academic departments, the Curriculum Materials Center, and the Racer Writing Center at the university library. The Recruitment and Retention Coordinator carefully monitors candidates' progress.

The Teacher Quality Institute coordinates intensive interventions through the COEHS Student Success Center, which provides instruction on how to use free, self-paced, test preparation resources for candidates that is available through University Libraries. The services of the COEHS Student Success Center are publicized to all candidates. Furthermore, the Recruitment and Retention Coordinator provides contact information for candidates in need of intensive intervention for PRAXIS CORE or PRAXIS II exams across subject areas (*Praxis Support*).

### 3. CAEP Feedback: How does the EPP ensure reliability and validity for each assessment related to content knowledge, other than proprietary assessments?

To verify candidates' content knowledge, the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board requires all candidates to maintain a cumulative GPA  $\geq 2.75$  average or a GPA  $\geq 3.0$  on the last 30 hours of completed credit. Moreover, this legislated mandate (16 KAR 5:010) requires candidates to pass the Praxis CORE examination to demonstrate their content knowledge in the areas of reading, mathematics, and writing before admission to teacher education. Completers must pass PRAXIS II examinations administered by the Educational Testing Service to demonstrate content knowledge associated with their chosen fields to become eligible for teacher certification.

Direct measures of candidates' content knowledge occur in the content area departments. The EPP uses indirect measures of candidate content knowledge including associated perception items on the Student Teaching Instrument, the Student Teaching Survey, and the Employer Survey. These data are summarized in *C-P Knowledge (new)*. Per Objective II.4 of the *Revised SIP (new)*, EPP faculty and P-12 partners will review and revise these assessment instruments to ensure content validity and reliability. The process described in the *EPP Assessment Guidelines (new)* will be applied to these instruments.

### 4. CAEP Feedback: Will site visitors be able to see candidate performance data related to content knowledge in LiveText during the onsite visit?

The EPP compiled data from multiple *LiveText* sources to document addendum evidence items for content knowledge. For reviewers seeking additional information about the data collection system, the *LiveText* Coordinator, Dr. George Patmor, will provide an orientation to the *LiveText* Exhibit Center and will be available for technical support at any point during the visit. EPP-wide assessment data are provided on the AIMS Self-Study Evidence Site. Reviewers who are interested in exploring additional data can access *LiveText* by following the directions below.

#### Instructions for Visiting the LiveText Exhibit Center

Follow these steps to access the Murray State University LiveText Exhibit Center:

- Go to the LiveText login page - [www.livetext.com](http://www.livetext.com)
- Click Visitor Pass at the top
- In the faint box right above the button that says Visitor Pass Entry, type or paste in **2465ADB**
- Click the Visitor Pass Entry button
- Click the Exhibit Center tab at the top of the page

Follow these steps to see program data for multiple years:

- Click '2009-2016 Continuous Assessment'
- Click 'Undergraduate/Graduate Programs' for programs that have both components, or
- Click 'Graduate Only Programs' for programs that do not have an undergraduate component
- Click the title of a program
- Click 2016-2017 on the lower right for data to be used this fall for continuous improvement efforts

- Data include course assignment reports, field experience evaluation reports, and student teaching portfolio reports.

Follow these steps to see all course assignment reports for multiple years within the Exhibit Center:

- Click ‘2009-2016 Reports’
- Click ‘Courses’
- Click any year to see reports created to be used during that year for continuous improvement efforts
- Reports with ‘EPP’ at the end of the title contain data from all candidates
- Reports with data from candidates in specific programs (filtered by major) are marked, such as ‘CTE’ for Career and Tech Ed, ‘SEC’ for secondary programs, ‘LBD’ for special education, etc.

### **5. CAEP Feedback: Are candidate performance data related to content knowledge available from principals, resource teachers, and teacher educators who serve on internship committees?**

As part of the Kentucky Teacher Intern Program, internship committees (University Supervisors, Resource Teachers, Principals, and Interns) assess interns’ performance. EPSB does not share committee members’ individual intern ratings with EPPs. They do, however, share aggregated data for each performance item (*KTIP Report- new*). Data from the cycle report do not fully reconcile in terms of the number of interns with EPP records. However, data do communicate important information regarding candidate preparedness; almost 100% of interns are rated at the *Accomplished* level.

Furthermore, the EPSB administers a *New Teacher Survey* to seek perspectives of intern teachers and resource teachers on interns’ proficiencies at meeting the Kentucky Teacher Standards (KTS), including KTS 1- content knowledge. The New Teacher Survey was administered in 2009, 2011, and 2013. Due to low response rate, Spring 2014 data were not included. Interns and Resource Teachers rated interns’ display of content knowledge using a 4-point Likert scale with (1) poor and (4) excellent. Interns rated their content knowledge as 3.24 (2009), 3.22 (2011), and 2.83 (2013). Resource teachers rated interns’ content knowledge as 3.43, 3.18, and 3.44 in 2009, 2011, 2013 respectively. Overall, interns demonstrated “good” content knowledge; resource teachers tended to rate interns’ knowledge than interns did. Data were not disaggregated by program. Beginning fall 2016, principals will receive the survey.

### **6. CAEP Feedback: The Link to More Extensive Data–MSU Student Teaching Survey Results (presumably program data) embedded with the SSR Evidence 6 table was not accessible and revealed an error message. What do data available at this link indicate regarding candidate content knowledge?**

The link was broken when the EPP recently moved intranet materials to a new server. We apologize for any inconvenience. This link has now been restored to access Student Teaching Survey data at this site: [http://coehsnet.murraystate.edu/survey\\_report/steacheval/?show\\_results=1](http://coehsnet.murraystate.edu/survey_report/steacheval/?show_results=1).

Using a 5-point Likert scale with (1) Little Opportunity to (5) Very Extensive, candidates responded to this survey item: “Learned the content knowledge appropriate for your certification.” Candidates rated

their content knowledge preparedness as extensive or very extensive: spring 2014 (90%), fall 2014 (85.71%), and spring 2015 (85.48%).

## **7. CAEP Feedback: What is the targeted performance level for measures of content knowledge in the TPA Eligibility Portfolio?**

The TPA Eligibility Portfolio is a measure of pedagogical knowledge, not content area knowledge. The purpose of the teacher performance assessment performance task is to document candidates' proficiency at designing developmentally appropriate lessons for a target student population, design and administer formative and summative assessments, analyze assessment results, and reflect upon data to inform future instruction. The University Supervisor and second reader (EPP faculty) rate candidates' efforts using a 4-point Likert scale with (1) Ineffective and (4) Exemplary. The targeted performance level is (3) Accomplished.

As part of the admission to student teaching requirements, candidates are required to hold a cumulative GPA  $\geq 2.75$  average or a GPA  $\geq 3.0$  on the last 30 hours of completed credit. Upon completion of the student teaching experience, to gain initial certification, candidates must pass the PRAXIS II examinations administered by the Educational Testing Service to demonstrate content knowledge associated with their chosen fields.

### **Standard One, Task 2 SSR Excerpt Clarifications**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** "Content and pedagogical knowledge are demonstrated through varied measures. In compliance with Kentucky regulation, the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) requires teacher candidates to pass the Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) examination to gain admittance to teacher education" (SSR, p. 21). The state does not require passing scores on the PLT for program admission. Is this an EPP requirement?

**EPP Clarification:** This was a typo in the SSR. The state requires candidates to pass the Praxis CORE exam to demonstrate a strong foundation of reading, mathematics and writing content knowledge before gaining admission to the teacher education program. Completers must pass a program-related PRAXIS II Content examination and the Principles of Learning and Teaching examination to qualify for initial teacher certification.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** "The Kentucky Teacher Internship Program provides evidence that first-year teachers complete a rigorous performance measure where they are assessed by the school principal, a mentor school-based teacher, and a university coordinator in all aspects of teaching effectiveness, including their ability to design and implement standards-aligned instruction" (SSR, p. 22). Are candidate performance data related to pedagogical knowledge available from principals, resource teachers, and teacher educators who serve on internship committees?

**EPP Clarification:** As part of the Kentucky Teacher Intern Program, internship committees (University Supervisors, Resource Teachers, Principals, and Interns) assess interns' performance. EPSB does not share committee members' individual intern ratings with EPPs. They do,

however, share aggregated data for each performance item (*KTIP Report-new*). Data from the cycle report do not fully reconcile in terms of the number of interns with EPP records. However, data do communicate important information regarding candidate preparedness; almost 100% of interns are rated at the *Accomplished* level.

As part of the Kentucky Teacher Intern Program, internship committees (University Supervisors, Resource Teachers, Principals, and Interns) assess interns' pedagogical knowledge. EPSB does not share committee members' individual intern ratings with EPPs. They do, however, share aggregated data for each performance item (*KTIP Report-new*). [1] Furthermore, the EPSB administers a *New Teacher Survey* to seek perspectives of intern teachers and resource teachers on interns' proficiencies at meeting the Kentucky Teacher Standards (KTS), including KTS 2- instructional design, KTS 3- learning climate, KTS 4- implement instruction, KTS 5- assessment, and KTS 6- technology. The New Teacher Survey was administered in 2009, 2011, and fall 2013. Data for spring 2014 are not included because of low response rates. Interns and Resource Teachers rated interns' display of pedagogical knowledge using a 4-point Likert scale with (1) poor and (4) excellent. Interns and resource teachers rated pedagogical performance items in the "good," or targeted performance, area for all five areas of pedagogical knowledge: instructional design, learning climate, implement instruction, assessment, and technology. Data were not disaggregated by program. Beginning fall 2016, principals will receive the survey.

## **Standard One, Task 2 Additional Questions**

### **1. CAEP Feedback: How does the EPP ensure reliability and validity for assessments of candidate pedagogical knowledge, other than proprietary assessments?**

The EPP submitted EPP-Wide Assessments for Early Review August 2015. CAEP provided feedback on these instruments June 2016. Because the EPP did not have an opportunity to revise the instruments before submitting the SSR March 2016, establishing validity and reliability of the instruments has become an important aspect of the *Revised SIP (new)*.

Candidates' pedagogical knowledge is assessed using multiple measures such as Field Experience Evaluations, Student Teaching Evaluations, COE-TPA Lesson Plan, and the TPA Eligibility Portfolio. As delineated by Objective II.4 of the Revised Selected Improvement Plan, EPP faculty and P-12 partners will review and revise these assessment instruments to ensure content validity and reliability. The process described in the *EPP Assessment Guidelines (new)* will be applied to these instruments.

Per the Revised Selected Improvement Plan, the EPP Administrative Cabinet approved the EPP Assessment Guidelines October 12, 2016. This policy governs the validation of EPP-wide instruments by articulating the roles and responsibilities across the EPP for the determination and maintenance of assessment validity and reliability. An Assessment Task Force, comprised of undergraduate program coordinators and P-12 partners, department chairs, the Director of Teacher Education Services, and representatives of the Dean's office will collaboratively establish and maintain the validity and reliability of assessment instruments. While not specified in the policy, each EPP-wide assessment will be examined using the Lawshe Method to determine the Content Validity Index (CVI) for individual items and the overall instrument. The instrument will be comprised of items receiving the highest CVI ratings. The EPP

will establish interrater reliability in two ways. Two raters will rate the same “live” administration of an assessment or multiple raters will participate in a training session during which they calibrate the instrument using a recorded scenario. Assessments will be revalidated every three years or sooner if substantial changes warrant revalidation.

## **2. CAEP Feedback: How is the EPP addressing the lower scores in the Professional Development, Leadership, and Community domain of the PLT?**

Data for the Professional Development, Leadership, and Community domain of the 2015-16 Principles of Learning and Teaching exam indicate that candidate performance increased dramatically over prior years’ performance. Specifically, scores in the upper quartile for this domain were 35.29%, 27.59%, and 52.17% for the K-6, 5-9, and 7-12 versions respectively. This was an increase from 9%, 12%, and 16% for this domain in prior years (*PLT Domain Data-new*).

Candidate performance on the PLT is impacted by candidates’ familiarity with the nature and format of test items in that domain of the test as well as candidate knowledge of the specific content associated with that domain of the test. Therefore, the EPP is using a two-pronged approach to address scores on Professional Development, Leadership, and Community domain of the PLT.

PLT support is available through the universal, targeted, and intensive supports described in Standard One, Task One, Question 2 response of this addendum. Familiarity with expectations and format impacts performance. Candidates are made aware of these supports. The EPP system for communicating opportunities for support has intensified over the past three years.

Per Objective I.2 of the *Revised SIP (new)*, a revision of the core curriculum will include the consideration of the topics and content contained with the Professional Development, Leadership, and Community domain. Incremental change has occurred since the completion of the SSR. An extensive realignment of foundation coursework will compliment the test preparation efforts that are well underway, resulting in improved candidate performance in this domain in the future.

## **3. CAEP Feedback: Who are the university supervisors and university coordinators described in the student teaching evaluation narrative? Are these terms used interchangeably?**

The teacher educator who monitors, scaffolds, and evaluates the student teacher’s efforts is called the University Supervisor. These terms were inadvertently used interchangeably.

## **4. CAEP Feedback: Two areas – assessment and differentiating instruction for diverse students – appear consistently throughout assessments and surveys as needed improvement areas. How is the EPP addressing these two areas? How are these data used to improve programs?**

Intervention I of the *Revised SIP (new)* focuses on ensuring high-quality clinical experiences at all levels within all programs. The initial examination of Student Teaching Surveys during the self-study led the EPP to put forward these areas of preparation for the original SIP.

As an initial step for Objective III.2 for the Revised Selected Improvement Plan, a revised Employer Feedback survey was administered in September. The revised survey is aligned to the Kentucky Teacher Standards and can be disaggregated by major licensure division across the EPP. On September 29, these data were shared with P-12 stakeholders and EPP faculty at the Partner Advisory Council meeting (Objective II.1). At this meeting, partners provided valuable information regarding assessment, differentiation, and other functional areas such as technology integration. The agenda, presentation, survey data, list of participants, and summarized focus group feedback are included in the *Advisory Council (new)* evidence. Faculty will use this information to support decisions as curriculum and clinical experiences are further analyzed and aligned per Objective I.1 and Objective I.2 of the Revised Selected Improvement Plan.

### **5. CAEP Feedback: Will site visitors be able to see candidate performance data related to pedagogical knowledge in LiveText during the onsite visit?**

The EPP compiled data from multiple *LiveText* sources to document addendum evidence items for pedagogical knowledge. For reviewers seeking additional information about the data collection system, the *LiveText* Coordinator, Dr. George Patmor, will provide an orientation to the *LiveText* Exhibit Center and will be available for technical support at any point during the visit. EPP-wide assessment data are provided on the AIMS Self-Study Evidence Site. Reviewers who are interested in exploring additional data can access *LiveText* by following the directions below.

Candidates' pedagogical knowledge is assessed using multiple measures such as the TPA Eligibility Portfolio, COE-TPA Lesson Plan, and Field Experience Evaluation forms. Per Objective II.4 of the *Revised SIP (new)*, EPP faculty and P-12 partners will review and revise these assessment instruments to ensure content validity and reliability. The process described in the *EPP Assessment Guidelines (new)* will be applied to these instruments.

#### **Instructions for Visiting the LiveText Exhibit Center**

Follow these steps to access the Murray State University LiveText Exhibit Center:

- Go to the LiveText login page - [www.livetext.com](http://www.livetext.com)
- Click Visitor Pass at the top
- In the faint box right above the button that says Visitor Pass Entry, type or paste in **2465ADBD**
- Click the Visitor Pass Entry button
- Click the Exhibit Center tab at the top of the page

Follow these steps to see program data for multiple years:

- Click '2009-2016 Continuous Assessment'
- Click 'Undergraduate/Graduate Programs' for programs that have both components, or
- Click 'Graduate Only Programs' for programs that do not have an undergraduate component

- Click the title of a program
- Click 2016-2017 on the lower right for data to be used this fall for continuous improvement efforts
- Data include course assignment reports, field experience evaluation reports, and student teaching portfolio reports.

Follow these steps to see all course assignment reports for multiple years within the Exhibit Center:

- Click '2009-2016 Reports'
- Click 'Courses'
- Click any year to see reports created to be used during that year for continuous improvement efforts
- Reports with 'EPP' at the end of the title contain data from all candidates
- Reports with data from candidates in specific programs (filtered by major) are marked, such as 'CTE' for Career and Tech Ed, 'SEC' for secondary programs, 'LBD' for special education, etc.

**6. CAEP Feedback: The Link to More Extensive Data–MSU Student Teaching Survey Results (presumably program data) embedded with the SSR Evidence 6 table was not accessible and revealed an error message. What do data available at this link indicate regarding candidate pedagogical knowledge?**

The link was broken when the EPP recently moved intranet materials to a new server. We apologize for any inconvenience. This link has now been restored to access Student Teaching Survey data at this site: [http://coehsnet.murraystate.edu/survey\\_report/steacheval/?show\\_results=1](http://coehsnet.murraystate.edu/survey_report/steacheval/?show_results=1). A summary of data appears below.

Using a 5-point Likert scale with (1) Little Opportunity to (5) Very Extensive, candidates responded to this survey item: "Practiced instructional strategies appropriate for your content area." Candidates rated their pedagogical knowledge preparedness as extensive or very extensive: spring 2014 (89.6%), fall 2014 (89.22%), and spring 2015 (92.74%). Three cycles of data indicate 83.07%-96.43% of candidates perceived their preparedness for effective instructional design using varied methods and instructional technology as extensive or very extensive. 87.5%-92.86% of candidates perceived their preparedness to create positive, respectful classroom learning environments as extensive or very extensive. 73.6%-91.94% of candidates perceived their preparedness to assess and evaluate student learning as extensive or very extensive (*C-P Knowledge- new*).

**7. CAEP Feedback: What is the targeted performance level for candidate pedagogical knowledge in the TPA Eligibility Portfolio?**

The purpose of the teacher performance assessment performance task is to document candidates' pedagogical proficiency at designing developmentally appropriate lessons for a target student population, design and administer formative and summative assessments, analyze assessment results, and reflect upon the data to inform future instruction. The University Supervisor and second reader (EPP faculty) rate candidates' efforts using a 4-point Likert scale with (1) Ineffective and (4) Exemplary. The targeted performance level is (3) Accomplished.

## Standard One, Task 3 SSR Excerpt Clarification

1. **CAEP Feedback:** There is limited discussion of candidate dispositions in the SSR. In the Student Teaching Survey narrative (SSR evidence 6), candidate dispositions are identified as inclusiveness, responsibility, enthusiasm, caring, confidence, ethics, and professionalism; however, SSR Evidence 13 (Candidate Dispositions) identified the dispositions as inclusive, responsible, enthusiastic, caring, confident, and ethical (no mention of professionalism). Professionalism is identified in the narrative of the Conceptual Framework document in SSR Evidence 13 but not identified in the data table. Clarification is needed on the specific professional dispositions required of candidates and how these dispositions are assessed.

**EPP Clarification:** The EPP’s Conceptual Framework, included in the *Candidate Dispositions* evidence, identifies and defines six professional dispositions. Please note, “professionalism” is the umbrella term that collectively references these six dispositions; it is not an additional disposition. These are the six EPP Professional Dispositions: inclusive, responsible, enthusiastic, caring, confident, and ethical.

Candidates are first introduced to the EPP Professional Dispositions in EDU 100T and EDU 103 when they self-assess their dispositions using the Dispositions Instrument. This instrument is included in the *Candidate Dispositions* evidence. During the admission to Teacher Education orientation, candidates are provided a written description of the dispositions in the *Teacher Education Sourcebook*. A one-page summary of the EPP Conceptual Framework, including the professional dispositions, is attached to every course syllabus.

EPP faculty and P-12 partners assess candidates’ professional dispositions at multiple points during the program. Many key course assessment instruments include performance criteria targeting professional dispositions. These data are recorded on *LiveText*. Candidates’ dispositions are formally evaluated during field and clinical experiences and during the interview for admission to teacher education.

Candidates whose behavior egregiously violates the Professional Dispositions espoused by the EPP receive negative “flags” as per the EPP *Flag System*. Faculty meet privately with candidates to discuss their concerns. When appropriate, they cooperatively design an action plan addressing the area of perceived need. This conversation is documented using the Evaluation of Student Performance form. Candidates may attach a statement of rebuttal. Faculty submit the “flag” to Teacher Education Services; the document is stored in the candidate’s file. The TES Admissions Committee reviews flags as part of the admission to teacher education and admission to student teaching application processes. Committee actions range from active monitoring to formal warnings to suspension for the teacher education program.

## Standard One, Task 3 *Additional Questions*

### 1. CAEP Feedback: What are the professional dispositions candidates are expected to demonstrate throughout their programs?

Effective educators not only need to exhibit knowledge and pedagogical proficiency, they also must exhibit professional dispositions. The EPP's Conceptual Framework, included in *Candidate Dispositions*, identifies and defines six professional dispositions. Please note, "professionalism" is the umbrella term that collectively references these six dispositions; it is not an additional disposition. The six EPP Professional Dispositions are defined below.

- Inclusive: Is an advocate for an inclusive community of people with varied characteristics, ideas, and worldviews.
- Responsible – Considers consequences and makes decisions in a rational and thoughtful manner for the welfare of others; acts with integrity to pursue an objective with thoroughness and consistency.
- Enthusiastic – Is eager and passionately interested in tasks that relate to beliefs about education.
- Caring – Demonstrates regard for the learning and wellbeing of every student.
- Confident – Exhibits certainty about possessing the ability, judgment, and internal resources needed to succeed as a teacher.
- Ethical – Conforms to accepted professional standards of conduct by making decisions based on standards and principles established by the education profession.

### 2. CAEP Feedback: Are disaggregated data available for candidate dispositions by program and reporting cycle? If so, what do these data indicate?

Disaggregated data are available for these programs: (1) Elementary, (2) Learning and Behavior Disorders, (3) Middle School, and (4) Music Education. Other programs lacked sufficient sample size to support disaggregation without revealing individual candidates' identity. Results were compiled from two primary sources, evaluations from field and student teaching experiences and the Student Teacher Survey. Survey results represent both candidate and cooperative teacher ratings, whereas the Student Teaching Survey is a self-report instrument. This entire report is included as *Dispositions Data (new)*.

Notable trends include the following:

- Ratings associated with Student Teaching are typically higher than with Practicum Placements
- The dispositions of Caring and Enthusiasm start highest with the Practicum and remain high with student teaching for all programs
- Confidence is the disposition that varies most
- The Student Teaching Survey results are generally lower than the Practicum and Student Teaching Observations
- Middle school responses were notably lower than other areas as related to Inclusive, Enthusiastic and Caring

The interpretation of these results suggests the following:

- According to Cooperating Teacher ratings, practicum and student teaching placement, candidates demonstrate appropriate professional dispositions consistently across programs
- Of the dispositions, confidence is the most ‘fragile’ in the practicum and student teaching settings
- When candidates self-assess, they are more critical of their experience
- Middle school candidates were most critical of the student teaching experience as related to the development of the professional dispositions

### **3. CAEP Feedback: How does the EPP ensure reliability and validity for assessments used to measure candidate dispositions?**

Feedback from the Offsite Report indicated that documentation of validity by subject matter experts was considered as face validity only and was therefore insufficient. Objective II.4 of the SIP addresses these concerns and significant steps have been taken to put into motion systems to ensure validity and reliability. Per the SIP, the EPP formed an interdepartmental task force with P-12 partner representation to address the scope and nature of the EPP-wide assessments. In late October, EPP faculty and P-12 partners will review and revise EPP assessment instruments to ensure content validity and reliability using the Lawshe method. Additional information will be available during the onsite visit.

Per the *Revised SIP (new)*, the EPP Administrative Cabinet approved the *EPP Assessment Guidelines (new)* October 12, 2016. This policy governs the validation of EPP-wide instruments by articulating the roles and responsibilities across the EPP for the determination and maintenance of assessment validity and reliability. An Assessment Task Force, comprised of undergraduate program coordinators and P-12 partners, department chairs, the Director of Teacher Education Services, and representatives of the Dean’s office will collaboratively establish and maintain the validity and reliability of assessment instruments. While not specified in the policy, each EPP-wide assessment will be examined using the Lawshe Method to determine the Content Validity Index (CVI) for individual items and the overall instrument. The instrument will be comprised of items receiving the highest CVI ratings. The EPP will establish interrater reliability in two ways. For example, two raters may rate the same “live” administration of an assessment or multiple raters may participate in a training session during which they calibrate the instrument using a recorded scenario. Assessments will be revalidated every three years or sooner if substantial changes warrant revalidation.

### **4. CAEP Feedback: Are candidates aware of the professional dispositions expected of them and how these are assessed?**

Candidates are first introduced to the EPP Professional Dispositions in EDU 100T and EDU 103 when they self-assess their dispositions using the Dispositions Instrument. This instrument is included in *Candidate Dispositions*. During the admission to Teacher Education orientation, candidates are provided a written description of the dispositions in the *Teacher Education Sourcebook*. A one-page summary of the EPP Conceptual Framework, including the professional dispositions, is attached to every course syllabus.

EPP faculty and P-12 partners assess candidates' professional dispositions at multiple points during the program. Many key course assessment instruments include performance criteria targeting professional dispositions. These data are recorded on *LiveText*. Candidates' dispositions are formally evaluated during field and clinical experiences and during the interview for admission to teacher education. See evaluation instruments included in *Candidate Dispositions*.

Candidates whose behavior egregiously violates the Professional Dispositions espoused by the EPP receive negative "flags" as per the EPP *Flag System*. Faculty meet privately with candidates to discuss their concerns. When appropriate, faculty work with the candidate to cooperatively design an action plan addressing the area of perceived need. This conversation is documented using the Evaluation of Student Performance form. Candidates may attach a statement of rebuttal. Faculty submit the "flag" to Teacher Education Services where the document is stored in the candidate's file. The TES Admissions Committee reviews flags as part of the admission to teacher education and admission to student teaching application processes. Committee actions range from active monitoring to formal warnings to suspension for the teacher education program.

### **5. CAEP Feedback: Will site visitors be able to see candidate data related to professional dispositions in LiveText during the onsite visit?**

The EPP compiled *Dispositions Data (new)* from multiple *LiveText* sources to document the addendum evidence item for professional dispositions. For reviewers seeking additional information about the data collection system, the *LiveText* Coordinator, Dr. George Patmor, will provide an orientation to the *LiveText* Exhibit Center and will be available for technical support at any point during the visit. EPP-wide assessment data are provided on the AIMS Self-Study Evidence site. Reviewers who are interested in exploring additional data can access *LiveText* by following the directions below.

#### **Instructions for Visiting the LiveText Exhibit Center**

Follow these steps to access the Murray State University LiveText Exhibit Center:

- Go to the LiveText login page - [www.livetext.com](http://www.livetext.com)
- Click Visitor Pass at the top
- In the faint box right above the button that says Visitor Pass Entry, type or paste in **2465ADBD**
- Click the Visitor Pass Entry button
- Click the Exhibit Center tab at the top of the page

Follow these steps to see program data for multiple years:

- Click '2009-2016 Continuous Assessment'
- Click 'Undergraduate/Graduate Programs' for programs that have both components, or
- Click 'Graduate Only Programs' for programs that do not have an undergraduate component
- Click the title of a program
- Click 2016-2017 on the lower right for data to be used this fall for continuous improvement efforts
- Data include course assignment reports, field experience evaluation reports, and student teaching portfolio reports.

Follow these steps to see all course assignment reports for multiple years within the Exhibit Center:

- Click '2009-2016 Reports'
- Click 'Courses'
- Click any year to see reports created to be used during that year for continuous improvement efforts
- Reports with 'EPP' at the end of the title contain data from all candidates
- Reports with data from candidates in specific programs (filtered by major) are marked, such as 'CTE' for Career and Tech Ed, 'SEC' for secondary programs, 'LBD' for special education, etc.

**6. CAEP Feedback: The Link to More Extensive Data—MSU Student Teaching Survey Results (presumably program data) embedded with the SSR Evidence 6 table was not accessible and revealed an error message. Does evidence presented at this link document professional dispositions?**

The link was broken when the EPP recently moved intranet materials to a new server. We apologize for any inconvenience. This link has now been restored to access Student Teaching Survey data at this site: [http://coehsnet.murraystate.edu/survey\\_report/steacheval/?show\\_results=1](http://coehsnet.murraystate.edu/survey_report/steacheval/?show_results=1). A summary of these data appears below.

Using a 5-point Likert scale with (1) Little Opportunity to (5) Very Extensive, candidates responded to multiple survey items to express their perceived preparedness to exhibit the EPP Professional Dispositions. Four cycles of data were presented (fall 2015, spring 2015, fall 2015, spring 2016). Percentages indicate candidates' perceptions they were extensively or very extensively prepared to exhibit each of these six professional dispositions:

- Inclusive: 84%-89%
- Responsible: 91%-98%
- Enthusiastic: 89%-98%
- Caring: 91%-98%
- Confident: 92%-95%

For disaggregated data and specific items, please reference *Dispositions Data (new)*.

## **Standard One Areas for Improvement**

### **1. Area for Improvement: Assessments do not have reliability and validity data.**

The EPP submitted EPP-Wide Assessments for Early Review August 2015. CAEP provided feedback on these instruments June 2016. Because the EPP did not have an opportunity to revise the instruments before submitting the SSR March 2016, establishing validity and reliability of the instruments has become an important aspect of the *Revised SIP (new)*.

Feedback from the Offsite Report indicated that documentation of validity by subject matter experts was considered as face validity only and was therefore insufficient. Objective II.4 of the SIP addresses these concerns and significant steps have been taken to put into motion systems to ensure validity and reliability. Per the SIP, the EPP formed an interdepartmental task force with P-12 partner representation to address the scope and nature of the EPP-wide assessments. In late October, EPP faculty and P-12 partners will review and revise EPP assessment instruments to ensure content validity and reliability using the Lawshe method. Additional information will be available during the onsite visit.

Per the Revised Selected Improvement Plan, the EPP Administrative Cabinet approved the *EPP Assessment Guidelines (new)* October 12, 2016. This policy governs the validation of EPP-wide instruments by articulating the roles and responsibilities across the EPP for the determination and maintenance of assessment validity and reliability. An Assessment Task Force, comprised of undergraduate program coordinators and P-12 partners, department chairs, the Director of Teacher Education Services, and representatives of the Dean's office will collaboratively establish and maintain the validity and reliability of assessment instruments. While not specified in the policy, each EPP-wide assessment will be examined using the Lawshe Method to determine the Content Validity Index (CVI) for individual items and the overall instrument. The instrument will be comprised of items receiving the highest CVI ratings. The EPP will establish interrater reliability in two ways. Two raters will rate the same "live" administration of an assessment or multiple raters will participate in a training session during which they calibrate the instrument using a recorded scenario. Assessments will be revalidated every three years or sooner if substantial changes warrant revalidation.

## **2. Area for Improvement: Content knowledge for candidates in some programs cannot be verified through pass rates on teacher certification exams.**

To verify candidates' content knowledge, the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board requires all candidates to maintain a cumulative GPA  $\geq 2.75$  average or a GPA  $\geq 3.0$  on the last 30 hours of completed credit. Moreover, this legislated mandate (16 KAR 5:010) requires candidates to pass the Praxis CORE examination to demonstrate their content knowledge in the areas of reading, mathematics, and writing before admission to teacher education. Completers must pass PRAXIS II examinations administered by the Educational Testing Service to demonstrate content knowledge associated with their chosen fields to become eligible for teacher certification. The original, five-year SSR Praxis data reflected scores of a few candidates who had taken the test multiple times. Furthermore, some test takers were not candidates in the EPP pre-service program; rather, they were practicing teachers seeking to become highly qualified. Data appearing on the *Praxis Pass Rates (new)* table has been adjusted accordingly. Candidates who enrolled in our programs with content degrees earned at other institutions and a desire to enter our alternative certification program failed PRAXIS II as well. These factors impacted the 5-year pass rates.

Direct measures of candidate content knowledge occur in the content area departments. The EPP uses indirect measures of candidate content knowledge include associated perception items on the Student Teaching Instrument, the Student Teaching Survey, and the Employer Survey. Per Objective II.4 of the Revised Selected Improvement Plan, EPP faculty and P-12 partners will review and revise these

assessment instruments to ensure content validity and reliability. The process described in the *EPP Assessment Guidelines (new)* will be applied to these instruments.

## STANDARD TWO: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

### Standard Two, Task 1 *SSR Excerpt Clarification*

1. **CAEP Feedback:** “Selected Improvement Plan will enhance clinical experiences through the exploration of Professional Development Schools and increased stakeholder input.” (Page 28)- Please clarify this statement.

**EPP Clarification:** In the *Revised SIP (new)*, Intervention I focuses upon developing a system to “ensure coordinated, high-quality clinical experiences at all levels within all programs.”

Objective 1.6 targets establishing “a network of Professional Development School sites to support a range of enhanced field and clinical experiences.” These Professional Development School pilot sites provide valuable feedback to inform further development of the PDS model. Current initiatives are described below. Site team members will have an opportunity to visit some of these partnerships venues during the Tuesday onsite visit (*PDS MS Model-new*).

- In partnership with four middle schools, the EPP is piloting a Professional Development School model at Mayfield Middle School, Murray Middle School, Paducah Middle School, and Browning Springs Middle School. Dr. David Whaley (Dean), Dr. Robert Lyons (Assistant Dean), Dr. Barbara Washington (ACS Department Chair), Ms. Pam Matlock (Paducah Education Site Coordinator), Ms. Kem Cothran (Director, Teacher Quality Institute), Dr. Alesa Walker (Director, Teacher Education Services), Dr. Kimberly Stormer (Middle School Professor), and Dr. Marty Jacobs (Professor) conducted research on this PDS model and developed the initial pilot. Dr. Lyons, Ms. Cothran, Ms. Thresher (TQI staff), and Ms. Matlock are overseeing the implementation of this special project. This PDS venue allows teacher candidates to serve as “junior faculty members” alongside master educators for an entire school year, beginning the very first day of school. The yearlong internship epitomizes the ideal of “learning by doing.” Candidates graduate as fully-prepared, competent, confident and committed educators able to meet the challenges that teachers face today. Teacher candidates benefit from the cooperating teachers’ expertise and extensive classroom experiences; districts benefit from having “junior faculty members” in schools; and students benefit from added assistance in the classroom. Teacher candidates, school-based educators, university supervisors, as well as school liaisons, principals, and EPP support staff collaborate to provide a constructive learning experience for both teacher candidates and students in partnership schools. As part of the ongoing evaluation of this effort, a survey was administered to students in MID 422. Some of these candidates are participating in the residency program; other respondents are in traditional placements. The results of this survey are posted in *PDS MS Survey (new)*.
- A partnership pilot program for practicum students began in August, 2016 between MSU-Paducah and Clark Elementary School. At the request of Principal Steve Ybarzabal, a Professional Development School program for Seniors to complete practicum hours and student teaching hours at Clark Elementary was initiated. The principal and MSU Paducah Education Site Coordinator, Pam Matlock, selected five

seniors to participate in the pilot program. Candidates and cooperating teachers met with the principal, assistant superintendent, and the education coordinator to co-determine expectations and co-plan anticipated experiences. A contract was signed, and students began assisting their cooperating teachers in August to set up their classrooms. The MSU students have been welcomed as "junior" faculty and included in all faculty professional developments, registrations, opening days and all aspects of preparing for the school year, as well as planning and evaluating instruction and student learning during the year. This fall, they will complete MSU course assignments specific to the elementary classroom, all practicum experiences, and co-teaching experiences at these Clark placements. Many of the PDS students are on-site 4 to 5 days per week. In the spring, candidates will student teach in the same placement. For comparative analysis between the PDS program and the traditional practicum/student teaching program, senior education students will complete a teaching competency survey at the beginning of the semester, the end of the semester, and at the end of student teaching. Early indications are that this program is meeting the needs and exceeding expectations of both the elementary school community and the MSU education program (*Clark Elem-new*).

- At the Madisonville regional campus, MSU and Hopkins County Schools have co-created "methods schools" at West Broadway (REA 306), Pride Elementary (ELE 307), Earlington Elementary (ELE 304), and Hanson Elementary (ELE 305). Candidates attend class in the same school site where their clinical experiences are held. They become totally immersed in the school's culture. Activities vary by site. Candidates spend up to six hours with exemplary teachers at the site. In addition, candidates tutor and engage students in literacy activities and debrief with the university instructor after the tutoring session. A local YMCA provides snacks each week.
- Fall 2015 an EPP doctoral candidate who is an elementary principal, initiated an enhanced clinical experience in cooperation with two EPP reading faculty, the Director of Teacher Education Services, and elementary educators at Graves County Central Elementary School (see candidate's assignment in *Central Elem-new*). Dr. Grant and Dr. Gill met with the teachers at an after-school meeting to exchange ideas about redesigning the field experiences for REA 306 and ELE 307. They agreed they wanted the students to assist teachers as well as teach lessons. As a result, students worked more closely with their cooperating teachers, co-teaching small reading groups or working with individual children. Candidates also conducted targeted academic interventions, learned about effective assessment and data analysis during professional learning community sessions, and experienced embedded professional development using research-based KAGAN strategies. This partnership began spring 2016 and continues fall 2016.

## **Standard Two, Task 1 *Additional Question***

**1. CAEP Feedback: Is a comprehensive list of meeting minutes, which clearly identify subject, date, and attendees available for review during the onsite review? Are data available to support concerns addressed? Are data available to demonstrate the impact of changes that were implemented by the EPP and partners?**

A list of program innovations and meeting participants are available in the *Program Changes (new)* document. Refining the process for keeping meeting minutes that document shared decision-making is an integral part of Intervention II: Refinement of Quality Assurance System in the *Revised SIP (new)*. The EPP has initiated a new way to collect and share meeting minutes on the EPP shared governance intranet site at [coehsnet.murraystate.edu](http://coehsnet.murraystate.edu). Click on the Meeting Minutes/Committees link under the heading COEHS Resources.

Meeting minutes for the past several academic years are posted in the *LiveText* exhibit room. For reviewers seeking additional information about the data collection system, the *LiveText* Coordinator, Dr. George Patmor, will provide an orientation to the *LiveText* Exhibit Center and will be available for technical support at any point during the visit. Reviewers who are interested in exploring additional data can access *LiveText* by following the directions below.

### **Instructions for Accessing Meeting Minutes on the LiveText Exhibit Center**

Follow these steps to access the Murray State University LiveText Exhibit Center:

- Go to the LiveText login page - [www.livetext.com](http://www.livetext.com)
- Click Visitor Pass at the top
- In the faint box right above the button that says Visitor Pass Entry, type or paste in **2465ADBD**
- Click the Visitor Pass Entry button
- Click the Exhibit Center tab at the top of the page
- Click on the 2009-2016 Minutes link
- Browse by department

### **Standard Two, Task 2 SSR Excerpt Clarification**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** “Many clinical experiences include an instructional technology component using school- or KATE-provided technology (Technology Matrix; KATE)” (Page 28). How does this instructional technology component support advanced candidates enrolled in courses? How many clinical experiences include instructional technology components used for P-12 teaching and learning opportunities?

**EPP Clarification:** Because the CAEP advanced standards have just been adopted, this CAEP accreditation visit is focused solely on initial, not advanced candidates. Therefore, the *Core Matrix (new)* delineates instructional technology integration throughout undergraduate coursework (*Technology Data-new*). Instructional technology is a required element of lesson delivery and implementation during candidates’ junior-senior level clinical experiences. Candidates’ proficiency toward implementing instructional technology is documented by formal evaluations by EPP faculty and/or cooperating teachers. Please reference *Field Experience Evaluations*, *Student Teaching Evaluations*, and *Field Hour Audit and Component Sheets*.

## **Standard Two, Task 2 *Additional Question***

### **1. CAEP Feedback: Who are ‘other’ community stakeholders engaged in strong collaborative partnerships with the EPP?**

EPP Faculty have formed innovative partnerships with several stakeholders. A few partnerships are briefly described below.

- Partnered with STEM area faculty in a STEM Women project funded by NSF.
- Partnered with families of children on the Autism Spectrum including providing a family support group.
- Forged a partnership with faculty from Equine Science, Special Education, and Communication Disorders to write and submit a \$100,000 grant to the Horse and Human Research foundation. Decision awaited in November.
- Partnered with the Kentucky Department of Education through the Work Group to Redefine College and Career Readiness.
- Partnered with Ruby Simpson Head Start to develop a Reggio Emilia-based preschool learning environment.
- Partnered with the National Forum to Accelerate Middle Level Education to monitor the i3 Innovation Grant.
- Led a partnership between the Family and Consumer Science Program, Social Work and Non-Profit Leadership to hold a forum for Women’s Issues.
- Partnered with Paducah City schools with "Parents as Partners" Family nights as part of the Outreach to Schools Grant. MSU candidates presented math and science strategies to parents and their children.
- Partnered with Murray Main Street Youth Center to provide tutoring with our teacher candidates.

## **Standard Two, Task 3 *SSR Excerpt Clarification***

1. **CAEP Feedback:** “They offer suggestions for improvement of candidate preparation (Meeting Minutes)” (Page 27). Please explain what data were used to improve by meeting attendees in order to improve candidate preparation. Please identify ‘they.’

**EPP Clarification:** The full statement reads “P-12 partners are consulted about coherence across clinical and academic components of candidate preparation; they offer suggestions for improvement of candidate preparation.” The P-12 partners offer suggestions for improvement of candidate preparation. P-12 partners sit on program-specific advisory councils, academic curriculum committees, and the Admission to Teacher Education committee. In those venues, they are appraised of and have input in proposed program challenges and innovations, review and vote upon proposed curricular changes, review entry data, discuss flags, and determine whether candidates should be admitted to the teacher education program and to student teaching based upon their academic progress and professional dispositions. Two intents of the Revised Selected Improvement Plan are to develop a systematic way to share data with stakeholders and to

strengthen P-12 partnerships through the creation of the Partner Advisory Council and collaborative review of curriculum and co-design of clinical experiences.

## **Standard Two, Task 3 *Additional Question***

**1. CAEP Feedback: Are data available to support the narrative prepared by the EPP? A list of artifacts provides opportunities to valid data. The narrative should include a discussion of data and findings.**

Here is a summary of the data contained in *ACT and GPA Student Teaching Survey*, and *Student Teaching Evaluations* those data.

### ***ACT and GPA***

To become admitted to the teacher education program, candidates must attain a GPA  $\geq 2.75$  on a 4.0 scale. The average GPA for 260 candidates admitted in 2012-13 was 3.41, in 2013-14, 222 candidates had an average GPA 3.46; 198 candidates had an average GPA 3.45 in 2014-15. The National Distributions of Cumulative Percents for ACT 2013-2015 documents the 50th percentile for the ACT composite is 20. Ms. Tracy Roberts, Murray State Registrar, provided documentation of teacher candidates' average ACT composite scores for the past three years. ACT scores were at or above the 50th percentile.

### ***Student Teaching Survey***

During the final student teaching seminar, candidates respond to the Student Teaching Survey by rating their preparation toward demonstrating each of the Kentucky Teacher Standards (KTS) using a 5-point Likert scale with (1) Little Opportunity to (5) Very Extensive. Here is a summary of the range of ratings by candidates who perceived their preparation as Extensive or Very Extensive for each of the standards and the EPP Professional Dispositions.

- KTS 1: Content Knowledge 85%-95%
- KTS 2: Instructional Design 92%-97%
- KTS 3: Learning Climate 61%-94%
- KTS 4: Instructional Implementation 75%-93%
- KTS 5: Assessment 67%-92%
- KTS 6: Technology 83%-89%
- KTS 7: Reflection 82%-92%
- KTS 8: Collaboration 68%-71%
- KTS 9: Professional Development 87%-93%
- KTS 10: Leadership 81%-98%
- Professional Dispositions (collectively): 83%-98%

Areas of perceived strength included instructional design and professional dispositions. Areas of perceived need included classroom management, differentiating instruction, pre-assessments to inform instructional design, and using student data. To address those perceived needs, all candidates take SED 300 *Educating Students with Disabilities*. Furthermore, the elementary program now requires ELE 310 *Classroom Environment and Student Engagement for Elementary Teachers*; IECE candidates take FCS

311 *Child Guidance*; LBD candidates take SED 455 *Practicum*; and Middle School and Secondary School candidates take MID 422 and SEC 420/422 practicums. Candidates develop additional pedagogical proficiency through 200 hours or clinical experiences before the student teaching semester. EPP faculty are exploring ways to develop candidates' abilities to integrate differentiated instructional practices and to use assessment to inform instruction throughout core professional education courses and enhanced, extended clinical experiences. These ongoing initiatives are captured in the ***Revised SIP (new)***, Intervention I - Ensure coordinated, high-quality clinical experiences at all levels within all programs.

### ***Student Teaching Evaluations***

During the student teaching semester, Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors respond to the Student Teaching Survey to formally evaluate student teacher's efforts using a 4-point Likert scale with (1) Not Making Progress to (4) Outstanding Progress; (3) Satisfactory Progress is the targeted level. A review of overall ratings at the Satisfactory/Outstanding levels indicated Cooperating Teachers perceived candidates as exhibiting proficiency for all items (86%-97%) and University Supervisors perceived candidates' proficiency for all items (95%-100%). Areas of strength included content knowledge and instructional design. Areas of perceived need included classroom management and differentiated assessment. Cooperating Teachers perceived addressing student exceptionalities as a strength and classroom management as a need. University Supervisors perceived classroom discipline as a strength and addressing student exceptionalities as a need. EPP faculty are exploring ways to develop candidates' abilities to integrate differentiated instructional practices and to use assessment to inform instruction throughout core professional education courses and enhanced, extended clinical experiences. These ongoing initiatives are captured in the ***Revised SIP (new)***, Intervention I - Ensure coordinated, high-quality clinical experiences at all levels within all programs.

## ***Standard Two Area for Improvement***

### **1. Area for Improvement: The EPP does not involve clinical partners in analysis of data.**

Based upon feedback from the Onsite Report, the EPP took steps to ensure stakeholder involvement, including P-12 clinical partners, in shared decision-making in using data to inform program improvement. The process for enhancing the EPP Quality Assurance System is detailed in Intervention I and II of the ***Revised SIP (new)***.

Intervention I ensures coordinated, high-quality clinical experiences at all levels within all programs. EPP faculty will work with P-12 partners to co-create enhanced, extended clinical experience procedures, support systems, data sharing, and professional development schools.

Intervention II focuses upon refining the Quality Assurance System by creating EPP-wide advisory groups to provide feedback to EPP data and input framed by EPP data that informs EPP-wide and program-specific changes. The EPP has a long tradition of decentralized continuous improvement with program-specific advisory councils. However, the pace and magnitude of change in recent years complicates the dissemination of information and stretches the capacity of the programs to leverage EPP-wide change. These EPP-wide advisories will serve to leverage change, as needed, across the EPP while allowing the programs to focus on program specific issues. The EPP has established three EPP-wide

advisory councils: the Student Advisory Council, the Superintendent Advisory Council, and the Partner Advisory Council. A description of the composition and focus of each of these advisory groups follows. See the *Advisory Council (new)* document for additional information.

Candidates and completers from programs across the College are asked to serve on the Student Advisory Council, which meets at least twice per year. The Council is asked to provide insight to College leadership regarding a wide range of topics, including the perceptions regarding the learning environment, instructional quality, college/program expectations, communication, and retention. The Student Advisory Council was organized over the 2015-2016 academic year and met on October 13, 2016 for the initial meeting for the 2016-2017 academic year.

The Superintendent Advisory Council is comprised of superintendents from the West Kentucky Education Cooperative who lead partner districts and are willing to represent the interests of the WKEC. This group meets twice annually and discusses issues pertinent to them as employers of our program completers. For example, the Employer Feedback Survey would be used to frame discussions of strengths and areas of need for our graduates. This new advisory group met for the first time on October 14, 2016.

The purpose of the Partner Advisory Council is to assist in identifying EPP-wide areas of strength and areas of need. All 27 members of the West Kentucky Education Cooperative are invited to send five district representatives to the Partner Advisory Council. After assisting with an analysis of provided data, the Partner Advisory Council explores possible solutions, with emphasis given to projects involving partnership to address a need. The Partner Advisory Council was new for 2016-2017 and met for the first time on September 29. A copy of the agenda, a roster of attendees, a copy of the presentation, notes from the concurrent sessions, and the evaluation of the session are included in the *Advisory Council (new)* document.

Objective II.3 addresses the need to ensure clear, frequent and two-way communication between the EPP and partners. The EPP allocated resources to support a communications position in 2015-2016. The number and quality of publications and of social media from the college has increased greatly during this period. Furthermore, the EPP is establishing a web page to report key outcomes and indicators of impact (Objective II.7). By providing stakeholders with more frequent and descriptive information, the quality and frequency of response to requests for feedback has also increased. The EPP is currently at the Baseline for this objective, but it is already clear that our efforts are positively impacting stakeholder involvement as evidenced by responses to our requests for assistance.

Objective II.6 addresses efforts to further strengthen the program-specific advisory process by standardizing critical operational aspects of these advisories, such as documentation and frequency of consultation. The EPP is currently at the Baseline for this objective.

## STANDARD THREE: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

### Standard Three, Task 1 *SSR Excerpt Clarifications*

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP's dispositional measures for each academic year within the "fall 2013-fall 2105" timeframe could not be determined by year or program.

**EPP Clarification:** In response to the FFR, disaggregated *Dispositions Data (new)* are now available. Data were gathered from the Field Experience and Student Teaching Evaluations. Both instruments use a 4-point *Likert* scale. Data reflect the percentage of ratings at the Satisfactory/Outstanding levels; Satisfactory is the targeted level. Disaggregated data for each of the EPP Professional Dispositions are available for these programs: (1) Elementary, (2) Learning and Behavior Disorders, (3) Middle School, and (4) Music Education. Other programs lacked sufficient sample size to support disaggregation without revealing individual candidates' identity. Results were compiled from two primary sources, evaluations from field and student teaching experiences and the Student Teacher Survey. Survey results represent both candidate and cooperative teacher ratings, whereas the Student Teaching Survey is a self-report instrument.

Notable trends include the following:

- Ratings associated with Student Teaching are typically higher than with Practicum Placements
- The dispositions of Caring and Enthusiasm start highest with the Practicum and remain high with student teaching for all programs
- Confidence is the disposition that varies most
- The Student Teaching Survey results are generally lower than the Practicum and Student Teaching Observations
- Middle school responses were notably lower than other areas as related to Inclusive, Enthusiastic and Caring

The interpretation of these results suggests the following:

- According to Cooperating Teacher ratings, practicum and student teaching placement, candidates demonstrate appropriate professional dispositions consistently across programs
- Of the dispositions, confidence is the most 'fragile' in the practicum and student teaching settings
- When candidates self-assess, they are more critical of their experience
- Middle school candidates were most critical of the student teaching experience as related to the development of the professional dispositions

2. **CAEP Feedback:** How does the EPP ensure improvements are made to their dispositional process based on P-12 partner and candidate feedback?

**EPP Clarification:** Cooperating teachers rate candidates' field experience dispositions using the provided form. Course instructors review these ratings. When candidates struggle exhibiting

professional dispositions, EPP faculty meet with candidates to discuss the concerns, ‘flag’ students and develop action plans, as per the EPP *Flag System*. These flags and action plans are housed in the Teacher Education Services’ candidate files and reviewed by the Admission to Teacher Education Committee (include P-12 committee members) when candidates apply for admission to teacher education and admission to student teaching. Committee decisions range from formal warnings to admittance with monitoring to non-admittance.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** Partnerships with KATE and KCEWS to develop statewide employer surveys for P-12 school districts that employ the EPP’s candidates.

**EPP Clarification:** Last academic year, the *Kentucky Collaboration for Quality Data* interstate agencies and statewide EPP representatives brainstormed items to include in a statewide Employer Survey. An ad-hoc group of EPP representatives further refined the instrument. The instrument has not been finalized at this time. Fall 2015 the EPP began administering surveys using *Google Forms*. This process has proven to be an efficient means of reaching employers. However, procuring current contact information has been an issue. As a result of working with the *Kentucky Collaboration for Quality Data* statewide efforts, the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board has designed a new Graduate Assignment and Certification Information (GACI) database to provide completer contact information and to identify where program completers are employed. This system will allow the EPP to contact employers. This system just became available fall 2016; the EPP has not had an opportunity to assemble the necessary completer data to administer new surveys yet. Because the GACI database will provide a way for the EPP to identify the location and current contact information for program completers and employers. Therefore, the EPP will be able to administer employer surveys using current contact information, thus increasing the response return rate. This statewide team is exploring the possibility of tracking completers in neighboring states, too, which would further increase response rates because the EPP is located in a section of Kentucky that is in close proximity to multiple states.

In past years, the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board administered the *New Teacher Survey* every other year to interns, resource teachers, and university supervisors. Recently, the EPSB decided to administer the New Teacher Survey every year and to include principals as survey participants. Furthermore, they will provide data disaggregated by program to inform program improvement (*EPSB Memo-new*).

Intervention III of the *Revised SIP (new)* focuses upon maintaining an active partnership with state agencies to develop a statewide system, enhancing current employer surveys to gather meaningful feedback to inform program improvement, and developing a process for gathering input from focus groups. These actions will provide additional, authentic data to assess completers’ preparedness as perceived by employers.

## Standard Three, Task 1 *Additional Questions*

### 1. CAEP Feedback: Can the EPP provide dispositional data for fall 2013-Fall 2015 disaggregated by year and program?

Yes, disaggregated *Dispositions Data (new)* are available for these programs: (1) Elementary, (2) Learning and Behavior Disorders, (3) Middle School, and (4) Music Education. Other programs lacked sufficient sample size ( $n < 5$ ) to support disaggregation without revealing individual candidate's results. Results were compiled from two primary sources, evaluations from practicum/student teaching and the Student Teacher Survey. University supervisors/EPP faculty and cooperating teachers evaluate candidates' field and clinical experience efforts. The Student Teaching Survey is a self-report instrument.

### 2. CAEP Feedback: What is the role of P-12 partner involvement in the design, evaluation, and revision of dispositional and TPA candidate assessments?

The EPP submitted EPP-Wide Assessments for Early Review August 2015. CAEP provided feedback on these instruments June 2016. Because the EPP did not have an opportunity to revise the instruments before submitting the SSR March 2016, working with P-12 partners to establish validity and reliability of the instruments has become an important aspect of the *Revised SIP (new)*.

Candidates' dispositions and pedagogical knowledge are assessed using multiple measures such as Field Experience Evaluations, Student Teaching Evaluations, COE-TPA Lesson Plan, and the TPA Eligibility Portfolio. EPP faculty, TES staff, and P-12 partners co-designed these instruments in 2002; revisions have involved partner input. As delineated by Objective II.4 of the Revised Selected Improvement Plan, EPP faculty and P-12 partners will review and revise these assessment instruments to ensure content validity and reliability. The process described in the *EPP Assessment Guidelines (new)* will be applied to these instruments.

Per the Revised Selected Improvement Plan, the EPP Administrative Cabinet approved the EPP Assessment Guidelines October 12, 2016. This policy governs the validation of EPP-wide instruments by articulating the roles and responsibilities across the EPP for the determination and maintenance of assessment validity and reliability. An Assessment Task Force, comprised of undergraduate program coordinators and P-12 partners, department chairs, the Director of Teacher Education Services, and representatives of the Dean's office will collaboratively establish and maintain the validity and reliability of assessment instruments. While not specified in the policy, each EPP-wide assessment will be examined using the Lawshe Method to determine the Content Validity Index (CVI) for individual items and the overall instrument. The instrument will be comprised of items receiving the highest CVI ratings. The EPP will establish interrater reliability in two ways. Two raters will rate the same "live" administration of an assessment or multiple raters will participate in a training session during which they calibrate the instrument using a recorded scenario. Assessments will be revalidated every three years or sooner if substantial changes warrant revalidation.

### **3. CAEP Feedback: How does the EPP ensure that it integrates instructional technology that prepares students to advance student achievement?**

The EPP requires candidates to demonstrate competency in the use of basic technology through the verification of a B or better in CSC 199 *Introduction to Information Technology* or EDU 222 *Instructional Technology*. Candidates are required to integrate technology when designing lessons, beginning in their initial teaching strategies class (e.g. EDU 303 *Strategies of Teaching*) and continuing throughout upper-level courses with associated field and clinical experiences.

Candidates learn how to use instructional technology to design and administer pre-assessments, formative assessments, and post-assessments in evaluation and measurement courses such as ELE 383 *Evaluation and Measurement in Elementary Education* and EDU 405 *Evaluation and Measurement in Education*. They use technology to analyze assessment data to inform instructional improvement resulting in higher student achievement. Candidates refine this Teacher Performance Assessment strategy throughout advanced field experiences and extended practicum experiences. As a capstone, student teachers complete a *Teacher Performance Assessment* during their student teaching semester.

The EPP employs Instructional Technology Specialists who provide professional development throughout the year for all teacher candidates. Specialists also conduct intensive professional development sessions at student teaching seminars to assist candidates in acclimating to specific instructional technology demands posed by their current student teaching placements.

As part of the implementation of the *Revised SIP (new)*, Objectives I.1 and I.2, the EPP will engage in a process to ensure that instructional technology expectations are in step with demands in P-12 classrooms. An audit of current technology integration into the EPP curriculum, the *EPP Technology Action Plan (new)*, provides a foundation for any revisions. This action plan was approved by the Administrative Cabinet October 12, 2016.

### **4. CAEP Feedback: How have reliability and validity been established for the TPA and Dispositional Measures used to assess candidate progression?**

The EPP submitted EPP-Wide Assessments for Early Review August 2015. CAEP provided feedback on these instruments June 2016. Because the EPP did not have an opportunity to revise the instruments before submitting the SSR March 2016, establishing validity and reliability of the instruments has become an important aspect of the Revised Selected Improvement Plan.

Candidates' dispositions and pedagogical knowledge are assessed using multiple measures such as Field Experience Evaluations, Student Teaching Evaluations, Student Teacher Survey, COE-TPA Lesson Plan, and the TPA Eligibility Portfolio. As delineated by Objective II.4 of the *Revised SIP (new)*, EPP faculty and P-12 partners will review and revise these assessment instruments to ensure content validity and reliability. P-12 partners will also be able to evaluate and suggest revisions as data are shared through the evaluation process. The process described in the *EPP Assessment Guidelines (new)* will be applied to these instruments.

Per the Revised Selected Improvement Plan, the EPP Administrative Cabinet approved the EPP Assessment Guidelines October 12, 2016. This policy governs the validation of EPP-wide instruments by articulating the roles and responsibilities across the EPP for the determination and maintenance of assessment validity and reliability. An Assessment Task Force, comprised of undergraduate program coordinators and P-12 partners, department chairs, the Director of Teacher Education Services, and representatives of the Dean's office will collaboratively establish and maintain the validity and reliability of assessment instruments. While not specified in the policy, each EPP-wide assessment will be examined using the Lawshe Method to determine the Content Validity Index (CVI) for individual items and the overall instrument. The instrument will be comprised of items receiving the highest CVI ratings. The EPP will establish interrater reliability in two ways. Two raters will rate the same "live" administration of an assessment or multiple raters will participate in a training session during which they calibrate the instrument using a recorded scenario. Assessments will be revalidated every three years or sooner if substantial changes warrant revalidation.

### **Standard Three Areas for Improvement**

#### **1. Area for Improvement: The EPP does not have a conclusive process for determining candidate positive impact on P-12 student achievement.**

EPP data on completers' impact on student achievement were not available at the time of the SSR submission. EPP representatives have continued to participate actively in this statewide collaborative effort to address data needs. A 2015-16 AACTE mini-grant provided funding for multiple group meetings; one of the major topics was EPP's access to completers' impact on student achievement data. Over the past few months, the Education Professional Standards Board has designed a system for providing annual completers' impact on student achievement. This EPP is one of the first IHEs in the state to receive impact on student learning data. The EPP received these data October 11, 2016. Completers' Overall Student Growth Ratings were based upon student growth goals (district data) and student growth percentiles (state data), or change in individual student's performance over time. State data were based upon state exams administered for specific subjects at specific grade levels. The provided pie graph depicted EPP completers' PGES overall student growth at three levels: low-expected-high. Aggregated data revealed that 96.5% of EPP program completers were rated at the expected or high levels in their ability to positively impact student achievement. The statewide EPP average was 95.9%, indicating that the EPP was at or slightly above the state average in terms of the impact of completers on student learning. The *Program Impact Report (new)* will be shared with faculty and leadership as part of the continuous improvement process. Data will be shared with stakeholders through the EPP-wide and program-specific advisory councils to inform program improvement.

#### **2. Area for Improvement: The EPP does not have a systemic process for analyzing and sharing data collected from candidate dispositions for program and EPP improvement.**

Candidates' Professional Dispositions are assessed using Field Experience Evaluations and Student Teaching Evaluations, and as part of the Admission to Teacher Education application process. EPP faculty and P-12 partners assess candidates' professional dispositions at multiple points during the program. Many key course assessment instruments include performance criteria targeting professional

dispositions. *Dispositions Data (new)* are recorded on *LiveText*. Candidates' dispositions are formally evaluated during field and clinical experiences and during the interview for admission to teacher education. See evaluation instruments included in *Candidate Dispositions*.

Candidates whose behavior egregiously violates the Professional Dispositions espoused by the EPP receive negative "flags" as per the EPP *Flag System*. Faculty meet privately with candidates to discuss their concerns. When appropriate, they cooperatively design an action plan addressing the area of perceived need. This conversation is documented using the Evaluation of Student Performance form. Candidates may attach a statement of rebuttal. Faculty submit the "flag" to Teacher Education Services; the document is stored in the candidate's file. The TES Admissions Committee, including P-12 partners, reviews flags as part of the admission to teacher education and admission to student teaching application processes. Committee actions range from active monitoring to formal warnings to suspension for the teacher education program.

Per the *Revised SIP (new)*, the EPP will enhance the Quality Assurance process by increasing P-12 partners' active involvement in the assessment instrument validation process (*EPP Assessment Guidelines-new*). P-12 partners will also expand their participation in shared decision-making through participation in the Superintendent Advisory Council, Partner Advisory Council, program-specific advisory councils, and co-creation of high-quality clinical experiences.

### **3. Area for Improvement: The EPP has not demonstrated a consistent approach for the integration of candidate application and candidate competency for instructional technology within its programs.**

The Core Matrix identifies how instructional technology is integrated across the EPP curriculum (*Technology Data-new*). The EPP requires candidates to demonstrate competency in the use of basic technology through the verification of a B or better in CSC 199 *Introduction to Information Technology* or EDU 222 *Instructional Technology*. Candidates are required to integrate technology when designing lessons, beginning in their initial teaching strategies class (e.g. EDU 303 *Strategies of Teaching*) and continuing throughout upper-level courses with associated field and clinical experiences. Candidates learn how to use instructional technology to design and administer pre-assessments, formative assessments, and post-assessments in evaluation and measurement courses such as ELE 383 *Evaluation and Measurement in Elementary Education* and EDU 405 *Evaluation and Measurement in Education*. They use technology to analyze assessment data to inform instructional improvement resulting in higher student achievement. Candidates refine this Teacher Performance Assessment strategy throughout advanced field experiences and extended practicum experiences. Student teachers complete a *Teacher Performance Assessment* during their student teaching semester. Moreover, student teachers must use instructional technology effectively during at least one of their formally observed lessons and include technology-based lessons in their instructional units.

The EPP employs Instructional Technology Specialists who provide professional development throughout the year for all teacher candidates. Specialists also conduct intensive professional development sessions at student teaching seminars to assist candidates in acclimating to specific instructional technology demands posed by their current student teaching placements.

As part of the implementation of the **Revised SIP (new)**, Objectives I.1 and I.2, the EPP will engage in a process to ensure that instructional technology expectations are in step with demands in P-12 classrooms. An audit of current technology integration into the EPP curriculum, the **EPP Technology Action Plan (new)**, provides a foundation for any revisions. This action plan was approved by the Administrative Cabinet October 12, 2016.

## STANDARD FOUR: Program Impact

### Standard Four, Task 1 *SSR Excerpt Clarification* - none

### Standard Four, Task 1 *Additional Questions*

#### 1. CAEP Feedback: How does the Selected Improvement Plan serve as evidence for component 4.2?

The *Revised SIP (new)* supports CAEP Component 4.2., completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys, as detailed in Interventions I, II, and III. Intervention I focuses upon ensuring coordinated, high-quality clinical experiences at all levels within all programs. The purposes of this portion of the SIP are to work with P-12 partners to revise foundation curriculum, refine and enhance field and clinical experiences, and establish a network of Professional Development School sites. Improved curriculum and enhanced field and clinical experiences will result in better prepared program completers, as evidenced by employers' survey results.

Intervention II refines the EPP's quality assurance system by establishing and supporting EPP-wide and program-specific advisory councils, enhancing decision-making processes, and refining evaluation instruments. Eliciting stakeholder input, working with P-12 partners to make decisions to improve programs, and cooperatively refining and calibrating evaluation instruments will result in improved educator preparation and meaningful measures of completers' preparedness.

Intervention III focuses upon maintaining an active partnership with state agencies to develop a statewide system, enhancing current completer and employer surveys to gather meaningful feedback to inform program improvement, and developing a process for gathering input from focus groups. These actions will provide additional, authentic data to assess completers' preparedness as perceived by completers and employers.

The initial steps of the SIP have been implemented. September 2016, the EPP administered a revised Employer Survey to 28 superintendents in the West Kentucky Educational Cooperative. There was a 33% return rate. Survey results were shared with faculty and P-12 stakeholders on September 29, 2016 at the Partner Advisory Council. See the *Advisory Council (new)* document for survey results and summaries of feedback from concurrent focus group sessions.

On October 11, the EPP received the *Program Impact Report (new)* from the Kentucky Center for Education and Workforce Statistics. This report summarized EPP completer job performance through ratings of the Professional Growth and Effectiveness System, which classifies teacher performance as *Ineffective, Developing, Accomplished* or *Exemplary*. About 95% of EPP teachers in the 2010-2015 cohort were rated as *Accomplished* or *Exemplary*, which is at the statewide EPP average.

## Standard Four, Task 2 *SSR Excerpt Clarifications*

1. **CAEP Feedback:** “Historically minimal return rates have not yielded useful data. Therefore, the EPP surveyed superintendents in districts who employed completers...” (SSR, p. 39)

**EPP Clarification:** The intent of this action was to gather employers’ input on the quality of program completers in eight areas of proficiency. A review of the data provided in the *Employer Perceptions* indicated ratings ranged from 3.65-4.63 on a 5-point Likert scale. Areas of perceived need included professional practice and teaching strategies. Areas of strength included learning climate and instructional technology.

Fall 2015 the EPP began administering surveys using *Google Forms*. This process has proven to be an efficient means of reaching program completers and employers. However, procuring current contact information has been an issue. As a result of working with the *Kentucky Collaboration for Quality Data* statewide efforts, the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board has designed a new Graduate Assignment and Certification Information (GACI) database to provide completer contact information and to identify where program completers are employed. This system will allow the EPP to contact completers and their employers. This system just became available fall 2016; the EPP has not had an opportunity to assemble the necessary completer data to administer new surveys yet. Because the GACI database will provide a way for the EPP to identify the location and current contact information for program completers and employers the EPP will be able to administer completer and employer surveys using current contact information, thus increasing the response return rate. The EPP will continue to work with the Kentucky Collaboration for Quality Data team to explore the possibility of tracking completers in neighboring states. This would further increase response rates because the EPP is located in a section of Kentucky that is in close proximity to multiple states.

In past years, the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board administered the *New Teacher Survey* every other year to interns, resource teachers, and university supervisors. Recently, the EPSB decided to administer the New Teacher Survey every year. Principals will now have an opportunity to respond to the survey. Furthermore, the EPSB will provide data disaggregated by program to inform program improvement (*EPSB Memo-new*).

Intervention III of the *Revised SIP (new)* focuses upon maintaining an active partnership with state agencies to develop a statewide system, enhancing current completer and employer surveys to gather meaningful feedback to inform program improvement, and developing a process for gathering input from focus groups. These actions will provide additional, authentic data to assess completers’ preparedness as perceived by completers and employers.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** “This EPP-created survey sought administrators’ perceptions of completers’ educational efficacy. Respondents considered all the MSU completers in their school. They rated completers using a 4-point Likert scale with (1) Low to (5) High/Exceptional. Data were gathered for the 2012 and 2013 academic years.” *Some means on the Employer Survey table were over 4.0* (Employer Perceptions, Evidence item #8).

**EPP Clarification:** Respondents rated completers using a 5-point Likert scale with (1) Low to (5) Exceptional. We apologize for the typo.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** “Therefore, the EPP conducted an additional survey in November 2015 and a focus group session in March 2016 to gather more Completer Perceptions” (SSR, p. 40).

**EPP Clarification:** The intent of this action was to gather completers’ input on the quality of their preparedness. Data provided in the *Completer Perceptions* artifact indicated > 80% of completers agreed or strongly agreed they were well-prepared for the knowledge, skills, and responsibilities encountered in their classrooms. The only area of marked perceived need was in collaborating with parents.

Fall 2015 the EPP began administering surveys using *Google Forms*. This process has proven to be an efficient means of reaching program completers and employers. However, procuring current contact information has been an issue. As a result of working with the *Kentucky Collaboration for Quality Data* statewide efforts, the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board has designed a new Graduate Assignment and Certification Information (GACI) database to provide completer contact information and to identify where program completers are employed. This system will allow the EPP to contact completers and their employers. This system just became available fall 2016; the EPP has not had an opportunity to assemble the necessary completer data to administer new surveys yet. Because the GACI database will provide a way for the EPP to identify the location and current contact information for program completers and employers, the EPP will be able to administer completer and employer surveys using current contact information, thus increasing the response return rate. The EPP will continue to work with the Kentucky Collaboration for Quality Data team to explore the possibility of tracking completers in neighboring states. This would further increase response rates because the EPP is located in a section of Kentucky that is in close proximity to multiple states.

Intervention III of the *Revised SIP (new)* focuses upon maintaining an active partnership with state agencies to develop a statewide system, enhancing current completer and employer surveys to gather meaningful feedback to inform program improvement, and developing a process for gathering input from focus groups. These actions will provide additional, authentic data to assess completers’ preparedness as perceived by completers and employers.

## **Standard Four, Task 2 Additional Questions**

**1-3. CAEP Feedback: What is the scale used for the Survey of Employers? Who administers the Survey of Employers? Is the Survey of Employers the same survey of all results listed as evidence?**

In September 2016, a revised Survey of Employers, aligned with the Kentucky Teacher Standards, was administered to 28 superintendents in the West Kentucky Educational Cooperative. Superintendents submitted one survey per district. The survey, distributed via *Google Forms*, had five sections: (1)

Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education, (2) Elementary Education, (3) Middle School, (4) Special education, and (5) Secondary/CTE/P-12. Respondents rated ‘typical’ EPP graduates hired by the school district over the past 3 years using a 5-point Likert scale with Excellent (5), Average (3), and Poor (1). Survey results provided a springboard for focus group discussions during the fall 2016 Partner Advisory Council meeting.

Employer Survey items will continue to evolve to align with Kentucky’s *Certified Evaluation Plans* which evaluate in-service teachers using Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching domains. The EPP will work with the Kentucky Collaboration for Quality Data team and P-12 administrators to refine the employer survey instrument to address current initiatives.

#### **4. CAEP Feedback: Who completes the Completer Satisfaction Survey that is part of the Completer Satisfaction evidence?**

The completer survey that was submitted as evidence in the SSR was administered at the Teacher Leader Capstone event attended by graduates of the EPP. This was a convenience sample.

### **Standard Four, Task 3 SSR *Excerpt Clarifications/Confirmations***

- 1. CAEP Feedback:** “An interdepartmental team, Dr. Jacqueline Hansen (Director of Assessment), Dr. Meagan Musselman (Coordinator of the MA Teacher Leader program), Dr. Dusty Reed (Assistant Professor), and Dr. Yuejin Xu (Associate Professor) designed a survey instrument to capture employers’ perceptions of the quality of graduates’ preparedness to teach P-12 students. Dr. Marty Dunham established the content validity of the instrument” (Employer Perceptions, Evidence item #8).

**EPP Clarification:** The interdepartmental team verified that survey items were clearly understood through the use of a pilot group and other reviewers. The EPP did not complete empirical studies of validity or reliability. Dr. Dunham assisted with the analysis of the Student Teacher Evaluation instead.

- 2. CAEP Feedback:** “The provider used a variation of the MSU completer survey templates to conduct completer surveys each semester beginning spring 2014. Survey items addressed degree earned and major field of study; graduation semester/year; employment location, relevance to degree, and type; and graduate school plans” (Completer Perceptions, Evidence item #7).

**EPP Clarification:** This is accurate. The EPP Director of Assessment and representatives from all MSU colleges and schools worked with the University Office of Institutional Effectiveness to design a university-wide template of completer survey items aligned with metrics required by the Kentucky Council of Postsecondary Education. The EPP has continued to use those items as per university procedures. In addition to these required items, however, as per Intervention III of the *Revised SIP (new)*, EPP faculty and P-12 partners will be revisiting and extending future Completer Surveys to add items that will gather information about completers’ perceptions of how their undergraduate program experiences prepared them for their current careers.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** “Because of the difficulty of obtaining current completer contact information, the survey response rate has been historically low (ranging from 1 to 5). Furthermore, survey items mostly target employment and continued education, not preparedness. Therefore, these data are not an accurate representation of all completers’ perceptions of their program preparedness” (Completer Perceptions, Evidence item 7).

**EPP Clarification:** Fall 2015 the EPP began administering surveys using *Google Forms*. This process has proven to be an efficient means of reaching program completers and employers. However, procuring current contact information has been an issue. As a result of working with the *Kentucky Collaboration for Quality Data* statewide efforts, the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board has designed a new Graduate Assignment and Certification Information (GACI) database to provide completer contact information and to identify where program completers are employed. This system will allow the EPP to contact completers and their employers. This system just became available fall 2016; the EPP has not had an opportunity to assemble the necessary completer data to administer new surveys yet. Because the GACI database will provide a way for the EPP to identify the location and current contact information for program completers and employers, the EPP will be able to administer completer and employer surveys using current contact information, thus increasing the response return rate. The EPP will continue to work with the Kentucky Collaboration for Quality Data team to explore the possibility of tracking completers in neighboring states. This would further increase response rates because the EPP is located in a section of Kentucky that is in close proximity to multiple states.

Intervention III of the *Revised SIP (new)* focuses upon maintaining an active partnership with state agencies to develop a statewide system, enhancing current completer and employer surveys to gather meaningful feedback to inform program improvement, and developing a process for gathering input from focus groups. These actions will provide additional, authentic data to assess completers’ preparedness as perceived by completers and employers.

4. **CAEP Feedback:** “To gain additional insight into employers’ satisfaction of completers’ preparedness, faculty conducted a focus group session with seven employers Spring 2016. Participants are current public school district administrators and graduate students in ADM 759 *Instructional Planning in Education*, a course in the EPP’s doctoral program” (Employer Perceptions, Evidence item #8).

**EPP Clarification:** The intent of this focus group session was to gain additional insight into employers’ satisfaction of completers’ preparedness using a convenience sample. The Offsite Report expressed the concern of a possible conflict of interest between focus group participants and focus group leaders due to employment or involvement with the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program as Interns, so the EPP assembled a new focus group. Participants must have already completed the Internship and be teachers in an area school. Eight participants were identified. The licensure areas for these students represented a range of educator preparation programs. The Focus Group leader, an experienced qualitative researcher, is not an instructor in the

undergraduate educator preparation programs. The focus group is scheduled for October 18, so results are not available at the time of this submission. However, results will be available at the time of the onsite visit.

5. **CAEP Feedback:** “To gain additional insight into completers’ satisfaction with their preparedness, faculty interviewed graduate students in EDU 600 *Introduction to Teacher Leader*. Questions were developed by Dr. Jacqueline Hansen (Director of Assessment), Dr. Meagan Musselman (Coordinator of the MA Teacher Leader program), Dr. Dusty Reed (Assistant Professor), and Dr. Yuejin Xu (Associate Professor). Questions were vetted with the CAEP Leadership Team before the session commenced” (Completer Perceptions, Evidence item #7).

**EPP Clarification:** The intent of this focus group session was to gain insight into completers’ satisfaction with their preparedness. A convenience sample was used. Questions were vetted with the CAEP Leadership Team (Dean, Assistant Dean, Director of Teacher Education Services, Department Chairs, Director of Teacher Quality Institute, and Director of Kentucky Academy of Technology Education) before meeting with completers.

Intervention III of the *Revised SIP (new)* focuses upon maintaining an active partnership with state agencies to develop a statewide system, enhancing current completer and employer surveys to gather meaningful feedback to inform program improvement, and developing a process for gathering input from focus groups. These actions will provide additional, authentic data to assess completers’ preparedness as perceived by completers and employers.

## Standard Four, Task 3 *Additional Questions*

### 1. CAEP Feedback: How will response rates be improved for all surveys?

Fall 2015 the EPP began administering surveys using *Google Forms*. This process has proven to be an efficient means of reaching program completers and employers. However, procuring current contact information has been an issue. As a result of working with the *Kentucky Collaboration for Quality Data* statewide efforts, the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board has designed a new Graduate Assignment and Certification Information (GACI) database to provide completer contact information and to identify where program completers are employed. This system will allow the EPP to contact completers and their employers. This system just became available fall 2016; the EPP has not had an opportunity to assemble the necessary completer data to administer new surveys yet. Because the GACI database will provide a way for the EPP to identify the location and current contact information for program completers and employers, the EPP will be able to administer completer and employer surveys using current contact information, thus increasing the response return rate. The EPP will continue to work with the Kentucky Collaboration for Quality Data to explore the possibility of tracking completers in neighboring states. This will further increase response rates because the EPP is located in a section of Kentucky that is in close proximity to multiple states.

In past years, the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board administered the *New Teacher Survey* every other year to interns, resource teachers, and university supervisors. Recently, the EPSB

decided to administer the New Teacher Survey every year. Principals will now have an opportunity to respond to the survey. Furthermore, the EPSB will provide data disaggregated by program to inform program improvement (*EPSB Memo-new*).

Intervention III of the *Revised SIP (new)* focuses upon maintaining an active partnership with state agencies to develop a statewide system, enhancing current completer and employer surveys to gather meaningful feedback to inform program improvement, and developing a process for gathering input from focus groups. These actions will provide additional, authentic data to assess completers' preparedness as perceived by completers and employers.

## **2. CAEP Feedback: How was the relationship of the faculty instructor to student focus group participant addressed? (Or, how could it be addressed?)**

In response to concerns expressed in the Offsite Report of a possible conflict of interest between focus group participants and focus group leaders due to employment or involvement with the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program as Interns, the EPP assembled a new focus group. Participants must have already completed the Internship and be teachers in an area school. Eight participants were identified. The licensure areas for these students represented a range of educator preparation programs. The Focus Group leader, an experienced qualitative researcher, is not an instructor in the undergraduate educator preparation programs. The focus group is scheduled for October 18, so results are not available at the time of this submission. However, results will be available at the time of the onsite visit.

## **Standard Four, Task Four SSR Excerpt Clarification**

- 1. CAEP Feedback:** "To analyze impact on students at this time, the EPP used the District Placement Map to identify districts who employed the most program completers. Student achievement in 8 of 17 districts that employed our completers ranked in the 90th percentile or above. Students in three districts ranked in the 47-63 percentiles. Because of aggregated results and lack of completer-student correlation, the provider can infer but not definitively state MSU completers caused the high rankings. A definite correlation will be possible once the new KCEWS system is in place." (SSR, p. 37)

**EPP Clarification:** EPP data on completers' impact on student achievement were not available at the time of the SSR submission. EPP representatives have continued to participate actively in this statewide collaborative effort to address data needs. A 2015-16 AACTE mini-grant provided funding for multiple group meetings; one of the major topics was EPP's access to completers' impact on student achievement data. The Education Professional Standards Board has designed a system for providing annual completers' impact on student achievement. This EPP is one of the first IHEs in the state to receive impact on student learning data! The EPP received these data October 12, 2016. The *Program Impact Report (new)* will be shared with faculty and leadership

as part of the continuous improvement process. Data will be shared with stakeholders through the EPP-wide and program-specific advisory councils to inform program improvement.

## **Standard Four, Task Four *Additional Questions***

### **1. CAEP Feedback: When will data be available to EPPs on completer impact on student achievement? Will it be disaggregated by EPP?**

EPP data on completers' impact on student achievement were not available at the time of the SSR submission. EPP representatives have continued to participate actively in this statewide collaborative effort to address data needs. A 2015-16 AACTE mini-grant provided funding for multiple group meetings; one of the major topics was EPP's access to completers' impact on student achievement data. The Education Professional Standards Board has designed a system for providing annual completers' impact on student achievement. This EPP is one of the first IHEs in the state to receive impact on student learning data! The EPP received these data October 11, 2016. The *Program Impact Report (new)* will be shared with faculty and leadership as part of the continuous improvement process. Data will be shared with stakeholders through the EPP-wide and program-specific advisory councils to inform program improvement. About 96% of EPP completers are attributed to *Expected* or *High* levels of Student Growth and about 95% of EPP completers were viewed as *Accomplished* or *Exemplary* in the classroom. These results are the same as, or a little higher than, the statewide EPP average.

### **2. CAEP Feedback: Will data from district Certified Evaluation Plans be made available to EPPs? If so, when? Will the results be disaggregated by EPP?**

Aggregated Certified Evaluation Plan data for EPP completers who met all criteria for inclusion in the Impact Study were reported. As per districts' *Certified Evaluation Plans*, schools began using the Professional Growth Evaluation System to evaluate in-service teachers in 2015. Each teacher is formally evaluated at least once every three years. For data analysis purposes, the state matched all MSU graduates from 2010-2015 to 2015 AY PGES data. Principals rated teachers' proficiency using a three-point scale: developing - accomplished-exemplary. Sources of evidence included student voice surveys, professional growth plans, and classroom observations. Aggregated data indicated 94.8% of EPP completers rated at the accomplished or exemplary levels in "overall professional practice." Completers demonstrated proficiency at meeting all four domains of the Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching model. The two strongest domains were planning/preparation and professional responsibility. The PGES Overall Summative Score for EPP Completers was about 95% at the *Accomplished* or *Exemplary* level. These data are captured in the *Program Impact Report (new)*.

### **3. CAEP Feedback: Will information from the KY Intern Program be made available disaggregated by EPP?**

EPP leadership looked at the *KTIP Report (new)* available through the EPSB Web Portal. A close inspection of these reports found them to be discrepant from the EPP records of KTIP placements. For example, for 2014-2015, the system indicated 13 KTIP placements for the EPP, when in fact there were about 200 placements. The EPP will continue to pursue custom reports from EPSB.

### **4. CAEP Feedback: Can an update be provided on the progress of the KY Collaborative for Data Quality?**

EPP representatives have continued to participate actively in this statewide collaborative effort to address data needs. A 2015-16 AACTE mini-grant provided funding for multiple group meetings to brainstorm employer survey items, explore ways to access impact on student achievement data, and provide teacher educator input to improve access to statewide data. The Education Professional Standards Board has upgraded and refined its data dashboard, created at-a-glance reviews of EPP programs, disseminated New Teacher Survey data graphics, created a Graduate Assignment and Certification Information database, and refined processes for administering the New Teacher Survey. This EPP is one of the first IHEs in the state to receive impact on student learning data! Completers' Overall Student Growth Ratings were based upon student growth goals (district data) and student growth percentiles (state data), or change in individual student's performance over time. State data were based upon state exams administered for specific subjects at specific grade levels. The provided pie graph depicted EPP completers' PGES overall student growth at three levels: low-expected-high. Aggregated data revealed that 96.5% of EPP program completers were rated at the expected or high levels in their ability to positively impact student achievement. The EPP received these data October 12, 2016. The *Program Impact Report (new)* will be shared with faculty and leadership as part of the continuous improvement process. Data will be shared with stakeholders through the EPP-wide and program-specific advisory councils to inform program improvement.

### **5. CAEP Feedback: How is input from the Advisory Council used?**

There are two-levels of advisory that occur through the year, EPP-wide and program-specific. In the fall, the Superintendent Advisory Council and the Partner Advisory Council meet to review changes in programs from the prior academic year and to study outcomes data generated by EPP-wide assessments. Meeting discussions are summarized. The Student Advisory Council meets at least twice yearly to share their perspectives of EPP and college programs, procedures, and initiatives (*Advisory Council- new*).

The Administrative Cabinet reviews EPP-wide advisory council meeting minutes. The Cabinet decides how to address concerns and initiatives at the appropriate level with relevant stakeholders. Working groups' recommendations are approved by the Administrative Cabinet. The EPP shares information about changes and decisions resulting from stakeholder input at the next EPP-wide advisory council meetings.

Program coordinators and faculty host program-specific advisory councils. Participants include program faculty, current and former undergraduate and graduate candidates, and P-12 partners. Advisory Council

meeting minutes capture stakeholders' concerns and suggestions. Program coordinators and faculty review stakeholders' input and study program-level data generated by key course assessments and EPP-wide assessments to inform program improvement.

Intervention II of the *Revised SIP (new)* refines the EPP's quality assurance system by establishing and supporting EPP-wide and program-specific advisory councils and enhancing the shared decision-making processes. Eliciting stakeholder input and working with P-12 partners to make decisions to improve programs will result in improved educator preparation.

## **Standard Four Areas for Improvement**

### **1. Area for Improvement: The EPP provided limited evidence of standard-aligned data demonstrating completer impact or a sufficient plan for future access to these data.**

EPP data on completers' impact on student achievement were not available from the state at the time of the SSR submission. EPP representatives continued to participate actively in this statewide collaborative effort to address data needs. The EPP received a preliminary report of these data October 11, 2016. The EPP received these data October 11, 2016. Completers' Overall Student Growth Ratings were based upon student growth goals (district data) and student growth percentiles (state data), or change in individual student's performance over time. State data were based upon state exams administered for specific subjects at specific grade levels. The provided pie graph depicted EPP completers' PGES overall student growth at three levels: low-expected-high. Aggregated data revealed that 96.5% of EPP program completers were rated at the expected or high levels in their ability to positively impact student achievement. The *Program Impact Report (new)* was shared with the Superintendent Advisory Council on October 14, 2016 and will be used with faculty and other stakeholders through the EPP-wide and program-specific advisory councils to inform program improvement. Per Objective II.7 of the Selected Improvement Plan, information on the report will be included along with the other eight outcome and impact impact measures.

### **2. Area for Improvement: Data collection and tools for determining completer and employer satisfaction have limited validity and reliability.**

The EPP submitted EPP-Wide Assessments for Early Review August 2015. CAEP provided feedback on these instruments June 2016. Because the EPP did not have an opportunity to revise the instruments before submitting the SSR March 2016, working with P-12 partners to establish validity and reliability of the instruments has become an important aspect of the *Revised SIP (new)*.

Intervention III focuses upon maintaining an active partnership with state agencies to develop a statewide system, enhancing current completer and employer surveys to gather meaningful feedback to inform program improvement, and developing a process for gathering input from

focus groups. These actions will provide additional, authentic data to assess completers' preparedness as perceived by completers and employers.

To increase response rates on completer and employer surveys, the EPP has maintained a close working relationship with the *Kentucky Collaboration for Quality Data* statewide efforts. Recently, the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board has designed a new Graduate Assignment and Certification Information (GACI) database to provide completer contact information and to identify where program completers are employed. This system will allow the EPP to contact completers and their employers. This system just became available fall 2016; the EPP has not had an opportunity to assemble the necessary completer data to administer new surveys yet. Because the GACI database will provide a way for the EPP to identify the location and current contact information for program completers and employers, the EPP will be able to administer completer and employer surveys using current contact information, thus increasing the response return rate. The EPP will continue to work with the statewide team to explore the possibility of tracking completers in neighboring states. This will further increase response rates because the EPP is located in a section of Kentucky that is in close proximity to multiple states.

In past years, the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board administered the *New Teacher Survey* every other year to interns, resource teachers, and university supervisors. Recently, the EPSB decided to administer the New Teacher Survey every year. Principals will now have an opportunity to respond to the survey. Furthermore, the EPSB will provide data disaggregated by program to inform program improvement (*EPSB Memo-new*).

Feedback from the Offsite Report indicated that documentation of validity by subject matter experts was considered as face validity only and was therefore insufficient. Objective II.4 of the *Revised SIP (new)* addresses these concerns. Significant steps have been taken to put into motion systems to ensure validity and reliability.

Per the Revised Selected Improvement Plan, the EPP Administrative Cabinet approved the *EPP Assessment Guidelines (new)* October 12, 2016. This policy governs the validation of EPP-wide instruments by articulating the roles and responsibilities across the EPP for the determination and maintenance of assessment validity and reliability. An Assessment Task Force, comprised of undergraduate program coordinators and P-12 partners, department chairs, the Director of Teacher Education Services, and representatives of the Dean's office will collaboratively establish and maintain the validity and reliability of assessment instruments.

While not specified in the policy, each EPP-wide assessment will be examined using the Lawshe Method to determine the Content Validity Index (CVI) for individual items and the overall instrument. The instrument will be comprised of items receiving the highest CVI ratings. The EPP will establish interrater reliability in two ways. Two raters will rate the same "live" administration of an assessment or multiple raters will participate in a training session during which they calibrate the instrument using a recorded scenario. Assessments will be revalidated every three years or sooner if substantial changes warrant revalidation.

## STANDARD FIVE: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement & Capacity

### Standard Five, Task One *SSR Excerpt Clarification*

1. **CAEP Feedback:** “Regular program and department meetings provide opportunities for the faculty to voice evaluative thoughts about institutional operations. Department heads are part of the EPP leadership team; they bring forward discussion items. Faculty have the opportunity evaluate the dean and department chairs.”

**EPP Clarification:** EPP faculty meet regularly as evidenced by the program and department meeting minutes posted on the *LiveText* Exhibit Center and the COEHS intranet site ([http://coehsnet.murraystate.edu/shared\\_governance/](http://coehsnet.murraystate.edu/shared_governance/)). During those meetings, faculty representatives for collegiate and university committees share committee updates and department chairs share current collegiate and university initiatives. Department chairs share faculty’s input on collegiate and university initiatives with members of the Administrative Cabinet to inform EPP-wide improvement.

Each year, the MSU Faculty Senate administers a survey instrument whereby faculty can evaluate department chairs, the dean, and university administrators. As per university policy, the dean administers a survey to department faculty to evaluate department chairs’ proficiency. Results are shared with administrators to precipitate growth in their ability to lead effectively.

### Standard Five, Task One *Additional Question*

1. **CAEP Feedback: Are there evidences to support operational effectiveness as part of quality assurance?**

In the Self-Study Report, the EPP defined the ‘quality assurance system’ in the narrowest of terms. Elements presented as evidence were solely related to the programmatic continuous improvement. Further review of CAEP materials, specifically pages 102-103 in the CAEP Handbook, indicated that a ‘quality assurance system’ is comprised of the procedures, processes, and structures that ensure the quality of hiring, admissions, courses, program design, graduates and other functions within the EPP. A description of systems critical to quality assurance is provided as new evidence below.

#### ***Structure and Governance***

The EPP is primarily housed within a College of Education and Human Services in three departments, Elementary and Early Childhood Education, Adolescent, Career and Special Education, and Educational Studies, Leadership and Counseling. Each department is led by a Department Chair who reports directly to the Dean of the College.

Four supporting units assist the EPP departments: (1) Teacher Education Services, (2) Teacher Quality Institute, (3) the Recruitment and Retention Center, and (4) the Kentucky Academy for Technology Education. The Director of Teacher Education Services reports directly to the Dean. The Director of the

Kentucky Academy for Technology Education and the Coordinators for the Teacher Quality Institute and Recruitment and Retention Center report to the Assistant Dean.

The Dean, Assistant Dean, Department Chairs, Directors, and Coordinators meet bi-monthly as the Administrative Cabinet for the College. The Administrative Cabinet is responsible for strategic decision-making and planning for the College, inclusive of college-wide policy related to finances, curriculum, personnel evaluation, student management, resource allocations, and other operational decisions as needed. The College Policy Manual is available online at <http://coehsnet.murraystate.edu/policy/>.

### ***Personnel Procedures***

Vacated faculty lines are evaluated within the context of programmatic needs within the department, college, and university. Accreditation requirements are part of this decision-making. Faculty and Department Chairs collaborate to develop position requirements and responsibilities, as well as proposed salary. Permission must be received from the Dean, Provost, and President of the University to advertise a position, to interview applicants, and to hire faculty. The ***Faculty Hiring Guide (new)*** depicts the flow of the hiring process.

The University and the College establish development processes to support the transition of new faculty to their new roles at the EPP. The University's Faculty Development Center offers targeted support through the first year of employment. The College provides a faculty development process designed to support and promote the retention of first- and second-year faculty. On October 12, 2016 the Administrative Cabinet of the EPP ratified a ***Diversity Action Plan (new)*** to guide efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty and students.

University and College policy guides the evaluation of faculty, with all faculty participating in the evaluation process each year. Department Chairs and Directors are responsible for the evaluation of all faculty and staff within their units. The Assistant Dean or unit Directors evaluate staff within coordinating units. The Faculty Senate coordinates an evaluation of administration (Chair, Dean, Provost, and President) by the Faculty.

Tenure and promotion policy is established by the College within the context of University guidelines. Collegiate tenure and promotion policy encompasses the traditional areas of teaching, scholarship and service, but with an emphasis on teaching. Guidelines are provided to ensure both transparency and rigor are present in the process. The tenure and promotion policy is posted on the College intranet.

### ***Curriculum***

Academic faculty are responsible for the development and delivery of programs and curriculum. New and revised programs and courses are reviewed by Department Curriculum Committees before progressing through the collegiate Undergraduate Studies or Graduate Studies Committee. Proposals that affect candidate licensure are additionally routed through the Policy and Review Committee for Educational Certification and Accreditation (PRC). This committee is comprised of representatives from across programs in the EPP, representatives from Arts and Science faculty, and public school teachers and administrators. Any proposal from any college that affects certification must be routed through this committee prior to review at the university level. Once programs exit the PRC, they are heard by the

University Academic Council. This curriculum governance system provides checks and balances to allow for decentralized program decision-making while ensuring adherence to licensure and accreditation requirements.

### ***Continuous Assessment of Programs***

The effectiveness of EPP programs is monitored by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness through the University's continuous assessment process. Programs' annual Academic Plans use Student Learning Outcomes comprised of two formative and two summative assessments per outcome. Assessments include a combination of program-specific Key Course Assessments or EPP-wide assessments. *LiveText* is typically used to archive program-specific assessment data for collection and use by program faculty in continuous assessment process. Program coordinators work with program faculty and program-specific advisory councils to identify SLOs, analyze formative/summative data, and determine how results will inform program improvement. Input from the EPP-wide Advisory groups implemented through Objective II.1 of the ***Revised SIP (new)*** also informs the work of the program faculty and program-specific advisory groups. Each fall, programs report progress on their Academic Plans and describe how results have been used to inform program improvement. Completer and employer feedback may also be used in the program assessment process. These program data support SACS, EPSB, CAEP, and Kentucky Council Postsecondary Education accreditation efforts.

### ***Continuous Assessment of Candidates***

The progress of candidates through EPP programs is monitored at distinct Checkpoints. Table 1 summarized these checkpoints, the requirements and purpose of each. Faculty provide feedback to candidates through Key Assessments, which are established by program faculty to measure outcomes viewed as critical to candidate development. (Note: Aggregated data from these Key Assessments may part of the Continuous Assessment of Programs).

Table 1. *Summary of Candidate Assessment Checkpoints*

Checkpoint	Requirements	Purpose
1: Admission to Teacher Education	Passing scores on the CASE or GRE; B or better in ENG 105, COM 161, MAT 117 or higher, EDU 103 or equivalent Overall GPA of 2.75 Complete an admission interview	Ensure candidate's basic knowledge of math, reading, writing, and communication skills; Verification of general academic capacity and professional dispositions.
2: Admission to Student Teaching	Completion of the 200 field hours and required components; 2.75 Overall GPA; 2.75 GPA in Major or Areas and 2.75 in Professional Education; Complete a student teaching placement interview.	Ensure candidate's familiarity with the school setting and capacity to positively impact student learning as teaching responsibilities are given during student teaching; Verification of academic and dispositional

		qualifications.
3: Completion of Program	Completion of Student Teaching; Passing score on Principles of Learning and Teaching Exam; Passing Score on PRAXIS II; Verification of 2.75 GPA Overall, in major/area and professional education.	Verification of candidates' demonstrated abilities to positively impact student learning and to contribute to the profession. Verification of academic and pedagogical qualifications.

### ***EPP Accountability***

Objective II.7 of the Revised Selected Improvement Plan establishes a plan to publicize CAEP's Eight Impact Factors and Outcomes on the EPP webpage. This information will be published on the webpage and also distributed to partner school districts.

### **Standard Five, Task Two *SSR Excerpt Clarification***

1. **CAEP Feedback:** "Due to lack of a current statewide system of measuring completer effectiveness and the positive impact on P-12 student learning, the EPP uses standardized test results, online school report card (where available), and other indicators of influence of our graduates on student achievement. As data become available to institutions of higher education, the EPP will use completer data as another critical indicator of our program's effectiveness."

**EPP Clarification:** EPP data on completers' impact on student achievement were not available from the state at the time of the SSR submission. EPP representatives continued to participate actively in this statewide collaborative effort to address data needs. Consequently, the EPP received a preliminary *Program Impact Report (new)* of these data October 11, 2016. The report was shared with the Superintendent Advisory Council on October 14, 2016 and will be used with faculty and other stakeholders through the EPP-wide and program-specific advisory councils to inform program improvement. Per Objective II.7 of the Selected Improvement Plan, information on the report will be included along with the other eight outcome and impact measures.

### **Standard Five, Task Two *Additional Questions***

#### **1. CAEP Feedback: What is evidence of impact?**

EPP data on completers' impact on student achievement were not available from the state at the time of the SSR submission. The *Program Impact Report (new)*, received October 11, 2016 from the Kentucky Center for Education & Workforce Statistics (KCEWS), provided feedback regarding 289 EPP completers who met the criteria for the study. Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) data, including the Student Growth data, were analyzed for the EPP completers. Results indicated that about 94% of completers were rated as *Accomplished* or *Exemplary* on the through the PGES system. Moreover, about 96% of completers' classrooms showed *Expected* or *High* Student Growth. Data from

this report were shared with the Superintendent Advisory Council on October 14, 2016 and will be used with faculty and other stakeholders through the EPP-wide and program-specific advisory councils to inform program improvement. Per Objective II.7 of the Selected Improvement Plan, information on the report will be included along with the other eight outcome and impact measures on the EPP webpage.

The EPP is committed to leverage other evidence of impact that can inform the continuous improvement process. Intervention III of the Selected Improvement Plan focuses specifically on actions of the EPP to obtain this evidence. Since the submission of the SSR, new evidence in addition to the KCEWS report have resulted from the current implementation of the SIP objectives. Each objective, the evidence created, and next steps are discussed below:

Object III.2 On September 16, 2016 an Employer Feedback survey was administered electronically to all member districts of the West Kentucky Education Cooperative (WKEC). The survey was sectioned by licensure areas: (1) Interdisciplinary Early Childhood, (2) Elementary, (3) Middle School, (4) Special Education, and (5) Secondary/CTE. Respondents rated completers' teaching proficiency using a 5-point Likert with (1) Poor and (5) Excellent. Survey items were aligned with the Kentucky Teacher Standards. An expanded, interdepartmental accreditation leadership team reviewed and approved the survey. Twenty-seven surveys were distributed and nine were returned (33% ROR). Results of the survey were shared with the Partner Advisory Council during the September 29, 2016 meeting. Advisory Council members (teachers, principals, and central office administrators) reviewed the survey as a whole group and then attended concurrent breakout focus group sessions organized by area. Notes were taken in each session. Please reference the *Advisory Council (new)* document to review the meeting agenda, presentation, survey data, participant list, and focus group feedback. Interdepartmental faculty attended the meeting and focus group sessions to actively listen to council members' comments and suggestions.

Objective III.3 The EPP followed guidance from a July 14, 2016 CAEP publication for EPPs in states with limited data access. This publication suggests a protocol whereby a small group of completers from across several licensure areas is identified for deeper, qualitative study. In this instance, a focus group of teachers was purposively selected based upon the following criteria (1) completed the EPP program, (2) employed as a teacher, (3) completed KTIP, and (3) less than three years of experience. These criteria ensured that completers were familiar with EPP programs and were actively developing as new teachers. Also, it was important that these teachers had completed KTIP so that there was no perceived conflict of interest between the university and the student. The initial focus group meeting will establish a baseline, with follow-up via additional face-to-face or virtual group meetings to follow over the course of the year. This meeting will occur on October 18, 2016 so results are not available at this time, but will be available at the time of the onsite visit.

Objective III.4 The EPP is collaborating with the MSU Office of Institutional Effectiveness to explore strategies to improve survey response rates. Work is in the initial stages and current response rates are being reviewed. Proposed strategies include the use of data from the Graduate Assignment and Certification Inquiry Report to more accurately locate completers for the purpose of completing this survey.

## Standard Five, Task Three *SSR Excerpt Clarifications*

1. **CAEP Feedback:** “The EPP gathers feedback through advisory councils, focus group sessions, surveys, and collaborative development and implementation of clinical experiences.” (see standard 2)

**EPP Clarification:** The EPP shares data regarding candidate outcomes with advisory councils at the EPP and program-levels. The EPP-wide advisories (eg, Student Advisory Council, Superintendent Advisory Council, Partner Advisory Council) were put in place as part of Objective II.1 of the Selected Improvement Plan to compliment the program-specific advisories that were already in place. The Partner Advisory met on September 29, 2016, the Student Advisory Council met on October 13, 2016, and the Superintendent Advisory Council met on October 14, 2016. These initial meetings were enormously successful and developed significant momentum toward EPP-wide changes.

An Employer Survey was developed and administered in advance of these meetings and was shared to provide a framework for dialogue and discussion. As the Eight Outcome and Impact Factors are fully developed, those outcomes will also be included, though it was the experience of the facilitator of the Partner Advisory Council that data to support program-specific discussion is most beneficial to the EPP.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** “Meeting minutes provide evidence of databased discussions and decision-making.”

**EPP Clarification:** Program minutes provide insight into program initiatives, challenges, and shared decision-making. EPP faculty and program-specific advisory councils meet regularly as evidenced by the program, department, and advisory council meeting minutes posted on the *LiveText* Exhibit Center and the COEHS intranet site. During department and program meetings, faculty representatives for collegiate and university committees share committee updates and department chairs share current collegiate and university initiatives. Department chairs share faculty’s input on collegiate and university initiatives with members of the Administrative Cabinet to inform EPP-wide improvement. In 2015, the EPP developed a template to create a systemized, uniform approach documenting these meetings. Now, meeting minutes are posted on the COEHS shared governance intranet site at ([http://coehsnet.murraystate.edu/shared\\_governance/](http://coehsnet.murraystate.edu/shared_governance/)). To see key excerpts of sample meeting actions, please see *Sample Meeting Minutes (new)*.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** “Student feedback is captured at multiple points.”

**EPP Clarification:** Student feedback is systematically gathered and addressed through clinical evaluations, course evaluations, New Teacher Survey, and advisory councils.

Upon completion of field experiences, candidates complete a rating form assessing the quantity and quality of field experience hours, the placement, and the quality of the overall experience.

Student teachers complete the *Student Teaching Survey*. EPP faculty and TES staff review this input to adjust future clinical experience placements and activities.

At the end of each semester, candidates complete IAS course evaluations to rate the EPP faculty's effectiveness, content knowledge, academic experiences and course rigor. They also have the opportunity to provide written feedback about the strengths and weaknesses of the course delivery. The Dean, Department Chairs, and faculty review this student input. Results are used to improve course delivery and to identify areas of EPP faculty strength and areas for professional development. Ratings are included and addressed in faculty's tenure, promotion, and annual evaluation documentation.

Preservice candidates participate in the Student Advisory Council (*Advisory Council-new*). Completers participate in focus groups, program-specific advisory councils, and the Partner Advisory Council. Furthermore, interns' perceptions are captured in their responses to the *New Teacher Survey*. This feedback is shared with EPP administrators, faculty, and P-12 partners to inform program improvement. The formal Partner Advisory Council is relatively new; all other elements were in place at the time of the initial SSR submission.

## **Standard Five, Task Three *Additional Questions***

### **1. CAEP Feedback: Is there evidence of stakeholder involvement in the quality assurance system?**

Based upon feedback from the Offsite Report, the EPP took steps to ensure stakeholder involvement in the quality assurance system. Intervention II of the *Revised SIP (new)* provides an overview of steps to strengthen the quality assurance processes of the EPP. Objectives II.1, II.3, and II.6 address stakeholder roles specifically.

Objective II.1 addresses the creation of EPP-wide advisory groups. The purpose of these groups is to provide feedback to EPP data and input framed by EPP data that informs EPP-wide and program-specific changes. The EPP has a long tradition of decentralized continuous improvement with program-specific advisory councils. However, the pace and magnitude of change in recent years complicates the dissemination of information and stretches the capacity of the programs to leverage EPP-wide change. These EPP-wide advisories will serve to leverage change, as needed, across the EPP while allowing the programs to focus on program-specific issues. The EPP has established three EPP-wide advisory councils: the Student Advisory Council, the Superintendent Advisory Council, and the Partner Advisory Council. A description of the composition and focus of each of these advisory groups follows. See the *Advisory Council (new)* document for additional information.

Candidates and completers from programs across the College are asked to serve on the Student Advisory Council, which meets twice per year. The Council is asked to provide insight to College leadership regarding a wide range of topics, including the perceptions regarding the learning environment, instructional quality, college/program expectations, communication, and retention. The Student Advisory

Council was organized during the 2015-2016 academic year and met on October 13, 2016 for the initial meeting for the 2016-2017 academic year.

The Superintendent Advisory Council is comprised of superintendents from the West Kentucky Education Cooperative who lead partner districts and are willing to represent the interests of the WKEC. This group meets twice annually and discusses issues pertinent to them as employers of our program completers. For example, the Employer Feedback Survey would be used to frame discussions of strengths and areas of need for our graduates. This new advisory group met for the first time on October 14, 2016.

The purpose of the Partner Advisory Council is to assist in identifying EPP-wide areas of strength and areas of need. All 27 members of the West Kentucky Education Cooperative are invited to send five district representatives to the Partner Advisory Council. After assisting with an analysis of provided data, the Partner Advisory Council explores possible solutions, with emphasis given to projects involving partnership to address a need. The Partner Advisory Council was new for 2016-2017 and met for the first time on September 29, 2016.

Objective II.3 addresses the need to ensure clear, frequent and two-way communication between the EPP and partners. The EPP allocated resources to support a communications position in 2015-2016. The number and quality of publications and of social media from the college has increased greatly during this period. Furthermore, the EPP is establishing a web page to report key outcomes and impact. By providing stakeholders with more frequent and descriptive information, the quality and frequency of response to requests for feedback has also increased. The EPP is currently at the baseline for this objective, but it is already clear that our efforts are positively impacting stakeholder involvement as evidenced by responses to our requests for assistance.

Objective II.6 addresses efforts to further strengthen the program-specific advisory process by standardizing critical operational aspects of these advisories, such as documentation and frequency of consultation. The EPP is currently at the baseline for this objective.

## **Standard Five, Task Four *SSR Excerpt Clarifications- None***

### **Standard Five, Task Four *Additional Question***

#### **5.D. CAEP Feedback: Where is evidence that eight outcome measures and impact data are monitored?**

The College's Director of Assessment works closely with the Dean's Office, Administrative Cabinet, program coordinators, and EPP faculty to coordinate assessment and accreditation efforts at the university, state, and national levels. The Director of Assessment, Assistant Dean, and Director of Teacher Education Services compile data addressing the eight outcome measures on the annual AIMS report.

Per Objective II.7 of the revised Selected Improvement Plan, the EPP established a web page to provide stakeholders with access to these critical program statistics. The web page is maintained through the Dean's Office and is updated once annually.

### **Standard Five, Task Five *SSR Excerpt Clarifications***

1. **CAEP Feedback:** "Internal consistency reliability was used to assess the consistency of results across items within an assessment."

**EPP Clarification:** In the absence of data from two raters, the assessment work group attempted to establish reliability by looking at the consistency of responses within the questions of an assessment that was administered to measure the same construct through calculations of relationship (eg, Cronbach's Alpha). The *EPP Assessment Guidelines (new)*, adopted by the EPP on October 12, 2016, will require inter-rater reliability rather than internal reliability. This revised process will be consistent with the expectations of CAEP.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** "Results were correlated to the criterion to determine how well they represent the criterion behavior or knowledge."

**EPP Clarification:** In the absence of data from two raters, the assessment work group attempted to establish reliability by looking at the consistency of responses within the questions of an assessment that was administered to measure the same construct through calculations of relationship (eg, Cronbach's Alpha). The *EPP Assessment Guidelines (new)* adopted by the EPP on October 12, 2016 will require inter-rater reliability rather than internal reliability. This revised process will be consistent with the expectations of CAEP.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** "All survey items were aligned with EPSB Kentucky Teacher Standards, EPP professional dispositions or theme, field/practicum experience legislated mandates, and student teaching guidelines."

**EPP Clarification:** The EPP submitted EPP-Wide Assessments for Early Review August 2015. CAEP provided feedback on these instruments June 2016. Because the EPP did not have an opportunity to revise the instruments before submitting the SSR March 2016, working with P-12 partners to establish validity and reliability of the instruments has become an important aspect of the *Revised SIP (new)*.

Feedback from the Offsite Report indicated that documentation of validity by subject matter experts was considered as face validity only and was therefore insufficient. Objective II.4 of revised SIP addresses these concerns. Significant steps have been taken to put into motion systems to ensure validity and reliability.

Per the revised Selected Improvement Plan, the EPP Administrative Cabinet approved the *EPP Assessment Guidelines (new)* October 12, 2016. This policy governs the validation of EPP-wide instruments by articulating the roles and responsibilities across the EPP for the determination and

maintenance of assessment validity and reliability. An Assessment Task Force, comprised of undergraduate program coordinators and P-12 partners, department chairs, the Director of Teacher Education Services, and representatives of the Dean's office will collaboratively establish and maintain the validity and reliability of assessment instruments.

While not specified in the policy, each EPP-wide assessment will be examined using the Lawshe Method to determine the Content Validity Index (CVI) for individual items and the overall instrument. The instrument will be comprised of items receiving the highest CVI ratings. The EPP will establish interrater reliability in two ways. Two raters will rate the same "live" administration of an assessment or multiple raters will participate in a training session during which they calibrate the instrument using a recorded scenario. Assessments will be revalidated every three years or sooner if substantial changes warrant revalidation.

## **Standard Five, Task Five *Additional Question***

### **1. CAEP Feedback: Where are reliability and validity data?**

The EPP submitted EPP-Wide Assessments for Early Review August 2015. CAEP provided feedback on these instruments June 2016. Because the EPP did not have an opportunity to revise the instruments before submitting the SSR March 2016, working with P-12 partners to establish validity and reliability of the instruments has become an important aspect of the *Revised SIP (new)*.

Feedback from the Offsite Report indicated that documentation of validity by subject matter experts was considered as face validity only and was therefore insufficient. Objective II.4 of the revised SIP addresses these concerns. Significant steps have been taken to put into motion systems to ensure validity and reliability.

Per the revised Selected Improvement Plan, the EPP Administrative Cabinet approved the *EPP Assessment Guidelines (new)* October 12, 2016. This policy governs the validation of EPP-wide instruments by articulating the roles and responsibilities across the EPP for the determination and maintenance of assessment validity and reliability. An Assessment Task Force, comprised of undergraduate program coordinators and P-12 partners, department chairs, the Director of Teacher Education Services, and representatives of the Dean's office will collaboratively establish and maintain the validity and reliability of assessment instruments.

While not specified in the policy, each EPP-wide assessment will be examined using the Lawshe Method to determine the Content Validity Index (CVI) for individual items and the overall instrument. The instrument will be comprised of items receiving the highest CVI ratings. The EPP will establish interrater reliability in two ways. Two raters will rate the same "live" administration of an assessment or multiple raters will participate in a training session during which they calibrate the instrument using a recorded scenario. Assessments will be revalidated every three years or sooner if substantial changes warrant revalidation.

## **Standard Five Areas for Improvement**

### **1. Area for Improvement: The EPP does not have a consistent, coherent quality assurance system.**

The EPP has a well-defined, consistent system of quality assurance. Functional areas inclusive of personnel, curriculum, and assessment are shaped and monitored within the context of a system of shared governance. The EPP has a strong tradition of decentralized processes driving the continuous improvement process at the program level. The Revised Selected Improvement Plan establishes an agenda for enhancing the existing system by building additional, stronger P-12 partnerships to facilitate the EPP's ability to quickly adapt to ever-changing needs of schools and candidates.

### **2. Area for Improvement: the EPP does not involve appropriate stakeholders in program evaluation, improvement, and models of excellence.**

The EPP's P-12 partnerships are evidenced through the long-term Memorandums of Agreement maintained with school districts throughout our region. Data collected from cooperating teachers' formal evaluations of candidates' field experiences and student teaching experiences are used as part of the MSU/EPP Continuous Assessment process to inform program improvement. P-12 partners, current candidates, and program completers participate in EPP program-specific advisory councils to help faculty maintain program quality and to keep programs moving forward. EPP faculty also receive stakeholder feedback by analyzing the results from focus groups, employer surveys, completer surveys, KDE/EPsB PGES Program Impact Report, and New Teacher Survey. They analyze these data as part of the MSU/EPP Continuous Assessment process.

Furthermore, many program graduates and other master educators serve as adjunct instructors for the 2+2 programs, especially at the regional campuses. Undergraduate courses are taught on a rotating basis at those sites. Each semester, adjunct instructors for the undergraduate courses come to campus for an all-day 2+2 Team Session to be appraised of current EPP initiatives, receive professional development, co-develop key course assessments, and participate in work sessions with course instructional teams to ensure a consistent, quality delivery of programs at all site. Their insights as expert practitioners and as adjunct instructors is invaluable.

EPP involves a variety of stakeholders in a variety of settings for the purpose of program evaluation and continuous improvement. Candidates evaluate course instructors. Candidates, P-12 Partners, and content area university faculty collaborate on the Teacher Education Committee and Policy and Review Committee for Certification and Accreditation.

The EPP reaches out to school partners to assist with innovative projects and approaches for candidate preparation. The current Professional Development School efforts with the elementary and middle school residency program are examples of involvement described in the responses to

Standard Two Excerpt Clarification #1 as well as the *PDS MS Model*, *PDS Central Elem*, *PDS Clark Elem (new)* documents.

The EPP took steps to ensure stakeholder involvement in data analysis and dialogue to inform program improvement by defining stakeholders' roles in the *Revised SIP (new)*. Intervention II of the revised SIP provides an overview of steps to strengthen the quality assurance processes of the EPP. Objectives II.1, II.3, and II.6 address stakeholder roles specifically.

Objective II.1 addresses the creation of EPP-wide advisory groups. The purpose of these groups is to provide feedback to EPP data and input framed by EPP data that informs EPP-wide and program-specific changes. The EPP has a long tradition of decentralized continuous improvement with program-specific advisory councils. However, the pace and magnitude of change in recent years complicates the dissemination of information and stretches the capacity of the programs to leverage EPP-wide change. These EPP-wide advisories will serve to leverage change, as needed, across the EPP while allowing the programs to focus on program-specific issues. The EPP has established three EPP-wide advisory councils: the Student Advisory Council, the Superintendent Advisory Council, and the Partner Advisory Council. A description of the composition and focus of each of these advisory groups follows.

Candidates and completers from programs across the College are asked to serve on the Student Advisory Council, which meets twice per year. The Council is asked to provide insight to College leadership regarding a wide range of topics, including the perceptions regarding the learning environment, instructional quality, college/program expectations, communication, and retention. The Student Advisory Council was organized during the 2015-2016 academic year and met on October 13, 2016 for the initial meeting for the 2016-2017 academic year.

The Superintendent Advisory Council is comprised of superintendents from the West Kentucky Education Cooperative who lead partner districts and are willing to represent the interests of the WKEC. This group meets twice annually and discusses issues pertinent to them as employers of our program completers. For example, the Employer Feedback Survey would be used to frame discussions of strengths and areas of need for our graduates. This new advisory group met for the first time on October 14, 2016.

The purpose of the Partner Advisory Council is to assist in identifying EPP-wide areas of strength and areas of need. All 27 members of the West Kentucky Education Cooperative are invited to send five district representatives to the Partner Advisory Council. After assisting with an analysis of provided data, the Partner Advisory Council explores possible solutions, with emphasis given to projects involving partnership to address a need. The Partner Advisory Council was new for 2016-2017 and met for the first time on September 29, 2016.

Objective II.3 addresses the need to ensure clear, frequent and two-way communication between the EPP and partners. The EPP allocated resources to support a communications position in 2015-2016. The number and quality of publications and of social media from the college has increased greatly during this period. Furthermore, the EPP is establishing a web page to report

key outcomes and impact. By providing stakeholders with more frequent and descriptive information, the quality and frequency of response to requests for feedback has also increased. The EPP is currently at the Baseline for this objective, but it is already clear that our efforts are positively impacting stakeholder involvement as evidenced by responses to our requests for assistance.

## DIVERSITY

### *Diversity Additional Questions*

#### **1. CAEP Feedback: How is Diversity defined, and what competencies have been identified as being taught and assessed?**

The College of Education and Human Services *Diversity Action Plan (new)* puts forward the following definition: Diversity, as a concept, describes an inclusive community of people with varied human characteristics, ideas, and worldviews related, but not limited, to race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, religion, color, creed, national origin, age, disability, socioeconomic status, life experiences, geographical region, or ancestry. Diversity in concept expects the creation by institutions of a safe, supportive and nurturing environment that honors and respects those differences. The Diversity Task Force frames diversity in terms of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy, which has three tenets: academic success, cultural competence, and critical consciousness.

Per Objectives I.1 and I.2 of the *Revised SIP (new)*, a process is underway to align the curriculum to ensure the proper growth and development of candidates in the area of diversity. Below is the current list of instructional objectives aligned to the Kentucky Teaching Standards and InTASC standards.

- to critically evaluate specific teaching/learning situations and/or programs (KTS #7; InTASC #9)
- to compare concepts of diversity, individual and institutional racism and sexism, prejudice, ethnocentrism, stereotypes, discrimination, segregation, desegregation, resegregation, assimilation, cultural pluralism, equity and equality (KTS #3; InTASC #3)
- to identify historical events and legal precedents for educational equity and equal educational opportunities (KTS # ; InTASC #1)
- to incorporate a diverse and social justice perspective in teaching (KTS #3; InTASC #2, 3);
- to plan and implement instruction that values and supports diverse student needs and assessment data (KTS #3,4; InTASC #3 )
- to understand how one's background and development shape one's worldview, attitudes and behaviors towards diversity (KTS #7; InTASC #9)
- to demonstrate consistent, responsive, and caring behavior that respect for the rights and responsibilities of others (KTS #10; InTasc #10)

#### **2. CAEP Feedback: How are the diverse placements for field experiences made? What are the skills being assessed in these placements and how?**

Beginning September 1, 2013, Kentucky legislation (16 KAR 5:010) mandated candidates to complete a minimum of 200 clock hours of field experiences in a variety of P-12 school settings before gaining admittance to student teaching. Moreover, the legislation required candidates to work with diverse student populations: “engagement with diverse populations of students which include students from a minimum

of two different ethnic or cultural groups of which the candidate would not be considered a member; students from different socioeconomic groups; English language learners; students with disabilities; and students from across elementary, middle school, and secondary grade levels.”

Furthermore, this legislation required all Kentucky EPPs to maintain electronic records of candidates’ compliance and completion of these field experiences before student teaching. EPP leadership decided to adopt the *LiveText* Field Experience Module (FEM) system to record the number and nature of candidates’ field experience hours. This system was piloted by volunteer faculty fall 2014. The Field Placement Coordinator and LiveText Coordinator enter placements on the FEM system. Candidates log completed field experience hours and note the nature of the activity (e.g. diverse placement). Cooperating teachers or EPP faculty confirm the accuracy of the candidates’ entries. This system also allows cooperating teachers, EPP faculty, and candidates to communicate, post artifacts, and evaluate candidates’ efforts. The Director of Teacher Education Services, Dr. Alesa Walker, validates candidates’ completion of 200 field experience hours, including legislated mandates such as diverse placements, before candidates are admitted to student teaching.

EPP candidate diversity is documented in *Completer Demographics (new)*. EPP faculty work closely with P-12 partners and Teacher Education Services to arrange diverse placements for field experiences to expand candidates’ knowledge of diverse cultures, increase their ability to embrace inclusiveness, and prepare candidates to work with increasingly diverse student populations. Field placements in diverse environments promote candidates’ understanding of the nature and needs of diverse students, provide opportunities for candidates to become reflective decision-makers, and present experiences to make concrete applications in their professional practice. Placements vary by course and program. The skills and abilities assessed in field and clinical placements are based upon the course context. As students progress from observing to participating and then eventually leading in a clinical setting, these skills become more advanced.

This process begins with the core courses listed below. Through these core education courses, candidates pursue curricular experiences designed to prepare them to meet the implicit mandate of education in a diverse society.

- EDU 103, Issues and Practices of American Education. Candidates examine their primary cultures and the major cultures from which their students might come and explore how diversity, ethnicity, or exceptionalities affect teaching, teacher-pupil interactions, and the classroom environment.
- EDP 260, Psychology of Human Development. Candidates explore human development from a multicultural perspective and connect and integrate knowledge and experience of human development across cultures.
- SED 300, Education of Students with Disabilities. Candidates develop a teaching philosophy which reflects appropriate dispositions of tolerance toward students with exceptionalities and their inclusion in general education, and they discuss multicultural aspects resulting in overrepresentation of minority of culturally diverse populations in special education classes. Candidates also work collaboratively to design an academic and behavioral program for diverse individuals.

- EDU 303, Strategies of Teaching. Candidates develop and apply a wide repertoire of questioning, differentiated instructional strategies, and assessment techniques.

The professional staff in Teacher Education Services (TES) ensures that each candidate has a minimum of three field/clinical experiences with students in a diverse setting by working closely with faculty and school personnel to identify diverse school settings. EDU 103, *Issues and Practices of American Education*, is designed to provide all candidates with an overview of the field of education. To acquaint candidates with preschool, elementary, middle, and high school classroom settings, field experiences in local schools representing the diversity of the region are arranged. Candidates are encouraged to note the diverse makeup of the classroom populations, how the teachers address such diversity, and to reflect upon ways they might deal with diversity in their future classrooms.

Candidates have systemic opportunities to work with diverse and exceptional populations. For example, all on-campus sections of the SED 300 Education of Students with Disabilities are involved in an urban field experience in a diverse setting. Candidates, after instruction pertaining to children with disabilities and multicultural education, participate in a field experience to a school system in an urban setting that has a diverse population. Candidates are transported to a school and spend approximately five hours in the school observing, assisting, and working with children. They are placed in the classrooms with teachers in their major field of study. They also eat lunch in the school cafeteria, which allows further interaction with children. When candidates return to campus, they are required to reflect on this experience. This experience is required in every initial program. Its field component alternates between districts that are the most diverse in the region – Christian County School District and Paducah Independent School District.

Selections for field experiences in other courses are made balancing factors such as the diversity of the school, quality and qualifications of the teachers and programs, travel time, and school and course schedules. Noting that the districts closest to campus include Calloway County (91% Caucasian), Murray (81% Caucasian) and Marshall County (97% Caucasian), which lack diversity, professional staff and faculty have been inventive in designing experiences to meet diversity goals. ELE 401 faculty arranged for an extended practicum experience in an elementary school with a growing minority population. Candidates from the 2+2 extended campus programs perform field experiences in communities where there are more opportunities to work with diverse students. Most placements in MID 395 and SEC 420 are in diverse placements. This is dependent upon availability of diverse classrooms settings during students' scheduled field placement. If students do not have diverse placements in MID 395 or SEC 420, their MID 422 or SEC 422 placements are in a diverse setting. Principals and teachers assist in identifying diverse classes. Through an agreement with Jefferson County Schools, candidates may select student teaching placement in the urban community of Louisville. The program placing student teachers in *Belize (new)* permits candidates to travel and interact with teachers and students in schools for a three week placement. These efforts demonstrate the initiatives undertaken in the part of the EPP to increase the opportunities for interactions with diverse P-12 students even while located in a relatively homogenous demographic region.

The EPP recognizes that education candidates will work in increasingly diverse classrooms and communities. To that end the EPP facilitates the development of candidates' knowledge, skills, and

dispositions with respect to addressing the needs of students of different genders, ethnicities, race, language, sexual orientation, geographical area, religions, exceptionalities, and socioeconomic backgrounds. To meet this need faculty design experiences that are well-planned, in depth, and reflective. Faculty prepare candidates for experiences with course activities that anticipate the situations candidates will encounter in schools. During and after the experiences faculty require candidates to reflect on and integrate their observations and experiences with course discussion and assignments. During clinical experiences, candidates design and implement instruction to address the needs of a diverse student population. Cooperating teachers and EPP faculty evaluate candidates' demonstration of inclusiveness, an EPP Professional Disposition, using field experience observation and student teaching evaluation forms.

### **3. CAEP Feedback: Is growth over time or change in knowledge, skills, beliefs over time assessed and how are candidates doing in their placement regarding working with diverse learners?**

The disposition of *Inclusiveness* is used as a measure of candidates' development in the area of diversity under the current assessment system. Results of a longitudinal analysis of this measure is included in *Diversity Data (new)*.

Current work by the Diversity Task Force focuses on using externally normed diversity assessment instrument to measure candidates' growth and development at least three points in the core education curriculum (*Diversity Data-new*). The external instrument will serve as a summative measure. Reflective activities are envisioned as formative. The tentative location of these assessments would be EDU 103, SED 300, and EDU 403, core professional education courses. It is envisioned that a Student Learning Outcome, assessed annually through the university and EPP continuous assessment system, will be adopted within the context of the MSU Assessment System to further crystallize the data collection and analysis process.

### **4. CAEP Feedback: How are ALL candidates, regardless of program ensured the same experiences and preparation regarding working with diverse populations? What are the ways in which the EPP assesses and provides data to stakeholders regarding candidates' preparation?**

Teacher Education Services staff, EPP faculty, and P-12 partners co-select quality clinical experiences that give candidates the opportunity to work with diverse student populations. Please reference the description of the field placement found in this section, item 2. The core education course curriculum ensures that all candidates have equitable experiences. In instances where a core course may be taught outside the EPP (e.g., English Education) the EPP faculty and content area faculty work together to ensure that the integrity of the essential elements and outcomes of the core course are maintained. This principle is true of all competencies, including diversity. For example, in SED 300 *Educating Students With Disabilities*, a foundations course taken by all education majors, candidates spend a day working with children with special needs. Audrey Brown, Field Placement Coordinator, arranges those trips. Middle school and secondary education majors work with diverse student populations during their extended practicum courses, SEC 420 *Practicum in Secondary Schools* and SEC 422 *Extended Practicum*. IECE, Elementary Education, and LBD dual certification candidates work with diverse

student populations during multiple field experiences associated with upper level methods courses in their respective programs. Intervention I in the *Revised SIP (new)* actions will strengthen alignment and clarify expectations further.

Based upon feedback from the Onsite Report, the EPP took steps to ensure stakeholder involvement in the quality assurance system. Intervention II of the Revised Selected Improvement Plan provides an overview of steps to strengthen the quality assurance processes of the EPP. Objectives II.1, II.3, and II.6 address stakeholder roles specifically. As per this plan, members of the Student Advisory Council, Superintendent Advisory Council, Partner Advisory Council, and program-specific advisory councils will work with EPP faculty and administrators to cooperatively review program data, provide insights into program challenges and strengths, conduct dialogue about current realities and future visions for the programs, and use data and input to inform program improvement through shared decision-making. The EPP is strengthening this process by standardizing critical operational aspects of these advisories, such as documentation and frequency of consultation. The EPP is currently at the Baseline for this objective (*Advisory Council-new*).

Furthermore, the *Revised SIP (new)*, Objectives II.3 and II.6, addresses the need to ensure clear, frequent and two-way communication between the EPP and partners. The EPP allocated resources to support a communications position in 2015-2016. The number and quality of publications and of social media from the college has increased greatly during this period. Communication will be enhanced further through the establishment of a web page reporting key outcomes and impact indicators (Objective II.7). By providing stakeholders with more frequent and descriptive information, the quality and frequency of response to requests for feedback has also increased. The EPP is currently at the Baseline for this objective, but it is already clear that our efforts are positively impacting stakeholder involvement as evidenced by responses to our requests for assistance.

## **Diversity Areas for Improvement**

- 1. Area for Improvement: More information (if it exists) is needed. We would like to see how the systematic introduction and assessment of diversity competencies are carried out, the ways in which all candidates are ensured adequate preparation to work with diverse populations, and a definition of diversity and competencies.**

Per Objectives I.1 and I.2 of the *Revised SIP (new)*, the Diversity Task Force established a framework for guiding and assessing the growth and development of candidates in the area of diversity. The EPP will use the tenets of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy to guide this process.

The Diversity Task Force is adamant that the ‘strategies’ view of diversity is wrought with problems, and in fact is a barrier to growth and development in the dispositions needed to support culturally relevant pedagogy. The Task Force has proposed that candidates will be assessed with an externally validated instrument at least three places in the core professional education courses with formative feedback occurring along the way. This process will be driven by the MSU Assessment Process, as Diversity will be a common Student Learning Outcome (SLO) across programs as part of the MSU/EPP Continuous Assessment Process. The *Diversity Action Plan (new)* further supports the work of the Task Force.

The current system of assessment of professional dispositions captures an aspect of culturally relevant pedagogy in the analysis of Inclusiveness (*Diversity Data*).

- 2. Area for Improvement: Diversity is not systematically addressed by the EPP.**

Diversity is assessed systematically through the measurement of Inclusiveness throughout all aspects of candidates’ academic coursework and clinical experiences (*Dispositions Data*). Field placements in diverse environments promote candidates’ understanding of the nature and needs of diverse students. They also provide opportunities for candidates, as reflective decision-makers, to tap into prior and present experiences to make concrete applications in their professional practice.

This process begins with the core courses listed below. Through these pre-admission courses, candidates pursue curricular experiences designed to prepare them to meet the implicit mandate of education in a diverse society.

- EDU 103, Issues and Practices of American Education. Candidates examine their primary cultures and the major cultures from which their students might come and explore how diversity, ethnicity, or exceptionalities affect teaching, teacher-pupil interactions, and the classroom environment.

- EDP 260, Psychology of Human Development. Candidates explore human development from a multicultural perspective and connect and integrate knowledge and experience of human development across cultures.
- SED 300, Education of Students with Disabilities. Candidates develop a teaching philosophy which reflects appropriate dispositions of tolerance toward students with exceptionalities and their inclusion in general education, and they discuss multicultural aspects resulting in overrepresentation of minority of culturally diverse populations in special education classes. Candidates also work collaboratively to design an academic and behavioral program for diverse individuals.
- EDU 303, Strategies of Teaching. Candidates develop and apply a wide repertoire of questioning, differentiated instructional strategies, and assessment techniques.

The professional staff in Teacher Education Services (TES) ensures that each candidate has a minimum of three field/clinical experiences with students in a diverse setting by working closely with faculty and school personnel to identify diverse school settings. EDU 103, Issues and Practices of American Education, is designed to provide all candidates with an overview of the field of education. In order to acquaint candidates with preschool, elementary, middle, and high school classroom settings, field experiences in local schools representing the diversity of the region are arranged. Candidates are encouraged to note the diverse makeup of the classroom populations, how the teachers address such diversity, and to reflect upon ways they might deal with diversity in their future classrooms.

Candidates have systemic opportunities to work with diverse and exceptional populations. For example, all on-campus sections of the SED 300 Education of Students with Disabilities: A Collaborative Approach are involved in an urban field experience in a diverse setting. Candidates, after instruction pertaining to children with disabilities and multicultural education, participate in a field experience to a school system in an urban setting that has a diverse population. Candidates are transported to a school and spend approximately five hours in the school observing, assisting, and working with children. They are placed in the classrooms with teachers in their major field of study. They also eat lunch in the school cafeteria, which allows further interaction with children. When candidates return to campus, they are required to reflect on this experience. This experience is required in every initial program. Its field component alternates between districts that are the most diverse in the region – Christian County School District and Paducah Independent School District.

Selections for field experiences in other courses are made balancing factors such as the diversity of the school, quality and qualifications of the teachers and programs, travel time, and school and course schedules. Noting that the districts closest to campus include Calloway County (91% Caucasian), Murray (81% Caucasian) and Marshall County (97% Caucasian), which lack diversity, professional staff and faculty have been inventive in designing experiences to meet diversity goals. ELE 401 faculty arranged for an extended practicum experience in an elementary school with a growing minority population. Candidates from the 2+2 extended campus programs perform field experiences in communities where there are more opportunities to work with diverse students. Most placements in MID 395 and SEC 420 are in diverse placements. This is

dependent upon availability of diverse classrooms settings during students' scheduled field placement. If students do not have diverse placements in MID 395 or SEC 420, their MID 422 or SEC 422 placements are in a diverse setting. Principals and teachers assist in identifying diverse classes. Through an agreement with Jefferson County Schools, candidates may select student teaching placement in the urban community of Louisville. The program placing student teachers in Belize permits candidates to travel and interact with teachers and students in schools for a three week placement. These efforts demonstrate the initiatives undertaken in the part of the EPP to increase the opportunities for interactions with diverse P-12 students even while located in a relatively homogenous demographic region.

The EPP recognizes that education candidates will work in increasingly diverse classrooms and communities. To that end the EPP facilitates the development of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions with respect to addressing the needs of students of different genders, ethnicities, race, language, sexual orientation, geographical area, religions, exceptionalities, and socioeconomic backgrounds. To meet this need faculty design experiences that are well-planned, in depth, and reflective. Faculty prepare candidates for experiences with course activities that anticipate the situations candidates will encounter in schools. During and after the experiences faculty require candidates to reflect on and integrate their observations and experiences with course discussion and assignments. During clinical experiences, candidates design, implement, and reflect on instruction, using the impact and refinement section of the KTIP-TPA lesson plan.

Per Objectives I.1 and I.2 of the *Revised SIP (new)*, the framework for developing candidates' competencies was established as Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. The Diversity Task Force has identified a diversity assessment (*Diversity Data-new*). Diversity will be included as a Student Learning Outcome in the MSU/EPP Continuous Assessment system for all undergraduate programs, further anchoring the process into the system of assessment.

## TECHNOLOGY

### Technology *Additional Questions*

#### 1. CAEP Feedback: Specific ways in which these skills are assessed.

As per the *EPP Technology Action Plan (new)*, adopted October 12, 2016 by the Administrative Cabinet, the vision of the EPP is to “recognize, teach, and assess candidates’ technology competencies across all programs.” At this time, the EPP systematically assesses candidates’ abilities to demonstrate technological proficiency according to Kentucky EPSB Kentucky Standard #6 (KTS 6): “The teacher uses technology to support instruction; access and manipulate data; enhance professional growth and productivity; communicate; collaborate with colleges, parents, and the community; and conduct research.” Technology competencies aligned with KTS 6 are stated below. Evaluators have these competencies in mind when rating candidates’ technology proficiency using existing EPP-wide assessments.

- 6.1 Uses available technology to design and plan instruction.
- 6.2 Uses available technology to implement instruction that facilitates student learning.
- 6.3 Integrates student use of available technology into instruction.
- 6.4 Uses available technology to assess and communicate student learning.
- 6.5 Demonstrates ethical and legal use of technology.

Using data and input gathered by technology surveys (*Technology Data-new*) and a review of state and national technology standards, the Education Technology Committee has begun to identify technology competencies for candidates for all programs that mirror P-12 classroom realities. Once these competencies are approved by the Administrative Cabinet and EPP faculty, the committee will “promote EPP-wide curriculum development to include identified technology competencies and provide a model for technology integration” (Goal 1, Strategy A). Moreover, EPP faculty will “utilize assessments addressing technology to measure candidate progress” (Goal 1, Strategy B, Action 3).

Candidates’ instructional technology proficiency is assessed at multiple points throughout their programs. As represented in the *Core Matrix (new)*, instructional technology is woven through the core education courses and assessed by EPP faculty. Candidates have an opportunity to use presentation technology in foundation courses such as EDU 103 *Issues and Practices of American Education* when groups present inquiry projects to peers. In courses such as EDU 222 *Instructional Technology*, EDU 303 *Strategies of Teaching*, and methods courses, candidates become acquainted with multiple forms of instructional and presentation technology to integrate into effective lesson design and implementation. Course instructors evaluate candidates’ presentation efforts using professor-created rubrics. Candidates are encouraged to use instructional and presentation technology in their field experiences. They are required to present at least one instructional technology-based lesson during a formal classroom observation in their student teaching semester. Cooperating teachers and EPP faculty evaluate candidates’ instructional technology-enhanced clinical experience efforts using EPP-wide *Field Experience Observation* and the Technology Assessment portion of the *Student Teaching Evaluation* instruments (*Technology Data-new*).

Candidates self-assess their technological proficiency by writing post-lesson reflections (*COE-TPA Lesson Plan*), professional growth plans during the student teaching semester, and responding to the Technology Assessment portion of the *Student Teaching Survey* at the end of their senior year (*Technology Data-new*).

## **2. CAEP Feedback: Candidates' use while in clinical placements?**

One vision statement supported by the *EPP Technology Action Plan (new)* states that the EPP will “place candidates in technology-rich P-12 settings.” As per Goal 2, Strategy A, Actions 1-2, the EPP will strengthen productive partnerships by collaborating with P-12 partners to promote candidate use of instructional technology in the field. Candidates are encouraged to use instructional and presentation technology in their field experiences, utilizing the available district technology. They are required to present at least one instructional technology-based lesson during a formal classroom observation in their student teaching semester. Cooperating teachers and EPP faculty evaluate candidates' instructional technology-enhanced clinical experience efforts using EPP-wide Field Experience Observation and Student Teaching Evaluation instruments (*Technology Data-new*). Candidates self-assess their technological proficiency by writing post-lesson reflections (*COE-TPA Lesson Plan*), developing professional growth plans during the student teaching semester, and responding to the Technology Assessment portion of the Student Teaching Survey at the end of their senior year.

## **3. CAEP Feedback: Assessment data to show how candidates do at various points with the technology use.**

The EPP's current continuous assessment system captures candidates' instructional technology proficiency throughout their programs. Candidates are encouraged to use instructional technology in their field experiences. Cooperating teachers and EPP faculty evaluate candidates' instructional technology-enhanced clinical experience efforts using EPP-wide *Field Experience Observation* and *Student Teaching Evaluation* instruments (*Technology Data-new*). Candidates self-assess their technological proficiency by writing post-lesson reflections (*COE-TPA Lesson Plan*), developing professional growth plans during the student teaching semester, and responding to the Technology Assessment portion of the Student Teaching Survey at the end of their senior year (*Technology Data-new*). Furthermore, the Director of Teacher Education Services and Certification Specialist affirm candidates have demonstrated technology proficiency by completing a technology course, as per EPSB requirements.

At the course level, candidates are assessed through instructor-created rubrics and assignments. As indicated in the *Core Matrix (new)*, instructional technology components are woven throughout core courses, providing both theoretical and practical education experiences multiple times during candidates' Teacher Education coursework. Candidates' efforts are formatively and formally assessed by course instructors.

As per the “Vision for Technology” stated in the *EPP Technology Action Plan (new)*, the EPP will “create and maintain technology systems to support continuous assessment” so faculty can monitor and affirm candidates' technology proficiency, content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge. Goal 1, Strategy B, Action 3 targets the “use of assessments addressing technology to measure candidate progress.”

#### **4. CAEP Feedback: Data to show that decisions regarding technology use are made in collaboration with P-12 partners.**

As stated in the “Vision for Technology” espoused in the *EPP Technology Action Plan (new)*, the EPP will promote productive partnerships and place candidates in technology-rich P-12 settings. To form powerful partnerships, three P-12 partners serve on the Education Technology Committee. This group identifies competencies; establishes timelines; identifies roles, responsibilities and resources; and works collaboratively to refine and implement the action plan. Goals 1 and 2 promote working with P-12 partners to identify high-technology clinical experience placements and “promote the use of instructional technology with P-12 districts by inviting teachers and administrators to participate in professional development activities led by EPP faculty and staff.”

Technology initiatives and innovations will be included in data and information shared with the Student Advisory Council, Partner Advisory Council, and Superintendent Advisory Council. Stakeholders’ input and collaborative dialogue will provide information to revise and extend the existing *EPP Technology Action Plan (new)* to ensure it continues to mirror the realities of today’s classrooms and the needs of an ever-evolving technological society.

#### **5. CAEP Feedback: How consistency across programs is ensured and assessed.**

As per the *EPP Technology Action Plan (new)*, adopted October 12, 2016 by the Administrative Cabinet, the vision of the EPP is to “recognize, teach, and assess candidates’ technology competencies across all programs.” Candidates take core education courses to create a common foundation of pedagogical content knowledge across all disciplines. As represented in the *Core Matrix (new)*, instructional technology is woven through the core education courses. Candidates have an opportunity to use presentation technology in foundation courses such as EDU 103 *Issues and Practices of American Education* when groups present inquiry projects to peers. In courses such as EDU 222 *Instructional Technology*, EDU 303 *Strategies of Teaching*, and discipline-specific methods courses, candidates become acquainted with multiple forms of instructional and presentation technology to integrate into effective lesson design and implementation. Candidates are encouraged to use instructional and presentation technology in their field experiences and required to present at least one instructional technology-based lesson during a formal classroom observation in their student teaching semester.

The *EPP Technology Action Plan (new)* includes professional development for EPP faculty and P-12 in-service teachers to ensure they are modeling best practices and scaffolding candidates’ use of instructional technology during clinical experiences. Thus, both novice and experienced educators support one another’s efforts as they cooperatively develop instructional technological proficiency.

### **Technology Area for Improvement**

- 1. Area for Improvement: Document the systematic (across programs) integration of technology, how what technologies and skills are decided upon with input from the partner schools, and document how these skills are assessed throughout the program to determine candidate effectiveness.**

As per the ***EPP Technology Action Plan (new)***, adopted October 12, 2016 by the Administrative Cabinet, the vision of the EPP is to “recognize, teach, and assess candidates’ technology competencies across all programs.” As stated in the “Vision for Technology” espoused in this plan, the EPP will promote productive partnerships and place candidates in technology-rich P-12 settings. To form powerful partnerships, three P-12 partners serve on the Education Technology Committee. This group identifies competencies; establishes timelines; identifies roles, responsibilities and resources; and works collaboratively to refine and implement the action plan.

Using data and input gathered from technology surveys (***Technology Data-new***) and a review of state and national technology standards, the Education Technology Committee has begun to identify technology competencies for candidates for all programs that mirror P-12 classroom realities. Once these competencies are approved by the Administrative Cabinet and EPP faculty, the committee will actualize these technology goals:

1. Shape candidates to use instructional technology in thoughtful and effective ways
2. Strengthen productive P-12 partnerships to promote and support instructional technology initiatives
3. Provide training, support, and access to foster technology proficiency and efficacy, enabling both candidates and faculty to successfully integrate technology into the educational process.

As per the “Vision for Technology” stated in the ***EPP Technology Action Plan (new)***, the EPP will “create and maintain technology systems to support continuous assessment” so faculty can monitor and affirm candidates’ technology proficiency, content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge. Candidates’ instructional technology proficiency is assessed at multiple points throughout their programs. As indicated in the ***Core Matrix (new)***, instructional technology components are woven throughout core courses, providing both theoretical and practical education experiences multiple times during candidates’ Teacher Education coursework. Candidates’ efforts are formatively and formally assessed by course instructors.

The EPP Technology Action Plan includes professional development for EPP faculty and P-12 inservice teachers to ensure they are modeling best practices and scaffolding candidates’ use of instructional technology during clinical experiences. Thus, both novice and experienced educators support one another’s efforts as they cooperatively develop instructional technological proficiency.

Candidates are encouraged to use instructional and presentation technology in their field experiences. One vision statement supported by the EPP Technology Plan states the EPP will “place candidates in technology-rich P-12 settings.” Candidates are required to present at least one instructional technology-based lesson during a formal classroom observation in their student teaching semester. Cooperating teachers and EPP faculty evaluate candidates’ instructional technology-enhanced clinical experience efforts using EPP-wide Field Experience Observation and the Technology Assessment portion of the Student Teaching Evaluation instruments (***Technology Data-new***). Candidates self-assess their technological proficiency by writing post-lesson reflections (***COE-TPA Lesson Plan***), develop professional growth plans during the student teaching semester, and respond to the Technology Assessment portion of the Student Teaching Survey at the end of their senior year. Furthermore, the

Director of Teacher Education Services and EPP Certification Specialist affirm candidates have demonstrated technology proficiency by completing a technology course, as per EPSB requirements.

Technology initiatives and innovations will be included in data and information shared with the Student Advisory Council, Partner Advisory Council, and Superintendent Advisory Council. Stakeholders' input and collaborative dialogue will provide information to revise and extend the existing ***EPP Technology Action Plan (new)*** to ensure it continues to mirror the realities of today's classrooms and the needs of an ever-evolving technological society.