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***CAEP Alignment***

(Note: If the assessment instrument does not address standard or sub-component you will state N/A)

CAEP Standard 1 –Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

CAEP Standard 2-Clinical Partnerships and Practice

CAEP Standard 3-Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

3.3 Educator preparation providers establish and monitor attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. The provider selects criteria, describes the measures used and evidence of the reliability and validity of those measures, and reports data that show how the academic and non-academic factors predict candidate’s performance in the program and effective teaching.

CAEP Standard 5- Provide Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

**What does the current data tell one about the EPP’s effectiveness in meeting the EPP’s goal and meeting the CAEP Standard(s) Component(s)? In using the data provided to answer this question, use the guidelines below in regard to the EPP’s goal and to EACH aligned CAEP Standard-Component found in Step 2.**

1. **Is the EPP effectively preparing our candidates to be professional educators? What do the data show as strengths and weakness for the EPP? (List specific strengths/weaknesses found and what specific evidence in the data supports the statements listed.)**

Our EPP has adopted a valid and reliable instrument, Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA). The EDA is administered at the beginning of the program, and there are multiple check points during the program where students are assessed.

The strength of EDA opens the eyes of the students to help them understand the importance of student dispositions from the beginning. Students are astounded that these are components that they will actually be measured on. One weakness of the EDA is that there are a large number of transfer students who do not take the intro course where the document is administered. Therefore, they may not have exposed to the assessment instrument. Another weakness is that because select faculty do department screenings, they may not have prior knowledge of the student.

1. Suggest concrete plans (2-3) for the EPP to implement in order to leverage the EPP’s strengths and/or address the EPP’s weaknesses discovered in part 1.

**Timeline:**

The instrument is introduced in the Intro to Education/Secondary Teaching course and the student then completes a self-assessment for the Admission screening. If the student is a transfer or at a Degree Center, the department will have a meeting before the Admission screening to make students aware of EDA.

At the Admission meeting, students bring a copy of their Self-Assessment. The EDA is included for review as part of the admission application. It is suggested that multiple faculty (at least 2) review the EDA during the personal interview before the Department Screening Committee. This is assessed on LiveText.

At the completion of the practicum experience for ELED, MLED, SPED, the professor who supervises the field experience (Elementary/Secondary Practicum or Internship 1) one semester prior to the capstone internship completes the EDA instrument on the candidate.

For the Secondary (K-12, 7-12) majors, they will be assessed by the professor who teaches the Special Methods course prior to the capstone internship. It is also completed by the professor who oversees the field experience (PBID).

At the completion of 8-weeks of the capstone teaching internship, the Clinical and University Supervisor collaboratively complete the EDA instrument.

1. **Does the data being examined inform the EPP about the CAEP cross-cutting themes of Diversity and Technology? If so, what specifically do the data show about the EPP in these two areas? (Give specifics as supported by specific evidence in the data.)**

Diversity is covered by Disposition 6: Exhibits an appreciation of and value for cultural and academic diversity.

Technology as a method of communication and appropriate materials for effective teaching. Both of these areas are assessed dispositions – Disposition 2, effective written communication and Disposition 5, preparedness in teaching and learning.

1. **List any perceived weaknesses of the assessment instrument to measure the achievement of the EPP’s goal and achievement of CAEP Standards/Components. For each weaknesses, provide brief suggested changes to the assessment instrument.**
* For ELED and MLED majors, it is suggested their professors will assess their students during the Junior 2 semester.
* Because of the uniqueness of our EPP, it is not suggested that professors complete an assessment on students during the Department Screening Interview.
* We must develop a committee to hear issues and problems to develop an intervention and/or remediation plan.
1. **If time allows, discuss the perceived reliability, validity, and fairness of the assessment instrument being used to collect this data. Area there very strong concerns in any of these areas?**

**edTPA**

**Group Members: Nicole Covey (group leader), Russell Young, Sarah Labovitz, Zelda McMurty, Sharla Felkins**

***CAEP Alignment***

(Note: If the assessment instrument does not address standard or sub-component you will state N/A)

CAEP Standard 1 –Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

1.1 Yes-Direct measure

1.2 Yes-indirect measure

1.3 Yes-indirect measure

1.4 N/A

1.5 N/A

CAEP Standard 2-Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 N/A

2.2 N/A

2.3 N/A

CAEP Standard 3-Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

3.1 N/A

3.2 Yes-indirect measure

3.3 N/A

3.4 Yes-indirect measure

3.5 Yes-indirect measure

3.6 N/A

CAEP Standard 4- Program Impact

4.1 Yes-direct measure

4.2 N/A

4.3 N/A

4.4 N/A

**What does the current data tell one about the EPP’s effectiveness in meeting the EPP’s goal and meeting the CAEP Standard(s) Component(s)? In using the data provided to answer this question, use the guidelines below in regard to the EPP’s goal and to EACH aligned CAEP Standard-Component found in Step 2.**

1. **Is the EPP effectively preparing our candidates to be professional educators? What do the data show as strengths and weakness for the EPP? (List specific strengths/weaknesses found and what specific evidence in the data supports the statements listed.)**

The committee does not feel we have enough data to answer this question. However, our Spring 2019 edTPA scores were not consistent with the national average. Out of 19 submissions only 2 scored higher than the average for states not requiring edTPA for licensure.

We can only infer why our students did below average. One of the reasons is that this was our first year and the students taking the assessment did not receive instruction in their education classes using the terminology and procedures found in the assessment.

Weaknesses of the assessment are the cost and the fact that the test is graded by outside graders.

1. **Suggest concrete plans (2-3) for the EPP to implement in order to leverage the EPP’s strengths and/or address the EPP’s weaknesses discovered in part 1.**

We suggest that the edTPA assessment be used to collect this valuable data but it should not readily have graduation or licensure implications. We would like those decisions to be at the program level.

A consequence of the assessment not having graduation implications is the finanicial responsibility of getting the test graded. The EPP will need to decide who and how is going to pay for the scoring. We do not think it should be the students.

1. **Does the data being examined inform the EPP about the CAEP cross-cutting themes of Diversity and Technology? If so, what specifically do the data show about the EPP in these two areas? (Give specifics as supported by specific evidence in the data.)**

Yes. The edTPA rubrics want interns to address special learners and their needs. Identifying and assessing special learners is a requirement of the assessment. Interns need to talk about how they are using student assets in their planning, instruction, and assessment.

Yes. EdTPA requires students to use audio/video capture and editing tools. It also requires students to use word processing, scanning, and other computing/ internet tools.

1. **List any perceived weaknesses of the assessment instrument to measure the achievement of the EPP’s goal and achievement of CAEP Standards/Components. For each weaknesses, provide brief suggested changes to the assessment instrument.**

The weakness of the assessment is that the scoring is done by outside scorers. We have no direct control over the assessment tool or its scoring.

 The cost is a perceived weakness.

1. **If time allows, discuss the perceived reliability, validity, and fairness of the assessment instrument being used to collect this data. Area there very strong concerns in any of these areas?** edTPA has been proven to be reliable and valid.

**EPP Intern Exit Evaluation**

Group Task: **EPP Intern Exit Evaluation**

Group Members: **Jacques Singleton, Sylvia Hiatt, Blair Dean, Joanna Grymes**

**CAEP Alignment**

(Note: If the assessment instrument does not address standard or sub-component you will state N/A)

CAEP Standard 1 –Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

CAEP Standard 2-Clinical Partnerships and Practice

CAEP Standard 3-Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

CAEP Standard 4- Program Impact

**What does the current data tell one about the EPP’s effectiveness in meeting the EPP’s goal and meeting the CAEP Standard(s) Component(s)? In using the data provided to answer this question, use the guidelines below in regard to the EPP’s goal and to EACH aligned CAEP Standard-Component found in Step 2.**

1. Is the EPP effectively preparing our candidates to be professional educators? What do the data show as strengths and weakness for the EPP? (List specific strengths/weaknesses found and what specific evidence in the data supports the statements listed.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strengths** | **Areas of Concern** |
| * Domain II Element 8 – creating an environment of respect and rapport
* Domain III – Instruction
* Domain IV Element 20 & 25 – reflection and professionalism
 | * Domain I Element 6 – student assessment
* Domain II Element 11 – managing student behavior
* Domain IV Element 22 – communicating with families
 |
| *\*3.35 was the benchmark for strength and below 3.0 an indication for area of concern* |

1. **Suggest concrete plans (2-3) for the EPP to implement in order to leverage the EPP’s strengths and/or address the EPP’s weaknesses discovered in part 1.**
* In order to consider this assessment appropriate for “program completers” the recommends that we accurately define “program completers” for the Unit. Secondly, it is our recommendation to reconsider when the assessment is administered. The purpose for changing the exit evaluation date is to assure the candidates are truly “program completers”. Therefore, when the candidates take the exit evaluation they have officially met the definition of “program completer”.
* We may need to strongly revisit requiring passing Praxis II (Licensure Exams: Content Knowledge, PLT and Foundations of Reading) examinations to be included in the definition of a “program completer”.
* We recommend forming an ad-hoc committee to research an alternative instrument for assessment for 4.4.
1. **Does the data being examined inform the EPP about the CAEP cross-cutting themes of Diversity and Technology? If so, what specifically do the data show about the EPP in these two areas? (Give specifics as supported by specific evidence in the data.)**
* The data being examined DOES NOT inform the EPP about the CAEP themes of Diversity and Technology.
1. **List any perceived weaknesses of the assessment instrument to measure the achievement of the EPP’s goal and achievement of CAEP Standards/Components. For each weaknesses, provide brief suggested changes to the assessment instrument.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Instrument Weaknesses** | **Suggestions for Improvement** |
| 1. Diversity and Technology are not represented.
 | 1. Include themes diversity and technology in the assessment instrument.
 |
| 1. The assessment instruments as a whole has not been confirmed valid and reliable.
 | 1. Reconsider the tool for assessment.
 |
| 1. There is not a comparison between candidate perception of preparedness and university supervisor evaluation of candidates’ performance.
 | 1. Include a statistical analysis that compares these two sets of data.
 |
| 1. There’s no evidence that Programs are reporting back to the EPP of how data from the exit evaluation is being utilized for Program improvement.
 | 1. Require Program Coordinators to provide feedback to the EPP.
 |

1. **If time allows, discuss the perceived reliability, validity, and fairness of the assessment instrument being used to collect this data. Area there very strong concerns in any of these areas?**
* We recommend forming an ad-hoc committee to research an alternative instrument for assessment for 4.4.

**Novice Teacher Survey**

Novice Teacher Survey Group: Kimberley, Dixie, Sandra, Anna

Initial Task: We quickly reviewed these.

Second Task: Our data instrument is designed and reported by the state (ADE). Not sure we have influence over making any changes; this is our completer report at the end of their first year as required by CAEP STD 4; we are not sure if the survey is sent out in their year 2 and 3 (it only mentions first year). Also, this survey doesn’t reach our completers that move out of state.

Third Task: Trends and Differences

* **Novice Teacher Survey Data**
	+ Was divided into traditional programs and alternative programs
* Noticed drops in classroom procedures and student behavior
* Drop in student assessments although above state average
* Drop in communicating with families; lower than state average
* Higher than state in flexibility and maintaining records and content pedagogy and professionalism
* MAT—differences
	+ Lower areas: instructional outcomes, knowledge of resources, student assessment, questioning and discussion techniques, using assessment in instruction, flexibility in responsiveness, reflecting on teaching
	+ Only one year of data reported rather than 2.
	+ Higher than state average with classroom procedures, managing space, communicating with families
* Perceived weaknesses of instrument
	+ Results do not consider the demographics of each completer’s school
* Suggested Changes
* **Supervisor Survey Data**
	+ Was ***NOT*** divided into traditional programs and alternative programs
* Overall, our averages from supervisors was lower than state average
* Supervisors rates us higher in managing student behavior than the averages from novice teachers; we also seemed to have improved from 2017 according to supervisors.
* Perceived weaknesses of instrument—
	+ No data separating alternative preparation
* Suggested Changes

Fourth Task: A summary of Task 3.

5?

6. We noted these strengths/weaknesses in the 3rd task.

7. Sandra shared a PD some professors are attending to help with the “Managing Student Behavior” component of the Novice Teacher Survey. The PD is called “Safe Classrooms’ (national training) [sometime this summer]; perhaps review the alternative programs in the EPP and compare course assignments/assessments/experiences

8. Diversity is cross-cutting in “knowledge of students,” “culture of learning,” and “communicating with families.’ Technology isn’t specifically mentioned or evaluated in this instrument.

9. We talked about how helpful it would be have each completer’s demographic info next to their information or as a part of the survey.

*Notes From our Visitor: try to triangulate the novice survey with edTPA with supervisor ratings (to see growth over time). By doing this, we will be able to see growth and room for improvement over time.*

**PRAXIS II REPORT**

**Group:** Daniel Parker (Recorder), Amanda Lambertus (Presenter), Ron Towery, David Holman

**CAEP Standard**: 1.3 (Content Knowledge for Candidates)

**Is the EPP effectively preparing our candidates to be professional educators? What do the data show as strengths and weaknesses of the EPP?**

Praxis II scores vary across programs and demographics. Aggregate scores indicate we fall short of the state benchmark; however, some programs perform significantly better than others. This indicates strengths of the EPP lie in individual program preparation. However, this also indicates a misalignment in preparation across the EPP. Daniel took an aggregate four-year sample of middle childhood completers and performed a factorial ANOVA. Variance is spread across gender, middle level praxis exams, and GPA. All variables held constant, males tend to score better on the exams than females, although there is an interaction effect between gender and GPA. Females score higher as GPA increases, while male scores decrease. In addition, all variables held constant, completers entering with a higher GPA score higher on the mid-level exams. All variables held constant, completers score highest on mid-level math and lowest on mid-level science.

**Suggest concrete plans (2-3) for the EPP to implement in order to leverage the EPP’s strengths and/or address the EPP’s weaknesses discovered in part 1.**

As the scores are descriptive, it is difficult to suggest plans for change as it does not explain why candidates score low on the Praxis II. However, faculty can propose EPP or program curriculum changes to influence scores. For example, mid-level can recommend changes for core science courses. In addition, establishing a standard checkpoint for students to take the Praxis II could also influence scores, particularly pass rates for completers. This would be important in addressing the state’s EPPQR requirements. Finally, additional preparation for exams could influence scores and pass rates. It is important, however, that proposed changes be evaluated.

**Does the data being examined inform the EPP about the CAEP cross-cutting themes of Diversity and Technology? If so, what specifically do the data show about the EPP in these two areas?**

Praxis II does not identify themes, nor is it meant to, for diversity and technology.

**List any perceived weaknesses of the assessment instrument to measure the achievement of the EPP’s goal and achievement of CAEP Standards/Components.**

Strengths of the instrument: strong validity, wide content area, nationally and state benchmarked, direct assessment, satisfies SPA reports

Weaknesses of the instrument: one dimensional, descriptive (does not explain “why”), can be hard to compare over time as tests change, small numbers in secondary programs make analysis difficult or impossible, could be a learning curve for some in an online testing environment

**Technology Assessment Plan**

**Group Task**: Technology Assessment

**Group Members:** Tonja Fillippino, Diana Williams, Scott Doig

*Currently COPE has accepted the initiation of the Technology Action Plan.*

* + 1. *Phase 1 recommended to start Summer 2019*

***CAEP Alignment***

(Note: If the assessment instrument does not address standard or sub-component you will state N/A)

**CAEP Standard 1 –Content and Pedagogical Knowledge**

* Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice

**CAEP Standard 2-Clinical Partnerships and Practice**

* Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation, including technology-based collaborations.
* Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple, performance-based assessments at key points….to demonstrate candidates’ development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions dispositions….associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.

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

* Provides present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates’ developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all of these domains.

**CAEP Standard 4- Program Impact**

* Candidate readiness

What does the current data tell one about the EPP’s effectiveness in meeting the EPP’s goal and meeting the CAEP Standard(s) Component(s)? In using the data provided to answer this question, use the guidelines below in regard to the EPP’s goal and to EACH aligned CAEP Standard-Component found in Step 2.

1. **Is the EPP effectively preparing our candidates to be professional educators? What does the data show as strengths and weakness for the EPP? (List specific strengths/weaknesses found and what specific evidence in the data supports the statements listed.)**
	* *Data taken from 2017/18 Intern Technology Survey Report; N ~ 200*
	* **Strengths**
		+ We are doing an excellent job preparing our teachers to be confident in a classroom setting (knowledgeable and capable)
		+ We are strong ( x > 4.4, *s* < .7) in TPACK with the exception of MLED/MATs
			- CK1(4.41)-(I have sufficient knowledge about my subject matter)
				* Jonesboro (4.41); Beebe (4.10); Mid-South (5.00); Mountain Home (4.75)
				* ELED (4.16), MLED (4.13), MLED/MAT (4.18), SPED (4.20), and SCED (4.81)
			- PK3(4.46)-(I can use a wide range of teaching approaches in a classroom setting.)
				* Jonesboro (4.42); Beebe (4.45); Mid-South (5.00); Mountain Home (4.75)
				* ELED (4.32), MLED (4.55), MLED/MAT (4.27), SPED (4.25), and SCED (4.58)
			- PCK2(4.50)-(I can produce lesson plans with a good understanding of the topic in my subject matter)
				* Jonesboro (4.46); Beebe (4.45); Mid-South (5.00); Mountain Home (4.92)
				* ELED (4.22), MLED (4.47), MLED/MAT (4.27), SPED (4.00), and SCED (4.67)
	* **Weakness** (x < 3.9, *s* > .9)
		1. How to use technology in a classroom setting (not knowledgeable nor capable)
			+ TK3(3.79)-(I know about a lot of different technologies)
				- Jonesboro (3.80); Beebe (3.70); Mountain Home (3.67)
				- ELED (3.53), MLED (3.72), and MLED/MAT (3.91)
			+ TK5(3.88)-(I have had sufficient opportunities to work with a range of technologies)
				- Jonesboro (3.92); Beebe (3.89); Midsouth (2.67); Mountain Home (3.58)
				- ELED (3.69), MLED (3.83), and MLED/MAT (3.55)
			+ PTK3(3.86)-(My teacher education program has stimulated me to think more deeply about how technology could influence the teaching approaches I use in my classroom know about a lot of different technologies)
				- Jonesboro (3.89); and Beebe (3.10)
				- ELED (3.72), MLED (3.73), and MLED/MAT (3.36); SPED (3.60);
2. **Suggest concrete plans (2-3) for the EPP to implement in order to leverage the EPP’s strengths and/or address the EPP’s weaknesses discovered in part 1.**
* A survey of completers is submitted by Superintendents. A more detailed survey should be requested of Supervisors (direct contact with students) AROUND the state to find out where specific gaps exist.
* Provide more authentic experiences with a range of technologies (process detailed in Technology Action Plan).
* Specific technology assessments in Watermark (portfolio needs to be created) - do a trend analysis to see where students are going from each Checkpoint.
1. **Does the data being examined inform the EPP about the CAEP cross-cutting themes of Diversity and Technology? If so, what specifically do the data show about the EPP in these two areas?** (Give specifics as supported by specific evidence in the data.)
	* Currently TPACK data collection has not been initiated. Once created in Watermark, experiences will be differentiated by methods profession (rubrics not content specific). Experiences in diversity will be included by methods faculty within individual courses.
	* Self-report data collected from 2017-18 Intern Technology Survey Report specifically targets confidence in use of educational technology.
2. **List any perceived weaknesses of the assessment instrument to measure the achievement of the EPP’s goal and achievement of CAEP Standards/Components. For each weaknesses, provide brief suggested changes to the assessment instrument.**
* Current data is lacking because the TPACK data is not currently included. Once Technology Action Plan is initiated all CAEP Standards will be covered as well as the ability to analyze trends in student technology capability development.
1. **If time allows, discuss the perceived reliability, validity, and fairness of the assessment instrument being used to collect this data. Area there very strong concerns in any of these areas?**
	* “Candidates need experiences during their preparation to become proficient in applications of digital media and technological capabilities. They should have opportunities to develop the skills and dispositions for accessing online research databases, digital media, and tools, and to identify research-based practices that can improve their students’ learning, engagement, and outcomes. They should know why and how to help their students access and assess critically the quality and relevance of digital academic content. Preparation experiences should allow candidates to demonstrate their abilities to design and facilitate digital, or connected learning, mentoring, and collaboration. They should encourage use of social networks as resources for these purposes and to help identify digital content and technology tools for P-12 students’ learning. Candidates should help their students gain access to what technology has to offer.” (CAEP, p. 120)
	* It is reliable and valid:
		1. The TPACK framework has been used in research to establish validity and reliability of assessments of knowledge and integration of technology in teaching (Harris, Grandgenett, & Hofer, 2010).