

Standard 1

1.1.6 Lesson Planning Rubric and 1.1.7 Lesson Implementation Rubric. Review of meeting agendas to evaluate the extent of stakeholder involvement in 1.1.6 and 1.1.7.

Evidence 1.1.8 includes a link that will direct you to the EPP accreditation website and Teacher Education, Teacher Education Advisory Councils, and Teacher Education Committee agendas indicating the involvement of stakeholders in developing the Lesson Plan Rubric and Lesson Implementation Rubric. In addition, Evidence 1.1.9 is a timeline from 2013-14 through 2017-18 that outlines the collaboration of EPP partners (P-12, Arts/Science, Alumni, Candidates) in developing the various evaluation rubrics, determining validity and reliability of the rubrics, reviewing data, and giving feedback to the EPP.

1. How and when are candidates informed of the rubrics?

All undergraduate initial certification candidates are informed of the Dispositions Survey and process for the first time during the EDU 104, Orientation to Education class. During the Admissions Field Experience teacher candidates are introduced to the Lesson Plan and Lesson Implementation Rubrics. They receive copies of each rubric and the university clinical educator discusses them in relation to the lesson plan. Rubrics are also on Blackboard/Canvas for candidates to access and review as needed. In addition, all of the rubrics are located in the resource section of Foliotek.

The lesson evaluation rubrics in the IECE, elementary, middle grades, and secondary education programs are again presented to the candidates in the Professional Semester I and II field experience seminars and class sessions that are conducted during the first week of each semester. The rubrics are also posted on Blackboard/Canvas for candidates to review additional times when needed. The physical education and music education programs introduce candidates to the evaluation rubrics during their methods classes and also post them on Blackboard/Canvas. In Professional Semester III, the evaluation rubrics are discussed with special education candidates during the first week of the semester in the Field Seminar course and posted on the course Blackboard/Canvas. Health education candidates are introduced to the rubrics during their combination health education methods and field experience courses. By the time candidates reach their clinical experience, they have been evaluated with the same rubrics from Admissions through Professional Semester II and/or III. This approach provides consistency in terms of expectations and allows program personnel and candidates to monitor progress throughout the program. The Director of Educational Placements and Internships meets with the candidates before the first day of their clinical experience, and reviews the evaluation rubrics as well as all of the policies, procedures, and requirements of the 16-week clinical experience. Through use of the same rubrics, candidates and university clinical educators are able to gauge candidate growth over time from admissions to the culminating clinical experience.

Candidates in the MAT program (traditional and option 6) are introduced to the lesson evaluation rubrics in their first semester during the EDMT 692 (Field Experience I) seminars.

Their knowledge of the rubrics is developed throughout their second and third field placements with opportunities to reflect on their growth across time as evidenced by lesson evaluation rubrics from the first, second, and third field placements. Finally, the candidates' culminating experience in EDMT 696, either in the form of clinical experience or successful completion of the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program, requires candidate mastery of the rubric.

2. How often are results shared with stakeholders and in what type of setting?

University and P-12 Clinical Educators share their assessments of candidates in a personal meeting with them as soon as possible after their evaluations are completed. In addition, clinical educators post their feedback and scores on Foliotek within a week of the evaluation so candidates can review the information as often as they want. Undergraduate and MAT candidates are evaluated and receive feedback on the Dispositions Survey in all of their field and clinical experiences. Candidates are evaluated and receive feedback on the lesson plan and lesson implementation rubrics during their Professional Semester I-III field experiences as well as their culminating clinical experience (student teaching).

Program and EPP-wide data is posted on the CAEP Data Dashboard (Evidence 1.1.8) in the fall of each academic year. After the data is posted, it is reviewed by program faculty during their monthly program team meetings to identify areas of strength as well as areas for improvement. The team looks at individual data points as well as trends across time to identify those areas. Data from the previous year is also reviewed annually with the Teacher Education Advisory Councils (TEAC) with the goal of asking our P-12 partners to provide practitioners' perspectives on the trends identified and to find ways to improve upon already strong school-provider partnerships to enhance the field-based component of each program. In addition, data is shared throughout the academic year during monthly Teacher Education Committee meetings (Evidence 1.1.8-link to agendas). The final step in the data review process is at the annual Quality Assurance Committee meeting which occurs during the spring semester. Representatives from each program serve on the committee, submit a program report reflecting decisions made during monthly program team meetings, and review and discuss EPP-wide data as well as individual program data. The members look for trends across the programs including areas of strength and areas for improvement.

3. How is the use of technology measured within the lesson?

Evidence 1.1.10 is the revised Lesson Plan that was implemented in spring 2018. In the resource section of the lesson plan, candidates are required to "Identify the resources and assistance available to support your instruction and facilitate students' learning. Be sure to include the technology needed for the lesson (if applicable)". In section A of the lesson procedures section, candidates are asked to "provide a detailed outline of your lesson, including how you will use technology to enhance P-12 learning (if applicable)". All initial certification candidates (undergraduate and MAT) are required to plan and teach instructional lessons during their field (Professional Semester I-III) and clinical experiences. Candidates are observed and evaluated by their university and/or P-12 clinical educator during

their teaching experiences. Evidence 2.1.17 (Lesson Implementation Rubric) has a technology component ("Uses Technology During Instruction") that is evaluated while the candidate is teaching, and Evidence 2.1.20 (Lesson Plan Rubric) has a technology component ("Plans for Technology During Instruction") that is assessed as part of the lesson plan evaluation. The target level of each rubric requires the candidate to "Plan/Use of technology by the teacher candidate and students in a manner that facilitates and enhances instruction and/or student learning". University and P-12 clinical educators meet with candidates after their evaluations are completed and discuss any questions or concerns they have about the candidate's use of technology.

4. Check status of state program review for all programs.

The EPP programs are currently being reviewed by the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board.

Standard 2

2.1 Dispositions, Lesson Planning and Lesson Implementation Changes

1. What were some of the changes the EPP made to the Dispositions, Lesson Planning and Lesson Implementation that occurred as a result of examining these instruments with P-12 partners?

Exhibit 1.1.9 is a 2013-14 through 2017-18 timeline that outlines the collaboration of the EPP with its P-12 and Arts/Science partners to review, develop, and revise the Dispositions Survey, Lesson Plan Rubric, and Lesson Implementation Rubric. Evidence 2.1.13 is the Dispositions Assessment that was used in 2014. Exhibit 2.1.14 is the Dispositions Survey that was piloted in spring 2015, revised/finalized in summer 2015, and fully implemented in fall 2015. Exhibit 2.1.14 is also the current Dispositions survey. As evidenced by the two forms, after reviewing data and seeking feedback, the decision was made to begin fresh with a new form to evaluate candidates' dispositions. The questions, evaluation criteria, process, and instructions were all changed from the original form.

Exhibit 2.1.15 is the Lesson Evaluation form that was used prior to fall 2015. Exhibits 2.1.16 and 2.1.17 are the fall 2015 and fall 2016 (current) versions of the Lesson Implementation Rubric. Exhibits 2.1.18 - 2.1.20 are the fall 2015, fall 2016, and spring 2018 (current) version of the Lesson Plan Rubric. As evidenced by each rubric, extensive changes were made from the original rubric (2.1.15) when it was aligned only to the Kentucky Teacher Standards and included assessment of both the lesson plan and lesson implementation on one form. The Lesson Plan and Lesson Implementation Rubrics were developed in summer 2015 with a group of EPP Faculty, Arts/Science Faculty, and P-12 partners. They were then piloted during the 2015-16 academic year, reviewed and revised in summer 2016, with the current version implemented in fall 2016. The Lesson Implementation Rubric has not changed since fall 2016,

but the Lesson Plan Rubric was updated in spring 2018 to include the last component “Plans for Technology During Instruction.”

2.2 Status of “updated and centralized” approach.

1. What is the status of the "updated and centralized" approach the EPP implemented to place candidates in particular schools and districts for admissions, field and clinical experiences?

Prior to fall 2017, EPP faculty members directed the placements of candidates in schools for the admissions and Professional Semesters I, II, and III field experiences, while the Office of Educational Placements coordinated candidates’ school assignments for clinical experiences (student teaching). However, starting in fall 2017, the EPP began a more centralized and coordinated approach to candidates’ placements for admissions, field, and clinical experiences. This approach was informed by three factors. First, our review of data through the EPP Quality Assurance System revealed the need for a more centralized and coordinated approach to making candidate placements. The goal of the change was to more thoroughly ensure high-quality placements with diverse student populations and P-12 clinical educators who model effective curricular and instructional practices. Second, feedback from P-12 administrators and staff who manage the placements in schools and districts indicated their preference for communicating with a single EPP contact to make all the placement requests, instead of responding to multiple EPP faculty members requesting placements for candidates in their respective programs. Third, some EPP faculty wanted more support in candidate placements, especially to minimize the use of the same schools or even teachers for admissions, field, and clinical experiences and to improve communication and follow-up with partner schools. Consequently, starting in fall 2017, the EPP’s Office of Educational Placements took a larger role in developing and implementing a more centralized approach to candidate placements for admissions, field, and clinical experiences. In addition to continuing placing candidates for clinical experiences, the office began handling placements for all admissions experiences and for the field experiences in the elementary (Professional Semester II) and secondary education (Professional Semesters I and II) programs, in consultation with respective program facilitators and faculty members. EPP faculty members who prefer to arrange their own field experience placements continue to have this option; such is the case for the elementary (Professional Semester I), middle grades (Professional Semesters I and II), special education (Professional Semesters III), music (all field experiences) and physical education/health (Professional Semesters I-III) programs. However, these faculty work closely with the Office of Educational Placements in order to eliminate overlapping placement requests and to address the collection and analysis of data from EPP candidates, university and P-12 clinical educators, and P-12 students.

At the end of the 2017-18 academic year, the EPP will engage in evaluative conversations with our P-12 partners to identify the benefits and challenges of the new centralized approach to candidate placements for admissions, field, and clinical experiences. Based on a review of

available data and feedback, the EPP will identify areas of strength to amplify or sustain, as well as areas for improvement, so that necessary changes can be made for the following year.

2.3 School-embedded residency effectiveness

- 1. How has the EPP been tracking the effectiveness of the school-embedded residencies**
- 2. programs and what decisions and/or modification have been made based on the data?**
 - 2. How has the EPP collaborated with P-12 partners in the implementation and assessment of the school-embedded residency programs?**

The elementary education program tracks the effectiveness of the school-embedded residency program at Florence Elementary School in several ways. As it relates to the effectiveness of the program for the P-12 partners, the university clinical educator sends an email at the end of each semester asking for feedback related to suggestions for improvement and any challenges that occurred during the semester. Additionally, the school principal and university clinical educator track reading scores for grades 1-5 since the EPP candidates are assisting during the school's literacy blocks. Although we acknowledge that direct correlation is not possible, many of the P-12 teachers utilize literacy centers during the time our candidates are there and feel that the progress of the P-5 students is markedly improved with the extra assistance in the classroom. Because of this need at the school, most of the candidate placements are in the lower primary grades (K-3) for early reading instruction. This focus on literacy instruction was a request of the school principal based on data from reading assessments of P-5 students. As it relates to the effectiveness of teacher candidates, the university clinical educator monitors and analyzes results from the PRAXIS Elementary Language Arts and Reading (#5002) exam for passing rates and number of attempts. The university clinical educator also analyzes the data from course exams and projects that directly connect to the school-embedded residency, and makes adjustments to the course content as appropriate to connect coursework theory to practice in the classroom.

The school-embedded residency program at R. A. Jones Middle School was implemented in fall 2017. Since the residency just completed its first semester, we have limited data to demonstrate effectiveness. The program collected initial data on effectiveness through interviews and surveys including the following: (1) University clinical educators had monthly meetings with the school principal to discuss the embedded residency program and any issues that may have surfaced. (2) Candidates completed surveys to evaluate the effectiveness of their placements and P-12 clinical educators. The candidates were also asked to respond to open-ended survey questions regarding the effectiveness of the residency program. (3) University clinical educators conducted grade-level focus groups with P-12 clinical educators at the end of the semester to discuss program strengths/weaknesses, effectiveness of the partnership, and recommendations to improve the experience for candidates, teachers, and students. The university clinical educators also used this time to share observations regarding the residency program and to review program expectations and rubrics. Based on the initial data/feedback received, the school-embedded residency program was a positive experience for candidates and teachers. The candidates and teachers recommended a change to the schedule for

intensive teaching weeks that will be piloted in spring 2018. As the EPP begins an additional partnership with another district's middle school, Tichenor Middle School, in spring 2018, the university clinical educators plan to collect similar data from candidates, teachers, and the principal. In future semesters, the university clinical educators will have the opportunity to assess whether candidates who participated in the embedded experience are better prepared for their clinical experience. Additionally, the EPP will be able to track if the embedded experience results in a higher percentage of candidates being hired by the two partner school districts as compared to our traditional program candidates.

In addition to the ongoing collaborations with our P-12 school and district partners during the embedded residency programs, university clinical educators invite the teachers and principals to participate in appropriate Teacher Education Advisory Councils. For example, each teacher from Florence Elementary School is a member of the Elementary advisory council. Among other items, advisory committee members are asked to provide feedback on the evaluation rubrics related to the content and language of the evaluation instrument.

The university clinical educators leading the embedded residency programs also presented a session at the Kentucky Association of Teacher Educators during the fall 2017 conference where they presented evidence on the success of the residency programs and plans for future directions (Evidence 2.3.6).

2.3 Evidence of affirming pedagogies

1. What data or measures does the EPP use to ensure candidates' minimum of one diverse field placement adequately integrates affirming pedagogies?

In section 2.3 of the Self-Study Report, the EPP wrote: "EPP ensures that candidates have at least one diverse school placement, and integrate affirming pedagogies, such as culturally responsive teaching, trauma informed care, and high leverage practices, to counter deficit perspectives and treatment of P-12 students of color." The EPP defines a "diverse school placement" as a school with at least 10% of its student population identified as racial/ethnic minority and at least 15% of its student population as eligible for free or reduced lunch. This definition primarily attends to the race and class aspects of diversity, and reflects the racial/ethnic population demographics of the Northern Kentucky service region (Evidence 2.3.7). In addition, the EPP considers other aspects of diversity, such as the proportion of students with special needs and/or who are English language learners, when placing candidates in diverse school placements.

A Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) regulation requires all candidates to work with various categories of diverse P-12 students, such as racial/ethnic minorities, English language learners, and students with disabilities. The EPP added the requirement of candidates having at least one diverse placement to the required EPSB criteria. The EPP requires the following under the category of Diverse Experiences: (1) Candidates have at least one diverse placement (as defined above), and (2) Candidates work with P-12 students from lower socio-

economic backgrounds, with special needs, who are English language learners, and/or from racial/ethnic minority backgrounds. Each of these requirements are systematically reviewed at the end of each semester and recorded in the Cumulative Progress Report located in Foliotek (Evidence 5.1.7). Per Kentucky EPSB regulation, all candidates must meet all of these requirements before they are admitted to their clinical experience (student teaching). Even though the EPP requirement is for each candidate to have at least one diverse placement, a large percentage of candidates actually have two or more diverse placements. Evidence 2.3.8 shows that candidates, on average, have diverse placements for more than 50% of their field/clinical experiences: Elementary 74%; IECE 71%; MAT 65%; Middle Grades 70%; Music 68%; PE/HEA 60%; Secondary 63%; and Special Education 64%.

Most candidates have placements in diverse schools during their admissions semester, which serve as the candidates' first official experience as aspiring teachers. All existing school-embedded residencies in the elementary and middle grades education programs are in schools that meet or exceed the EPP definition of diverse placement. This includes Florence Elementary School (Boone County Schools) in elementary Professional Semester I, R.A. Jones Middle School (Boone County Schools) in middle grades Professional Semester I, and Glenn O. Swing Elementary School (Covington Independent Public Schools) in a combined one-year Professional Semester II field and clinical experience. The EPP is currently developing a school-embedded residency for the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program at Holmes Middle and High Schools (Covington Independent Public Schools). To begin in summer 2018, this new residency will be located in what is considered to be the most diverse and urban school district in northern Kentucky. In addition, the EPP continues to expand its placements in Cincinnati Public Schools (CPS), the largest school district in the greater Cincinnati and northern Kentucky region. For instance, admissions field experience has specific CPS sections, so that candidates become more familiar with and engage in effective practices for urban teaching, learning, assessment, and school-family relations. Increasingly, more candidates are also selecting CPS as one of their top five options for their final clinical experience placement.

Through these diverse school placements with high-quality P-12 clinical educators for admissions, field, and clinical experiences, candidates acquire knowledge, skills, and dispositions that counter prevailing stereotypes and deficit views and treatment of P-12 students of color. They observe, participate in, and enact pedagogies that affirm diverse cultural backgrounds as assets and resources for teaching and learning. They also learn from professional development workshops that offer research-based support and interventions. For example, they gain insights into trauma-informed care and classrooms from teachers and administrators in the Erlanger-Elsmere Independent School District who have been involved in a district-wide initiative to learn about and develop appropriate strategies to help PK-12 students deal with adverse childhood experiences and their effects on children's academic, physical, and emotional development.

To ensure that all candidates meet these diverse experience requirements, university clinical educators review each candidate's Cumulative Progress Report at the beginning of each semester to determine which requirements candidates may be missing. The university clinical

educator and/or Director of Educational Placements then works with candidates to place them in schools that will help them meet their missing requirements, such as a having placements in diverse schools or schools that have large populations of English language learners or students with disabilities. A final check is completed by the Director of Educational Placements once candidates apply for their clinical experience. The Director undertakes a systematic review of all of the requirements that candidates must meet before they can be admitted to the clinical experience (student teaching). The EPP encourages candidates to work with as many diverse P-12 students as possible during each of their admissions, field, and clinical experiences. Candidates write about those experiences in their final semester reflection which they upload in Foliotek. University clinical educators review the final reflection to determine what, if any, categories of diverse experiences candidates worked with that semester and mark the result in the Cumulative Progress Report. Evidence 1.1.8 has a link for examples of final semester reflections.

Standard 3

Professional Dispositions

1. Who was involved in developing the Dispositions policy?

The CAEP Standard 3 team developed the Dispositions policy and shared it in the Teacher Education Department meeting for feedback. The feedback was used by the Standard 3 team to revise the policy and presented it to the Teacher Education faculty at their January 2017 department meeting where it was approved. During the fall 2017 semester, the new Director of Educational Placements noted that the approved dispositions policy did not include the language “Clinical Experience”. The Standard 3 team facilitator then added the “Clinical Experience” terminology where appropriate to the approved policy. This revised policy and the rationale was shared during the November 2017 meeting of the Teacher Education Leadership Team and then voted on at the December 2017 Teacher Education Department meeting, where the changes were approved (Evidence 3.3.3 revised). The policy was also added to the January 2018 Teacher Education Committee for review and feedback from our collaborative partners (Evidence 1.1.8).

2. Is the Dispositions policy adhered?

As noted above, the Dispositions policy was approved and implemented in January 2017. At this time two candidates have been referred for a meeting and/or improvement plan.

3. Are instructors, CTs and University Supervisors clear about the dispositions and rubrics?

At the beginning of each semester the Teacher Education Department Chair, the Director of Educational Placements, and the Assessment Coordinator meet with the university clinical educators and the Teacher Education and Arts/Science faculty to review the dispositions and lesson evaluation rubrics. Any changes made in the rubrics, policies, and procedures are

reviewed with university clinical educators to ensure everyone knows and understands the EPP expectations. After that meeting, university clinical educators meet with the P-12 clinical educators in their schools to review the same information and to ensure they know and understand the EPP expectations. University clinical educators review a checklist and the lesson evaluation rubrics with P-12 clinical educators during their orientation meeting. At the end of the meeting, both parties sign the orientation checklist (Evidence 2.3.3) to document the meeting and discussion. In addition, university clinical educators give the P-12 clinical educators their contact information for any future questions that may arise. In reviewing the data from the dispositions rubrics the only concern noted by university clinical educators is that many P-12 clinical educators evaluate the candidate as “First Year Profession Ready” during the field experiences even though it is not the expected “Target” level. In the orientation meetings with P-12 clinical educators University clinical educators remind them of the EPP expectations.

4. Do candidates understand the disposition rubrics?

As noted in previous sections, candidates are continually assessed on their dispositions by both the University and P-12 clinical educators, beginning in the admissions field experience and continuing through their clinical experience. In addition, in seminars at the beginning of each semester, field experience supervisors review the professional behaviors expected of each candidate. Finally, one of the candidate requirements in each field and clinical experience is to self-assess their dispositions in Foliotek, using the dispositions rubric. Candidates begin this in the admissions field experience and continue through all of their subsequent field experiences, completing their last self-assessment during their clinical experiences.

Recruitment of Underrepresented Minorities

1. Who was involved in the five-year plan for recruitment and retention?

The five year plan was developed by the Recruitment and Retention Committee, which was comprised of five representatives from various programs and advisors from the College of Education and Human Services Advising Center. The group met over two academic years and started their process by reviewing the research literature to determine what strategies are most successful for recruiting and retaining candidates, in particular underrepresented minority (URM) students and students interested in teacher shortage areas. The committee met and collaborated with the institution’s Office of Admissions recruitment staff to develop and finalize the plan. The plan was also reviewed by the Teacher Education Committee with feedback solicited, especially for ideas on how the EPP could collaborate with the College of Arts and Sciences and P-12 schools to recruit future candidates in teacher shortage areas.

2. What is knowledge and commitment of the five-year plan?

The plan has been shared with EPP faculty and members of the Teacher Education Committee. One way the EPP demonstrated its commitment to the five-year plan was through the creation of the new Assistant Dean of Administration, Inclusive Excellence and Special Projects position

(more thoroughly discussed below). Additional evidence of the EPP's commitment to the five-year plan is described below, through various recruitment and retention strategies and special events.

3. Is there evidence beyond SSR for activities mentioned in the five year plan?

The EPP developed a closer partnership with two NKU offices that specifically serve URM students: the African American Programs & Services Office and the Latino Program & Services Office. Starting in fall 2017, the EPP began offering a one-credit course (EDU 294) for students involved in these two offices' mentoring programs, which have been proven to have higher retention and graduation rates compared to non-participating URM students. This collaboration between academic and student affairs units was driven by two factors. First, URM candidates who are Education pre-majors or majors and who participate in these mentoring programs benefit from culturally relevant and empowering support and activities, which help retain and graduate them. Second, the one-credit course (EDU 294) exposes non-Education students to Teacher Education, thereby serving as a recruitment tool for URM students and encouraging them to pursue teaching as a profession. The EDU 294 course sections for the African American mentoring program were taught by Ms. Tracy Stokes, director of the African American Programs & Services Office. In fall 2017, there were 4 mentors and 16 mentees enrolled in these sections. These sections will not be offered in spring 2018 due to Ms. Stokes' departure from NKU, but are planned to resume in fall 2018 with a new office director. Meanwhile, the EDU 294 course sections for the Latino mentoring program were taught by Mr. Leo Calderon, director of the Latino Programs & Services Office. In fall 2017, there were 21 mentors and 20 mentees enrolled in these sections, and these sections are being taught again in spring 2018 with 12 mentors and 11 mentees enrolled.

On September 15, 2017, the EPP hosted a national symposium on Teacher Diversity Matters (3.1.6) that focused on the preparation, recruitment, and retention of teachers of color. Organized primarily by three EPP faculty members and sponsored by the College of Education and Human Services, it drew close to 300 presenters and participants. This included not only teacher candidates, faculty members, and administrators in the EPP, but also high school and university students, educators, researchers, and government officials across Kentucky and other states in the country. The feedback on the Teacher Diversity Matters national symposium was very positive from both presenters and participants. As a result, plans are underway for the next national symposium in two years, in early Fall 2019 at NKU. The Kentucky Department of Education has already expressed solid interest in becoming a co-sponsor of the 2019 symposium. As a follow-up to the national symposium on Teacher Diversity Matters, two EPP faculty members will be serving as guest editors for a special issue in *Educational Studies*, a top-ranked, peer-reviewed journal. A select number of the symposium presentations will be solicited for full paper submissions and will go through the journal's anonymous peer review process. Papers receiving positive reviews will move forward for revision and, if necessary, additional review, and then eventual publication. The journal's special issue for Teacher Diversity Matters is slated for release in fall 2018.

The Director of the College of Education and Human Services Advising Center, education advisors, and members of the Teacher Education faculty are continually involved in university-wide recruitment and retention events, such as Major Minor Fair, Black and Gold, Welcome Wednesdays, and the Latino College Fair. In addition, they have an ongoing collaboration with the Office of Admissions to attend off-campus college fairs and other recruitment events with the intention of recruiting students to the teacher education program, especially URM students and people interested in math, science, and other teacher shortage areas (Evidence 3.1.8).

In the summers of 2016 and 2017, the EPP partnered with Cincinnati Public Schools (CPS) to host their Advanced Placement Blended Learning Boot Camp. CPS will again partner with the EPP in summer 2018 to host another residential boot camp for the students. The boot camps were created to give students a leg up on college-readiness skills through the district's new [My Tomorrow*ed](#) initiative. Students attend courses during their time on NKU's campus, and then complete the rest of the AP coursework on their own time. Eleven of CPS's high schools had students attend the camps, with an average of 70 students each summer. The boot camps draw a diverse range of students from the high schools they attend, with approximately 75% of the participating students are African Americans, 15-20% Caucasians, and the remaining 5% Latinos or Hispanics. During the summer camps, CPS students are on campus for 4 days and 3 nights, mixing academics with time to explore the NKU campus and programs.

3. Has the assistant dean position been filled? If assistant dean is on board, what has the person done regarding this initiative?

Yes, Dr. Lewatis McNeal was hired as the Assistant Dean of Administration, Inclusive Excellence and Special Projects and began at the EPP during summer 2017. Some of the first steps the Assistant Dean took were to review and familiarize himself with the five- year plan and meet with the COEHS Advising Center director to discuss ideas and strategies to recruit and retain underrepresented minority students for teacher education and other programs in the college. In addition to meeting with the Advising Center, the Assistant Dean met with the college's Inclusive Excellence Committee to work on developing an Inclusive Excellence plan for the entire college. During this process components of the EPP five- year plan regarding minority recruitment and retention were incorporated into the college's inclusive excellence plan. The Inclusive Excellence Committee partnered with the NKU Office of Inclusive Excellence and the NKU Center for Student Inclusiveness to host two university-wide discussions on diversity and inclusion. Dr. Holly Riffe, Professor of Social Work, and Dr. Lewatis McNeal, Assistant Dean of Administration, Inclusive Excellence and Special Projects, presented a diversity and inclusion dialogue discussion entitled "Social Justice Moving Forward: A social justice dialogue on moving forward after Charlottesville" (Evidence 3.1.4). Dr. Brandelyn Tosolt, Associate Professor in Teacher Education, also facilitated a diversity and inclusion dialogue entitled "Woke: Becoming Culturally Conscious".

The Assistant Dean also worked with the COEHS marketing director to change its marketing strategy for recruiting URM students into the various education programs. The current marketing strategy emphasizes diversity and inclusion by highlighting a current faculty member

of color, and two current candidates of color in Teacher Education (Evidence 3.1.7). The Assistant Dean is also working with the candidate group, Black and Brown Educators of Excellence, to develop minority teacher recruitment and outreach opportunities.

Statewide needs for shortage areas

1. What is the evidence of progress for recruiting and preparation for shortage areas beyond special education?

The EPP has focused on the recruitment of more teacher candidates in general, and those in shortage areas more specifically, by partnering with the Office of Admissions, College of Arts and Sciences, P-12 partners, and Pathway programs with community colleges. Enrollment data over the past 3 years indicate that most teacher shortage program areas have held steady in their numbers of pre-majors and majors, with a few exceptions such as World Languages and Secondary Sciences. Consequently, the EPP continues to target these programs for increased candidate enrollment (Evidence 3.1.9). Evidence of the EPP involvement in recruiting events is as follows:

- (1) NKU had a National Science Foundation Noyce grant from 2009-2015 which increased the number of math candidate completers. NKU is planning to submit another Noyce grant proposal this summer with the focus on increasing the number of middle and secondary math teachers. If awarded, the grant will begin in fall 2019.
- (2) The facilitator of the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program has been recruiting science and math candidates by working with Arts and Sciences department chairs to identify and contact all fall and spring graduates about the MAT program and inviting them to learn more about becoming a teacher. In addition, an EPP math educator and the MAT facilitator will be coordinating pizza/information sessions with those same Arts and Science graduates to speak with them about the MAT program. The EPP marketing representative developed posters for the MAT program to be hung in campus buildings on campus including: Natural Science, Founders, and other buildings, targeting STEM students about to graduate from the College of Arts and Sciences.
- (3) During the spring 2017 semester, the COEHS Advising Center participated in college fairs in the tri-state area: Jefferson County School District Educators Rising Conference College Fair KY), Middletown Ohio High School College Fair, and the Greater Indianapolis Southside Fair.
- (4) During spring 2017, the COEHS advisors conducted an information session for undeclared students in University Studies to introduce them to the majors in the College of Education and Human Services.
- (5) The COEHS Advising Center Director included a slide in the orientation PowerPoint that lists the teacher shortage areas and encourages students, with their parents in attendance, to consider majoring in one of those programs (Evidence 4.1.6)
- (6) In May 2017, the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) initiated an education pathway through the Career and Technical Education Program areas. The EPP worked with KDE to develop a pathway for high school students, freshmen through seniors, to take dual-credit courses in the Teaching and Learning Career Pathway. The purpose of the NKU Teaching

and Learning Career Pathway is to empower students with the knowledge, dispositions, and skills to be effective educators in a variety of disciplines and grade levels. Cooperative experience, internships, shadowing and mentoring opportunities provide depth and breadth of learning in the instructional program, and allow high school students to directly apply concepts learned in the classroom. We believe the hybrid teaching approach (on-site and online teaching) will enable the Teacher Education Scholars, school district teachers, and EPP faculty to provide opportunities for hands-on teaching experience, sustain an interest in the profession, and help cultivate skills and dispositions to be successful educators. The program was piloted in fall 2107 with the Kenton County Academies of Technology and Innovation's Future Educators academy. A total of 35 students, freshmen through seniors, from the district high schools in Kenton County School District took the initial course in the dual-credit pathway. Through this pathway, students will complete four of the courses (12 credit hours total) that are required for admission to the EPP Teacher Education program. The EPP is in discussion with several other school districts to offer this pathway, with the potential of having eight high schools partnering with NKU for the 2018-19 school year, dependent upon state funding support.

Standard 4

KTIP

1. Does the EPP have observation data from the KTIP Results for completers?

The raw observation data has been added to the revised Evidence 4.2.1 document and includes the Cycle III scores from the principal, resource teacher, and teacher educator.

Student Voice Survey

1. Is there additional information on Student Voice Survey?

The Student Voice Survey provides teacher candidates with feedback from P-12 students related to their learning experiences, with the results having the potential to improve the teacher candidate's learning environment and instructional practice. The Student Voice survey asks P-12 students to assess teacher candidates on seven constructs: support, transparency, understanding, discipline, engagement, nurture and trust. The Student Voice Survey was modified from the Tripod Survey, developed by Cambridge Education, and used in the Gates Foundation Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) study of teacher quality.

The Student Voice Survey is part of the Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) created by the Kentucky Department of Education evaluate practicing teachers in Kentucky. It is also a mandated requirement of the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (KTIP) that all first year Kentucky teachers must successfully complete to become fully certified. Although the PGES system was recently removed as the mandatory system for evaluating Kentucky teachers,, KTIP still requires the Student Voice Survey be given to P-12 students as part of the

KTIP evaluation system. The Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) requires EPPs to align their initial certification programs to the requirements of the KTIP program. Consequently the EPP began to require candidates to administer the Student Voice Survey to their P-12 students during the first eight weeks of the clinical experience. Candidates work with their P-12 clinical educators to have their P-12 students complete the appropriate Student Voice Survey via SurveyMonkey, which means candidates must arrange to have each of their students access the survey via a computer or personal device. Candidates are required to have only one of their classes complete the survey, although some choose to have more students complete it. Once the survey has been completed the EPP generates a pdf file for each candidate and sends them the results of their P-12 Student Voice evaluations. This allows candidates to use the results of the survey to improve their teaching during the second eight weeks of the semester.

This information is repeated in the Standard 5 question about the Student Voice Survey.

Employer Satisfaction Survey

1. Any follow-up on New Teacher Survey /Alumni Survey data that revealed for the most part, completers reported that they were on target, however, there was a decrease in their rating of their in the areas of Learner and Learning and of Content Knowledge?

The New Teacher Survey and Alumni surveys are completed anonymously, consequently it was not possible to follow up with any of the specific responders to the survey. However, faculty in each program and the Teacher Education Committee (TEC) members reviewed the data. Faculty noted the slight decrease in the mean scores but indicated that other data, such as the Praxis II Content and the Praxis Principle of Learning and Teaching exams indicated that program completers are well versed in these two InTASC categories. Faculty have also suggested that these questions be added to the spring 2018 program advisory council agendas. P-12 members of the TEC stated they have not observed any challenges with understanding P-12 student learning or content knowledge with the EPP completers teaching in their schools.

2. Any follow-up information on the “not rehired” completers from the Employment Satisfaction Survey?

The completers who submitted the Employment Satisfaction Survey were anonymous so the EPP was not able to follow-up with specific people. The data (Evidence 4.1.5 revised) from the two school districts providing information on EPP completers indicate 5% of the EPP completers did not return at the end of their first year of teaching, with 3% resigning and 2% not rehired. At the end of the second year 13% of the EPP completers did not return, with 6% resigning and 7% not being rehired. Due to confidentiality rules, the school districts were not able to provide specific reasons why completers were not rehired but stated the following information: budget cuts, poor classroom management skills, and lesson/unit planning.

Standard 5

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

1. Third cycle of data from Technology Assessment (1.5.1)

The third cycle of data has been added to the Technology Assessment data spreadsheet (Evidence 1.5.2). The EPP-wide data indicate the fall 2017 means are the highest of the three semester evaluations except in the Podcast category. In addition, all of the categories (except the Podcast) have mean scores of 1.93 or higher from the fall 2017 semester. The technology EPP faculty have indicated they are reviewing the Podcast evaluation criteria for possible changes in fall 2018.

2. Clinical Experience Surveys (2.2.3 and 2.2.4) Are the clinical experience surveys (2.2.3 and 2.2.4) EPP-wide assessments? Are data from these surveys reported? Provide examples of changes to clinical experiences as a result of data collected using these surveys.

These are not EPP-wide assessments. They are surveys that are used by the Director of Educational Placements. Each of the members of the triad (university clinical educator, P-12 clinical educator, and teacher candidate) evaluates one another in order to determine whether or not specific clinical educators are a good fit for the EPP Teacher Education program. The data is triangulated to rule out individual personality conflicts. However, when two surveys come back with negative feedback on the same P-12 clinical educator, conversations are had with the university clinical educators and, in some cases, the decision has been made to not work with a particular P-12 educator during future semesters. In addition, if patterns are identified in the P-12 feedback, such as if they identify a lack of communication at the university level, the Director of Educational Placements shares this feedback with the university clinical educator in order to ensure this issue, or any other that is identified, is improved going forward.

Feedback from our surveys has indicated that many teacher candidates and P-12 clinical educators prefer to work with fulltime university clinical educators, instead of part-time/adjunct supervisors. Over the last three years the EPP has moved away from using many part-time /adjunct university clinical educators to just a few. The EPP currently employs six part-time/adjunct university clinical educators, which is a small number when compared to the 25 fulltime faculty who are eligible to supervise from the Department of Teacher Education. In addition, the EPP also has full-time faculty from the College of Arts/Sciences who serve as university clinical educators. Using the feedback from the surveys the EPP made a decision to move to a model that utilizes more full-time university professors for clinical educators working with candidates in their clinical experience.

Another program change brought about via survey feedback includes no longer hosting large orientation meetings for P-12 clinical educators. Through feedback on these surveys the EPP learned that these large meetings were not conducive to promoting our desired level of

communication and the schedule restraints of local teachers. The EPP now requires triad orientation meetings among the teacher candidate, P-12 clinical educator, and the university clinical educator, in which the Orientation Form (Evidence 5.1.8) is discussed in its entirety and signed by all triad members.

3. Clarify the Student Voice Surveys, i.e., the survey administered using Survey Monkey referred to in 5.1.2 and the KDE survey referenced in 1.2.4 and 1.2.5.

This question was also asked in Standard 4 and we have re-entered the same information here.

The Student Voice Survey provides teacher candidates with feedback from P-12 students related to their learning experiences, with the results having the potential to improve the teacher candidate's learning environment and instructional practice. The Student Voice survey asks P-12 students to assess teacher candidates on seven constructs: support, transparency, understanding, discipline, engagement, nurture and trust. The Student Voice Survey was modified from the Tripod Survey, developed by Cambridge Education, and used in the Gates Foundation Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) study of teacher quality.

The Student Voice Survey is part of the Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) created by the Kentucky Department of Education evaluate practicing teachers in Kentucky. It is also a mandated requirement of the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (KTIP) that all first year Kentucky teachers must successfully complete to become fully certified. Although the PGES system was recently removed as the mandatory system for evaluating Kentucky teachers,, KTIP still requires the Student Voice Survey be given to P-12 students as part of the KTIP evaluation system. The Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) requires EPPs to align their initial certification programs to the requirements of the KTIP program. Consequently the EPP began to require candidates to administer the Student Voice Survey to their P-12 students during the first eight weeks of the clinical experience. Candidates work with their P-12 clinical educators to have their P-12 students complete the appropriate Student Voice Survey via SurveyMonkey, which means candidates must arrange to have each of their students access the survey via a computer or personal device. Candidates are required to have only one of their classes complete the survey, although some choose to have more students complete it. Once the survey has been completed the EPP generates a pdf file for each candidate and sends them the results of their P-12 Student Voice evaluations. This allows candidates to use the results of the survey to improve their teaching during the second eight weeks of the semester.

4. Is the teacher work sample an EPP-wide assessment?

Yes it is an EPP-wide assessment. It is a proprietary assessment that was developed by the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) to assess first year teachers participating in the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (KITP). This evaluation is one of the multiple measures used to verify EPP candidates meet the ten Kentucky Teacher Standards (KTS). The EPSB will be replacing the KTS with the InTASC standards in June 2018. The EPP plans

to develop a new Teacher Work Sample assessment, aligned to the InTASC standards, over summer 2018 and implemented as a pilot assessment during fall 2018. The EPP will use the Lawshe process to determine the validity of the new assessment and use multiple evaluators to determine the inter-rater reliability of the new assessment.

5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

1. How did the EPP ensure instruments would yield reliable, valid, and actionable data? Who was involved in the process?

EPP faculty worked with Arts and Science faculty and P-12 partners to develop the Lesson Plan and Lesson Implementation rubrics and determine the validity and reliability of the instruments. As noted in earlier responses, the instruments were developed during the summer of 2015 and implemented in fall 2015. During the fall 2015 Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) meeting the instruments were reviewed by the attendees using the Lawshe validity process. Evidence 5.2.4 records the 2015 CVR results. During summer 2016 both instruments were revised and the Lawshe method was used again during the fall 2016 TEAC meeting. Evidence 5.2.5 records the 2016 CVR results. According to the Lawshe process the minimum CVR value for 30 reviewers is 0.33. All of the components on the fall 2016 Lesson Plan and Lesson Implementation rubrics were evaluated to have a CVR value greater than 0.33, thus making the instruments valid.

In addition, from the fall 2015 semester, and each semester since then, inter-rater reliability has been calculated for the Lesson Plan and Implementation instruments. The University and P-12 clinical educators evaluate and observe each candidate's final lesson plan and teaching implementation at the exact same time during their clinical experience. Evidence 5.2.6 presents the inter-rater reliability (IRR) data for each component of the current instruments. The Lesson Plan rubric has an overall IRR of 87%, with each component ranging from 82%-94%. The Lesson Implementation rubric has an overall IRR of 86%, with components ranging from 73%-97%. The EPP plans to review the three components that have IRRs in the 70% range during their spring 2018 Quality Assurance Committee and if needed, will make changes to the rubric over summer 2018 and implement the revised rubric in fall 2018.

The Reflection rubric was developed by the CAEP Standard Two team during fall 2016 and implemented for the first time in spring 2017. The rubric was assessed for validity through the Lawshe process. Fifteen university clinical educators reviewed the rubric and checked which components they deemed were essential. According to the Lawshe process the minimum CVR value for 15 reviewers is 0.49. All of the components of the Reflection rubric were evaluated to have a CVR greater than 0.49, making the instrument valid (Evidence 5.2.7).

The Assessment Coordinator served as the second evaluator of the Reflection rubric to determine the inter-rater reliability. Fifteen percent of the clinical experience Reflection rubrics were randomly chosen during the spring 2017 semester and evaluated by the Assessment

Coordinator. As evidenced in document 5.2.8, all of the components had an average IRR of 0.80 or higher.

2. Describe the process used to determine the Technology Assessment yields reliable, valid, and actionable data.

This information is also stated in the Technology Cross-Cutting Theme section.

The EPP technology professors developed the Technology Assessment as another measure to assess candidates' use of technology to enhance P-12 student learning. The assessment was developed during the spring/ summer 2016 and was implemented in fall 2016. The assessment rubric was developed and aligned to the National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers, as well as the technology-based Standard Six of the Kentucky Teacher Standards. During the fall 2017 semester the Technology Assessment was reviewed by 7 technology experts to determine Lawshe CVR for each component (Evidence 5.2.9). According to the Lawshe process the minimum CVR value for 7 reviewers is 0.99. Components 1 and 4 have CVR values of 0.14. The EPP plans to review and revise the Technology Assessment over the spring and summer 2018 semesters and to have the new version reviewed by technology content experts again to determine the Lawshe CVR. The plan is to implement the revised version during the fall 2018 semester.

The technology professors determined the inter-rater reliability of the Technology Assessment instrument. During the fall 2016 semester, there were several sections of the technology classes, taught by two different professors. Each professor used the rubric to independently evaluate each candidate on the rubric, submitting the evaluation in Foliotek. At the end of the semester, each professor randomly chose 10% of the candidates in the other professor's course and evaluated their technology projects using the technology rubric. When compared, the percent of agreement on the evaluations was at least 80% on each component, which meets the CAEP standard for inter-rater reliability. This process was completed again at the end of the fall 17 semester and an overall inter-rater reliability score of 87%, with components 1 and 2 at 100% agreement.

5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

1. How are data used to improve programs? What process is used to review data and make program changes based upon these data?

Data are provided annually to program faculty through the Assessment Coordinator and posted on the EPP website. Program data are reviewed by all program faculty from November through February during their program meetings, by the program advisory councils in February/March, the Teacher Education Committee throughout the academic year, and by the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) during March/April. The facilitator of each program uses the information discovered in the data reviews to prepare the Quality Assurance Report (QAR) (Evidence 5.1.5), which highlights the results of the previous year changes, the current data analysis, and

changes proposed (if any) by the program faculty based on the data. The QAR is then presented at the annual quality assurance retreat. EPP-wide data is reviewed and discussed, along with individual program data, to determine if there are any trends in individual programs or across all programs in the EPP. After the QAC each program facilitator takes the agreed upon recommendations back to the program faculty for consideration and discussion about any additional changes to improve program quality and candidate performance. Recent changes are also reviewed to see if they have resulted in any improvements in candidate performance and/or program quality.

2. Has the EPP/program reviewed the impact of changes made previously to ensure the changes are improvements?

Yes, reviewing the impact of previous changes to the program's curriculum or processes is a regular part of the Quality Assurance system. The first section of the Quality Assurance Report (QAR) asks the program facilitators to identify changes made to the program in previous years and determine the impact, if any, the change made on candidates' performance or program quality. One of the challenges is that recent curriculum changes have typically not been in effect long enough for the data to reflect the impact of the changes. For example, if a curriculum change is made to improve Praxis II Content scores typically the results will not be evident for 3-5 years. The QAR also requires the facilitator to identify any recommended changes for the upcoming year and state them in the document. Those changes will be reviewed the following year, thus completing the continuous improvement cycle. Evidence 5.1.6 states the impact of changes made in previous years.

5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared, and used in decision making

1. Describe the process used to secure completer impact data.

The process used depended on the outcome data that was being secured. The P-12 student learning and development and observation of teaching effectiveness were secured through the Kentucky Center for Education and Workforce Statistics (KCEWS) Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) report and by working with two partner school districts to secure additional data about EPP completers who are employed by those districts. The KCEWS Teacher Preparation Feedback Report (TPFR) provided the EPP with data on several completer measures, including completer persistence. Evidences 5.4.4 and 5.4.5 are the state and NKU TPFR reports. These reports indicate EPP completers have similar retention rates as completers from all of the state EPPs. The 2008 EPP cohort had a retention rate of 85% (90% state) in year two and 70% (73% state) in year five; the 2009 EPP cohort had a retention rate of 92% (91% state) and 81% (76% state) in year five; and the 2010 cohort had a retention rate of 87% (91% state) in year two and 74% (73% state) in year five. The employer and alumni surveys were sent annually to the appropriate people. The completer, graduation, and licensure rates were generated from data tracked by the Director of the COEHS Advising Center. The employment rate was secured by reviewing information on the EPSB website and emails sent to EPP

completers. Consumer information was identified by working with various offices on the NKU campus.

3. How are completer impact data analyzed and shared?

The data was shared at the Teacher Education Department meeting, the Teacher Education Committee, and the Quality Assurance Committee. Each group reviewed and analyzed the data for any EPP-wide trends or challenges. No one in the groups identified concerns, and the EPP seems to have positive performance in most, if not all, of the categories.

4. How are completer impact data used in decision making?

The data is used as appropriate to determine any changes that might need to be made in the EPP, such as modifying curriculum or placements or changing EPP rubrics, processes, or surveys.

5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

1. What is the role of the Teacher Education Committee as related to quality assurance?

The Teacher Education Committee is an important part of the quality assurance cycle. The committee members are representative of Teacher Education and Arts/Science faculty members and administrators, current candidates, and P-12 teachers and administrators. The committee meets monthly and has several important functions. It is the committee that has final approval on all candidates being admitted to the education program and student teaching and final approval for all curriculum items before they leave the college and move to the university level. The Teacher Education Committee gives important feedback and perspectives on various education discussions and questions, reviews and develops rubrics and processes, and reviews and analyzes EPP wide data.

2. What is the role of the Teacher Education Advisory Council as related to quality assurance?

The Teacher Education Advisory Council is an important part of the quality assurance cycle. Each program has its own advisory council that is composed of alumni, P-12 teachers and administrators, and some current candidates. The advisory councils meet once or twice during the academic year, and give feedback to EPP faculty on questions and processes that are on the agenda. For the past few years, the advisory councils have played a key role in determining the validity of various rubrics by serving as content experts in the Lawshe content validity process. The advisory councils also review and analyze data with the program faculty.

3. What is the current status of the PK-12 University Task Force?

The P-12 University Task Force was in existence for one academic year, 2013-14. It was created as a short-term task force with the charge of initiating discussions on how the EPP could form

closer partnerships with their P-12 and Arts/Science partners. This task force was also the beginning of the EPP's preparations for CAEP accreditation.

Diversity Cross Cutting Theme

1. What are candidates' experiences in teaching all learners?

All candidates in all programs are required to work with as many diverse students as possible during each of their field and clinical experiences. Diversity is defined in a broad sense and includes students with disabilities, English language learners, socio-economic and racial/ethnic diversity. As noted in Evidence 5.1.7, Foliotek Cumulative Progress Report (CPR), university clinical educators systematically review candidates' experiences in their field/clinical placements and note those experiences on the CPR at the end of each semester. Candidates must have each diverse category, as well as a diverse placement, completed before they can be admitted to the clinical experience. The Director of Educational Placements and Internships completes a final check of the CPR before candidates can begin their clinical placement.

2. Confirm the integration of diversity in course syllabi.

Evidence 1.1.8 lists the website link to the EPP syllabi. All of the EPP's pedagogy syllabi, and many content syllabi are on the website. These include the syllabi listed in the Cross-Cutting Theme section and closely related to diversity issues, such as EDU 300, 305, 316 and EDS 360.

3. Examine candidate lesson plans that show specific strategies for addressing diverse learners.

Evidence 1.1.8 lists the website link to the candidate lesson plans. The examples have diversity information highlighted in yellow in the Lesson Procedures section of the lesson plan.

4. Examples of reflections uploaded to Foliotek related to diversity.

Evidence 1.1.8 lists the website link to the candidate final reflections. The examples have diversity information highlighted in yellow throughout the entire reflection document. Candidates are asked to reflect on the interactions/collaboration they had with diverse students during the semester, including socio-economic, ethnic/racial- minimum of 2 different ethnic or cultural groups other than your own, students with disabilities, and English language learners.

Technology Cross Cutting Theme

1. How is technology infused in the EPP programs?

All initial certification candidates complete an education technology course: EDU 313 (Technology in Education), in the undergraduate program; and EDMT 641 (Technology in

Middle/Secondary Classrooms) in the MAT program. These courses give candidates a foundation in technology hardware and software, as well as strategies for using technology to enhance student learning. Candidates are continuously exposed to the role of technology in facilitating instruction and feedback from their first field experience through their culminating clinical experience. Candidates are placed in P-12 classrooms that integrate technology into many aspects of the curriculum and instruction. Many candidates have experience with electronic gradebooks and communication programs in multiple field placements. In addition, they are asked to integrate technology into every lesson where it would not detract from the effectiveness of the lesson. Candidates are asked to demonstrate their use of technology in all four semesters of their work in the field, including all field placements and their culminating clinical experience.

As described earlier, candidates are expected to include technology in at least one of their lesson plans and to use that technology when teaching the lesson. Candidates are required to include technology in at least one of their lessons during each of their field and clinical experience. University and P-12 Clinical Educators use the Lesson Plan and Lesson Implementation Rubrics to evaluate the candidate's ability to plan and use technology while teaching, with the emphasis on both the teacher candidate and students using technology in a manner that facilitates and enhances instruction and/or student learning.

2. Describe the reliability and validity methods of the technology assessment rubric.

This is the same information that was stated in Standard 5.2, question 2.

The EPP technology professors developed the Technology Assessment as another measure to assess candidates' use of technology to enhance P-12 student learning. The assessment was developed over the spring/ summer 2016 and was implemented in fall 2016. The assessment rubric was developed and aligned to the National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers, as well as the technology-based Standard Six of the Kentucky Teacher Standards. During the fall 2017 semester the Technology Assessment was reviewed by 7 technology experts to determine Lawshe CVR for each component (Evidence 5.2.9). According to the Lawshe process the minimum CVR value for 7 reviewers is 0.99. Components 1 and 4 have CVR values of 0.14. The EPP plans to review and revise the Technology Assessment over the spring /summer 2018 semesters and have the new version reviewed by technology content experts again to determine the Lawshe CVR. The plan is to implement the revised version during the fall 2018 semester.

The technology professors determined the inter-rater reliability of the Technology Assessment instrument. During the fall 2016 semester there were several sections of the technology classes, taught by two different professors. Each professor used the rubric to independently evaluate each candidate on the rubric, submitting the evaluation in Foliotek. At the end of the semester, each professor randomly chose 10% of the candidates in the other professor's course and evaluated their technology projects using the technology rubric. When compared, the percent of agreement on the evaluations was at least 80% on each component, which meets

the CAEP standard for inter-rater reliability. This process was completed again at the end of the fall 2017 semester with an overall inter-rater reliability score of 87%, with components 1 and 2 at 100% agreement.