# Self-Study Report

## Selected Improvement (SI) Pathway



# NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

Nunn Drive
Highland Heights, KY 41099-0800
March 18, 2018 12:00 a.m.

**Type of Visit:**
Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation

CAEP Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

# CAEP Self-Study Report for SI Pathway

## I. EPP Overview

a. Context and Unique Characteristics

The College of Education and Human Services (EPP) is part of Northern Kentucky University (NKU), which is the newest of Kentucky's eight state universities and was founded in 1968. It is the commonwealth's only regional university located in a major metropolitan area. In 1971 the degrees of Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science were initiated in business, education, and most of the basic arts and sciences. Major construction of the campus began in 1972 and continues today to accommodate a growing enrollment that now numbers almost 15,000 students.

NKU is a public regional university nestled in the hills of a quiet suburb in Northern Kentucky. It is accessible from four major highways and just 20 minutes away from the Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport. NKU is located seven miles south of downtown Cincinnati, Ohio and less than two hours north of Lexington and Louisville, Kentucky. In order to become more student-friendly, NKU moved the undergraduate and graduate programs beyond the traditional delivery formats to include evenings, weekends, off-campus, online programs, and technology-enhanced instruction. Extracurricular programming and participation have greatly expanded and nearly $300 million in facilities have been added.

The EPP collaborates closely with area school districts and involves all stakeholders in various advisory and decision making committees. All initial certification programs offer candidates experiential learning opportunities in authentic settings. Each program requires at least 3 semesters of field experiences, with candidates completing a minimum of 200 hours, before they are eligible to enroll in the clinical (student teaching) experience. During their clinical experience candidates are in their school placement Monday through Friday for 16 continuous weeks. All candidates, except secondary education majors, are in two placements during their clinical experience.

b. Description of Organizational Structure

The College of Education and Human Services, one of six colleges at NKU, is comprised of three departments responsible for coordinating all programs offered for the initial and advanced preparation of teachers, administrators, and school counselors. The many programs offered allow candidates to enter the teaching profession from a variety of contexts and backgrounds. The programs offered by the COEHS include: (1) Bachelor of Arts in Education and Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) leading to initial teaching certification; (2) a Master of Arts in Education (MAEd) degree as an advanced program for licensed teachers; (3) a Master of Arts in School Counseling; (4) Educational Specialist degrees in Educational Leadership and Teaching and Learning; and

(5) non-degree programs for candidates who wish to add certification, endorsements to existing certifications, or increase their teaching certification to a higher rank. All undergraduate initial certification programs are offered as traditional face to face programs. The MAT program is a hybrid, with some classes offered as face to face and some offered online. There is a close working relationship among the COEHS, College of Arts and Sciences, and P-12 school partners to design, implement, and assess teacher preparation programs. Because we believe it is a joint responsibility to prepare future and current educators, university faculty and P-12 personnel serve jointly on governance and advisory committees to ensure high quality teacher preparation programs.

c. Vision, Mission, and Goals

NKU Mission: As a public comprehensive university located in a major metropolitan area, Northern Kentucky University delivers innovative, student-centered education and engages in impactful scholarly and creative endeavors, all of which empower our graduates to have fulfilling careers and meaningful lives, while contributing to the economic, civic, and social vitality of the region.

NKU Vision: NKU will be acclaimed by students, alumni, the region, and the commonwealth for:
. Our Success... in preparing outstanding graduates for a global society
. Our Contribution... to regional progress and economic growth
. Our Delivery... of distinctive academic programs
. Our Dedication... to the development and wellbeing of our people
. Our Effectiveness... in securing and managing resources sustainably

EPP Mission: The College of Education and Human Services plays an important leadership role and collaborates with others in the creation, dissemination, and application of knowledge and research that enhances professional practice and transforms lives, schools, and communities.

EPP Vision: The College of Education and Human Services aspires to be known throughout the Commonwealth of Kentucky and region at-large as the leader in providing opportunities for engaged learning and applied scholarship that fosters individual growth and collective success.

d. EPP's Shared Values and Beliefs for Educator Preparation

The EPP programs emphasize active participation of candidates in content and pedagogy classes as well as appropriate field and clinical experiences. During these experiences candidates construct their knowledge by engaging in a variety of activities, such as developing and teaching lesson plans, assessing P-12 students, and collaborating with their peers, university, and P-12 clinical educators. The EPP programs foster learning environments that invite collaboration and cooperation between candidates and instructors and provide opportunities for candidates to be reflective about many issues related to

their future profession. Within this context, candidates are asked to continually reflect and examine their knowledge, skills, and dispositions with the ultimate goal of becoming an excellent teacher that positively impacts P-12 students.

The EPP prepares candidates who see learning as a lifelong process. Candidates are asked to reflect on their own experiences as learners and the implications of those experiences for their growth as future educators. Through reflection of their experiences as learners, candidates establish connections among the role the student plays in learning, the environments in which learning occurs, and the knowledge bases that help support learning. Specifically, the EPP works to enable the development of candidates who are committed to the continuing process of learning with an emphasis on learning pedagogy skills; take an active role in promoting the learning of all students; embrace diversity and support pluralistic views; and examine the role of technology and apply it effectively to advance their students' knowledge.

The EPP programs promote the development of professionals who consider and act on these ideals. This is evident in the programs through traditional classroom experiences, school partnerships, and field experiences, which compel attention to diversity, authentic learning opportunities, and performance-based assessment. The faculty carefully design courses and select resources that develop candidates' knowledge and skills while emphasizing reflection on and articulation of the purposes and goals of learning. Candidates are guided through the processes of respecting diversity and culturally diverse qualities of learning. Candidates, through readings and discussion in courses and field-based experiences, come to see individual differences along lines of ethnicity, race, culture, gender, language, and abilities.

In order to impact P-12 learners it is essential for candidates to demonstrate systemic and developmentally appropriate practices. Consequently, each program in the EPP has developed a planned sequence of experiences in content specialization, professional studies, and integrated field-based experiences for the purpose of positively impacting P-12 student learning. The ultimate goal is to prepare teachers who effectively demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of highly qualified certified professionals.

Though differences exist among individual faculty members' philosophical belief systems, they share the core belief that knowledge in all content fields is ever-changing and expanding. Faculty further believe they and their students must keep abreast of these changes. Faculty serve as models in the classes they teach and the procedures they use to evaluate candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Candidates in turn demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions during course and field experiences, always with the intent of positively impacting P-12 student learning.

e. Is the EPP regionally or institutionally accredited?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No. the EPP is ineligible for regional/institutional accreditation or such accreditation is not available

## EPP is regionally or institutionally accredited

a. If your institution/EPP is regionally accredited, please upload a PDF copy of the award of regional accreditation here. If your institution/EPP is NOT regional accredited, please move to the next page.

SACS NKU Accreditation Letter

See Attachment panel below.

## Table 2. Program Characteristics

a. Complete this table of program characteristics by entering the information requested for every program or program option offered by the EPP. Cross check the list with the programs listed in the EPP's academic catalog, if any, as well as the list of state-approved registered programs, if applicable. Site Visitors will reference this list in AIMS during the accreditation review process.

| Name of Program/specialty area | Enrollment in current fall cycle | Enrollment in last fall cycle | Degree, certificate or licensure level | Method of Delivery | State(s) which program is approved | Date of state approval(s) | Program Review Option (National Recognition, state-only, or Program Review with Feedback) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 160 | 161 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education | 21 | 19 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Middle School English | 22 | 18 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Middle School Mathematics | 27 | 41 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Middle School Science | 19 | 25 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Middle School Social Studies | 25 | 21 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Physical Education | 4 | 8 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Health Education | 4 | 8 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Secondary Biological Sciences | 5 | 7 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Secondary Chemistry | 1 | 1 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Secondary Earth/Space | 0 | 0 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Secondary Physics | 0 | 0 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Secondary English | 23 | 13 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Secondary Mathematics | 6 | 6 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Secondary Social Studies | 29 | 25 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Secondary P-12 Art | 2 | 2 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Secondary P-12 Integrated Music | 16 | 9 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Secondary P-12 French | 1 | 1 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Secondary P-12 German | 0 | 1 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Secondary P-12 Spanish | 7 | 6 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| Learning and Behavior Disorders (Special Education) | 53 | 48 | Bachelor of Arts/ Initial Undergraduate | Face to Face | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| MAT Middle School English | 5 | 2 | Master of Arts in Teaching/ Initial Graduate | Hybrid | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| MAT Middle School Mathematics | 5 | 8 | Master of Arts in Teaching/ Initial Graduate | Hybrid | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| MAT Middle School Science | 3 | 2 | Master of Arts in Teaching/ Initial Graduate | Hybrid | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| MAT Middle School Social Studies | 6 | 0 | Master of Arts in Teaching/ Initial Graduate | Hybrid | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| MAT Secondary Biological Sciences | 5 | 0 | Master of Arts in Teaching/ Initial Graduate | Hybrid | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| MAT Secondary Chemistry | 3 | 1 | Master of Arts in Teaching/ Initial Graduate | Hybrid | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| MAT Secondary Earth/ Space | 0 | 0 | Master of Arts in Teaching/ Initial Graduate | Hybrid | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| MAT Secondary Physics | 2 | 2 | Master of Arts in Teaching/ Initial Graduate | Hybrid | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| MAT Secondary English | 2 | 6 | Master of Arts in Teaching/ Initial Graduate | Hybrid | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| MAT Secondary Mathematics | 3 | 1 | Master of Arts in Teaching/ Initial Graduate | Hybrid | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| MAT Secondary Social Studies | 4 | 3 | Master of Arts in Teaching/ Initial Graduate | Hybrid | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MAT Secondary P-12 French | 0 | 1 | Master of Arts in Teaching/ Initial Graduate | Hybrid | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| MAT Secondary P-12 German | 0 | 3 | Master of Arts in Teaching/ Initial Graduate | Hybrid | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |
| MAT Secondary P-12 Spanish | 6 | 2 | Master of Arts in Teaching/ Initial Graduate | Hybrid | Kentucky | Current- under review | State Only |

## Table 3. EPP Characteristics

Complete a table of EPP characteristics in AIMS to provide an expanded profile by which the accreditation process is managed by CAEP staff. EPP characteristics are also used by CAEP staff in compiling CAEP's Annual Report to the public and used as a series of filters for dashboard comparison by the EPP itself. The AIMS version of this table, in which the data are actually entered, has drop-down menus by which characteristics are selected and the table is completed.

| | |
|---|---|
| Control of Institution | Public |
| Student Body | Coed |
| Carnegie Class | Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs) |
| Location | Suburban |
| Teacher Preparation Levels | Currently offering initial teacher preparation programs<br>Currently offering advanced educator preparation programs |
| EPP Type | Institution of Higher Education: State/Regional |
| Religious Affiliations | Not applicable |
| Language of Instruction | English |
| Institutional Accreditation (Affiliations) | Southern Association of Colleges and Schools |

## Table 4. Clinical Educator Qualification Table

a. The clinical educator (EPP faculty & supervisors) qualifications table is completed by providing information for each of the EPP-based clinical educators.

| Name | Highest degree earned | Field or specialty area of highest degree | Program Assignment(s) | Teaching assignment or role within the program(s) | P-12 certificates or licensures held | P-12 experiences including teaching or administration dates of engagement in these roles |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

Upload the clinical educator qualifications table, if not provided in the previous table.

Clinical Educator Qualifications Table.xlsx

See Attachment panel below.

## Table 5. The Parity Table

a. The parity table of curricular, fiscal, facility, and administrative and support capacity for quality is used to satisfy requirements of the U.S. Department of Education and is completed by providing data relevant for the EPP and making a comparison to an EPP-determined comparative entity. The comparative entity might be another clinical EPP within a university structure, a national organization, the college or university as a whole or another entity identified as a benchmark by the EPP. Again, this chart offers an example of how the chart might be completed.

| Capacity Dimension | EPP description of metric(s) | EPP data | Comparative entity data | Title and description of supplemental evidence/documentation of quality for each dimension |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Facilities | | | | |
| Fiscal Support | | | | |
| Administrative support | | | | |
| Candidate support services | | | | |
| Candidate feedback, formal and informal | | | | |

Upload Parity Table

| |
|---|
| EPP Table 5- Parity.xlsx |
| EPP Budget |
| Screen Shots |
| EPP Org Chart |

See Attachment panel below.

## Table 6. Accreditation Plan

a. The Accreditation Plan is an educator preparation provider's (EPP's) identification of the sites outside of the main campus or administrative headquarters and the programs offered at each site that will be included in the EPP's accreditation review. This information, in combination with the table of program characteristics, is used by CAEP staff and site visit team leads to plan the site visit, including the sites that will be visited by site team members.

| Geographic Site(s) administered by the EPP | Program offered at each site | Is the program to be included in accreditation review? (Y or N) | Is the program approved by state in which program is offered? (Y or N or approval not required) | Notes/Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| None, other than the main Northern Kentucky University Campus | | | | |

## Table 7. EPP Assessments

Please list proprietary assessments used by the EPP (no more than 7):

| Proprietary Assessment No. | Title of Assessment | Validity & Reliability information if available & applicable |
|---|---|---|
| Proprietary Assessment No.1 | Praxis Core Academic Skills for Educators | None available |
| Proprietary Assessment No.2 | Praxis Subject Assessments | None available |
| Proprietary Assessment No.3 | Student Voice Survey - Kentucky Teacher Internship Program P-12 Student Surveys- Kentucky version of the Tripod Survey | Tripod survey instruments were the only classroom-level surveys studied and validated by the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) project. The MET project found that Tripod surveys were the most reliable of the measures studied, and that they also predicted year-to-year gains in test scores. |
| Proprietary Assessment No.4 | Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board New Teacher Survey | None available |
| Proprietary Assessment No.5 | Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (KTIP)evaluations | Reliability and Validity of the KTIP Assessment<br>Terry Hibpshman; Martin School; February 2017<br>KTIP IPR composite committee ratings are sufficiently reliable to be used to determine which interns should be granted professional certification. Scoring was applied accurately and consistently, at least in the final cycle, as indicated by the generalizability study |
| Proprietary Assessment No.6 | | |
| Proprietary Assessment No.7 | | |

Please map above proprietary assessments to the appropriate CAEP Standards:

| | CAEP Standard 1 | CAEP Standard 2 | CAEP Standard 3 | CAEP Standard 4 | CAEP Standard 5 | State |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Proprietary Assessment No.1 | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Proprietary Assessment No.2 | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☐ |
| Proprietary Assessment No.3 | ☑ | ☐ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☐ |
| Proprietary Assessment No.4 | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☑ | ☐ |
| Proprietary Assessment No.5 | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☑ | ☐ |
| Proprietary Assessment No.6 | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Proprietary Assessment | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

| No.7 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## II. CAEP Standards and Evidence

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard and answer the following questions for each item.)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | 1.1.1 Disp Eval PK-12_Univ CE 3 cycles data.xlsx |
| 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards | |
| 2 | 1.1.2 Lesson Planning PK-12_Univ CE 3 cycles data.xlsx |
| 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards | |
| 3 | 1.1.3 Lesson Implementation PK-12_Univ CE 3 cycles data.xlsx |
| 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards<br>1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.<br>1.5 Model and apply technology standards | |
| 4 | 1.1.4 3 year Praxis test comparisons.xlsx |
| 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards | |
| 5 | 1.1.5 Dispositions survey FA 16.docx |
| 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards | |
| 6 | 1.1.6 Lesson Planning Rubric both years.docx |
| 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards | |
| 7 | 1.1.7 Lesson Implementation Rubric both years.docx |
| 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards<br>1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.<br>1.5 Model and apply technology standards | |
| 8 | 1.2.1 Foliotek Clinical Experiences Final Reflection rubric.docx |
| 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress | |
| 9 | 1.2.2 Semester Reflection data 1 cycle.xlsx |
| 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress | |
| 10 | 1.2.3 Model Syllabus spring 17.docx |
| 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress | |
| 11 | 1.2.4 Student_Voice_Surveys.docx |
| 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress | |
| 12 | 1.2.5 Student Voice Survey 2 cycles data.xlsx |
| 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress<br>1.5 Model and apply technology standards | |
| 13 | 1.2.6 Teacher Work Sample Pre-Post data.xlsx |
| 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress | |
| 14 | 1.2.7 Teacher Work Sample Rev_Stds 3 cycles data.xlsx |

1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
1.5 Model and apply technology standards

15 1.2.8 TWS process.pdf

1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
1.5 Model and apply technology standards

16 1.2.9 TWS Foliotek scoring rubric.pdf

1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress

17 1.3.1 EPSB approved programs.xls

1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge

18 1.4.1 Model LessonPlan.FA16.docx

1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.

19 1.4.2 Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS).docx

1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.

20 1.5.1 Technology Assessment Rubric.docx

1.5 Model and apply technology standards

21 1.5.2 Technology Assessment 2 cycles data.xlsx

1.5 Model and apply technology standards

22 2.1.1 MOA-generic.docx

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards

23 3.2.1 Applicants, admits and enrolled 3cycles data.xlsx

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards

* ii. Analysis of evidence (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that makes the case that the standard is met

The EPP ensures that all candidates develop an understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline by using multiple measures to address each component of CAEP Standard One. The last three cycles of data (fall 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016) indicate that Northern Kentucky University teacher candidates perform strongly in all components.

1.1 Evidence of the EPP's overall effectiveness is demonstrated in candidate performances on the required Praxis examinations (1.1.4), which were compared against state and national benchmarks. Among all Praxis content exams, only one EPP licensure area was below the state average for the past three cycles of data (Elementary Social Studies at 80% vs. 82%) but above the national average (75%). The few licensure areas that experienced a downward trend in passing rates were also above state and national benchmarks, such as Middle Grades (70% EPP, 64% state, 52% national) and Secondary Language Arts (83% EPP, 81% state, 76% national). Significant improvement was seen in several licensure areas over the three-year period, such as Elementary Science (80% increased to 93%) and Early Childhood

Education (82% in fall 2015 but 100% in each of the last two data cycles).

Isolated candidate cohorts prompted slight concern regarding their passage rates, but were not a trend when considered over three years of data. Concerns included 2013-2014 IECE and Secondary English test cohorts, the 2014-2015 Chemistry test cohort, and the 2015-2016 Secondary Social Studies test cohort - each of which was 5% or more below the Kentucky average. Discussions are taking place within these content-area programs, including representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences, to address programmatic curriculum and areas for improvement. Conversely, multiple licensure areas displayed exemplary scores. In the two years where there were five or more candidates taking the tests, Middle Grades Language Arts and Math, Secondary Math, Music, and Spanish candidates passed at a rate 5% or higher than the Kentucky average. For certain content areas (French, German, Biology, Physics, Earth and Space Science, Physical Education, Health, and Art), there was a low number of candidates taking each test, making it difficult to discern any trends.

Candidate performance on the Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) exam was also consistently strong across the EPP over the three-year period. The passage rate for those taking the K-6 exam ranged between 98-100% and was above the state (87-97%) and national levels (92-93%). The 5-9 Middle Grades exam experienced a similar trend (95-100% within the EPP as compared to 94% (state) and 90-92% (nation). While EPP candidate performance on the 7-12 PLT exam was slightly lower than statewide peers over the last three cycles (93-94% versus 96-97%), the EPP figure was above the national rate (90%). Further evidence of candidate content proficiency is seen in the aggregate GPA of enrolled candidates in the EPP (3.2.1), indicating teacher candidate GPAs are comparable to non-candidate overall GPAs when studying the same content areas.

The EPP compiled key assessments data to assure candidates mastered and applied content and pedagogy knowledge in each of the four Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) categories and Kentucky Teacher Standards (KTS). Candidate dispositions, as well as lessons planned and taught by candidates in each of the EPP's programs, are evaluated via the Dispositions Rubric (1.1.5), Lesson Planning Rubric (1.1.6) and Lesson Implementation Rubric (1.1.7). Data for three cycles of each assessment were disaggregated for all licensure areas and presented in Excel sheets: Dispositions Assessment (1.1.1), Lesson Planning Assessment (1.1.2), and Lesson Implementation Assessment (1.1.3). As noted in the EPP-created assessments information, the Lesson Planning and Lesson Implementation rubrics were revised and updated in fall 2016. Both versions of the assessments are included.

The Dispositions evaluations are completed during the candidate's three transition points (TP1-admissions, TP2-field experiences, TP3-clinical

experience) by both P-12 Clinical Educators (PCE) and University Clinical Educators (UCE). The Dispositions rating scale is First Year Profession-Ready (3 points), On Target to Be First Year Profession-Ready (2 points), and Not on Target to be First Year Profession-Ready (1 point). The target score for all three transition points is On Target to Be First Year Profession-Ready.

The lesson plan and lesson implementation evaluations are completed during TP2 and TP3 by both the PCE and UCE. The rating scale used for each rubric is Accomplished (4), On Target (3), Emerging (2), and Ineffective (1). The target score for TP2 is Emerging and the target score for TP3 is On Target, but candidates can successfully complete each assessment in TP3 with some scores of Emerging (1.1.6; 1.1.7). EPP-wide mean score serves as the benchmark for each program since these are EPP-created assessments.

Learner and Learning. The component of the Dispositions Assessment (1.1.1) that addresses the Learner and Learning category states, "Overall, how ready is this NKU teacher candidate to build on individual P-12 students' strengths to enhance the learning of all students?" In Transition Point 1 (TP1-admissions) 95-99% of all candidates met the target of "On target to become 1st year profession ready"; for TP2 96-99% of candidates across all programs met the target, and for TP3 98-100% of all candidates met the target. There was a clear trend moving from TP1 to TP3 across the EPP, with nearly all licensure areas approaching 100% in TP3 (clinical experience). There was also a clear trend in the EPP-wide mean scores, which ranged from 2.06-2.51 in TP1 and from 2.57-2.95 in TP3.

"Facilitate multiple levels of learning" is the only Learner and Learning component on the Lesson Planning Rubric. EPP-wide, the range of mean scores for candidates in TP2 for this indicator was 2.63 to 2.89, with 99-100% meeting the target, in TP3 71-85% met the target with mean scores ranging from 2.82 to 3.10. The ranges and differences between TP2 and TP3 mean scores varied across programs. For example, in middle grades the range of mean scores for candidates in TP2 was 2.20 to 3.14, while the range in TP3 was 2.67 to 4.00. In examining the trends from the Lesson Planning data, it is notable that PCEs generally rated the candidates higher than UCEs on most components of the Learner and Learning category.

The Learner and Learning components of the Lesson Implementation Assessment (1.1.3) in TP2 had EPP-wide mean scores that ranged from 2.39 to 3.31 - which are above the target level of Emerging (2.00). Within individual specialty licensure areas, nearly all were near the 3.00 level (while a small number of other areas were not statistically significant; n=3 or fewer). A notable exception to this trend was the Special Education program, with means ranging from 3.08 to 3.50 and all 22 components averaged 3.00 or higher. The agreement between the UCE and PCE Lesson Implementation assessment scores was generally strong, with standard deviations mostly under 0.50 and many near zero. The component of the Learner and Learning

category that assesses a Safe Learning Environment appeared to be a particular strength in TP2, as EPP-wide means ranged from 3.03 to 3.24 across both UCE and PCE evaluations with all but one candidate meeting the target. In TP3, EPP-wide the Learner and Learning components ranged from 81-99% of candidates meeting the target score, with EPP-wide means of 3.00 or higher on all components.

Content Knowledge. The portion of the Dispositions Assessment (1.1.1) which addresses the Content Knowledge category had an upward trend of mean scores and percent met from TP1 through TP3. EPP-wide mean scores ranged from 2.06-2.48 and % met ranged from 93-100% in TP1; EPP-wide means for TP3 ranged from 2.74-2.90 with 97-100% of candidates meeting the target. Most candidates in all programs met the target score. Two exceptions were candidates in the secondary social studies (75% met for TP3) and physical education (88% met for TP3) programs.

In the Content Knowledge components of the Lesson Planning Rubric EPP-wide mean scores for candidates ranged from 2.58 to 3.18 in TP2 and from 2.80 to 3.38 in TP3 for both years combined. At least 97% of candidates met the target for TP2 over the three cycles of data, with nearly all licensure areas over 90% with the exceptions of: P-12 German, Middle Grades English, and MAT Option 6 Middle Grades math on the Developing Objectives component; and Middle Grades English, math, and science in the Connecting to Life Experiences component. In TP3, the EPP-wide mean scores for candidates ranged from 2.80-3.38, with 80% to 97% of candidates meeting each of the Content Knowledge components. The data again showed that PCEs scored higher than UCEs, which indicates there is more professional development needed to determine scores on the Lesson Planning Rubric.

There are several components related to Content Knowledge in the Lesson Implementation Rubric (1.1.7). For candidates in TP2 the EPP-wide mean scores ranged from 2.32- 3.34, with a range of 96%-100% meeting the target of Emerging. The Understanding Different Perspectives component had several programs with less than 90% of candidates meeting the target during at least one cycle: Middle Grades math, science, and social studies. However, there were no trends across the cycles or other components. The TP3 candidates had mean scores between 2.71-3.23, with 76-94% of candidates meeting the target score. In general, most candidates in our programs had a mean score of less than 3.00 on the component ¡°Facilitates Higher Order Thinking¡±.

Instructional Practice. The portion of the Dispositions Assessment (1.1.1) that addresses the Instructional Practice category states, "Overall, how ready is this NKU teacher candidate to self-analyze and persevere to improve instructional practices?" For TP1, EPP-wide mean scores ranged from 2.09-2.54, with 93-98% of candidates meeting the component. TP2 EPP-wide had means scores of 2.28-2.49, and 97-100% of candidates meeting the target.

TP3 EPP-wide had candidates with mean scores of 2.79-3.02 and 98-100% of candidates meeting the target. The trend showed that candidates improved their mean scores and percent meeting the target as they moved from TP1-TP3.

On the Lesson Planning Rubric (1.1.6) five components are part of the Instructional Practice category in 2015-16. In the first component (the use of pre-assessments), the candidates' mean scores ranged from 2.48 to 2.87 in TP2 and from 2.80 to 3.10 in TP3. On the second component, which focuses on planning assessments, the candidates' mean scores ranged from 2.71 to 3.00 in TP2 and from 2.90 to 3.27 in TP3. Using contextual data to plan instructional strategies is the third component related to instructional practice. In this area, the candidates' mean scores ranged from 2.66 to 3.01 in TP2 and from 2.89 to 3.20 in TP3. The fourth component pertains to candidates using appropriate instructional strategies and mean scores ranged from 2.86 to 3.14 in TP2 and from 3.09 to 3.35 in TP3. The set of mean scores from TP3 on this indicator represents the highest set among the data, as all of the mean scores were above the target rating of 3.00. Finally, candidates' lesson plans are also evaluated on the extent to which they use technology to design and plan instruction. For this indicator the candidates' mean scores ranged from 2.63 to 3.04 in TP2 and from 2.98 to 3.23 in TP3. For fall 2016, in the Instructional Practices category there are four components with EPP-wide means ranging from 2.83-3.13 for TP2, and 2.90-3.27 for TP3. The trend for both years had EPP-wide mean scores increasing from TP2 to TP3. Another notable trend is that PCEs generally rated the candidates higher than UCEs on most components.

Several indicators of the Lesson Implementation Rubric (1.1.7) address the category of Instructional Practice. The EPP-wide means for all components over both years ranged from 2.30-3.23 and 93-100% met during TP2, and 2.58- 3.26 EPP-wide means with 60-95% of candidates meeting the target during TP3. For TP2 and TP3, the component "Allows Opportunity for Student Self- Assessment" had the lowest EPP-wide range of mean scores: TP2 range of 2.30-2.85; TP3 range of 2.11-2.93. In general, across all programs the PCE evaluated candidates higher than the UCE.

Professional Responsibility. In the Professional Responsibility category of the Dispositions Assessment the EPP-wide mean scores ranged from 2.06-2.56 in TP1, 2.25-2.74 in TP2, and 2.76-3.05 in TP3. The trend shows an increase in mean scores from TP1 to TP3, indicating that candidates' dispositions are improving in the Professional Responsibility category as they move through their education programs. Several of the MAT Option 6 programs (secondary biology, chemistry, mathematics) had an N of 1 and none of them met the target.

In the component specifically related to Professional Responsibility on the Lesson Planning Assessment 92% or more of the candidates EPP-wide met

the target during TP2 for both years, with EPP mean scores ranging from 2.56 to 3.10. All four of the middle grades programs had 100% of their candidates meet the Professional Responsibility target during fall 2016. During TP3 mean scores ranged from 2.98 to 3.29 with 85-95% of candidates meeting the target. While the 2.98 UCE mean score in fall 2015 was slightly below the target score, the other cycles all had EPP-wide means above the target of 3.00.

The Lesson Implementation Assessment (1.1.3) components of the Professional Responsibility category had EPP-wide mean scores of 2.35-3.09, with 92-99% of candidates meeting the target in TP2. However, the Health and Physical Education, Middle Grades English, Middle Grades Math, and P-12 Secondary candidates had some challenges with this component. In TP3 candidates in all programs generally improved in the Professional Responsibility category, with EPP-wide means ranging from 3.00-3.30.

Dispositions Assessment Summary. Data over the three cycles, three transition points, and all programs, indicate the vast majority of candidates were evaluated as "On target to be first-year profession ready" which is the target score. The only anomalies to this strong trend appeared to occur in Fall 2015, and most notably with individual candidates within the Middle and Secondary programs. Specifically, the mean for Secondary Social Studies candidates during this semester was 1.94 on Questions 1 and 2. In assessments provided by the UCEs on Question 2, the Secondary English mean was 1.75 and Middle Grades Social Studies mean was 1.67, while Secondary Math had a PCE mean of 1.50. Nonetheless, the Fall 2015 semester seems to be an aberration based on our analysis of the data. Moreover, it is noteworthy that the scores for these cohorts were higher in the Spring 2016 and Fall 2016 semesters. Therefore, with these few exceptions, candidates throughout the EPP have almost exclusively been rated at dispositional levels that meet the EPP's target score and suggest a readiness to be become successful first year teachers.

Lesson Plan Assessment Summary. Over the entire Lesson Plan Assessment (1.1.2) across the EPP there were no mean scores lower than 2.48 - indicating that most prospective teachers were rated as emerging or better in all areas assessed by the rubric. In general, PCEs evaluated candidates higher than UCEs on most components of the rubric. In TP2, EPP-wide mean scores were higher than 2.00 indicating that all components for all 4 InTASC categories were scored at the target level or above. For TP3, the EPP-wide mean scores, in general, were higher than the EPP-wide mean scores for TP2 across all components and all InTASC categories. There was also a trend of higher average scores during fall 2016 with the revised lesson plan rubric. Both the Content Knowledge and Professional Responsibility categories had EPP-wide mean scores of 3.00 or higher.

Lesson Implementation Assessment Summary. In Transition Point 2 (field

experiences) a large percentage of candidates across the EPP programs met the target (Emerging- 2.00) on all components, with the vast majority of programs meeting the target at a rate of 98% and above. The EPP-wide mean was above the target score of 2.00 for all 4 InTASC categories. In Transition Point 3 (clinical experience) the target was moved to "On Target" and EPP-wide the average mean scores ranged from 2.58-3.50. For the Fall 15 and Spring 16 cycles the EPP-wide mean scores were above 3.00 on all components in the Learner and Learning and Professional Responsibility InTASC categories. For Fall 16 the Learner and Learning, Content Knowledge, and Professional Responsibility InTASC categories had mean scores above 3.00 on all components. Across all cycles, both transitions points, and all programs, the component "Allows Opportunity for Student Self-Assessment" was consistently evaluated with the lowest scores by both the PCE and UCE. EPP-wide the % of candidates meeting the target declined from TP2 to TP3; however the range of EPP-wide mean scores increased from TP2 (2.32-3.34) to TP3 (2.58-3.50). In general, the PCEs scored candidates higher than UCEs across all components and all InTASC categories.

1.2 Every pedagogy course offered within the EPP is required to adhere to the "model¡" syllabus (1.2.2). A matrix is presented within each syllabus that displays how the given course aligns with state and national standards, including the Kentucky Teacher Standards (KTS) and the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Standards. Therefore, each assessment cited in every course syllabus is linked to one or more sets of standards.

The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) (1.2.8) is completed during the clinical experience semester and requires candidates to collect and analyze P-12 student pre- and post-assessment data on two objectives, for both the whole class and a gap group within the class. The TWS pre/post-test data (1.2.6) indicate the majority of candidates, across all programs, increased their P-12 students' scores from the pre- to post-test on both objective 1 and objective 2, for both the whole class and gap groups. This trend was true for all 3 data cycles.

Candidates are also evaluated on the completed TWS project (1.2.7). This evaluation provides evidence of a candidate's ability to successfully use research and evidence to plan, implement, and evaluate P-12 students' progress. The TWS (1.2.9) is evaluated by the UCE, who rates each component with a score of 2 "Met Stated Criteria" or 1 "Did Not Meet Stated Criteria". In the portions of the TWS related to the InTASC category of Instructional Practice the EPP-wide means ranged from 1.88 to 1.99 over the three cycles, with the vast majority of individual licensure areas displaying a perfect mean of 2.00 each semester (the licensure areas of Physical Education, Music, and Art did not provide enough data to derive trends). Further data for documenting the development of candidates at the clinical stage is provided by the clinical experience "Final Reflection Rubric" (1.2.1

and 1.2.2), which provide candidates an opportunity to reflect on their clinical experience, including their impact on P-12 student learning. Data show an EPP-wide mean ranging from 3.35-3.54 (3=target), with the individual licensure areas of IECE, all MAT programs, Middle Grades English, Physical Education, Special Education, and Secondary biology, chemistry, English, math, social studies, and Spanish scoring at 100% target on all components.

The Student Voice Survey (1.2.4), a 25-question instrument allowing P-12 students to provide feedback on the candidate's impact in the clinical semester, is yet another piece of evidence that addresses candidate proficiency, specifically their dispositions in interacting with P-12 students. The benchmark for the Student Voice survey (1.2.5) was met by 53-89% of candidates EPP-wide (with the majority of individual area scores in the 70s and 80s) while the licensure areas of Health and Physical Education, Middle Grades English, Middle Grades Social Studies, and Secondary P-12 Art were above 90%.

1.3 The Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) has a state only approval process for EPP programs. The EPP is required to successfully complete "periodic state review of program level outcome data" and submit all programs for EPSB approval. The EPSB Program Approval document (1.3.1) provides a list of EPP state-approved programs. The EPSB is currently reviewing all EPP initial certification programs and will complete the process before the CAEP onsite visit in 2018. The state review requires the submission of course syllabi, program curricula, faculty qualifications, and other evidence. The Learning and Behavior Disorders (Special Education) program voluntarily submitted information for CEC SPA review and has achieved national recognition status.

1.4 Toward the goal of demonstrating skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards, candidates are required to use the EPP-wide lesson plan template when developing lesson plans (1.4.1). The template requires candidates to align the lesson to several standards, including the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS) (1.4.2), which are Kentucky's version of the Common Core standards. Candidates include these standards at the beginning of each lesson plan. When submitted to the UCE and PCE during the field and clinical experience, the lesson plans are assessed via the Lesson Plan Rubric, which ensures that rigorous college- and career-ready standards are included in the lesson and correctly aligned to the content.

The specific portion of the Lesson Planning Rubric which addresses Component 1.4 is shown in the sub-heading entitled "Using Contextual Data to Plan Instructional Strategies". In review of the most recent cycles of data, the mean score given to candidates by PCEs in this area ranged from 3.04 to 3.12, while the mean score from UCEs ranged from 2.89 to 2.91. This indicates a strong consistency (as well as reasonable inter-rater reliability) in

the development of lessons for college- and career-readiness. Within individual licensure areas, there was no mean score below 2.67 (Secondary English in Spring 2016 from PCEs) while some mean scores were as high as 3.50 (P-12 Music in Spring from 2016 PCEs). EPP-wide, over 97% met the target. On the Lesson Implementation Rubric and Assessment (1.1.7 and 1.1.3), the areas of "Communicates High Expectations" and "Facilitates Multiple Levels of Learning" specifically relate to Component 1.4. Once again, the data shows strong candidate preparation in this regard, with an EPP-wide mean of 3.06-3.14 for "Communicates Expectations" (with only IECE, Secondary English, and Secondary Social Studies slightly under the target). The EPP-wide mean for "Facilitates Multiple Levels of Learning" was in the range of2.87-2.89, but was still well above the level of "Emerging".

1.5 The rubric utilized for the EPP-wide Technology Assessment (1.5.1) is aligned with the National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers, as well as the technology-based Standard Six of the KTS. The Technology Assessment was initiated during the fall 2016 semester, thus there are only two cycles of data. In reviewing the data the results confirm the EPP is strongly preparing candidates in the area of technology. The aggregate data from all licensure areas (1.5.2) shows an "Overall Met" rate at 92% for the first round of data from Fall 2016. The licensure areas from Middle Grades, Elementary, IECE, P-12 Art, and Secondary Math programs scored above 90%. While the overall EPP average dropped to 80% in Spring 2017, a mean of 1.80 in this semester (with 2=Met, 1=Partially Met, and 0=Not Met) suggests that nearly all candidates received a score of "Partially Met" or higher.

Another source of evidence for Component 1.5 is the TWS, which requires candidates to "demonstrate the ability to design and facilitate digital learning" and "track and share student performance digitally". This is illustrated in Task A, Item 4 of the TWS process (1.2.8), which requires candidates to "provide an overview of technology that will be integrated to enhance instruction and demonstrate P-12 student use of technology". Within Sections 6.1, 6.2, and 6.4 of the TWS Assessment Data (1.2.7), high means were once again seen, ranging from 1.88 to 1.99 (a score of 2.00 means 100% of candidates met the target).

Moreover, candidate proficiency in planning for and utilizing technology in their instruction, as well as having their P-12 students use technology is seen in the Lesson Implementation Rubric (1.1.7). With the "On Target" description stated as "Use of technology by the teacher candidate and students in a manner that facilitates and enhances instruction and/or student learning" (and target=3), the EPP-wide mean on this portion of the rubric (1.1.3) ranged from 3.11-3.40, with the licensure areas of Secondary English and Social Studies only slightly below the target mean (2.80 and 2.75 respectively) This further illustrates that EPP candidates are successful in weaving technology into their teaching.

Summary. Evidence provided by the EPP clearly indicates that its candidates have a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their disciplines, and by program completion can use discipline-specific practices to advance the learning of all P-12 students toward the attainment of college- and career-readiness standards. To this end, high achievement is displayed by the EPP in each component of Standard One. In 1.1, all InTASC categories are addressed through the multiple measures of the Lesson Planning Assessment, Lesson Implementation Assessment, Disposition Assessment, and other instruments that demonstrate the content and pedagogical knowledge of candidates. Candidate scores on Praxis II tests and EPP-developed instruments are also consistently strong across licensure areas. Candidates demonstrate their positive impact on P-12 students through their successful completion of the Teacher Work Sample, with data showing candidates in all licensure areas had gains in their Whole-Class and Gap Group for both Objectives #1 and #2. While the state of Kentucky does not require Specialty Professional Association accreditation, the EPSB has approved all programs offered by the EPP. To ensure meeting 1.4, candidates are required by the EPP to align their lesson plans and instruction to the Kentucky Academic Standards, which are Kentucky's P-12 college and career readiness standards. In regards to 1.5, the EPP has created a new assessment that evaluates candidates' technology proficiencies; data from the lesson implementation assessment indicates that candidates use and have their P-12 students use technology when teaching lessons during their field and clinical experiences.

## Specialty Licensure Area Data

Program Review Option (per state partnership agreement)

- [ ] CAEP Program Review with National Recognition (SPA)
- [ ] CAEP Program Review with Feedback (State-selected standards)
- [x] State Program Review (State-selected standards)

Answer the following prompts for programs reviewed for National Recognition (SPA) and Program Review with Feedback. Upload state reports for state reviewed programs.

1. Based on the analysis of the disaggregated data, how have the results of specialty licensure area or SPA evidence been used to inform decision making and improve instruction and candidate learning outcomes?

2. Based on the analysis of specialty licensure area data, how have individual licensure areas used data for change?

3. For Program Review with Feedback only: How does the specialty licensure area data align with and provide evidence for meeting the state-selected standards?

4. For National Recognition only: How are SPA reports that are not Nationally Recognized being addressed?

State Review Only: Upload State Program Reports here.

List of NKU EPSB Approved Programs

See Attachment panel below.

## Standard 2: Clinical Partnership and Practice

i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard.)

1 1.1.1 Disp Eval PK-12_Univ CE 3 cycles data.xlsx

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

2 1.1.2 Lesson Planning PK-12_Univ CE 3 cycles data.xlsx

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

3 1.1.3 Lesson Implementation PK-12_Univ CE 3 cycles data.xlsx

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

4 1.1.5 Dispositions survey FA 16.docx

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

5 1.2.1 Foliotek Clinical Experiences Final Reflection rubric.docx

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

6 1.2.6 Teacher Work Sample Pre-Post data.xlsx

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

7 1.2.9 TWS Foliotek scoring rubric.pdf

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

8 1.5.1 Technology Assessment Rubric.docx

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

9 2.1.2 Teacher Education Committee Membership.docx

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

10 2.1.3 Teacher Education Advisory Council fall

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

11 2.1.4 Spring Teacher Education Advisory Council.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

12 2.1.5 PK-12 Univ Task Force charge_rec.docx

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

13 2.1.6 TEC Bylaws.docx

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

14 2.1.7 Teacher Education Committee Agenda.docx

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

15 2.1.8 EPSBAdm to Education.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

16 2.1.9 16 EPSB Admto Student Teaching.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

17 2.1.10 PK-12 CE prog feedback survey.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

18 2.1.11 PK-12 Clinical Educator Program Feedback 3 cycles data.xls

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

19 2.2.1 PK-12 CE _ School Dist Diversity.xlsx

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

20 2.2.2 Clinical Experiences Orientation Packet.docx

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators

21 2.2.3 PK-12_UCE eval of each other survey.pdf

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators

22 2.2.4 Teacher candidate eval of PK-12_ Univ CE survey.pdf

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators

23 2.3.1 Clinical Experiences Handbook.docx

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

24 2.3.2 Technology Enhanced Learning Opp.docx

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators

25 2.3.3 FE orientation checklist.docx

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

26 2.3.4 Field_Clinical Selection.docx

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators

27 2.3.5 Field _Clinical Experience Courses.docx

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

28 3.3.2 TE Dept Meeting Minutes.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

29 4.1.4 KCEWS NKU_PGES.pdf

## 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

* ii. Analysis of evidence (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that makes the case that the standard is met

The EPP ensures that it has effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice in its initial preparation programs. It enables candidates to acquire, cultivate, and enhance the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to serve all P-12 students and positively impact their learning and development.

2.1 The EPP has established, maintained, and benefited from partnerships through formal Memoranda of Agreement with 16 school districts in Kentucky and 5 school districts in Ohio (2.1.1). These partnerships have offered the EPP rich opportunities to place candidates in schools for diverse admissions, field, and clinical experiences. They have facilitated continuous reflection and improvement of EPP policies, procedures, and practices related to candidate preparation.

In November 2013, the EPP convened a P-12/University Task Force to "develop the priorities for action that will guide the education programs' efforts to review and revise each program to meet the needs of the 21st century educator" (2.1.5). The Task Force was composed of 22 members, including P-12 educators and faculty members in the Department of Teacher Education and the College of Arts and Sciences. In March 2014, the task force released a report that provided recommendations for developing candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions, and offered discussion questions for field and clinical placements.

The Task Force was a catalyst for ushering in a more centralized approach for partnerships. Two EPP coordinating entities were directly impacted by the Task Force - the Teacher Education Committee (TEC) and the Teacher Education Advisory Councils (TEAC). The TEC became the official body to address policies for admission and retention of candidates, curriculum changes, and student appeals (2.1.6). Chaired by the dean of the College of Education and Human Services (COEHS), the TEC is composed of the COEHS associate dean, department chairs, and program facilitators, College of Arts and Sciences' associate dean and faculty representatives, and undergraduate and graduate students. Representing P-12 schools are teachers and principals. Thus all EPP stakeholders are represented on the TEC (2.1.2). Meanwhile, a larger and more robust TEAC was formed. Previously, some programs had separate advisory meetings, while others did not have any. The TEAC serves as a sounding board for policies, curriculum, and protocols that involve candidate preparation (2.1.3). It consists of EPP and P-12 educators as well as alumni and community educators. Please note that special education faculty participate in the general fall and spring TEAC meetings because special education candidates double-major in both "general" and special education. Consequently, special education has its own additional

advisory council meeting every spring semester.

The TEC and the TEAC serve as EPP-wide forums that meet and collaborate regularly with P-12 educators to share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. The TEC meets monthly while the TEAC meets once each semester. The TEC votes on the admission of candidates into the education major and clinical experience, discusses and approves course and program changes, and analyzes data, such as alumni/employer surveys and disposition evaluations (2.1.7). In these meetings, the EPP gains input from P-12 educators and other stakeholders regarding criteria for entry/exit into clinical experiences, makes decisions together on curriculum development, and co-constructs instruments and evaluations. For instance, the revision of the Professional Behaviors and Dispositions process and forms emerged, in large part, from the Task Force recommendations in 2014 and from discussions in the TEC (3.3.3). EPP and P-12 educators identified a crucial need to have clear and consistent procedures to address and rectify early signs and ongoing problems regarding candidate disposition. The revised disposition process and forms are concrete examples of meaningful collaboration that enabled clinical educators to provide useful and immediate feedback to candidates.
The TEAC functions similarly in regards to articulating mutually agreeable expectations and adhering to shared accountability between EPP and P-12 educators. Topics and tasks for these meetings range from discussing federal and state education policies and the latest developments in educator preparation, to validating instruments and analyzing candidate data. For instance, in fall 2016, the EPP and P-12 educators used the Lawshe method as an instrument to measure content validity and gauge inter-rater agreement on the Lesson Observation Form (2.1.3). In spring 2017 (2.1.4), they examined data on Dispositions (1.1.1), Lesson Planning (1.1.2), and Lesson Implementation (1.1.3), discerned patterns, highlighted areas of strength and shortcoming, and provided recommendations for potential plans of action.

Since the 2014 Task Force report, ongoing discussions between the EPP and P-12 educators have generated curriculum changes for the purpose of continuous improvement. For example, in Middle Grades Education, the EPP and P-12 educators noted two areas for consideration: candidates' below-average performance in the Praxis exam for Language Arts, and the need for stronger preparation in classroom management. As a result, Language Arts instructors took the Praxis exam to better support candidates in this area. The classroom management course became two credit hours, instead of one, to allow more contact hours to incorporate effective principles and practices for inclusive and engaging classrooms.

Through meaningful partnerships, P-12 educators are involved in the selection of mentor teachers and in the provision of admissions, field, and clinical experiences for candidates. The EPP's criteria for admissions and field

experience mentors include: at least 1 year of teaching experience, appropriate certification, and principal recommendation (2.3.4). Kentucky regulations guide the selection of mentors for clinical experience (2.1.9 ). P-12 clinical educators (PCE) must have valid teaching certificates, have at least three years of teaching experience, and demonstrate effectiveness in curriculum, instruction, assessment, and classroom management. To be discussed further in the next section, the EPP also consults with P-12 administrators to help identify teachers who can serve as mentors and utilize best practices in teaching and student learning.

In addition, PCEs actively participate in the preparation of candidates in schools, especially in the candidates' graduated responsibility for teaching and student learning. Prior to Admission, candidates must meet GPA, Praxis exam, and coursework requirements (2.1.8). In the admissions semester, PCEs help orient candidates to the workings of elementary, middle, and high schools (2.3.4). During professional semesters, they engage candidates in effective teaching practices, as candidates take education courses in curriculum fundamentals, instructional methods, assessment, and classroom management. PCEs take more intensive mentoring roles during clinical experience (2.3.1). To ensure that candidates are job-ready at the end of this culminating experience, they work closely with candidates to build on their strengths and address areas of concern. Overall, the active involvement of PCEs in school-based experiences enables candidates to observe and implement effective teaching practices linked to coursework.
Moreover, PCEs play a substantial role in providing feedback to candidates and EPP programs. For example, they evaluate candidates in clinical experience based on the Kentucky Teacher Standards (KTS) (2.1.10). KTS is aligned with standards from the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC), and the Kentucky Framework for Teaching (KFfT). PCEs assess if candidates are accomplished, on target, developing, or ineffective. They are also asked to indicate program strengths and areas for improvement. Data from fall 2015, spring 2016, and fall 2016 reveal that PCEs rated at least 75% of candidates as being generally on target or above based on Kentucky Teacher Standards (2.1.11). However, in fall 2015, there were three areas where only 50% of the candidates were rated as on target or above: (a) using formative assessments; (b) identifying professional strengths and priorities; and (c) identifying leadership opportunities to enhance student learning and/or school environment. Determining areas for improvement enabled the EPP to take appropriate interventions. As a result, the EPP saw an increase from 50% to at least 88% of the candidates being rated on target or above in these three areas in subsequent semesters.

While the EPP benefits greatly from clinical partnerships, P-12 schools and educators also benefit. Evidence 2.3.4 outlines some of those benefits, such as an extra educator in the classroom, a stipend to the teacher, collaboration on extracurricular and special projects, and learning new technology.

2.2 The EPP employs high-quality clinical educators, both university- and school-based, who positively impact candidates' development. It ensures the quality of clinical educators, in part, through terminal degrees and state mandates. In the EPP's Department of Teacher Education, all but two full time faculty members have doctorates as terminal degrees. Kentucky regulations provide specific criteria for the selection of PCEs as mentors for clinical experiences (2.1.9). Partners also co-select clinical educators. For example, PCEs participated in the hiring process for the department chair of Teacher Education in spring 2016 and for the director of Educational Placements and Internships in summer 2017. A district superintendent and a school principal served as search committee members, helped construct the selection criteria, and provided final recommendations for these positions, respectively.

UCEs and PCEs consult with each other to identify appropriate school-based mentors to maximize the benefits for the candidates' development. For admissions, field, and clinical experiences, EPP works with P-12 school principals and district human resources personnel (2.3.4). The following factors are considered when co-selecting PCE as mentors: grade/content expertise and years of experience; strengths in curriculum, instruction, assessment, and classroom management; interpersonal relations and professional dispositions; availability and willingness. Additional factors, such as the demographics of PCEs and schools, are considered to ensure diversity in mentors and work contexts (2.2.1). In fall 2016, EPP worked with 333 PCEs as mentors. Out of 333, 2.7% were PCEs of color: 5 African Americans, 2 Hispanics, and 2 Asians. This figure is slightly lower compared to the percentage of total educators of color in Northern Kentucky's school districts. Out of 3,935 P-12 educators in the region, 130 or 3.3% are educators of color. The selection of school-based mentors, ultimately, depends on what candidates need to advance their knowledge, skills, dispositions, and job-readiness, including being able to competently engage with diverse colleagues, students, and families.

University Clinical Educators (UCE) and PCEs who serve as mentors receive online and in-person training and coaching. For example, they are provided with online resources on the following topics: (a) roles and responsibilities of PCE as mentors; (b) evaluation of candidates; (c) co-teaching; and (d) positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) (2.3.2). For clinical experiences, mentors also receive a handbook and an orientation packet. The handbook delineates: the roles and responsibilities of PCEs, candidates, and placement director; key policies and procedures related to clinical experiences; and other important state and education notices (2.3.1). The orientation packet compiles various forms, rubrics, and checklists related to the Teacher Work Sample, unit or lesson plan progression, dispositions and reflections, and student voice (2.2.2). It also provides details about Kentucky Teacher Standards and Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching, adopted by the state Department of Education. At the beginning of each

academic year, orientation trainings for admissions, field, and clinical experience supervision are held in-person. At the beginning of each semester, the UCE is tasked with orienting the PCE in the use of evaluation rubrics and other EPP requirements. This orientation is completed during a personal meeting, giving them a chance to review evaluation assessments and EPP requirements and to answer any questions. During the semester, the UCE is available to answer questions as they come up. Throughout the year, program facilitators and the placement director provide additional in-person coaching and support as needed. During these orientation and follow-up meetings, UCEs and PCEs collaborate in setting goals and making changes in clinical experiences. They also discuss candidates' progress, professional dispositions, and future placement assignments.

Furthermore, the EPP provides opportunities for university- and school-based clinical educators to be evaluated by each other and by candidates. For the evaluation of UCEs (2.2.3), survey questions include: clear communication of expectations, provision of suggestions and co-teaching feedback, availability as a resource and for consultation, and professional disposition. For the evaluation of PCEs (2.2.4), survey questions consist of: knowledge of academic standards, teaching methods, and instructional resources; constructive criticism, problem solving, and moral support; and encouragement of innovation/creativity, critical/independent thinking, and help-seeking. In both surveys, the final question asks: Would you recommend this clinical educator to teacher candidates? Results from these surveys, especially the responses to the final question, are used by the EPP to provide feedback to UCEs and PCEs, offer relevant support through individualized coaching and group professional development training, and make decisions to retain or not retain particular clinical educators.

The EPP regularly updates its database of UCEs, who are full-time and part-time faculty members and instructors in the Department of Teacher Education, the College of Education and Human Services, and the College of Arts and Sciences. It is also developing a comprehensive database of current and potential PCEs who can serve as mentors. Previously each program kept its own separate database of P-12 Clinical Educators. The EPP is now taking a more centralized and coordinated approach to place candidates in particular schools and districts for admissions, field, and clinical experiences. This new approach aims to ease communication with school partners, eliminate overlaps in placement requests, identify more effective school-based clinical educators, and build deeper relationships with schools. For this new approach to work, database details for P-12 Clinical Educators need to include: teaching grade/content, personal and school demographics, mentoring/supervision experience, and formal and informal feedback from candidates and university-based clinical educators. The databases are intended to support the placement of candidates in diverse and effective classrooms and schools, facilitate the review and selection of high-quality clinical educators as mentors, and to serve as a repository for clinical educators' evaluations.

2.3 Candidates undergo a purposeful process of assuming graduated responsibility for teaching and student learning in admissions, field, and clinical experiences (2.3.5). In this process, their responsibility: (a) starts with an exploratory orientation of P-12 classrooms; (b) is followed by an introductory experience of lesson planning and student support; (c) progresses to professional field semesters of increasing duties for teaching, assessment, and management; and (d) culminates to taking full ownership for the teaching and learning in the clinical placement classroom. Such graduated responsibility offers candidates with scaffolded breadth, depth, and coherence that facilitate their professional development and job-readiness. At key points of the program, candidates are assessed in terms of their lesson planning and implementation (1.1.2 and 1.1.3), dispositions (1.1.5), reflection (1.2.1), use of technology (1.5.1), and overall teacher work sample (1.2.9). More specific data and analysis are detailed in the Standard 1 section.

In this four-step process, candidates also increase their number of hours in schools (2.3.5): 9 hours in orientation; 50 hours in admissions field experience; 150 hours in two professional field experiences; and 16 weeks in clinical experiences with a minimum of 70 full instructional days. Hence, candidates complete at least 200 hours of field experiences prior to their culminating clinical experiences (2.3.1). These school-based hours are required for all candidates pursuing initial teaching certification in Kentucky. In their placements, candidates work closely with clinical educators to use formative and summative assessments and to be data-informed in their instructional decision-making and differentiation. Special education and health education majors complete additional 75 hours in a third field experience.

In each step of the graduated responsibility process, candidates advance in their knowledge, skills, and dispositions. For instance, during field experiences, they complete a lesson observation form, a midpoint checklist, and a final dispositions survey (2.3.3). During clinical experiences, they develop a professional portfolio that includes placement school details and student demographics, unit/lesson plans, self-reflections, dispositions, and formative/summative evaluations. The Teacher Work Sample portfolio uses performance-based criteria to assess if candidates meet certain objectives, and uses data to measure impact on student learning (1.2.6). Candidates also participate in co-teaching, complete evaluation surveys, and maintain a time log (2.3.1). In their clinical placements, candidates attend school meetings and trainings, parent-teacher conferences, field trips, and other school-related activities.

Coherence between coursework and clinical experience is a perennial concern for educator preparation programs across the country. To address this concern, in spring 2016, the EPP began a school-embedded residency at Florence Elementary in Boone County Schools. Focusing on the first

professional semester in elementary education, candidates take their literacy and classroom management courses on-site, while doing field experience four days a week in the school. Other embedded residencies are: a one-year immersion combining field and clinical experiences at Glenn O. Swing Elementary in Covington Schools; and a math-focused methods and field experience at Bellevue and Dayton school districts. The success of these innovative projects has led more EPP faculty to pursue residency partnerships with other schools. In fall 2017, two new embedded residencies will be launched: middle grades education's two professional semesters will be at R.A. Jones Middle in Boone; and orientation and admissions courses will be offered at Kenton County Schools' Future Educator Academy as part of the state's new Teaching and Learning Career Pathway. In Summer 2018, a one-year, initial certification Master of Arts in Teaching program will be embedded at Holmes Middle and High in Covington. The benefits of residencies to candidates and P-12 students have been remarkable. In time, school-embedded residencies will be a major signature feature for teacher preparation programs at Northern Kentucky University.

In selecting placements for admissions, field, and clinical experiences, P-12 student diversity is an important consideration. EPP seeks diverse placements in terms of race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, language, and (dis)ability. It strives to immerse candidates in contexts that reflect a wide range of students, families, and communities. School-embedded residencies are purposefully located in schools with comparatively large proportions of underserved students. Even though PCE in our region are over 96% white (2.2.1), the number of students of color is increasing. EPP ensures that candidates have at least one diverse school placement, and integrates 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.

Ultimately, clinical experiences are designed to prepare candidates so they can competently serve all P-12 students. Data from PCEs and UCEs (fall 2015, spring 2016, and fall 2016) indicate that the overwhelming majority of candidates meet standards in field and clinical experiences (1.1.2). For example, during clinical experiences, they are able to address multiple levels of learning, apply appropriate instructional strategies, plan and use various assessments, and use technology for instruction. For these four criteria, 71% to 97% of candidates are deemed on target. Successfully meeting these criteria enable candidates to support student learning and achieve gains. Data from Teacher Work Sample show that candidates enable gains in student learning with averages ranging mostly between 3% and 26% in two comparison points of pre- and post-tests (1.2.6). Their impact on underserved gap groups is relatively similar, with average gains ranging mostly between 5% and 24%. Moreover, ongoing impact can be discerned from EPP completers during their internship year. 2015 data reveal that completers positively contribute to student growth, to be discussed further in

the Standard 4 report (4.1.4).

Clinical Partnerships and Practice are essential in candidates' professional development and P-12 students' academic and personal advancement. The EPP works toward these goals in purposeful, coherent, and data-informed ways through meaningful collaborations with schools and districts, engagements with effective school- and university-based educators, and immersion in diverse and impactful experiences.

## Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity

i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard.)

1 1.1.5 Dispositions survey FA 16.docx

3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability

2 1.1.6 Lesson Planning Rubric both years.docx

3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students

3 1.1.7 Lesson Implementation Rubric both years.docx

3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students

4 1.2.1 Foliotek Clinical Experiences Final Reflection rubric.docx

3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students

5 1.2.5 Student Voice Survey 2 cycles data.xlsx

3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability

6 1.2.6 Teacher Work Sample Pre-Post data.xlsx

3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students

7 1.2.8 TWS process.pdf

3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students

8 1.2.9 TWS Foliotek scoring rubric.pdf

3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students

9 1.4.2 Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS).docx

3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress

10 2.1.2 Teacher Education Committee Membership.docx

3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress

11 2.1.5 PK-12 Univ Task Force charge_rec.docx

3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability

12 3.1.1 Education recruitment_retention plan.docx

3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool

13 3.1.2 Black_brown educ.pdf

3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool

14 3.1.3 USED Teacher Shortage Areas.pdf

3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool

15 3.2.1 Applicants, admits and enrolled 3cycles data.xlsx

3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students

16 3.2.2 ACT scores mean_median 2014-16.pdf

3.2 Sets selective admission requirements

17 3.3.1 Disp Midpoint checklist.docx

3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability

18 3.3.2 TE Dept Meeting Minutes.pdf

3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability

19 3.3.3 TC.Dispositions.ReviewProcess.docx

3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress

20 3.3.4 CourseInstructors_Dispositon.Rating.Form.docx

3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability

21 3.3.6 Disp Improvement.Plan.docx

3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability

22 3.3.7 Initial Cert Educ Prog Admissions Criteria.docx

3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress

23 3.4.1 Elementary Curriculum Contract all.pdf

3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress

24 3.4.2 UG_MAT Initial Certification Transition Points.docx

3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress

25 3.4.3 Transition Points 3 cycles data.xlsx

3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress

26 3.4.4 Graduation info comp to adm.xlsx

3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students

27 3.4.5 Pro II Rubric FA16.docx

3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress

28 3.6.1 COEHS Code of Ethics.docx

3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability

29 3.6.2 EPSB Code of Ethics.pdf

3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability

30 3.6.3 IncludingCode.of.Ethics.docx

3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession

31 4.1.4 KCEWS NKU_PGES.pdf

3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability

32 4.1.5 Program Graduates Teaching Data.xlsx

## 3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability

33 5.1.5 Quality Assurance Report Form.docx

## 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress

* ii. Analysis of evidence (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that makes the case that the standard is met

The focus of the EPP is to develop high quality teacher candidates. The EPP endeavors to facilitate development of effective teachers for their specialty licensure areas through monitoring of academic and non-academic competency of candidates throughout the program. The three cycles of data analyzed for sufficiency determination of Standard 3 components are Fall 2015, Spring 2016 and Fall 2016.

3.1. The majority of the EPP admitted undergraduate and MAT candidates for the three cycles were white: 91% Fall 2015, 93% Spring 2016, and 96% Fall 2016, and female: 81%, 73%, and 78% respectively (3.2.1). The pools of applicants were slightly more diverse than the admitted cohorts. The applicant data for underrepresented minority (URM), which includes African-American, Asian, American Indian or Native Alaskan, Hispanic and 2 or more races, for Fall 2015 was 8.4%, 9.4% for Spring 2016, and 7.4% for Fall 2016; whereas admitted URM was 8.8%, 6.8%, and 4%, respectively. Across Kentucky EPPs, 4% of admitted candidates were from URM populations in 2014 and 5% were from URM populations in 2016. The percent of male applicants, with 25% for Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, and 28% for Fall 2016, was slightly higher than the admitted cohort where males represented 19%, 27%, and 22%, respectively. Across Kentucky EPPs, 22% of admitted candidates were males in 2014 and 19% were males in 2016. The EPP percentages of admitted URM and male candidates are similar to the percentages for EPPs across Kentucky, however, the EPP is actively engaged in recruiting and retaining more diverse candidates.

Comparison of candidates who are Pell eligible as well as who self-identified as having a disability among applicant and admitted cohorts suggest similarity in the prevalence rate, with approximately 40% for Pell eligibility and 2% or less for disability identification over the three cycles (3.2.1). However, examination of disaggregated EPP data by licensure specialty area for candidates who self-identified as having a disability indicate the Elementary Education program had the highest percent of applicants: 4% Fall 2015, 4% Spring 2016, and 3% Fall 2016 as well as enrolled candidates with 1%, 5%, and 6%, respectively. Of the admitted pool of candidates, Middle Grades had 2% in Fall 2015 and Secondary had 3% in Spring 2016. Data for Pell eligible candidates indicate approximately half of Middle Grades applicants, admitted, and enrolled candidates were Pell eligible. For applicants, 53% Fall 2015, 54% Spring 2016, and 39% Fall 2016 were Pell eligible. The percent of admitted candidates was 50% for Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 then 39% in Fall 2016. Of the enrolled Middle Grades candidates,

the rate was 47% for Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, and 51% in Fall 2016. Physical Education program also had high Pell eligible enrolled candidates with 71% in Fall 2015 and 50% in Spring 2016.

The academic record comparison indicates the cohort cumulative GPAs, ACT median scores, and state-normed test scores were slightly higher with the pool of admitted than applicant candidates. Applicant GPAs for 3-cycles were 3.29 Fall 2015, 3.19 Spring 2016, and 3.23 Fall 2016, as compared to the pool of admitted GPAs of 3.33, 3.4, and 3.38, respectively (3.2.1). The ACT means for the pool of applicants were 23 Fall 2015, 24, Spring 206, and 23 Fall 2016 as compared to 24 for both Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, and 23 Fall 2016 for admitted candidates. The state-normed test scores of applicants were 179, 180, and 178 for Reading; 172, 171, 169 for Writing, and 170, 166, and 165 for Mathematics. For the admitted, scores were 181, 184, and 180 for Reading; 175, 173, and 171 for Writing; and 172 for Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, and 168 for Fall 2016. Even though the difference is slight between the pool of applicants versus admitted, EPP recognizes that candidates' academic performance can be a contributing factor in stopping applicants from being admitted.

In order to increase the number of admitted candidates who are more diverse, including more URM and male candidates, as well as to address identified teacher shortage areas for Kentucky (Exceptional Children, World Languages, Mathematics, Sciences, English, and Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education) (3.1.3) the EPP developed a 5-year recruitment and retention plan in Fall 2015 (3.1.1). The 5-year plan focuses on the EPP's mission, which is to enhance professional practice and transforms lives, schools, and communities. The EPP recognizes that one way to help fulfill its mission is with a more diverse pool of candidates and completers. Specific initiatives targeting URM candidates and struggling candidates began in 2015-2016. The achieved outcomes by the end of Spring 2017 include creation of a new Assistant Dean position with the responsibility to help recruit and retain URM candidates, initiation of the Black and Brown Educators of Excellence student group (3.1.2), and hosting the Cincinnati Public Schools Advanced Placement summer boot camp. Strategies that focus on supporting struggling candidates include development of Student Success Workshops, providing Praxis study workshops and Praxis online resources. Fall 2016 data allude to initial success of these efforts as evidenced by 40% raising their GPAs and 46% pass rate for state-normed test. The 5-year plan also outlines strategies to be more intentional in sharing of teacher shortage information and requirements for being admitted to educational program to prospective and current candidates. These efforts include infusing admission information into EPP-hosted community events (e.g., Governor's Scholars, Dreamfest, and Young Women Lead Conference), reaching out to high school students who are interested in becoming teachers, discussing teacher shortage areas in EDU 104, Orientation to Education, and informing new freshmen and transfer students at orientation events. The EPP plans to closely monitor further

implementation of various initiatives and modify based on data analysis over the next several years. The addition of the Assistant Dean position, projected for a Summer 2017 hire date, will play a pivotal role in facilitating the EPP goals of increasing the diversity of teacher candidates and having more candidates choose education programs in identified teacher shortage areas.

3.2. Per the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) requirement for teacher education programs, EPP candidates must acquire a minimum of 2.75 cumulative GPA and successfully meet the minimum scores on the three Praxis Core Academic Skills for Educators tests: Reading (156), Writing (162), and Mathematics (150). The EPP average score of each admitted cohort for Fall 2015, Spring 2016 and Fall 2016 not only meet but exceed the CAEP minimum: GPA of 3.0 and performance on a nationally normed test of academic achievement in the top 50% (3.2.1). The admitted cohort average GPA was 3.33 for Fall 2015, 3.40 for Spring 2016, and 3.38 for Fall 2016. The disaggregated by specialty licensure cohort average GPA for admitted candidates also meet the CAEP 3.0 GPA requirement, except for programs with only one candidate: MAT Social Studies (Fall 205) 2.85; MAT German (Fall 2015) 2.99; and MAT Mathematics (Fall 2016). The median composite score of admitted cohort on ACT is 24 Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, and 23 for Fall 2016. The national median score for 2014-16 ACT is 20 (3.2.2). The median admitted cohort average scores on the required state-normed tests during three cycles are also well above the 2014-16 median score for each area. EPP median score for Reading is 181 Fall 2015, 184 Spring 2016, and 180 Fall 2016; as compared to median Reading of 174. For Writing, median is 166 and EPP is 175 Fall 2015, 173 Spring 2016, and 171 Fall 2016. The median Mathematics score for 2014-15 was 154, and score of 152 for 2015-16. The EPP median score for Mathematics is 172 for Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, and 168 for Fall 2016. Thus, the EPP cohort of candidates admitted are strong in their academic ability.

3.3. The EPP deems monitoring of candidates' professional attributes and dispositions, in addition to academic knowledge and skills, critical to developing successful future teachers. To be admitted to an education program, undergraduate candidates must demonstrate they are on a trajectory toward becoming first-year profession ready by successfully completing the Admission Field Experience course, which involves receiving positive evaluations on their dispositions (1.1.5) and professional behaviors (3.3.1). The MAT applicants have to be successful in their panel interview and on-demand written essay that assesses dispositions, among other attributes (3.4.2).

Beginning in Fall 2015, the EPP established new evaluation criteria for candidates' professional behaviors (3.3.1) and dispositions (1.1.5). In Spring 2017, a dispositions review process for this new evaluation criteria was formalized with department approval (3.3.2). The new dispositions and professional behaviors items reflect EPP P-12 partners' input regarding critical

factors for the success of EPP candidates (2.1.5), research on candidates' disposition, and InTASC standards.

The Professional Dispositions Survey is organized in three sections: P-12 Students as Learners, Teacher Candidate's Professional Learning, and Professional Behaviors (1.1.5). These three sections target candidate's perceptions about students, other people, self, and general frame of reference. Research (e.g., Wasicsko, 2003) provides evidence for how candidates' dispositions (perceptions about students, about teaching, and about themselves) strongly influence the impact they will have on student learning and development. Wasicsko's (2003) Perceptual Dispositions Model is based on the perceptual psychological theory and subsequent research of Arthur W. Combs. Over 40 years Combs investigated the perceptual characteristics of transformative educators who were able to significantly and positively affect others' lives and identified general perception areas about self, other people, and the teaching task that can serve to differentiate effective from ineffective teachers. The first two items under the P-12 Students as Learners assess candidates' ability to enhance and deepen all P-12 students' understanding of content through relevant experiences, which are aligned with InTASC categories of The Learner and Learning, Content Knowledge, and Instructional Practice. The three items under the Teacher Candidate's Professional Learning category evaluate the candidate's ability for self-analysis, perseverance, and navigating challenges to their own frame of reference, as well as a collaborative capacity to promote P-12 student learning and improve instructional practices. All of these items focus on the InTASC category of Professional Responsibility. The Professional Behaviors section consists of the same 10 professional behavior attributes from the Mid-Point Professional Behaviors Checklist (3.3.1), with candidates re-evaluated on their progress from the mid-point of their field or clinical experience.

During all field experiences the P-12 Clinical Educators (PCE) rate candidates' professional behaviors (e.g., takes initiative, maintains professional boundaries) at the semester mid-point and candidate's dispositional attributes at the end (1.1.5) of the semester. University Clinical Educators also complete a Dispositions Survey during each professional field or clinical experience. Each course instructor also has the discretion to evaluate candidates' dispositions in their coursework throughout the program (3.3.4). Each licensure program team monitors their candidates' disposition ratings as noted in the Dispositions Review Process (3.3.3). An improvement plan (3.3.6) is activated when a candidate receives a "Not on target" rating. The University Clinical Educator (UCE) will develop an improvement plan with the candidate's input. The goal of the improvement plan is to provide intervention that will enable the candidate to ultimately be a more successful and effective teacher. If the candidate fails in meeting what was jointly agreed upon in the improvement plan, the program team and the Department Chair will collectively decide the next step. The potential outcomes, including dismissal from the program, are listed on the improvement plan (3.3.6) and are fully

disclosed to the candidate.
The EPP also established dispositions and professional behaviors recognized as essential by the profession in the code of ethics established by the Kentucky EPSB (3.6.2) and the EPP (3.6.1). Candidates must acknowledge their responsibilities to follow both sets of ethics by signing each of the codes during their admissions' field experience. The EPP expects all candidates to read, understand and abide by both sets of ethics throughout their program (3.6.3).

The EPP's goal is for candidates to exhibit increased integration of dispositions, content, and pedagogy (indicating a more thorough amalgamation) as they move toward completion of the program. The EPP associates non-academic criteria with increased teaching effectiveness of candidates and completers. Kentucky's teacher evaluation system, effective 2015, is the Professional Growth and Effective System (PGES). PGES examines teachers on two components: Overall Professional Practice (target rating of "Developing" for 1st year teacher) and Overall Student Growth Contribution (target rating of "Expected") (4.1.4). The 2015 PGES data of EPP completers for the Overall Professional Practice suggests that they received the "Accomplished" rating most. The 2015 PGES data of EPP completers for the Overall Student Growth Contribution component indicate the level of "Expected" which is the target for first year teachers. Another component of PGES is the student voice survey, where students beginning in grade 3 rate their teachers on the following areas: Support, Trust, Discipline, Nurture, Transparency, Understand, and Engage (1.2.5). The state does not provide Student Voice Data, however, the EPP received data on program completers from two school districts, one urban and one suburban (4.1.5). Data for the 19 completers in their first year of teaching rated by their students on the Student Voice Survey are positive. The rating scale is from 1-100 on each category of the student voice survey. The areas of the survey include the following average scores: Support (78), Transparency (78) Understand (81), Discipline (51), Engage (61), Nurture (74), and Trust (78). Twelve EPP completers in their second year of teaching were rated by their students. Data indicate the following average scores: Support (86.), Transparency (84), Understanding (81), Discipline (76), Engage (71), Nurture (71), Trust (84). Three EPP completers in their third year of teaching were rated by their students. Data indicate the following average scores (with 100 being the best): Support (81), Transparency (76), Understanding (65), Discipline (60), Engage (62), Nurture (73), and Trust (76).

Student Voice data for EPP candidates show P-12 students generally rate them at or above the target rating of 4 out of 5 except in the Discipline area. The fall 2016 mean ratings for four Discipline items for Grades 6-12 were close to 4 with 4.13, 3.86, 3.91, and 4.01. For grades 3-5, the trend was consistent with 3.85 and 3.86 for first two items. The third item's mean was 2.05. However, rating of 2 "Mostly Not" is an appropriate response for this item: Students behave so badly in this class that it slows down our learning.

Similar trends were found in spring 2017 (1.2.5).

3.4 The EPP has specific requirements for successful program progression and tracks three categories (Knowledgeable scholar, Collaborative scholar, and ePortolio) at each of the three transition points (3.4.2). The first transition point is admission into the teacher preparation program. The undergraduate candidates, regardless of their preferred specialty licensure area, are allowed to apply for admission into the teacher preparation program only if applicants meet specific criteria (3.3.7). First, they must successfully complete EDU 104, Orientation to Education, course, which is the prerequisite for four education courses that focus on human growth and development, introduction to education, instructional technology, and children with exceptionalities in schools. Second, pass the appropriate Admission Field Experience course. To enroll in Admission Field Experience candidates must meet the following criteria: 45 credit hours of college coursework completion, a minimum 2.75 cumulative GPA or 3.0 GPA on the last 30 hours of credit completed, receipt of mandated scores on the Praxis Core tests for Reading, Writing, and Mathematics, and cleared background check. For an applicant to become an admitted candidate, the following criteria have to be met: 1) demonstrated competency in communication, creativity, and critical thinking skills through attaining of minimum grade for the appropriate courses; 2) signed curriculum contract (3.4.1) stemming from a meeting with the academic advisor to outline their 4-year graduation plan, 3) successfully completing a minimum of 60 credit hours of coursework, 4) completing an approved professional ePortfolio from the Admission Field Experience; and 5) approval from the Teacher Education Committee, which consists of P-12 partners, EPP and Arts/ Science faculty (2.1.2). The MAT applicants must submit pre-admission documents that includes a letter explaining experiences related to the intended content licensure area and transcripts, which will be evaluated to determine the need for additional content area coursework (3.3.7). When the MAT applicants receive positive recommendation on the pre-admission documents (the panel interview and on-demand essay), they can proceed to phase II: application and admission. The MAT applicant, then, becomes admitted when there is evidence of a cleared background check, minimum scores on the Praxis Core tests (Reading, Writing, and Mathematics) or GRE minimum scores, and completion of a bachelor's degree with a minimum of 2.75 cumulative GPA or 3.0 GPA on the last 30 hours of coursework.

After admission to the program, all undergraduate candidates proceed to Professional Semesters 1, and 2. Special education and health education candidates also have Professional Semester 3 as part of their curriculum. After successful completion of professional semester 2 or 3, candidates are eligible for admission to the clinical experience (student teaching). The criteria for being admitted to the clinical experience include having passed all pedagogy course with a "C" or better and maintaining a minimum of 2.75 GPA for overall, professional courses, as well as content courses. The P-12 and University Clinical Educators evaluate candidates with standardized

assessments in their field experiences: lesson planning, lesson implementation (combined in one form), and professional dispositions survey. PCEs also complete mid-point professional behaviors check. Candidates must also successfully complete their professional ePortfolio, which includes several requirements, including a final reflection that aligns experiences to the Kentucky Teacher Standards (3.4.5).

The enrolled candidates become completers at transition point 3, program completion. The completers must pass their clinical experience to exit from their respective programs. Successful completion of clinical experience mandates positive ratings on various forms that evaluate the candidate's ability on lesson planning and implementation, dispositions, and professional behaviors as well as the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) and professional ePortfolio (3.4.2). Successful completion of TWS necessitates partnering with the PCE in implementing a unit or progression of lessons stemming from pre-assessments of P-12 students' baseline knowledge and interest, with the ultimate goal of fostering P-12 student learning. A well implemented TWS demonstrates candidate competency of content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, integration of use of technology, and connection to college- and career-ready standards through alignment of unit/lesson targets with the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS). KAS addresses content recommended by the teaching profession and academic expectations for all students before graduation (1.4.2). The criteria for a successful clinical experience ePortfolio includes candidates' ability to address all 10 Kentucky Teacher Standards (KTS) in their reflection with specific artifacts documenting professional growth in content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, and the appropriate use of technology.

Disaggregated data by specialty licensure areas from three cycles indicate the majority of candidates successfully transition through the three gateways, and the success rate increases with program progression (3.4.3). At transition point 1, four programs had applicants who were not admitted: 3-15% across three cycles for Elementary Education; 1 of 3 (33% in Fall 2016) Physical Education; 2 of 7 (29% in Fall 2016) Middle Grades Social Studies; 2 of 14 (14% in Fall 2015) Secondary Social Studies program candidates were not admitted. At transition point 2, two programs (Elementary Education: 1-9% and Secondary Social Studies: 12-15% across three cycles) prevented candidates from continuing to transition point 3. Course failure and dispositions were the reasons for stopping the candidates' progress according to collected data. As noted in the Transition Points evidence file (3.4.2), the EPP allows candidates multiple opportunities to develop as knowledgeable scholars, collaborative scholars and reflective professionals through repeating of courses and improving their areas of challenges in order to successfully continue in the program.

During the spring semester of each academic year, program facilitators share Quality Assurance Reports (5.1.5) with each other and include information on

suggested changes to the program. An example of an EPP-wide continuous improvement is the initiation of the Dispositions Review Process (3.3.3). This was in response to feedback from clinical educators and course instructors as well as the transition Points 3 cycle data, which showed that two causes for stopping during transition 1 and 2 were course failure and dispositions. The change allows faculty to provide more timely, consistent and formalized intervention for candidates, including counseling out.

3.5 The EPP verifies candidates have reached a high standard of content knowledge in their specialized licensure area through multiple indicators before recommending them for the specific licensure or certification. The performance level expected of candidates at the end of the program professional experience is to receive rating at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators and class average at or above acceptable levels on the EPP scoring guide indicators specific to the four categories of InTASC Standards. The acceptable performance rating for the lesson plan (1.1.6) and lesson implementation (1.1.7) is "Target" for completing candidates, as compared to the acceptable rating of "Emerging" during prior professional experiences. Another requirement is receiving a rating of "Met" on the TWS, a unit or lesson progression consisting of minimum five activities and its impact on P-12 student learning (1.2.8). TWS data on P-12 student learning illustrates an increase in scores on both objectives one and two, from the pre- to post-test (1.2.6). The TWS also assesses completing candidates' competency in meeting all four InTASC categories (1.2.9). The rating of "Met" for the TWS is only possible if the rating for each standard component listed on the scoring guide is checked as "Met". Any section that is not deemed to be "Met" must be resubmitted. Completing candidates must submit a reflection of their final professional experience, describing their professional growth, impact on student learning, differentiation for diverse students, and collaborative activities including co-teaching to increase teaching effectiveness and impact (1.2.1). The expected performance level for their reflection, which addresses InTASC Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibility, is "Target" by the third submission. Please refer to CAEP Standard 1, section 1 of the self-study report for more specific data and information on each of the EPP-wide assessments.

GPA could be an indication of content knowledge of candidates. When comparing the GPA of EPP enrolled candidates to GPAs of students enrolled in comparative NKU programs, the EPP candidates' GPAs are generally higher (3.2.1). In Fall 2015, Secondary Art with two candidates had 3.32 GPA vs. 3.36 for NKU art program. MAT Secondary Social Studies and Middle Grades Mathematics candidates did not fare as well as NKU equivalent subject area students (Secondary Social Studies Fall 2015: 2.78 vs. 2.97 NKU GPA, Spring 2016: 2.79 vs. NKU 2.91 GPA; Middle Grades Mathematics Fall 2015 2.43 vs. NKU 3.17 GPA). However, the EPP candidates' GPAs for these programs increased in subsequent semesters and the GPAs were significantly higher than the comparable NKU program GPAs. The average GPA at exit for EPP

candidates is generally higher than the average GPA at admission for all programs, except Elementary and IECE candidates (3.4.4). The average GPAs at exit for Elementary were slightly lower for all three cycles. For the IECE, completing candidates' average GPAs were slightly higher in Fall 2015 and the same for Fall 2016. The exit average GPA was lower than at admission for Spring 2016.

3.6 The EPP provides multiple opportunities for candidates to understand the expectation of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies (3.6.3). Candidates experience many opportunities to gain detailed and extensive understanding of the EPSB and EPP codes of ethics throughout their program and in their professional experiences. In addition, special education law and policies are taught in pre- and co-requisite admission education courses. In addition, candidates revisit and examine the codes and laws throughout their coursework and field experiences. All candidates are also mandated to annually submit a valid certificate of completion for Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) to their university clinical educator and placement school (2.3.2).

Evidence discussed in each section demonstrates the EPP's continuing and purposeful efforts to foster high candidate quality through monitoring candidates' admission and progression through their respective programs. The EPP has plans in place for addressing recruitment of and support for increasing a diverse pool of candidates, especially URM candidates. The EPP will continue in its effort to achieve the EPP mission of being leaders to enhance professional practice and transform lives, schools, and communities.

## Standard 4: Program Impact

i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4.1.3 KCEWS State_PGES.pdf | |
| | | 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning<br>4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys |
| 2 | 4.1.4 KCEWS NKU_PGES.pdf | |
| | | 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning<br>4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys |
| 3 | 4.1.5 Program Graduates Teaching Data.xlsx | |
| | | 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning<br>4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys<br>4.3 Employer satisfaction |
| 4 | 4.2.1 KTIP Results 3 cycles data.xlsx | |
| | | 4.3 Employer satisfaction |
| 5 | 4.3.1 Alumni_Principal Surveys.xlsx | |
| | | 4.3 Employer satisfaction<br>4.4 Completer satisfaction |
| 6 | 4.3.2 Principal Survey.pdf | |
| | | 4.3 Employer satisfaction |
| 7 | 4.3.3 MAED NKU Completers.xlsx | |
| | | 4.3 Employer satisfaction |
| 8 | 4.4.1 New Teacher Survey NKU data.xlsx | |
| | | 4.4 Completer satisfaction |
| 9 | 4.4.2 Ex alumni survey (1yr_3Yr).pdf | |
| | | 4.4 Completer satisfaction |

* ii. Analysis of evidence (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that makes the case that the standard is met

The EPP uses several data sources to demonstrate its completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development. For this standard, data from the Kentucky Center for Education and Workforce Statistics (KCEWS), two local school districts, and surveys from principals and alumni are highlighted.

4.1 According to KCEWS data, EPP completers positively contribute to P-12 student learning, and their contributions are on par or slightly above state benchmarks. The Kentucky Department of Education uses the Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) as a summative evaluation mechanism for P-12 teachers that draws from local and state measures to determine overall student growth ratings. The local contribution to these ratings derives from district assessments to determine Student Growth Goals

(SGG). The state contribution is based on Median Student Growth Percentiles (MSGP), which compares students' rate of changes to that of peers with similar test score histories in language arts and mathematics for grades 4-8. Overall student growth ratings include SGG and MSGP data, and are categorized as Low for growth below 30th percentile, Expected for growth between 30th and 65th percentile, or High for growth above 65th percentile. Data for categories with fewer than 10 completers are not included.

PGES data for the 2015-16 school year show the student growth impact of P-12 educators who completed their teaching certification between 2010 and 2015 (4.1.3 and 4.1.4). In local contribution, EPP completers were generally on par with others across the state. For High growth, EPP completers were slightly lower than the state benchmark (26% vs. 30%). For Expected growth, they were slightly higher than the state benchmark (67% vs. 64%). For Low growth, they were slightly higher than the state benchmark (7% vs. 6%). In state contribution, EPP completers were also generally equal to their state counterparts. For High growth, no EPP completers were rated, and the state benchmark was 9%. For Expected growth, EPP completers were slightly higher than the state benchmark (92% vs. 87%). For Low growth, no EPP completers were rated, and the state benchmark was 5%.

In addition, two school districts (one urban, one suburban) provided information on EPP completers who worked as elementary, middle, and high school teachers in their districts within the past three years (4.1.5). The number of recorded completers from Year 1 to Year 3 decreased for two reasons: school districts do not evaluate all teachers each year on PGES criteria; and some completers did not return to the district for a second or third year. In local contribution, 36 completers in their first year were rated as High (22%), Expected (67%), or Low (11%), with an average score of 2.11 which is slightly above the Expected score of 2.0. In their second year, 29 completers were rated as High (48%), Expected (41%), or Low (3%), with an average score of 2.38. In their third year, 9 completers were rated as High (56%), Expected (44%), or Low (0%), with an average score of 2.56. In state contribution category, 5 completers in their first year were rated as High (20%) or Expected (80%). In their second year, all 5 were rated as Expected (100%). In their third year, all 3 were rated as Expected (100%).

The two school districts also gave overall ratings based on district decision rules when combining local and state contributions to student growth. In their first year, 27 completers were rated as High (22%) or Expected (78%), with an average score of 2.19. In their second year, 22 completers were rated as High (36%), Expected (55%), or Low (9%), with an average score of 2.27. In their third year, 9 completers were rated as High (56%) or Expected (44%), with an average score of 2.56. In sum, the data indicate a trend of increasing High student growth ratings and increasing average scores as EPP completers gain more teaching experience.

In regards to their professional journey, P-12 teachers who pass the required Praxis II exams receive a statement of eligibility to teach in their certification area. When hired in a Kentucky school district, they undertake an internship in their first year to be eligible for a Rank 3 teaching certificate. Kentucky requires all P-12 teachers to start their master's degree in education within 5 years of employment and complete it within 10 years to be eligible for a Rank 2 teaching certificate. Many completers return to EPP for their master's degrees: 33 completers graduated in 2014-15 and 26 graduated in 2015-16 (4.3.3). In their master's program, they pursue action research projects that address, for example: effects of ability grouping, literacy centers, online learning, STEM in rural schools, flipped math classroom, formative assessment, and project based learning. The projects, ultimately, focus on advancing student learning and development in their classrooms.

4.2 PGES provides teaching effectiveness data based on the Kentucky Framework for Teaching. This framework evaluates P-12 teachers in four domains: planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities. For each domain, teachers are rated as Exemplary, Accomplished, Developing, or Ineffective. First year teachers are expected to attain a rating of Developing in each domain, while continuing teachers are expected to attain an overall rating of Accomplished. PGES data for 2015-16 reveal three key findings on EPP completers: (1) their ratings were generally on par with state benchmarks; (2) their overall ratings improved from Year 1 to Year 3; (3) their highest domain was professional responsibilities, and their lowest domain was instruction (4.1.3 and 4.1.4).

In planning and preparation, EPP completers were rated in comparison to state benchmarks as Exemplary (7% vs. 10%), Accomplished (80% vs. 82%), or Developing (12% vs. 8%). In classroom environment, they were rated as Exemplary (19% vs. 15%), Accomplished (70% vs. 78%), or Developing (11% vs. 7%). In instruction, they were rated as Exemplary (6% vs. 8%), Accomplished (78% vs. 80%), or Developing (15% vs. 11%). Finally, in professional responsibilities, they were rated as Exemplary (16% vs. 14%), Accomplished (78% vs. 80%), or Developing (6% for EPP and state benchmarks). EPP completers received slightly lower ratings than their state counterparts in the Exemplary and Accomplished areas. They were higher in Developing in all domains, and no one was considered Ineffective. Compared to state benchmarks, EPP completers had higher percentages of Exemplary in the domains of classroom environment and professional responsibilities. However, in general, they were on par with completers across the state.

The same two school districts provided PGES data for teaching effectiveness on EPP completers in their districts (4.1.5):
In planning and preparation, 37 completers in their first year were rated as Accomplished (81%) or Developing (19%), with an average score of 2.81 which is above the Developing score of 2.0 targeted for first year teachers. In their second year, 31 completers were rated as Exemplary (13%),

Accomplished (81%), or Developing (6%), with an average score of 3.0 which matches the Accomplished score of 3.0 targeted for continuing teachers. In their third year, 9 completers were rated as Exemplary (22%), Accomplished (67%), or Developing (11%), with an average score of 3.11.

In classroom environment, 37 completers in their first year were rated as Exemplary (3%), Accomplished (78%), or Developing (19%), with an average score of 2.86. In their second year, 31 completers were rated as Exemplary (19%), Accomplished (75%), or Developing (6%), with an average score of 3.0. In their third year, 9 completers were rated as Exemplary (22%) or Accomplished (78%), with an average score of 3.22.

In instruction, 37 completers in their first year were rated as Exemplary (3%), Accomplished (81%), or Developing (16%), with an average score of 2.86. In their second year, 31 completers were rated as Exemplary (3%), Accomplished (87%), or Developing (10%), with an average score of 3.0. In their third year, 9 completers were rated as Exemplary (11%), Accomplished (78%), or Developing (11%), with an average score of 3.0.

In professional responsibilities, 37 completers in their first year were rated as Accomplished (97%) or Developing (3%), with an average score of 2.97. In their second year, 31 completers were rated as Exemplary (16%), Accomplished (78%), or Developing (6%), with an average score of 3.0. In their third year, 9 completers were rated as Exemplary (44%), Accomplished (45%), or Developing (11%), with an average score of 3.33.

Data from the school districts indicate that EPP completers' ratings improved from Year 1 to Year 3, as evidenced by the increasing percentages in Exemplary ratings and the increasing average scores. No completer was rated Ineffective in any domain across three years. Completers teaching elementary grades received the highest ratings, with an average score of Accomplished (3.0) in their first year. Those in middle schools teaching math/science or math/English received the lowest ratings, with an average score of 2.0 in their first year. However, 2.0 or Developing is the target rating for first year teachers. They improved in their second year, with an average score of 3.0 or Accomplished, the target for second year teachers. In sum, completers demonstrate teaching effectiveness in the four domains, and meet their target stages for professional development.

Another data source for teaching effectiveness is the Student Voice Survey from PGES (4.1.5). P-12 students give feedback on their teachers in relation to the seven S.T.U.D.E.N.T. constructs of Support, Transparency, Understanding, Discipline, Engagement, Nurture, and Trust. Each construct's score (between 1 and 100) is determined by the number of positive responses divided by the number of responses for the construct. Since the state did not provide Student Voice Survey data to EPPs, this report features data from two local school districts.

According to the Student Voice Survey completed in 2015-16, student ratings of EPP completers were positive, and displayed growth in subsequent years. In their first year, 19 completers received the following construct average scores: Support (78), Transparency (78), Understanding (81), Discipline (51), Engagement (61), Nurture (74), and Trust (78). In their second year, 12 completers received these construct average scores: Support (86), Transparency (84), Understanding (81), Discipline (76), Engagement (71), Nurture (71), and Trust (84). In their third year, 3 completers received these scores: Support (81), Transparency (76), Understanding (65), Discipline (60), Engagement (62), Nurture (73), and Trust (76). The most growth was in the Discipline construct, with 15% increase in mean score. The Understanding construct with 13% change and the Transparency and Trust constructs with 6% change in their respective mean scores showed growth, as well. Only the Nurture construct decreased from Year 1 to Year 2. EPP completers in their third year had somewhat lower ratings compared to those in their second year. This result may be due to a much lower number of third year teachers evaluated by students. Overall, survey data indicate that EPP completers are exhibiting appropriate dispositions for teachers working with P-12 students.

Moreover, an important milestone is the successful completion of the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (KTIP). According to the state Department of Education, KTIP is "designed to provide assistance to new teachers. Its main goal is to help new teachers experience a successful first year in the classroom." When hired in Kentucky, new teachers must successfully complete KTIP to receive a Professional Teaching Certificate at the Rank 3 level. Based on three cycles of data, the KTIP pass rates of EPP completers often exceed that of the state (4.2.1). In 2013-14, 130 EPP completers had a pass rate of 98.48%, compared to 99.44% for the state. In 2014-15, 79 completers had a pass rate of 100%, compared to 99.94% for the state. In 2015-16, 55 completers had a pass rate of 100%, compared to 99.86% for the state. The perfect or near-perfect passing rates of EPP completers are a solid indicator of teaching effectiveness.

4.3 To discern employer satisfaction, Principal Surveys provide information about EPP completers' first three years of teaching (4.3.2). For three cycles of Principal Surveys (4.3.1), two data sets are used. The first survey was aligned to the Kentucky Teacher Standards (KTS), and was administered in 2014-15. It utilized a 5-point rating scale of extremely well (5), moderately well (4), neutral (3), moderately poor (2), and extremely poor (1). The second survey drew from a revised version that was aligned to KTS and InTASC, and was administered in 2015-16 and 2016-17. It utilized a 4-point rating scale of Accomplished (4), Target (3), Developing (2), and Ineffective (1). The survey response rates were at least 30% for all three years.

In the 2014-15 survey, principals rated EPP completers from a high of 4.34 to a low of 3.63, with a target score of 3.0 (Neutral). The highest rating was for

"Applied content knowledge," and the lowest was for "Assessment and communicates learning results." In the 2015-16 survey, completers were rated from a high of 2.88 to a low of 2.18, with a target score of 3.0 (Developing). The highest rating was for "Displays appropriate dispositions for teaching children," and the lowest was for "Co-teach lessons with special education teacher." In the 2016-17 survey, completers were rated from a high of 3.0 to a low of 2.45. The highest rating was for "Use of technology that facilitates student learning," and the lowest was for "Co-teach lessons with special education Teacher." Although co-teaching was rated lowest once again, the scores improved, most likely due to the increased emphasis on co-teaching in the program.

The revised survey included an overall rating for "Based on teaching performance, how well EPP prepared completer to teach academic subject and grade level." The principals' mean ratings for EPP completers were 2.88 in 2015-16 and 2.77 in 2016-17, which were below the target score of 3.0. Closer review of ratings by teaching certification reveals that, even in lowest rated areas, there was growth. For instance, in 2015-16, completers in middle grades math received the lowest rating at 2.33. In 2016-17, those in middle grades math and science received the lowest ratings at 2.50. Principals gave the highest ratings to completers of physical education in 2015-16 and to those in physical education, special education, and elementary education in 2016-17. Overall, principals seemed fairly satisfied with the preparation of EPP completers.

Another factor in employer satisfaction is retention of P-12 educators. The same two school districts provided retention data on EPP completers within the past three years (4.1.5). After their first year, 93% of EPP completers returned, 3% resigned, and 4% were not rehired. The two completers who resigned were in elementary and middle grades math/science. The three who were not rehired were in elementary. After their second year, 82.5% of EPP completers returned, 5% resigned, and 12.5% were not rehired. The two who resigned were in middle grades special education and middle grades science. The five who were not rehired were a physical education teacher, a middle grades English/social studies teacher, two high school English teachers, and one high school biology teacher. After their third year, 75% of EPP completers returned, and 25% were not rehired. Statewide data on teacher retention and attrition would reveal if these local figures are similar to or different from state patterns.

4.4 To discern completer satisfaction, the New Teacher Survey provides "data about the perception of the quality of teacher certification programs in Kentucky and to gauge attitudes toward current institutional training" (4.4.1). The survey is aligned to the Kentucky Teacher Standards with a 4-point rating scale of Excellent (4), Good (3), Fair (2), and Poor (1). Data from the New Teacher Survey in 2015-16 reveal that EPP completers have somewhat similar ratings to completers across the state for the ten Kentucky Teacher

Standards. Across all standards, EPP completers have slightly more ratings of Fair and Poor and have slightly fewer ratings of Good, in comparison to statewide completers. For example, for higher order thinking in Standard 4, 16% of EPP completers gave Fair or Poor rating, compared to 12% statewide. For use of pre-assessment in Standard 5, 20% of EPP completers gave Fair or Poor rating, compared to 16% statewide. For use of data in Standard 7, slightly lower percentages of EPP completers gave Excellent or Good rating across three indicators. In standard 10, EPP and statewide completers gave relatively similar ratings in their preparation to effectively teach students with disabilities and English language learners and to differentiate instruction. The survey reveals that EPP completers would like to learn more about assessment, data-informed instruction, and working with diverse students.

Another data source for completer satisfaction is the Alumni Surveys, which were sent to EPP completers after the first and third year of teaching (4.4.2). Similar to the Principal Surveys, two data sets are used. The first Alumni Survey was aligned to the Kentucky Teacher Standards (KTS), and was administered in 2014-15. It utilized a 5-point rating scale of extremely well (5), moderately well (4), neutral (3), moderately poor (2), and extremely poor (1). The second survey drew from a revised version that was aligned to KTS and InTASC, and was administered in 2015-16 and 2016-17. It utilized a 4-point rating scale of Accomplished (4), Target (3), Developing (2), and Ineffective (1). The survey response rates were at least 21% for all three years (4.3.1).

In the 2014-15 survey, alumni gave ratings from a high of 3.92 to a low of 3.11, with a target score of 3.0 (Neutral). The highest rating was in "Design and implement instruction," and the lowest was in "Assessment and communicates learning results" similar to the principal survey. In the 2015-16 survey, first year alumni gave ratings from a high of 3.49 to a low of 3.06, and third year alumni gave a high of 3.43 to a low of 2.63, with a target score of 3.0 (Developing). For first year alumni, their highest rating was for "Creates a classroom environment that is emotionally and physically safe," and their lowest was for "Use of technology that facilitates student learning." For third year alumni, their highest rating was for "Displays appropriate dispositions for teaching children," and their lowest was for "Co-teach lessons with special education teacher" once again similar to the principal survey. In the 2016-17 survey, first year alumni gave ratings from a high of 3.09 to a low of 2.74, and third year alumni gave a high of 3.24 to a low of 2.83. For first year alumni, their highest rating was for "Displays appropriate dispositions for teaching children," and their lowest was for "Implement instructional strategies that promote higher order thinking skills." For third year alumni, their highest rating was for "Clear and correct written and verbal language to communicate content," and their lowest was for "Implement instructional strategies that promote higher order thinking skills" similar to first year alumni.

The revised survey included an overall rating for "Based on teaching performance, how well EPP prepared completer to teach academic subject and grade level." The 2015-16 survey shows mean ratings of 3.50 for first year alumni and 3.28 for third year alumni. The 2016-17 survey shows mean ratings of 2.93 for first year alumni and 3.24 for third year alumni. With the exception of the 2.93 rating, all are above the target rating of 3.0. In the domain of Instructional Practice, there is a general increase by Year 3, particularly in the areas of co-teaching and the teachers' sense of self-efficacy. However, in the domains of Learner and Learning and of Content Knowledge, there is a general downward trend in their indicators from 2015-16 to 2016-17. The downward trends in the alumni's general self-ratings in relation to KTS and InTASC may be due to their realization that they need to know more to become better teachers. However, as evinced by their high and low ratings, EPP completers still perceive themselves as being on-target in their professional career, and feel adequately prepared by their program.

A holistic review of the data presented in Standard 4 indicates the EPP program completers have become successful early career teachers, positively impacting P-12 student learning and development. Based on the new teachers' performance, principals and alumni also reported overall satisfaction with the educator preparation programs provided by the EPP.

## Standard 5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement and Capacity

i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard.)

1 1.1.4 3 year Praxis test comparisons.xlsx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

2 1.1.5 Dispositions survey FA 16.docx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

3 1.1.6 Lesson Planning Rubric both years.docx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

4 1.1.7 Lesson Implementation Rubric both years.docx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

5 1.2.1 Foliotek Clinical Experiences Final Reflection rubric.docx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

6 1.2.4 Student_Voice_Surveys.docx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

7 1.2.8 TWS process.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

8 1.2.9 TWS Foliotek scoring rubric.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

9 1.5.1 Technology Assessment Rubric.docx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

10 2.1.3 Teacher Education Advisory Council fall

5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

11 2.1.5 PK-12 Univ Task Force charge_rec.docx

5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

12 3.1.1 Education recruitment_retention plan.docx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

13 3.2.1 Applicants, admits and enrolled 3cycles data.xlsx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

14 3.4.2 UG_MAT Initial Certification Transition Points.docx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

15 3.4.3 Transition Points 3 cycles data.xlsx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

16 3.4.4 Graduation info comp to adm.xlsx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

17 4.1.4 KCEWS NKU_PGES.pdf

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

18 4.1.5 Program Graduates Teaching Data.xlsx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

19 4.3.1 Alumni_Principal Surveys.xlsx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

20 4.4.1 New Teacher Survey NKU data.xlsx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

21 5.1.1 Continuous Improve Cycle and QAS Graphic.docx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

22 5.1.2 EPP-Wide Key Assessments and Quality Assurance System Process(2).docx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

23 5.1.3 Quality Assurance Committee.docx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

24 5.1.4 Quality Assurance Committee Agenda.docx

5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

25 5.1.5 Quality Assurance Report Form.docx

5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

26 5.1.6 Quality Assurance Report Summary 2014-2017.xlsx

5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

27 5.1.7 Foliotek Cumulative Progress Report.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

28 5.2.1 Relevant and Verifiable Table.docx

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

29 5.2.2 Teacher Education Committee.docx

5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

30 5.2.3 Quality Assurance Committee.docx

5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

31 5.3.1 NKU Innovation Projects.docx

5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

32 5.3.2 Completers with Jobs -NKU comp to 1st yr teach.xlsx

5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

33 5.3.3 Completer jobs 2013- 2016.xlsx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

34 5.4.1 Outcome and Impact Measures table.docx

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

35 5.4.3 Consumer Information.xlsx

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and

actionable data.
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

36 5.5.1 Teacher Education Committee Agenda.docx

5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

* ii. Analysis of evidence (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that makes the case that the standard is met

The EPP maintains a quality assurance system that includes valid data from multiple measures which indicate the positive impact of candidates and program completers on P-12 student learning. The EPP engages in continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and identifies priorities to enhance programs and pursue innovations in order to improve completer effectiveness on P-12 student development.

5.1 The EPP's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple components that work together to support continuous improvement through an ongoing cycle of data gathering, analysis, and sharing for program and candidate/completer improvement. As shown in the Quality Assurance System (QAS) graphic (5.1.1), the system is comprised of multiple measures and steps that allow the EPP to monitor candidate progress and completer achievements. The QAS is comprised of 13 key assessments as outlined in the EPP-Wide Key Assessment document (5.1.2). Through these key assessments, stakeholders monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. The QAS is comprised of several technologies that help to collect, store, and analyze data. These technologies include an education database that provides a mechanism to electronically record EPP data, retrieve data from the institution's student information system (SAP), and generate reports on these data. The only data that are entered into the database are those which are not maintained in the central system but are required for continuous improvement, such as transition points (3.4.2) and field/clinical placement information. Several surveys are housed on the SurveyMonkey website, including the principal, alumni, and P-12 program feedback surveys, which are sent to various stakeholders for their input and feedback about EPP candidates and programs. Several EPP-wide assessments are also housed in Foliotek, the electronic portfolio system that candidates are required to use throughout their education programs.

The Quality Assurance System begins with collecting EPP-wide data from appropriate stakeholders, such as P-12 (PCE) and university (UCE) clinical educators, during the academic year on one of the technologies listed above. After the academic year, the data is then downloaded and disaggregated for each certification area. The associate dean in the College of Education and Human Services (COEHS) organizes the data on spreadsheets, by transition points, for ease of review by the COEHS dean, department chairs, program faculty, and other EPP stakeholders. These reports and the reports from

Educational Testing Services and the state's Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) initiate the continuous improvement and reporting cycle. When the new academic year begins, the data is shared with program faculty, who review and analyze the data and begin to make program decisions. Simultaneously, selected data is shared each month with the Teacher Education Committee and once each semester with the Teacher Education Advisory Council. Feedback from those groups is shared with program faculty, and becomes another source of data for consideration. Throughout the academic year, as UCEs and PCEs review and discuss data, program faculty begin to finalize decisions on curriculum and other program changes. The final step in the QAS is the Quality Assurance Committee (QUAC) (5.1.3), comprised of the COEHS dean and associate dean, department chairs, placement director, and program faculty representatives. The QUAC group reviews and discusses data across all programs, and identifies EPP-wide challenges and solutions to those challenges, such as revising or developing assessments and making changes in field and clinical experiences. This EPP use of evidence-based practices assures that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

Data from the coherent set of multiple measures are used to inform, modify, and evaluate the EPP's operational effectiveness and to demonstrate how the EPP satisfies all CAEP standards. The QAS provides the system for the EPP to collect, analyze, and share data for CAEP Standards 1, 3, and 4. For example, the Professional Dispositions Survey (1.1.5), used to evaluate candidates' dispositions and professional behaviors, is a measure of candidate progress collected once per semester across all three transition points (admissions [TP1]; professional semesters 1, 2, and 3 [TP2]; and clinical experiences [TP3]). PCEs and UCEs are responsible for completing the surveys. Data collected from the QAS are displayed on the EPP Education Data Dashboard (5.4.3), and are shared with and reviewed by all system stakeholders, including program faculty, the Teacher Education Advisory Council, the Teacher Education Committee, and the Quality Assurance Committee. This process is true for all EPP-wide assessments in CAEP Standard 1, such as Praxis Tests (1.1.4), Lesson Plan Rubric (1.1.6), Lesson Implementation Rubric (1.1.7), Reflection Rubric (1.2.1), Student Voice Survey (1.2.4), Teacher Work Sample Process (1.2.8), Teacher Work Sample Evaluation Rubric (1.2.9), and Technology Rubric (1.5.1). It is consistent for all EPP-wide data in CAEP Standard 3, such as the Recruitment and Retention Plan (3.1.1), Applicants/Admits/Enrolled (3.2.1), Transition Point Data (3.4.3), Graduate Info Compared to Admissions (3.4.4). The same process also holds for all EPP-wide data in Standard 4, such as Program Completers (4.1.5), Jobs for Program Completers (5.3.3), KTIP Results (4.2.1), Alumni/Principal Survey (4.3.1), and New Teacher Survey (4.4.1).

Data analysis and setting of program priorities are natural outcomes of the EPP's QAS process. Examples of program and EPP-wide items that have been identified over the past three years are documented in the Quality Assurance

Report Summary (5.1.6). Finally, the QAS supports disaggregation of data by certification area and other dimensions, which include the required EPSB field and clinical experience criteria and the Kentucky Teacher Standards that candidates must meet throughout their education program. The Cumulative Progress Report (5.1.7) is used to document the above requirements in the Foliotek electronic portfolio system.

5.2. The EPP's Quality Assurance System relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence so that interpretations of data are valid and consistent. The Relevant and Verifiable Table (5.2.1) outlines each proprietary and EPP-created assessment and survey used within the EPP.

Relevance. All rubrics have been tagged to the Kentucky Teacher Standards and to the InTASC Standards and Categories. Additionally, in order to establish relevance for EPP-wide assessments, the EPP uses Lawshe's Content Validity Methodology for the four EPP-created assessments that require validity and inter-rater reliability verification. The lesson plan and implementation evaluation rubrics were developed by a group of P-12 and university clinical educators in summer 2015. Once developed, the rubrics were piloted during the 2015-16 academic year. In fall 2015, the rubrics were reviewed by various stakeholders, such as TEC and TEAC members, using the Lawshe method to determine content validity. In summer 2016, the piloted lesson plan and implementation rubrics were reviewed again by a group of P-12 and university clinical educators. The group provided feedback, and made changes to several components and evaluation statements of the rubrics. The revised rubrics were then implemented starting in fall 2016. During the same semester, the revised rubrics were reviewed by P-12 program advisory boards and university clinical educators to determine content validity using the Lawshe method. Consequently, the lesson plan and implementation evaluation rubrics have had two validity checks, thereby assuring valid and reliable data. In addition to content validity, inter-rater reliability has also been established. PCEs and UCEs were first trained on the lesson plan and implementation evaluation rubrics before fall 2016 semester began. During the EPP candidate's final teaching session in the clinical experience semester, the PCE and UCE independently evaluated the candidate using the rubrics. Both PCE and UCE entered their evaluations in Foliotek. Data from their independent assessments were then compared to determine the percent of agreement or inter-rater reliability (IRR) of each component of the rubrics. Each IRR was determined to be at 0.80 or higher.

The technology assessment rubric and the rubric for the final reflection of clinical experience were both piloted during the 2016-17 academic year. The content validity and inter-rater reliability for each rubric were determined, and are outlined in the EPP-created assessment information uploaded in AIMS. Both rubrics were found to be valid and reliable. All other EPP-wide assessments are either surveys or proprietary assessments and, in

accordance with CAEP guidelines, do not need to have validity and reliability measures determined.

To follow candidates through their education programs, three transition points have been established. The first one is at admission to the education program. The second one is at the entrance to the clinical experience. The third transition point is at program completion. Data are kept on candidates at each transition point for each program (3.4.2), and reviewed as part of the quality assurance system (3.4.3).

Verifiable. Each semester, the Teacher Education department chair works with the technology coordinator to ensure that PCEs and UCEs have submitted their required assessments in the Foliotek system. These assessments include the lesson plan, lesson implementation, and dispositions evaluations, as well as the semester reflection, cumulative progress report, and other required Foliotek documentation. At the end of the academic year, the technology coordinator downloads the data from Foliotek, and begins the Quality Assurance System for another year.

Representative. PCEs, UCEs, and other stakeholders periodically review evaluation practices and teacher candidate assessments to minimize bias and ensure fairness. As part of the TEC and TEAC processes, two evaluators (P-12 and university clinical educators) are used to reduce bias and ensure fairness. Both evaluations are used to determine candidate's grade and movement to the next transition point. Field and clinical experience assessments are independently completed by both PCEs and UCEs. The data from the independent evaluations are then aggregated and compared as part of the annual data review and analysis. Additionally, assessments are aligned with state and national standards, resulting in outcomes that are fair, accurate, and consistent. Review sessions are also held at the beginning of each semester to train PCEs and UCEs in the use of the identified scoring instruments. The systems' operations, comprised of data from Foliotek, Praxis, SurveyMonkey, and SAP, allow for disaggregation of data by certification area and other dimensions.

Cumulative. Data from the EPP quality assurance system includes at least three or more cycles of administration and collection of all EPP-wide assessments (see assessment data in Standards 1, 3, and 4). In addition, data is published on the EPP Data Dashboard, and is available for all stakeholders to review on a continuous basis.

Actionable. Data from the EPP quality assurance system are accessible on the College of Education and Human Services website (5.4.3). As a result of several reviews during the Continuous Improvement Cycle (5.1.1), decisions are made about the strengths and areas for growth within each program. Program faculty review the data and determine what changes will be made to the program. The TEC and Quality Assurance Committee review data across

programs to identify and suggest EPP-wide changes. Data provide the information needed to determine what, if any, changes will be made within a specific program or EPP-wide (5.1.6).

5.3 As noted in the EPP-Wide Quality Assurance System Process (5.1.2), modeled in the Continuous Improvement graphic (5.1.1) and described in sections 5.1 and 5.2, the EPP Quality Assurance System ensures that data are systematically collected, analyzed, monitored, and reported throughout the academic year. Program faculty and TEC members review data during their monthly meetings, P-12 advisory boards review data twice each year, and the QUAC group reviews program and EPP-wide data annually.

Each year, program facilitators develop a Quality Assurance Report (5.1.5) that discusses the strengths and challenges identified by the EPP assessments, such as the Praxis exams, dispositions survey, or lesson plan. The report is completed and discussed at the annual QUAC meeting. To ensure that results of program modifications are monitored and adjusted, the first question on the form asks the program to review and discuss program changes that were identified in the previous year's Quality Assurance Report. It also asks the program to identify changes that were previously initiated and the impact of those changes on teacher candidates and/or the program.

The Quality Assurance Report Summary (5.1.6) was developed to systematically review the data and program modifications during the last three Quality Assurance Committee meetings. The summary documents the priorities established by each program and the results of the changes (if available) on programs, candidates, and P-12 students. The summary identifies that 100% of program and EPP-wide changes were based on identified data. All data included within the continuous improvement process are tracked over time. Assessment data included in Standards 1 to 4 are shared annually with faculty, and are posted on the EPP Data Dashboard to ensure monitoring and review of data and to give stakeholders the ability to track results over time.

A group of university faculty in the elementary, middle grades, and secondary education programs formed an Innovative Programs group that meet to share information on innovative practices they initiated in their respective programs. This group has met several times throughout the year to collaborate and discuss the innovative practices they have developed and/or implemented in partnership with P-12 school districts. The Innovative Programs group collected data each semester, and will share the results of their projects with UCE and PCE colleagues, both inside and outside of the EPP (5.3.1). The group will continue to review the data and determine which programs they might replicate during future semesters.

The EPP collaborates closely with two partner school districts (one urban and one suburban) to identify selected program completers' teaching performance

and impact on P-12 students during their first few years of teaching. These districts provided the results of annual principal evaluations, P-12 student growth data, and student voice survey results. The EPP also systematically compared the program admissions and exit data for each of the identified program completers to determine their progress in the program and their performance as first year certified teachers (5.3.2). Analysis of extant data indicates that the selection criteria for the education programs are appropriate for candidates to successfully complete the program and become effective teachers. Most of the identified program completers graduated from their program with higher GPAs, and all program completers were evaluated by their school principals as "Developing" (which is the target score) or higher during their first year of teaching.

Data, including various demographics such as gender, racial/ethnic, GPA, Praxis Case test scores, and ACT scores, are collected at admission to the education program, and then compared to completers' exit GPAs and other criteria in Evidence 3.4.4. Analysis of collected data reveals that the entrance requirements for education programs are appropriate for developing successful candidates and program completers. Most programs had very few candidates drop out or withdraw, with many programs having a 100% graduation rate. In addition, when education candidates' GPAs are compared to GPAs of students enrolled in non-education majors, the education candidates fare very well, typically with GPAs that are equal to or higher than their counterparts. Perhaps the best indicator of successful program completers is the number who are employed as teachers after graduation (5.3.3). For the 2013-14 completer cohort, we located 57% of the graduates, and 100% of them were employed as teachers in 2014-15. For the same cohort, 59% were located the next year, and 100% of them were employed as teachers in 2015-16. For the same cohort the following year, 48% of completers were located, and all but two were employed as teachers in 2016-17. Similar results were found for the 2014-15 and 2015-16 cohorts of program completers. The employment data indicates that program completers are being hired and retained as teachers in area school districts.

5.4 As a part of the continuous improvement cycle detailed in the previous section, measures of completer impact are included in the process, and are drawn from a variety of data sources. The eight outcome and impact measures, listed in this evidence, are appropriately monitored and reported together with the following considerations: accurate analysis of trends; comparisons with benchmarks; evidence of corresponding resource allocations; and future direction informed by data.

For example, P-12 student learning/development data comes from the Kentucky Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) (4.1.4) and selected local school district data (4.1.5). The COEHS associate dean is tasked with identifying which school district partners hire program completers. Once the match is identified, the EPP requests selected school district partners to

send teaching effectiveness and student learning data for program completers they hired. The data is reviewed and analyzed, with stakeholders looking for relevant trends that inform the EPP of needed program changes to develop high quality completers. Current data indicate EPP program completers are successful teachers who are positively impacting P-12 student learning and development through their first three years of teaching (4.1.5). These eight outcome measures are posted on the EPP Data Dashboard (5.4.1), and are available to all stakeholders, including candidates, program faculty, College of Arts and Sciences faculty, P-12 program advisory groups, the Teacher Education Committee, and the Quality Assurance Committee.

5.5 As indicated in previous sections, a wide variety of appropriate stakeholders including candidates, alumni, employers, practitioners, and school and community partners are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence. For example, at the program level of the continuous improvement cycle, program advisory committees, comprised of P-12 clinical educators, administrators, program completers, and current candidates meet with program faculty twice a year as part of the ongoing decision-making process required for program monitoring and evaluation (2.1.3).

In addition to program level stakeholder involvement, the Teacher Education Committee (TEC) (5.2.2) meets monthly as a part of the ongoing EPP-wide decision-making processes (5.5.1). The TEC, comprised of internal and external stakeholders of P-12 clinical educators and university clinical educators, including College of Arts and Sciences faculty and administrators, reviews data and inputs from programs, and makes decisions that impact the entire system. The TEC is also the final EPP decision-making body on all program curriculum items. All program curriculum changes must be discussed and approved by the TEC before it leaves the EPP and moves to the university level. Additionally, P-12 clinical educators complete a survey at the end of each semester giving feedback on how candidates perform on each standard and the strengths and challenges of the programs that prepared teacher candidates (2.1.10).

Finally, at the end of the academic year, program representatives serve on the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) to review and discuss the data from each program (5.2.3). Each program develops a Quality Assurance Report (5.1.5), which is then reviewed by QAC during its annual meeting (5.1.4). Based on the most current data, the QAC discusses findings across programs, and makes recommendations for program changes, with the ultimate goal of developing candidates who will positively impact P-12 students.

The first example of diverse stakeholders influencing EPP decisions is the P-12/University Task Force (2.1.5) that was created in 2013-14. Diverse stakeholder involvement was critical to achieving the purpose of the task force, which included developing priorities to review and revise the education

programs to meet the needs of the 21st century P-12 student and educator. This collaborative effort led to the development and recommendations of revised and updated admissions criteria, field and clinical experiences, and pedagogy course changes.

The second example of diverse stakeholder involvement in EPP decision-making was developing and validating three main EPP-wide assessment rubrics (dispositions, lesson plan, and lesson implementation). For example, the lesson plan and implementation evaluation rubrics were developed by a group of P-12 and university clinical educators during summer 2015. Once developed, they were piloted during the 2015-16 academic year. During fall 2015 the new rubrics were also reviewed by various stakeholders, using the Lawshe method, to determine content validity. During summer 2016 the piloted lesson plan and implementation rubrics were reviewed again by a group of P-12 and university clinical educators. The group provided feedback and made changes to many of the components and evaluation statements on the rubrics. The revised rubrics were then implemented during the fall semester of the 2016-17 academic year (2.1.3). During the same semester the revised lesson plan and implementation rubrics were reviewed by PK-12 clinical educators and university clinical educators to determine content validity using the Lawshe method.

In closing, the EPP's Quality Assurance System (QAS) outlines a framework that embodies the essential elements of the EPP programs, and provides a blueprint for ensuring coherence among curriculum, instruction, assessment of candidates, and participation in field and clinical experiences. The QAS offers a shared view of how to best prepare EPP teacher candidates to deliver educational services to children, youth, schools, families, and communities. It is a guide for the systematic experiences each program requires of candidates, and provides the basis for developing quality programs that facilitate continuous improvement. The EPP works with its clinical partners and identified stakeholders to continuously evolve and improve each program, while developing candidates who effectively demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to advance P-12 student learning and development.

## III. Cross-cutting themes

a. Statement of integration of diversity

* i. Analysis of evidence that demonstrates diversity integration

Most education courses include readings and assignments that help prepare candidates for the diverse contexts found in today's classrooms. Candidates in the undergraduate initial certification education programs are required to complete several general education courses that increase awareness of the importance of diversity. All undergraduate candidates complete one course in each of the categories of Cultural Pluralism, Global Viewpoints, and Individual and Society. All initial certification candidates take the following courses that infuse diversity issues throughout the course objectives. The EDU courses are part of the undergraduate programs and the EDMT courses are part of the MAT program.

. EDU 300 - Human Growth and Development; EDMT 611- Studies of the Learners. The focus is on the process of diverse individual development.

. EDU 305 - Introduction to Education; EDMT 610- Foundation of American Schooling. Infuses the topics of poverty, race, gender, sexual orientation, special education, ethnicity, and English Language Learners and the role they play in educational success.

. EDU 316 - Racism and Sexism in Education; EDMT 622 - Cultural Identity and Schooling. Focus is on the role cultural identity plays in students' experiences in schools.

. EDS 360 - Students with Exceptionalities in the Schools; EDMT 621 - Students w/Exceptionalities in Regular Middle/Secondary Classrooms. Focus is on general information about disabilities and exceptionalities students may have, with undergraduate majors participating in a service learning project that requires interaction with individuals with disabilities.

. Methods Classes - Candidates develop lesson and unit plans that require them to include modifications/adaptations for diverse learners.

. Field Experience Classes - Candidates implement lesson plans and submit a written reflection that includes a discussion about diverse learners and results of teaching diverse learners.

. All Undergraduate and MAT traditional candidates complete a sixteen week semester of clinical experiences (student teaching). They are required to develop and implement at least one unit plan or series of lesson plans that include modifications/adaptations for diverse learners. Candidates also complete a Teacher Work Sample (TWS) as part of the unit plan in which they identify at least one "gap" group. Candidates discuss the results of the pre- and post-assessments, as well as the implications for instruction, for the identified group of diverse P-12 students. MAT Option 6 candidates complete the TWS through the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program.

. EDU 315/325/343 - Educational Assessment; EDMT 632-Curriculum Design and Assessment. Candidates adapt assessments for students with exceptional needs and review data for various gap groups, which typically include diverse categories of students.

. EDS 322/323/324 - Planning and Implementing Instruction for Students

with Exceptionalities; EDMT 621-Students with Exceptionalities in Middle/Secondary Classrooms. Focus is on strategies for adapting instruction to diverse learners.
. Physical Education candidates take PHE 500 - Adapted Physical Education. Focus is on adapting and modifying instruction for students with disabilities.
. IECE and special education candidates complete many courses that include topics about diversity.

The Dispositions Survey (1.1.1) is one of the EPP wide assessments and is used to evaluate candidates' proficiencies related to dispositions. The survey is completed by both the P-12 and university clinical educators during all field and clinical experiences. Two of the questions on the survey are related to diversity. A review of the EPP wide data indicates that 96-100% of candidates in Transition Points 1 (admission), 2 (admission to clinical experience) and 3 (program completion) meet the target criteria of "On target to become first year profession ready."

The EPP wide Lesson Planning assessment (1.1.2) found similar results for Transition Point 2. Five of the nine components evaluate candidates' abilities to plan lessons for diverse students. In the Learner and Learning category 99-100% of candidates met the target of "Emerging"; Content and Knowledge 97-98%; Instructional Practice 90-100%; and Professional Responsibility 92-99%. The EPP wide Lesson Implementation assessment (1.1.3) has seven of fourteen components related to evaluating candidates' ability to implement instruction for diverse students. In the Learner and Learning category 98-100% of candidates met the target of "Emerging"; Content and Knowledge 96-100%; Instructional Practice 95-100%; and Professional Responsibility 92-99%.

For transition point 3 the evaluation target was raised to "On Target" for both the lesson planning and lesson implementation EPP wide assessments. In reviewing TP3 data the percent of candidates meeting the target was generally lower than TP2. For the Lesson Planning assessment, the Learner and Learning category had 71-85% meet the criteria; Content Knowledge 80-87%; Instructional Practice 75-97%; and Professional Development 85-95%. For the Lesson Implementation assessment, the Learner and Learning category had 81-99% meet the criteria; Content Knowledge 76-94%; Instructional Practice 75-99%; and Professional Development 83-93%. Collectively, the results for all three assessments and all three transition points indicate that generally candidates have the dispositions to teach students from diverse backgrounds, as well as the ability to plan and implement lessons to meet the needs of all children.

In addition, all candidates are required to complete a semester reflection and upload it in Foliotek (3.4.5). As part of their reflection, candidates are required to give detailed information about the characteristics of the P-12 students they worked with during the semester (i.e. gender, race/ethnicity,

special needs) and the implications for developing future instructional materials. In the two components related to diversity on the reflection rubric (1.2.2) 94-98% of candidates met the "target" criteria.

The EPP offers opportunities for candidates to interact in school settings with school district and higher education personnel who are diverse relative to ethnicity, race, socio-economic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area. In addition, candidates complete courses from other departments on campus which gives them additional opportunities to interact with faculty of diverse backgrounds and experiences. On a regular basis, candidates have the opportunity to learn from scheduled speakers of diverse backgrounds and experiences that come to the NKU campus for events such as International Education Week, Martin Luther King Day, Black History month, and National Hispanic Heritage month. More specifically, the EPP has sponsored several Think Tanks over the past several years. This series has included the following speakers and topics: Dr. Julian Vasquez Helig, Addressing Educational Justices Through Community Based Reforms; Teddy Kremer, Don't Tell Me What I Can't Do. Let Me Show You What I Can Do; and Dr. Crystal Laura, If Black Lives Matter- At School, Too- Then Act Like You Know. The EPP is also hosting a national symposium, "Teacher Diversity Matters" in September 2017. This is a symposium on the topic of preparing, recruiting, and retaining teachers of color.

The EPP is a member of COST, the Consortium for Overseas Student Teaching and has sponsored, on average, 2-3 undergraduate candidates per semester in an international student teaching experience of at least 8 weeks, ranging from South Africa to Australia. The EPP, in collaboration with the NKU Office of Education Abroad, has offered several study abroad programs for undergraduate education candidates over the past several years, including programs in Mexico, Ghana, and South Africa.

The Kentucky Department of Education indicates that 97% of school-based faculty in the northern Kentucky region are of white/non-Hispanic ethnicity. The EPP P-12 clinical educators are of similar ethnicity. The EPP continues to work with schools to identify and select P-12 clinical educators and gives priority to those who come from diverse backgrounds, among other selection criteria. EPP faculty have many direct experiences working with diverse students or in situations, ranging from P-12 teaching experience in diverse schools, research on topics of diversity, and presenting professional development seminars on improving diverse students' academic achievement. Faculty bring all of their rich multicultural experiences back to the NKU classroom to create an awareness of the importance of diversity and its impact on candidates' teaching and student learning.

During 2016-17 the Inclusive Excellence Committee, one of the college's standing committees, recommended that a dean's office position be created to have responsibilities for coordinating inclusive excellence activities.

Consequently, a new assistant dean position was created and will begin in July 2017. The EPP also sponsored an equity audit during 2015-16 that was designed to offer candidates, faculty and staff insights about their perceptions related to diversity/inclusive excellence within the college. The audit results were used to establish baseline data for the college and develop a strategic work plan and benchmarks to address areas for improvement in curriculum, practice, and policies. The college continues to work on the goals established by the equity audit.

The COEHS includes candidates from many backgrounds and demographics, including age, gender, religious groups, sexual orientation, ability, socio-economic status, and racial/ethnic diversity. The EPP typically has a large number of nontraditional adult candidates in the initial certification programs. Rural, urban, and suburban localities are all within 15 minutes of the NKU campus and the EPP has candidates that commute from each of those localities. However, the percent of candidates from underrepresented minorities is lower than the institution's. The EPP has developed several recruitment and retention efforts, one of which is the Minority Educator Recruitment & Retention Scholarship (MERR) offered through the state of Kentucky. Evidence 3.1.1 outlines all of the EPP strategies, including the creation of the Black and Brown Educators of Excellence student group and sponsoring the Cincinnati Public Schools Advanced Placement boot camp. The EPP also collaborates very closely with the NKU Office of Admissions to support recruitment of diverse candidates. Activities include participation in recruitment fairs and informational sessions offered to potential candidates in the community.

Candidates in all programs are required to work with students from diverse backgrounds during their field and clinical experiences, with at least one field experience placement in a diverse school. Undergraduate candidates are placed in a diverse urban school (typically Covington, Newport, Erlanger, or Cincinnati Public) during their admissions' field experience. In each succeeding semester, field experience professors place candidates in as diverse schools as possible. A final check occurs before the clinical experience placement is made. Any candidate who has not been in a diverse school is then placed in one. Candidate placements are tracked each semester via the cumulative progress report on Foliotek (5.1.7). During their field and clinical experiences initial certification candidates complete specific activities that focus on areas of diverse needs. These include developing adaptations for students with exceptionalities or identifying gap groups during the Teacher Work Sample. Candidates interact with and receive feedback from P-12 and university clinical educators during field experiences, clinical experiences, and evaluation conferences. Candidates are also required to complete reflective activities that focus on diversity during each of their field and clinical experiences. Initial candidates share their challenges and successes related to teaching diverse students in P-12 schools with other candidates and faculty. Peers informally give feedback in course discussions and more formally

through focused questions on Blackboard. For example, Special Education candidates formally critique their lesson's effectiveness to align instructional strategies with individual student strengths and needs. Since diversity is embedded throughout each program's standards, candidates have many interactions and discussions about issues of diversity. They encourage each other through reflective dialogues to assess their skills, dispositions, and beliefs about interacting with diverse groups.

b. Statement of integration of technology

* i. Analysis of evidence that demonstrates technology integration

The EPP is committed to the integration, infusion, and application of technology to enhance instruction and advance student learning. All candidates in the initial certification programs must meet all ten Kentucky Teacher Standards for successful completion of their programs. Standard 6 is the technology standard and states "The Teacher Demonstrates the Implementation of Technology." As part of their methods courses and field experiences, candidates are required to develop lesson and unit plans that provide strategies for using technology to enhance student learning. More specifically, the model lesson plan (1.2.8) includes a resource section where candidates are required to identify the technology used in the lesson. During their clinical experience candidates are required to develop a unit or series of lessons that required identifying the technology that will be used (1.4.1). To develop their technology skills, initial certification candidates must successfully complete an educational technology class, as well as assignments in various content and pedagogy courses. IECE and special education candidates complete an assistive technology course to help them determine how to plan for and implement assistive technology for students with disabilities.

The 2015-16 EPP-wide Lesson Plan assessment (1.1.2) had one component that was aligned to technology "Uses technology to design and plan instruction". 87-98% of candidates met the target criteria in Transition Point 2 (TP2, admission to clinical experience) with most programs having a 100% met rate. 82-93% met the target criteria in Transition Point 3 (TP3, program completion) with candidates in several programs showing a low percentage of meeting the target- IECE, Secondary Math, Music, and Social Studies. The EPP wide Lesson Implementation assessment (1.1.3) has one component aligned to technology "Uses technology during instruction". 98-100% of candidates met the target during TP2, with almost all programs having a 100% met rate. 84-98% of candidates met the criteria during TP3, with several programs scoring below 90% met during one or more semesters:

Middle Grades Math, Science, Social Studies; Secondary English, Social Studies, Music; IECE; Special Education; and MAT Option 6 Secondary English. The data indicates that candidates are generally well skilled in the use of technology for planning and implementing instructional lessons.

A technology assessment (1.5.2) was also developed to determine how well candidates meet the National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers. The assessment has five components with 53% to 100% of candidates meeting the target criteria. The component with the lowest evaluation was "Engage in professional growth and leadership" which was evaluated through candidates completing a Screenshot Web 2.0 tutorial; another component "Facilitate and inspire student learning and creativity", evaluated through a podcast, had a 65% met rate. The component, "Model digital age work and learning," evaluated through a Google document had the highest pass rate at 98% The professors of the technology classes have identified the two low scoring components as topics for further development and improvement.

All undergraduate and MAT candidates are required to develop and maintain an electronic portfolio in Foliotek during their professional semesters. The portfolio requires candidates to use technology to document their knowledge, skills, and dispositions as outlined in the portfolio rubric and aligned with the appropriate state and national standards (3.4.5). Through various forms of instructional technology candidates learn how to create meaningful experiences and personalized learning for P-12 students. Computers and information technologies offer candidates a myriad of possibilities to bring the digital world into the classroom. Education faculty are committed to modeling positive technology usage by seamlessly infusing technology into their lessons and require candidates to do the same.

The use of technology is infused throughout all initial certification programs. Nearly all courses incorporate the use of Blackboard to organize assignments, make course materials available, display grades to students, and conduct online discussion assignments. Faculty also use a wide array of technologies and technologically-based instructional strategies, including the use of PowerPoint, voice over, video, web quests, interactive websites, blogs, discussion boards, Wimba, online databases, library databases, SmartBoards, iPads, and classroom "clickers." The EPP has also created several courses in an online or hybrid format. An instructional technology specialist within the college works with faculty to help develop and implement online courses as well as infuse instructional technology into courses based in Blackboard. The entire campus, including most outside areas, are Wi-Fi hotspots that have both public access and a secure wireless network for faculty and staff.

All faculty and staff have modern technology to complete their work and enhance their instruction. This includes the faculty member's choice of a desktop or laptop (Mac or PC) with a plethora of University-supported software. In addition, most faculty have a university-issued iPad for

instructional and personal use. Faculty members may also use University-licensed software on their personal computers. The EPP has digital cameras and projectors for use during presentations, meetings, or events. All classrooms are "smart" classrooms that contain built in LCD projectors, document projectors, DVD players, and student response systems. NKU has a technology replacement plan that replaces faculty and staff computers approximately every 5-6 years. The EPP has "ownership" of one computer lab which is used for teaching the instructional technology classes. The EPP also has a modern mobile computer lab with 20 laptops and an iPad cart with 20 iPads available for faculty to use in their courses. The Smart classrooms, computer lab and mobile technology labs allow professors to model current technology being used in surrounding school districts and allows candidates to practice using the technologies and infusing them in their lesson plans and instruction.

NKU maintains a 24-hour technology assistance hotline for faculty and students, with a staff of technicians to add software, repair computers, or assist with training. Additionally, the IT department offers many professional development workshops for faculty and staff. Various technology workshops and one-on-one trainings are available to all EPP faculty and staff throughout the year. These workshops focus on the use of technologies to use in the classroom as well as the development and ongoing support of online course materials.

Every classroom on campus is a "smart classroom" and as a result of the technological infrastructure, faculty have access to all their resources from any computer in any classroom. While all classrooms are open to use by any program on campus, the EPP has first rights on six modern, well-equipped classrooms located in MEP that accommodate between 20 and 60 students, a 450-person capacity lecture hall, laboratories for instruction in science, mathematics, computer technology, and literacy methods. Additionally, the EPP has first rights to four well-equipped classrooms in AHC. This includes a human performance lab that is designed to measure physiological and biomechanical principles and houses technology-enhanced instructional equipment.

Computers and information technologies offer candidates a myriad of possibilities to bring the digital world into the classroom. Education faculty are committed to modeling positive technology usage by infusing technology into their lessons. For example, Blackboard is used for blended and online course delivery. Blackboard allows educators to provide collaborative activities, critical reflections, and instructional resources to candidates in both online and face-to-face courses. Faculty have the opportunity to attend on-campus technology seminars and workshops to enhance their technological skills. Faculty and candidates also receive technology support as needed from the university's Office of Information Technology as well as the Technology Coordinator and Instructional Design Specialist housed within the EPP. The technology coordinator works with faculty and students to help with Foliotek and assists the associate dean in managing data, which is used to track

student progress and assess program effectiveness. The instructional design specialist assists faculty in building online course materials and enhancements for face-to-face courses and regularly conducts individual and group professional development opportunities that include the latest teaching technologies. Monthly "Technology Tips" and information is also sent to all faculty and staff in the Monday Message communication. The NKU Office of Information Technology offers a wide array of professional development sessions to help both faculty and staff in the implementation of the student information system (SAP), the use of Blackboard, and the development of interactive, online courses.

Several information technologies are used to maintain the EPP's assessment system and includes the COEHS Database, Survey Monkey, and Foliotek. The college's Access Database System is the result of collaborative efforts between the College of Education and Human Services and the Office of Information Technology. It provides a mechanism to electronically record EPP data, retrieve candidate data from NKU's Student Information System (SAP), and generate reports regarding these data. The only data that are entered into the database are those which are not maintained in the central system but are required for continuous improvement, such as transition points and field experience placement information.

The primary database software is Microsoft Access. Some of the data that is needed in the database are housed in the SAP system and are automatically downloaded to the EPP education database. The Office of Information Technology is also responsible for providing the programming for the database. Examples of reports generated include a summary of candidates' Praxis II Content and PLT scores, field and clinical experiences diversity placements, and transition points for each program.

Several EPP surveys, such as the alumni and employer surveys, are housed on the Survey Monkey website and are sent to various stakeholders for their feedback about the EPP candidates and programs. In addition to the above, EPP wide assessments are housed on Foliotek. Candidates upload various assignments in Foliotek and PK-12 and university clinical educators submit candidate dispositions, lesson plan, and lesson implementation evaluations in the Foliotek portfolio system.

## IV. Areas for Improvement (AFIs) from previous accreditation decisions, if any

a. Statement of progress in support of removing the AFI(s)

No AFIs from last accreditation review in 2011.

b. Overview of evidence in support of removing the AFI(s)

No Evidence found.

c. Holistic summary statement (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that provides a narrative explication for how the evidence collection, taken as a whole, demonstrates that area(s) for improvement are corrected.

No AFI's from last accreditation review in 2011.

## V. Selected Improvement Plan

a. Provide a description of the selected area for improvement and a rationale for selection.

I verified with Tatiana Rivadeneyra that the Self Improvement Plan is optional for our spring 2018 visit. Below is the email from her confirming this statement.

Hello Carol,

Thank you for the email seeking clarity over the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP) and Northern Kentucky University (NKU).

As I mentioned in the presentation, and further confirmed with Gina Burkhardt, for EPPs' with S18 or F18 onsite visits the SIP is optional. Continuous improvement must now be suitably addressed in required components 5.3 and 5.4 in Standard 5; as respectively each speaks to data decision-making, evaluation, improvements of program elements and process, and future directions.

Northern Kentucky University's next onsite visit will be held in spring of 2018, and therefore falls under the SIP as optional, please take care to address continuous improvement.

Note, some EPPs received the SIP within AIMS; others did not, and so that is why you see. This is due to the CAEP transition toward a uniform accreditation process.

Hope this information clarifies and helps.

Best,
Tatiana Rivadeneyra, Ed.D.
Director of Selected Improvement and Transformation Initiative Pathways
202.753.1653 Direct
d with

* b. Identify goals and objectives aligned with the selected area for improvement

N/A

* c. Describe the specific strategies and interventions to be implemented in the Selected Improvement Plan along with a timeline for implementation

N/A

* d. Present a complete description of the assessment plan that details how each goal or objective is to be assessed

N/A

* e. Describe the resources available to implement the plan. This includes staffing and faculty cost (time, salary, or reassignment time), budgeting impacts such as travel or training costs, expertise, and other resources

N/A

If preferred, please upload entire SI plan as an attachment here.

Selected Improvement Plan Evidence

No Evidence found.

## State Standard(s) Evidence

Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard and answer any questions provided by the state.)

No Evidence found.

## Please click "Next"

This is the end of the Self-study Report. You may log out at any time and come back to continue; your report will be saved.

When you are ready to submit the report click "Next" below. This will take you to the submit button on the next page. Once you click on "Submit" you will not be able to make changes to the report and evidence.