

# Formative Feedback Report for the Selected Improvement Pathway

## I: Introduction

1. Brief overview of the Educator Preparation Provider (EPP): Context and unique characteristics; organization structure; vision, mission, and goals; shared values and beliefs; capacity tables

Shepherd University is a rural public liberal arts university in West Virginia, with a history dating back to 1871. It became a four-year baccalaureate teacher training college in 1930 and was authorized to offer liberal arts programs in 1943. It strives to serve as a regional center for academic, cultural, and economic opportunity, with core values centered on learning, engagement, integrity, accessibility, and community. The EPP is the Professional Education Unit (PEUC), which consists of the dean of education and professional studies, the director of teacher education, coordinators from specialization content areas, all members of the education department, and two elected teacher candidates. The PEUC is responsible for all aspects of the teacher preparation program. The EPP's conceptual framework is Teacher as Reflective Problem Solver, and guides candidates through a continuous of action and reflection that links coursework and field experiences.

2. Summary of programs offered: Number, delivery mode, location(s)

The EPP offers 17 programs, all initial teaching programs at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Programs are offered in the following fields: elementary, early childhood, PE, art, music, family and consumer science, English, math, social studies, biology, chemistry, general science, and Spanish. Elementary education is by far the largest program, with 202 candidates in the most recent fall semester, followed by music (70), PE (62), and social studies (44). Five programs (Spanish, family and consumer science, general science, chemistry, and biology, have enrollments in the single-digits. All programs are offered in a face-to-face mode on the main campus.

3. Special circumstances of the formative feedback review, if any

The team consisted of four CAEP members and two state members, while the state partnership agreement calls for a team of three national and two state members. However, after conferring with CAEP staff, the state consultant agreed that the 4-2 makeup was acceptable.

## II: Standard 1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

### 1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

#### A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

There are 25 programs listed for the EPP in AIMS, all at the initial level. The undergraduate elementary, foreign language, and the graduate foreign language-Spanish are not recognized by their respective SPAs. The recognition-with-conditions for the graduate physical education and the endorsement-only social studies 5-9 program expired on February 1, 2017. The family and consumer science programs are listed as being on the Feedback Option. No status is indicated for the graduate health program. The total number of recognized or accredited programs is 17, which concurs with the number reported by the EPP in the SSR. Art programs are accredited by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) and the undergraduate music program is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). The endorsement-only programs of early education and special education and the graduate mathematics program are recognized with conditions. The endorsement-only health program is recognized with probation.

The SSR identifies five in-common key assessments: PRAXIS Content (though specific to program area), PRAXIS PLT, TPA, Pro 05, and ST-11. In addition to SPA reports, data from these assessments are presented to show that candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the categories of learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

Historically, candidates were not required to take either the PRAXIS Content or the PRAXIS PLT assessments prior to student teaching. Candidates had the option of graduating without a recommendation for state certification and, consequently, candidates did not have passing scores for some tests. A new state policy that takes effect in the fall of 2017 will require a passing score on the PRAXIS Content test(s) prior to student teaching. The PRAXIS Content Assessment Data exhibit shows candidate scores for the fall 2015, spring 2016, and fall 2016 semesters. The document reports the cut score for each test, each candidate's individual score, an average score for each test area, and the number of attempts each candidate has taken to achieve a passing score. Although the document does not show a calculated pass rate, a count of the candidates in all three semesters shows only 11 candidates who have yet to pass their specific content test. Eight of these candidates were taking Elementary content test.

The EPP's data for the PRAXIS PLT continues to be incomplete. Similar to the document presented for the Praxis Content Assessment, the PRAXIS PLT Assessment Data exhibit shows candidate scores for the fall 2015, spring 2016, and fall 2016 semesters and reports the cut score for each test, each candidate's individual score, an average score for each test area, and the

number of attempts each candidate has taken to achieve a passing score. Here again, the document does not show a calculated pass rate, however, a count of the candidates in all three semesters shows only one candidate who has yet to pass his/her specific PLT test.

The SSR reports that the EPP's Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) instrument has undergone several changes. The exhibit that is presented shows data from the fall 2015 administering of the PPAT, the fall 2015 for the edTPA, and Teacher Work Sample-Revised (TWS-R) for spring 2016. With four different assessments administered over three semesters, each with its own rubric and grading scale, it is not possible to determine any sort of trend in candidate performance. The SSR states that prior to spring 2015, all student teachers completed a teacher work sample (TWS) during the student teaching semester. In the fall of 2014, the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDOE) announced that it planned to adopt one of two proprietary TPAs, the edTPA or the PPAT, to replace the PRAXIS PLT. After piloting the two TPAs, the WVDOE's decided to not dictate use of either of the TPAs but rather to collaborate with the state's EPPs to develop a TPA for the state. The EPP joined with 12 other EPPs in the state to develop the WV-TPA which was piloted in the fall of 2016. An exhibit provided displays a document entitled West Virginia Teacher Performance Assessment. The document describes the instrument as requiring candidates to draw on pedagogical and content pedagogical knowledge to plan and deliver instruction that builds on each student's strengths, needs, and prior experiences and that through this performance assessment, teacher candidates provide credible evidence of student impact. The instrument includes seven performance tasks that have been identified by research and best practice as fundamental to improving student learning. The tasks are (1) Contextual Factors, (2) Standards and Goals, (3) Assessment Plan, (4) Design for Instruction, (5) Implementation and Reflection on Daily Instruction, (6) Impact on Student Learning, and (7) Reflection and Self-Evaluation. In Task 1 (Contextual Factors) candidates are to consider classroom factors that affect student learning (e.g., classroom arrangement; classroom rules and routines; extent of parental involvement; scheduling; and availability of technology). Rubrics used to evaluate candidate performance show the correlation of each task with specific CAEP, InTASC, and state professional teaching standards. Candidates are rated on each of the tasks as either "distinguished" (4 points), "accomplished" (3 points), "emerging" (2 points), or "unsatisfactory" (1 point). A data chart shows the results of the fall 2016 pilot administration. Average scores are given for each of the elements of the seven tasks. The averages for Elementary candidates ranged from 1.75 to 3.125, for Early Education from 2.0 to 3.0, for Art from 2. To 4.0, for Physical Education/Health from .5 to 3.5, for English from 2.33 to 3.67, for General Science from 1.0 to 3.0, for Music from 1.0 to 2.5, and for Social Studies from 1.67 to 3.0. The SSR indicates that the WV-TPA will again be piloted during the current semester.

The EPP assesses candidate dispositions with the Instructor's Qualitative

Evaluation of Teacher Education Student instrument, referred to as the Pro 05. It is implemented in all education courses and is reviewed each semester by the candidate's advisor. With the Pro 05 instructors rate candidates on a six-point scale: "excellent" (6 points), "excellent good" (5 points), "good" (4 point), "good fair" (3 points), "fair" (2 points), or "poor" (1 point). Candidates are rated on personal characteristics such as personal integrity and seriousness of intent and on professional characteristics such as capacity for professional development and appreciation of diversity and dignity of individuals. The data tables provided for this assessment show results from the fall 2015, spring 2016, and fall 2016 for Elementary, Early Education, and Secondary programs. In each of the semesters candidates generally score either "excellent" or "excellent good" 60 to 70 percent of the time.

Candidate portfolios are evaluated at Juncture 1 (Admission) of the teacher education program which generally takes place at the end of the sophomore year or beginning of the junior year and at Juncture 2 (Progression to Student Teaching). The SSR states that while specific portfolio requirements vary from program to program and among advisors, all include artifacts that represent dispositions in addition to knowledge and skills. The only course all candidates have completed, regardless of program area, when they apply for admission (Juncture 1) is EDUC 200. Accordingly, the PEUC has focused its analysis on this class. Concerns about the instrument and the results it produces led the PEUC to form a committee to research other available disposition instruments. PEUC minutes for bi-monthly meetings held between October 5, 2016 and November 16, 2016, indicate that after reviewing sample disposition assessments the committee found none that met CAEP required development criteria. Subsequently, the PEUC plans to create a new disposition assessment.

In 2009, the West Virginia Board of Education required all teacher certification programs to be reauthorized by the state and to align their programs with the West Virginia Professional Teaching Standards and the National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers. Consequently, Shepherd University found it necessary to realign their system of assessing student teachers with the new state standards. The new Student Teaching 2011 Evaluation Tool (referred to as ST-11) replaced the forms previously used by the EPP. The new ST-11 was piloted and revised throughout the 2010-2011 school year. The ST-11 is completed by candidates, their cooperating teacher and their university supervisor. Candidates are rated on the standards of (1) curriculum planning, (2) the learner and the learning environment, (3) teaching, (4) professional responsibility for self-renewal, and (5) professional responsibilities for school and community. Each of these standards is divided into functions and each function is further delineated with specific performance indicators. Candidates' performance on each of the functions is rated as either "exceeds standard" (4 points), "meets standard" (3 points), "approaches standard" (2 points), or "unsatisfactory" (1). ST-11 results for the fall of 2015, spring of 2016, and fall of 2016 were provided showing the

ratings for the candidate, the cooperating teacher, and the university supervisor for each of the standards' functions. Ratings generally ranged from 3.5 to 4.0 with no ratings below 3.0.

No evidence was provided that showed that the EPP's candidates can demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards).

#### A.1. Analysis of program-level data

The SSR identifies five in-common key assessments: PRAXIS Content (though specific to program area), PRAXIS PLT, TPA, Pro 05, and ST-11. In addition to SPA reports, data from these assessments are presented to show that candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the categories of learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

All data were disaggregated by specialty licensure area. At least three cycles of data were submitted and some analysis was presented in the form of minutes of the Professional Education Unit Council (PEUC). The EPP's TPA was revised several times and, therefore, they had less than 3 cycles of data from a single instrument. They did submit data from all previous versions of the assessment. All cycles of data were sequential and the latest available.

#### B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. Through data provided from PRAXIS Content, PRAXIS PLT, and the Student Teaching 2011 Evaluation Tool (ST-11) the EPP demonstrated that candidates have an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards in the categories of the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility at the appropriate progression level(s).
2. Through data provided for the TPA used for the last 3 years the EPP demonstrated that candidates use research and evidence to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice and that they model and apply technology standards as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning.
3. The EPP has shown that candidates can apply content and pedagogical knowledge by the number of programs that are recognized by Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) or other accrediting bodies.
4. The Student Teaching 2011 Evaluation Tool (referred to as ST-11) has been realigned to be consistent with the National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers, ensuring that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice.

#### C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. No evidence was presented that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards.
2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconstant with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.

Tasks

Title: Verify when and where in the EPP's program candidates are required to demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college-and career-ready standards.

- A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration  
 B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed  
 C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
- 1.

(1) What evidence can the EPP provide that candidate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college-and career-ready standards are being assessed?

- Title: Verify evidence of data analysis
- A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration  
 B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed  
 C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
- 2.

(1) What evidence beyond the PEUC minutes provided can the EPP show to confirm analysis of data?

3. Preliminary recommendations for new areas for improvement (AFIs) including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
The EPP does not assess candidate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college-and career-ready standards.	No evidence was provided to demonstrate that the EPP assesses candidate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college-and career-ready standards.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale
none	

## II: Standard 2. Clinical Partnerships and Practice

### 1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

#### A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings.

The EPP has a wide range of collaborative relationships with schools and districts across four states. The collaboration efforts of a broad constituency created the conceptual framework, Teacher as Reflective Problem Solver (TARPS). EPP partnerships are formalized through Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) agreements. The Program Coordinator in collaboration with faculty members works to find programs and schools to support the student and program needs when making the practicum placement. Students are placed in a content specific classroom, with teachers who are recommended by the school administrators for field experiences. The MOUs include information and descriptions about the responsibilities of all parties involved as well as the desired outcomes of the partnerships for all parties. An online practicum manual available to cooperating teachers fully describes the nature and expectations for each level of clinical experience.

School partners engage with program design and evaluation in several ways. P-12 educators serve on the Education Preparation Program Advisory Council (EPPAC), which meets twice a year to consider a variety of issues related to the program. Sample minutes provided with the SSR showed members of the EPPAC discussing the student teaching experience, the candidate performance assessment used during student teaching, and candidate recruitment. In addition, cooperating teachers are asked to complete a survey on the effectiveness of the student teaching experience, including the support offered by the EPP. Sample minutes from the Professional Education Unit Council shows faculty members discussing implications of the most recent survey, although it was not clear how regularly this analysis occurs. After analyzing feedback from cooperating teachers, PEUC identified the need to be more systematic and effective when gathering information. This is an area PEUC is reviewing to develop an improved survey and data analysis system.

Evidence provided in the SSR showed that a multi-tiered process is used to ensure qualifications of faculty and cooperating teachers. Faculty qualifications are determined during the hiring process with a position description approved by the department chair, school dean and Provost. Shepherd University and the EPP comply with programmatic accrediting bodies who address faculty qualifications within the discipline. The SSR notes that selection of cooperating teachers is consistent with West Virginia state requirements (Policies 5100 and 5202), meeting requirements of programmatic levels and supervisor qualifications. In addition, MOUs between the EPP and school districts identify additional requirements, including three years of successful experience in the area and level of assignment, recommendation of the building principal, and expressed interest and willingness to serve as a cooperating teacher. However, the SSR did not indicate how the EPP monitors and documents compliance with these

requirements.

Field experiences are designed to provide a progressive "gradual release" sequence from early experiences through student teaching. Each practicum level is associated with an education course, and has clearly defined expectations for candidates, ranging from observation to full responsibility for a classroom. For each level, multiple examples of possible candidate experiences are provided. Roles for university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and principals are also clearly described. University supervisors are expected to make at least three classroom visits, and data from a cooperating teacher survey indicated that this usually the case. The Field Placement Coordinator works closely with students to place them in schools to match their specific interests and needs, including finding placements in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia as well as through the state of West Virginia, with an emphasis on placement in the three surrounding counties.

Field experiences are not just opportunities for applications, but are occasions for critical reflection on the theory and practice interaction. Candidates complete key assessments to validate the candidates' positive impact on student learning. These assessments include a teacher performance assessment (most recently the WVTPA or Teacher Work Sample) and the Student Teacher -11 (ST-11). These major assessments produce evidence on candidate performance on a wide range of teacher tasks, of including the ability to assess impact on student performance. A modified version of the ST-11 is used in practicum levels 2 and 3 as preparation for ST-11 in student teaching.

The SSR notes that the field placement coordinator works with candidates to find appropriate clinical placements, and provides demographic information on school districts in the EPP's service area, but there is little information on how the EPP assures that candidates experience diverse settings.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. The sequence of clinical experiences is well articulated and well supported, providing candidates with a graduated range of experiences with ample opportunity for reflection.
2. The EPP has well-established channels of communication and collaboration with its school partners.

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. Evidence is lacking on how the EPP assures that all candidates will gain experience in diverse settings.
2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconstant with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.

Task

Title: Assuring diversity in field settings
---

1. A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- (1) There was no evidence on how the EPP assures that all candidates will gain experience in diverse settings.

- B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

- (1) How does the EPP determine that candidates are experiencing diverse settings? What criteria are used? How are placements monitored and documented to assure diversity in placement?

Title: Analyzing feedback from cooperating teachers

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- (1) The SSR indicated a perceived need to improve its system for gathering and analyzing feedback from cooperating teachers.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

2.

- (1) "While data from the CT Exit Survey has been gathered over the past year, review of the data and the quality of the survey has been limited to now. The PEUC recognizes the need to more systematically and effectively gather and analyze feedback from CTS and is working to develop an improved survey and data analysis system." (p 26)

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

- (1) What progress in this area has been made since submission of the SSR?

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFI's including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
None	

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale
None	

## II: Standard 3. Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

### 1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

#### A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

Teacher shortages have been consistent for the last few years in WV and in some surrounding states. The communities served by SU have manifested these shortages, which is exacerbated by the fact that teachers prepared can easily relocate to receive a higher salary. The university must then be very cognizant of needs in the surrounding area, as well as competing preparation programs. The area is not ethnically diverse, but includes a significant number of families in poverty. The program has developed a five-year recruitment plan (2017-2022). The plan includes both national and state data describing the teacher shortage, with targeted areas indicated. The program and the university encourage ethnic diversity, but experience difficulties in attracting an ethnically diverse student population.

Much focus is evident on other measures of diversity, including poverty; the university has plans for a scholarship targeted at STEM preparation. SU has not adopted the cohort system as described in assessment standards, seemingly because of the very small numbers in many of the content areas.

At admission to the education program (Juncture 1), aggregate data show that the GPA and national test scores exceed the standards. Exceptions occurred in Biology, Early Education, and English. In the evidence document "Academic Excellence Documentation, tables of data are presented showing cohort GPAs consistently above 3.0, and ACT and SAT scores above the median. The program has a commitment to giving teacher candidates (especially non-traditional students) an opportunity to be successful, i.e. "prove themselves" in their first two years at SU. As a result, some students entering by way of local community and technical colleges enter the program without ACT or SAT scores. The approach to admissions decisions appears to be a holistic evaluation of prospective candidates. The overall average GPA is 3.36; some specializations which are very small in size do not meet the 3.0 minimum.

A portfolio is evaluated at Juncture 1 and 2 by the advisor. The specifics are not consistent across the unit, but have a consistent goal of including the evaluation of non-academic issues. A consistent disposition document (Pro05) is required of each teacher candidate in each education course. The EPP notes that this assessment does not fully align with the CAEP evaluation framework, and a new approach is under consideration. Several examples and case studies were given to demonstrate how students are monitored and remediated or counseled upon inadequate progress.

The program has a clear and well-articulated program of monitoring candidates as they progress through the program. Comprehensive advising includes expectations at three benchmarks (Junctures) and includes the monitoring of content, pedagogy and professional knowledge.

The final evaluation at Juncture 3 examines the teacher candidate's record against all requirements, including the WVTPA with elements of professional dispositions, knowledge and P-12 impact assessment. Data from this assessment show a strong indication that with only a few exceptions, teacher candidates meet or exceed all expectations. (3.5) The EPP has used several different assessments over the last few years to cover these issues; it appears that a decision is yet to be made as to how to move forward. It is also unclear as to the documentation of the elements in 3.6, as well as the use of data to make program revisions.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. A detailed recruiting plan with focused efforts and a strategic approach has been developed. Various activities have been planned and implemented, including working with community colleges, following up with interested students from general recruiting events, and seeking to establish a scholarship specifically designated to entice diverse enrollment.
2. Documentation of test scores, GPAs and other measures to show the success of teacher candidates in meeting or exceeding minimums in nearly all cases have been provided. This is provided in both aggregate form and disaggregated.
3. A clear description and supporting data for selectivity throughout the program are provided.

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. The Pro05 Disposition document does not fully align with the CAEP evaluation framework.
2. The current portfolio is not an EPP-wide assessment, and therefore does not provide a consistent measure of progress.

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.

Task

Title: Academic Excellence - policy changes

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- (1) A. The overall GPA of the cohort identified in the data exceeded the CAEP minimum requirements.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

1. (1) B. "However, analysis of GPA for individual specializations/endorsements showed that two specializations had an overall GPA of less than 3.0, Biology and Early Education. Cohort size for these two areas was 1 and 2 candidates respectively. Applying criteria to such small numbers may not fairly represent the preparation of candidates in these programs for admission to teacher education. Furthermore, the early education program is new and the two early education candidates are nontraditional students."

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

- (1) Aside from the rationale provided to explain the problems, what plans are being made to address the candidates who do not meet the minimums? After examination and discussion of the policies at

the state and national levels, what discussions are continuing?

Title: Disposition assessment

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- (1) Portfolios vary across programs and among advisors; Pro05 is not aligned with the CAEP evaluation framework.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

2.

- (1) B. "... commented that the Pro05 will not meet CAEP standards and so we will have to begin the process of developing a disposition assessment following the CAEP guidelines." "...noted that as an assessment, the development of a portfolio will need to follow the procedures outlined by CAEP to establish validity and reliability. All recognized this as accurate."

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

- (1) What progress has been made on addressing these issues since the SSR was submitted?

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFI's including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
None	

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale
None	

## II: Standard 4. Program Impact

### 1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

#### A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

The following is a summary of the analysis of evidence the EPP provided to support Standard 4 and relative components. The summary includes evidence that support the standard and specific areas of concern that may need some clarification.

Evidence #35 (Post Graduate Survey Results) is reported to align to Components 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4. Data that was provided include the number of respondents to the survey rather than specific data that can be used for program improvement. The EPP noted in the SSR that although the response rate exceeds CAEP minimum expectation "the information gathered is sparse and does not speak to the impact completers are having on their students." (SSR, p. 35-36). It would be important to understand the issues in the gathering of the data or why the data is sparse.

The EPP has entered into an agreement to address the concerns outlined above through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with North Dakota State University. According to the MOU, "NDSU will provide the survey instruments, data analysis and reporting" (Evidence 38, p 1) about the Exit Survey (by June 15, 2017), Transition to Teaching Survey (by June 15, 2017) and Supervisor Survey (by September 1, 2017). It was also evident that the reports should be received by October 2017 or January 2018. One example of the survey is Evidence #37 and #39, the Next Exit Survey. According to the EPP, the survey is designed "to assess the quality of our institution's teacher education program..." (Evidence #37 p. 1). Also, the survey will be administered one year after they (candidates) graduate to "determine how well our program prepared you for your first year of teaching." Evidence #39 presents initial data but as the EPP noted in the SSR "the data was received by the EPP just before the submission of the Self-Study Report, leaving little time for deep analysis of the results" (SSR p. 39). Although the EPP aligned the Next Exit Survey to standard component 4.1-4.4 within the SSR (p. 35) it is unclear specifically how this instrument, given the purpose identified above, aligns with Component 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3. Data provided seem only consistent with component 4.4. Although the Transition to Teaching Survey and Supervisor Survey provide a means of addressing impact of completers, it is unclear how the survey as described in the MOU will relate to components 4.1 - 4.4. (Note: Evidence #39 includes identifiable information (email, phone number, and address) of participants completing the survey. There may be privacy concerns with having this data within the AIMS site.)

The EPP listed Evidence # 36 discussion notes to support component 4.1. The notes are from various conversations with the Professional Education Unit Council (PEUC) regarding component 4.1, but no evidence within the conversation outlines a specific plan. The SSR sheds some perspective on what the EPP will do to address not only 4.1 but other components within

Standard 4. Specifically, the EPP notes they have a plan to "work through EPPAC members and county superintendents to evaluate test scores in individual classrooms and overall schools (if the state determines a way to provide this information). Personal data such as complete names and ID numbers will be redacted from reports. This will be accomplished through reports of student achievement scores" (SSR, p. 37).

A Phase-in plan is noted in the School Improvement Plan (SIP), and SSR outlines the specific personnel, technology, and other resources need to implement the plan. It is not clear on the specific procedures to ensure "the surveys and assessments reach level 3 or above on the CAEP assessment rubric" (CAEP Assessment Handbook, p. 188). It is also not clear on the "specific steps to ensure content validity and validate the interpretations of the data..." (CAEP Assessment Handbook, p. 188). SIP Goal #3 does list some activities, but it does not include the depth required as noted above. When reviewing the SSR, it is not clear how the EPP will develop a plan to address component 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3. There is reference to the Supervisor and Teaching Survey listed above, but no evidence noted to understand the purpose of the survey or what component those survey will address. Finally, the SIP plan does not mention the "steps that will be taken to attain a representative response..." (CAEP Assessment Handbook, p. 188).

In summary, the EPP provided some data and developed a plan to address some components of Standard 4. Evidence #38 and #39 shows clear promise that the EPP has made significant steps toward meeting the standards. Some specific details and clarity detailed some survey outlines in Evidence #38 and the relationship to components in Standard 4. The plan outlined in the SSR and SIP needs additional information as evidence to support Standard 4.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. Evidence #37 and #39 (Next Exit Survey) seem consistent with addressing component 4.4.

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. Plans described in the SSR lack specificity about how the EPP will meet expectations for components 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3.

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconstant with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary

Task

Title: Clarification of Transition to Teaching Survey and Supervisor Survey

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- (1) Need to verify the intent of the Transition to Teaching Survey and Supervisor Survey discussed in Evidence #38

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

According to the MOU "NDSU will provide the survey instruments, data analysis and reporting" (Evidence 38, p 1) about the Exit Survey (by June 15, 2017), Transition to Teaching Survey (by June

- (1) 15, 2017) and Supervisor Survey (by September 1, 2017). Additional information or clarity needed on the purpose of the Transition to Teaching Survey (by June 15, 2017) and Supervisor Survey (by September 1, 2017). A copy of the survey (if available) would be helpful.
1. C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
- (1) What is the purpose of the surveys? What standards and components will they address and how do they align? It will be helpful to meet with members from the Professional Education Unit Council (PEUC)

- Title: Clarification of the Phase-in Plan outlined in the SSR
- A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
- (1) Verification on how the SIP is related to the components of Standard 4. Additionally, need clear understanding of timelines and resources needed to support the phase-in plans for Standard 4. (See specific questions below.)
- B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
- C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
- (1) What role will the Exit Survey and Teaching Survey play in your phase-in plan? Although a timeline is provided in the SIP, "what data will be available in the calendar years following accreditation..." (CAEP Accreditation Handbook p. 188). The time line within the SIP does not indicate the data that will be available, only steps or actions that will be taken. How will the evidence be linked to the standard or components? No clear alignment is provided within the phase-in plan.

- Title: Interpretation of data in Evidence #39.
- A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
- (1) Would like to verify the interpretation of the data collected from Evidence #39
- B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
3. (1) Evidence #39 presents initial data but as the EPP noted in the SSR "the data was received by the EPP just before the submission of the Self-Study Report, leaving little time for deep analysis of the results" (SSR p. 39).
- C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

- (1) What common themes were noted when analyzing Evidence #39? How will this data be used to within the cycle of continuous improvement? Interviews with faculty, administrator, and/or assessment coordinator.

## 3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFI's including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
Phase-in plan lacks sufficient clarity to show how the EPP will meet the requirements of Standard 4.	The SSR notes the intent to "Develop a variety of tools to measure value-added data for SU's EPP. In addition to a variety of surveys, annual evaluations ..." p.37), but there is little evidence suggesting how they will ensure content validity or how the data will be used to support continuous improvement.

## 4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale

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

### 1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

#### A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

The SSR provided evidence that the EPP is using a system of multiple measures to monitor candidate progress, complete achievements, and operational effectiveness. The suite of assessments has been undergoing review, but currently includes tests of basic skills and content knowledge (both proprietary), a dispositions assessment, a student teaching evaluation, and a performance-based capstone assessment. The latter assessment has taken different forms in recent data cycles: two proprietary assessments (edPA and WVTPA) and two versions of a teacher work sample. Data were provided for all assessments. Data showed that the EPP has the capability to disaggregate assessment results by program.

The EPP reported that its quality assurance system has been in transition, due partly to changing state policies and partly to turnover in several key positions. Minutes from the Professional Education Unit Committee (PEUC) showed that EPP faculty were analyzing recent assessment data, although there was little evidence of a well-articulated system to support the process (e.g., identification of responsibilities for collecting, distributing, and reviewing data, supportive technology, timelines, etc.). The EPP appears to be addressing many of these issues through its Selected Improvement Plan.

The SSR identifies a number of key EPP-developed assessments that track candidate performance: a student teaching evaluation (ST-11), the Pro 05 dispositions assessment, and a field-based capstone assessment. As noted earlier, the EPP has experimented with four different capstone instruments over the past three data cycles. Since it appears likely that going forward the EPP will choose either the WVTPA (a proprietary assessment) or the revised teacher work sample (TWS-R), the team's review of EPP-created assessments accordingly focused on the ST-11, Pro 05, and the TWS-R.

**Pro 05:** The instrument is completed by all education faculty members for candidates taking their course, and is used for identifying potential dispositional issues as candidates progress through the program. Any concerns that may surface on this assessment trigger conversations between the candidate and the advisor. The SSR provided representative case histories to illustrate how the assessment has been used. The instrument consists of a list of twelve personal and professional attributes (personal integrity, seriousness of intent, capacity for professional development, etc.) plus a judgment ("yes," "no," or "not sure.") about whether the candidate belongs in teacher education. These criteria are not tagged to specific standards. Anecdotal comments are also allowed. The instrument attempts to provide somewhat greater specificity by providing a few examples for each trait; e.g., "interpersonal skills" is exemplified by "hears and listens to spoken and unspoken messages, accepted by peers, shows genuine interest in other people, etc." However, the language in most cases is very broad. Evaluators

are asked to rate each attribute on a scale of 1 ("poor") to 6 "excellent"), with an option for "cannot judge." The six levels are not accompanied by behavioral criteria.

Data were provided for spring of 2015 and spring and fall of 2016. Results for personal attributes showed that over 90 percent of responses fell into the "good" to "excellent" range, with only two candidates marked "poor" in three data cycles. Results for the seven personal attributes are remarkably similar, with the exception of "personal integrity," for which 30 percent of respondents selected "cannot judge." Similar patterns were found for the professional attributes. Analysis of the Pro 05 during PEUC meetings indicated that faculty felt that criteria were overly broad and ambiguous, and that the process of developing a new instrument has begun. Evidence from minutes showed that the EPP has consulted with school partners to help identify key dispositions, but the overall direction of the revision is not yet apparent.

TWS-R: The teacher work sample (TWS-R) is administered during the student teaching experience and is based on a three to five day segment of instruction. It appears to be conceptually rich, consisting of fifteen criteria within five components (context, profile of a struggling learner, data-based instruction, analysis of student learning, and reflection); in addition elementary candidates are rated on five criteria aligned with specific ACEI standards. The elementary criteria are tagged to ACEI standards; other criteria are not directly linked to standards. The rubric has four levels: exceeds standards, meets standards, approaches standards, and insufficient evidence of standards.

Candidates are given detailed instructions for completing the assessment and are provided with copies of the rubric. Candidates are told how the results will be used. The instructions explain that candidates must attain a level of "meets expectations," although it is not clear whether this means candidates must meet expectations on all criteria or whether it means the assessment as a whole. Although the current instrument was based on experience with and analysis of an earlier version, no information was provided on how the EPP determines the validity and reliability of the instrument.

ST-11: The student teaching evaluation is administered by university supervisors and cooperating teachers. It consists of 30 criteria distributed over five major components, with four performance levels: exceeds standard, meets standard, approaches standard, and unsatisfactory. Attainment of a level is based on the number and quality of specified teacher behaviors demonstrated by candidates. Criteria are not tagged to specific standards. Training is provided to supervisors, but no information on validity and reliability was provided with the SSR.

The SSR notes that analysis of assessment data has historically been conducted primarily within the areas of specialization; no direct documentation of these discussions was provided. However, the EPP has

begun taking steps to establish systematic review and analysis of data at the unit level. The Selected Improvement Plan outlines plans and timetables for accomplishing this. There was evidence in PEUC minutes from December 2016 and January 2017 that the EPP was analyzing data from recent key assessments, including the Praxis PLT and content knowledge exams, student teaching evaluation (ST-11), WVTPA, and dispositions (Pro 05). Although discussions included consideration of possible program changes, there was no direct evidence from these meetings that actions based on data had yet been taken.

The system for collection and analysis of completer impact appears to be at an early stage of development. The state does not currently provide student achievement data at the classroom level, and the institution's geographic location attracts out-of-state candidates who do not go on to teach in West Virginia. The EPP is exploring alternatives for gathering impact data, and has begun discussions with local P-12 administrators on the EPPAC to find solutions. The EPP, in collaboration with other universities, has also begun collecting completer and employer satisfaction data through use of the NExT survey that will be administered annually. At the time of the formative feedback review, the only performance information posted on the university website was recent content knowledge test scores in connection with Title II. While the EPP is clearly addressing the need for impact data, plans described in the SSR are not highly detailed.

Involvement of external stakeholders comes in large part through the Educational Personnel Preparation Advisory Committee (EPPAC), which includes many P-12 school administrators and teachers, and which meets once a semester. Minutes from recent EPPAC meetings showed that members were consulted on a variety of issues, including development of a new dispositions assessment. There were also discussions on the nature of new performance-based assessments and on the post-graduate survey showing employment status of program completers. The minutes provided did not show any evidence of EPPAC reviewing and analyzing data from key assessments.

Beyond the EPPAC, the EPP solicits formal and informal input from P-12 partners in a number of venues. For example, there was evidence of teachers being consulted on development and implementation of the student teaching evaluation (ST-11), and being surveyed on the effectiveness of the student teaching experience.

The SSR pointed to the Professional Education Unit Committee (PEUC) as a key example of input from internal stakeholders. PEUC includes representatives of content specialty areas as well as education department faculty. The SSR also notes that the EPP is subject to periodic program review at the institutional level that involves a self-study and an external reviewer. The reviews include program mission, candidate outcomes, faculty scholarship, and costs.

The EPP also cites other data available through a variety of sources, such as the Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges and Universities (COPLAC) and the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission. These data focus primarily on data for the institution as a whole, and it is not clear how they are used within the EPP.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. The EPP has adopted or developed unit-level assessments that provide information on key elements of candidate performance.
2. The EPP has evaluated its quality assurance system against CAEP standards and has developed a plan to address areas of concern.

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. EPP-developed assessments are not fully aligned with the CAEP evaluation framework.
2. Plans to address component 5.4 are not clearly articulated.

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconstant with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary

Task

Title: Clarify alignment of assessments with standards.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

1. (1) The SSR indicates alignment with state and InTASC standards, but assessments do not identify how criteria are tagged to specific standards.
2. B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed  
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews  
(1) What documents or other evidence can the EPP provide to show links between standards and criteria on assessments?

Title: Clarify relationship of program-level vs EPP-level review of data

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

2. (1) The SSR notes that analysis of assessment data has historically been conducted at the program level. How will program-level analysis be linked to or integrated with EPP-level analysis?
3. B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed  
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

Title: How will the EPP assure reliability and validity of EPP-developed assessments?

3. A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- (1) The SIP indicates a goal of improving reliability and validity of EPP-developed assessments, but strategies are not highly detailed.
- B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

- (1) What strategies will the EPP use to improve reliability and validity of its assessments? What issues has the EPP identified as needing attention in its existing assessments? What progress has been made in replacing the Pro 05 since the SSR was submitted?

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFI's including a rationale for each. AFI's related to the Selected Improvement Plan are cited under Standard 5.

Area for Improvement	Rationale
EPP-developed assessments are not fully aligned with the CAEP evaluation framework.	While the EPP has demonstrated plans to improve reliability and validity of instruments, strategies are not highly detailed.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each. Stipulations related to the Selected Improvement Plan are cited under Standard 5.

Stipulation	Rationale
None	

### III: Cross-cutting Themes of Diversity and Technology

#### DIVERSITY

1. Preliminary analysis of evidence from Self Study-Report (SSR)
  - a. Holistic evaluation of the completeness, quality, and strength of evidence related to diversity

1. The SSR asserts that the foundation of the EPP's diversity efforts is the conceptual framework, Teacher As Reflective Problem Solver (TARPS), which seeks to prepare candidates with an understanding of the social and psychological conditions affecting learning, including student developmental characteristics, exceptionalities, and cultural/linguistic differences. Additionally, the conceptual framework aims to help candidates develop a constructivist, integrated, and multicultural pedagogy and curriculum.

The SSR notes that the EPP has taken the approach of integrating topics of diversity throughout the program rather than concentrating the content into a dedicated course. The assertion was supported by contents of course syllabi and a diversity alignment chart that identified key activities and assignments. For example, as they progress through the program, candidates engage in readings on diversity and social justice, examination of textbooks for bias, analysis of multicultural theories, development of a thematic unit that includes accommodations for students with special language needs, creation of lesson plans using universal design, writing of a cultural autobiography, and other activities. In addition to courses within the EPP, the university's core curriculum also gives considerable emphasis to global and multicultural perspectives. Beyond the assignments within specific courses, the capstone assessment (TWS-R) contains several components related to diversity, especially for elementary candidates.

Beyond coursework, the EPP asserts that it seeks to provide opportunities for diverse placements as candidates progress through a series of practica. However, no direct evidence about the diversity of placements was provided. The EPP also cites its service learning model, which asks candidates to engage in tutoring at a nearby Job Corps office while enrolled in the course Foundations of American Education. The experiential component is combined with reflective assignments that require candidates to view their tutoring experience within the context of the social and cultural issues taught in the course.

The SSR also notes that diversity is embedded throughout the candidate experience at the university, exemplified by disability support services, a multicultural leadership team and scholarship program, and groups such as the Gay-Straight Alliance, Pan-African Student Organization, and Alianza (a Hispanic/Latino association).

2. The EPP has provided evidence that diversity is adequately addressed and integrated in multiple courses throughout the program, though there is limited evidence on how the EPP assures diversity in field settings.

- b. Evidence that adequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of diversity

1. Course syllabi and an alignment chart provided evidence that the theme of diversity was addressed in a variety of ways in multiple courses throughout the program.
- c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of diversity
  1. It was not clear how the EPP monitors and documents placements to assure that candidates experience diverse settings in field experiences.
2. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data and/or interviews, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting a standard (if applicable)
  1. How does the EPP monitor and document diversity within candidate placements?

**Recommendations for new AFI(s) and/or stipulations including a rationale for cross-cutting themes are cited under the relevant standard(s)**

#### TECHNOLOGY

1. Preliminary analysis of evidence from self-study report (SSR)
  - a. Holistic evaluation of the completeness, quality, and strength of evidence related to technology

1. Similar to its approach with diversity, the EPP infuses technology throughout its curriculum, although it also offers a dedicated technology course. Review of course syllabi and an alignment chart provide evidence of this infusion.

As part of their Juncture 1 (entry to program) portfolios, candidates are expected to provide verification of basic technology competencies, either through individual demonstration or completion of designated courses. These basic competencies include Internet navigation, use of electronic library resources, and use of Word and Excel. As candidates progress through the program, they are required to learn about, reflect on, and demonstrate mastery of technology. Candidates are required to take a three-credit course, Technology in 21st Century Teaching and Learning. In this course they are asked to demonstrate knowledge and skills that include NETS technology standards, use of technology in designing developmentally appropriate learning activities, identification and evaluation of technology resources, management and assessment of student learning, digital tools for communication, equitable access, and ethical issues related to technology. As part of this course, candidates are expected to develop a project-based unit using at least two INTEL instructional resources; identify and demonstrate the use of an Instructional Web 2.0 tool; design a set of instructional technology tools; and design two instructional supports using designated technology tools.

A review of syllabi shows that other courses in the program make regular use of technology, including the Sakai collaborative learning environment (for posting and accessing class readings and assignments) and the TK-20 assessment management system. Syllabi explicitly call out the technological components of the course, helping candidates understand the role of technology in their own learning.

The SSR also called attention to the university's technological infrastructure. Most classrooms contain a computer, screen, Internet access, and a white board. A number also have SMART boards and high-end sound systems; however, it was not clear whether these classrooms are used for candidates

in the EPP's program.

The campus also has 31 dedicated computer labs overall, although some are reserved for the use of specific disciplines. Additional technological resources are available in the university library, including wireless access and data ports throughout the building. The library also offers laptops and other technology for circulation, as well as public access computers in the building.

As noted above, all courses in the EPP have access to (and use) the Sakai collaborative learning environment and the TK-20 assessment management system.

2. The EPP has provided solid evidence that technology is addressed throughout the program, both as content to be mastered and as hands-on skills to be learned. Additionally, candidates appear to have access to adequate technological resources.

b. Evidence that adequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of technology

1. Course syllabi and an alignment chart provide evidence that technology is addressed throughout the program and is supported by adequate technological resources.

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of technology

2. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data and/or interviews, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting a standard (if applicable)

---

Recommendations for new AFI<sup>s</sup> and/or stipulations including a rationale for cross-cutting themes are cited under the relevant standard(s)

**IV: Preliminary findings related to Area(s) for Improvement (AFIs) from previous accreditation decisions, if any**

1. Area for Improvement

No AFI(s) found.

## V: Response to the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP)

1. Use the Rubric For Evaluating the Capacity and Potential of the SIP to provide analysis on:

A. The EPP's capacity for initiating, implementing, and completing the SIP

The SIP is clearly articulated, with objectives and timelines based on a forthright analysis of EPP needs for improvement. Strategies for improving reliability and validity of EPP-created assessments could be more specific for such substantive goals. For example, Goal 3 includes strategies such as "develop a new disposition assessment" and "continue refining the ST-11." It would be helpful to know more about the EPP's current sense of direction. What will be the basis for selecting the dispositions to be assessed? Has the faculty examined examples of other disposition assessments that might serve as a model? What areas in the ST-11 does the EPP see as needing revision?

B. The potential of the SIP to have a positive impact on the EPP and its candidates

When implemented, the SIP has strong potential to have a positive impact by increasing EPP capacity to assess program effectiveness, especially at the EPP level.

C. The proposed use of data and evidence

SIP objectives are stated in terms of fairly tangible procedural outcomes such as developing a single integrated data platform and developing data analysis and feedback cycles. However, the plan does not identify evidence or criteria that would be used to determine the impact or effectiveness of those outcomes.

D. The potential of the EPP to demonstrate a higher level of excellence beyond what is required in the standards

The SIP appears to be aimed at making improvements that would assure that the EPP meets CAEP expectations rather than going beyond the standards. However, when fully implemented it would provide the necessary foundation for higher levels of excellence.

E. Overall evaluation of SIP

The plan will meet a significant need, provides a structure for action with four goals and associated timelines, and appears to be within the capacity of the EPP to achieve. However, as noted above, greater specificity is needed.

### Evaluation of the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP)

This rubric is intended to be used as a tool by the site visit team to provide feedback to an EPP on the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP) and its progress, including

- (a) its capacity for initiating, implementing, and completing a SIP;
- (b) the potential of the SIP to have a positive impact on the EPP and its candidates;
- (c) the proposed use of data and evidence;
- (d) the potential of the EPP to demonstrate a higher level of excellence beyond what is required in the standards. An overall evaluation of the SIP is also provided.

Click [here](#) to open the rubric in a new window.

Comments from state on requirements, standards, and/or perspective