Shepherd University Letterhead

Shepherd University

CAEP Formative Feedback Report Addendum

Table of Contents

Overview

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

Standard 1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Standard 1, Task 1 – Additional Questions

CAEP Feedback:
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?

EPP Response:

Evidence that the EPP assesses that candidates have the skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college-and career-ready standards is found in the ==*ST-11 Standard 3.A, 3.C and 3.E and as well as TPA Tasks 3, 4 and 6. The data submitted with the SSR is located in Evidence files 15 (ST-11) and 5 (TPA).*==

The Descriptors and Rubric for the ST-11 Standard 3 components (==*see Evidence file 14*==) are as follows:

A. Importance Of Content	Connects lesson content to authentic 21st century application; Engages students in collaboration, critical thinking, and problem-solving with the subject matter. Has students use technology in a way that enhances their learning.
C. Questioning & Discussion Techniques	Asks open-ended questions and initiates discussions that promote understanding of concepts and higher-order thinking; Asks questions and initiates discussions using techniques that engage many or most students in active participation, differentiating for students with exceptionalities; Prepares questioning and prompts prior to lesson.
E. Instruction Based on Assessment	Clearly aligns assessments with content standards and instructional objectives; Provides on-going, formative feedback to students; Analyzes summative/benchmark assessment data to monitor student progress; Provides students with rubrics, checklists, and other self-assessment tools; Facilitates student goal-setting and self-monitoring of learning; Records assessment data to use for differentiating instruction; Encourages student goal-setting and self-monitoring of learning.

The Descriptors and Rubric for the WV TPA (see *Evidence file 9*) Tasks 3, 4 and 6 (see Data set for F16 in *Evidence file 5* as this is the assessment instrument that is now in use for the TPA, with changes made by the State as deemed necessary) are as follows:

TASK 3	Distinguished (4 points)	Accomplished (3 points)	Emerging (2 points)	Unsatisfactory (1 point)
Alignment with Learning Goals WVPTS 1E, InTASC 6, CAEP 1.1	The candidate's assessment plan assesses each of the learning goals. The plan contains pre-assessments, formative assessments and post assessments which are developmentally appropriate and congruent with the learning goals in content and complexity. The candidate can articulate the reason that the assessment(s) align with each goal.	The candidate's assessment plan assesses each of the learning goals. The plan contains pre-assessments, formative assessments and post assessments which are developmentally appropriate and congruent with the learning goals in content. The candidate can articulate the reason that the assessments(s) align with each goal.	The candidate's assessment plan assesses each of the learning goals. The plan contains pre-assessments, formative assessments *(daily assessments) and post assessments* Which are developmentally appropriate and congruent with the learning goals in content.	The candidate's assessments lack congruence with learning goals and/or lack cognitive/performance complexity that is appropriate to the content taught and the developmental stage of the learner.
Assessment Criteria/ Technical Soundness WVPTS 1E, InTASC 6, CAEP 1.1	The candidate's scoring procedures are explained; items or prompts are clearly written/*presented*; directions and procedures are clear to students. The assessment is designed so the candidate can make decisions about whether the student has met each goal. The minimum score for mastery of each learning goal is present on all appropriate assessments. The candidate provides a description of how he/she attempted to establish content validity.	The candidate's scoring procedures are explained; items or prompts are clearly written/*presented*; directions and procedures are clear to students. The assessment is designed so the candidate can make decisions about whether the student has met each goal. The minimum "score" for mastery of each learning goal is present on all appropriate assessments.	The candidate described all assessments and the candidate's scoring procedures are explained; items or prompts are clearly written/*presented*; directions and procedures are clear to students. The level of mastery is identified for all summative assessments.	The candidate did not fully describe all assessments or did not explain scoring procedures.

Balance of Assessments WVPTS 3E, InTASC 6, CAEP 1.1	The candidate designs, plans, and implements multiple modes of assessment to assess student learning. The teacher plans opportunities for students to peer or self-assess.	The candidate plans multiple modes of assessment to assess and evaluate student performance. The assessments enable the teacher to identify patterns or gaps in each student's learning.	The candidate plans and implements multiple modes of assessment to assess and evaluate student achievement or the specified learning objective.	The candidate does not plan to use a balance of formative/*daily* and summative assessments.
TASK 4				
Factors in Planning WVPTS 1A, InTASC 4, CAEP 1.1	The candidate integrates multiple factors (e.g., contextual factors, student performance data) to design lessons (based on individual student needs, learning styles, and differences) that maximize the learning of each individual.	The candidate integrates multiple factors (e.g., pre-assessment data, contextual factors, prior knowledge, individual differences) to plan instruction and provides evidence of integration of these factors in the lesson plans throughout the unit	The candidate identifies contextual factors, *and* uses pre-assessment data, and plans lessons based on students' prior knowledge.	The candidate identifies contextual factors and students' prior learning, but is not able to use this knowledge to design lessons that facilitate learning for each individual.
Consultation WVPTS 4B, InTASC 10, CAEP 1.1	The candidate documents consultation with multiple clinical educators for lesson planning and provides the rationale for selecting the consultants.	The candidate documents consultation with multiple clinical educators for lesson planning.	The candidate documents consultation with one clinical educator for lesson planning.	The candidate does not document consultation with a clinical educator for planning.
Instructional Strategies WVPTS 1D, InTASC 5, CAEP 1.1				

	The candidate designs/implements varied and diverse instructional strategies based on research/evidence that are challenging and developmentally appropriate for the content, individual and groups of learners in the class and is likely to result in maximized learning of the content for each student.	The candidate designs/implements a variety of instructional strategies based on research/evidence that are developmentally appropriate and challenging to create meaningful learning experiences that could result in measurable learning for **all** students.	The candidate designs different instructional strategies based on research/evidence that are developmentally appropriate and could result in measurable learning for **most** students.	The candidate designs one learning strategy in lessons that, while developmentally appropriate, may not result in measurable learning for all students.
Instructional Strategy/ Rationale WVPTS 1C, InTASC 7, CAEP 1.1	The candidate provides at least one instructional strategy for each learning goal, along with a meaningful rationale for each, based on research/evidence	The candidate provides at least one instructional strategy for each learning goal, along with a meaningful rationale for each (one per goal based on research/evidence that facilitates critical thinking, problem-solving, and mastery of content for most students.	The candidate provides at least one instructional strategy for most learning goals, along with a meaningful rationale (for one instructional strategy), based on research/evidence that moves students toward mastery of the standard.	The candidate provides an instructional strategy for the entire unit that is not based on research/evidence And Which may or may not be aligned with state and/or professional standards.
Learning Resources (including technology) WVPTS 2D, InTASC 3, CAEP 1.1	The candidate integrates a variety of instructional resources and materials, including technology, into instruction to expand learners' experiences and facilitate learning for each student. The candidate also uses technology to enhance teacher/student learning	The candidate integrates a variety of instructional resources and materials, including technology, into instruction to facilitate students' and teacher learning and manage/track student data.	The candidate uses resources and materials, including technology, to facilitate learning for self or students (not both), as well as to track and manage student data.	The candidate includes little integration of technology to expand learners' experiences or facilitate learning. The candidate does not use technology to track and/or manage student performance data.

	and to track/manage student performance data.			
TASK 6				
Clarity and Representation of Evidence WVPTS 1E, InTASC 6, CAEP 1.1	The candidate provides multiple types of developmentally appropriate evidence of pre- and post-test (learning) data for each learning goal for each student in the class and for the whole class. Graphs (visual representations) can be used by other teachers to identify patterns of learning.	The candidate provides evidence of developmentally appropriate pre- and post-test (learning) data for each learning goal for each student in the class and for the whole class. Graphs (visual representations) are clear and accurately reflect the pre- and post-assessment data.	The candidate provides evidence of pre- and post-test (learning) data for each learning goal for each student in the class and for the whole class.	The candidate provides evidence of pre- and post-test (learning) data for one learning goal or multiple learning goals. However, the data is incomplete for all students in the class or for the whole class. Or, the graphs (visual representations) are not representative of the data and are not easily understood.
Interpretation of Data WVPTS 3E, InTASC 6, CAEP 1.1	The candidate provides complete data for every student in the class. The candidate analyzes formative and summative data in a format that can be used to share data on individual students.	The candidate provides complete data or, if incomplete, addresses why and attempts to get all of the missing data. The candidate analyzes formative and summative data to evaluate learning and generically reports learning progress related to the overall goals of the unit for all students (including the two focus students).	The candidate provides complete data or addresses why the data is incomplete. The candidate analyzes evidence of student learning, including the two focus students, but may not always interpret the data accurately.	The candidate analyzes evidence of student learning for students from whom data was collected. However, because data was incomplete the candidate is unable to evaluate learning progress for all students or does not interpret the data accurately.
Evidence of Impact WVPTS 3E, InTASC 6, CAEP 1.1	The candidate provides evidence, including data, of impact on patterns of learning for the whole class and each individual learner (including the two focus students) for each learning goal. Factors contributing to these patterns are well-described	The candidate provides evidence, including data, of impact on learning for the whole class and each individual learner (including the two focus students). The candidate uses appropriate examples to highlight patterns of	The candidate provides evidence of impact on learning for the two focus students and the whole class. The candidate highlights patterns of learning for the	The candidate attempts to provide evidence of impact on student learning, but does not provide appropriate evidence of student growth and learning.

7 Shepherd University SSR Addendum

		learning to the class as a whole relative to each learning goal.	class as a whole relative to each learning goal.
	And conclusions are supported with clear evidence.		

Standard 1, Task 2 – Additional Questions

CAEP Feedback:
What evidence beyond the PEUC minutes provided can the EPP show to confirm analysis of data?

EPP Response:
Evidence of data analysis beyond the PEUC minutes provided with the Self-Study Report are limited. The university in general, and the Department of Education in particular, have experienced turnover in several key positions since the last accreditation cycle, including:
- Four Directors of Assessment and Accountability
- Four Directors of Teacher Education
- Six Chairs of the Department of Education
- New President of the University, Spring 2017
- Vacant Dean of the School of Professional Education since Fall 2017

The turnover in these key positions has meant a lack of consistency, particularly in the role of DAA. The acting Provost (as of July 2017) is currently working with the Chair of the Department of Education (since Summer 2016) who is also now the acting Dean of SOPES (since July 2017) to develop position description, along with funding sources, for a full-time, permanent Director of Assessment and Accountability as a result of the work done in preparation of the SSR and the clear recognition that such a position needs to be created. The position has been a part-time, temporary position for the past three years, with two different people in the position. The current DAA works in a consultant role (since September 2016). She is working closely with the acting Provost, acting Dean, and the Director of Teacher Education to develop systems and protocols to ensure that data is regularly analyzed and programmatic decisions are made based upon that analysis.

Standard 1 Areas for Improvement

CAEP Feedback:
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.

EPP Response:
As noted above, the EPP assesses candidate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college-and career-ready standards via the TPA and the ST-11.

Tasks 3, 4, and 6 in the TPA directly assess candidate skills by focusing on the candidate's ability to develop Assessment Plans and Lesson Plans that reflect rigorous college-and career-ready standards as well as measure the Impact on Student Learning their Assessment and Lesson Plans had, once again, in relation to rigorous college-and career-ready standards.

Standard 3, components A, C, and E of the ST-11 directly assess candidate skills by focusing on the candidate's ability to determine the Importance of Content, to engage in Questioning and Discussion Techniques, and facilitate Instruction Based on Assessment that are all aligned to rigorous college-and career-ready standards.

Due to the rigor of the TPA and ST-11 assessments, scores on them reflect both skill and commitment to provide P-12 students with instruction focused on state mandated college-and career-ready standards.

Standard 2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice

Standard 2, Task 1 – Evidence in need of verification

CAEP Feedback:
There was no evidence on how the EPP assures that all candidates will gain experience in diverse settings.

EPP Response:
The ==**School Designation Data April 2017**== document provides the evidence of diverse settings in which candidates are placed throughout their practicum and student teaching experiences. The field placement coordinator checks the ratings of each experience as field placements are made through EDUC 150, 320, 351, 352, 270, 443, and student teaching to ensure that all students have experience in each required area. Student field placements are currently recorded in the File Maker Pro database (as per the SIP, all data will be recorded in Tk20 beginning F17). Also, the students' experiences are noted on the student teaching request form, and any missing experiences are made up during the student teaching experience prior to completion of the program.

Another part of our program is the Service Learning component of EDUC 200. SU candidates tutor students who want to complete their high school diploma or their GED at Harpers Ferry Job Corps during this time. The point of the assignment is for them to be able to talk with peers about their schooling experience, since these folks at Job Corps did not complete their high school diploma in school, but have a high motivation to do so—hence they are at Job Corps. The idea is for them to learn from these Job Corps students what didn't work for them. This will be important information for future teachers. The added benefit of this field component of this course is that the majority of the Job Corps students are African American or Latino from inner city DC or Baltimore. Thus the level of diversity is high. So high in fact that Shepherd students who are then placed in area schools with a high level of diversity don't think those schools are diverse.

Standard 2, Task 1 – Additional Questions

CAEP Feedback:
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?

EPP Response:
See the ==**School Designation Data April 2017**== evidence document, which reflects the diversity of the schools where the EPP's candidates are placed for Practicum and Student Teaching experiences. In this document, schools are coded based on the individual school percentages

of student race, eligibility for free or reduced lunch, student disabilities, and English language learner students.

The criteria used to determine the diversity of school placements, based on Census data, is as follows:
- Maryland) 1. M Diversity (non-white population) 25% or greater 2. S Low SES (Free or reduced lunch) <50% 3. E Exceptionality (SWD) >7% 4. ELL English Language Learner >10%.
- Virginia: 1. M Diversity (non-white population) 25% or greater 2. S Low SES (Free or reduced lunch) <50% 3. E Exceptionality (SWD) >8% 4. ELL English Language Learner >12%.
- West Virginia: 1. M Diversity (non-white population) 25% or greater 2. S Low SES (Free or reduced lunch) <50% 3. E Exceptionality (SWD) >10% 4. ELL English Language Learner >6%.

Students must have at least two distinct experiences coded E, M, OR EM, with at least one of those coded E OR M. From the Practicum Manual (*Evidence File 19*):

> *To insure our pre-service teachers have opportunities through the Action-Reflection-Action Cycle to realize the development of "Habits of Mind" through the gradual infusion of programmatic elements, especially the Diversity element, we have established a required minimum Student Practicum Profile. Using data provided by the school systems with which we work, each school in each system is coded in terms of its relationship to the system-wide average percentages of Exceptional and Minority students.*
>
> *Schools below average in both categories of diversity are coded "A".
> Schools below average in Minority but at or above average on Exceptionality are coded "E". Schools at or above average on Minority but below average on Exceptionality are coded "M". Schools at or above average in both Exceptionality and Minority are coded "EM".*
>
> *We require that upon completion of their practicum experiences each Student Practicum Profile include at least two distinct experiences coded E, M, or EM, with at least one of those coded E or M. The Director of Teacher Education maintains the Student Practicum Profile for each student and selects placements for each student to achieve the required standard.*

Placements are monitored and documented by the Field Placement Coordinator in a spreadsheet currently housed in the EPP's File Maker Pro database. New evidence files showing examples of these data are **Juncture Review, Juncture Review 2, and Placement Information.** Additionally, the following information outlines the process the Field Placement Coordinator follows each semester to ensure candidates have diverse field experiences

1. Each semester, the field placement coordinator sends an electronic version of a blank spreadsheet and Field Placement Request form to each faculty member with a field course.
   a. Faculty members enter student information and course requirements into the spreadsheet and distribute the forms to students.
   b. Students complete the Field Placement Request form and return to course instructor.
   c. Course instructor collects all forms and returns to the field placement coordinator.
2. Field placement coordinator reviews the forms and reviews student records in File Maker Pro database.
   a. The previous placements are reviewed to ensure the student is working toward completing field requirements including field experience at each programmatic level of anticipated certification, and the completion of the practicum profile.
   b. During review of the forms and file, the field placement coordinator eliminates schools where students have relatives working or attending.
3. After review of the student form and record, the field placement coordinator maps out potential placements that will fulfill the set requirements and work within the preferred schools provided by faculty members.
   a. Faculty members supervise students and placing as many students within one school as possible is most convenient, as long as students are working within the requirements.
4. The field placement coordinator contacts local school administrators to coordinate placements for the students. Specific field requirements are shared as well as teacher expectations and the number of required hours.
5. Confirmed placement information is entered into the spreadsheet and shared with the course instructor who notifies the students of field placements.
6. The field placement coordinator enters placement information from the spreadsheet into the File Maker Pro database.
7. Student teaching is a separate process. The field placement coordinator schedules meetings to visit classes each semester to provide registration information to prospective student teachers.
   a. Student teachers register for student teaching via Tk20 by completing an application form and creating a resume.
   b. The process for student teaching placement is the same as the field placement process; the only difference is that these requests are coordinated with the county board of education offices, and not the individual school administrators.
   c. Any remaining requirements not met by students during field experiences are met during student teaching.

Standard 2, Task 2 – Evidence in need of verification

CAEP Feedback:
The SSR indicated a perceived need to improve its system for gathering and analyzing feedback from cooperating teachers.

EPP Response:
Prior to Fall 2014, cooperating teachers were being sent hard copy surveys by a Department of Education administrative assistant, with follow ups via phone to those who did not complete the survey. Despite the commitment of time and effort to this process, this approach netted less than 10%. Intense follow up by the Administrative Assistant did result in a significant return rate increase, but with an intense amount of time required for better results.

During the Fall 2014 semester, the Field Placement Coordinator (FPC) met with the Director of Assessment and Accountability (DAA) and the Tk20 System Administrator regarding candidate placement and cooperating teacher survey data. After discussion about the lack of survey responses, the FPC suggested converting the cooperating teacher survey from a paper to electronic process. The FPC copied the survey into Survey Monkey, the trio edited the survey, and then the FPC sent the survey link to all cooperating teachers from the 2014-2015 school year in the spring of 2015. Survey responses increased with the switch to the electronic format. During the spring of 2015, the survey was edited to include feedback from cooperating teachers regarding potential improvements to the program. Review of the cooperating teacher feedback inspired the idea to create the **Performance Review**, an evaluation to be completed by cooperating teachers in the middle of the student teaching placement instead of only completing a summative evaluation.

To date, the EPP has gathered feedback from cooperating teachers who work with candidates who are student teachers, but not those who work with candidates who are in practicum placements. The feedback, which is currently gathered via Survey Monkey, has only been analyzed and considered by the Director of Teacher Education and the Field Placement Coordinator. Beginning with in Fall 2017, survey results from the previous semester will become part of the data analysis work done in the EPPC (formerly the PEUC).

New evidence files: CT Survey Original Fall 2014; CT Survey 2014-2015; CT Survey 2015-2016; CT Survey 2016-2017.

Standard 2, Task 2 – SSR Excerpt Clarifications

CAEP Feedback:
"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)

EPP Response:
The Cooperating Teacher Exit Survey (CT Exit Survey) has been distributed electronically since the spring of 2015 (for the 2014-2015 school year). The response rate from CT Exit Survey has increased since switching to the electronic version of the survey. Survey data is shared with the Chair and Director of Teacher Education. Otherwise, review of the data has been very limited until now. Moving forward, the trends and key concerns from each round of survey data will be reviewed and discussed in the EPPC (formerly PEUC) and any changes or revisions to the program or to the placement process that need to be made will be determined and implemented accordingly.

Standard 2, Task 2 – Additional Questions

CAEP Feedback:
What progress in this area has been made since submission of the SSR?

EPP Response:
The EPPC (formerly the PEUC) has held discussion concerning the value and purpose of the CT Exit Survey. Consensus is that review of the survey data by the EPPC, especially the anecdotal/narrative data, is worthwhile and should become part of the EPPC data analysis process each semester. Moving forward, analysis of this data will be part of the EPPC meeting schedule on a semester basis.

Standard 3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

Standard 3, Task 1 – Evidence in need of verification

CAEP Feedback:
The overall GPA of the cohort identified in the data exceeded the CAEP minimum requirements.

EPP Response:
As seen in **_Table 1 in Evidence file 32,_** as previously submitted, the data for GPA by cohort is provided. Also in **_Evidence file 32, Tables 3 and 4,_** provide the individual student GPA's from which this summary data was drawn.

Short of pulling the official transcripts for each of the 97 students making up these three cohorts, the EPP is unsure what additional evidence is needed to corroborate our claim that each cohort met the CAEP required cohort minimum of 3.0 or higher.

While policy changes regarding GPA were considered, as was shown in the submitted PEUC minutes (**_contained within Evidence file 32_**), this consideration was not because our cohorts were not meeting the 3.0 CAEP cohort requirements. Rather discussion centered on philosophical issues of fairness. The PEUC resolved these philosophical issues in keeping with the CAEP intent of not precluding candidates who might be excellent teachers from entering an educator preparation program due to previous difficulties with their academic record that had since been resolved.

Standard 3, Task 1 – SSR Excerpt Clarification

CAEP Feedback:
"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."

EPP Response:
Evidence file 32, Table 2 reflects the GPA data by specialization and endorsement areas, as well as narrative, part of which is reflected in the CAEP feedback above.

In response, statistical analysis of data emphasizes the need to have a sample size large enough to be able to draw conclusions that are not skewed by the presence of an outlier. Traditionally, an n of at least 10 is required for any meaningful analysis. Consequently, the PEUC felt that it would be reactive and poor practice to consider changes to something as important as

programs or policy in response to GPA and/or test scores the first time such data were analyzed at the unit level where there were only 1 or 2 students, as was the case for Biology and Early Education . We will continue to monitor academic excellence data moving forward to determine if indeed changes are needed to ensure that the academic excellence demonstrated at the overall program level is also present within each specialization. No Biology or Early Education students were in the Spring 2017 Cohort so additional analysis will take place in the future as more students come through these specializations.

While CAEP does not address minimum GPA at the individual candidate level (the cohort model allows EPPs to admit promising students with GPA's below 3.0 as long as the cohort GPA is above 3.0), potential candidates who have GPA's below a 2.75 work closely with an advisor to analyze factors related to low GPA and to develop a plan for improving GPA. Such plans regularly include intensive tutoring which is available free of charge at the academic support center, retaking courses in which the candidate achieved a C or lower, and counseling if issues such as stress or test anxiety are impacting ability to demonstrate their full potential. In addition, advisors help potential candidates access a range of services that provide support to enable those with the capacity for academic excellence to demonstrate it (see program supports documentation).

Academic Advisors also work closely with those students who are unable to demonstrate capacity for academic excellence despite, these supports in identifying alternative majors where their respective strengths will be a better fit.

Once admitted, candidates who have GPA's between 2.75 and 3.0 continue to work closely with their advisors to demonstrate excellence in their continued coursework.
In regard to Praxis CORE test difficulties, students who are concerned about their preparedness to show excellence are counselled to receive additional free tutoring focusing on PRAXIS preparation at the academic support center. Advisors also consider many factors to make course recommendations that will allow candidates to be well-prepared to excel on initial test administration. Recently some email dissection within the department of education has taken place regarding the potential for offering a PRAXIS prep course as a program elective in the future.

Standard 3, Task 1 – Additional Questions

CAEP Feedback:
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?

EPP Response:
Please refer to ==*Evidence file #31 Supports for Completion*== submitted with the SSR to review the supports in place for all students within EPP programs. Additionally, general support is available to all students via ==http://www.shepherd.edu/academic-support/ **- link to academic support page and** http://www.shepherd.edu/aac-students **- link to Advising Assistance Center.**==

==**As an example of program specific support, please see the Elementary Education Handbook, especially pages 10 - 18.**==

Students generally fit into one of the following categories:
1. Students who are progressing on pace.
2. Students who have issues and concerns who are receiving support and guidance from their Academic Advisors.
3. Students who despite the ongoing efforts of their Academic Advisor, typically with input from the DTE, Chair and/or broader discussion within the PEUC/EPPC, do not show significant progress and are then counseled out of the program.

For students in Category 3, an alternative program is the Regents Bachelor of Arts (a statewide degree completion program - go to http://www.shepherd.edu/rba for more information). Additionally, Shepherd University offers a wide variety of majors into which those students who are not finding success in their education program may transfer.

Beyond this, the EPPC has been considering the option of offering an Education emphasis in the RBA program. The EPPC has the support of the acting Provost to move in this direction and efforts to develop the program will begin in earnest during the 2017-2018 school year.

Standard 3, Task 2 – Evidence in need of verification

CAEP Feedback:
Portfolios vary across programs and among advisors; Pro05 is not aligned with the CAEP evaluation framework.

EPP Response:
Discussion regarding the implementation of in-common portfolio content and formats across program areas has been ongoing, with no resolution to date. As part of the process to pull all data into one electronic database, the prospect of housing portfolios within Tk20 (which has the capacity and features necessary) with currently in-common assessments and components will undergo review during the Fall 2017 semester. The Pro05 was rewritten, under the leadership and guidance of the Director of Teacher Education, during the Spring 2017 semester. The newly drafted instrument, ==**Disposition Assessment 17 (DA17**==), was piloted during the first Summer 2017 session. ==**Outcome Statistics and Observations**== have been made by the DTE. The assessment and observations have been shared with the EPPC (formerly the PEUC) for Review and Feedback after implementation during the Summer 1 session. Based on ensuing feedback,

changes will be made to the new instrument and the revised assessment will be given in PED 1 and PED 2 during the Fall 2017 semester. The question remains whether or not instrument will be used across all classes even though reliability would be hard to establish at this time.

Standard 3, Task 2 – SSR Excerpt Clarification

CAEP Feedback:
"... 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."

EPP Response:
As stated above, a new disposition assessment named DA17 has been created under the guidance of the Director of Teacher Education. CAEP guidelines were used during this process, and moving forward, continued revision and refinement, with feedback from the EPPC (formerly the PEUC) will be ongoing during the 2017-18 school year. Once a final assessment has been decided upon, efforts to ensure reliability and validity will begin.

Portfolios are widely used across programs currently. The discussion to date has focused on the practicality, purposefulness, and necessity for an in-common portfolio to be developed and required across program areas. Until a decision is made regarding this matter, no reliability or validity of portfolios across programs is possible.

Standard 3, Task 2 – Additional Questions

CAEP Feedback:
What progress has been made on addressing these issues since the SSR was submitted?

EPP Response:
The new Disposition Assessment 17 (DA17), developed during the Spring 17 semester, has been piloted during the Summer 1 session and is currently out for review and feedback from EPPC (formerly the PEUC) members. The instrument will undergo revisions based on this feedback prior to being used in PED 1 and PED 2 during the Fall 17 semester. The data and instrument will once again be offered up for review following the Fall 17 semester, with ongoing discussion regarding the use of the instrument across courses prior to it being finalized and undergoing reliability and validity testing by members of the EPPC.

Standard 4 Program Impact

Standard 4, Task 1 – Evidence in need of verification

CAEP Feedback:
Need to verify the intent of the Transition to Teaching Survey and Supervisor Survey discussed in Evidence #38.

EPP Feedback:
The intent of the Transition to Teaching Survey in Evidence #38 is to gather data from program completers at the end of their first, second and third years of teaching after successfully completing the EPP program.

The intent of the Supervisor Survey discussed in **Evidence #38** is to gather data from the school supervisors of recent EPP completers following their first, second, and third years as classroom teachers. The MOU represented in Evidence #38 allows for the EPP to receive this information from the state of West Virginia for teachers who are teaching in WV classrooms as all teachers and supervisors will be required to complete the survey at the end of each school. Completion of the survey includes information about the EPP from which teachers received their preparation, thereby ensuring the data is received by the corresponding EPP.

Standard 4, Task 1 – SSR Excerpt Clarification

CAEP Feedback:
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. 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.

EPP Response:
A copy of the Exit Survey was provided with the SSR as **Evidence file #37**. At this time, this is the only survey to which the EPP has access. Moving forward, it is possible the EPP will have access to the Transition to Teaching and the Supervisor Survey as well.

The results of another Exit Survey were received in June 2017, but as yet, not results have been received from the Transition to Teaching Survey. This survey is to be completed by completers one year after exiting the EPP, and for those who are in the teaching profession, two and three years after completion as well. The purpose of the Exit Survey is to get completer feedback on their perceptions about the EPP and the level of preparation they have received in order to be successful in the classroom. The Transition to Teaching Survey will gather feedback after completers are in the classroom at one, two, and three years, thereby gathering data on the

actual results of preparation for the classroom rather than the perceived preparation. Additionally, results from completer's supervisors will help further paint a picture of how well prepared SU's completers are based on the perception of those who evaluate their classroom performance.

Each survey serves the following purpose:

Exit Survey CAEP Standard 4.4	Transition to Teaching Survey CAEP Standard 4.4	Supervisor Survey CAEP Standard 4.2 and 4.3
● Completer contact information for continued follow up ● Completer's initial impression of quality of EPP across multiple categories upon completion of the program but prior to being employed as a classroom teacher	● Completer contact information for continued follow up ● Completer's impression of quality of EPP across multiple categories upon completion of the program following the first, second and third years being employed as a classroom teacher	● Survey completed by completer supervisor tagged to EPP for each completer by the state and data results shared with EPP accordingly.

Standard 4, Task 1 – Additional Questions

CAEP Feedback:
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).

EPP Response:
The purpose of the Transition to Teaching Survey is to hear from completers to determine how well our programs prepared them for their first year of teaching. The initial survey, the Exit Survey, is asking for contact information to send this survey as well as to get initial impressions of the EPP at the point of completing the program. The Supervisor Survey is submitted by the completer's supervisor within the same timeframe that the completer submits the Transition to Teaching Survey.

The survey was just introduced this past year, with several WV colleges and universities agreeing to pay the fee required to implement the program. To date, only the Exit Survey has been completed. Those candidates, no completers, will be the first ones to complete the Transition to Teaching Survey in the spring of 2018 as their first-year teaching in the classroom is drawing to a close. They will complete the survey one time in each of their first three years of teaching. Their supervisors will share impressions regarding the quality of preparation they see in each teacher/completer as well via the Supervisor Survey.

20 Shepherd University SSR Addendum

As the Transition to Teaching and Supervisor Surveys have yet to be released to the EPP and administered to teachers and supervisors, there is no data available for these two surveys.   As discussion regarding the surveys took place within and among EPP's, the understanding was that participation in this survey would offer the opportunity to collect completer data that would directly address Standard 4.3, Satisfaction of Employers, by getting survey information regarding completer effectiveness, promotions, level of employer regard for completers as well as Standard 4.4, Satisfaction of Completers, by getting survey information regarding their perception of the quality of preparation they received from the EPP as well as the relevance of the preparation they received. A desired and hoped-for outcome is that the surveys also address Standard 4.2, Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness in that both observations and student surveys will factor into the completers' evaluations and therefore be reflected in the Supervisor Surveys.

Standard 4, Task 2 – Evidence in need of verification

CAEP Feedback:
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.)

EPP Response:
In an effort to gather meaningful data on completers, the SU EPP is working with other WV EPPs and the West Virginia State Department of Education to develop a process to access data from the state-wide teacher evaluation to track completer impact on P-12 students. See 3.e in the updated SIP.

Standard 4, Task 2 – SSR Excerpt Clarification

CAEP Feedback:
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 timeline 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.

EPP Response:
The EPP will get data from the NExT Exit Survey completer and supervisor surveys once a year (June) and will use this data to track and determine teacher effectiveness and impact on P-12 learners. See the NExT Exit Survey Guide for more details. The EPP will distribute the Exit Survey. Once the survey is closed, we will pull and clean the raw data using a template provided by NDSU. NDSU will create reports at the EPP, state, and consortia level. The WVDE is collaborating with HEPC and the EPPs to administer the Transition to Teaching Survey and Supervisor Survey. Currently the plan is to use the

21 Shepherd University SSR Addendum

student-teacher licensure number to match current teachers in the system. The surveys will then be emailed and/or embedded in the WVDE Evaluation System for the completer and their supervisor to finish. Embedded within the supervisor survey response will be data collected from the West Virginia Teacher Evaluation Tool, used to evaluate teacher effectiveness once a year in a teachers first three years of teaching.

Instrument	Purpose	Survey Administration	Data Submission from IHEs	Data Reports to the IHEs
Exit Survey	Identify learning opportunities and practices that are perceived by candidates as effective teacher preparation strategies. The Exit Survey is designed to gather candidates' perspectives on their teacher preparation programs as they leave IHEs and prepare to enter the teaching profession.	-Administered on academic-year basis near the end of every fall, spring, and summer term to all graduating students. -Administer to all summer graduates	-By end of June -Data corrections are due two weeks from the day the IHE was notified of errors.	By end of October
Transition to Teaching Survey	Identifies graduates' employment status, steps they took to seek teaching positions, and the extent to which they believe they were prepared for teaching responsibilities. If the graduate is a part-time or full-time teacher, the survey assesses what she/he knows and is able to do after a year of employment.	-Every spring semester to all graduates/program completers from the previous academic year. -Administration window is open from early March to early June	-By end of June	By end of October
Supervisor Survey	Gain supervisors' perspectives of recent graduates' performance as novice teachers. The survey measures employers' perceptions of the quality of NExT graduates. The survey requests supervisors' opinions on graduates' instructional practices, abilities to work with diverse learners, abilities to establish positive classroom environments, and levels of professionalism.	Every spring semester to supervisors of graduates from the previous academic year who have entered the teaching profession with full-time or part-time status. -Administration window is open from April to mid-August	-By mid-September	By end of January

Standard 4, Task 3 – Evidence in need of verification

CAEP Feedback:
Would like to verify the interpretation of the data collected from Evidence #39

EPP Response:
The interpretation of the data from **Evidence #39** has been limited in scope to this point. Generally, the most notable feedback gleaned from the survey includes the following:
- Desire for longer placement in student teaching role
- Desire for more opportunities to plan and deliver lessons prior to student teaching experience (limited opportunity in current practicum model)
- Concern about perceived disconnect between specialty programs and the Department of Education – different responses and information coming from each
- Need for continuity and consistency of messaging between advisors (when switching advisors)
- Preparation for working with Diverse Students received overall higher level of concern or "tend to disagree" than other categories
- Preparation to collaborate with parents and guardians an area of concern
- Overwhelmingly positive response to receiving support during student teaching
- Overwhelmingly positive feedback regarding quality of Cooperating Teacher placement
- Overall, positive feedback. Generally, students felt well-prepared for student teaching and believed the program is rigorous and challenging.

Review of Evidence #39 will corroborate this interpretation.

Standard 4, Task 3 – SSR Excerpt Clarification

CAEP Feedback:
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).

EPP Response:
The results of the Fall 2016 data were given a cursory review by the PEUC prior to the submission of the SSR in early March 2017. Data from the Spring 17 completers was received in June and is being merged with the data from Fall 17 to be analyzed and reviewed by the PEUC early during the Fall 2017 semester. During the Fall 17, part of the process within the PEUC will be to determine how to evaluate and respond to the data provided by this report to systematically analyze and utilize the data as it is received moving forward.

Standard 4, Task 3 – Additional Questions

CAEP Feedback:
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.

EPP Response:
The most noted themes from **Evidence #39** included:
- Desire for longer placement in student teaching role
- Desire for more opportunities to plan and deliver lessons prior to student teaching experience (limited opportunity in current practicum model)
- Concern about perceived disconnect between specialty programs and the Department of Education – different responses and information coming from each
- Need for continuity and consistency of messaging between advisors (when switching advisors)
- Preparation for working with Diverse Students received overall higher level of concern or "tend to disagree" than other categories
- Preparation to collaborate with parents and guardians an area of concern
- Overwhelmingly positive response to receiving support during student teaching
- Overwhelmingly positive feedback regarding quality of Cooperating Teacher placement
- Overall, positive feedback. Generally, students felt well-prepared for student teaching and believed the program is rigorous and challenging.

Currently, no clear process exists for incorporating this data into a cycle of continuous improvement. As with assessment data and analysis, the Director of Assessment and Accountability and the Director of Teacher Education are working together to develop protocols, systematic structures and calendared discussions of Survey data results and ensuing changes within the construct of the EPPC (formerly the PEUC).

Standard 4 Areas for Improvement

CAEP Feedback:
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 SUs 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.

EPP Response:

In examining the SU-EPP plan for gathering data from program completers, key stakeholders within the EPP, academic affairs, P-12 partners and state agencies will assist the EPP in meeting the requirements of Standard 4.

SU-EPP PLAN FOR GATHERING DATA FROM PROGRAM COMPLETERS:

1. In EDUC 400, before student teachers graduate, identify those who plan to apply and eventually teach in WV. Since some attrition is to be expected, include ALL those who plan to apply/teach in WV and are willing to participate in this project. Goal: Initial cohort of 15-17 students representing a cross section of content areas.

FEEDBACK: Designated positions within the EPP will gather the information from students in EDUC to determine participants in each cohort. The cohort will wherever possible include representation across content areas. This task is the responsibility of the Field Placement Coordinator and the Director of Teacher Education. Resources are therefore committed by the institution for the full-time position of the field placement coordinator, and in the form of release time and an increased salary (compared to a regular faculty line) for the Director of Teacher Education. The start of the first cohort began in spring 2017.

2. Develop a variety of tools to measure value-added data for SUs EPP. In addition to a variety of surveys, annual evaluations are linked to personal goals and student learning. Follow would include identifying clear learning targets for students in the class that are appropriate to the developmental level and specialization area of the students and subsequent measurement of learning against those goals. Examples include collaborating with survey instruments from the Gates Foundation. Shepherd's LMS SAKAI or Tk20 (accounts are active for 7 years) will be used to administer these surveys and analyze the resulting data. The faculty member(s) assigned to this project will receive course release time to oversee its development and implementation.

FEEDBACK: According to the APA Taskforce report, *Evaluating and Assessing Teacher Preparation Programs*, "although student surveys have been used for many years (Aubrecht, Hanna, & Hoyt, 1986), ... rating observable teaching behaviors requires less judgment on the part of the students completing the survey, and thus is more likely to produce consistent results than are global questions that require students to make inferences about teacher performance. "

Accordingly student surveys of teaching effectiveness have considerable support in the empirical literature. Additionally, in conducting postgraduate assessment and program evaluation, and in the possible absence of student achievement data, surveys as noted above "may take on additional significance, as they are more highly correlated with student achievement than are surveys completed by other raters (Wilkerson, 2000).

3. Offer an incentive to completers for participating in the project: Professional development credits for licensure re-certification (1 credit for each year of participation-value: $60) or a

waiver of 1 graduate-level degree credit waiver for the 3-year study (value: $420-$650). The Dean of Graduate Studies and Continuing Education has agreed to work with completers participating in the program to ensure completion of registration forms and application of fee waivers.

FEEDBACK: Working through the Director of Continuing Education and the Dean of Graduate Studies and Continuing Education, the waiver of the fee for these continuing education courses is in place. This division has regularly offered discounts or fee waivers for special populations of students, such as those participating most recently in the "Voices of the Misty Mountains" institute through the National Endowment for the Humanities. This financial incentive will begin with the fall 2017 cohort.

4. Follow up by SU DoE faculty with the teachers and/or administrators (if this is not a DAA responsibility, this time should be factored into faculty teaching load, in a way similar to student teacher supervision).

FEEDBACK: In determining next steps for the potential hire of a permanent Director of Assessment and Accountability, and in examining other vacancies within the department, there is an opportunity to realign responsibilities and release time within the EPP to address items directly tied to the implementation of Standard 4. These include in addition to the DAA and DTE, the role of instructors within the student teacher culminating courses.

For Items 5-7, please see the paragraphs following these points.

5. Utilize information from the Voluntary System of Accountability Survey (VSA) administered by SU Institutional Research to compare satisfaction and future plans of education majors as compared to the overall SU student body.

6. Segment data received from the graduation survey and alumni surveys to determine completer perception of preparation and quality of the program.

7. Use this data in conjunction with findings from the NExT Exit Survey to determine the same items.

FEEDBACK FOR ITEMS 5-7: The DAA in cooperation with the Director of Institutional Research, Alumni Affairs and the Center for Teaching and Learning would work cooperatively to compare this data against norms within the institution, and also comparing current cohorts with historical data collected and compared.

INDICATORS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: As the EPP strives to obtain valid data of program and teaching effectiveness, and as noted by the APA taskforce report, data can be utilized to

identify trends related to factors such as years of experience, district demographics, and other factors that may be specific to SU's EPP program and the areas it serves. Comparative analyses of survey data (e.g., candidates and graduates, students, principals, and self-surveys) can be used as valid data models to revisit program standards and to identify areas or competencies that require attention, additional resources or need to be added to the EPP.

A good example of these efforts is the participation of the SU-EPP in the survey developed by the North Dakota State University developed called the NExT Exit Survey. SU, along with several other institutions across the state of West Virginia, has committed resources ($1,400 annual fee) to be a part of this statewide project that will provide comparative data to the individual EPP as well as larger data across the state.

This represents an important step for the state in assisting individual EPP programs to gather this data. The West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE for the P-12 system) is collaborating with the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission and the EPPs to administer the Transition to Teaching Survey and Supervisor Survey. Currently the plan is to use the student-teacher licensure number to match current teachers in the system. The surveys will then be emailed and/or embedded in the WVDE Evaluation System for the completer and their supervisor to finish.

Lastly, to summarize several recommendations from the previously mentioned 2014 APA report, the SU-EPP is striving to meet those goals, including:

- States should work with teacher preparation program providers to design systems of data collection that include information collected at the stages of selection, progression, program completion, and postgraduation, including relevant indicators of performance at each stage. These systems of data collection should include instruments with the best available technical features. These systems should aim to provide longitudinal, prospective information on multiple constructs across the various outcome/performance assessments described in this report.

- States and teacher preparation programs should track candidates' involvement in various preparation experiences and identify models of various program elements or candidate attributes that predict a positive contribution to preK–12 student learning.
- States should work with teacher preparation programs to develop valid measures of student learning outcomes forall school subjects and grades to assess student learning outcomes similar to those currently available in mathematics, language arts, and science.

As noted Standard 5 Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement and Capacity

Standard 5, Task 1 – Evidence needing verification

CAEP Feedback:
The SSR indicates alignment with state and InTASC standards, but assessments do not identify how criteria are tagged to specific standards.

EPP Response:
The **Crosswalk with WVPTS and INTASC for CAEP document** shows the explicit alignment of the three bodies of standards: the state, INTASC, and CAEP. State, INTASC, and/or CAEP standards are referenced within the data set evidence files submitted with the SSR in March. **(Evidence #3, 4, 5, 12 and 15).** Now that clear and explicit alignment has been identified and provided by the state, all assessments and data sets moving from here on out will be tagged for all three sets of standards according to the guidance provided in this document.

Standard 5, Task 1 – SSR Excerpt Clarification

CAEP Feedback:
What documents or other evidence can the EPP provide to show links between standards and criteria on assessments?

EPP Response:
Please see the **Crosswalk with WVPTS & INTASC for CAEP document** to better understand the connection between the standards and the criteria on assessments that were included with the SSR submission.

Standard 5, Task 2 – Evidence needing verification

CAEP Feedback:
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?

EPP Response:
Through discussion and analysis of data in the PEUC during the 2016-2017 school year, members identified two key areas where data analysis across program areas not only made sense, but could help faculty outside the Department of Education feel more connected to and integrated with the PEUC as well as help their individual programs as a result. Those two key

areas are the PRAXIS tests (both general knowledge and content area) and the possibility of developing portfolios that have significant requirements in common across program areas.

PRAXIS results provide a good starting point to build upon as the EPPC can identify trends or outliers and determine if there are any programmatic changes that need to be made. Additionally, if any individual program stands out in a particular area, the collective group can offer suggestions and strategies for that particular program and then monitor progress in future analysis sessions.

As has been stated previously, portfolios are used in most if not all programs in some way or another. The discussion began in earnest during the fall 2016 semester regarding the feasibility of having an in common portfolio to provide a more systematic and equitable experience for candidates across programs. While in theory this seems reasonable and practical, in practice is proving to be a challenge as the needs and requires of each program are so varied. The EPPC continues to look at options that make sense for candidates as well as program faculty, all with the purpose of being able to review data across program areas in an effort to ensure all candidates are receiving excellent preparation.

Standard 5, Task 3 – Evidence needing clarification

CAEP Feedback:
The SIP indicates a goal of improving reliability and validity of EPP developed assessments, but strategies are not highly detailed.

EPP Response:
The EPP is currently pursuing the goal of improving the reliability and validity of EPP developed assessments through several different avenues.
- The Director of Teacher Education is currently consulting with a Research Statistician regarding reliability and validity factors. The DTE is currently applying the steps recommended by the RS with the new Disposition Assessment 17 which is being piloted this academic school year.
- The EPP currently uses the Student Teaching 11 (ST-11) assessment. Other West Virginia colleges and universities either use an ST-11 like instrument or use the actual state teacher evaluation as their assessment tool during student teaching semester. There is a movement to create something at the state level (by universities) to use across schools, but this movement is in its nascent stage. Much of the push for a statewide assessment is due to the acknowledged concern around reliability and validity of current assessments. Having a common assessment tool developed and used statewide would help ensure consistency across EPPs and would help with improving the validity and reliability of such an assessment tool.

- Additionally, the EPP will continue to work closely with the WVDOE to carefully monitor the current development and future implementation of the proposed state-wide assessments, with embedded validity and reliability mechanisms, such as the TPA.

- In the meantime, the EPP will continue to appropriately revise its currently used assessments for enhanced validity and reliability, as well as consistency across the various programs within the EPP (such as the ST-11 and the proposed electronic portfolio), guided in these efforts by the overall mission and vision of Shepherd University and its core values.

Standard 5, Task 3 – Additional Questions

CAEP Feedback:
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?

EPP Response:
The Director of Teacher Education is currently consulting with a Research Statistician regarding reliability and validity factors in general. The DTE is currently applying the specific steps recommended by the RS with the new Disposition Assessment 17 which is being piloted this academic school year, which will replace the Pro05. While the DA17 is being piloted specifically in PED 1 and PED 2 this coming academic year, with an emphasis on establishing reliability and validity within this small pilot group, all members of the EPPC will have the option to implement the DA17 in its current form as soon as the fall 2017 semester.

Standard 5 Areas for Improvement

CAEP Feedback:
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.

EPP Response:
As stated above, several specific steps are already being taken to address the issue of reliability and validity of the assessment instruments currently in use as well as the consideration of revised (ST-11 like assessment across WV institutions, for example) and new (cross-program electronic portfolios) and the embedded reliability and validity of those instruments.

Diversity

Diversity – Additional Questions
How does the EPP monitor and document diversity within candidate placements?

8. Each semester, the field placement coordinator sends an electronic version of a blank spreadsheet and Field Placement Request form to each faculty member with a field course.
   a. Faculty members enter student information and course requirements into the spreadsheet and distribute the forms to students.
   b. Students complete the Field Placement Request form and return to course instructor.
   c. Course instructor collects all forms and returns to the field placement coordinator.
9. Field placement coordinator reviews the forms and reviews student records in File Maker Pro database.
   a. The previous placements are reviewed to ensure the student is working toward completing field requirements including field experience at each programmatic level of anticipated certification, and the completion of the practicum profile.
   b. During review of the forms and file, the field placement coordinator eliminates schools where students have relatives working or attending.
10. After review of the student form and record, the field placement coordinator maps out potential placements that will fulfill the set requirements and work within the preferred schools provided by faculty members.
    a. Faculty members supervise students and placing as many students within one school as possible is most convenient, as long as students are working within the requirements.
11. The field placement coordinator contacts local school administrators to coordinate placements for the students. Specific field requirements are shared as well as teacher expectations and the number of required hours.
12. Confirmed placement information is entered into the spreadsheet and shared with the course instructor who notifies the students of field placements.
13. The field placement coordinator enters placement information from the spreadsheet into the File Maker Pro database.
14. Student teaching is a separate process. The field placement coordinator schedules meetings to visit classes each semester to provide registration information to prospective student teachers.
    a. Student teachers register for student teaching via Tk20 by completing an application form and creating a resume.
    b. The process for student teaching placement is the same as the field placement process; the only difference is that these requests are coordinated with the county board of education offices, and not the individual school administrators.
    c. Student teaching

Technology

No issues raised.

Revised Self-Improvement Plan

All aspects of the previously submitted SIP have remained the same except for changes made to the goal chart (see below). The two columns highlighted in green reflect added detail, as per CAEP feedback, for segment "d. **Present a complete description of the assessment plan that details how each goal or objective is to be assessed."**

Goal 1: Systematize input and output of data using one database					
Strategy	**Measure and Baseline Data Prior to Fall 2016**	**Progress since F16**	**Plan for SY 17-18 & F18**	**Mid-Point Goal** **Spring 2019**	**Final Year Goal** **Spring 2023**
a. Gather feedback from faculty and students on usability of TK20, i.e., setting up juncture process on TK20, auto upload functionality for inputting scores from ETS.	Data entered into TK20 or FileMaker Pro. Individual program areas used data for SPA reports. No use of data in PEUC across program areas. No inclusion of data from ETS. No regular pulling of reports.	Throughout the 2016-17 school year, the PEUC engaged in analysis of data. During these sessions (see PEUC meeting notes uploaded as evidence file #17), discussion ensued as to the current limits of data gathering and reporting, what we'd like reports to reflect and how they could be formatted to allow for optimal use of time and efficiency (data reports were discovered to be in a format that required manual manipulation and transfer into Excel files to be usable), and how to migrate data from	-Meeting of DTE, DAA and Tk20 System Administrator to outline needs to present to Tk20 support staff. - Work with Tk20 support staff to restructure our reports, including format, content, and rubrics. - Begin migrating data from Banner, ETS, and File Maker Pro to ensure all data is in Tk20 and accessible by all faculty for individual courses taught as well as to the DTE, DAA, and Tk20 System Administrator for the purpose of pulling reports and analyzing	TK20 sole database in use, with any data from other databases deemed relevant by the PEUC uploaded to TK20 for reference. ETS data regularly uploaded to TK20 to consolidate all EPP relevant data in one place where all faculty have access.	Annual review of data entry and report generation process to inform ongoing use of TK20 database.

		multiple data-bases into one single system (Tk20).	data across programs.		
b. Periodically meet with TK20 representative to determine options for the design of the database to better support and create the types of reports we need to effectively analyze data.	TK20 set up done in 2010. No feedback given on design of reports, ease of use, practicality of report styles. No evaluation of database design completed.		As Tk20 is restructured and new reports are accessible, feedback opportunities by staff will be integrated into the data analysis sessions to allow for further refining and revision of the reports.	Initial meeting with TK20 representative to revise and refine reports based on CAEP SSR process feedback from faculty (Spring 2017) with annual review thereafter.	Review and refine report structures as needed at least once annually and create new report structures as needed.
c. Consolidate data into TK20 from various existing sources as needed	Data uploaded into at least two separate data bases, no merging or cross use of data bases.		- Begin migrating data from Banner, ETS, and File Maker Pro to ensure all data is in Tk20 and accessible by all faculty for individual courses taught as well as to the DTE, DAA, and Tk20 System Administrator for the purpose of pulling reports and analyzing data across programs.	Annual upload of relevant ETS/Title 2 data and WV TPA data (as long as EPP uses this assessment).	Annual review of data collection to ensure data from all assessments currently in use is being entered into TK20 and reports being pulled are usable.
Goal 2: Develop and implement data analysis and feedback cycles which would be facilitated by Goal 1					

Strategy	Measure and Baseline Data Prior to Fall 2016	Progress since F16	Plan for SY 17-18 & F18	Mid-Point Goal Spring 2019	Final Year Goal Spring 2023
a. Develop assessment, data entry, data analysis, and feedback cycle calendar.	General understanding that data is to be entered by end of semester. No regular review of assessments, data analysis or feedback conducted.	Feedback gathered during PEUC throughout SY16/17 regarding report usability, analysis protocol, data cycles to inform steps moving forward	F17 Identify all reports needed to be pulled each semester for review following semester.	Calendar in place and accessible online for PEUC/EPPC to reference. Documentation of decisions posted to PEUC folder in SAKAI.	Annual review of current Data Analysis Calendar to inform creation and implementation of upcoming year's calendar.
b. Develop protocols for data analysis and feedback.	No regular review of assessments, data analysis or feedback conducted. No protocols for process in place.	During the 16-17 school year, data analysis was conducted on each key assessment incommon across program areas. A protocol was introduced and revised during the ongoing process.	Further development of data analysis process and protocols. First tier data analysis to be completed by DAA, with feedback and support by DTE. Areas of concern or interest to be presented to PEUC for deeper analysis and action steps.	At least two semesters implementation of data analysis and feedback using PEUC created protocols.	Review feedback from data analysis protocol implementation after each cycle. Revise protocols as needed.
c. Develop system to document analysis, feedback, and follow-up cycles.	No regular review of assessments, data analysis or feedback conducted.	During the 16-17 school year, data analysis was conducted on each key assessment incommon across program areas. Documentation of the analysis and feedback was done via PEUC	Develop and use an analysis and feedback form to systematize the process of recording and maintaining all information related to the data analysis process.	Use of Google Drive (or other agreed upon system) to store "living" documents. Upload to Sakai once documents	Annual review of documentation systems and procedures to inform revision

		meeting notes that were shared with Unit members and uploaded on SAKAI.		"fixed" and permanent.	as needed.
e. Track impact of changes made based on data analysis cycles.	No regular review of assessments, data analysis or feedback conducted.	Analysis of data began in earnest during the 16-17 school year. Changes being made as a result of this analysis are all technical at this time, primarily the work being done to streamline the data collection and reporting process (See Goal 1).	Move toward analyzing data to determine what, if any, changes need to be made at a program level. Make comparisons between past semester data (the two previous data cycles) to begin determining trends or patterns. By F18, at least three semesters of consistent data comparison will have taken place, making any decisions for changes possible moving forward.	Feedback sessions considering anecdotal as well as empirical data calendared and held at least once per semester.	At least annual feedback sessions considering anecdotal as well as empirical data to determine impact of changes made based on prior cycle feedback.

Goal 3: Revise/adopt assessments (with a particular focus on rubrics) and establish reliability and validity for each.

Strategy	Measure and Baseline Data Prior to Fall 2016	Progress since F16	Plan for SY 17-18 & F18	Mid-Point Goal Spring 2019	Final Year Goal Spring 2023
a. Develop a new disposition assessment to replace the Pro 05	Pro-05 review highlighted lack of descriptors to guide ratings on 6 point scale. Disposition	DA '17 was developed by an adhoc committee of faculty, supervisors, cooperating teachers, and students (grad and	F17 Pilot for reliability and validity F17 will use DA '17 in place of Pro 05 across courses if EPPC decides to do so	New valid disposition assessment developed with stakeholders to be piloted Spring 2018	Annual review of disposition assessment to refine as needed.

	assessment limited to campus faculty.	undergrad) at the conclusion of Spring Semester.. It was piloted in three summer courses with feedback provided by both instructors and students who rated themselves. Summary statistics were gathered on this application.	S18 Revise DA '17 based on feedback from F17 implementation feedback S18 Continue Reliability and Validity process F18 "Final" DA '17 implemented across courses	on campus and in field. Revisions from initial data and user feedback made by Spring 2019.	
b. Provide training for Faculty, University Supervisors and Coordinating Teachers to ensure reliability across all courses and practicums where the disposition assessment is used.	No training provided around use of Pro-05. No reliability established in use.	Discussions took place during the development of the DA '17 to determine the best ways to be able conduct training for all users to ensure reliability of use.	SY 17-18 Webinar will be developed showing how to rate student actions consistently. SY 17-18 System for recording that all users of the assessment have viewed and understand how to use the instrument.	Training materials for use with the DA '17 developed and used for training of faculty, University Supervisors and Cooperating teachers to establish reliability (no later than Spring 2018).	Document ed yearly training for implemen tation and scoring of dispositio n assessme nt.
c. Continue refining the ST-11 to ensure consistent reliable implementati on, and scoring.	Initial sessions held in Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 to begin revision process as well as establish reliability of instrument.	Feedback from supervisor sessions was compiled as comments with revised formatting suggested by supervisors and faculty. Currently posted for additional feedback and	F17 Review ST-11 rubric- any changes that are voted on/decided will be made accordingly and used in subsequent semesters	Scheduled, 1 time per semester training for implementati on and scoring of ST-11 assessment. On-line scoring supports developed for	Scheduled , 1 time per semester training for implemen tation and scoring of ST-11 assessme nt to

		comments Summer 2017		cooperating teacher use.	maintain reliability.
d. Develop electronic portfolios that reflect both overall and specialty area program criteria	Review of current Portfolio and ePortfolio implementation across program areas began Fall 2016 as well as formation of committee to review ePortfolio options.		F17 move to standardize portfolio content and format (housed in TK20?) across advisors and programs--kept to simple unit-wide juncture requirements. Program specific criteria to be added as needed by specialization coordinators	Implementation of common ePortfolio by 2018-2019 school year. Collect data and feedback for necessary revision moving forward.	Systematic implementation of ePortfolio across all program areas with data collected and analyzed annually as per the Data Analysis Calendar (See Goal 1).
e. Examine feasibility of using the State Teacher Evaluation and other measures of teacher quality (value-added) to verify the quality of our completers impacting P-12 learners.	Beyond the survey given once students complete their programs, no significant follow up with completers occurs and none that specifically verifies the quality of their impact on P-12 learners	The PEUC discussed several options for addressing Standard 4's requirement to measure completer success and quality, ultimately generating a plan (included in SSR) to be implemented beginning F17. The PEUC recognized that other measures needed to be considered and acquired.	EPPs across the state of West Virginia are meeting to examine and address the need for effective and authentic measures of teacher quality to verify the quality of completers from their programs. Shepherd University will continue to engage in these discussions with other EPPs and the WV DOE regarding the use of the State Teacher Evaluation, access to teacher Value-added data, and the development of other state-wide	Dependent upon results of SU and state-wide EPPs work with the state department of education to develop system to access and use teacher evaluation data in a meaningful way.	

			measures to verify the quality of completers impact on P-12 learners		

Goal 4: Revise EPP publications to develop consistency of format, language, policy and accuracy to ensure compliance with accreditation and federal and/or state policy.					
Strategy	**Measure and Baseline Data Prior to Fall 2016**	**Progress since F16**	**Plan for SY 17-18 & F18**	**Mid-Point Goal** **Spring 2019**	**Final Year Goal** **Spring 2023**
a. Update Specialization Area Handbooks to reflect current course progression and align expectations across programs.	Each Specialization Area has its own handbook, with each being revised and updated independently, thereby reflecting different styles and iterations of policies, procedures, and course alignment.		F17 Develop template (electronic?) to have consistency across specialization handbooks (1st half of handbook should be identical across programs - common information) then specific program area content reflective of that program requirements S18 By end of semester all program area documents reflect same format and common content	All Specialization Area Handbooks to be reviewed by the PEUC and updated to reflect the most current and accurate policies, procedures, and course requirements.	Annual review and update of PEUC level information of all handbooks concurrently.
b. Consolidate all PEUC documentation into a single manual (policy, assessment, and practicum	Separate PEUC manuals exist for different aspects of the program. These separate manuals have not been updated or	Identified all forms, documents, and manuals needed to be included PEUC Policy Manual	F17 Manuals will be posted on DOE webpage with easy to click link. F17 Review and revise content as needed	Revision (as needed) and consolidation of all aspects of PEUC manuals by Spring 2018. Indexing and cross-referencing	Annual review of Consolidated PEUC handbook to assess for accuracy and usability.

manuals merged into one, with indexing and cross-referencing.)	revised in a consistent manner for the past 5 – 7 years. No indexing or cross-referencing exists.	PEUC Practicum Manual Proposed changes to Practicum Manual have been posted to PEUC/EPPC for summer review with changes to be voted on fall 2017 PEUC Assessment Manual		completed by Spring 2019.	