



**Department of Education
College of Professional studies**

**CAEP Formative Feedback Report
Addendum**

Concord University Addendum to CAEP Formative Feedback Report

Overview

Concord 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." Concerns were addressed through new data, a more complete explanation of existing data, and/or reference to the Self-Study Report. When possible, evidence is grouped into a combined document by topic.

Standard 1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Task 1: Admission Requirements: Admission to the Teacher Education Program application admission requirements state "Candidates must complete 100 hours of documented field experience working with school age children/youth in organized settings prior to admission to the Teacher Education Program." This differs from the description in the Concord University Department of Education Clinical Experiences handbook that states 75 hours must be completed.

Response:

Minutes from the April 26, 2019 Department of Education meeting (See 1-1 Department Minutes) state that the number of "volunteer" field experience hours required for admission to the Teacher Education Program (TEP) were reduced from 100 to 75 clock hours. The application now reflects this change, which was not caught during the process. Minutes from the Department Meeting (4/26/19) and the updated TEP application are included as evidence.

The rationale for the change of hours was predicated on the increased number of field experience hours for all teacher candidates when the Department adopted the year-long residency model at the undergraduate level. Candidates in the professional block semester of the year-long residency, complete a minimum of 400 hours in the classroom under the direction of a licensed teacher. West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE) Policy 5100 Approval of Educator Preparation Programs (See 1-2 WVDE Policy 5100) requires that all teacher education candidates have a minimum of 125 field experience hours prior to the student teaching clinical experience. The reduction from 100 hours to 75 hours prior to admission to the program gives all candidates a total of 150 field experience hours (75 "volunteer hours" and 75 total hours from Clinical Experiences I, II, and III) (See 1-3 Updated TEP Application).

Task 2: STOT Plan: Is there additional data available after the full implementation? Any significant findings based on the pilot and full implementation data? Is there evidence of public school partner involvement in the selection of this instrument? What work has been done on IRR? What is the target score? What happens if a candidate does not read the target score in one or more areas? Given

that the STOT will be used at multiple levels of candidate progression, how will the data be aggregated/disaggregated?

Response:

In the evidence provided in the SSR, the STOT (See 1-4 STOT Plan) was piloted during the S2019 semester. University Supervisors were trained on the use of the STOT and reported that they found it to be a much more useful tool than what had previously been used (Concord University Student Teaching Final). The STOT was piloted during S2019 with 10 student teachers, six elementary and four secondary. All were undergraduate initial candidates. For InTASC 1 and 2 which evaluate candidates' knowledge of learner development and learning differences, the pilot group had overall means of 2.51 and 2.28 out of 4. Standards 4 and 5 assesses candidates' content knowledge and application of content knowledge. The pilot group had overall means of 2.2 evaluate candidates' professional learning, leadership, and collaboration. The overall means for these standards were 2.28 and 2.23. These means indicate that candidates perform at the Emerging and Proficient levels which are the expected levels of performance (S2019 STOT DATA). (SSR pp. 13-14)

The STOT was fully implemented during the F2019 semester with 31 student teachers both undergraduate (22) and MAT (9) initial candidates. A listing of student teachers sorted by undergraduate and MAT, and by content program area is provided in the evidence. The average overall (Standards 1-10) rating of the 10 pilot candidates (S2019) was 2.26, and for undergraduate candidates F2019, the average overall rating was 3.05; for MAT candidates – 3.25; and for all initial candidates – 3.15. Per content program the average overall rating for undergraduate candidates during F2019 increased when compared to the pilot group. Overall rating performance within each of the 10 INTASC Standards for all candidates during F2019 were in the proficient range (3.06 to 3.20). At this point, the EPP feels that it is too soon to identify significant findings. There certainly are multiple factors to explore. The target score for the STOT is “Emerging – 2,” which means that the initial candidate must have an average overall score of 2.00 or above. However, the candidate cannot have a score of “Underdeveloped -1” on any element within any of the 10 INTASC Standards. If this is the case, then the candidate would not successfully complete student teaching and would be required to repeat the experience following a plan of improvement for professional growth and development. Reviewing the data for F2019, all candidates met this requirement and completed the program. The EPP did note that overall performance within each Standard for F2019 was higher than the pilot group in S2019 which were all in the “Emerging-2” range (2.11 – 2.30). Possible causes for this could be that the University Supervisors were more familiar with the instrument and were more experienced in identifying behaviors reflected in the rubric. The EPP plans to continue to train University Supervisors and explore ways to improve IRR.

During the fall 2018 semester, the EPP began exploring the adoption of the STOT as a key assessment of candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions during the student teaching clinical experience. On February 13, 2019 (1-5 Webinar Email), the EPP

participated in a webinar, Examining the Reliability and Validity of Teacher Candidate Evaluation Instruments. This webinar presented the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards, which require that educator preparation programs use evaluation instruments with evidence of reliability and validity. The presenters shared examples of methods used to examine and ensure the reliability and validity of a sample of widely administered teacher candidate evaluation instruments. One of these evaluation instruments was the STOT (Webinar email). Following this webinar, the EPP decided to pilot the STOT with ten student teachers who were being supervised by three University Supervisors. These three University Supervisors were trained on the use of the STOT using the protocol developed by the North Dakota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (NDACTE). (See webpage <https://ndacte.org/stot-presentation-caep-march-2017/>). According to NDACTE, “the training is offered to increase interrater reliability and accuracy in scoring.”

In March 2019 (See 1-6 C-TEC/C-PAC Minutes), during teacher/principal advisory groups assisted the EPP in designing the new evaluations for Levels I-IV field experiences and student teaching for initial candidates. (See minutes of meeting). During this meeting the STOT was presented and was compared to field experience and student teaching evaluations that were currently being used. Mentors of teacher candidates completing early field experiences had voiced concerns for a number of semesters citing the inconsistencies between the field experience requirements and the evaluation tool which was based on the West Virginia Professional Teaching Standards. During this meeting the advisory group supported the change in the student teaching final to the STOT, and assisted in the creation of the early field experience evaluations for Levels I-III, which identified INTASC Standards and candidate actions that were appropriate for each level. The STOT Plan presented in the SSR outlined the process for the selection of the STOT and the involvement of advisory groups.

Continuing with the STOT Plan, with the fall 2019 full implementation of the STOT, all University Supervisors are required to complete the STOT training modules and to submit certificates of completion to the EPP. In addition to the training modules for use of the STOT provided by the NDACTE, the EPP plans to share information with University Supervisors needed to review the use of the STOT for evaluation of student teachers.

As a part of the year-long residency model, teacher candidates are placed in the classroom with mentor teachers for no less than 400 hours the semester prior to student teaching. This semester is informally called the professional block semester. During this time, the teacher candidate is observed and is evaluated by a University Supervisor who is trained in the use of the STOT. At the completion of the block field experience which is not less than 400 hours in a classroom under the direction of a licensed mentor teacher, the University Supervisor, the mentor teacher, and the candidate discuss the candidate’s performance based on the University Supervisor’s observations and STOT evaluation, and the mentor’s observations and WVERT evaluation of the candidate. Based on this review, the candidate develops a plan of action for professional growth and development, by establishing two learning goals based on INTASC Standards, and five action steps to

achieve the learning goal. The plan of action for each learning goal is housed in LiveText, and the University Supervisor works with the candidate during the student teaching experience to monitor the candidate's progress in attaining the two learning goals. This experience provides the University Supervisor with a fuller picture of the student teacher and assists the University Supervisor in the STOT evaluation of the student teacher. It also serves as a scaffolding approach to helping student teachers improve in areas that are less than "emerging."

In addition to the STOT used during the professional block field experience and the student teaching clinical experience, which are identical and include all 10 INTASC Standards, variations of the STOT which were developed collaboratively with public school teachers and administrators, are used in Clinical Experiences I, II, and III. The following excerpt from the SSR identifies the INTASC Standards that are assessed in each level of clinical (early-field) experience. In the SSR it was stated, "During the Level I field experience, candidates observe students and assist the mentor teacher in various teaching responsibilities. InTASC Standards 1, 3, and 9 are emphasized in course discussions and are used to assess candidate performance. The next courses taken are EDUC 301 and EDUC 305. These courses are taught on-site at two elementary schools and two middle schools, and course professors supervise and assess candidates while in the public school classrooms. In the Level II field experience, Candidates are required to plan and teach two lessons through collaboration with the mentor teachers. InTASC Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 9 are used to assess candidate performance. Next, candidates complete EDUC 306 along with the Level III field experience. Candidates are assessed on InTASC Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9. Candidates are expected to create and teach engaging, developmentally appropriate lessons that are based on contextual factors, WV content standards, and include research based instructional strategies."

The purpose of the variants of the STOT is to provide a more vibrant portrait of teacher candidates as the progress through the program. These serve as course assessments, but also serve to provide the EPP with a better understanding of candidate growth and progress. With the implementation of these field evaluations based on the STOT, the EPP will be able to track and monitor candidates' progress within each InTASC Standard, specifically identifying where they are within a range of "underdeveloped," "emerging," to possible proficient actions and behaviors. Although a score of "underdeveloped" does not keep a candidate from progressing to the next level of field experiences, the candidate will be expected to have no "underdeveloped" actions or behaviors by the completion of the capstone, student teaching experience. Candidates who repeatedly show "underdeveloped" actions and behaviors will be reviewed by the Admission/Dismissal/Retention Committee. At this time, the EPP is gathering the data from each leveled field experience. This data will be aggregated and disaggregated by clinical level, program, and individual candidate, and shared with the EPP and its stakeholder groups beginning S2020.

Task 3: Validity & Reliability of Proprietary Assessments. Is there validity and reliability evidence available on the WVTPA, mini-TPA, STOT, WVERT, and the EDA (IRR only on EDA)?

Response:

The EPP believes that for an assessment to provide valid and reliable data, it must be aligned to standards and instruction (Long and Benson, 1998, La Marca, 2000). Because of this, all assessments are aligned to one or more of the following standards: InTASC, WV Professional Teaching Standards, EPP's Conceptual Framework, SPA Standards, and ISTE Standards. All professional education coursework, is aligned to those same standards, plus Praxis objectives and CAEP standards.

The following items are included as evidence regarding the validity and reliability of proprietary assessments. West Virginia Teacher Performance Assessment (WVTPA): 1-7 Development and Implementation of the WV Teacher Performance Assessment; EPP 1-8 Reliability Studies for WVTPA. Student Teacher Observation Tool (STOT): 1-9 Validation Study for the Student Teacher Observation (ND Common Metrics Project); 1-10 Certificates for University Supervisors completion of STOT training. West Virginia Evaluation Rubrics for Teachers: 1-11 West Virginia Educator Evaluation System for Teachers; 1-12 West Virginia Revised Educator Evaluation System for Teachers 2011-2012 First Year Pilot Report. Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA): 1-13 EDA Technical Guide; 1-14 EDA Calibration Training Certificates.

Task 4: Mini-TPA. Clarify when reported mini-TPA data was collected, and if it is tied to the same candidates that completed the WVTPA in Spring 2019. Clarify the difference between the WVTPA and the Mini-TPA. If there are changes made to the WVTPA (portions deleted, etc.) have there been validity/reliability studies done on the Mini-TPA?

Response:

During the 2017-18 academic year, the EPP examined the professional education core classes required of all teacher candidates. As a part of this review, the assessment course that was originally part of a three course sequence known as EPAT, Educational Psychology, Assessment, and Technology – EDUC 305, EDUC 310, and EDUC 301. Candidates usually took this course during their second semester sophomore year or their first semester junior year. During the 2016-17 academic year, Concord was one of the twelve institutions in West Virginia to pilot the West Virginia Teacher Performance Assessment (WVTPA). The WVTPA is aligned to WV Professional Teaching Standards (WVPTS), InTASC, and CAEP standards. It has 7 tasks: 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. Ratings on the WVTPA are: Unsatisfactory, Emerging, Accomplished, and Distinguished. Candidates complete the WVTPA during the first placement and must receive a score of Emerging on every indicator. Candidates that are not successful must address unsatisfactory areas of the WVTPA and submit these for review. If the candidate is unable to score Emerging on every indicator, the candidate does not graduate and must pass the WVTPA by repeating the student teaching experience. Since the WVTPA was a high-stakes assessment, the EPP conducted seminars during the student teaching semester during the 2016-17 and 2017-18 academic years to introduce the WVTPA and to scaffold

candidates through the process. In order to prepare candidates for the rigors of the WVTPA more effectively and efficiently, the EPP moved the assessment course out of the EPAT courses and created a new course, EDUC 416, Assessment and the Data Informed Teacher. This course was designed to expand candidates' understanding of assessment as a tool to measure learning and to promote learning. Since understanding assessment is key to a successful WVTPA, the course prepares candidates to use classroom assessment, both formative and summative, and formal and informal, to improve both teaching and student learning. EDUC 416 was placed in the professional semester the semester prior to the student teaching semester. The professional block semester included a field experience with significant classroom presences that would allow the candidate to use their knowledge of assessment in the classroom and to gather examine data similar to the plan of the WVTPA.

EDUC 416 was first piloted during the spring 2019 semester during the elementary professional block. These were the twelve elementary candidates identified and referenced in the SSR cited above. During this pilot, the mini-TPA was comprised of Tasks 1-5 of the WVTPA. These twelve elementary candidates were the first candidates to pilot the mini-TPA. The data that is cited compares the twelve elementary candidates' performance on Tasks 1-5 of the WVTPA during the fall 2019 student teaching semester to the other candidates who completed student teaching during fall 2019, but who did not complete a mini-TPA the semester prior to student teaching.

Beginning with the fall 2019, all teacher candidates, elementary and secondary, complete a professional block semester prior to the student teaching semester. The EPP now has data on candidate performance on the mini-TPA that was completed during fall 2019. This data will be compared to their performances on the WVTPA during the spring 2020.

The mini-TPA is a course evaluation, implemented and graded in EDUC 416. It does not function in the same way as other key assessments in the undergraduate teacher education program function. Undergraduate candidates must successfully complete EDUC 416, as well as other professional block courses, with a grade of "C" or better in order to be admitted to the student teaching semester. The mini-TPA is an assignment in EDUC 416 and is completed during the extensive 400 hour field experience that is part of the year-long residency model. The course instructor grades the mini-TPA. Unlike the WVTPA, the candidate can score less than Emerging on any of the indicators; however, an overall score must be achieved for the candidate to successfully complete the course evaluation and to pass the course.

The mini-TPA is designed to be a reduced version of the WVTPA in that the amount of data that must be collected in the WVTPA is reduced for mini-TPA. During the pilot semester, candidates were assigned Tasks 1-5 of the WVTPA as the assignment. During the spring 2019 semester, the EPP revised and updated the mini-TPA to include all seven tasks of the WVTPA. The plan for the mini-TPA that was adopted for EDUC 416 is included in the list of evidence in this addendum. The rubric that is used to assess the mini-TPA is the same rubric that is used to assess the WVTPA. The validity study on the WVTPA that is included in this addendum supports the validity of the mini-TPA. The

course instructors for both the elementary and secondary EDUC 416 courses grade the mini-TPA following the same guidelines that are used for the WVTPA. These course instructors participate in the reliability study that is required each year by the WVTPA. All members of the EPP who assess the WVTPA during the academic year, must participate in the evaluation of a sample WVTPA obtained from another IHE. Members score the WVTPA and submit their scores for consensus. The results of the 2019-2020 reliability study for the WVTPA are included as evidence in this addendum (See 1-15 WVTPA 2019-20 EPP Reliability and 1-16 Concord EPP Validity and Reliability of Assessments).

Task 5: WVTPA. SSR Clarification - "Task 1.3 focuses on the candidates' ability to identify individual student factors and identify implications for teaching students based on these factors. Candidates have an overall mean score of 2.43. On Task 2.1 candidates are evaluated on how well they align their learning goals to state and national standards. The overall mean is 2.5. Task 4.3 evaluates the candidates' use of a variety of research-based, high-leverage strategies. The overall mean is 2.48. Task 4.5 evaluates the candidates' ability to differentiate instruction. The overall mean is 2.28. Task 7 examines professional responsibilities of reflection, collaboration, and professional learning for growth and improvement. The overall mean is 2.48. Candidate scores have improved from the first use of the WVTPA. The overall mean for all tasks during S2019 is 2.6" What data set are these numbers referring to? They do not seem to be reflected in the All Content Areas Chart, except for the overall score of 2.6. How does the mini-TPA differ from the WVTPA? Who scores this instrument? Is IRR ensured?

Response:

The data that is presented in the excerpt from the SSR is an overall mean of all candidates who completed the WVTPA during the F2017-S2019 semesters. This data was hand calculated and was not presented in a separate chart. Each semester overall means are calculated for each of the tasks in the WVTPA for all candidates completing student teaching, both undergraduate and MAT. Overall means are also collected by program content areas, both undergraduate and MAT. In the data was supplied for the SSR for the WVTPA the data represents aggregated data of all candidates completing student teaching by semester. The WVTPA data was disaggregated by program content areas; however, it was not disaggregated within these content program areas by undergraduate and MAT candidates. Undergraduate candidates and MAT candidates both complete the WVTPA during the student teaching experience. Disaggregated data for these two degrees have been examined, since MAT candidates are identified by name and degree. Still, to assist our stakeholders in distinguishing the data, disaggregation of WVTPA data for undergraduate candidates and MAT candidates has been completed for data from F2019.

The distinction between the mini-TPA and the WVTPA has been presented in Task 4 above. Only undergraduate candidates complete the mini-TPA. Graduate candidates are provided online resources to assist them in the completion of the WVTPA. EPP faculty members score the mini-TPA and the WVTPA. The EDUC 416 course professors

(elementary and secondary) score the mini-TPA, and EPP faculty members who have participated in the IRR study for the academic year score the WVTPA for candidates completing student teaching each semester. Typically, each faculty member scores 2 to 3 WVTPAs per semester. The following passage from the document, “Development and Implementation of the WV Teacher Performance Assessment” identifies the plan for IRR. “On October 20, 2016, inter-rater reliability training was conducted. Additionally, participating IHEs were required to sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the WVHEPC in order to use the WVTPA. As part of that agreement, each participating IHE was expected to participate in a state-wide inter-rater reliability training using the WV TPA, as well as complete inter-rater reliability training at each institution.” Documentation of this training is provided in the evidence for this task.

Task 6: Data. Is there any updated data on currently used, recently adopted, or piloted instruments? All of the data you provide includes undergraduate and graduate programs aggregated. I assume that the graduate programs are the MAT counterpart to the undergrad. What is the rationale for only providing this data aggregated when they are two separate programs?

Response:

Updated data for the undergraduate program is provided from F2019 for the following key assessments: 1-17 Praxis I Core Academic Skills for Educators; 1-18 Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA); 1-19 STOT Field Experience Evaluations; 1-20 Teacher Candidate Portfolio; 1-21 TPACK Lesson Integration, 1-22 ProEthica; 1-23 PLT; 1-24 Praxis II Subject Assessments; 1-25 STOT; 1-26 WVTPA; 1-27 WVERT; 1-28 TPACK Observation Instrument; and 1-29 Student Teacher EDA

Updated data for the MAT program is provided from F2019 for the following key assessments: See: 1-17 Praxis I Core Academic Skills for Educators; 1-18 Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA); Field Experience Evaluations; 1-23 PLT; 1-24 Praxis II Subject Assessments; ProEthica; 1-30 STOT; 1-31 WVTPA; 1-32 WVERT; and 133 EDA.

The data that was provided in the SSR did include aggregated data of the undergraduate and MAT programs. However, the EPP does disaggregate data between undergraduate and MAT. Data from the different Pathways is housed in two locations; however, data from the student teaching semester is all submitted in LiveText. Reports from LiveText were disaggregated by content program areas. When the EPP views these reports MAT candidates are identified within their content program areas. The EPP does look at disaggregated data. This was our error in not providing the data in the SSR in this format. Data from F2019 is disaggregated by undergraduate and MAT.

Task 7: WVERT. What happens if candidates score below the target? How are the scores for Standard 7 used in data review as they are not reflected in the SSR?

Response:

The WVERT is comprised of seven standards: 1 Curriculum and Planning, 2 The Learner and the Learning Environment, 3 Teaching, 4 Professional Responsibilities for Self-Renewal, 5 Professional Responsibilities for School and Community, 6 Student Learning, and 7 Professional Conduct. Ratings on the WVERT Rubric are: Unsatisfactory, Emerging, Accomplished, and Distinguished. A rating of Emerging is required on each indicator on Standards 1-6. If candidates do not achieve the required score on each indicator, then the candidate does not successfully complete student teaching.

Candidates are provided copies of the WVERT during orientation seminars for the student teaching semester. Candidates are also informed of the required ratings for each indicator. During the student teaching semester, mentor teachers monitor candidates' performances on each of the indicators and conference with them at mid-placement. As with the STOT, if candidates are not meeting WVERT standards at mid-placement, they must address these through a plan of action. Since the first implementation of the WVERT, mean scores for student teachers were all between Emerging and Accomplished for all indicators, Standards 1-6.

Standard 7 of the WVERT assesses the professional conduct of the student teacher. Initially, the EPP decided that Standard 7 would be used by University Supervisors who complete the Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA), and that the dispositions reflected in Standard 7 were assessed by the EDA. Since that first use of the WVERT, the EPP has decided to include the data from Standard 7 of the WVERT. Currently, both at standard and below standard are accepted as meeting the Standard. This decision is being monitored since only one candidate scored below standard during F2019.

Task 8: STOT/WVERT: Is there documentation of University Supervisor Training? Are there plans to ensure IRR when new University Supervisors are hired? Do mentor teachers receive formal training on how to use the WVERT as an evaluator instead of a person being evaluated?

Response:

All University Supervisors must complete the online training modules provided by the North Dakota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (NDACTE). According to the NDACTE, "The training is offered to increase interrater reliability and accuracy in scoring. The training begins with information on preventing bias and using evidence for rating. It then moves through three tasks. If the rater is off more than a ½ point from the expert panel, they are encouraged to review the bias prevention information." After completing the training, NDACTE sends the University Supervisor a certificate of training, and the EPP keeps these on file. Any new University Supervisor hired will be required to complete the training.

At this time, mentor teachers do not complete training on how to use the WVERT other than being familiar with the instrument as a tool by which they are evaluated. The plan for the WVERT does outline the depth to which teachers become familiar with the WVERT. There are three levels of implementation: initial, intermediate, and advanced. The following is an excerpt from the manual:

At the beginning of the evaluation year, the principal assigns all teachers, including both classroom teachers and specialists, to one of three progressions for evaluation purposes. The Initial progression provides educators multiple opportunities to demonstrate what they know and do best during the first three years of their professional teaching careers.

Educators on the Initial progression will meet with their evaluators to assess effective instruction through four observations. Two of the observations are scheduled with educators. Educators in the Initial progression will likewise benefit from consistent constructive feedback on evidence they submit throughout the evaluation cycle. Professional development and support, as part of induction, are required for educators on the Initial progression whose performance is evaluated as emerging on a single element.

The Intermediate progression focuses on educators who are in either the fourth or fifth years of their teaching careers who have demonstrated professional progress.

Evaluators, in this progression, will collect professional teaching performance data through evidence submissions and two observations. One of the two observations is scheduled with educators.

The Advanced progression offers experienced educators the opportunity to participate in a self-reflection process through which they will also provide evidence of their success.

In the Intermediate and Advanced progressions, emerging performance is addressed at the school and district level. Quality sustained job-embedded professional development should be available to any educator who seeks to improve practice.

Professional development resources, including online tools and other media, are accessible to all West Virginia educators as part of the comprehensive system of support developed by counties.

Recommendations from the WVERT Pilot Study Review included: *Provide similar [extensive and ongoing] support for educators by incorporating training on the new evaluation system as a requirement for all teachers and as part of the new teacher induction process within each county.*

Mentor teachers also have access to WVDE Policy 5310 Performance Evaluation of School Personnel that describes the teacher evaluation system in WV and how the WVERT is used within that process. The EPP strongly believes that this training and familiarity with the WVERT provides mentor teachers with the skills need to be reliable evaluators of student teachers and their abilities to meet WV Professional Teaching and InTASC Standards.

Task 9: EDA. What is the target score? Which chart corresponds to the candidates applying for admission and the student teachers? Please clarify who scores candidates at each administration of this instrument.

Response:

The Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA) is administered prior to admission to the teacher education program and full admission to the MAT Program. As stated in the SSR, Candidates are introduced to the Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA) and procedures for assessing dispositions during EDUC 210/EDUC 505 and the professional seminar required for admission to the teacher education program. Candidate dispositions are assessed at Admission to the teacher education program, admission to the yearlong residency block semester (undergraduate candidates only), admission to the yearlong residency student teaching semester, and during the student teaching semester. The EDA can also be used by EPP faculty to address undesired professional behaviors during any field experience and/or participation in professional core class, or to share professional insight regarding the disposition of the candidate. EDA data is housed in Watermark (LiveText) and is easily disaggregated to identify underlying patterns of behavior at the individual and program levels. The Admission, Retention, and Dismissal /Candidate Performance (ARD/CP) Committee which is comprised of EPP faculty is assembled to discuss and recommend courses of action in cases of candidates who fail to meet program admission requirements, or to progress once in the program at an acceptable level on Critical Performance Assessment Tasks as documented on the rubric.

EPP faculty assess the candidates at admission to the Teacher Education Program (TEP). Course professors in EDUC 210, EDSP 303, and EDUC 505 who have completed the calibration training for the EDA provided by Watermark score candidates. The target score for candidates at this Pathway is “Developing;” however, candidates can be admitted to the TEP with scores of “Needs Improvement” as long as a plan of action for improvement has been presented to the ARD/CP Committee. The EDUC 306 course professor(s) score the EDA for enrolled candidates prior to admission to the professional block semester. At this point, candidates are expected to score “Developing” on all nine dispositions. Course professors in the professional block semester score the EDA for candidates enrolled in the yearlong residency during the semester prior to student teaching. Scores of “Developing” are accepted for admission to student teaching; however, candidate dispositions during student teaching are expected to be “Meets Expectations. Student teachers’ EDA is scored by the University Supervisor who has also completed the Watermark calibration training. The University Supervisor monitors the student teacher carefully during student teaching to see that the nine dispositions are being successfully addressed and are being attained. All scored EDAs are submitted and housed in LiveText. Candidate receive copies and appropriate feedback at each Pathway. Data is systematically reviewed and shared with stakeholders. See the attached EDA Plan.

Task 10: PRAXIS Data. “The SSR states ‘The EPP has a 100% pass rate as reported in the institution’s Title II Reports’ when it comes to the PLT and Subject Assessments.” The data provided reflect several pass rates lower than 100% (Spanish being 50%). Please clarify the data reflected in the PRAXIS data chart.

Response:

WVDE Policy 5100 states, “Candidates for completion of a WVBE approved program shall be required to meet WVBE Praxis II specialty area test score(s) indicated for the

anticipated specialization(s),” and “Candidates for completion of a WVBE approved program shall be required to meet WVBE Praxis II specialty area test score(s) indicated for the anticipated specialization(s).” Additionally, Policy 5100 states, “Effective July 1, 2017, candidates shall obtain passing scores on grade-level appropriate, WVBE-adopted Praxis II content test(s) as described in the West Virginia Licensure Testing Directory of this policy in order to enter the student teaching assignment/clinical experience component of the WVBE-approved program.” Concord’s EPP has required that candidates pass Praxis PLT and Subject Assessments prior to admission to student teaching for more than twenty years. Because all candidates must pass all Praxis tests before student teaching, the WVDE recognizes a 100% pass rate for program completers. However, to monitor candidate performance, the EPP tracks test-taker data. The PRAXIS data presented identifies pass rates above 98% for candidates taking the PLT on the first attempt. Also, as stated in the SSR, “A review of Praxis Subject Assessment trend data shows that candidates score at or above state and national means and the majority are successful upon first attempt.” For those candidates who are not successful after multiple attempts, Policy 5100 states, “EPPs shall have provisions for providing remediation/support for candidates after two unsuccessful attempts at passing any of the WVBE-required Praxis assessments.” The EPP has identified multiple resources to assist candidates, and provides individual counseling to help candidates make the best decisions concerning their progression in the program. Using the Spanish candidate that was noted as an example, after several unsuccessful attempts at passing the Praxis Spanish subject assessment required for certification and for admission to student teaching, the EPP worked with the candidate in finding a tutor, a recent Spanish completer, to work with the candidate in preparation for the test. During this time, the candidate was also working with the Director of Teacher Education to identify possible pathways to certification. Eventually the candidate completed the required courses for English 5-12 certification, passed the required Praxis subject assessment for this endorsement and was able to student teach and graduate. The candidate is still pursuing the Spanish certification and will be able to add this once the subject assessment is passed.

Task 11: SPAs. Are there updates on the resubmitted SPAs for Elementary Education, General Science, and Physical Education, and Health 5-9?

Response:

The Elementary Education SPA was submitted in S2019 and was recognized as meeting 2007 ACEI Standards. (See 1-34 Elementary SPA)

The General Science 5-Adult SPA was moved from “Recognized with Probation” to “Recognized with Conditions.” National Science Teacher Standards (NSTA) 1, 5, and 6 were met, but 2, 3, and 4 were met with conditions. Based on the SPA review, much improvement had been made to the program and the assessments; however, the program “needs strong evidence of candidates demonstrating proper chemical and materials safety (4a), use of safety procedures (4b), and ethical treatment of living organisms (4c) in P-12 classroom settings and in a manner appropriate for their area(s) of licensure,” and “improvement of the rubrics will make the report stronger.” The SPA review also stated, Review of reports using NSTA Standards has been discontinued as part of the CAEP

accreditation process. Programs that have conducted review using these standards can refer to the NSTA decision report they have received so far, while discussing evidence for CAEP Component 1.3 on the self-study report (SSR). Evidence of the program's efforts to address the remaining concerns may be provided on the self-study report and to the CAEP site team, as required, for CAEP accreditation purposes.” Revisions to the Assessments 3 and 7 which specifically address NSTA Standards, 2, 3, and 4 have been made; however, because of low enrollment in the General Science 5-Adult, no candidates have been assessed using these revised rubrics. At the completion of the S2020 semester, one teacher candidate will have completed Assessment 3, and if this candidate is admitted to the student teaching semester, the candidate will complete Assessment 7 at the end of F2020. (See 1-35 General Science SPA)

Both the Physical Education PreK-Adult and Health 5-Adult programs submitted SPAs during S2019 and F2019. However, NASPE and AAHE both professional organizations withdrew from CAEP SPA review and the accreditation process, and these SPAs were not reviewed. During that time, the West Virginia Department of Education provided a new Wellness PreK-Adult certification that combined the two programs. The EPP was granted permission to develop this program, and now Wellness PreK-Adult has replaced Physical Education PreK-Adult and Health Education 5-Adult. Candidates now will complete the program for the Wellness PreK-Adult certification. However, for the Wellness PreK-Adult program, two separate reports, Physical Education PreK-Adult and Health Education 5-Adult, are provided in Addendum Evidence. (See 1-36; 137 Physical Education PreK-Adult and Health Education 5-Adult reports)

Task 12: TPACK. What progress has been made on the plan components of TPACK Assessments?

Response:

As stated in the TPACK Plan (See 1-38), the TPACK Technology Integration Assessment Rubric was piloted with teacher candidates enrolled in EDUC 301 during the F2019 semester. The TPACK Technology Integration Assessment Rubric was integrated into the second lesson plan assignment and the first scoring of the rubric is provided in the Addendum Evidence. On a scale of 0-3 (Unsatisfactory-0, Emerging-1, Proficient-2, Distinguished-3), the overall mean for all candidates on all four indicators for technology integration was 2.38. Elementary majors, music majors and wellness majors had the highest overall means, 2.528, 2.583, and 3.00 respectively. English majors had the lowest overall mean, 1.900. The course professor of EDUC 301 scored the rubric. Student teachers were evaluated on integrating technology into a lesson which was observed and scored by the University Supervisor using the TPACK Technology Integration Assessment Rubric. On a scale of 1-4 (Unsatisfactory-1, Emerging-2, Proficient-3, Distinguished-4), the overall mean for undergraduate candidates was 3.34; for MAT candidates, 3.30. The data for individual majors is also provide in Addendum Evidence.

Standard A1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

A.1

In order to be unconditionally admitted to the advanced program, candidates must hold an undergraduate degree from a regionally-accredited institution with a minimum overall GPA of 2.5, submit a valid teaching license or be license-eligible to teach in P-12 schools, submit scores in the 50th percentile or above on either the Graduate Record Exam (GRE) or Miller Analogies Test (MAT), provide official undergraduate and graduate transcripts, submit two letters of recommendation including one letter from a principal, supervisor, or someone who has observed the applicant in the classroom, submit a completed GRIT application (prior to fall 2019) or have an Educational Leadership Disposition Assessment (EDLDA) completed by an Education faculty member beginning fall 2019 to the present.

Applicants to the M.Ed. program can be conditionally admitted to take up to nine credit hours following submission of a graduate application, the application fee, an official undergraduate transcript from a regionally-accredited higher education institution with a minimum overall GPA of 2.5, and a valid teaching license or evidence that the applicant is license-eligible to teach in P-12 schools. Conditionally admitted candidates must submit the remaining application materials in order to be approved to take credits beyond the ninth credit hour.

Applicants who do not meet the minimum requirements for admission to the M.Ed. are reviewed by the M.Ed. Coordinator and faculty representatives from each of the graduate programs (Educational Leadership, Reading Specialist, and Special Education). Typically, an applicant with GRE or MAT scores less than the 50th percentile is allowed to take 6 graduate credits to see how the student performs in graduate level courses. If the candidate performs favorably and earns at least a 3.0 GPA in the six graduate credit hours, the candidate is allowed to progress through the program provided all other admission and retention criteria are met.

As indicated in the QAS, data are collected and analyzed at five transition points in the M.Ed. program including admission to the University, admission to the program, admission to the internship/practicum, program completion, and follow-up of completers and employers. Data from each program (Educational Leadership and Supervision, Reading Specialist, and Special Education) at the advanced level are collected at the end of each semester and aggregated at the end of each academic year by content specializations. Summaries are shared with the EPP and appropriate councils/committees such as CTEC and CPAC.

M.Ed. Pathway				
Unconditional Admission to the University	Unconditional Admission to the M.Ed. Program	Admission to the Internship or Practicum	Program Completion	Following Graduation

Application; Official transcript documenting a Baccalaureate degree with a minimum GPA of 2.75; Valid teaching license or license-eligible	2 letters of recommendation; GRE or MAT scores at the 50 th percentile or above Note: Sub-scores below the 50 th percentile will be reviewed by the Graduate Faculty and M.Ed. Coordinator. Applicants who have completed a master's degree from an accredited institution of higher education are exempt from taking and submitting GRE/MAT scores.); Grit Scale or EDLDA	Overall GPA of 3.0 and have earned a "C" or better in all graduate coursework; Successful completion of at least 24 hours of coursework; ProEthica Foundations for Leaders	Overall GPA of 3.0 and have earned a "C" or better in all graduate coursework; Grit Scale or EDLDA	Follow-up Survey of Graduates; Supervisor/Employer Survey; Selected Case Studies
---	--	--	--	--

A.1.1

As indicated in our mission statement, the EPP is committed to extending and enhancing the knowledge base of all teachers and other school personnel. All candidates enrolled in the advanced programs at CU must complete 36 semester hours of graduate coursework including 12 hours of professional education core (EDUC 510, 520, 530, and 540), 21 hours of content specific coursework in one of three content specializations (EDEL, RDNG, and SPED) that includes an internship/practicum, and a 3-hour capstone action research in their field of study for a total of 24 hours of content. The EDEL and RDNG programs lead to advanced certification for teachers and include an intensive internship or practicum experience as part of the 24 hours of content. The SPED program may lead to endorsements in special education K-5 and 6-Adult if the teacher is not already certified in special education.

The EDEL program includes a 215-hour internship experience spread over 6 continuous months in elementary, middle, and high school settings, the RDNG program includes a 6 credit-hour reading practicum working with P-12 students during the summer, and the SPED program includes two, 25-hour practicum experiences working in inclusive general education classrooms. During these experiences, candidates demonstrate their knowledge of instructional strategies, depth of content, and the facilitation of P-12 student learning.

Additionally, these experiences require that candidates demonstrate mentoring and leadership, as well as an in-depth understanding of students and the contexts in which they learn.

Faculty in the advanced program work with P-12 teachers/administrators to design, deliver and evaluate field/clinical practice so that advanced candidates can refine the requisite knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn. Faculty, the Coordinator of Clinical Experiences, and the M.Ed. Coordinator work cooperatively with P-12 colleagues to identify and place advanced candidates in appropriate early field experiences and internships at the elementary, middle, and secondary level in the EDEL program. Candidates in the Reading Specialist and Special Education programs use their own classrooms whenever possible to work with P-12 students and complete clinical experiences. Additionally, candidates in the Reading Specialist program also complete a summer practicum working with P-12 students.

Even though the Reading Specialist and Special Education candidates use their own classrooms whenever possible for clinical experiences, the EPP tracks the P-12 placements for advanced candidates in LiveText to ensure that all candidates have appropriate field experiences and/or internships/practicums, as well as ensure candidates have diverse experiences working with diverse P-12 students (See A1.1-9 EDEL 550 & 560 School Diversity Chart for Internship Placements).

Internship and practicum experiences in the advanced program are intentionally designed to enable advanced candidates to refine, hone and reflect on their content, professional, and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as well as their use of technology. The assignments/tasks associated with each of the field/clinical experiences in the advanced program are aligned with the WV Professional Teaching Standards, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, the ISTE Standards for Teachers, the Specialized Professional Association Standards including the ELCC, ILA and the CEC, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (See A1.1 -1 Advanced Program NBPST, Diversity and Technology Chart, A1.1 – 2 Advanced Program Crosswalk of Standards for EDEL Program, A 1.1-3-Advanced Program Crosswalk of Standards for Reading Specialist Program, A1.1-4-Advanced Program Crosswalk of Standards for Special Education Program).

The assignments/tasks associated with coursework and internship/practicum experiences require that advanced candidates interact with diverse P-12 students, teachers, families of students, administrators, and University faculty/supervisors, as well as with their peers. In addition to the data collected at each pathway, the SPA reports and other sources of evidence such as samples of candidate work provide multiple examples of the opportunities that advance candidates have to reflect on and justify their practice, as well as deliver/participate in PD opportunities. Additionally, all advance candidates complete a capstone action research project that requires that the candidates synthesize educational theory and practice in their area of specialization to improve teaching and learning. Finally, the follow-up graduate surveys, supervisor/employer surveys, and the case

studies provide additional evidence that graduates of the M.Ed. program are knowledgeable, competent professionals.

The M.Ed. program utilizes four proprietary key assessments including the GRE or MAT, PRAXIS II Content Assessments for Principal/Supervisors, Reading Specialists, and Special Education, ProEthica Foundations for Leaders, and the GRIT Assessment and/or the EDLDA. As indicated in the SSR, advanced candidates have completed the GRIT Assessment at program admission and completion prior to fall 2019. Beginning in fall 2019, the EPP piloted Watermark's EDLDA as a disposition assessment. Beginning spring 2020, all candidates will complete the EDLDA at admission to the M.Ed. program and at completion (See A1.1 - 5-Revised Pathway Assessment and Key Assessments Chart).

While each of the content specializations in the M.Ed. program have content specific assignments that require advanced candidates to demonstrate professional ethics, the EPP felt more information about candidates' applications of ethics could be beneficial.

Toward that end, the EPP developed a plan (See **Exhibit 62-Phase-In Plan for ProEthica Advanced Program**) to pilot and phase in the use of the Educational Testing Service's (ETS) *ProEthica Foundations*. The *ProEthica Foundations* was intended to be piloted with EDEL candidates in fall 2019. However, the EPP discovered that ETS also marketed *ProEthica Foundations for Leaders* and needed more time to research the instruments to ensure the appropriate instrument was chosen. Following research and input from CPAC, the EPP adopted *ProEthica Foundations for Leaders* as a key assessment for all three content specializations in the M.Ed. program beginning spring 2020. This assessment requires the advanced candidates to complete seven modules aligned with the Model Code of Ethics for Educators (MCEE) to provide proactive instruction in the application of professional ethics in daily decision making.

Score reports and data from the *ProEthica for Leaders* are sent to the EPP by ETS and are reviewed by EPP faculty and CPAC each semester and annually as indicated on the EPP's Data Review Timeline Schedule. See A1.1-6 –Advanced Program Key Assessment Validity and Reliability.

The EPP also monitors advanced candidates' course grades and overall GPAs at multiple transition points in the M.Ed. program. Candidates who earn less than a "C" in any graduate class must repeat the class and earn at least a grade of "C." Candidates' overall GPAs are also monitored and any candidate whose GPA falls below a 3.0 is placed on academic probation by the University. In this case, the candidate must raise the overall GPA to at least a 3.0 the following semester or be dismissed from the University and the M.Ed. program.

Advanced candidates seeking to add an endorsement in either Principalship/Supervision, Reading Specialist, and Multi-categorical K-6 and 5-Adult must take and meet WVBOE required scores on the respective PRAXIS II content assessment (See **Exhibit 63-Content Knowledge Exams M.Ed. Program Completers** for disaggregated and aggregated data.)

As noted in the SSR, the program does not require PRAXIS II scores for every candidate for a variety of reasons. Candidates in the Special Education program who achieve minimum passing scores on PRAXIS II receive a K-6 and 5-Adult endorsement in special education to add to their original teaching license. Some candidates in the Special Education content specialization already hold an initial license in special education and do not retake the PRAXIS II content exam. Instead, most of these candidates take autism classes that lead to an additional endorsement in Autism through the West Virginia Board of Education. Some M.Ed. completers use the advanced degree to further their knowledge and have no desire to leave the classroom as in the case of many elementary teachers in the Reading Specialist program. Thus, these teachers may choose not to take the PRAXIS exam since it is not required for graduation. Since Concord is located in the southernmost part of the state, some of our M.Ed. candidates live and work in Virginia and must take different PRAXIS II assessments than those required by the West Virginia Board of Education. Since these teachers' licenses are issued by another state and they need a different PRAXIS II assessment than those required for licensure by the West Virginia Board of Education, their scores are not sent to the EPP or reported.

A number of course assignments in the M.Ed. programs are specifically aligned with the respective SPA standards and provide evidence that the candidates in each content specialization have a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their content specialization to facilitate P-12 students' learning (See A1.1-8 A.1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge Chart). These assignments in combination with the key assessments utilized in the M.Ed. program enable candidates to demonstrate their deep knowledge of content and by program completion, that they can use professional specialty practices flexibly to advance the learning of all P-12 students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards. These data are triangulated by follow-up surveys of graduates and employers, as well as in the advanced completer case studies (See A1.1-7-Advanced Program Case Studies).

A.1.2

The Reading Specialist SPA report was submitted to the ILA in spring 2017 in preparation for the EPP's CAEP re-accreditation in 2019-2020. The Reading Specialist Program was recognized by the ILA through February 2028 (See A1.2-1 Advanced Program SPA Reports and Exhibits).

The Educational Leadership and Supervision Program submitted a SPA report to the ELCC/NELP in spring 2017. The Educational Leadership and Supervision Program was recognized with conditions until the program revised scoring rubrics addressing concerns with the lack of differentiation in performance indicators. The Educational Leadership and Supervision Program resubmitted the SPA report in fall 2018 with revised scoring rubrics and the program was "recognized" through February 2026 (See See A1.2-1 - Advanced Program SPA Reports and Exhibits).

As indicated in the SSR, the Special Education advanced program submitted a SPA report to the CEC in fall 2019. The EPP received the recognition decision of “further development required” just before the Addendum was submitted in February 2020 (See A1.2-1 -Advanced Program SPA Reports and Exhibits). In the two weeks since receiving the SPA decision, the special education faculty have already begun addressing the areas of concern. While all the advanced candidates (n=1) taking PRAXIS II- Education of Exceptional Students: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Application between spring 2018 and fall 2019 met minimum passing scores set by the West Virginia Board of Education, the SPA report did not report Subtest scores or disaggregate the data by standards. This was an easily corrected oversight as the EPP had the PRAXIS II scores and Subtest scores already disaggregated. The candidate had the highest sub-score in “Foundations and Professional Responsibilities” (CEC Standard 1, 3, & 6) and the lowest sub-score in “Planning and the Learning Environment (CEC Standard 2).” As indicated by the pie charts, this candidate still scored within the average range of scores nationally on the lowest sub-scores. This candidate scored above the average range of scores nationally on “Foundations and Professional Responsibilities” (CEC Standard 1, 3, & 6). (See A1.2-2 M.Ed. PRAXIS II Summary for SPED).

The SPA Recognition Report also noted that Assessment 3: Content-Specific Lesson Plans, while aligned to key elements of CEC Standard 5, did not provide percentages for each item thus making it impossible to determine whether the standard had been met. The data chart has been revised and aligned with the elements of Standard 5 and the percentage of “distinguished,” “proficient,” “basic,” or “unsatisfactory” have been included. The report also noted problems with the scoring rubric that will be addressed in the near future (See A1.2-3- SPED 512 Assessment 3 Revised Data Chart 2017-2019 and Interpretation).

The SPA Recognition Report noted that the assessments “provided some evidence that candidates have the knowledge as stated in the CEC standards.” The report also noted that each of the product-based rubrics included in the SPA Report included vague language such as “clearly,” “limited,” or “loosely identified.” The report encouraged the program to ensure that all assessment descriptions, scoring guides/rubrics, data and data analysis for each assessment provide evidence that they are aligned to the major elements of each CEC standard. To address this problem, the program faculty have identified an advisory committee composed of program faculty, special educators, and principals to review, align, and revise the assessment descriptions and scoring guides/rubrics. The revised assessment descriptions and scoring guides/rubrics will be available for use beginning fall 2020 so that the program can meet the specification of an additional cycle of data included in the Recognition Report and resubmit in the SPA report in spring 2021.

Standard 2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice

Task 1 Investigate how the EPP enacts a shared responsibility model. How have partners co-constructed instruments and evaluations? What training has been

provided to mentor teachers? Have criteria for mentor teachers been co-constructed? How is feedback sought from P-12 teachers and administrators to determine whether a collaborative process for supporting clinical experiences? How is input from P-12 teachers and/or administrators regularly (at least twice a year) sought for candidate preparation including criteria for entry/exit into clinical experiences? How do partners participate in development of PD opportunities for the use of evaluation instruments, professional disposition evaluation of candidates, specific goals/objectives of the clinical experience, and providing feedback?

Response:

The EPP at Concord University has a long history of involvement in area public schools. EPP faculty have provided professional development opportunities for public school teachers in areas of literacy, research-based instructional strategies and best practices, and technology use and incorporation to name a few. Equally, public school teachers and administrators have presented to both faculty and teacher candidates on National Board Certification, robotics in the classroom, trauma sensitive schools, current standardized assessments, and working with children of poverty. EPP faculty serve as read aloud volunteers, host book clubs, and serve as judges in school science and social studies fairs, reading and spelling bees, and local and state geography bees. Additionally, the EPP has hosted numerous classroom field trips, providing public school students a variety of hands-on, interactive learning experiences. School-based faculty and administrators deliver presentations in EPP classes, provide student teaching seminars on areas of expertise, facilitate workshops, participate on advisory boards, and serve as adjunct instructors. Opportunities abound for public school teachers and administrators to be on campus, and for EPP faculty to be in the public school classroom. These opportunities have always been used to share ideas and practices to improve our candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions, while at the same time having a positive effect on P-12 student learning. During the last several years, the EPP has made a concerted effort to enact a shared responsibility model.

The Educational Personnel Preparation Advisory Committee (EPPAC) has been a standing committee at Concord for more than thirty years. EPPAC is mandated by WV Policy 5100 and consists of representatives from the WVDE, EPP faculty, IHE representatives, candidates, community, and public school teachers and administrators. EPPAC serves as an advisory body and meets once a semester to review matters pertaining to the preparation and licensure of personnel.

Partnerships are natural to the EPP and collaboration is a common thread throughout the EPP's work. The size and nature of the institution lends itself to close collaboration within the institution, community and the P12 school system. The EPP has received the WV Partnerships for Teacher Quality grant that funds the Partnerships Project for nearly 25 years. The Professional Development School Initiative has been an integral part of the EPP's program and affords a close collaborative relationship between public schools and the EPP.

The current PDS Initiative has agreements with 10 schools in EPP's service region. Superintendents, administrators, and teachers have served on the PDS Advisory Council. Teachers in these schools serve as liaisons between the school and the EPP. These liaisons have been invaluable in sharing EPP program information related to field experience requirements and assessments. In turn they relay to the EPP any questions, concerns, and/or suggestions their school faculty have. Also, EPP faculty are frequently present in these schools, supervising field experience placement candidates and student teachers. EPP faculty members serve on the Local School Improvement Council in each of these partner schools.

As presented in the SSR, “this [PDS Advisory] Council was reconfigured in an effort to acquire better dissemination of data and feedback. It was decided that there was a need for two advisory groups. One group would provide insights from the teachers' perspective, and the other would look at data through the lens of Both groups are equally important but will be able to provide input for program improvement from two different viewpoints. The two groups are: Concord Teacher Educator Council (C-TEC) and Concord Principal's Advisory Council (C-PAC). These groups meet once a semester. Minutes from these advisory groups highlight some of the changes that have resulted from these collaborations. In December, a combined C-TEC/C-PAC meeting, the group examined expectations of candidates from program admission to program completion. As a result, five seminars were developed and are now in place for candidates to complete before program completion. In April, the advisory groups assisted the EPP in designing the new evaluations for Levels I-IV field experiences and student teaching for initial candidates...In order to communicate more effectively and to share data, the EPP has developed on our webpage, the Concord University Teacher Education Professional Learning Community. All stakeholder groups will have access to this webpage.” (SSR pp. 39-40)

The Department of Education Field Experience Handbook and requirements for Clinical Experiences and Internships are posted on the EPP's website. These contain information to guide school-based educators as they work with candidates during field experiences and student teaching. Mentor teachers are also provided letters of introduction for each field/clinical experience, which provide specific requirements of the experience, access to LiveText, and access to the Coordinator of Clinical Experiences and Program Associates.

Prior to July 2017, mentor teachers for student teachers, were required by the EPP to have a minimum of three years of teaching experience, certification in the area for which the student teacher was seeking, and at least one year of experience at the current grade level. This requirement still stands for mentor teachers of early field experience candidates, but, according to changes in Policy 5100, by July 2018, school-based clinical supervisors must hold a WV five-year teaching credential, a minimum of five years of teaching experience, a rating of "Accomplished" or higher on the WVERT, and have successfully completed a WVBE-approved mentor coaching course or be eligible for the Master Mentor Advanced Credential or be nationally board certified. Mentor teachers for all clinical experiences are selected upon these previously listed qualifications. In many cases principals and school-based liaisons make recommendations for qualified mentors.

The majority of mentors have supervised our candidates for numbers of years, and are also graduates of our program. This provides them with “insider” information that has been very useful for supervising our teacher candidates. This close connection to mentor teachers allows the EPP an opportunity to have open lines of communication.

Mentor teachers frequently contact the Director of Teacher Education, the Coordinator of Clinical Experiences, and/or Program Associates to request information, to share information, or to express concerns. The EPP is in the process of designing a survey for mentor teachers of early field candidates and student teachers to gain feedback on current evaluation instruments. The pilot will begin during spring 2020 to gather information on the use of the InTASC Standards via the STOT field evaluation rubrics for Level I, II, and III clinical experiences.

Formal means of gathering information and feedback come through our Concord Teacher Education Council (C-TEC) and Concord Principal Advisory Council (C-PAC) meetings. On September 6, 2019 (See 2-1 Meeting Minutes), a joint C-TEC and C-PAC meeting was held with all EPP faculty. During this meeting, a review of the teacher education program was presented which highlighted changes to the program and changes to field experience/clinical requirements, and which reviewed the key assessments being used within the program. The PowerPoint presentation for this meeting is included in Addendum evidence (See 9/6/19 PowerPoint) as well as minutes from the meeting which provide the feedback received from our public school stakeholders.

Task 2: Investigate how the EPP ensures that all candidates have experience in diverse settings. Who chooses and tracks the placement assignments for an individual candidate? How does the EPP ensure diverse field experiences for all candidates? Is completing field experiences in diverse settings a requirement of the EPP programs?

Response:

The field experience component of the program systematically begins with early observations and transitions to candidates taking full responsibility in the classroom during the student teaching experience. With the full implementation of the undergraduate year-long residency model, Candidates spend are actively engaged in a variety of classroom settings for over 500 hours prior to the full-time, sixteen week student teaching experience. During the student teaching semester, candidates complete 600 hours in a classroom. Candidates are also required to complete 75 hours of service learning. This totals approximately 1175 field hours required for all undergraduate teacher education programs. Some programs have additional field experience requirements which mean that most candidates have 1200 hours in the classroom prior to program completion.

Field placements associated with the EPP allow candidates to apply and reflect on content, professional, and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions in a variety of settings. The conceptual framework, The 21st Century Professional, is reflected

throughout field placements in performance requirements and assessments. The EPP prepares the 21st Century Professional to be competent, intentional, reflective, culturally responsive, leading, and empathetic.

To ensure these qualities in our candidates, field experience placements develop sequentially with specific goals delineated in each placement. Placements follow a continuum with the beginning levels being more collaborative in nature with more scaffolding. As candidates progress through the program, the scaffolding decreases. During the student teaching semester, candidates are required to complete 16 weeks of teaching. Candidates are responsible for all activities and expectations of the mentor teacher that are not supplementary to the teacher's instructional contract. This includes taking part in parent teacher conferences, open houses, staff meetings, Faculty Senate, school based assistance team meetings, professional development, and school year preparations. Student teachers are responsible for planning, implementing, and evaluating effectiveness of lessons for all subject areas, making sure they are meeting the needs of all students in their classrooms, and completing all necessary paperwork.

To ensure that candidates are culturally responsive, the EPP has a commitment to help candidates value diversity, acquire cultural knowledge, and adapt to diversity and the cultural contexts of the communities they serve. The EPP uses the definition of diversity in regard to placements as presented in the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers. “Diversity is inclusive of individual differences (e.g., personality, interests, learning modalities, and life experiences), and group differences (e.g., race, ethnicity, ability, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, nationality, language, religion, political affiliation, and socio-economic background).” Consequently, the EPP makes every attempt to ensure that all candidates have diverse field experiences that include working with student individual differences as well as working in settings that share group differences. Candidates experience varied grade levels in a variety of schools and programs that allow them to work with diverse learners. The demographics of placement schools reflect the demographics of the southern West Virginia, southern Appalachia setting. Although racial and ethnic diversity are low in this region, socio-economic diversity is quite high, with extreme levels of poverty in most schools. Most schools in the service area school districts are Title I schools, and many schools have moved from providing free and reduced lunches to qualifying students to providing free meals to all students. Demographics of schools (See 2-3 School Demographics) within the service area of southern West Virginia and southeastern Virginia where most candidates are placed provide a snapshot of the demographics of the region. The most recent report from the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE) for the 2017-18 year indicated that 90% of the currently enrolled P-12 students in WV were white, 4% black, and 2% Hispanic. An estimated 336,301 West Virginians lived in poverty in 2018, for a total poverty rate of 19.1 percent.. West Virginia's poverty rate is 5.7 percent higher than the national average, and the state had the second highest poverty rate among the 50 states in 2018. The poverty rate among children is 25.5 percent.

LiveText is used by the EPP is managed by the two Program Associates. Candidates are required to purchase a LiveText account during EDUC 210 and have access to the account for five years. Placement demographics are maintained in both LiveText and in an electronic database ensuring that the EPP can track all placements. By program completion, the majority of candidates have been placed in at least four different school/classroom settings, have had experiences in a minimum of two developmental levels (K-2 and 3-5 for elementary, 6-8 and 9-12 for 5-adult majors, and K-5, 5-8 or 9-12 for PreK-Adult majors), and have worked with students in inclusive classrooms. To ensure that all candidates have an experience in a school with group differences, e.g. race and ethnicity, six schools within the area with the greatest racial/ethnic diversity are used as the placement sites for the Level II Clinical Experience. Demographics for Princeton Primary, Princeton Senior High School, Bluefield Intermediate School, Bluefield Middle School, Stratton Elementary and Beckley Stratton Middle School are more diverse than any school in the service region. The Level II Clinical Experience is also unique in that the EDUC 305 and EDUC 301 courses that are linked to this field experience are taught on-site in these schools, and the course instructors supervise the candidates and monitor their performance. Two lesson plans are taught by each candidate and are observed by the course professor. Additionally candidates have a field experience in an inclusive classroom with the required special education methods course. In conclusion, candidates complete field experiences in diverse settings that cut across developmental levels, race/ethnicity, socio-economic status, and student exceptionalities.

Task 3: Evaluation of clinical experiences based on performance-based criteria. How are candidates evaluated in early field experiences based on performance based criteria? What evaluation systems are in place for the continuum of field experiences? How is data shared among partners and candidates?

Response:

Prior to the fall 2019 implementation of the collaboratively constructed STOT field evaluations for Levels I, II, and III Clinical Experience, the EPP used identical evaluations that were based on the five West Virginia Professional Teaching Standards: 1. Curriculum and Planning; 2. The Learner and the Learning Environment; 3. Teaching; 4. Professional Responsibilities for Self-Renewal; and 5. Professional Responsibilities for School and Community. For some time, the EPP did not feel that these evaluations reflected the responsibilities of the field experience or the abilities of the candidates. For example, candidates in the Level I field experience primarily observe and assist in the classroom. No classroom instruction of students is required. Yet, the evaluation of this field experience included curriculum and planning, and teaching components. It was not uncommon for mentor teachers to leave much of the field evaluation incomplete, with many stating that the evaluations were not applicable to the candidates' responsibilities during the placement. When the EPP began its interest in using the STOT as the final student teaching evaluation, the thought occurred that the InTASC Standards used in the STOT could be used to evaluate candidates during the field experiences prior to student teaching. The EPP felt it would be more effective to create rubrics to be used during field experience placements that were consistent to the final student teaching evaluation, but

were responsive to the expectations of the candidate during the professional education core field experiences.

During a stakeholder meeting in spring 2019, the EPP presented a plan to pair professional education courses with a field experience evaluation that would allow candidates to grow in their knowledge, skills, and dispositions, while at the same time providing greater opportunity to monitor candidate progress and identify areas of concern. During this meeting, four groups were formed, one each for Level I, II, III, and IV Clinical Experience. Each group included a public school teacher/administrator, a University Supervisor, and EPP faculty members, one of which was the instructor in the course associated with the field experience. The requirements of the field experience and the expectations for candidate performance during the field experience were shared and were compared to the 10 InTASC Standards and the indicators within these InTASC Standards as presented in the STOT. The result was creation of different rubrics for each field experience based on the STOT which would be used in its entirety during the Level IV professional block field experience and student teaching semester. The EPP feels that the consistent, developmental rubrics will allow for meaningful data comparisons among candidates prior to admission to the program, through admission to student teaching and completion. The field experience evaluations and the candidate data collected from fall 2019 are presented in this addendum. This data will be shared with the EPP during spring assessment meetings and stakeholder meetings. The EPP will now gather input from mentor teachers' reflections on the use of the new field experience evaluations, and will share this data with candidates and various stakeholder groups.

Task 4: Candidate experiences to document impact on student learning. How do candidates use comparison points, use impact data to guide instructional decision-making, modify instruction based on impact data, and differentiate instruction?

Response:

Prior to the implementation of the WVTPA, EPP teacher candidates demonstrated their effect on student learning through the Renaissance Teacher Work Sample. After WV Policy 5100 was amended to require teacher candidates to pass a performance assessment in June 2016, faculty worked with other IHEs to create the WV Teacher Performance Assessment based on the Renaissance Teacher Work Sample, EdTPA, and PPAT. WV The document, Development and Implementation of the WV Teacher Performance Assessment describes this process. The seven tasks of the WV TPA require candidates to plan a unit of study based on contextual factors, state standards and pre-assessment data. Candidates must prepare an assessment plan that includes pre-assessments, formative assessments, and post-assessments so that data can be collected that will demonstrate the candidate's impact on student learning in Task 6. Prior to teaching the instructional unit, candidates must use pre-assessment data to determine appropriate instructional strategies and design for successful attainment of the unit's learning goals. Throughout instruction, candidates must use formative assessment data to monitor students' progress and to reflect on instructional strategies and design. Finally, candidates compare pre-assessment

and post assessment data for each unit learning goal to determine the impact they have had on student learning. Throughout the WVTPA candidates must reflect upon the contextual factors of the community, the school, their classroom, and their students in the decision-making process of planning instruction and assessments. Candidates specifically identify two focus students and must identify how they have differentiated assessments and instruction for these two students. Task 6 requires candidates to “provide evidence of impact on student learning for the two focus students and the whole class and highlight patterns of learning for the class as a whole relative to each learning goal” (Wording of Emerging rating.) Candidates must create charts and graphs that demonstrate their effect on student learning. After the candidates plan, teach, and assess, they must reflect on the entire process and identify ways that they impacted student learning and ways they can improve their instruction and student learning. Candidates that do not pass this assessment during their first student teaching placement, by achieving a rating of Emerging on every indicator of every rubric, must revisit the WVTPA correcting Unsatisfactory areas. If they are unable to correct the deficiencies by the end of the student teaching semester, they must return for a third placement the following academic semester. No candidates have had to do a third placement since the inception of the WVTPA.

During fall 2019, the mini-TPA (See 2-6 Mini-TPA Plan and Outline) was fully implemented for all undergraduate teacher candidates in EDUC 416, Assessment and the Data Informed Teacher. The mini-TPA mirrors the task of the WVTPA. This course assignment provides candidates with an opportunity to explore their impact on student learning prior to the student teaching experience. Task 6 of the mini-TPA For Task 6, the teacher candidate presents the assessment data for the identified learning goal that was presented in the video of the candidate’s instruction. The teacher candidate will use the Excel graphs and charts to present the data. The teacher candidate will follow the prompts in Task 6 to analyze student learning and their impact on student learning for the single learning goal for the whole class and the single focus student.

All teacher candidates are required to take six credit hours of special education coursework. The first course is EDSP 303 Introduction to Special Education. EDSP 409 Strategies for the Secondary Classroom Inclusive Environment (for secondary candidates) and EDSP 416 Co-Teaching, Consultation, and Collaboration (for elementary candidates) prepare teacher candidates to meet the diverse needs of all learners in inclusive education environments. Emphasis is placed on the identification of the individual needs of special education students and the development of effective instructional strategies/teaching techniques to address those needs. A twenty-five hour field experience in an inclusive classroom setting is required.

By the completion of their programs, candidates have had multiple opportunities to provide evidence of their impact on student learning through carefully designed assignments in a variety of teaching experiences in P-12 classrooms.

Standard A.2. Clinical Partnerships and Practice

As noted in the SSR, advanced candidates in the Reading Specialist and Special Education programs typically complete field experiences in their own classrooms/schools. The EPP tracks these placements in LiveText to ensure that each classroom meets the criteria for a specific class (e.g., included special needs students). In the event the candidate is not a full-time teacher and does not have access to a classroom, the course professor will identify an appropriate school/classroom and work with the school principal to provide the candidate with access. Similarly, if a teacher's classroom does not meet the field experience requirements, the course professor will work with the principal and candidate to identify another classroom in the school that does meet criteria and provide the candidate access. If another classroom within the candidate's school cannot be identified, then the course professor will work with the principals of other schools to identify an appropriate placement.

In the Reading Specialist program, candidates are required to complete an early field placement where they identify three P-12 students and administer numerous screening and diagnostic reading and writing assessments, submit assessments results, interpret assessment data accurately, and develop instructional plans driven by the assessment results. This information is submitted in the form of a case study. The study is performed in the public school with a university faculty member overseeing it. Additionally, all candidates in the Reading Specialist program complete a 6-hour summer practicum course that includes working with P-12 students in a summer reading "camp." Faculty teaching in the Reading Specialist program are on-site during the summer reading camp and are responsible for observing and monitoring the advanced candidates daily.

Advanced candidates in the Special Education program, complete two 25-hour early field placements in SPED 503 and SPED 555. In both early field experience classes, candidates design, plan, and deliver at least three content lessons that include pre-assessment activities, differentiated instruction, and post-assessments to determine P-12 students' progress and achievement. Although the course professor grades each lesson plan, the mentor teacher must assess each lesson plan prior to its being taught. Mentors assess each lesson plan using the "Lesson Design" rubric. Once approved, the lesson is taught while the mentor teacher observes/assesses a candidate's delivery of each lesson. During the second field experience associated with SPED 555, the advanced candidates design, plan and deliver instruction that incorporates specified instructional models including Backward Design, the Co-Teaching Model, and the Differentiated Instruction/Learning Styles Model. Each of model is to include pre- and post-assessments and an analysis of student learning/progress. Again, the course professor grades the lesson plans, but the mentor teacher first assesses the plan prior to being taught, then observes/assesses the lesson delivery and/or participates in the lesson delivery as a co-teacher.

The West Virginia Board of Education *Policy 5100* specifies the criteria for mentor/supervising teachers that all approved Teacher Education Programs in WV must meet. As stated in Section 5.18.a. and 5.18.a.1 of the policy:

Effective July 1, 2018, the cooperating educator for clinical experience should, at a minimum: 1) hold a valid West Virginia five-year teaching credential in the content area of the candidate placed in his/her classroom with a minimum of five-years of teaching experience; 2) hold “Accomplished” or higher as a summative performance rating on the West Virginia Educator Evaluation during the last two-years of employment; and 3) have successfully completed a WVBE-approved cooperating teacher course, at no cost to the teacher, or hold or be eligible for the Mentor or Master Mentor Advanced Credential or hold certification through the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

5.18.a.1. An out-of-state cooperating teacher must hold a valid teaching credential beyond the initial license and in the content area of the candidate placed in his/her classroom and in the state of the placement and have a minimum of five-years of teaching experience with evidence of successful performance (such as educator evaluations) during the last two-years of employment or hold certification through the NBPTS. A cooperating educator who meets all requirements except the experience requirement may submit an exception request to the WVDE.

Both the initial and advanced programs require that mentor/supervising teachers and principals meet the criteria outlined in WVBE Policy 5100.

Standard 3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

Task 1 - Prior to the EDA. What are “expected levels” and how are they documented?

Response:

A disposition assessment was used S18 and F18 prior to the implementation of the EDA. This assessment was known as the Concord University Disposition Assessment (CUDA) and was included in the SSR evidence. The EPP took the following steps to implement the CUDA:

- During fall 2017, an initial Q-sort conducted with faculty revealed important candidate dispositional elements. A group of experts, including EPP faculty and P-12 teachers/administrators completed a survey validating essential items. The Lawshe study was conducted with the EPP and the Teacher Educator Council. Participants were asked to rate key factors of the assessment as: essential, useful but not necessary, or not necessary of initial candidates’ dispositions.
- During the semesters of spring 2018 and fall 2018, the Concord University Disposition Assessment (CUDA) was piloted and used with EDUC 210 candidates and was required for admission to the teacher education program. A reliability study was conducted during fall 2018, and the CUDA was found to be a likely reliable assessment of candidate dispositions.

Ratings on the CUDA are: Unsatisfactory (1), Emerging (2), Proficient (3), or Distinguished (4). Data presented in the SSR indicated that candidates scored at expected levels. The “expected levels” were defined as emerging given the assessment was administered during Pathway I – Admission to the TEP. The emerging level on the CUDA rubric would indicate a minimum score of 2. Expected levels were also determined by the group of experts including EPP faculty and P-12 teachers/administrators.

The disposition assessment was implemented during spring 2018 and was last used during fall 2018. At the fall 2018 CAEP Conference, members of the EPP participated in a workshop/presentation of Watermark’s The Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA). These EPP faculty presented the EDA to the EPP and other stakeholders, and the decision was made to proceed with moving toward the EDA as the EPP’s candidate disposition assessment spring 2019. The EDA was piloted during summer 2019, and fully implemented fall 2019.

Task 2 - Teacher Candidate Portfolio. What efforts have been made by the EPP to assure validity and reliability of the TCP?

Response:

Implemented S18, the TCP was based on the work of the EPP and the expert panel that identified essential dispositions of teacher candidates and the InTASC standards. The TCP was developed from the disposition assessment where candidates provide artifacts showing evidence of the dispositions in action. The EPP pulled a panel of raters of the TCP and conducted a percentage agreement study to determine inter-rater reliability based on a sample TCP (See 3-2: EPP Admission Portfolio Inter-Rater Reliability Percentage Agreement). This study resulted in an overall inter-rater reliability score of 78.75% among all five raters.

Task 3 - Recruitment Plan Effectiveness. What evidence is there to support the activities in the recruitment plan? What success can be documented at this point? The collaboration with athletic recruitment has started; the SSR indicated some data on success would be available Fall 2019.

Response:

The EPP has evidence (See 3-3: Evidence of Activities in Recruitment Plan) to support the activities in the recruitment plan and include:

- Athletics meeting agenda and emails – a meeting was held with all coaches on campus to discuss recruitment and how the EPP can offer a mutually beneficial partnership. We offered to meet one-on-one with athletic recruits interested in education when they are on campus for visits. A new football coach was hired, and the EPP has reached to meet with him to establish this protocol with football recruits.

- Careers in Education signed MOU – The Careers in Education MOU was signed over the summer and has proven to be positive. We have 13 students who have been awarded credit (9-F19, 4-S20) through the agreement.
- 4-year plans on CU website/Catalog change forms – all education programs have been tasked to reduce the total number of hours to 120. This has been an ongoing process, but all programs will be at 120 hours beginning fall 2020. 4-year plans currently published will be revised for the F2020 year to reflect the 120 hours as well as the inclusion of a year-long residency for all teacher education candidates.
- Emails regarding participation in Careers in Education state-wide conference
- Proposal for an online elementary program track,
- Intent to plan a cognate in the Educational Leadership program for STEM/STEAM education

Although overall enrollment in the university and teacher education program has been declining, the EPP can document that the implementation of the recruitment plan is beginning to be successful. For example, a review of enrollment data indicates that there has been an increase in the diversity of EPP candidates (See 3-1: Diversity of Declared Education Majors). There has been a slight increase in the percentage of males who have declared education as their major as well as an increase in the ethnic diversity of candidates. There has also been an increase in the number of candidates from outside of the state WV which indicates that the partnership with the athletic programs is contributing to this increase. Additionally, the partnership with the WV Careers in Education program is also seeing some success with 13 candidates being documented as Careers in Education Completers. One of the Careers in Education completers has already been officially accepted into the Teacher Education Program F19 semester.

Task 4 – Praxis PLT and Praxis II pass rates. The SSR claims 100% pass rate, since program completers much pass these exams to be fully admitted and to be admitted to student teaching. Evidence shows that not all candidates are successful at meeting these benchmarks. What is being done to improve Praxis II pass rates? Most are high, but a few could be improved.

Response:

For a candidate to successfully move through the Pathway to Teaching, he/she must successfully meet the requirements for each stage prior to progressing to the next stage. In order to be fully admitted into student teaching, a candidate must pass the Praxis PLT and Praxis II content exams. While most candidates pass the PLT on the first attempt (97.56% - elementary and 100% secondary), over the past three semesters, one did not. In this case or in the event a candidate does not pass the PLT in the future, the candidate meets with his/her academic advisor, director of clinical experiences, and/or the department chair for advising. Each candidate is advised on an individual basis. In this instance, the candidate was encouraged to attempt the PLT again. This candidate has since passed the PLT and is currently completing their student teaching semester. In terms of Praxis II (See 3-4: Praxis Trend Data), candidates typically do well. As noted, however, a few areas have overall scores that could be improved. The EPP strives for all candidates to pass Praxis II. In order to move closer to this goal, education faculty has

begun sharing Praxis II data with content faculty outside of the department of education during EPPAC meetings. Sharing Praxis II data with content faculty enables faculty across campus to collaboratively evaluate curriculum and courses. The data shared, also provides a comparison for how our candidates perform on the exam compared to test takers nationally. This data helps content faculty to see where programs are the strongest and even if there is 100% pass rate, where candidates could improve. Having this data allows content faculty the knowledge needed to emphasize specific topics in courses and/or make curricular changes to better address the topic. In the one case of a Spanish Praxis II test taker, the individual was a MAT candidate, therefore, needing to document their content knowledge of Spanish prior to progressing through the MAT program. The EPP advised this candidate as well as set up private tutoring for this candidate. This particular candidate ended up passing the Praxis II in another content area and progressed through the MAT program in another field.

Task 5 – STOT – Cooperating Teachers. How are cooperating teachers trained to use the STOT?

Response:

As part of the North Dakota Common Metric Project, representatives from the twelve constituent institutions of the North Dakota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (NDACTE) recently developed the Student Teacher Observation Tool (STOT), a new instrument for assessing the performance of student teachers during the clinical experience. The assessment is aligned with [Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium] InTASC standards, meets CAEP sufficiency level expectations, and went through the process of being piloted, analyzed, and revised and is now being used for the benefit of student teachers and program improvement.

EPP faculty and University Supervisors participated in online training on the use of the STOT provided by the NDACTE during the fall 2019 semester. **The STOT is completed by EPP faculty or University Supervisors - cooperating teachers do not use the STOT.** Cooperating teachers have access to the STOT through the EPP's Professional Learning Community (TEPLC) and have representation in data sharing and evaluation activities hosted by the EPP. The EPP has evidence that all university supervisors and EPP faculty have successfully completed the STOT training developed and administered through the NCACTE.

Standard A.3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

There was a question in the FFR about the EPP's use and comparison of the MAT and GRE scores. The EPP uses GRE scores as one indicator of a candidate's ability to think critically and use analytical writing skills, articulate complex ideas, comprehend and apply reasoning skills, interpret and analyze quantitative information, and solve problems using mathematical models. Similarly, the MAT involves general academic knowledge and analytical skills acquired over years of study and learning to measure the analytical thinking ability of prospective advanced candidates. The EPP reviews the scores of each prospective candidate as an indicator of the candidate's potential success in a graduate program. The EPP requires that advance candidates score at least in the 50th percentile

for admission to the M.Ed. program. In the event a candidate does not score in the 50th percentile or above, the M.Ed. Coordinator meets with graduate content faculty to review all the candidate's application materials and to make a decision regarding admission to the advanced program. Typically, candidates whose scores are below the 50th percentile on either the GRE or the MAT are allowed to take 6 graduate credits to demonstrate their ability to successfully complete graduate level work.

The FFR indicated that reviewers had a question about PRAXIS II trend data for the three content specializations in the M.Ed. program. This data was submitted with the SSR Exhibits as **Exhibit 63-PRAXIS II Content Knowledge Exams M.Ed. Program Completers**.

Standard 4 Program Impact

Task 1 – Exit Survey. The NExT Exit Survey does not provide disaggregated data by programs. Please explain how the survey can be beneficial to understand how shifts in the IHE program's coursework and clinical experiences affect candidate's perception of and satisfaction with their education programs.

Response:

The NExT Exit Survey does not disaggregate data by programs. It does provide information on the number of completers by program who completed the Survey. For example the 2019 Exit Survey Report (See 4-1 NeXT Exit Survey Report 2018-19) was completed by twenty seven elementary majors and twenty six secondary majors. The report also breaks down the secondary majors into numbers of completers by program. What the data does provide is an overall view of the teacher education program relative to the completer satisfaction. The 2019 Exit Report shows that the majority of candidates expressed an overall satisfied to very satisfied opinion of the teacher education program in multiple areas such as advising, quality of instruction, integration of technology, and clinical experiences. The same can be surmised regarding completers sense of their overall preparation in lesson design, lesson instruction, and student assessment. Other feedback refers to preparing candidates for working with diverse students, for managing the learning environment, and for preparation for instruction. The report provides candidate feedback on their student teaching experience, especially their satisfaction with the University Supervisor. What all of this information allows the EPP is an opportunity to assess the program over periods of time. The completers for the 2019 report were actively involved in the program during the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 academic years. As additional reports are received, the EPP will be able to determine if changes to the program have resulted in less, similar, or improved satisfaction. The NExT Exit Survey is not disaggregated, but it still provides valuable data for the EPP to review and to use for program improvement.

Task 2 – Completer Milestones. Please clarify the time period and how the EPP track completer milestones.

Response:

The completer milestones that were presented in the SSR covered various time periods. For example, the EPP utilized the NBPTS website to identify West Virginia teachers who have hold current National Board Certification. We also contacted local school district Human Resource Directors to provide information on teachers who have been identified as county and/or state Teacher of the Year. The EPP is also utilizing the Concord Teacher Education Facebook page for completers to self-report their accomplishments and milestones. It is a small start, but as time continues, the EPP hopes to build a greater database of completer milestones.

Task 3 – 4.1 P-12 Student Growth Data. Please provide evidence of completer impact on P-12 student learning at the inservice level (not candidate level) disaggregated by program. How do programs other than elementary program track completer impact on P-12 student learning. Please explain the case study participant selection process and how the selected participants are representative of CU completers.

Response:

As documented in the self-study report, the EPP uses multiple measures to document completer impact on P-12 student learning. The West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE) provides very limited data to the EPP. As indicated previously, WV does not collect value added measures and does not release student test data connected to specific teachers. To help EPPs in the state address Standard 4, the WVDE and West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission (WVHEPC) collaborated to provide school-wide data testing data in reading and math to EPPs who had completers/in-service teachers working as first year teachers in an identified school. These results provide measures of student achievement which principals and other administrators use in the development of school performance plans.

To supplement this limited data from the state, the EPP has developed case studies of completers/in-service teachers. Candidates agree to participate in a three-year case study that includes P-12 student test data, classroom observations and principal observation/evaluations, student surveys, and a WVTPA completed in year three of the case study.

The plan for the case study began in 2017-18 by selecting two elementary completers/in-service teachers for year one of the three-year cycle. It was decided to use elementary completers/in-service teachers since that is our largest program. Also, since the State did not provide data that was needed for the case studies, the EPP worked with the local school district which agreed to provide student data from STAR Assessment in reading and math, and the State benchmark and summative assessments. Elementary teachers were the teachers for whom the school district had this data.

The case study continued to evolve. In 2018-19 two additional elementary completers were added.

The case study assessment in 2019-20 added one secondary completer (Lillian), one MAT completer (Ashleigh), and two elementary completers (Melanie and Chris). The

secondary completer is an English teacher and representative of secondary programs at this point. The MAT completer is a high school biology teacher. Disaggregation of data for case study participants by program:

According to CAEP's Phase-In option, and because our visit falls within the Phase-In timeline, the data is still being collected for the case studies. The EPP chose to begin the case studies by using elementary majors since that is our largest program. Our phase-in plan includes adding participants from MAT and secondary content as the process progresses.

In 2019-20 a secondary completer (English) was included in the case study assessment, as well as a participant from the MAT program. Data is currently being collected from these candidates and will be reviewed and analyzed by the EPP at the end of the 2019-20 school year to determine impact on student learning.

Additionally, while the plan for the case studies for the initial program was continuing to progress and evolve, the case studies for the advanced program were being developed. The phase-in plan for the case studies in the advanced program called for implementation in 2020-21. However, the EPP decided to move forward with early implementation of the plan for the advanced program by piloting it with the Reading Specialist Program in fall 2019. That data was not available when the Self-Study Report was submitted but has since been collected and analyzed by the case study team. The advanced case studies are located in A.4.

Data Disaggregated by Program:

I. Case Study- Elementary Program (Initial Level)

II. Case Study- Secondary Program (Phase-In) (begin data collection 2019-20)

III. Case Study- MAT Program (Phase- In) (begin data collection 2019-20)

Now in the third year (F2019-S2020) the EPP is gathering data on completers in the following program areas: secondary education major in English; MAT secondary certification in biology, and M.Ed. in the Reading Specialist program. At the end of the current academic year, the EPP will have the first year data collection for these completers. Detailed information on these completers is contained in Completer Case Studies found in the SSR. For the F2020-S2021 academic year, the EPP will begin case studies for undergraduate secondary education majors in the physical education PreK-Adult program and the English education 5-Adult program; a MAT completer; and a M.Ed. completer in the Educational Leadership program, and the Special Education program.

The following presentation is the first year case study of a secondary English education completer and an MAT completer in biology.

The case study for the secondary program completers began in 2019-20 as a part of the EPP's phase-in plan. One secondary program completer/in-service teacher has been

selected and the case study team has been working with her to collect data. Some data has already been submitted and all data will be reviewed and analyzed by the EPP at the end of the year.

The completer selected is an English teacher at Mt. View High School in McDowell County. McDowell County is ranked 55th out of 55 counties according to School Digger. According to the census report, the decline of the coal industry has devastated the economy of the county causing 33.3% of the population to fall below the poverty line. Only 5.4% of the population has a bachelor's degree or higher.

Mt. View High School is located on the grounds of an old strip mine in the mountains of McDowell County, WV. It is a 6-12 school and houses 712 students. The student teacher ratio is 16:3 which is higher than the WV state level of 15:1. According to public school review it has a minority enrollment of 23% which is higher than the West Virginia state average of 10%. It has a population of 76% white, 20.9 % African American, and 2% two or more races. It is ranked 107th out of 114 West Virginia High Schools. It has a graduation rate of 92% which is above the state average of 90% according to greatschools.org.

The case study participant, Lillian, was hired during her student teaching semester as lead teacher in the classroom. The teacher shortage in West Virginia has created the opportunity for some student teachers to be hired as the lead teacher during the second semester of their residency. Such was the case with Lillian. However, this case study was completed after she graduated and had been hired by the county. It was not completed during her student teaching even though she was lead teacher.

Participant (Pseudonym)	Gender	Race/ Ethnicity	Program Area	School/ Grade	Current Position	Years Taught
Lillian	F	White	English	Mt. View High School 11 th Grade	Teacher	2 years

Case study team members are currently collecting data from Lillian who is in year one of the case study. The data collected will include:

Year One:

- All principal evaluations, both walk-through and formal
- Benchmark and summative assessments- The SAT is the summative assessment administered in McDowell County for 11th grade students.

Year Two

- All principal evaluations, both walk-through and formal
- Benchmark and summative assessments- The SAT is the summative assessment administered in McDowell County for 11th grade students.

- Data will be collected on two focus students to demonstrate student learning

Year Three

- All principal evaluations, both walk-through and formal
- Benchmark and summative assessments- The SAT is the summative assessment administered in McDowell County for 11th grade students.
- Classroom observation by case study team member
- Interview with participant
- Interview with principal
- Teacher Performance Assessment

I. Case Study- MAT Program

The case study for the MAT program began in 2019-20 as a part of the EPP’s phase-in plan. One MAT completer/in-service teacher has been selected and the case study team has been working with her to collect data. Some data has already been submitted and all data will be reviewed and analyzed by the case study team and the EPP at the end of the year.

The MAT completer selected was Ashleigh, a 9th/10th grade biology teacher at Princeton Senior High School in Mercer County, West Virginia. According to the 2018 census, the socio-economic status of Mercer County is diverse with a 22.7% poverty rate. The ethnicity of the county is 91.3% white alone, 6.1% African American alone, 0.2% American Indian or Alaska Native alone, 0.6% Asian alone, and 1.8% two or more races. Mercer County Schools are ranked 28th out of 55 counties in WV. Like McDowell County, Mercer County depends largely on coal for the strength of its economy.

Princeton Senior High School is a 9-12 school which houses 1,018 students. It is the largest school in Mercer County and is ranked 37th out of 114 West Virginia High Schools according to School Digger. According to the public school review, the student teacher ratio is 17.1 which is above the WV state level of 15.1. The racial breakdown of the school is 88% white, 8.2% African American, and 1.8% two or more races. Greatschools.org records a graduation rate of 86% which is below the state average of 90%.

Participant (Pseudonym)	Gender	Race/ Ethnicity	Program Area	School/ Grade	Current Position	Years Taught

Ashleigh	F	White	Biology	Princeton Senior High School 9 th /10 th Grade	Teacher	3 years
----------	---	-------	---------	---	---------	---------

While interviewing Ashleigh and discussing her responsibility as a participant in the case study, the case study team learned that the state of WV does not administer summative assessments to 9th and 10th graders. While data from benchmark and summative assessments had been the initial plan for analyzing student scores and determining teacher impact, a different method was needed for Ashleigh. After discussion and research, it was decided that Ashleigh would administer pre-test and post-test for her classes. The pre/post test data would provide evidence of teacher impact on student learning.

Learning that 9th and 10th graders were not tracked through benchmark and summative assessments was valuable data for us to know for the future of our case studies. It enabled us to identify other possibilities for data collection which will still demonstrate teacher impact.

The case study team for Ashleigh will collect the following data:

Year One:

- All principal evaluations, both walk-through and formal
- Pre-test and Post-test data for biology for 9th and 10th graders

Year Two

- All principal evaluations, both walk-through and formal
- Pre-test and Post-test data for biology for 9th and 10th graders
- Data will be collected on two focus students to demonstrate student learning

Year Three

- All principal evaluations, both walk-through and formal
- Pre-test and Post-test data for biology for 9th and 10th graders
- Classroom observation by case study team member
- Interview with participant
- Interview with principal
- Teacher Performance Assessment

The EPP is cognizant of the fact that changes might occur during the three-year period which would alter some of the case study information, i.e., a case study participant relocating or changing grade levels and/or content fields. The EPP is prepared to address those changes and make modifications as necessary.

At the end of each school year the data collected will be disaggregated in a number of ways. The EPP will disaggregate the data according to secondary, MAT, and elementary.

The data will also be analyzed by county, school, and grade level. Additionally, data will be reviewed by looking at each content field separately. The data will be disaggregated by years of participation in the case study. The disaggregation of the data will enable the EPP to identify patterns that can be hidden by aggregated data, and enable effective planning for the future improvement of our programs.

All programs will track completer impact on P-12 student learning using the case study identified in the Self-Study Report and also in this document. According to CAEP's Phase-In option, and because our visit falls in the Phase-In timeline, the data is still being collected. It will be reviewed by the case study team and the EPP at the end of each school year to determine candidate impact on student learning.

EPP faculty members met with local superintendents to obtain permission to select teachers in their county to participate in the case study assessment. The EPP needed the superintendent's support and approval in order to obtain student test data, interview principals, observe in the classrooms, and interview teachers. Case study participants were selected from the counties where permission was granted to obtain that information.

The EPP reviewed:

- a list of completers who were teaching in the counties which had agreed to participate,
- those who were teaching in their field, and
- those who were not experiencing life altering circumstances at the time, i.e., terminal illness.

From the original list of possible participants, a separate list was generated of those who met the above criteria. The EPP began contacting individuals on the list and informing the possible participants about the case study assessment. The three-year commitment along with the steep learning curve for new teachers, plus the additional work load required for the case study participants was enough to cause some to decline the offer. We continued the search until willing participants were located. Those identified were eager to partner with Concord to demonstrate how they impacted student learning. In return for their participation, each participant received a small stipend and three hours free graduate credit.

As the process has continued, the EPP continues to use the above listed criteria to select case study completers; however, we also now use already participating case study participants to help identify possible completers for each upcoming year.

Standard A.4. Program Impact

As indicated in the SSR, the EPP has administered a Follow-up Survey of Graduates (See **Exhibit 84**-M.Ed. Graduate Follow-Up Survey Summaries 2015-2018) and an Employer Survey (See **Exhibit 83**-M.Ed. Employer Satisfaction Survey Summary 2015-18). The M.Ed. Employer Satisfaction Survey was based on West Virginia Professional Teaching Standards and asked employers to rate CU graduates on a scale of 0-3 (0=Unsatisfactory,

1=Basic, 2=Proficient, and 3=Distinguished), as well collected information about the completer's content specialization and asked for written comments.

The Follow-up Survey of Graduates is discussed in the SSR. The surveys provided some indication that completers were satisfied with the advanced program and felt prepared for their content specializations.

The SSR also included Phase-In Plans for revised Graduate Completer Satisfaction Surveys that are specific to each of the three content specializations in the M.Ed. program (See **Exhibit 86**-Phase-In Plan for Graduate Completer Satisfaction Survey). Similarly, the SSR exhibits included a phase-in plan for the revised Employer Satisfaction Survey (See **Exhibit 88**-Phase-In Plan for Employer Satisfaction at Advanced Level). The EPP has made progress on both plans and has developed and piloted new surveys for each M.Ed. program (See A.4-3, A.4-4, A.4-5 Survey of Candidate Satisfaction and A.4-5, A.4-6, A.4-7 Survey of Employer Satisfaction for Advanced Program). A description of the process that EPP and its P-12 partners used to develop the Survey of Completers/Graduates and the Supervisor/Employer Survey is included (See A4.1-Advanced Program New Supervisor-Employer Survey Development Description and A4.1-2-Advanced Program-New Supervisor-Employer Survey Development Description). The EPP believes that the new surveys of graduates and employers will provide faculty with richer data related to each content specialization.

Standard 5 Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity

Task 1 - Reliability and Validity of Proprietary Assessments. Is there validity & reliability evidence available on the WVTPA, Mini-TPA, STOT, WVERT, and the EDA (IRR only on EDA)?

Response:

The West Virginia Teacher Performance Assessment (WVTPA) was developed by a consortium of teacher educators from twelve IHEs in an effort to create a common performance assessment. This group studied the Renaissance Group Teacher Work Sample (TWS), the ETS Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT), and Pearson's edTPA, all of which had been used and/or piloted by one or more of these institutions. The group followed guidelines for validity and reliability as they have worked to bring the WVTPA to its current format. The history of the development of the WVTPA in the Addendum Evidence provides the process for establishing its reliability and validity (See 5-1 Development and Implementation of the WVTPA)

The Mini-TPA was created by the EPP as a means of preparing teacher candidates during the professional block semester of the yearlong residency for the full implementation of the WVTPA the student teacher semester. As explained earlier in this document, the mini-TPA is designed to be a reduced version of the WVTPA in that the amount of data that must be collected in the WVTPA is reduced for mini-TPA. During the pilot semester, candidates were assigned Tasks 1-5 of the WVTPA as the assignment. During the spring

2019 semester, the EPP revised and updated the min-TPA to include all seven tasks of the WVTPA. The plan for the mini-TPA that was adopted for EDUC 416 is included in the list of evidence in this addendum. The rubric that is used to assess the min-TPA is the same rubric that is used to assess the WVTPA. The validity study on the WVTPA that is included in this addendum supports the validity of the min-TPA. The course instructors for both the elementary and secondary EDUC 416 courses grade the mini-TPA following the same guidelines that are used for the WVTPA. These course instructors participate in the reliability study that is required each year by the WVTPA. All members of the EPP who assess the WVTPA during the academic year, must participate in the evaluation of a sample WVTPA obtained from another IHE. Members score the WVTPA and submit their scores for consensus. The results of the 2019-2020 reliability study for the WVTPA are included as evidence in this addendum. (See 5-2 2019 20 WVTPA EPP Reliability)

The Student Teacher Observation Tool (STOT – now referred to by NDACTE as the Skills of Teaching Observation Tool) was developed by the North Dakota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (NDACTE) institutions as a system of common metrics with a focus on the student teaching observation tool. The NDACTE has presented multiple times at CAEP Conferences and is accepted as a valid, reliable assessment instrument that promotes teacher candidate learning and teacher preparation improvement, and meets CAEP expectations. The paper, VALIDATION STUDY FOR THE STUDENT TEACHER OBSERVATION TOOL ND COMMON METRICS PROJECT, provides a review of the various steps taken to establish validity. NDACTE provides online training modules to increase interrater reliability and accuracy in scoring. All EPP faculty and University Supervisors participate in the online training modules prior to supervising student teachers. Certificates of participation in the training module are included in Addendum Evidence (See 5-3 Certificates).

The WVERT was developed through collaboration of West Virginia Department of Education and school administrators and teachers. The driving goal of this group was to create a revised evaluation system for teachers that set high standards of performance for both veteran and new teachers, ensured high-quality instruction focused on increasing student achievement; and encouraged continuous growth and improvement over time. Documents that present a complete examination of the WVERT, that present the first year pilot of the WVERT, and that present WVDE policy on the evaluation of teachers are included as Addendum Evidence (See 1-11 WV Educator Evaluation System for Teachers; 1-12 WV Revised Educator Evaluation System for Teachers; 5-4 WVDE Policy 5310).

The EPP learned of the Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA) while attending the fall 2018 CAEP Conference. During this presentation, Watermark presented the EDA along with the studies on the validity of the instrument. The EDA Technical Manual provided as evidence in the SSR and this Addendum provide that evidence. Watermark also provides calibration training for EDA scorers. The EPP participated in this training during spring 2019. Certificates of this training are provided as Addendum Evidence. All faculty members and University Supervisors must have this training prior to the use of the instrument for candidate assessment.

Task 2 - Data in the Aggregate. Could you disaggregate data at the program level for each assessment?

Response:

Assessment data is housed in LiveText. Program Associates are able to gather and assemble data in a variety of presentations for EPP review and dissemination to stakeholders. Data for all assessments are presented in Excel spreadsheets and are able to be viewed as aggregated data and disaggregated data. When a key assessment such as the STOT is presented, all candidates' scores for each indicator are presented by program content area as an overall mean. Additionally, the overall mean of candidates' scores across content areas are presented. This allows the EPP and stakeholders to monitor and determine overall candidate performance and to monitor and determine candidate performance by program areas. As can be seen in assessment data presented from fall 2019, the EPP has further disaggregated the data by providing mean scores for all candidates completing the assessment, for candidates completing the assessment by program areas, and in cases where both undergraduate and MAT candidates complete the same assessment, the data is disaggregated to include MAT candidate performance within content areas. If needed, the data can also be examined by individual candidate performance rather than by cohorts in a specific program. This presentation of data is typically what is reported within SPA reports.

Task 3 – Program Completers. Could you provide information regarding program completer information for programs other than Elementary Education?

Response:

The Case Study Plan presented an overview of the how the EPP will identify completers with in all program areas. The case studies were piloted with elementary majors. Now in the third year (F2019-S2020) the EPP is gathering data on completers in the following program areas: secondary education major in English; MAT secondary certification in biology, and M.Ed. in the Reading Specialist program. At the end of the current academic year, the EPP will have the first year data collection for these completers. Detailed information on these completers is contained in Standard 4 of this Addendum. For the F2020-S2021 academic year, the EPP will begin case studies for undergraduate secondary education majors in the physical education PreK-Adult program and the English education 5-Adult program; a MAT completer; and a M.Ed. completer in the Educational Leadership program, and the Special Education program.

Task 4 – Application of Data. Could you provide an additional application of data from Fall 19 semester for all assessments included in the QAS?

Response:

Data from fall 2019 for all assessments in the QAS are provided in the Addendum Evidence (See Data provided for Standard 1: 1-17 – 1-33.)

Task 5: EPP Assessments. Could you provide reliability and validity development information regarding EPP made assessments?

Response:

An updated chart of Pathway Assessments (See 5-6 Pathway Assessments Chart) is provided in the Addendum Evidence. The EPP has identified all assessments that part of the Pathway to Teaching for the undergraduate teacher education program, the MAT program and the Advanced Program. Assessments highlighted in yellow have been identified as key assessments which require a minimum score or better before progression is permitted to the next Pathway. The NExT Exit Survey does not have a score, but this is a requirement for completion since Concord is a part of the State IHE consortium that gathers exit data using NExT Common Metrics Instruments. Pathway assessments which are not key assessments are used by the EPP to monitor candidate progress and to gather data for program improvement. These assessments are checked from one Pathway to the next, but are not assessments that are used to serve as gatekeepers to the next Pathway. For example, the Level I, II, III, and IV field experience evaluations are based on the STOT assessment which is a proprietary assessment. These field experience evaluations must be completed during each level, and the data is used as evidence of candidate growth, but it is not until student teaching that the STOT becomes a key assessment for program completion. (See

Currently, the only EPP created assessment that is used as a key assessment in the Pathway to Teaching is the Teacher Candidate Portfolio (TCP) required for Admission to the Teacher Education Program. Implemented S18, the TCP was based on the work of the EPP and the expert panel that identified essential dispositions of teacher candidates and the InTASC standards that were originally identified for the Concord University Disposition Assessment (CUDA). The TCP was developed from the CUDA and later compared to the Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA) for validation. In the TCP, candidates provide artifacts showing evidence of the identified dispositions in action. The EPP pulled a panel of raters of the TCP and conducted a percentage agreement study to determine inter-rater reliability based on a sample TCP (EPP Admission Portfolio Inter-Rater Reliability Percentage Agreement). This study resulted in an overall inter-rater reliability score of 78.75% among all five raters. (See Standard 1 Evidence – 1-16 Concord EPP Validity and Reliability of Assessments.)

Standard A.5 Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity

The FFR asked the EPP to provide PRAXIS II data for the advanced programs. This data was submitted with the SSR as **Exhibit 63-PRAXIS II Content Knowledge Exams M.Ed. Program Completers**. The EPP has updated the chart to include fall 2019 PRAXIS II data that is included as an exhibit with the Concord University Addendum.

An explanation of why all advanced candidates are not required to take the PRAXIS II-Content Assessment is provided in A.1.1 of the Concord University Addendum.

The EPP included exhibits with the SSR that provided evidence that data from the advanced program was shared with stakeholders (See **Exhibit 58**-EPPAC Minutes Fall 2016-Spring 2019.)

Cross-Cutting Themes – Diversity

1. How does the EPP define diversity for its candidates?

Response:

Current teacher candidates reflect the diversity represented in the community and the southern Appalachian region; however, the EPP recruitment plan is to diversify the demographics of our candidates to reflect the diversity public schools across the nation. The EPP monitors the diversity of candidates admitted to the Teacher Education Program in terms of race, age, gender, socio-economic status (based on financial aid information), citizenship, marital status, and armed forces service (veteran). What we have found is that although our candidates are not diverse in race and ethnicity, our candidates do have cultural diversity representative of southern Appalachia, and in terms of age, socio-economic status, and life experiences. Although our candidate population may look very much alike, our candidates form an inclusive community of people with varied human characteristics, ideas, and world views. (See D 1 – Diversity of TEP Candidates F2017-F2019.)

2. What is meant by placement in a diverse setting? Developmental level? Race? SES?

Response:

To answer this question, the response from Standard 2, Task 2 is provided. The EPP uses the definition of diversity in regard to placements as presented in the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers. “Diversity is inclusive of individual differences (e.g., personality, interests, learning modalities, and life experiences), and group differences (e.g., race, ethnicity, ability, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, nationality, language, religion, political affiliation, and socio-economic background).” Consequently, the EPP makes every attempt to ensure that all candidates have diverse field experiences that include working with student individual differences as well as working in settings that share group differences. Candidates experience varied grade levels in a variety of schools and programs that allow them to work with diverse learners. The demographics of placement schools reflect the demographics of the southern West Virginia, southern Appalachia setting. Although racial and ethnic diversity are low in this region, socio-economic diversity is quite high, with extreme levels of poverty in most schools. Most schools in the service area school districts are Title I schools, and many schools have moved from providing free and reduced lunches to qualifying students to providing free meals to all students. Demographics of schools within the service area of southern West Virginia and southeastern Virginia where most candidates are placed provide a snapshot of the demographics of the region. The most recent report from the West Virginia Department

of Education (WVDE) for the 2017-18 year indicated that 90% of the currently enrolled P-12 students in WV were white, 4% black, and 2% Hispanic. An estimated 336,301 West Virginians lived in poverty in 2018, for a total poverty rate of 19.1 percent.. West Virginia's poverty rate is 5.7 percent higher than the national average, and the state had the second highest poverty rate among the 50 states in 2018. The poverty rate among children is 25.5 percent. (See Standard 2 Evidence 2-3 School Demographics.)

LiveText Field Experience Module (FEM) is used by the EPP is managed by the two Program Associates. Candidates are required to purchase a LiveText account during EDUC 210 and have access to the account for five years. Placement demographics are maintained in both LiveText and in an electronic database ensuring that the EPP can track all placements. Program Associates who oversee early field experience placements and student teaching placements enter placements on the FEM system. Candidates log completed field experience hours and note the nature of the activity (e.g. diverse placement). Cooperating teachers or EPP faculty confirm the accuracy of the candidates' entries. This system also allows cooperating teachers, EPP faculty, and candidates to communicate, post artifacts, and evaluate candidates' efforts.

By program completion, the majority of candidates have been placed in at least four different school/classroom settings, have had experiences in a minimum of two developmental levels (K-2 and 3-5 for elementary, 6-8 and 9-12 for 5-adult majors, and K-5, 5-8 or 9-12 for PreK-Adult majors), and have worked with students in inclusive classrooms. To ensure that all candidates have an experience in a school with group differences, e.g. race and ethnicity, six schools within the area with the greatest racial/ethnic diversity are used as the placement sites for the Level II Clinical Experience. Demographics for Princeton Primary, Princeton Senior High School, Bluefield Intermediate School, Bluefield Middle School, Stratton Elementary and Beckley Stratton Middle School are provided. The Level II Clinical Experience is also unique in that the EDUC 305 and EDUC 301 courses that are linked to this field experience are taught on-site in these schools, and the course instructors supervise the candidates and monitor their performance. Two lesson plans are taught by each candidate and are observed by the course professor. Additionally candidates have a field experience in an inclusive classroom with the required special education methods course. In conclusion, candidates complete field experiences in diverse settings that cut across developmental levels, race/ethnicity, socio-economic status, and student exceptionalities.

The EPP recognizes that education candidates will work in increasingly diverse classrooms and communities. To that end the EPP facilitates the development of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions with respect to addressing the needs of students of different genders, ethnicities, race, language, sexual orientation, geographical area, religions, exceptionalities, and socioeconomic backgrounds. To meet this need faculty design experiences that are well-planned, in depth, and reflective. Faculty prepare candidates for experiences with course activities that anticipate the situations candidates will encounter in schools. During and after the experiences faculty require candidates to reflect on and integrate their observations and experiences with course discussion and assignments. During clinical experiences, candidates design and implement instruction to

address the needs of a diverse student population. Cooperating teachers and EPP faculty evaluate candidates' demonstration of inclusiveness via the Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA), and field experience and student teaching observation instruments and STOT evaluation forms.

3. What objectives in the specific courses cited address diversity?

Response:

Please see the table of professional education core course objectives that address diversity in the Addendum Evidence.

4. What does the LiveText data for clinical experiences include and what process is used to ensure the experiences of students are "diverse"?

Response:

LiveText Field Experience Module (FEM) is used by the EPP is managed by the two Program Associates. Candidates are required to purchase a LiveText account during EDUC 210 and have access to the account for five years. Placement demographics are maintained in both LiveText and in an electronic database ensuring that the EPP can track all placements. Program Associates who oversee early field experience placements and student teaching placements enter placements on the FEM system. Candidates log completed field experience hours and note the nature of the activity (e.g. diverse placement). Cooperating teachers or EPP faculty confirm the accuracy of the candidates' entries. This system also allows cooperating teachers, EPP faculty, and candidates to communicate, post artifacts, and evaluate candidates' efforts.

5. How does the EPP use data to ensure recruitment efforts are successful?

Response:

The following information is taken from Standard 3 in this Addendum. The EPP has evidence (Evidence of Activities in Recruitment Plan) to support the activities in the recruitment plan and include:

- Athletics meeting agenda and emails – a meeting was held with all coaches on campus to discuss recruitment and how the EPP can offer a mutually beneficial partnership. We offered to meet one-on-one with athletic recruits interested in education when they are on campus for visits. A new football coach was hired, and the EPP has reached to meet with him to establish this protocol with football recruits.
- Careers in Education signed MOU – The Careers in Education MOU was signed over the summer and has proven to be positive. We have 13 students who have been awarded credit (9-F19, 4-S20) through the agreement.
- 4-year plans on CU website/Catalog change forms – all education programs have been tasked to reduce the total number of hours to 120. This has been an ongoing process, but all programs will be at 120 hours beginning fall 2020. 4-year plans currently published will be revised for the F2020 year to reflect the 120 hours as well as the inclusion of a year-long residency for all teacher education candidates.

- Emails regarding participation in Careers in Education state-wide conference
- Proposal for an online elementary program track,
- Intent to plan a cognate in the Educational Leadership program for STEM/STEAM education

Although overall enrollment in the university and teacher education program has been declining, the EPP can document that the implementation of the recruitment plan is beginning to be successful. For example, a review of enrollment data indicates that there has been an increase in the diversity of EPP candidates (See D-1 Diversity of TEP Majors). There has been a slight increase in the percentage of males who have declared education as their major as well as an increase in the ethnic diversity of candidates. There has also been an increase in the number of candidates from outside of the state WV which indicates that the partnership with the athletic programs is contributing to this increase. Additionally, the partnership with the WV Careers in Education program is also seeing some success with 13 candidates being documented as Careers in Education Completers. One of the Careers in Education completers has already been officially accepted into the Teacher Education Program F19 semester.

Cross-Cutting Themes – Technology

1. According to the SSR, the EPP's courses in the advanced program "focus on specialized technologies in the specializations of education leadership, reading, and special education such as assistive technology for special needs students, or assessments for reading comprehension." However, no evidence was provided.

Response:

Advanced candidates have multiple exposure to technology and technological applications in the professional education core courses. Evidence is provided in the table of Advanced Level Technology.

Advanced candidates in the EDEL program have multiple opportunities to use and promote effective and appropriate technologies through course assignments as indicated in the EDEL SPA report. EDEL candidates complete a School-Wide Discipline project and a School-wide Improvement Plan that requires that candidates both use and promote appropriate technologies to complete the assignment. Similarly, EDEL candidates utilize technology to complete the internship evaluation required in EDEL 550 and 560 as well as the action research project required in EDEL 560.

Advanced candidates in the SPED program also have multiple opportunities to use and promote effective and appropriate technologies through course assignments as indicated in the CEC SPA report. Candidates complete use technologies to support instructional assessment, planning, and delivery for individuals with exceptionalities. Additionally, the SPED candidates demonstrate that they are familiar with augmentative and alternative communication systems, as well as a variety of assistive technologies to support the communication and learning of individuals with exceptionalities through differentiated

planning and delivery of lessons. Candidates' use of these technologies is evaluated by the clinical experience evaluation. Additionally, candidates use technology and demonstrate their understanding of appropriate technologies as part of the capstone action research project in SPED 560.

Advanced candidates in the Reading Specialist program plan an integrated unit that will be delivered to their class and utilize technology to deliver lessons utilizing a variety of literacy strategies within a content unit in RDNG 520. Candidates explore various literacy apps, websites, and digital literacy program that can provide assistance to students as they progress in their literacy skills in RDNG 550. Candidates also explore digital options for literacy assessment, and apply these with work with P-12 students in RDNG 530.