

## **Fort Hays State University EPP**

**Document Evidence:** Annual Data Retreats (with focus on 2015 retreat)

**CAEP Standard/Component:** 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5

**Context Statement:** Annually, the EPP's Assessment Committee schedules and plans a data retreat. Stakeholders from all areas are invited to participate in this key day for evaluation of the EPP. The event usually involves the stakeholders examining EPP candidate/completer/employer data for strengths and weaknesses in the preparation programs as well as EPP processes/assessments. During the 2015 Data Retreat, the morning session involved examination of data from several EPP-wide assessments, primarily non-EPP-developed assessments. The afternoon session involved assessing the EPP-developed assessments per the CAEP's initial "Evaluation Tool for EPP-created Assessments."

**Document:** See documents attached below:

- Data Retreat Schedule Spring 2014 (officially the postponed Fall 2013 Retreat)
- Data Retreat Schedule Fall 2014
- Data Retreat Schedule Fall 2015
- Attendance Records for latest three data retreats
- Group Tasks for Data Analysis and Assessing the Assessments
- Example Group Record of Findings on Data—KPTP Data Group
- Example Group Record of Findings on Assessment—TECS 290/301 Group

**Analysis and Interpretation(s):** The EPP does collect and regularly examine evidence data from a set of multiple measures to evaluate, inform, and modify the EPP's operational effectiveness as tied to all CAEP standards and cross-cutting themes. The examination and interpretation of the data is open to a wide variety of stakeholders, results of this examination leading to proposed actions. The use of groups of stakeholders at the data retreats to examine the data versus just a few individuals support the EPP claims of data driven, consistent, and accurate interpretations. Also, the EPP uses these data retreats to examine programs strengths/weakness based on collected data, examination which then drives the proposed EPP improvement plans.

**Use and Continuous Improvement Statement(s):** The EPP must improve EPP-created assessments to higher standards. An improved development of assessments process requiring certain components to each assessment would strengthen the EPP assessments. Greater variety in stakeholder involvement to the selection of changes for improvement is needed.

# FHSU EPP SPRING 2014 DATA RETREAT

## SCHEDULE (updated 2/20/2014)

DATE: March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2014

TIME: 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM (working lunch...lunch provided)

Invite List: Janet Stramel (working on this)

TIMELINE:

Time	Activity	Responsibility
10:00 AM to 10:25 AM	<p>Welcome CAEP update</p> <p>Overview CAEP standards CAEP Terms icebreaker</p> <p>Emphasis on Shared Values &amp; Beliefs Time line to next visit</p>	<p>Dean Scott Janet Stramel</p> <p>Regi Wieland &amp; Steve Sedbrook Janet Stramel</p>
10:25 AM to 10:45 AM	<p>EPP vs Program data Clarify the difference Example Comparison of program data points versus EPP data points, use of graphic organizer Current EPP data collection points briefly, “jet” lag issues TK-20 update in relation to the EPP data collection points Include vision for complete program data collection in TK-20 Reliability–Validity–Fairness issues</p>	<p>Janet Stramel</p> <p>Lorie Cook-B. Jeff Sadler Janet Stramel</p> <p>Paul Adams</p>
10:45 AM to 1:15 PM  Includes working lunch	<p>TASK Intro Begin Data Analysis in breakout groups: Exit survey (Transition point 4—Standard 4) Standard Statement, Instrument DATA need: Fall 2013 Whole-group AND disaggregated by (1)Campus/T2T/Virtual type and (2)Major program level (ECU,Elem.,Sec., etc.)</p> <p>Praxis II Scores &amp; Licensure(Transition point 4—Standard 4) Standard Statement, Instrument DATA need: 2010 to current Whole-group AND disaggregated by (1)Campus/T2T/Virtual type and (2)Major program level (ECU,Elem.,Sec., etc.)</p>	<p>Jeff Sadler</p> <p>Suzanne Becking</p> <p>Kerry Schuckman</p>

	<p>Entrance Data (Transition point 1—Standard 3)  Standard Statement, Instrument(s)  DATA need: Waivers and GPA for Whole-group AND disaggregated by (1)Campus/T2T/Virtual type and (2)Major program level (ECU,Elem.,Sec., etc.).</p> <p>Disposition Data (Transition point 1 to 4—Standard 3)  Standard Statement, Instrument(s)  DATA need: Whole-group AND disaggregated by (1)Campus/T2T/Virtual type and (2)Major program level (ECU,Elem.,Sec., etc.)</p> <p>FPA Data (Transition point 2 and 3—Standard1)  Standard Statement, Instrument(s)  DATA need: 2012? to current Whole-group AND disaggregated by (1)Campus/T2T/Virtual type and (2)Major program level (ECU,Elem.,Sec., etc.)</p> <p>KSDE 3 year out Completer/Employer Data (Transition point 4-</p>	<p>Lorie Cook-B.</p> <p>Lorie Cook-B.</p> <p>Joe Chretein &amp; Yaprak Ward</p> <p>Paul Adams?</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Standard 4)  Standard Statement, Instrument(s)  Data need: 2013 Fall Whole-group AND disaggregated by  (1)Campus/T2T/Virtual type and (2)Major program level  (ECU,Elem.,Sec., etc.) Also past Completer/Employer data  from 2012</p> <p>Candidate Teaching Evals (Transition point 3—Standard 2)  Standard Statement, Instrument(s)  Whole-group AND disaggregated by (1)Campus/T2T/Virtual  type and (2)Major program level (ECU,Elem.,Sec., etc.) and  (3) Rater</p> <p>OTHERS????</p>	<p>Mike Karl</p>
<p>1:15 PM  to  1:50 PM</p>	<p>Group summary presentation, focus on how EPP can improve candidate  quality, etc.</p>	<p>Group leaders</p>
<p>1:50 PM  to  2:00 PM</p>	<p>Final Retreat Summary</p>	<p>Paul Adams</p>

## Fall 2015 EPP Initial Programs Data Retreat

Event: located at Robbins Center October 20th, 2015	Time of Day
<b>Opening:</b> Welcome by Dean, Director Accreditation Overveiw/CAEP Standards overview Purpose of Data Retreat and Results from last retreat Comments to first time attendees and "external stakeholders"	9:00 AM to 9:20 AM
<b>Breakout Task Overview:</b> Focus/Guidance plan for analysis of data Breakout Goup Tasks	9:20 AM to 9:30 AM
<b>Data Analysis Breakout Groups</b> KS Educator Alumni Survey--Facilitators Jim Barrett and Reade Dowda  KS Employer/Mentor Survey--Facilitators Joe Chretien and Jeff Sadler  KPTP--Facilitators Elodie Jones and Sarah Broman (Rhoades)  KEEP--Facilitators Shawn Henderson, Sherri Brantley, and Janet Stramel  Demographics--Facilitators Gary Andersen, Lorie Cook-Benjamin, and Amie Wright	9:30 AM to 11:45 AM
<b>Working Lunch</b> Inner group comparison per breakout groups, summarization of morning findings	11:45 AM to 12:30 PM
<b>Brief Oral Reports on Group Findings</b>	12:30 PM to 1:00 PM
<b>CAEP Assessment Rubric Intro and Training by Kathi Sanders</b>	1:00 PM to 1:45 PM
<b>Assessing FHSU Assessments Breakout Groups</b> Ed Psych Matrix--Facilitators Elodie Jones and Sheri Brantley  Prof Intro Video--Facilitators Paul Niencamp and Andi Beckman  Dispositions--Facilitators Lorie Cook-Benjamin and Joyce Ellis  Teacher Exit Survey--Facilitators Keith Dreiling and Joe Chretien  TECS 301 Tech Project (new assessment form)--Facilitators Kenny Rigler and Robert Moody	1:45 PM to 2:45 PM
<b>Summary Statements/Findings</b>	2:45 PM to 3:00 PM

**College of Education and Technology--FHSU EPP**

**2013-2014 Annual Data Retreat**

**Thursday, March 6, 2014**

Last	First	Attending	Last	First	Attending	Last	First	Attending
Adams	Paul	x	Gerstner	Lance	x	Olmstead	Eddie	No
Andrews	Laura	x	Glaze	Mick	No	Ottley	David	No
Barrett	Jim	x	Greathouse	John	No	Pallister	Craig	No
Becking	Suzanne	x	Griffith	George	No	Park	Allen	No
Beckman	Andi	No	Guyot	Wally	No	Plunkett	Diane	No
Bieker	Brandi	No	Hattan	Carla	No	Renfrow	Duane	x
Boldra	Sue	No	Harman	Nancy	No	Rigler	Kenny	x
Bonds-Raacke	Jennifer	No	Hester	Tiffany	No	Rohleder	Elaine	No
Brantley	Sherri	x	Holden	Adam	x	Sadler	Jeff	x
Briggs	Jeff	No	Huntington	Linn Ann	No	Sanders	Kathi	x
Brummer	Judy	No	Hyatt	Linda	No	Schuckman	Kerry	No
Chretien	Joe	x	Jones	Elodie	x	Scott	Rob B.	x
Colwell	Lisa	No	Jones	Scott	No	Scott	Rob F.	x
Cook-Benjamin	Lorie	x	Jordan	Randy	x	Sedbrook	Steve	x
Craven	Allen	No	Katt	Dean	No	Shepherd-Adams	Cheryl	No
Crawford-Leeds	Betsy	No	Karl	Mike	x	Spichal	Kevin	x
Culver-Turner	Rebecca	No	Keffer	Lee	No	Stewart	Kim	x
Dalat Ward	Yaprak	x	Kenne	Linda	No	Stramel	Janet	x
Deneault	Amanda	x	Kulmala	Dan	No	Straub	Marty	No
Deneault	Eric	x	Meagher	Tom	x	Stroup	Sara	x
Dreiling	Keith	x	Meckenstock	Mary	x	Unruh	Natalie	x
Eberle	Mark	No	Miller	Cynthia	No	Walizer	Beth	x
Ellis	Joyce	x	Moody	Robert	No	Wieland	Regi	x
Engler	Joe	x	Cline	Ben	No	Wilson	Sharon	No
Faber	Paul	x	Munsch	Kris	x	Wright	Amie	x
Finck	Elmer	No	Muth	Stephanie	x	Zelenda	Valerie	x
Fisher	Erica	x	Nienkamp	Paul	x			
Fulton	Dorothy	No				Grimes	Zach	x
Fuqua	Joy	x						

	RSVP'd	Attended	
School Partners	12	1	FHSU Robins Center 10:00 - 2:00 pm
FHSU- Department Chairs	5	2	
FHSU - Secondary Unit Faculty (non-COE)	16	7	
FHSU - COET Students	1	1	
FHSU College Dean's	3	1	
FHSU-COE Unit Faculty	46	31	
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>43</b>	

**College of Education and Technology--FHSU EPP**

**2014-2015 Annual Data Retreat**

**Thursday, November 6, 2014**

Last	First	Attending		Last	First	Attending		Last	First	Attending
Adams	Paul	x		Glaze	Mick	No		Olmstead	Eddie	No
Andrews	Laura	x		Griffith	George	No		Ottley	David	No
Barrett	Jim	x		Guyot	Wally	x		Pallister	Craig	No
Becking	Suzanne	x		Hattan	Carla	x		Park	Allen	No
Beckman	Andi	No		Harman	Nancy	No		Plunkett	Diane	No
Bieker	Brandi	No		Hester	Tiffany	x		Renfrow	Duane	x
Boldra	Sue	No		Holden	Adam	x		Rigler	Kenny	x
Bonds-Raacke	Jennifer	x		Huntington	Linn Ann	No		Rohleder	Elaine	No
Brantley	Sherri	x		Hyatt	Linda	No		Sadler	Jeff	x
Briggs	Jeff	No		Jones	Elodie	x		Sanders	Kathi	x
Brummer	Judy	No		Jones	Scott	x		Schuckman	Kerry	No
Chretien	Joe	x		Jordan	Randy	x		Scott	Rob B.	x
Colwell	Lisa	No		Katt	Dean	No		Sedbrook	Steve	x
Cook-Benjamin	Lorie	No		Karl	Mike	x		Shepherd-Adams	Cheryl	No
Craven	Allen	No		Keffer	Lee	No		Spichal	Kevin	x
Crawford-Leeds	Betsy	x		Kenne	Linda	No		Stewart	Kim	x
Culver-Turner	Rebecca	x		Kulmala	Dan	No		Stramel	Janet	x
Dalat Ward	Yaprak	x		Meagher	Tom	x		Straub	Marty	x
Deneault	Amanda	x		Meckenstock	Mary	x		Stroup	Sara	x
Deneault	Eric	x		Moody	Robert	x		Unruh	Natalie	x
Drelling	Keith	x		Cline	Ben	No		Walizer	Beth	x
Eberle	Mark	No		Munsch	Kris	x		Wieland	Regi	x
Ellis	Joyce	x		Muth	Stephanie	x		Wilson	Sharon	No
Faber	Paul	x		Nienkamp	Paul	x		Wright	Amie	x
Farley	Greg	No						Zelenda	Valerie	x
Fisher	Erica	x								
Fulton	Dorothy	x						Grimes	Zach	
Fuqua	Joy	x								

	RSVP'd	Attended	
School Partners	12	2	<b>FHSU Memorial Union 9:00 AM - 3:00 PM</b>
FHSU- Department Chairs	6	3	
FHSU - Secondary Unit Faculty (non-COE)	15	9	
FHSU - COET Students	1	0	
FHSU College Dean's	2	1	
FHSU-COE Unit Faculty	41	31	
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>46</b>	

**College of Education--FHSU EPP  
2015-2016 Annual Data Retreat  
Tuesday, October 20, 2015**

Last	First	Attending		Last	First	Attending		Last	First	Attending
Adams	Paul	x		Glaze	Mick	No		Ottley	David	No
Anderson	Gary	x		Griffith	George	No		Pallister	Craig	No
Andrews	Laura	x		Guyot	Wally	x		Park	Allen	No
Barrett	Jim	x		Henderson	Shawn	x		Plunkett	Diane	No
Becking	Suzanne	x		Harman	Nancy	No		Rigler	Kenny	x
Beckman	Andi	x		Hester	Tiffany	x		Rohleder	Elaine	No
Benjamin	Don	x		Huntington	Linn Ann	No		Sadler	Jeff	x
Boldra	Sue	x		Jones	Elodie	x		Sedbrook	Steve	x
Bonds-Raacke	Jennifer	No		Jones	Scott	No		Shepherd-Adams	Cheryl	No
Brantley	Sherrri	x		Jordan	Randy	No		Splichal	Kevin	x
Briggs	Jeff	No		Katt	Dean	x		Stewart	Kim	No
Broman	Sarah	x						Stramel	Janet	x
Chretien	Joe	x		Keffer	Lee	No		Straub	Marty	x
Cook-Benjamin	Lorie	x		Kenne	Linda	No		Stroup	Sara	x
Craven	Allen	No		Kulmala	Dan	No		Unruh	Natalie	x
Crawford-Leeds	Betsy	x		Meagher	Tom	x		Walizer	Beth	x
Dowda	Reade	x		Meckenstock	Mary	No		Wieland	Regi	x
Dalat Ward	Yaparak	No		Moody	Robert	x		Wilson	Sharon	No
Deneault	Eric	No		Cline	Ben	No		Woods	Teresa	x
Dreiling	Keith	x		Munsch	Kris	No		Wright	Amie	x
Eberle	Mark	No		Muth	Stephanie	x		Young	Lanee	x
Ellis	Joyce	x		Nienkamp	Paul	x				
Engler	Joe	x								
Faber	Paul	x								
Farley	Greg	No								
Fisher	Erica	x								
Fulton	Dorothy	x								
Fuqua	Joy	No								

			RSVP'd	Attended				<b>FHSU Robins Center</b>		
								<b>9:00 AM - 3:00 PM</b>		
<b>School Partners</b>			12	3						
FHSU- Department Chairs			4	1						
FHSU - Secondary Unit Faculty (non-COE)			18	10						
FHSU - COET Students			0	0						
FHSU College Dean's			4	2						
FHSU-COE Unit Faculty			27	25						
		Totals:	<b>65</b>	<b>41</b>						



## Overview of DATA Groups Tasks:

What is our ultimate goal as an EPP: To prepare our candidates through program completion in order to impact the P-12 student development and learning. This includes impacting the foundational content/pedagogical knowledge, field experiences, and quality of FHSU teacher candidates.

CAEP: The quality of an EPP is measured by the abilities of its completers to have a positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. Program quality and improvement are determined, in part, by characteristics of candidates that the provider recruits to the field; the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions that candidates bring to and acquire during the program; the relationships between the provider and the P-12 schools in which candidates receive clinical training; and subsequent evidence of completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development in schools where they ultimately teach. To be accredited, a preparation program must meet standards on each of these dimensions and demonstrate success in its own continuous improvement efforts.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). (2013). *CAEP Accreditation Standards* (p. 15). Washington, DC: CAEP. Retrieved from [http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/final\\_board\\_approved1.pdf](http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/final_board_approved1.pdf)

The purpose for the EPP Data Retreat today —to analyze our unit's effectiveness in preparing our candidates to be professional educators while also seeking ways to improve our candidates' quality as they transition through the program, developing an executable plan for improvement, AND recognizing any needed adjustments to our assessment process or instruments. To do that one must:

- Have Familiarity with the CAEP Standards
- Familiarity with the Assessment Instruments and Assessment Process
- Familiarity with the Data collected in the Assessment Process
- Familiarity with the EPP quality improvement process

Thus the following tasks are given to each group as a guideline for achieving these retreat goals.

**Initial Task:** Read and become reasonably familiar with the CAEP standards and standard COMPONENTS assigned to the subgroup.

**Second Task:** Examine the data instrument(s) briefly. Do not be overly critical of the assessment/collection instrument at this point of the tasking process. All of these instruments/data sets are "external" in some sense to the EPP and hence we have little recourse in the forms (just in our choice to use of such instruments). All these instruments must be formally aligned to the CAEP standards and the INTASC standards, but this is not your key task.

**Third Task:** Get down and dirty with the data. Examine the whole group and then the disaggregated data (when available) looking for trends and differences in groups. As you examine the data, make sure you attempt to answer these questions, keeping a written record of your answers:

Overarching: What does the current EPP data tell us about our unit's effectiveness in meeting the various CAEP Standards? If the data does not address a specific standard or standard component, state so.

Standard 1 with 5 components

Standard 2 with 3 components

Standard 3 with 6 components

Standard 4 with 4 components

List any perceived weaknesses of the assessment instrument(s) you found when trying to use the resulting data to measure the EPP's achievement of the CAEP Standard components. <Do note that one assessment instrument should not be expected to necessarily measure every standard or every standard component. > Briefly provide suggested changes to the EPP on use of this instrument.

As time allows for the group, also discuss the perceived reliability, validity, and fairness of the instrument(s) being used to collect this data.

**Fourth Task:** Please develop a brief summary written record of your groups work above. This report should include a summary of how the EPP is doing in regard to the components of the CAEP standards AND the group's suggested concrete plans for recommended actions. Also, prepare a short 5-minute "report" to share with the entire group which highlights your groups MOST key findings.

## Breakout Group TASKS on FHSU DATA

**Preliminary:** Determine Recorder and Presenter (will use Chrome book and a Google doc tied to your group's data/assessment instrument.)



**Step 1 (5 minutes):** Briefly review the CAEP Standards/Components. Begin to focus on ONE component of the standard at a time.

**Step 2 (20 minutes):** Become familiar with the data collection instrument(s) and with the components of that instrument (portfolio, survey, demographics, etc.) Then align each question/task/item/demographic, etc in terms of the CAEP Standard(s) and Component(s). Use subgroups as needed for this task. This can be marked on the paper form of the instrument with codes such as S1.2 for CAEP Standard 1-Component 2.

**Step 3: (1 hour 45 minutes):** Begin to focus on the summarized data collected by that instrument, looking for trends or interpretations of the data, recording key group findings. Use the following to direct the group discussion:

Overarching Question: What does the current data tell one about FHSU EPP's effectiveness in meeting the EPP's goal and meeting the CAEP Standard(s)/Component(s)? In using the data provided to answer this question, use the guidelines below in regard to the EPP's goal and to EACH aligned CAEP Standard-Component found in Step 2:

- (1) Is the EPP effectively preparing our candidates to be professional educators? What do the data show as strengths and weakness for the EPP? (List specific strengths/weaknesses found and what specific evidence in the data supports the statements listed.)
- (2) Suggest concrete plans (3 at most) for the EPP to implement in order to leverage the EPP's strengths and/or address the EPP's weaknesses discovered in part (1).
- (3) Does the data being examined inform the EPP about the CAEP cross-cutting themes of Diversity and Technology? If so, what specifically do the data show about the EPP in these two areas? (Give specifics as supported by specific evidence in the data.)
- (4) As time allows, list any perceived weaknesses of the data form and assessment instrument to measure the achievement of FHSU EPP's goal and achievement of CAEP Standards/Components. For each weakness, provide brief suggested changes to data form and assessment instrument.
- (5) As time allows, discuss the perceived reliability, validity, and fairness of the data form and assessment instrument being used to collect this data. Are there very strong concerns in any of these areas?

**Step 4 (15 minutes):** Have presenter share in short summary the group responses to these guiding tasks. This report should include a summary of how the EPP is doing in regard to the EPP's goal, to specific CAEP Standards/Components AND the group's concrete plans for recommended actions.

## Breakout Group TASKS on CAEP Evaluation of FHSU Assessments Instruments

**Preliminary:** Determine Recorder (will use Chrome book and a Google doc tied to your group's assessment instrument.)



**Step 1 (10 minutes):** Become familiar with the data collection instrument(s) and with the components of that instrument. Examine the current FHSU assessment matrix tied to that instrument (if any).

**Step 2 (40 minutes):** Using appropriate subcategory(ies) of the CAEP Assessment Matrix of internal assessments (A,B,C,D) quickly score the FHSU Assessment. Recall the training by Kathi Sanders. As a group, list perceived deficiencies in the FHSU Assessment as indicated by the CAEP Assessment Matrix.

Overarching Question: How well does the current state of the FHSU data collection instrument satisfy a CAEP accreditation assessment of the instrument? As time allows and as the group can determine with the given FHSU assessment information, complete the following tasks:

- (1) Does this FHSU assessment adequately satisfy CAEP subcategory A? If so, list some of the specific strengths. If not, list some of the specific weaknesses. If the current information is not sufficient for the group to “assess the assessment” for this subcategory, briefly explain.
  
- (2) Does this FHSU assessment adequately satisfy CAEP subcategory B? If so, list some of the specific strengths. If not, list some of the specific weaknesses. If the current information is not sufficient for the group to “assess the assessment” for this subcategory, briefly explain.
  
- (3) Does this FHSU assessment adequately satisfy CAEP subcategory C? If so, list some of the specific strengths. If not, list some of the specific weaknesses. If the current information is not sufficient for the group to “assess the assessment” for this subcategory, briefly explain.
  
- (4) Does this FHSU assessment adequately satisfy CAEP subcategory D? If so, list some of the specific strengths. If not, list some of the specific weaknesses. If the current information is not sufficient for the group to “assess the assessment” for this subcategory, briefly explain.

**Step 4 (10 minutes):** As a group, briefly review the progress made in the “assessing of the assessment.” Make sure the recorded report is reflective of the progress made (likely this report will be added to and expanded by Standard Committees.) A final paragraph of major strengths and issues with the assessment found by the group would be useful.

## KPTP Data Group Findings

### **Breakout Group on FHSU DATA Retreat - October 20, 2015**

**Group: Elodie Jones, Sarah Broman, Laura Andrews, Lanee Young, Steve Sedbrook, Beth Walizer, Robert Moody, Joy Fuqua.**

#### **Background:**

Prior to discussing alignment regarding the KPTP and CAEP Standards, our group actively discussed the KPTP tool, the background and its organic growth from the the FPA (2004-2014)) to the KPTP (2014-current), the individual Tasks, the KPTP components, scoring, preparation, etc. Essentially filling in the blanks for those who are new to the KPTP tool.

### **CAEP Alignment**

#### **CAEP Standard 1 - Content and Pedagogical Knowledge**

**(1.1)** Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s)1 in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility. **(KPTP - Task 2)**

**(1.2)** Providers ensure that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice. **(KPTP - 2.2.1, 2.4.1)**

**(1.3)** Providers ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies (e.g., National Association of Schools of Music – NASM). **(KPTP - Task 2.3.1, 2.2.2, Task 3.1, 3.2.1)**

**(1.4)** Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards). **(KPTP - 1.4)**

**(1.5)** Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice. **(KPTP - 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.3.1, 3.2.1)**

#### **CAEP Standard 2 - Clinical Partnerships and Practice**

**(2.1)** Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and shared accountability for candidate outcomes.

**(KPTP - 1.2, 4.3.1)**

**(2.2)** Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based

applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings. (KPTP - 1.2.1, 4.3.1)

(2.3) The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all. (KPTP - 1.1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3.1, 2.2.2, 2.3.1)

**CAEP Standard 3 - Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity**

Our group felt that because this standard focuses on the provider and not the candidate, connection to the KPTP is not necessary.

**CAEP Standard 4 - Program Impact**

Our group felt that because this standard focuses on the program impact, connection to the KPTP is not necessary.

**Step 3: (1 hour 45 minutes):** Begin to focus on the summarized data collected by that instrument, looking for trends or interpretations of the data, recording key group findings. Use the following to direct the group discussion:

**Overarching Question:** What does the current data tell one about FHSU EPP's effectiveness in meeting the EPP's goal and meeting the CAEP Standard(s)/Component(s)? In using the data provided to answer this question, use the guidelines below in regard to the EPP's goal and to EACH aligned CAEP Standard-Component found in Step 2:

- 1) Is the EPP effectively preparing our candidates to be professional educators? What do the data show as strengths and weakness for the EPP? (List specific strengths/weaknesses found and what specific evidence in the data supports the statements listed.)

**Strengths** - The KPTP has a great impact with regard to CAEP Standard 4 in which it documents great pedagogy regarding our candidates. As well, Standard 1 and 2 in multiple areas.

**Note** - The KPTP does not address CAEP Standard 3; however, there are other instruments as an EPP that does.

- 2) Suggest concrete plans (3 at most) for the EPP to implement in order to leverage the EPP's strengths and/or address the EPP's weaknesses discovered in part (1).

**1) Suggestion** - Most Kansas institutions, other than FHSU, provide a "prep" course for the KPTP, we feel that we could offer an intersession (T2T) KPTP prep where students partner and rate one another over a 4 weeks session, one task per week. Only Elementary Ed have a Corrections of Reading Disabilities as a prep course or Pre-KPTP. Could be an optional side course for ECU and Elementary Ed while they student-teach as a replacement or addition to the Elementary School Course (not mandatory).

**2) Suggestion** - A training for the EPP regarding the KPTP when the new document is released.

**3) Suggestion** - Train our Cooperating Teachers and make sure they have

information regarding the KPTP, KEEP, Evals, etc.

**4) Suggestions** - Faculty (ALL) need to be informed regarding all Student-Teaching meetings at Sternberg, because it helps provide insight as to outside help, tips for future students and support via email when they reach out in the field.

**5) Suggestion** - EPP wants to make sure FHSU has a faculty member on the state KPTP committee

- 3) Does the data being examined inform the EPP about the CAEP cross-cutting themes of Diversity and Technology? If so, what specifically do the data show about the EPP in these two areas? (Give specifics as supported by specific evidence in the data.)

*“See our documentation above (CAEP) regarding those cross-cutting areas. However, if we wanted clear cut data, we would have to disaggregate the data per diversity/technology.”*

- 4) As time allows, list any perceived weaknesses of the data form and assessment instrument to measure the achievement of FHSU EPP’s goal and achievement of CAEP Standards/Components. For each weakness, provide brief suggested changes to data form and assessment instrument.

**1) Suggestion** - EPP needs to ask the candidate to reflect on the student population, community, etc.; however, EPP could introduce the student to introspective reflection regarding their own thoughts/metacognition. Beth is on the KPTP Committee and feels this could be added to Task 2,

- 5) As time allows, discuss the perceived reliability, validity, and fairness of the data form and assessment instrument being used to collect this data. Are there very strong concerns in any of these areas?

**1) Concerns** - Reliability (fairness) - provide training all EPP/adjuncts and all candidates.

**2) Concerns** - Validity - Does the assessment truly measure capability beyond being a good writer, test taker; a snapshot of teaching instead of the entire picture (e.g. grit, soft skills, dispositions)?

## **Breakout Group on Assessing the Assessment—TECS 301 Group Record of Findings**

**Complete Step 1 on the task page before beginning to record in this document.**

**Step 2 (40 minutes):** Using appropriate subcategory(ies) of the CAEP Assessment Matrix of internal assessments (A,B,C,D) quickly score the FHSU Assessment. Recall the training by Kathi Sanders. As a group, list perceived deficiencies in the FHSU Assessment as indicated by the CAEP Assessment Matrix.

Overarching Question: How well does the current state of the FHSU data collection instrument satisfy a CAEP accreditation assessment of the instrument? As time allows and as the group can determine with the given FHSU assessment information, complete the following tasks:

- (1) Does this FHSU assessment adequately satisfy CAEP subcategory A? If so, list some of the specific strengths. If not, list some of the specific weaknesses. If the current information is not sufficient for the group to “assess the assessment” for this subcategory, briefly explain.

There were 4 components to the project so would like to find one single project for this.

Scholarly Essay

Prezi

Video

Handout

Last semester (Spring 2015) a new rubric was developed for the approval of the EPP to use.

- Now they create a Prezi and record it with screencast-o-matic

Will need to go to a four level scale instead of 5 levels at this time.

Are the student receiving the technology they need?

Strengths -

- All candidates take the course for Admission entrance and must receive a “C” or before.
- Assignment is administered later in the course so the students have time to build on their technology
- Will pilot for one semester and review and make changes as needed
- Assessment will be reviewed at several stages

Weaknesses -

- Need to establish a purpose
- Might want to use a pre and post assignment to show understanding and growth.
- Bases of judgement



- (2) Does this FHSU assessment adequately satisfy CAEP subcategory B? If so, list some of the specific strengths. If not, list some of the specific weaknesses. If the current information is not sufficient for the group to “assess the assessment” for this subcategory, briefly explain.

Strengths -

- Alignment to the ISTE Standards but will need to align to the CAEP or InTASK standards
- He has a higher level functioning with the rubric
- All instructor are using the same rubric

Weaknesses -

- Will need to align to InTASK
-

- (3) Does this FHSU assessment adequately satisfy CAEP subcategory C? If so, list some of the specific strengths. If not, list some of the specific weaknesses. If the current information is not sufficient for the group to “assess the assessment” for this subcategory, briefly explain.

Strengths -

- 

Weaknesses -

- Raters are not currently trained on the rubric and using the rubric the same.
- Need to define what the level of performances are
- Collecting data and determining inter-rater reliability

- (4) Does this FHSU assessment adequately satisfy CAEP subcategory D? If so, list some of the specific strengths. If not, list some of the specific weaknesses. If the current information is not sufficient for the group to “assess the assessment” for this subcategory, briefly explain.

Does not apply because it is not a survey.

**Step 3 (10 minutes):** As a group, briefly review the progress made in the “assessing of the assessment.” Make sure the recorded report is reflective of the progress made (likely this report will be added to and expanded by various Standard Committees.) A final paragraph of major strengths and issues found by the group regarding the assessment would be useful.