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1. **Program Profile: This profile describes a program category, which includes potential variations of program offerings. Each instance or variation must be distinguished among the others in order to ensure regulatory compliance. Please see the “Program Review Technical Guide” for additional details.**

Program Identification

**Name of the Program Category: Learning and Behavior Disorders**

**Grade Levels: (check all that apply)**

B-P  P-5  5-9  5-12  8-12  P-12

**Program Classification: (check all that apply)**

Undergraduate  Undergraduate – Cert Only

Graduate  Graduate – Cert Only

**Program Route: (check all that apply)**

Traditional  Option 6  Option 7

**Program Sites: (check all that apply)**

Main/Residential Campus  Off-Site Campus (list each location)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Campus Name | City |
| Name each campus |  |
|  |  |

**Delivery Modes: (check all that apply)**

Face-to-Face Only  Online Only  Hybrid

**EPP Submission Coordinator: If Option 6 - provide Program Coordinator:**

Name \_\_\_\_Dr. Beverly Ennis Name \_\_Dr. Beverly Ennis\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Phone \_\_\_270 789-5344 Phone \_\_270 789-5344\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Email [\_\_\_bcennis@campbellsville.edu](mailto:___bcennis@campbellsville.edu) Email [\_bcennis@campbellsville.edu](mailto:_bcennis@campbellsville.edu)

Program Experiences

# Program Innovations: (Optional)

Program-Initiated Innovations. These innovations may span over the most recent three years and should include all variations within this program category.

|  |
| --- |
| Limit of 2,000 characters. |

Program Curriculum:

Each EPP must inform a potential candidate about the program’s content, performance expectations and assessment processes.

How does the EPP communicate/Identify below the following program requirements: required coursework and electives, certification and/or degree result, admission requirements, exit requirements, Praxis II test disclaimer. If the EPP offers multiple program routes for this category and certification, include each variation.

|  |
| --- |
| We use the curriculum guides as the primary method to communicate program details with each student and candidate. Please see our attached guides in the addendum.  See [Addendum A](#A) |

**Admission criteria for each program code in this category:** This must include **admission criteria** such as GPA, admission assessments, evidence of Code of Ethics and Character and Fitness Review. Reference the applicable program code(s) and regulations (i.e., 16 KAR 5:020, 16 KAR 9:080, 16 KAR 9:090) and the “Program Review Technical Guide” for additional details. Information provided below should correlate to the QAS documentation.

|  |
| --- |
| Admission (CAP 5) criteria for MASE program meets the standards established in 16 KAR 5:020 for admissions to teacher education programs and 16 KAR 9:080 for alternative programs and includes a cumulative GPA of 2.75 as documented on official transcript for a bachelor’s degree (or 3.0 on last 30 hours). Candidates must also have passing scores on the Praxis Core Academic Skills for Educators (CASE) or the GRE. Further, candidates must provide three letters of recommendation, a clear, state criminal background check, and a signed disposition assessment policy. They must also sign and commit to the *KY Code of Ethics/Character and Fitness*, complete a diversity survey and a creativity self-assessment. Candidates must successfully complete an entrance interview/ presentation and writing competency assessment that will be evaluated by education and content faculty. 16 KAR 9:090 is not applicable to this program as it is not an alternative certification program for world languages.  [See Addendum B](#B) |

**Pre-Student Teaching Experiences:** (Option 6 will skip this section)

How does the program ensure candidate’s pre-student teaching experiences meet the requirements as outlined in **16 KAR 5:040 Section 3(3)?**

1. Engagement with diverse populations of students which include:  
   1. Students from a minimum of two (2) different ethnic or cultural groups of which the candidate would not be considered a member;  
   2. Students from different socioeconomic groups;  
   3. English language learners;  
   4. Students with disabilities; and  
   5. Students from across elementary, middle school, and secondary grade levels;
2. Observation in schools and related agencies, including:  
   1. Family Resource Centers; or  
   2. Youth Service Centers;
3. Student tutoring;
4. Interaction with families of students;

(e) Attendance at school board and school-based council meetings:  
(f) Participation in a school-based professional learning community; and  
(g) Opportunities to assist teachers or other school professionals.

|  |
| --- |
| Candidates complete 200 field (clinical) hours throughout the coursework portion of their degree. Each course has 15-40 hours of intentional clinical experiences designed to amplify coursework through practical application of teaching pedagogy while enhancing student development and learning in the classrooms where they are working. Examples of field experiences which fulfill the mandates of16 KAR 5:060 3(3) include but are not limited to:   * ED 607 Graduate/Practicum Seminar where candidates prepare and teach 3-5 lessons in their content area utilizing the appropriate Sources of Evidence; * SED 504 Emotional Disturbance and Behavioral Disorders where candidates produce written reflections of field experiences noting what effect the classroom had on creating and maintain a positive learning environment. Develop a lesson plan in a content area of choice. Include in the plan behavior interventional strategies to improve student/s behavioral challenges (as noted from field experience observations) * SED 506 Behavior Management of Children with Learning and Behavior Problems where candidates collaborate with general education teacher and parent to develop a behavior management plan for a student. * SED 602 Classroom Management where candidates collaborate with general education teacher to develop a classroom management plan based on the needs of all diverse learners. * SED 603 Teaching Mathematics to Children and Youth with Learning and Behavior Disorders where candidates collaborate with general education teacher and parent to develop a plan for intervention in the area of math based on the informal assessment. |

**Describe the culminating Clinical/Professional Experiences for each instance in this program category:** Reference the regulation 16 KAR 5:040 Section 6 about professional experiences. The Option 6 instance of this program category can ignore this section since the program must use KTIP as the culminating experience.

|  |
| --- |
| The culminating Clinical/Professional Experience for the MASE traditional track is student teaching. Candidates are placed in cooperating accredited schools for the study of teaching in a laboratory setting. The experience consists of directed observation, guided participation and full-time classroom teaching. During this capstone experience the student teacher is under the supervision of a qualified teacher and a university supervisor. All placements are in compliance with 16 KAR 5:040 Section 6. Student teaching requires one full semester (16 weeks) of classroom experience. Student teachers are required to attend regularly scheduled campus seminars in addition to their placement. (MASE traditional candidates).  The student teaching experience culminates in a real world educational evaluation model supervised by certified teachers and University Supervisors who have completed the Co-teaching Training. Candidates utilize modified KTIP Source of Evidence documents throughout the experience.  A major component of the Student Teaching experience is the ​ Co-Teaching Model. This model is utilized to provide professional learning opportunities for Student Teacher Candidates in collaboration with districts/schools through a systematic process based on effective implementation practices, effective adult learning strategies, evaluation of delivery, evaluation of on-going implementation and improvement cycle analysis to promote sustainability. The outcomes of this teaching experience will focus on increasing student engagement, student achievement and supporting teacher's ability to implement with fidelity and to ultimately close achievement gaps. |

**Exit requirements for each instance in this program category:** This must include **exit assessments.**

( i.e.,: KTIP assessment, portfolio/work sample, GPA, and if the program requires passing or taking the Praxis II for program completion, list it here.) Reference CAEP 3.5 and 3.6

|  |
| --- |
| In order to exit the program, candidates must have a 3.0 cumulative GPA on 45-57 hours of coursework, pass the Praxis II demonstrating a high standard for content and pedagogical knowledge as outlined in CAEP Standard 3.5. Candidates must also pass student teaching and submit the exit portfolio based on student teaching for traditional candidates, meeting all Kentucky Teacher Standards, and demonstrating CAEP Standard 3.5 “…teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development” and CAEP Standard 3.6 which outlines professional standards, laws and ethics. For students who are in the traditional MAT program, CAP 7 would be completed at the end of their student teaching placement with a grade of C or higher. For Option 6 candidates, full exit occurs after successful completion of the KTIP year.  See [Addendum B](#B) |

Kentucky P-12 Curriculum Requirements

The following information is gathered in accordance with Kentucky Senate Bill 1 - <http://www.lrc.ky.gov/record/09RS/SB1.htm> and the associated legislation tied to this bill.

How does the EPP ensure each candidate’s knowledge/proficiency of the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS)? How does the EPP measure the depth of knowledge of each candidate?

|  |
| --- |
| For lessons and units candidates are required to align/integrate the KAS as appropriate for the content along with the ELA standards, particularly for reading and writing. Content specific standards include the ELA, mathematics, social studies and Next Generation Science Standards. Candidates make accomodations for candidates with learning and behavior disabilities demonstrating a scaffolded knowledge of the content. The EPP measures candidate depth of knowledge utilizing the Praxis II and GPA. Analysis of portfolio artifacts is also conducted to ensure candidates are able to apply depth of knowledge in planning for instruction and assessment. |

Briefly describe how candidates use the Kentucky P-12 curriculum framework and the Kentucky P-12 assessment system to guide instruction.

|  |
| --- |
| Candidates apply the Kentucky P-12 Curriculum framework and the Kentucky P-12 School Assessment system in developing lesson plans and assessments. All lesson plans require lesson objectives that are directly linked to KAS, and candidates must document the corresponding KAS in the lesson plan. All objectives in the lesson plan must be measured formatively and eventually summatively in order to demonstrate the P-12 student mastery of the standards. This prepares students to demonstrate proficiency on state mandated assessments. In addition, all lessons and assessments include accommodations that demonstrate an understanding of how the diverse learners in the class process the lesson and demonstrate mastery through assessment. Candidates use KTIP Source of Evidence documents for developing lessons in each course. These Sources of Evidence are tagged to specific KTS and PGES standards. |

Provide evidence (KTIP assessments/portfolio/other data) of candidates’ use of the KAS framework in lesson plans (include lesson plan format if not using the current KTIP format).

|  |
| --- |
| Candidates are required to submit a portfolio for program exit that demonstrates their skill and commitment to creating supportive environments that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college and creer ready standards. Artifacts from the portfolio that document this include lesson and unit plans, a classroom management plan, sample assessments, and a collaborative plan where the candidate collaborates with other professionals to meet the individual learning and other needs of one student. In addition, during student teaching, candidates demonstrate these same skills and commitment and are assessed using Form C, a rubric to measure proficiency of the KTS.  See [Addendum C](#C), [Addendum D](#D), and [Addendum E](#E) |

Provide evidence of candidate’s abilities to create and use formative and summative assessments to

guide instruction toward mastery of the Kentucky P-12 curriculum framework.

|  |
| --- |
| Candidates are required to submit a portfolio for program exit that demonstrates their ability to create and use formative and summative assessments to guide instruction toward mastery of the Kentucky P-12 curriculum framework. In addition, during student teaching, candidates demonstrate these same abilities and are assessed using Form C, a rubric to measure proficiency of KTS 5 The Teacher Assesses and Communicates Learning Results.  See [Addendum C](#C), [Addendum D](#D), and [Addendum E](#E) |

Courses

**Use the “Program Review Courses” spreadsheet**

Provide a list of the program courses (include all courses in the curriculum guide; General Education courses are not required). Ensure that the courses are identified and linked to each program category and program code on the “Program Review Courses” spreadsheet. When completing the “COURSES” tab, the EPP can enter all courses for all programs in one spreadsheet.

# Clinical Educators

**Use the “Program Review Clinical Educators” spreadsheet**

# Provide a list of all Clinical Educators who prepare candidates in this program category. Include full-time and part-time faculty; identify the adjunct teachers; do not include cooperating teachers. These should be members who are directly involved with program delivery. Ensure that each educator is identified and linked to one or more program categories. When completing the “Program Review Clinical Educators” spreadsheet the EPP can enter all educators for all programs in one spreadsheet.

# Key Assessment Areas

**Use the “Program Review Assessments” spreadsheet**

# In this section, identify the assessment areas used to generate program data to demonstrate mastery of the Kentucky Teacher Standards. For each assessment area, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program. EPPs must identify the assessments for each assessment area to demonstrate meeting the Kentucky Teacher Standards. Reference the “Program Review Technical Guide” for additional details. When completing the “Assessments Initial” tab, the EPP can either enter all assessments for all initial programs in one spreadsheet (this approach requires that each assessment is tagged to specific program codes), or enter the assessments for each program code in a separate spreadsheet.

# Align to Standards

**Use the “Program Review SPA Alignment” spreadsheet**

# The purpose of the alignment section is to indicate where the program courses address the applicable Specialty Professional Standards. Some programs will be expected to demonstrate alignment with multiple SPAs (i.e., ACEI, NCTM, ILA, ISTE, etc.). The Program Review Spreadsheet provides each of the major standard areas, including the SPAs to be used to show this alignment. This alignment provides direction and guidance for the evaluation of addressing all the standards through the program review process. Many EPPs have their own alignment tables and combine standards through various crosswalks – these may be attached as an addendum and may replace the alignment tables in the Program Review Spreadsheet.

(Assessments are aligned with the KTS and the course alignments are for the SPA.)

# Evidence and analysis

# Repeat this section for each assessment

**Evidence for meeting standards -** For each instance in this program category, provide a narrative about the eight (8) assessment areas, discuss the instrument, scoring guide/criteria, and alignment to the Kentucky Teacher Standards. The narrative provides a rationale for how the assessment area demonstrates candidate mastery of the standards. Many EPPs study their assessments on a periodic basis and develop comprehensive reports and graphs; this report may be attached as an addendum and may be used to replace the table questions below only if all equivalent information is provided. When completing this section, the EPP will copy this table eight (8) times for each instance in this program category. If the assessments are the same for each instance, then declare in your narrative that they are the same, or only show those assessments which are different. Reference the “Program Review Technical Guide” for additional details.

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessment Title:**  PRAXIS Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications (5543) |
| **Assessment description:**  The Praxis Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderage Applications (5543) is the state mandated assessment for content and pedagogical knowledge in this program. |
| **How do the Assessment and any related measures address the Kentucky Teacher Standards?**  According to the Praxis Study Companion for this test, the Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Monderate Applications test is designed for examinees who plan to teach students with mild to moderage disabilities at any grade level from preschool through grade 12. Its focus is on five major content areas: Development and Characteristics of Learners (KTS 1), Planning and the Learning Environment (KTS 3), Instruction (KTS 1, 2, 4), Assessment (KTS 5), and Foundations and Professional Responsibilities (KTS KTS 6, 7, 8, 9, 10). |
| **Discuss the data analysis for this assessment:** Explain how the assessment data supports/validates a candidate’s ability through the progressions of this program:  The PRAXIS Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications (5543) is typically taken at the end of the program, when the candidate has finished the coursework. Candidates who pass this assessment have usually successfully completed all of the other program requirements prior to this assessment. This assessment supports the candidate receiving certification for Learning and Behavior Disorders. |
| **Provide a link to the assessment scoring guide or rubric.** (Not required for Praxis II)  No rubric attached, the passing scores are determined by EPSB. |
| **Discuss how the reliability and validity of this assessment has been established and supported.**  The assessments are proprietary; therefore, reliability and validity have been established by the Educational Testing Services.  See the*,* [*Praxis Technical Manual*](https://www.campbellsville.edu/education/files/2017/09/Praxis-Series-Technical-Manual.pdf)*,* p. 11-20, “Assessment Development.” |
| **Describe how the data from this assessment is used for the continuous improvement of this program.**  Data from the PRAXIS Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications test revealed that candidates scored an average of 170.13 over three years. In 2016 candidates scored an average of 174. This was up from the 2015 average of 170.55. CU candidates score lower than candidates in other programs statewide, not only LBD certification. This is why the first goal and the three corresponding objectives of the selected improvement plan for the EPP have to do with improving performance on the PRAXIS assessments. Program faculty analyzed the PRAXIS data and determined that more PRAXIS preparation materials needed to be available for students. Program faculty will also align class discussions and assignments more intentionally with the PRAXIS Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications test. In addition, the Praxis is a large part of the EPPs CAEP Selected Improvement Plan, and there are several EPP policy changes and training opportunities for students that will be implemented as a result.  The EPP has not kept PRAXIS scores that are not passing. While the overall trend is improvement from the 2014 cohort to the 2016 cohort, the candidate numbers in the program have dropped significantly. This coupled with the lack of knowing when candidates did not pass the Praxis made drawing generalizations with the existing data difficult. When analyzing data for all programs this year, EPP faculty determined that we need to keep track of PRAXIS test scores that are not passing as well as passing scores for use in data analysis and program improvement. |
| **Assessment Title:**  GPA | | |
| **Assessment description:**  The average obtained by dividing the total number of grade points earned by the total number of credits attempted. GPA is the arithmetic average of all graded assignments and assessments in a course, program, and/or degree. | | |
| **How do the Assessment and any related measures address the Kentucky Teacher Standards?**  GPA measures candidate achievement cumulatively on all of the components of all of the standards. Course activities, assignments, and assessments are all linked to KTS and overall GPA documents the level of student mastery of the prescribed coursework. Candidate GPA is utilized at CAP 7, program completion in order to demonstrate that the candidate has completed program experiences at a sufficient level to practice effectively as special education teacher for grades P-12. Grades are routinely used at all levels in education and are accepted predictors of future performance (Soh, 2011; Jones, J., McDonald, C., Maddox, A., & McDonald, S., 2011; Harrell, P., Harris, M., & Jackson, J., 2009). GPA also documents other candidate qualities not measured by more formal assessments such as giftedness, organization, work ethic and quality of interactions with others (Dickinson & Adelson, 2016; Jones, J. et. al, 2011). Bradley, Sankar, Clayton, Mbarika, & Raju (2007) found that students with higher GPAs perceived they had increased capability of using higher order thinking skills that lead to complex abilities such as integrating and evaluating.  The minimum GPA requirement to successfully exit the program is 3.0 GPA. Candidates may not have any grade below a C in any course.  Bradley, R., Sankar, C., Clayton, H., Mbarika, V., & Raju, P. (2007). A study on the impact of  GPA on perceived improvement of higher order cognitive skills. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Educatio*n, 5(1), 151-167.  Dickinson, E. & Adelson, J. (2016). Choosing among multiple achievement measures. *Journal*  *of Advanced Academics*, 27(1), 4-15.  Harrel, P, Harris, M., & Jackson, J. (2009). An examination of teacher quality variables with  passing state content tests. *Journal for the Association of for Alternative Certification*, 4(2),  18-40.    Jones, J., McDonald, C., Maddox, A. & McDonald, S. (2011). Teacher candidate success  on state mandated professional tests: On predictive measure. *Education*, 131(4), 905-920.  Soh, K. (2011). Grade point average: what’s wrong and what’s the alternative? *Journal of*  *Higher Education Policy and Management*, 33(1), 27-36. | | |
| **Discuss the data analysis for this assessment:** Explain how the assessment data supports/validates a candidate’s ability through the progressions of this program:  Candidate GPA on previous degrees is one criteria (minimum 2.75 or 3.0 on last 30 hours) for program admissions and demonstrates candidate’s potential for successfully completing college work. At program midpoint (CAP 6) GPA is used as a check to ensure candidates are progressing successfully through program coursework (minimum 3.0). Candidates are required to have a cumulative 3.0 or higher to exit the program. | | |
| **Provide a link to the assessment scoring guide or rubric.** (Not required for Praxis II)  **Grading Scale:** A 90-100%  B 80-89%  C 70-79%  D 60-69%  F 0-59% | | |
| **Discuss how the reliability and validity of this assessment has been established and supported.**  Several studies support the reliability and validity of decisions made based on GPA. Bacon and Bean (2006) studied the reliability and validity of the cumulative GPA and determined the reliability to be “quite high” (p.38). They recommended when using GPA in research, for reliability and validity purposes using the overall GPA as opposed to program only GPA. This coincides with a study commissioned by the New Jersey State Board of Education (2007) which found that use of the overall GPA was more reliable and valid than a single year GPA or a major or content area GPA. The National Education Association (NEA) described GPA as a more reliable predictor of future student success than other assessments because it “…capture[s] content, knowledge, and skills critical to success, such as perseverance and self-control” (n.d., p. 1). In addition, GPA is considered a valid predictor of future success (Herrera & Blair, 2015). Love, Holter, and Krall (1982) found GPA to be a “significant predictor” of success on the comprehensive examination for a medical professional program at West Virginia University and the Board of Registry examination.  Bacon, D. & Bean, B. (2006). GPA in research studies: An invaluable but neglected opportunity.  *Journal of Marketing Education*, 28(1), 35-42.  Herrera, C. & Blair, J. (2015). Predicting success in nursing programs. *Research in Higher Education*,  28, 1-8.  Love, B., Holter, J., & Krall, J. (1982). Validity of grade point average as a predictor of student success.  *Laboratory Medicine*, 13(3), 186-194.  National Education Association. (n.d.). Indicators of future success: GPA and noncognitive skills.  Retrieved from: <https://www.nea.org/assets/docs/Indicators_of_Success-BGH_ac5-final.pdf>.  New Jersey State Board of Education. (2007). *Summary of Grade Point Average Research*. Retrieved  From: [*www.state.nj.us/education/sboe/meetings/2007/.../GPA%20research%20discussion.doc*](http://www.state.nj.us/education/sboe/meetings/2007/.../GPA%20research%20discussion.doc) | | |
| **Describe how the data from this assessment is used for the continuous improvement of this program.**  In the past three cycles of data, candidates in the traditional track had an average exit GPA of 3.73 (2014), 3.97 (2015), and 3.76 (2016). In the past three cycles of data, candidates in the option 6 track had an average exit GPA of 3.84 (2014), 3.69 (2015), and 3.74 (2016). These GPAs scores indicate that program candidates have the content and pedagogical knowledge necessary to be a teacher of students with learning and behavior disabilities and are able to apply it in classroom situations. | | |
| **Assessment Title:**  PRAXIS Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications (5543) | | |
| **Assessment description:**  The Praxis Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderage Applications (5543) is the state mandated assessment for content and pedagogical knowledge in this program. | | |
| **How do the Assessment and any related measures address the Kentucky Teacher Standards?**  According to the Praxis Study Companion for this test, the Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Monderage Applications test is designed for examinees who plan to teach students with mild to moderage disabilities at any grade level from preschool through grade 12. Its focus is on five major content areas: Development and Characteristics of Learners (KTS 1), Planning and the Learning Environment (KTS 3), Instruction (KTS 1, 2, 4), Assessment (KTS 5), and Foundations and Professional Responsibilities (KTS KTS 6, 7, 8, 9, 10). | | |
| **Discuss the data analysis for this assessment:** Explain how the assessment data supports/validates a candidate’s ability through the progressions of this program:  The PRAXIS Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications (5543) is typically taken at the end of the program, when the candidate has finished the coursework. Candidates who pass this assessment have usually successfully completed all of the other program requirements prior to this assessment. This assessment supports the candidate receiving certification for Learning and Behavior Disorders. | | |
| **Provide a link to the assessment scoring guide or rubric.** (Not required for Praxis II)  No rubric attached, the passing scores are determined by EPSB. | | |
| **Discuss how the reliability and validity of this assessment has been established and supported.**  The assessments are proprietary; therefore, reliability and validity have been established by the Educational Testing Services.  See the*,* [*Praxis Technical Manual*](https://www.campbellsville.edu/education/files/2017/09/Praxis-Series-Technical-Manual.pdf)*,* p. 11-20, “Assessment Development.” | | |
| **Describe how the data from this assessment is used for the continuous improvement of this program.**  Data from the PRAXIS Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications test revealed that candidates scored an average of 170.13 over three years. In 2016 candidates scored an average of 174. This was up from the 2015 average of 170.55. CU candidates score lower than candidates in other programs statewide, not only LBD certification. This is why the first goal and the three corresponding objectives of the selected improvement plan for the EPP have to do with improving performance on the PRAXIS assessments. Program faculty analyzed the PRAXIS data and determined that more PRAXIS preparation materials needed to be available for students. Program faculty will also align class discussions and assignments more intentionally with the PRAXIS Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications test. In addition, the Praxis is a large part of the EPPs CAEP Selected Improvement Plan, and there are several EPP policy changes and training opportunities for students that will be implemented as a result.  The EPP has not kept PRAXIS scores that are not passing. While the overall trend is improvement from the 2014 cohort to the 2016 cohort, the candidate numbers in the program have dropped significantly. This coupled with the lack of knowing when candidates did not pass the Praxis made drawing generalizations with the existing data difficult. When analyzing data for all programs this year, EPP faculty determined that we need to keep track of PRAXIS test scores that are not passing as well as passing scores for use in data analysis and program improvement. | | |
| **Assessment Title:**  Student Teaching or KTIP documentation | | |
| **Assessment description:**  Candidates who are not employed in a school system as a special education teacher (Option 6), complete student teaching. Form C is the final documentation of their performance on the 10 Kentucky Teacher Standards. Option 6 candidates complete an internship (KTIP) before they successfully exit the program. The Intern Performance Record (IPR) is the final documentation of their performance on all components of the *Kentucky Framework for Teaching* which is linked to the 10 Kentucky Teacher Standards. These documents are utilized to demonstrate candidates’ clinical experiences that measure teaching proficiency and application of content knowledge and pedagogical skills. | | |
| **How do the Assessment and any related measures address the Kentucky Teacher Standards?**  All Kentucky Teacher Standards are assessed both formatively and summatively throughout the student teaching and KTIP experience. Form C and the IPR are used to document candidate proficiency. Candidates cannot successfully exit the program without a minimum score of a 2 of 3 (student teaching) or Developing (KTIP) on all criteria. | | |
| **Discuss the data analysis for this assessment:** Explain how the assessment data supports/validates a candidate’s ability through the progressions of this program: | | |
| **Provide a link to the assessment scoring guide or rubric.** (Not required for Praxis II)  [**Form C**](#C)  Danielson, C. (2014). Framework for Teaching (adapted for the Kentucky Department of Education).  Education Professional Standards Board Website: <http://education.ky.gov/teachers/PGES/TPGES/Documents/Kentucky%20Framework%20for%20Teaching.pdf>.  Education Professional Standards Board. (2016). KTIP/IECE 2016-2017 forms and resources. Education  Professional Standards Board Website: <http://www.epsb.ky.gov/internships/KTIP_2016-2017_Forms.asp>. | | |
| **Discuss how the reliability and validity of this assessment has been established and supported.**  The *IPR* and *Kentucky Framework for Teaching* are proprietary; therefore, reliability and validity have been established by the organization that owns them (EPSB). Form C utilizes the Kentucky Teacher Standards verbatim; therefore, according to the *Early Instrument Review Report: Campbellsville University* (CAEP, 2016), it is considered proprietary as well.  Penland, D., Dix, J., & Eldridge, D. (2016). *Early Instrument Review Report: Campbellsville University.*  Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation: Washington, DC. | | |
| **Describe how the data from this assessment is used for the continuous improvement of this program.**  Only one candidate completed student teaching during the 2014-2015 academic year, and this candidate scored a 3 out of 3 for KTS 1 and 7 and a 2 out of 3 for all other KTS except KTS 9 and 10. The candidate received no scores for those two standards. Only one candidate completed student teaching during the 2015-2016 academic year, and this candidate scored a 3 out of 3 on all 10 of the KTS. There were no candidates who completed student teaching during the 2016-2017 academic year.  It is difficult to generalize with so few candidates in this program who student teach. They are performing at an acceptable level on all standards. A more effective process for data collection and/or data input is needed to ensure all candidates have scores for all standards. | | |
| **Assessment Title:**  **Exit Portfolio scores for KTS 5, Assessment and KTS 7,** **Reflection** | | |
| **Assessment description:**  The exit portfolio includes KTS 5, Assessment that requires student teachers to include a minimum of five different forms of formative and summative, created and designed by the candidate. Student work samples are to be included with three of the five selected entries. Scoring guides and rubrics are required when appropriate. The entries may come from the TPA assessments with rubrics, scoring guides and documentation of ability to analyze data.  KTS 7 Requirements in the exit portfolio are part of the TPA and involve post observation reflections and analysis of student learning results for the unit. | | |
| **How do the Assessment and any related measures address the Kentucky Teacher Standards?**  Explain how the aligned standard is met at the indicator level. This section should be a narrative on the measures in the assessment and how these meet the standards. Cite standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.  The rubric used to evaluate KTS 5, Assessment and KTS 7, Reflection, includes all indicators for all 10 KTS. | | |
| **Discuss the data analysis for this assessment:** Explain how the assessment data supports/validates a candidate’s ability through the progressions of this program:  Candidates in the traditional track of the MASE program scored an average of 2.56 out of a possible 3.0 for KTS 5 for the past three cohorts. This average has trended downward for the past three cycles from a high average of 2.75 out of 3.0 for the 2014 cohort to a 2.0 for the 2016 cohort. The number of candidates in the traditional track has dropped as well from four candidates in the 2014 cohort to two candidates in the 2016 cohort. The three year average for KTS 7 for the past three cohorts has been 2.67. The high, 3 out of 3 during this time was for the 2015 cohort. The low, 2 out of 3, was for the 2016 cohort.  Candidates in the Option 6 track of the MAST program scored an average of 2.42 out of a possible 3.0 for KTS 5 for the past three cohorts. This average has not fluctuated significantly ranging from a low 2.25 in 2015 to a high 2.5 in 2014. The number of candidates completing the program has dropped more dramatically from a high of 10 in 2014 to a low of four in 2015 and back up to five in 2016. The three year average for KTS 7 for the past three cohorts has been 2.53. The high, 2.7 out of a possible 3, during this time was for the 2014 cohort. The low, 2.25 out of 3, was for the 2015 cohort.  These scores demonstrate that candidates in both tracks of the MASE perform at an acceptable level on these two standards and support progression through the program. | | |
| **Provide a link to the assessment scoring guide or rubric.** (Not required for Praxis II)  [Addendum F](#F) | | |
| **Discuss how the reliability and validity of this assessment has been established and supported.**  The KTIP documents have been determined, through CAEP’s early review of assessments, to be proprietary since they were developed by the EPSB for use with first year teachers. However, the reliability is being further ensured through use of inter-rater reliability. | | |
| **Describe how the data from this assessment is used for the continuous improvement of this program.**  The data from the CAP 7 or exit Portfolio, specifically from KTS 5, Assessment, and KTS 7 Reflection completed are analyzed during each assessment cycle, either the May retreat or the fall or December assessment sessions. The data are additionally used to meet several objectives. The first is to provide feedback to students. The second objective is to monitor program effectiveness and develop annual Student Learning Objectives. The data over time also provide insight into program effectiveness. | | |
| **Assessment Title:**  **CAP 7 Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) in the Exit Portfolio** | | |
| **Assessment description:**  The TPA in the exit portfolio involves KTS 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7. It is an instructional unit taught during the capstone clinical experience of student teaching. Candidates must follow the unit guidelines as required in the unit Sources of Evidence. The TPA unit is composed of the following Sources of Evidence and must contain a minimum of three lesson plans:  Source of Evidence 1.1: Unit Guidelines  Source of Evidence 1.2: Unit Assessment Plan with a pre test, analysis of pre and post tests  Source of Evidence 1.3: Design of Instructional Activities  Source of Evidence 2: Lesson Plans  Source of Evidence 4: Post Observation Reflections for lessons taught  Source of Evidence 1.4 Organizing/Analyzing Results for Unit  Source of Evidence 6: Records and Communication  Source of Evidence 9: Student Voice | | |
| **How do the Assessment and any related measures address the Kentucky Teacher Standards?**  Explain how the aligned standard is met at the indicator level. This section should be a narrative on the measures in the assessment and how these meet the standards. Cite standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.  The rubric used to evaluate the TPA is a KTIP document based on the KTS so all of the indicators for KTS 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 are evaluated as a result of these TPA artifacts in the exit portfolio. | | |
| **Discuss the data analysis for this assessment:** Explain how the assessment data supports/validates a candidate’s ability through the progressions of this program:  Candidates in the traditional track of the MASE program scored an average of 2.67 out of a possible 3.0 for KTS 1 for the past three cohorts. The averages for this standard ranged from a high of 3.0 for the 2015 cohort to a low of 2.0 for the 2016 cohort. The number of candidates in the traditional track has dropped as well from four candidates in the 2014 cohort to two candidates in the 2016 cohort. Candidates scored an average of 2.78 for KTS 2. For this standard, the averages ranged from a low of 2.0 in 2014 to a high of 3.0 in 2015 and 2016. Candidates scored an average of 2.7 for KTS 4. For this standard, the averages ranged from a low of 2.5 in 2014 to a high of 3.0 in 2015 and 2016. Candidates scored an average of 2.58 for KTS 6. For this standard, the averages ranged from a low of 2.75 in 2014 to a high of 3.0 in 2015 and 2016. The three year average for KTS 7 for the past three cohorts has been 2.53. The high, 2.7 out of a possible 3, during this time was for the 2014 cohort. The low, 2.25 out of 3, was for the 2015 cohort.  Candidates in the Option 6 track of the MASE program scored an average 2.42 out of a possible 3.0 for KTS 1 for the past three cohorts. The averages for this standard ranged from a high of 2.5 in 2014 to a low of 2.25 for the 2015 cohort. The number of candidates completing the program has dropped more dramatically from a high of 10 in 2014 to a low of four in 2015 and back up to five in 2016. Candidates for the past three cohorts scored an average of 2.63 for KTS 2. For this standard, cohort averages ranged from a high of 2.9 for the 2014 cohort to a low of 2.2 for the 2016 cohort. Candidates for the past three cohorts scored an average of 2.68 for KTS 4. For this standard, cohort averages ranged from a high of 2.9 for the 2014 cohort to a low of 2.4 for the 2016 cohort. Candidates for the past three cohorts scored an average of 2.58 for KTS 6. For this standard, cohort averages ranged from a high of 2.7 in 2014 to a low of 2.4 in 2016. The three year average for KTS 7 for the past three cohorts has been 2.53. The high, 2.7 out of a possible 3, during this time was for the 2014 cohort. The low, 2.25 out of 3, was for the 2015 cohort.  These scores demonstrate that candidates in both tracks of the MASE perform at an acceptable level on these two standards and support progression through the program. | | |
| **Provide a link to the assessment scoring guide or rubric.** (Not required for Praxis II)  [Addendum F](#F) | | |
| **Discuss how the reliability and validity of this assessment has been established and supported.**  The KTIP documents have been determined, through CAEP’s early review of assessments, to be proprietary since they were developed by the EPSB for use with first year teachers. | | |
| **Describe how the data from this assessment is used for the continuous improvement of this program.**  The data from the CAP 7, exit Portfolio, specifically for the TPA or unit are analyzed during each assessment cycle, either the May retreat or the fall or December assessment sessions. The data are additionally used to meet two major objectives. The first is to provide feedback to students on a key clinical assessment The second objective is to monitor program effectiveness and develop annual Student Learning Objectives. The data over time also provide insight into program effectiveness. | | |
| **Assessment Title:**  **CAP 7 Exit Portfolio TPA** | | |
| **Assessment description:**  The TPA in the exit portfolio involves KTS 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7. It is an instructional unit taught during the capstone clinical experience of student teaching. Candidates must follow the unit guidelines as required in the unit Sources of Evidence. The TPA unit is composed of the following Sources of Evidence and must contain a minimum of three lesson plans:  Source of Evidence 1.1: Unit Guidelines  Source of Evidence 1.2: Unit Assessment Plan with a pre test, analysis of pre and post tests  Source of Evidence 1.3: Design of Instructional Activities  Source of Evidence 2: Lesson Plans  Source of Evidence 4: Post Observation Reflections for lessons taught  Source of Evidence 1.4 Organizing/Analyzing Results for Unit  Source of Evidence 6: Records and Communication  Source of Evidence 9: Student Voice | | |
| **How do the Assessment and any related measures address the Kentucky Teacher Standards?**  Explain how the aligned standard is met at the indicator level. This section should be a narrative on the measures in the assessment and how these meet the standards. Cite standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.  The rubric used to evaluate the TPA is a KTIP document based on the KTS so all of the indicators for KTS 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 are evaluated as a result of these TPA artifacts in the exit portfolio. | | |
| **Discuss the data analysis for this assessment:** Explain how the assessment data supports/validates a candidate’s ability through the progressions of this program:  Candidates in the traditional track of the MASE program scored an average of 2.67 out of a possible 3.0 for KTS 1 for the past three cohorts. The averages for this standard ranged from a high of 3.0 for the 2015 cohort to a low of 2.0 for the 2016 cohort. The number of candidates in the traditional track has dropped as well from four candidates in the 2014 cohort to two candidates in the 2016 cohort. Candidates scored an average of 2.78 for KTS 2. For this standard, the averages ranged from a low of 2.0 in 2014 to a high of 3.0 in 2015 and 2016. Candidates scored an average of 2.7 for KTS 4. For this standard, the averages ranged from a low of 2.5 in 2014 to a high of 3.0 in 2015 and 2016. Candidates scored an average of 2.58 for KTS 6. For this standard, the averages ranged from a low of 2.75 in 2014 to a high of 3.0 in 2015 and 2016. The three year average for KTS 7 for the past three cohorts has been 2.53. The high, 2.7 out of a possible 3, during this time was for the 2014 cohort. The low, 2.25 out of 3, was for the 2015 cohort.  Candidates in the Option 6 track of the MASE program scored an average 2.42 out of a possible 3.0 for KTS 1 for the past three cohorts. The averages for this standard ranged from a high of 2.5 in 2014 to a low of 2.25 for the 2015 cohort. The number of candidates completing the program has dropped more dramatically from a high of 10 in 2014 to a low of four in 2015 and back up to five in 2016. Candidates for the past three cohorts scored an average of 2.63 for KTS 2. For this standard, cohort averages ranged from a high of 2.9 for the 2014 cohort to a low of 2.2 for the 2016 cohort. Candidates for the past three cohorts scored an average of 2.68 for KTS 4. For this standard, cohort averages ranged from a high of 2.9 for the 2014 cohort to a low of 2.4 for the 2016 cohort. Candidates for the past three cohorts scored an average of 2.58 for KTS 6. For this standard, cohort averages ranged from a high of 2.7 in 2014 to a low of 2.4 in 2016. The three year average for KTS 7 for the past three cohorts has been 2.53. The high, 2.7 out of a possible 3, during this time was for the 2014 cohort. The low, 2.25 out of 3, was for the 2015 cohort.  These scores demonstrate that candidates in both tracks of the MASE perform at an acceptable level on these two standards and support progression through the program. | | |
| **Provide a link to the assessment scoring guide or rubric.** (Not required for Praxis II)  [Addendum F](#F) | | |
| **Discuss how the reliability and validity of this assessment has been established and supported.**  The KTIP documents have been determined, through CAEP’s early review of assessments, to be proprietary since they were developed by the EPSB for use with first year teachers. | | |
| **Describe how the data from this assessment is used for the continuous improvement of this program.**  The data from the CAP 7, exit Portfolio, specifically for the TPA or unit are analyzed during each assessment cycle, either the May retreat or the fall or December assessment sessions. The data are additionally used to meet two major objectives. The first is to provide feedback to students on a key clinical assessment The second objective is to monitor program effectiveness and develop annual Student Learning Objectives. The data over time also provide insight into program effectiveness. | | |
| **Assessment Title:**  Final Grade for SED 600 Theories of Reading and Educational Practice | | |
| **Assessment description:**  SED 600 Theories of Reading and Educational Practice has been identified as demonstration of the literacy outcomes. All assignments in the courses are identified as demonstration of the literacy outcomes. | | |
| **How do the Assessment and any related measures address the Kentucky Teacher Standards?**  The following are course objectives and the KTS addressed by each objective:   1. Review the research on best practices in teaching reading and describe the attributes of a quality instructional reading program. KTS 1, 6, 10 2. Research and review formal and informal reading instruments. KTS 5, 7, 8 3. Use students’ IEP’s to adapt lesson plans. KTS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 4. Design and use research-supported methods for academic and nonacademic instruction of individuals with learning and behavioral disorders. KTS 1, 2, 3, 10 5. Identify and teach essential concepts, vocabulary, and content across the general curriculum. KTS 1, 2, 3, 4 6. Implement systematic instruction in teaching reading comprehension and monitoring strategies. KTS 4 7. Teach strategies for organizing and composing written products. KTS 4 8. Identify supports needed for integration into various program placements and teach parents to use appropriate behavior management and counseling techniques. KTS 1, 8, 10 9. Incorporate and implement instructional and assistive technology into the educational program. KTS 6 10. Integrate academic instruction, affective education, and behavior management for individuals and groups with emotional/behavioral disorders. KTS 4 11. Understand measurement theory and practices for addressing issues of validity, reliability, norms, bias, and interpretation of assessment results. KTS 1, 10 12. Participate in activities of professional organizations relevant to the field of emotional/behavioral disorders. KTS 9 | | |
| **Discuss the data analysis for this assessment:** Explain how the assessment data supports/validates a candidate’s ability through the progressions of this program:  The Literacy Plan was just approved and implemented during the last academic year. Data is not currently available. | | |
| **Provide a link to the assessment scoring guide or rubric.** (Not required for Praxis II)  **Grading Scale:** A 90-100%  B 80-89%  C 70-79%  D 60-69%  F 0-59% | | |
| **Discuss how the reliability and validity of this assessment has been established and supported.**  Several studies support the reliability and validity of decisions made based on GPA. Bacon and Bean (2006) studied the reliability and validity of the cumulative GPA and determined the reliability to be “quite high” (p.38). They recommended when using GPA in research, for reliability and validity purposes using the overall GPA as opposed to program only GPA. This coincides with a study commissioned by the New Jersey State Board of Education (2007) which found that use of the overall GPA was more reliable and valid than a single year GPA or a major or content area GPA. The National Education Association (NEA) described GPA as a more reliable predictor of future student success than other assessments because it “…capture[s] content, knowledge, and skills critical to success, such as perseverance and self-control” (n.d., p. 1). In addition, GPA is considered a valid predictor of future success (Herrera & Blair, 2015). Love, Holter, and Krall (1982) found GPA to be a “significant predictor” of success on the comprehensive examination for a medical professional program at West Virginia University and the Board of Registry examination.  Bacon, D. & Bean, B. (2006). GPA in research studies: An invaluable but neglected opportunity.  *Journal of Marketing Education*, 28(1), 35-42.  Herrera, C. & Blair, J. (2015). Predicting success in nursing programs. *Research in Higher Education*,  28, 1-8.  Love, B., Holter, J., & Krall, J. (1982). Validity of grade point average as a predictor of student success.  *Laboratory Medicine*, 13(3), 186-194.  National Education Association. (n.d.). Indicators of future success: GPA and noncognitive skills.  Retrieved from: <https://www.nea.org/assets/docs/Indicators_of_Success-BGH_ac5-final.pdf>.  New Jersey State Board of Education. (2007). *Summary of Grade Point Average Research*. Retrieved  From: [*www.state.nj.us/education/sboe/meetings/2007/.../GPA%20research%20discussion.doc*](http://www.state.nj.us/education/sboe/meetings/2007/.../GPA%20research%20discussion.doc) | | |
| **Describe how the data from this assessment is used for the continuous improvement of this program.**  This mandate was implemented last year. Data is not currently available. | | |

# Summary Analysis for Program

Provide a holistic summary and rationale for how **all** key assessment areas demonstrate the program’s overall quality, and how each candidate has demonstrated appropriate performance of the Kentucky Teacher Standards. Many EPPs study their assessments on a periodic basis and develop comprehensive reports and graphs; this report may be attached as an addendum and replaces the analysis summary and improvement sections below. If the EPP chooses to append EPP-designed reports, a narrative description/interpretation of the report(s) must be included.

|  |
| --- |
| Overall, data from the past three cohorts on all assessments support the candidates’ progression through the MASE program for both tracks. Based on low numbers of candidates in the program for both tracks it is difficulty to make generalizations program wide. Candidates pass the Praxis and perform at a satisfactory level on portfolio assessments. |

**Continuous Improvement Plan for this program category:** Provide an explanation of how assessment data are/were used to improve this program.

|  |
| --- |
| While all candidates pass the Praxis in the MASE program, first time Praxis pass rate is an issue that is consistent with other programs in the EPP for this reason, a large portion of the Selected Improvement Plan is to focus on additional training and resources for candidates in preparation for the Praxis in addition to some policy revisions and changes regarding Praxis.  In addition, data collection has been an issue in this program. Additional staff are being trained to assist in data entry. One staff devoted completely to special education will begin entering data for all special education programs. |

# Option 6

**If this program category has an Option 6 alternative route, then the following data is also required:**

**Include a narrative to describe how the alternative route program differs from the traditional route program:**

|  |
| --- |
| The MASE program differs from the traditional (undergraduate) initial certification programs at CU in several ways. First, coursework is geared toward adult learners and/or candidates with more life experiences. The alternative route (Option 6) candidates serve in teaching positions while experiencing MASE coursework, bringing a higher level of experience and needs into the classroom. Standards for both programs are aligned to appropriate Kentucky Teacher Standards, SPA standards for content, ILA content literacy standards as well as Kentucky Academic standards for grades P-12 literacy. Second, the MASE candidates will engage in action research at a more in-depth level than traditional undergraduate candidates.  The MASE does not result in a second certification; it is for initial certification only. If an Option 6 candidate does not complete the program for any reason, the former candidate must re-apply for the program and adhere to all current admissions requirements set forth by the standards board and Campbellsville University. In order to obtain rank change from a temporary provisional (Rank 3) to a master’s Rank 2, graduates must complete the CA-1 form requesting rank change based on the completion of the program.  Alternative certification route candidates must have an assigned mentor (**16 KAR 9:080**) once admitted to the MASE program. Alternative candidates acquire the 200 required field hours while serving in their own classroom while traditional MASE candidates must complete the specified, intentional field hours for Kentucky Field Experience Tracking System (KFETS) documentation and monitoring. The specific types and number of field hours are monitored throughout the program but must meet the state requirements when candidates formally apply for student teaching at CAP 6. Alternative route candidates must participate in the course-required experiences as well, but may use their own classroom to articulate these experiences when appropriate. All field hours for both routes will be documented and tracked for diverse experiences. |

**Option 6 Mentoring Experiences:** (limit of 2000 characters)

**(Per KAR 9:080 Section 3)**

**Your response text can be all in one section; however you must address each item.**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Provide evidence of selection criteria and evaluation of University and District mentors. |
| All candidates employed as full-time teachers enrolled in a CU alternative certification program (Option 6) and are not completing their KTIP internship project, will work with a teacher mentor under the guidance of the university professor and/or program coordinator. Mentor teachers will work with the candidate throughout the school year. In collaboration with the principal of the partner school and school level coach, mentor teachers will be identified that meet the following minimum criteria:   * 3 years teaching experience * Completed Master’s degree * Teaches same content (or similar) as the candidate * Current or retired teacher   *Teacher candidates in the* Option 6, *Alternative Route Teacher Certification Program are new to the classroom (no prior teaching experience as the teacher of record). They are required to participate in formal observations by a support team consisting of a university mentor and school level coach.* The 5-5-5 rule (16KAR 9:080) is implemented as follows: 5 hours completed by Campbellsville University faculty mentor; 5 hours is completed by the school level teacher mentor; and 5 hours are to be completed as determined by the alternative certification candidate’s support team comprised of the principal, university faculty mentor, and teacher mentor. |
| 1. Explain the process through which at least 15 annual observation hours (minimum 5 for university faculty, minimum 5 by district-based mentor, minimum 5 additional by university faculty or district-based mentor) are assigned to the mentors. If the program uses a template for the mentoring plan that is submitted to the EPSB for certification, please attach a copy of that template. |
| The 5-5-5 rule (16KAR 9:080) is implemented as follows: 5 hours completed by Campbellsville University faculty mentor; 5 hours is completed by the school level teacher mentor; and 5 hours are to be completed as determined by the alternative certification candidate’s support team.  See [Addendum G University/District Mentor Agreement](#G) |
| 1. Explain how the hours are monitored and reported. |
| ***Principal/designee*** Building administrators are asked to participate in an orientation and an end-of-the-year meeting with the university mentor, coach, and candidate to establish expectations and provide feedback on the candidate’s teaching performance. The end-of-the-year meeting will also be used to discuss the candidate’s professional growth needs for the coming year.  ***University Faculty Mentors*** University mentors are asked to participate in an orientation meeting and a minimum of one (1) formal observation. Mentors and school level coaches are expected to spend a minimum of 5-10 clock hours with candidate throughout the year. They are to provide feedback to the candidate after each meeting. The university mentors are also expected to conduct an end-of-the-year meeting with the building administrator, school level coach, and candidate to provide feedback on the candidate’s teaching performance. The end-of-the-year meeting will also be used to discuss the candidate’s professional growth needs for the coming year.  ***Teacher Mentor/School Level Coach*** School level coaches (assigned by building and or district administrators) are asked to participate in an orientation and an end-of-the-year meeting with the building administrator, regional mentor, and candidate to establish expectations and provide feedback on the candidate’s teaching performance. The end-of-the-year meeting will also be used to discuss the candidate’s professional growth needs for the coming year. Coaches are asked to participate in formal and informal observations of the candidate. They are asked to participate in a minimum of one (1) formal observation. Coaches are expected to provide ongoing and regular feedback to the candidate.  The University/District Mentorship Agreement provides evidence of selection criteria and evaluation of University and District mentors.  See [Addendum G](#G) |
| 1. Describe how support will be offered to the candidate during in-class and out-of-class time to assist the candidate in meeting the teacher’s instructional responsibilities. |
| The University/District Mentorship Agreement provides evidence of support offered to the candidate during in-class and out-of-class time to assist the candidate in meeting the teacher’s instructional responsibilities by University and District mentors.  See [Addendum G](#G) |
| 1. Describe the process established to maintain regular communication with the employing school to assist the candidate and address identified areas of improvement.   . |
| The University/District Mentorship Agreement provides evidence of the process to maintain regular communication with the employing school to assist the candidate and address identified areas of improvement.  See [Addendum G](#G) |

**Option 6 ONLY - How does the EPP (Provider) monitor and support candidate completion through KTIP?**

**(Per** **16 KAR 9:080. University-based alternative certification program - Sections 3 and 7)**

|  |
| --- |
| During KTIP, the candidate has a team consisting of the principal, a teacher mentor, and a teacher educator who are assigned by the state to support the candidate through the internship program. During this time, the EPP university faculty will continue to be available to the teacher candidate through completion of KTIP on an as needed basis for consultation purposes. |

**Addendum A**

**Campbellsville University**

**School of Education**

**Master of Arts in Special Education**

**LBD P-12 Initial Certification**

**CURRICULUM GUIDE SHEET**

**󠆶 B.A. or B.S. (without Temporary Provisional Certification in LBD)**

**󠆶 B.A. or B.S., with Temporary Provisional Certification in LBD**

**(Alternative Certification Program)**

Name CU ID#\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ SSN#\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Advisor\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Ethnicity\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Gender: M/F

Address \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Cell \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail Address \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

CAP 5\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ CAP 6\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ CAP 7 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

PRAXIS II Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications

5543 (computer) \_\_\_\_\_(158 passing) Date Taken\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Praxis II Disclaimer:** Kentucky educator certification requirements are subject to change.  Before registering for the test(s), please check the Education Professional Standards Board website at [www.epsb.ky.gov](http://www.epsb.ky.gov) for current test requirements and current cut scores.  You may also contact 502-564-4606 or toll free at 888-598-7667.

**Reminder:**

\*A minimum overall GPA of 2.75 is required for admission to the program.

\*A GPA of 3.0 required to exit the program

\*Students must take and pass the PRAXIS exam and submit a successful portfolio before exiting the program.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| CAP 5 - Entrance Requirements Application | CAP 6 – Mid-Point Admission to Candidacy | CAP 7 – Exit Requirements |
| Bachelor’s Degree from accredited institution  \_\_\_\_\_State \_\_\_\_\_ Degree  Official Transcript \_\_\_\_Y \_\_\_\_N  Cumulative GPA 2.75 or 3.0 on last 30 hours \_\_\_Y \_\_\_N  GPA\_\_\_\_\_ Review date: \_\_/\_\_/\_\_  Three (3) Letters of Recommendation  (1)\_\_\_\_\_ (2) \_\_\_\_\_ (3)\_\_\_\_\_  Entrance Exam:  Praxis I (PPST)  Reading (0710/5710) \_\_\_\_(date) \_\_\_\_(176)  Math (0730/5730) \_\_\_\_(date) \_\_\_\_(174)  Writing (0720/5720) \_\_\_\_(date) \_\_\_\_(174); OR    *Praxis Core Academic Skills for Educators (CASE*):  \_\_\_\_ Reading (5712)     156  \_\_\_\_ Writing (5722)      162  \_\_\_\_Mathematics (5732)     150 ; OR  GRE Scores  \_\_\_\_\_Verbal Reasoning - minimum score of 450 or 150 ( as  of 8/1/2011)  \_\_\_\_\_Quantitative Reasoning - minimum score of 490 or  143 ( as of 8/1/2011)  \_\_\_\_\_Analytical Writing - minimum score of 4.0  \_\_\_\_\_Criminal Background Check (State)  \_\_\_\_\_TB Risk Assessment  \_\_\_\_\_One-page essay on rationale for graduate study  \_\_\_\_\_Disposition Recommendation (self)  \_\_\_\_\_Disposition Policy (signed)  \_\_\_\_\_KY Code of Ethics (signed)  \_\_\_\_\_Character & Fitness (signed)  \_\_\_\_\_Diversity Survey (signed)  \_\_\_\_\_ Statement of Acknowledgement/Commitment  (signed) (see reverse)  \_\_\_\_\_Professional Growth Plan Self-Assessment  \_\_\_\_\_Professional Growth Plan (PGP)  \_\_\_\_\_PGES Domains  \_\_\_\_\_Praxis II Study Plan/Statement of Understanding (signed)  \_\_\_\_\_Curriculum Contract/Guide sheet (signed) | CAP 6 will be implemented after the completion of at least 24 credit hours  Transcript Review  \_\_\_\_\_GPA (minimum 3.0)  \_\_\_\_\_Transcript Attached  \_\_\_\_\_ Credit Hours Completed    Disposition Recommendations:  \_\_\_\_\_Self  \_\_\_\_\_Professor  \_\_\_\_\_ Online Candidate Assessment  \_\_\_\_\_Field Hours Completed  \_\_\_\_\_Curriculum Contract/Guide sheet (signed, updated and attached)  \_\_\_\_\_Professional Growth Plan  Self-Assessment (updated)  \_\_\_\_\_Professional Growth Plan (PGP)(updated)    *Praxis Disclaimer: Teacher certification requirements are subject to change. Before registering for the test(s) please refer to the KY Education Professional Standards Board website at http://www.kyspsb.net for current requirements or contact 502-564-4606 or toll free 888-598-7677.* | \_\_\_\_\_Graduation Application: completed and on file with the Office of Student Records  Transcript Review  \_\_\_\_\_GPA (minimum 3.0)  \_\_\_\_\_Transcript Attached  \_\_\_\_\_Disposition Recommendations  (1)\_\_\_\_(faculty) (2)\_\_\_\_(faculty)  (3)\_\_\_\_(self)  \_\_\_\_\_Field Hours Completed - 200 field hours documented in KFETS  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Curriculum Contract/Guide sheet  (signed, updated and attached)  Portfolio  \_\_\_\_\_Holistic Score  \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_Date Submitted    \_\_\_\_\_Professional Growth Plan  Self-Assessment (updated, attached)  \_\_\_\_\_Professional Growth Plan (PGP)(updated, attached)  \_\_\_\_\_ PGES Domains (attached)  \_\_\_\_\_Praxis II Exam  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 5543 (158 passing score )  (score)  \_\_\_\_\_CA-TP/CA-1 Form Completed (attached)  \_\_\_\_\_Transcript Request  Student Teachers Only  \_\_\_\_\_Required Training *in Use of Physical Restraint and Seclusion* (704 KAR 7:160)  *NOTE:*  *Praxis II exam must be taken and passed before candidate can apply for LBD certification* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Online Courses**  **45 Hours** | |
| **Foundational Courses: 9 hours**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_** ED 500 Human Growth and Development  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ED 604 Introduction to Teaching  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ED 606 Educational Technology  **Online Courses: 36 Hours**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ SED 503 Intro. to Special Ed. (3)  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ SED 504 Emotional Disturbances (3)  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ SED 505 Curr. and Methods in Learn. Dis. (3)  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ SED 506 Behavior Management (3)  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ SED 600 Theories of Reading and Ed. Prac.(3)  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ SED 601 Pres. and Instr. Strategies (3)  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ SED 602 Classroom Management (3)  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ SED 603 Teaching Math to Child. w/ LBD (3) | **Online Courses: Continued**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ SED 604 Assessment and Inst. Methods (3)  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ ED 605 Research Methods and Proc. (3)  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ SED 606 Intro. to Learning. Dis. (3)  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ ED 607 Graduate Practicum/Sem. (3) (all candidates)  **Student Teaching: 12 Hours** (students not teaching with a temporary provisional certificate)  \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ED 608 Student Teaching  **Minimum Hours for Graduation: 45-57**  Online Courses: 45 hours  Student Teaching: 12 hours (students not teaching with a temporary provisional certificate) |

My signature below indicates I hereby recognize it is my responsibility to review and ensure I complete the

above requirements for successful continuation in and exit from the this program.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Student Signature Date

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Advisor Signature Date

**Addendum B**

**CAMPBELLSVILLE UNIVERSITY**

**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

**Candidate Continuous Assessment Plan**

**Master of Arts in Special Education (LBD), Initial Certification**

(Check one) \_\_\_\_\_ B.A. or B.S. degree; not employed as a special education teacher (LBD)

\_\_\_\_\_ B.A. or B.S. degree; employed as a special education teacher (LBD); holding a Temporary

Provisional certificate

*Note: Praxis II exam 5543 must be taken and passed \_\_\_\_\_(158) before being eligible to be an intern in Kentucky Internship Program (KTIP). Student must successfully complete KTIP to receive professional certification.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CAP 5 - Entrance Requirements**  **Application** | **CAP 6 – Mid-Point**  **Admission to Candidacy** | **CAP 7 – Exit Requirements**  **CAP 7 will be implemented in SED 607 Graduate Practicum/Seminar** |
| Bachelor’s Degree from accredited institution  \_\_\_\_\_State \_\_\_\_\_ Degree  Official Transcript \_\_\_\_\_Y \_\_\_\_\_N  Cumulative GPA 2.75 or 3.0 on last 30 hours \_\_\_Y \_\_\_N  GPA\_\_\_\_\_ Review date: \_\_/\_\_/\_\_  Three (3) Letters of Recommendation  (1)\_\_\_\_\_ (2) \_\_\_\_\_ (3)\_\_\_\_\_  Entrance Exam:  Praxis I (PPST)  Reading (0710/5710) \_\_\_\_(date) \_\_\_\_(176)  Math (0730/5730) \_\_\_\_(date) \_\_\_\_(174)  Writing (0720/5720) \_\_\_\_(date) \_\_\_\_(174); **OR**    *Praxis Core Academic Skills for Educators (CASE*):  \_\_\_\_ Reading (5712)     156  \_\_\_\_ Writing (5722)      162  \_\_\_\_Mathematics (5732)     150 ;  **OR**  GRE Scores  \_\_\_\_\_Verbal Reasoning - minimum score of 450 or 150 ( as  of 8/1/2011)  \_\_\_\_\_Quantitative Reasoning - minimum score of 490 or  143 ( as of 8/1/2011)  \_\_\_\_\_Analytical Writing - minimum score of 4.0  \_\_\_\_\_Criminal Background Check (State)  \_\_\_\_\_TB Risk Assessment  \_\_\_\_\_One-page essay on rationale for graduate study  \_\_\_\_\_Disposition Recommendation (self)  \_\_\_\_\_Disposition Policy (signed)  \_\_\_\_\_KY Code of Ethics (signed)  \_\_\_\_\_Character & Fitness (signed)  \_\_\_\_\_Diversity Survey (signed)  \_\_\_\_\_ Statement of Acknowledgement/Commitment  (signed) (see reverse)  \_\_\_\_\_Professional Growth Plan Self-Assessment  \_\_\_\_\_Professional Growth Plan (PGP)  \_\_\_\_\_PGES Domains  \_\_\_\_\_Praxis II Study Plan/Statement of Understanding (signed)  \_\_\_\_\_Curriculum Contract/Guide sheet (signed) | **CAP 6 will be implemented after the completion of at least 24 credit hours**  Transcript Review  \_\_\_\_\_GPA (minimum 3.0)  \_\_\_\_\_Transcript Attached  \_\_\_\_\_ Credit Hours Completed    Disposition Recommendations:  \_\_\_\_\_Self  \_\_\_\_\_Professor  \_\_\_\_\_ Online Candidate Assessment  \_\_\_\_\_Field Hours Completed  \_\_\_\_\_Curriculum Contract/Guide sheet (signed, updated and attached)  \_\_\_\_\_Professional Growth Plan  Self-Assessment (updated)  \_\_\_\_\_Professional Growth Plan (PGP)(updated)    ***Praxis Disclaimer****: Teacher certification requirements are subject to change. Before registering for the test(s) please refer to the KY Education Professional Standards Board website at http://www.kyspsb.net for current requirements or contact 502-564-4606 or toll free 888-598-7677.* | **\_\_\_\_\_Graduation Application: completed and on file with the Office of Student Records**  Transcript Review  \_\_\_\_\_GPA (minimum 3.0)  \_\_\_\_\_Transcript Attached  \_\_\_\_\_Disposition Recommendations  (1)\_\_\_\_(faculty); (2)\_\_\_\_(faculty)  (3)\_\_\_\_(self)  \_\_\_\_\_Field Hours Completed - **200**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Curriculum Contract/Guide sheet  (signed, updated and attached)  Portfolio  \_\_\_\_\_Holistic Score  \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_Date Submitted    \_\_\_\_\_Professional Growth Plan  Self-Assessment (updated, attached)  \_\_\_\_\_Professional Growth Plan (PGP)(updated, attached)  \_\_\_\_\_ PGES Domains (attached)  \_\_\_\_\_Praxis II Exam  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 5543 (158  **passing score** )  (score)  \_\_\_\_\_CA-TP/CA-1 Form Completed (attached)  \_\_\_\_\_Transcript Request  Student Teachers Only  **\_\_\_\_\_**Required Training *in**Use of Physical Restraint and Seclusion* (**704 KAR 7:160)**  ***NOTE:***  *Praxis II exam must be taken and passed before candidate can apply for LBD certification* |

**Statement of Acknowledgement/Commitment**

As a student in the special education preparation program, I understand and agree to the following:

1. To be retained in the program and to be eligible for continuation and completion, I must satisfactorily meet all requirements of CAPs 5, 6, and 7.
2. Upon final approval of CAP 5, I will receive a letter of notification to be used for admission and registration.
3. Neither Campbellsville University nor any professor or administrator assumes responsibility for the CAPs nor for graduation; the responsibility resides with me.
4. I will participate in all online class sessions and teleconferences. I will follow the online procedure list provided.
5. I will follow the correct procedures for state certification.
6. I commit to upholding the Code of Ethics for Kentucky School Personnel.
7. I am committed to the ethical and legal use of technology.
8. I am committed to abide by the School of Education policy on plagiarism and cheating.

**Signed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_**

**This Section Is For Official Use Only**

Decision by the School of Education Faculty Decision: \_\_\_\_Program Satisfactorily Completed

Decision: Approval\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Denial\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_Program Not

Letter of Notification Mailed: Date \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_ Satisfactorily Completed

Letter in Student File

**Addendum C**

**Campbellsville University School of Education**

**Teacher Candidate Summative Evaluation: Form C**

**P-12**

|  |
| --- |
| Teacher Candidate \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date of Meeting\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  School \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ District \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  University Supervisor Signature \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Cooperating Teacher Signature \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Check evidence reviewed: Form A/B Journal Portfolio |

***Directions: Circle a rating for each indicator and standard using scoring guide:***

***3=Satisfactory 2=Progress Made 1=Unsatisfactory***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Standard 1: The Teacher Demonstrates Applied Content Knowledge** | **3 2 1 N/A** |
|  | |
| **Standard 2: The Teacher Designs & Plans Instruction** | **3 2 1 N/A** |
|  | |
| **Standard 3: The Teacher Creates & Maintains Learning Climate** | **3 2 1 N/A** |
|  | |
| **Standard 4: The Teacher Implements & Manages Instruction** | **3 2 1 N/A** |
|  | |
| **Standard 5: The Teacher Assesses & Communicates Learning Results** | **3 2 1 N/A** |
|  | |
| **Standard 6: The Teacher Demonstrates the Implementation of Technology** | **3 2 1 N/A** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Standard 7: Reflects on and Evaluates Teaching and Learning** | **3 2 1 N/A** |
|  | |
| **Standard 8: Collaborates with Colleagues/Parents/Others** | **3 2 1 N/A** |
|  | |
| **Standard 9: Evaluates Teaching & Implements Professional Development** | **3 2 1 N/A** |
|  | |
| **Standard 10: Provides Leadership Within School/Community/Profession** | **3 2 1 N/A** |
| **Total Summative Score (30 Possible Points)** |  |

Evidence:

Strengths/Growth Areas:

Overall Comments:

white – office copy yellow – student copy

**Addendum D**

|  |
| --- |
| **Campbellsville University**  **School of Education** |
| **Source of Evidence: Lesson Plan** |
| **Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium Standards (InTASC)**  **Kentucky Teacher Performance Standards (KTPS)**  **Standard 1: Learner Development**  **Standard 2: Learner Differences**  **Standard 3: Learning Environments**  **Standard 4: Content Knowledge**  **Standard 5: Application of Content**  **Standard 6: Assessment**  **Standard 7: Planning for Instruction**  **Standard 8: Instructional Strategies** |

**Guidelines for Developing the Source of Evidence: Lesson Plan**

The lesson plan template should be used in planning all lessons, some of which will be observed by your P-12 teacher and/or university instructor. Your lesson plan will provide the framework upon which you will create the classroom environment and implement instruction. Each lesson plan should be sent to the appropriate persons 2-3 days before any scheduled observation to allow for review and feedback. Include any and all teaching materials used with each lesson plan (i.e. rubrics, assessments, PP, activities, websites, SmartBd activities, etc.). Please use the lesson plan rubric to guide development of your lesson plan.

**1. Context**

Identify your students backgrounds, special needs, cultural differences, interests, and language proficiencies. Consider how this

Context information should guide lesson procedures and instructional strategies.

**2. Learning Target (s)/Objectives**

Connect the lesson targets/objectives to appropriate state curriculum/content area standard. Your lesson objective should include a measurable criteria. If your lesson is part of a unit, you should complete parts A, B, and C. If this is a stand-alone lesson, you should only complete part B. However, a strong lesson will include a discussion of what is occurring both before and after the lesson.

a.Previous lesson’s learning targets/objectives

b.Current lesson’s learning target (s)/objective (s).

c. Next lesson’s learning targets/objectives

**3. Students’ Baseline Knowledge**

Briefly describe the strategies used to identify students’ baseline knowledge and skills. As a pre-service teacher, that may include a conversation with the teacher and/or other stakeholders prior to the lesson.

**4. Formative Assessment (s)**

Identify the type of formative assessments and data that will be used to determine student progress in achieving the

learning target/objectives. If needed, identify how these assessments will be differentiated to address the needs of

your students. In addition to the formative assessments you will use, describe how you will provide examples of quality work and

guides learners in examining their own thinking (self-assessment). Explain when and how formative assessments will be used

within the lesson. Include copies of all assessments and rubric used.

**5. Resources**

Identify the resources and assistance that will be needed for the lesson. Include internet links and copies of ALL class handouts,

presentations, and assessments.

**6. Lesson Procedures**

Describe the sequence of strategies/procedures and activities and assessments which help students attain the learning objective

and align with formative assessments.

Within this sequence, be sure to:

1. Utilize and identify a specific instructional strategy such a direct instruction, 5E, inquiry based instruction, etc. Include a strong introduction to gain student attention and summary or review of lesson.
2. Describe the differentiated strategies/activities and/or assessments designed to meet the needs and strengths of your students (refer to context)
3. Identify the questions you will use to promote higher order thinking, metacognition, and encourage discussion. Include key vocabulary.
4. Include a realistic time interval.

**7. Watch For------**

Are there specific indicators for the components of Domain 2-Classroom Environment and/or Domain 3-Instruction

that you would like specifically observed during this lesson? If there are, please note these on your plan to alert the

observer.

|  |
| --- |
| **Campbellsville University**  **School of Education** |
| **Source of Evidence: Lesson Plan** |
| **Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date of Lesson: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ CU Course: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **School/School District: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Collaborating Teacher: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Ages/Grades Number of Number of Number of Number of**  **of Students Students in Students Gifted Students**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Class \_\_\_\_\_ having IEP \_\_\_\_ Students \_\_\_\_\_ having ELL \_\_\_\_\_**  **Lesson Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Unit Title (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |
| **1. Context: Describe the Students for which this lesson is designed (KTPS/InTASC 1A, 1B, 1E, 1G, 2, 3F, 6H, 7B, 8A, 8C)**  Identify your students’ backgrounds, special needs, cultural differences, interests, and language proficiencies. |
| **2. Learning Target (s)/Objectives (KTPS/InTASC 7A)**  **If this lesson is part of a unit, complete parts A, B, and C. If this is a stand-alone lesson, only complete part B.**  a.Previous lesson’s learning targets/objectives **(**Connect each target/objective to the appropriate state curriculum/content  area standards)    b.Current lesson’s learning target (s)/objective (s). (Connect each target/objective to the appropriate state curriculum/content  area standards)  c. Next lesson’s learning targets/objectives (Connect each target/objective to the appropriate state curriculum/content  area standards) |
| **3. Students’ Baseline Knowledge and Skills (KTPS/InTASC 4D, 7D)**  Describe and include the strategies used to establish students’ baseline knowledge and skills for this lesson. |
| **4. Formative Assessment (KTPS/InTASC 6B, 6D, 6F, 6G, 8B)**  Describe and include the formative assessment(s) and rubrics to be used to measure student progress during this lesson. |
| **5. Resources (KTPS/InTASC 1C, 4F, 4G, 5C)**  Identify the resources and assistance available to support your instruction and facilitate students’ learning. Include internet  links and copies of ALL class handouts, presentations, and assessments. |
| **6. Lesson Procedures (KTPS/InTASC 7A, 7C, 8E, 8F, 8I)**  Describe the sequence of strategies/activities/assessments that will be used to scaffold instruction, engage your students, facilitate attainment of the lesson objective(s), and promote higher order thinking. Within this sequence, be sure to describe how the instruction will be differentiated to meet your students’ needs, interests, and abilities. |
| **7. Watch For \_\_\_\_\_**  If the lesson were observed what would like specifically like the observer to watch for: |

**Addendum E**

**CAMPBELLSVILLE UNIVERSITY**

**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

**2017-18**

**EXIT CAP E-PORTFOLIO GUIDELINES**

All candidates are required to prepare an EXIT CAP E-portfolio. Entries/Artifacts (Sources of Evidence) come from the student teaching placement(s). The EXIT CAP E-portfolio demonstrates the ability to meet all ten **Kentucky Teacher Standards**. It is to include student work samples *gathered during the student teaching experience*. (Note: protect students’ right to privacy by removing all last names.)

The e-portfolio is organized electronically and categorized by sections. The sections represent the Kentucky Teacher Standards (KTS). Five standards are *combined* into one section called the **TPA Section**. This section includes KTS 1, 2, 4, 6, 7. The remaining standards are separate sections entitled Learning Climate (KTS 3), Assessment (KTS 5), Collaboration (KTS 8), Professional Development (KTS 9) and Leadership (KTS 10).

The two following key definitions are vital to the successful completion of the Exit E-Portfolio.

* ***Rationales*** – narratives that explain how entries/artifacts demonstrate and meet the respective Kentucky Teacher Standards and supporting indicators
* ***Entries or Artifacts (Sources of Evidence)*-**evidence provided that demonstrates competency for each of the Kentucky Teacher Standards and supporting indicators

1. **General Requirements Section** 
   * 1. Competency in writing skills will be scored for the Exit E-Portfolio.
     2. All documents in the CAP Portfolio should be original work.
     3. A Student Teaching Video (minimum of 15 minutes) will be submitted with the accompanying lesson and a reflection.

**COMPONENTS OF THE EXIT CAP PORTFOLIO**

|  |
| --- |
| **1. The Preliminary Documents Section must include:** |
| 1. Main Page: Name, Major, Date, University 2. Signed form Verifying Original Work & Permission to Review 3. Completed Self-Evaluation of Portfolio 4. Resume/Vita (name and contact information not sufficient) 5. Educational Philosophy–updated (2 pages, size 12 font, double spaced) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2. TPA Section: Kentucky Teacher Standards 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7**  ***Descriptor:*** *Include an Instructional Unit that you have taught in your placement classroom. You must follow unit guidelines as specified in the required unit Sources of Evidence. The unit is composed of the following TPA Sources of Evidence and must contain a minimum of* ***3*** *lesson plans:* | |
| **Evidence/Artifacts** | **Source of Evidence** |
| Unit Guidelines | Source of Evidence-1.1 |
| Unit Assessment Plan  Pre-Test  Analysis of Pre-Test and  Post-Test | Source of Evidence-1.2 |
| Design of Instructional Activities | Source of Evidence-1.3 |
| Lesson Plans  At least three lesson plans with all materials  Post-Observation Reflections for Lessons taught and observed | Source of Evidence-2  Source of Evidence-4 |
| Organizing/Analyzing Results for Unit | Source of Evidence-1.4 |
| Records and Communication | Source of Evidence-6 |
| Student Voice | Source of Evidence-9 |
| *It is advised that you complete the* ***TPA Unit*** *early during your 1st placement. If you have one-placement, then complete the* ***TPA Unit*** *early in the 1st eight weeks.*  *The Sources of Evidence will be posted on the School of Education website; until then, please use the documents to be sent through your personal CU Email.* | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3. Kentucky Teacher Standard 3: Learning Climate** | |
| **Evidence/Artifacts** | **Source of Evidence** |
| Rationale |  |
| Classroom Management Plan |  |
| At least three Observation Evaluations | Observation Forms A/B |
| Lesson Reflections for Observed Lessons | Source of Evidence-4 |
| ***Narrative about Classroom Management:***  *A one-page narrative analysis focusing on personal performance growth in classroom management. To develop this narrative, review your Classroom Management Plan for CAP 3, reflect on your growth based on KTS 3 indicators, and your performance evaluations:*   1. *Did you communicate high expectations for students?* 2. *Did you maintain a positive learning environment?* 3. *Did you value and support student diversity and address individual needs?* 4. *Did you foster mutual respect between teacher and students and among students?* 5. *Did you provide a safe environment for learning?* | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4. Kentucky Teacher Standard 5: Assessment**  ***Descriptor:*** *KTS 5 is to include a minimum of five (5) different forms of formative and summative assessments, created and designed by the candidate.* ***No commercially developed assessments may be submitted.*** *Student work samples are to be included with 3 of the 5 selected entries. Include scoring guides/rubrics when appropriate. Entries for KTS 5 may come from the TPA. Examples are:*   1. On-Demand Prompts 2. Open Response Prompts 3. Culminating Events 4. Informal Assessments, (e.g.) Webbing, Concept Mapping, Observation Sheets, Anecdotal Records, Checklists 5. Student Self-Assessment 6. Peer Assessment 7. Traditional Tests 8. Samples of student work with teacher feedback. 9. Portfolio entry prompts with scoring guide and student sample | |
| **Evidence/Artifacts** | **Source of Evidence** |
| Rationale |  |
| Assessment 1  Student work samples and scoring guide or rubric |  |
| Assessment 2  Student work samples and scoring guide or rubric |  |
| Assessment 3  Student work samples and scoring guide or rubric |  |
| Assessment 4  Student work samples and scoring guide or rubric |  |
| Assessment 5  Student work samples and scoring guide or rubric |  |
| Record and Communication: Brief Reflection | SoE-6 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5. **Kentucky Teacher Standard 8: Collaboration** | |
| **Evidence/Artifacts** | **Source of Evidence** |
| Rationale |  |
| Collaboration Project during one placement: *The plan must include collaboration with another professional in the school system such as a resource teacher, guidance counselor, youth resource center, etc.* | Source of Evidence-10 |
| Analysis and evaluation of student performance  *The plan must include collaboration with another professional in the school system such as a resource teacher, guidance counselor, youth resource center, etc.* |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6. Kentucky Teacher Standard 9: Professional Development** | |
| **Evidence/Artifacts** | **Source of Evidence** |
| Rationale |  |
| Self-Assessments (KTS, Domains, Dispositions) |  |
| Pre-Professional Development Plan | Source of Evidence-5 |
| Reflective Narrative |  |
| Professional Involvement | Source of Evidence-7 |
| ***Note:*** *Include evidence of attendance and/or participation at professional meetings or conferences with reflective piece stating activities and knowledge gained. Do not include certificates.* | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **7. Kentucky Teacher Standard 10: Leadership** | |
| **Evidence/Artifacts** | **Source of Evidence** |
| Rationale |  |
| Leadership Project:  A project you implement in the school that would demonstrate your ability to provide professional leadership as a teacher | Source of Evidence-11 |
| Narrative Reflection:  A reflection of your project accomplishments regarding student learning and school environment. What did you learn from your leadership experience - what worked, what did not, and why? How could you strengthen the project? Why? |  |

**Addendum F**

**Campbellsville University  
School of Education  
Portfolio Evaluation Rubric**

|  |
| --- |
| **CU ID#\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Major\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Name\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator Code\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Holistic Portfolio Score\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Check appropriate box: CAP 3 CAP 4 CAP 7** |

Directions: Record a *holistic* score for each standard and an *analytical* score for each indicator.

Scoring Guide: 3=Satisfactory 2=Progress Made 1=Unsatisfactory

Important Note: Evidence for evaluating KTS 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 in *CAP 4 and 7 portfolios only* is located in the TPA Section of the portfolio.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **General Portfolio Requirements** | **3 2 1** |
| a. Main Page | **3 2 1** |
| b. Signed form verifying original work and permission to review | **3 2 1** |
| c. Self-evaluation of portfolio | **3 2 1** |
| d. Resume/vita | **3 2 1** |
| e. Educational philosophy located after the resume/vita (2 pages, size 12 font, double-spaced) | **3 2 1** |
| f. Competency in writing skills | **3 2 1** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard 1: The Teacher Demonstrates Applied Content Knowledge** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **Score** |
|  |
| **a. Communicates concepts, processes and knowledge** | Accurately and effectively communicates concepts, processes and/or knowledge AND uses vocabulary that is clear, correct, and appropriate for students | Accurately communicates concepts, processes and knowledge BUT omits some important ideas, uses vocabulary inappropriate for students or overlooks student misconceptions | Inaccurately and ineffectively communicates concepts, processes and knowledge |  |
| **b. Connects content to life experiences of students** | Effectively connects MOST content, procedures, and activities with relevant life experiences of students | Connects SOME content, procedures, and activities with relevant life experiences of students | RARELY or NEVER connects content, procedures, and activities with relevant life experiences of students |  |
| **c. Demonstrates instructional strategies that are appropriate for content and contribute to student learning** | Uses instructional strategies that are CLEARLY appropriate for the content and processes of the lesson AND make a CLEAR contribution to student learning | Demonstrates instructional strategies that are SOMEWHAT appropriate for content and processes of the lesson AND make SOME contribution to student learning | Demonstrates instructional strategies that are RARELY or NEVER appropriate for content and processes of the lesson OR make NO contribution to student learning. |  |
| **d. Guides students to understand content from various perspectives** | REGULARLY provides opportunities and guidance for students to consider lesson content from different perspectives to extend their understanding | SOMETIMES provides opportunities and guidance for students to consider lesson content from different perspectives to extend their understanding | RARELY or NEVER provides opportunities and guidance for students to consider lesson content from different perspectives to extend their understanding |  |
| **e. Identifies and addresses students’ misconceptions of content** | REGULARLY identifies misconceptions related to content and addresses them during planning and instruction | SOMETIMES identifies misconceptions related to content and addresses them during planning and instruction | RARELY or NEVER identifies misconceptions related to content and addresses them during planning and instruction |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard 2: The Teacher Designs and Plans Instruction** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **Score** |
|  |
| **a. Develops significant objectives aligned with standards** | States learning objectives that reflect key concepts of the discipline AND are aligned with local or state standards | States learning objectives that reflect key concepts of the discipline but are not aligned with local or state standards OR states learning objectives that do not reflect key concepts of the discipline | Uses objectives that are not clearly stated or are trivial AND are not aligned with local or state standards |  |
| **b. Uses contextual data to design instruction relevant to students** | Plans and designs MOST instruction that is clearly and appropriately based on significant student, community, and/or cultural data | Plans and designs SOME instruction that is appropriately based on some student, community, and/or cultural data | Plans and designs LITTLE TO NO instruction that is based on student, community, and cultural data OR planning and design reflect biased or inappropriate use of data |  |
| **c. Plans assessments to guide instruction and measure learning objectives** | Plans MOST assessments that guide instruction, measure learning results, and are aligned with learning objectives | Plans SOME assessments that guide instruction, measure learning results, and are aligned with learning objectives | Plans FEW assessments that guide instruction, measure learning results, and are aligned with learning objectives |  |
| **d. Plans instructional strategies and activities that address learning objectives for all students** | Aligns MOST instructional strategies and activities with learning objectives for all students | Aligns SOME instructional strategies and activities with learning objectives for all students | Aligns FEW instructional strategies and activities with learning objectives for all students |  |
| **e. Plans instructional strategies and activities that facilitate multiple levels of learning** | Plans MOST instructional strategies that include several levels of learning with SOME requiring higher-order thinking | Plans instructional strategies that include at least TWO levels of learning with at least ONE requiring higher-order thinking | Plans instructional strategies that do not include levels of learning OR do not require higher- order thinking |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard 3: The Teacher Creates and Maintains Learning Climate** | | **3** | **2** | **1** | **Score** |
|  |
| **a. Communicates high expectations** | | Sets significant and challenging objectives for students AND verbally/nonverbally communicates confidence in students’ abilities to achieve these objectives. | Sets significant and challenging objectives for students BUT does not communicate confidence in students’ ability to achieve these objectives | Does not set significant and challenging objectives for students AND does not communicate confidence in students |  |
| **b. Establishes a positive learning environment** | | Establishes clear standards of conduct, shows awareness of student behavior, AND responds in ways that are both appropriate and respectful to students | Makes efforts to establish standards of conduct, and monitor and respond to student behavior, BUT efforts are ineffective and or appropriate | Does not establish clear standards for student conduct, AND does not effectively monitor behavior, AND does not appropriately respond to behavior |  |
| **c. Values and supports student diversity and addresses individual needs.** | | Consistently supports student diversity and addresses individual needs using a VARIETY of strategies and methods | Inconsistently supports student diversity and addresses individual needs or uses a LIMITED repertoire of strategies and methods | Makes LITTLE or NO attempt to respond to student diversity and individual needs – tends to use a “one size fits all” approach |  |
| **d. Fosters mutual respect between teacher and students and among students** | | Consistently treats all students with respect and concern AND monitors student interactions to encourage students to treat each other with respect and concern | Inconsistently treats all students with respect OR does not monitor students | Does not treat all students with respect and concern AND does not monitor students |  |
| **e. Provides a safe environment for learning** | | Creates a classroom environment that is BOTH emotionally and physically safe for all students | Creates a classroom environment that is physically safe for all students BUT is inconsistent in ensuring a safe emotional environment for all students | Fails to create an emotionally AND physically safe environment for students |  |
| **Standard 4: The Teacher Implements and Manages Instruction** | **3** | | **2** | **1** | **Score** |
|  |
| **a. Uses a variety of instructional strategies that align with learning objectives and actively engage students** | Uses a variety of instructional strategies that engage students throughout the lesson on tasks aligned with learning objectives | | Uses a variety of instructional strategies that engage students throughout the lesson on tasks BUT are not aligned with learning objectives OR tasks are aligned with learning objectives BUT do not keep students engaged | Uses instructional strategies that do not engage students AND are not aligned with learning objectives |  |
| **b. Implements instruction based on diverse student needs and assessment data** | Implements instruction based on diverse student needs and assessment data AND adapts instruction to unanticipated circumstances when needed | | Implements instruction based on diverse student needs and assessment date BUT does not adapt instruction to unanticipated circumstances when needed | Does not base instruction on diverse student needs and assessment data AND does not adapt instruction to unanticipated circumstances when needed |  |
| **c. Uses time effectively** | Establishes EFFICIENT procedures for performing non-instructional tasks, handling materials and supplies, managing transitions, and organizing and monitoring group work so that there is MINIMAL loss of instructional time | | Establishes SOMEWHAT efficient procedures for performing non-instructional tasks, handling materials and supplies, managing transitions, and organizing and monitoring group work that vary in their effectiveness so there is SOME UNNECESSARY loss of instructional time | Fails to establish consistent procedures for performing non-instructional tasks, handling materials and supplies, managing transactions, and organizing and monitoring group work resulting in significant loss of instructional time |  |
| **d. Uses space and materials effectively** | Uses classroom space AND materials effectively to facilitate student learning | | Uses classroom space but not materials to effectively facilitate student learning OR uses materials but not classroom space to effectively facilitate student learning | Fails to effectively use classroom space AND materials to facilitate student learning |  |
| **e. Implements and manages instruction in ways that facilitate higher-order thinking** | CONSISTENTLY uses a variety of appropriate strategies to facilitate higher-order thinking | | SOME instruction promotes higher-order thinking | LITTLE or NO instruction promotes higher-order thinking |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard 5: The Teacher Assesses and Communicates Learning Results** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **Score** |
|  |
| **a. Uses pre-assessments** | Uses a variety of pre-assessments to establish baseline knowledge and skills for all students | SOMETIMES uses pre-assessments to establish baseline knowledge and skills for all students | DOES NOT USE pre-assessments to establish baseline knowledge and skills for all students |  |
| **b. Uses formative assessments** | Uses a variety of formative assessments to determine each student’s progress and guide instruction | Uses SOME formative assessments to determine each student’s progress and guide instruction BUT offers LITTLE variety | Does not use a variety of formative assessments to determine each student’s progress and guide instruction AND offers NO variety |  |
| **c. Uses summative assessments** | Uses varied summative assessments to determine each student’s progress | Uses LITTLE variety in summative assessments to determine each student’s progress | Uses NO variety in summative assessments to determine each student’s progress |  |
| **d. Describes, analyzes, and evaluates student performance data** | Analyzes assessment data to guide instruction and learning and measure learning progress | Analyzes assessment data to guide instruction and learning OR to measure learning progress | Does not analyze assessment data to guide instruction OR measure learning progress |  |
| **e. Communicates learning results to students and parents** | Communicates learning results to students AND parents in a meaningful and timely manner | Communicates learning results to students OR parents in a meaningful and timely manner | Does not communicate learning results to students AND parents in a meaningful and timely manner |  |
| **f. Allows opportunity for student self-assessment** | CONSISTENTLY promotes opportunities for students to engage in accurate self-assessment of learning | SOMETIMES promotes opportunities for students to engage in accurate self-assessment of learning | RARELY OR NEVER promotes opportunities for students to engage in accurate self-assessment of learning |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard 6: The Teacher Demonstrates the Implementation of Technology** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **Score** |
|  |
| **a. Uses available technology to design and plan instruction** | REGULARLY uses technology to design and plan instruction | SOMETIMES uses technology to design and plan instruction | RARELY or NEVER uses technology to design and plan instruction |  |
| **b. Uses available technology to implement instruction that facilitates student learning** | REGULARLY uses technology to implement instruction and facilitate student learning | SOMETIMES uses technology to implement instruction and facilitate student learning | RARELY or NEVER uses technology to implement instruction and facilitate student learning |  |
| **c. Integrates student use of available technology into instruction** | REGULARLY integrates student use of technology into instruction to enhance learning outcomes and meet diverse student needs | SOMETIMES integrates student use of technology into instruction to enhance learning outcomes and meet diverse student needs | RARELY or NEVER integrates student use of technology into instruction to enhance learning outcomes and meet diverse student needs |  |
| **d. Uses available technology to assess and communicate student learning** | REGULARLY uses technology to assess and communicate student learning | SOMETIMES uses technology to assess and communicate student learning | RARELY or NEVER uses technology to assess and communicate student learning |  |
| **e. Demonstrates ethical use of technology** | Ensures that personal use and student use of technology are ethical and legal | Ensures that personal use OR student use of technology are ethical and legal | DOES NOT ensure that personal use OR student use of technology is ethical and legal |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard 7: Reflects on and Evaluates Teaching and Learning** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **Score** |
|  |
| **a. Uses data to reflect on and evaluate student learning** | REGULARLY reflects on and evaluates student learning using appropriate data | SOMETIMES reflects on and evaluates student learning using appropriate data | RARELY or NEVER reflects on and evaluates student learning using appropriate data |  |
| **b. Uses data to reflect on and evaluate instructional practice** | REGULARLY reflects on and evaluates instructional practice using appropriate data | SOMETIMES reflects on and evaluates instructional practice using appropriate data | RARELY or NEVER reflects on and evaluates instructional practice using appropriate data |  |
| **c. Uses data to reflect on and identify areas for professional growth** | REGULARLY identifies areas for professional growth using appropriate data | SOMETIMES identifies areas for professional growth using appropriate data | RARELY or NEVER identifies areas for professional growth using appropriate data |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard 8: Collaborates with Colleagues/ Parents/ Others** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **Score** |
|  |
| **a. Identifies students whose learning could be enhanced by collaboration** | Identifies ONE or more students whose learning could be enhanced by collaboration and provides an appropriate rationale | Identifies ONE or more students whose learning could be enhanced by collaboration, but does not provide an appropriate rationale | Fails to identify a student whose learning could be enhanced by collaboration |  |
| **b. Designs a plan to enhance student learning that includes all parties in the collaborative effort** | Designs a plan to enhance student learning that includes ALL parties in the collaborative effort | Designs a plan to enhance student learning that includes SOME parties in the collaborative effort | Does not design a plan OR the plan does not enhance student learning |  |
| **c. Implements planned activities that enhance student learning and engages all parties** | Implements planned activities that enhance student learning AND engage ALL parties | Implements planned activities that enhance student learning AND engage SOME parties | Does not implement planned activities OR plan does not enhance student learning |  |
| **d. Analyzes data to evaluate the outcomes of collaborative effort** | Analyzes student learning data to evaluate the outcomes of collaboration AND identifies next steps | Analyzes student learning data to evaluate the outcomes of collaboration BUT does not identify next steps | Does not evaluate outcomes of collaboration OR does not analyze student learning data to evaluate outcomes of collaboration |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard 9: Evaluates Teaching and Implements Professional Development** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **Score** |
|  |
| **a. Self-assesses performance relative to Kentucky’s Teacher Standards** | THOROUGHLY and ACCURATELY assesses current performance on all Kentucky Teacher Standards | PARTIALLY assesses current performance on some Kentucky Teacher Standards | Does not assess current performance on Kentucky Teacher Standards |  |
| **b. Identifies priorities for professional development based on data from self-assessment, student performance and feedback from colleagues** | Identifies priority areas for growth based on self-assessment, student performance, AND feedback from colleagues | Identifies priority areas for growth based on self-assessment , student performance OR feedback from colleagues | Does not identify priority areas OR identified areas are not based on any self-assessment, student performance or feedback from colleagues |  |
| **c. Designs a professional growth plan that addresses identified priorities** | Designs a clear, logical professional growth plan AND addresses all identified priorities | Designs a professional growth plan that is somewhat clear and logical and addresses all identified priorities OR only clearly and logically addresses some identified priorities | Designs a professional growth plan that is not clear and logical AND does not address identified priorities |  |
| **d. Shows evidence of professional growth and reflection on the identified priority areas and impact on instructional effectiveness and student learning** | Shows CLEAR evidence of professional growth and reflection relative to identified priority areas and impact on instructional effectiveness and student learning | Shows SOME evidence of professional growth and reflection relative to identified priority areas and impact on instructional effectiveness and student learning | Shows LITTLE evidence of professional growth and reflection relative to identified priority areas and impact on instructional effectiveness and student learning |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard 10: Provides Leadership Within School/Community/ Profession** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **Score** |
|  |
| **a. Identifies leadership opportunities that enhance student learning and/or professional environment of the school** | Identifies leadership opportunities in the school and selects one for a leadership project that has BOTH the potential for positive impact on learning and/or the professional environment of the school and is realistic in terms of knowledge, skill, and time needed for completion | Identifies leadership opportunities and selects one for leadership project that has potential for positive impact BUT is unrealistic OR the project is realistic BUT has limited potential for positive impact | Does not identify leadership opportunities that have real potential for impact on either the learning or professional environment |  |
| **b. Develops a plan for engaging in leadership activities** | Develops a work plan for a leadership project that CLEARLY describes the purpose, scope, and participants involved and how the plan will impact student learning and/or the professional environment | Develops a work plan for a leadership project that provides a LIMITED description of the purpose, scope, and participants involved and how the plan will impact student learning and/or the professional environment | Develops a work plan for a leadership project that provides a SUPERFICIAL description of the purpose, scope, and participants involved and how the plan will impact student learning and/or the professional environment OR has developed no plan |  |
| **c. Implements a plan for engaging in leadership activities** | Implements a well-organized leadership plan that has a clear timeline of events/actions AND a clear description of how impact will be assessed | Implements a well-organized leadership plan that has a clear timeline of events/actions BUT lacks a clear description of how impact will be assessed | Implements a poorly organized leadership plan that does NOT have a clear timeline of events/actions AND lacks a clear description of how impact will be assessed OR does not implement leadership plan |  |
| **d. Analyzes data to evaluate the results of planned and executed leadership efforts** | REGULARLY analyzes student learning and/or other school data appropriately to evaluate the results of planned and executed leadership efforts | OCCASIONALLY analyzes student learning and/or other school data appropriately to evaluate the results of planned and executed leadership efforts | RARELY or NEVER analyzes student learning and/or other school data appropriately to evaluate the results of planned and executed leadership efforts |  |

**Addendum G**

Campbellsville University

MASE Program (Option 6)

University/District Mentorship Agreement

The purpose of the University/District Mentorship Agreement is to outline the mentoring responsibilities of School District and Campbellsville University Faculty with candidates in the alternative certification program (Option 6) for LBD teachers in fulfillment of 16 KAR 9:080 Section 3.

In collaboration with the principal of the partner school and school level coach, mentor teachers will be identified that meet the following minimum criteria:

* 3 years teaching experience
* Completed Master’s degree
* Teaches same content (or similar) as the candidate
* Current or retired teacher

Mentors will evaluate the program utilizing a survey at the completion of the program. The candidate will evaluate each mentor and the program utilizing a survey at the completion of the program.

Campbellsville University Faculty Mentor Responsibilities:

* Provide a minimum of 5-10 (as determined by the hours of observation and an additional five hours of one-on-one support (feedback, securing information and resources, conferencing, etc.) for two hours per eight-week term. Document the observational hours utilizing the Teacher Observation Summary Form and submit to the graduate programs assistant.
* Respond promptly to communication from the candidate by telephone or email.
* Honor the time demands of the candidate, offering services on site as much as possible.
* Consult with the candidate in developing the PPGES Self Reflection and Professional Growth Plan.
* Consult with the candidate on meaningful goals for successfully completing the program.

Develop a Praxis Study Plan for the *PRAXIS Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications (5543).*

* Meet with the teacher mentor and candidate a minimum of two times during the program to discuss progress and/or issues as they arise.

Teacher Mentor Responsibilities:

* Provide a minimum of 5-10 hours of observation and an additional five hours of one-on-one support (feedback, securing information and resources, conferencing, etc.) for three hours per eight-week term. Observations should include teaching lessons and assessing students utilizing technology.
* Respond promptly to communication from the candidate by telephone or email.
* Consult with the candidate in developing the PPGES Self Reflection and Professional Growth Plan.
* Consult with the candidate on goals for successfully completing the program.
* Meet with the university faculty mentor and candidate a minimum of two times during the program to discuss progress and/or issues as they arise.

Candidate Responsibilities:

* Take full advantage of the support offered by mentors.
* Communicate regularly with mentors concerning progress and issues as they arise.
* Work with the mentors to identify meaningful goals for the program, in concert with the development of the PPGES Self Reflection and Professional Growth Plan.
* Arrange for real-work situations for observations that allow for targeted feedback including teaching lessons and assessing students utilizing technology.
* Participate in evaluation of the program and contribute ideas for program improvement.
* Complete all major program assessments.
* Meet with the university faculty mentor and teacher mentor a minimum of two times during the program to discuss progress and/or issues as they arise.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

University Faculty Mentor Signature Date

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Teacher Mentor Signature Date

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Principal Signature Date