Campbellsville University
Rejoinder
Teacher Leader Master's and Endorsement

1. **The certification only option for this certification is not identified on the curriculum contract.**

   The curriculum contract was updated with this information.

2. **Summary analysis of the program assessment on dispositions is not included in the data analysis summary section on the program template.**

	Number of CAP 7 Surveys	Evaluator	Professional Conduct	Professional Services	Professional Ethics	Professional Responsibilities	Professional Communication	Clinical Field Experience	High Expectations	Engages in Effective Practice/Reflection
2014-15	33	Mean	3.40	3.32	3.32	3.36	3.33	3.32	3.20	3.00
2014-15	17	Candidate	3.33	3.64	3.64	3.71	3.59	3.64	3.00	2.67
2014-15	16	Faculty	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.06	3.00	3.50	3.50
2015-16	20	Mean	3.26			3.05	3.10		3.06	3.00
2015-16	9	Candidate	3.25	3.00	3.00	2.78	3.00	3.00	2.88	2.88
2015-16	11	Faculty	3.27			3.27	3.18		3.20	3.10
2016-17	43	Mean	3.35			3.21	3.16		3.16	3.14
2016-17	25	Candidate	3.28			3.08	3.04		3.08	3.00
2016-17	18	Faculty	3.444			3.39	3.333		3.28	3.33
2017-18	72	Mean	3.33			3.27	3.21		3.26	3.23

| 2017-18 | 57 | Candidate | 3.43 | | 3.28 | 3.26 | | 3.23 | 3.16 |
| 2017-18 | 64 | Faculty | 3.28 | | 3.27 | 3.17 | | 3.29 | 3.27 |

From 2014-2015 through 2017-2018, candidates were evaluated on eight indicators with a scale of one to four. At CAP 7 (exit), candidates self-evaluate and were evaluated by faculty.

In 2014-2015, the lowest mean reported by candidates was 2.67 in Engages in Effective Reflection. The lowest mean reported by faculty was 3.0 in Professional Services, Professional Ethics, Professional Responsibilities, and Clinical Experiences.

In 2015-2016, the lowest mean reported by candidates was 2.78 in Professional Responsibilities. In 2015-2016, the lowest mean reported by faculty was 3.18 in Engages in Effective Reflection.

In 2016-2017, the lowest mean reported by candidates was 3.0 in Engages in Effective Reflection. In 2016-2017, the lowest mean reported by faculty was 3.28 in High Expectations.

In 2017-2018, the lowest mean reported by candidates was 3.16 in Engages in Effective Reflection. In 2017-2018, the lowest mean reported by faculty was 3.17 in Professional Communications.

In three of the four years, Effective Reflection was the lowest mean reported by candidates. The faculty lows were more distributed. It is clear, though, that reflection is a concern with candidates in this program.

3. **Information included in the Continuous Improvement Plan for this program is not linked to the data analysis summary.**

   The information in the Continuous Improvement Plan focused on the importance of improving the quality of key assessments in the program. Both the Master's Action Research Project (MARP) and Assessment Design Project (ADP) were improved with alignment to Kentucky Teacher Performance Standards (KTPS/InTASC) and Teacher Leader Model Standards (TLMS). These improvements included Lawshe's Content Validity testing and establishment of inter-rater reliability. Subsequently, data analysis indicated that these improvements caused candidates to improve scores in key indicators.

   The MARP requires candidates to write a literature review based on current empirical studies. This expectation exemplifies candidate ability with applications of data literacy. KTS advanced standard two, teacher demonstrates applied content knowledge and standard four, the teacher implements and manages instruction, align with applications of data literacy. The overall scores for 2017-2018 were higher than the two preceding years.

This may indicate that the revisions that were made to the rubric assist candidates in being successful. For 2015-2016 cycle and beyond, KTPS/InTASC standard six (assessment) data indicated a mean score of 2.97 out of three for the two cycles of data. Future cohorts of MARP data will be further disaggregated at the indicator level. In 2017-2018, CAEP 1.1 was a measurable indicator on the MARP. Candidates scored a mean of 3.36 (S.D. = .48). This score evidences candidate use of technology and ability to analyze data.

The MARP additionally requires candidates to write a methodology, in which they utilize qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods data collection tools. Next, they write a data analysis section in which they analyze the results of this data collection. KTS advanced standard five, the teacher assess and communicates learning results aligns with the use of research. For the five KTS advanced standards for three cycles of data, all mean scores were above 2.5 out of three except 5.1, which was 2.44, the use of pre-assessments during the 2014-2015 cycle. Beyond this one year, however, the scores increased for this indicator. For 2015-2016 cycle and beyond, KTPS/InTASC standard six data indicated a mean score of 2.97 out of three for the two cycles of data. The mean (on a scale of four) for KTPS/InTASC standard six for 2017-2018 was 3.41 (S.D. = .49).

Some candidates (depending on their MARP topic) discuss supportive school environments. This indicator is reflected in KTS 7.2, candidates use performance data to conduct an in-depth analysis and evaluation of instructional practices to inform future teaching. The mean score for the three cycles of data is 2.96 on a scale of three for this indicator. Additionally, for the last two cycles of data, KTPS/InTASC standard 3, learning environments, has a mean of 2.89, which means that candidates are successfully developing supportive school environments. In 2017-2018, the mean for KTPS/InTASC standard 3 was 3.45 (S.D. = .5).

The MARP requires candidates to write a conclusion, in which candidates discuss how they share their research findings with colleagues, administrators, community organization, and parents as appropriate. This indicator is reflected in KTS 8, collaboration. Mean scores for the standard eight indicators show growth in candidate performance across the three cohort cycles. Additionally, for the last two cycles of data, KTPS/InTASC standard ten has a mean of 2.89. These scores indicate that candidates are successfully collaborating as appropriate for their MARP topic. In 2017-2018, the mean score for KTPS/InTASC standard ten was 3.23 (S.D. = .42).

Candidates utilize technology within the MARP in numerous ways. For example, they retrieve scholarly data for the literature review, develop data collection tools, analyze data with excel, and report their findings with a digital presentation. Additionally, depending on the MARP topic, some candidates demonstrate the use of technology within their classrooms by using a technology application as their MARP topic. KTS standard six evidences the utilization of technology. All cohort cycles had means above 2.5 on a scale of three for technology indicators, which demonstrates successful use of technology. In 2017-2018, CAEP 1.1 was a measurable indicator on the MARP.

Candidates scored a mean of 3.36 (S.D. = .48). This score evidences candidate use of technology and ability to analyze data.

Overall candidates demonstrate competences in their field and specialty areas scoring above minimum on all data with some cohorts showing a perfect score. Rank Two programs show continuous improvement in application of data literacy with the third cycle higher than the two preceding years. All candidates across all programs demonstrate the use of research and understanding of qualitative, quantitative, and/or mixed methods research methods.

Trends and Implications
Challenges for the EPP include small cohorts, development of data measurements for some programs. For example, a reoccurring challenge for the EPP continues to be working with diverse students because of our rural location in central Kentucky. The homogenous student bodies of our candidates make it difficult to meet some KTPS/InTASC standards related to diversity.

Based on review of data across the TLMAE program, candidates demonstrate consistent and/or continuous progress made content and pedagogical knowledge and its application. Lower scores on student use of preassessment seems to be a trend; we need to develop a plan of action to address this deficit. Overall, the EPP recognizes a lack of data collection aligned to KTPS/InTASC and CAEP standards for advanced program. This makes it difficult to analyze data for select programs.

4. **The program template identifies three hours of required field experience for ED 670 while the spreadsheet identifies six hours.**

Candidates are expected to complete three hours of clinical in ED 670. See spreadsheet below.

Course Number and Title	Public School Field Hours	Purpose/Example of Activities in Classroom
ED 655 Empowerment for Teacher Leadership	6 Write a reflection	Review the cumulative folders for all students in the classroom where you currently teach or will be implementing the research project to determine the primary learning needs of the class. **(5 hours)** Use the information collected to develop the research topic. **(1 hour)**
ED 660 Formative Assessment and Intervention for All Students	6 Write a reflection	In collaboration with the school and or district RTI consultant, review and analyze RTI data in a school setting. Use assessment information in making eligibility, program, and placement decisions for individuals with disabilities and those students from culturally and/or linguistically diverse backgrounds.

ED 665 Research Methods	6 Write a reflection	Design a research question. **(1 hours)** Collaborate with a building principal and discuss possible ways to investigate the research question in their building. **(2 hours)** Collaborate with a classroom to discuss the logistics of implementing the research. **(2 hour)** Write a draft of the letter of consent that will be sent in ED 670. Get IRB approval for the study.**(1 hour)**
ED 670 Action Research Project Practicum I	3 Write a reflection	Letter of consent informing parents of study. **(2 hours)** Begin implementation of an Action Research Project in a school setting. **(1 hour)**
ED 675 Action Research Project Practicum II	3 Write a reflection	Continue implementation and analysis of ARP research data.
ED 685 Digital-Age Technology for Teaching and Learning	6 Write a reflection	In collaboration with the district technology coordinator, review and analyze a district's technology plan in the following areas: personnel, state mandates, budgeting, professional development, equipment purchase, and maintenance, and assistive technologies. (**4hours**) Shadow a district technology coordinator.
ED 690 Supervision of Instruction	6 Write a reflection	Interview a district level instructional supervisor on job related responsibilities. One hour can be for scheduling and preparation for the interview. **(3 hours)** Shadow an instructional supervisor. **(3 hours)**

5. **Note: The program syllabi need to be redesigned around the Teacher Leader Model Standards instead of KTPS.**

   See all course syllabi with TLMS included.