

Campbellsville University
Rejoinder
Chemistry, Grades 8-12 (Baccalaureate (5))

1. Additional information is needed to describe how partners are using technology-based collaborations and how they are involved in the shared responsibility for continuous improvement.

CAP 2 admissions involves P-12 Partners and University Faculty assessing student created videos which exhibit technology-based collaboration of 21st Century Skills as they relate to communication, collaboration, critical thinking, and creativity. Evidence 2.1.6 includes video assessments from P-12 Partners, University Faculty, & Student Self-Assessment. In addition, the CAP 4 Exit Event includes an online technology-based e-portfolio pre-event scoring where partners score portfolios and provide feedback to candidates. Evidence 2.1.7 includes copies of exit surveys, portfolio feedback, and interview feedback.

Evidence 2.2.5 includes documentation of accessible online resources to clinical educators. Documentation includes instructions provided to clinical educators on accessing evaluation resources on the EPP's School of Education website. Evidence also includes online recordings of professional development training for cooperating teachers to access in preparing for their supervision of EPP candidates.

Evidence 2.2.6 includes documentation of online and face-to-face trainings designed to prepare clinical educators for successful facilitation of student teachers. Emails (Evidence A2.1.3) are included in evidence documents which demonstrate communication between EPP and P-12 partners in requesting partners to complete electronic surveys, as well as collaborating on scheduling both electronic and face-to-face meetings for development of programs, courses, and evaluations.

In an effort to include a wide-range of participants in program development and evaluation this technology has produced good results in feedback and participation for technology-based collaborations. Feedback from candidates and mentors also allow the EPP to be reflective of current clinical experience and to prepare for future purposeful placements. Agreed upon clinical experience will include providing support to candidates in the application of appropriate technology within their field of specialization.

Evidence 5.2.1 describes plans for improving technology applications within the EPP regarding student and faculty use as well as in collaborations with our P-12 partners.

2. While the documentation identifies the required components of the clinical experiences, it is not clear how the courses address and ensure the experiences.

The EPP collaborates with P-12 partners in designing clinical experiences to prepare candidates for positive impact on P-12 learning. Clinical experiences are explicitly designed for candidates to achieve experience in assisting P-12 partners within diverse settings while achieving a

minimum amount of 200 clinical hours prior to Student Teaching. EPPs evaluate candidate performance and learning through multiple performance based assessments at key points throughout their program. EPP CAP Documents are completed by the candidate prior to admission, at admission, prior to Student Teaching and upon completion of Student Teaching. Candidates use technology to compile these assessed portfolios to demonstrate evidence of developed knowledge, skills, and dispositional performance.

Evidence 2.3.1 is a candidate sample which includes the EPSB Student Teacher Requirement Checklist where candidates document a minimum of completed diverse clinical experience requirements of 200 hours prior to Student Teaching. Candidates also submit field hour forms with P-12 teacher signatures to verify completed experience in working with diverse populations which are recorded by the EPP and write reflections connecting the experiences to the course content. EPP Staff spot check the experiences with sign in logs kept at the various schools where students complete their clinical experiences. They also spot check by contacting teachers through email and phone calls. In addition, many of the field experiences are set up by professors of courses and the program through a professor who is the clinical experience coordinator as part of her load. Beginning in the next month, the EPP has hired a full time Clinical Support Specialist who will work in this capacity.

Evidence 1.1.1 is the Field Experience Matrix which describes focused, purposeful, and varied clinical experience aligned to the courses offered within the EPP program. Clinical experiences are intentionally designed to occur in diverse settings. The EPP outlines specific criteria for each required clinical experience in each course syllabus. Evidence 2.3.2 is a sample syllabus to illustrate the specific strategies practiced in the P-12 settings which is varied by each course. Evidence 1.1.5 is the summative evaluation instrument used to assess candidate progress throughout their completed clinical experience.

3. Additional information is needed to describe how the program/EPP seeks stakeholders' involvement and shares evidence with internal and external audiences.

The EPP participates in several mutually beneficial partnerships collaborating on candidate preparation, curriculum, field experiences, and assessment of candidate application of knowledge and skills.

Evidence 2.1.1 contains collaborative agreements the EPP has with partner schools and districts where candidates participate in a variety of clinical based experiences such as Marion County gifted education events, Taylor County literacy nights, Campbellsville High School Family Resource and Youth Service Center Reality Town, Marion County live scoring of P-12 student work, Green County International Days. In addition, the EPP collaborates with other programs on campus such as the English as a Second Language Institute to provide tutors, mentors, and services for P-12 partner schools. Another example is a collaboration facilitated by the EPP science methods courses between Clay Hill Memorial Forest and P-12 Partner Schools. These partnerships provide EPP candidates with real time experiences with diverse P-12 student populations utilizing instructional practices and strategies they learn in their coursework. Candidates are also mentored informally by P-12 practitioners during these collaborative events. Partner schools and districts benefit through lower student to mentor ratios, increased P-12

interest in learning activities, and more immediate feedback to students.

Evidence 2.1.2, the Memorandum of Agreement between the Collaborative for Teaching and Learning and the EPP, provides professional development for P-12 teachers in using mathematical modeling as an instructional tool for Algebraic Instruction. In addition to the collaborative agreement, the document provides a log of contact hours where EPP faculty and P-12 faculty are co-creating, modeling tasks, and co-teaching. While the term of the grant is two years, EPP faculty will continue to serve as mentors in math instruction for regional districts and schools. This process has enabled the student teaching director to identify, evaluate, and recruit cooperating teachers for student teaching resource teachers and mentors.

The Clinical Teacher Agreement, Evidence 2.1.3, documents a cooperative agreement for providing "...professional laboratory experiences and student teaching experiences for students preparing for the education profession. The University and the Board accept joint accountability to educate qualified teachers." This agreement is aligned and compliant with KRS 161.042 and 16 KAR 5:040. On an annual basis each district where EPP candidates are placed for clinical experiences and student teaching are asked to review the process and recommit to follow it in the selection of mentor teachers and placement of student teachers.

The Teacher Educator Advisory Council (TEAC) meets biannually to review and advise the EPP on curriculum, content validity (Lawshe's), program capstone course, exit criteria, etc. Evidence 2.1.4 is compiled of meeting minutes and communications. Some meetings are conducted face to face while others are electronic. Minutes reflect discussions about co-construction of rubrics, lesson plans, and unit development.

The Teacher Educator Committee (TEC) meets six times each year on campus to align content methods courses and clinical experiences based on review of Praxis scores and faculty recommendations from student interactions. Evidence 2.1.5 is compiled of meeting minutes and communications.

Entry into the EPP in part involves P-12 Partners and University Faculty assessing student created videos which exhibit technology-based collaboration of 21st Century Skills as they relate to communication, collaboration, critical thinking, and creativity. Artifacts included in Evidence document 2.1.6 will include video assessments from P-12 Partners, University Faculty, & Student Self-Assessment.

The EPP hosts a biannual exit event for candidate assessment. Administrators from partnering districts assess portfolios which document effective candidate preparation linked to their coursework and implementing effective teaching strategies (see also Evidence 2.3.1 Clinical Matrix). Candidates receive feedback through their portfolios assessed by P-12 partners as well as feedback from the exit interviews. Participating districts set up displays and recruitment centers for districts and candidates to discuss employment opportunities. These employment contacts provide opportunities for ongoing communication between district employment coordinators and EPPs on district needs and candidate qualifications. Partner input into exit criteria is solicited through an exit event survey. Overall survey data demonstrates partner satisfaction with the exit event. One example of a change in the exit event process based on

partner feedback is a movement from hard copy on-site portfolio scoring to online technology-based e-portfolio pre-event scoring. Evidence 2.1.7 includes copies of exit surveys, portfolio feedback, and interview feedback.

The EPP works closely with P-12 partners to co-select highly effective clinical educators who continue to demonstrate positive impact on P-12 students. The EPP partners with P-12 educators to co-construct criteria for candidates based on a variety of measures, which is continually used to evaluate and refine expectations of continued improvement and retention.

Evidence 2.2.1 contains the student teacher agreement, which includes state regulation 16.KAR.5:040 and is co-selected by the EPP and cooperating teachers. This document communicates the foundation for accountability and its co-constructed expectations for the EPP, P-12 clinical educators, and administrators in the selection of future clinical educators.

Evidence 2.2.2 includes survey data completed by cooperating teachers to evaluate EPP based clinical educators and candidates according to INTASC Standards. Results are shared through a database and accessed by the EPP to make future decisions on program improvement and extension.

Evidence Document 2.2.3 includes survey data completed by candidates and clinical educators on cooperating teachers. Results are shared in faculty meetings and feedback is provided to cooperating teachers for continual improvement and partnership in preparing candidates for future teaching.

Evidence 2.2.4 includes survey data (Evidence document 2.2.2) shared by cooperating teachers in providing feedback on current and future placements within recently used clinical settings. Criterion was reviewed and evaluated by EPP and cooperating teacher to determine future student teacher placements in private school settings. Criterion was co-constructed from EPP and cooperating teacher to recommend future student teachers to be allowed to complete only one 8-week placement in a private school setting. Evidence for 2.2.4 also includes Undergraduate Faculty Meeting Minutes where this recommendation was formulated into EPP policy for future student teachers.

Evidence 2.2.5 includes documentation of accessible online resources to clinical educators. Documentation includes instructions provided to clinical educators on accessing evaluation resources on the EPP's School of Education website. Evidence also includes online recordings of professional development training for cooperating teachers to access in preparing for their supervision of EPP candidates.

Evidence 2.2.6 includes documentation of online and face-to-face trainings designed to prepare clinical educators for successful facilitation of student teachers. University Supervisors are also required to provide follow-up face-to-face trainings to clinical educators as well. Documents as evidenced in 2.2.6 verify training was provided to all clinical educators serving as cooperating teachers.

The EPP collaborates with P-12 partners in designing clinical experiences to prepare candidates for positive impact on P-12 learning. Clinical experiences are explicitly designed for candidates to achieve experience in assisting P-12 partners within diverse settings while achieving a minimum amount of 200 clinical hours prior to Student Teaching.

The EPP reflects on candidate scores and the provided feedback from P-12 partners to modify candidate preparation. As represented in Evidence 1.1.6, candidates construct Professional Growth Plan Standard 6 based on data from formative and summative feedback provided by both P-12 partners and EPP to brainstorm next steps for future impact on students.

Evidence 1.1.6 also includes the evaluation documents which P-12 partners and the EPP completes based on candidate submission of electronic portfolios. These portfolios provide evidence of candidates' use of technology in teaching. Candidates submit samples of data within their CAP portfolios to also document their use of technology in tracking P-12 student performance and progress.

4. Some information regarding assessments for Academic Competency in the Admission Criteria section of the curriculum contract is inaccurate. The PPST is no longer an acceptable assessment. Also, scores are good for five years 16 KAR 5:020.

When the 2016-17 edition of the curriculum guide was included in the program submission in the fall of 2017, the PPST was still a valid option and the PPST scores were good for 10 years. The current curriculum guide and CAP documents for 2018-19, attached, no longer lists the PPST as a second option and now reflects the policy change for all Praxis scores to be good for five years.

5. The curriculum contract does not identify the admission and exit criteria. The information provided in the 'Reminder' section should be update (i.e., 2.5 GPA required for admission). The Praxis disclaimer is not included on the curriculum contract.

The 2018-19 edition of the curriculum contract/guide for Chemistry reflects those changes.

6. It is not clear why ED310 shows alignment to all the ILA standards. How are the SLOs (like foundational knowledge, for example) really being assessed in the technology projects? Are candidates really being asked to design these projects around reading/writing processes, major theories and empirical research that inform reading/writing instruction? Although the ILA standards are tagged, it is not clear how they are truly aligned with either the SLOs or assessments.

When the program was submitted in the fall of 2017, the literacy mandate was newly implemented and faculty were encouraged to align syllabi with the new ILA standards. At that time, most alignment in syllabi was conducted at the standard rather than at the indicator level. Since then, the revised ED 310 syllabus has an alignment matrix with just a few ILA indicators and includes tasks/assignments that meet the respective objectives. There is a much more specific match between the ILA indicators selected and the

assessments/tasks.

7. It is not clear how ED 300, 310, 325, and 329 are all teaching all of the ILA standards. All of the courses that are supposedly aligned to NCTE and/or ILA do not demonstrate that content in either the SLOs or tasks. The standards appear to be tagged but not really taught.

As noted in #6, when the programs were submitted in the fall of 2017, the literacy mandate was newly implemented and the syllabi aligned with standards rather than indicators. Since then, the syllabi have reflected alignment with specific indicators, including the ILA indicators. Over many years, ILA has partnered with NCTE to develop the standards and at that time, may have been listed for that reason.

ED 300 has been revised to reflect specific ILA standards relevant to the course objectives and key assessments.

The revised ED 310 syllabus is currently aligned with just a few of the ILA indicators and align with tasks identified in the alignment matrix which also includes the objectives which align with the respective assignments. There is a much more specific match between the ILA indicators selected and the assessments/tasks.

The revised ED 325 syllabus shows alignment with specific ILA indicators relevant to the course objectives and key assessments.

The ED 359 syllabus was developed to meet the literacy mandate for 8-12 and P12 majors and was implemented during the 2016-17 academic year. It was a new course specifically designed to meet the ILA standards for those majors. At that time, the mandate template required either one or more courses to meet intent of the regulation. The course was designed to meet as many of the ILA standards/indicators as possible, reflected in the alignment matrices and rubrics included in the syllabus. The literacy mandate, as approved by the EPSB, is provided as further documentation.

8. The narrative indicates that candidates are introduced to the KAS in the very first education course. At what point do they learn the content of the relevant KAS? The narrative is unclear about how the program assures that candidates understand the content they are expected to teach.

Candidates are introduced to the KAS overall and to the relevant content standards in their first education course and in all education courses thereafter. During all developmental lesson and unit plans, in all education courses, candidates are required to align instructional plans with the relevant content standards for their majors and teach to those standards during that instruction. Those are required on both the lesson plan and unit forms candidates are required to use for those assignments.

For a majority of the clinical experiences, candidates are assigned to classrooms in their content area; efforts are expended to ensure they have clinical experiences at all grade levels (especially with RTI) but, when they take methods courses, they are assigned to P-12 classes in their content areas. All instruction planned and implemented in those classes must align with the respective content KAS. Please see the lesson and unit templates and rubrics attached, noting that the KAS are required during preliminary plans.

In ED 220, ED 300 and ED 310, candidates plan and teach one lesson in their content area. In ED 325, they plan a unit and teach one lesson in a P-12 setting in their content area; In ED 390 candidates are placed with a teacher in their content where they plan and teach a five-day unit using KAS under the guidance of their cooperating teacher and the school's curriculum maps/pacing guides. In ED 351, ED 361, and ED 359, candidates plan and teach a variety of lessons and/or units and in ED 414, they plan and teach a complete unit in one of their P-12 placements for student teaching.

Additionally, the Teacher Education Committee consists of content faculty across campus who represent varied content certification programs and meets several times annually. The chair of that committee ensures that those content faculty understand the KAS and the importance of candidates aligning their instruction to the KAS as well as teaching to those standards.

CHEMISTRY GRADES 8-12 (Master's (4506) and Option 6 (4507))

These programs were approved by the EPSB on April 10, 2017.

While there was no summary analysis for the program linked to continuous improvement at the time the program was submitted, it is expected that program assessment data has been collected, analyzed, summarized, and linked to continuous improvement for each of the programs at the time of the onsite visit.

*Since the MAT program in chemistry was approved in April, 2017, there have been no students who have completed the program yet so there are no candidate data.