Campbellsville University
School of Education

Rejoinder

Learning and Behavior Disorders, Grades P-12
(Baccalaureate (33))

3/16/19

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. The curriculum contract includes a reference to the PPST which is no longer an acceptable assessment.

The curriculum contracts/guides do not list the admission Praxis exams, only the exit Praxis exams. When the program was submitted in the fall of 2017, the CAP 2 admission form listed all options available, including the PPST that was still a valid option at that time. Since then, the updated editions of CAP 2 no longer list the PPST as an acceptable assessment. Please see the 2018-19 CAP 2 admission, other CAP forms, and the curriculum contract/guide for this program.

5. 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 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 includes 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. Please see the most recent edition of the ED 310 syllabus.

6. It is not clear how ED 300 is 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 #5, 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.

ED 300 has been revised to reflect/asses specific ILA standards relevant to the course objectives and key assessments. Please see the most recent edition of the ED 300 syllabus.

One of the key assertions regarding content literacy is that all teachers are literacy teachers and that all teachers need to teach their students how to read, understand and retain the materials for the specific content of the courses they teach. Therefore, all of the EPP courses include alignment to and assessment of relevant ILA indicators to support that assertion.

Since program submission, the EPP programs have been aligned with the KTPS/InTASC standards. As a result, all course syllabi are aligned to the KTPS/InTASC standards; the key assessments in the program utilize rubrics based on the KTPS/InTASC standards as well. For instance, 5(h) states that ‘The teacher develops and implements supports for learner literacy development across content areas’.

7. 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 KAS content standards in their first education course and in all education courses, thereafter. During development of all lesson and unit plans, in all education courses, candidates are required to align instructional plans with the relevant KAS content standards for their majors and teach to those standards during that instruction. The relevant KAS content standards are required on both the lesson plan and unit forms that candidates 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. Lesson and unit templates and rubrics (see evidence 1.2.2) note that the KAS are required during preliminary plans.

In ED 220, ED 300, ED 310, candidates plan and teach one lesson. In the special education courses, they plan a unit and teach lessons in a P-12 setting. In both the special education courses and the related studies courses, 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.

8. It is not clear where the KAS for science are addressed.

Candidates in the LBD program take a science methods course, ED 343, and must align all instructional plans and units to the science KAS/NGSS.

9. In the Summary Analysis for Program section no summary of the program assessment data is provided. It seems to just be a summary of the assessments, but not a summary of the performance data results. There is no connection between the analysis of the program data and the continuous improvement plan for the program.

Revised Summary Analysis for the LBD program:

According to Assessment 1, Praxis scores on the subject assessment, 5543, there was a 100% pass rate for candidates in this program. Due to low numbers in the program for the last three cycles of data (one candidate each year), generalizations cannot be made other than to indicate that there was a 100% pass rate, with scores ranging between 159 and 172. Although all scores were passing, when they were compared to the national scores, the national range was 164-179 with a national median of 172. Therefore, two of the scores were below the median and one right at the median, indicating that two scores were in stanine 2 and one in stanine 3. Therefore, these comparisons may warrant examining category scores to identify any areas of concern to determine additional steps to increase the scores.

Assessment 2 involved the mean GPA scores for candidates in the program, indicating

that they scored well above the 2.75 to be admitted and retained in the program. This area is a strength of the program and at that time, warranted no action plan.

Assessments 3 (CAP 4 Portfolio), 4 (Form C), 5 (KTS 5 & 7), 6 (CAP 4 Portfolio Unit) and Assessment 7 (Student Teaching Final Grade) were all based on the Kentucky Teacher Standards at the time of program submission and were evaluated using a rubric scale of 1-3. All data from these key program assessments yielded no area of concern except for Form C showing that the lowest scores were for KTS 3 (Management) and 5 (Assessment). However, they were above a 2.5 on a 3.0 scale. Therefore, further steps might involve examining the indicator scores for these two KTS to identify areas of further focus and action.

Assessment 8 dealt with the literacy mandate and final grades in SED 107 and 412. There few candidates (3 total) earned either an A, B+ or C+ which did not warrant further action.

How Data were Used to Improve the Program
Based on the overall analysis of the data from these eight assessments, at least three areas may be further examined with possible action plans. First, examine the category scores of the Praxis exams to identify categories of concern; second, examine the indicators for the lowest KTS to identify any of concern for further action and examine performance on key assessments in the literacy courses in addition to the final grades.

At the time of program submission in the fall of 2017, the EPP was conducting data analyses sessions in May at an annual retreat and in December. During these data analyses sessions, each set of program data for the CAPs were summarized and analyzed to identify strengths and growth areas. Based on the data from these key assessments, the program is being successful in preparing candidates to teach students identified as LBD. Candidates are passing their Praxis, successful in student teaching and their exit portfolio. However, as mentioned above, further examination may reveal further areas for improvement since none appear at the standard level. At the time of program submission, the EPP had an annual Program Improvement Plan that was reviewed monthly to identify steps taken to improve overall areas for improvement.

10. It is not clear where applicable SPA standards (i.e., NCTM, NCSS, ISTE) are addressed within the courses.

The key SPA standards are listed in matrices in all current editions of syllabi for the LBD program. Included in the LBD program, as listed on the curriculum guide/contract, the candidates take 9 hours of education courses, 33 hours of SED courses and 24 hours of related studies that include varied content areas. Below is a list of the various SPA standards and sample courses that align to and address them.

Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS/KAS)
See #8 above for national science standards alignment with ED 343 (KAS/NGSS).

Council for Exceptional Children (CEC):
The SED syllabi include, among others, alignment to and address the CEC; other education syllabi also include alignment to and address the CEC standards.

National Council for Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM):
MTH 201 and MTH 202, ED 341 Math Methodology course address and include intentional alignment to the NCTM; additionally, candidates in this program take SED 410, Teaching Math to Children, which is aligned to the NCTM standards and requires candidates to align their instruction to the NCTM standards.

National Council for Social Studies (NCSS):
ED 331 Social Studies Methodology course includes intentional alignment to the NCSS;

National Council for Teachers of Science (NCTS):
ED 341 Science Methodology includes alignment to the NCTS;

International Literacy Association (ILA)
SED 107 Reading Theory includes alignment to the ILA standards.
SED 412 Developmental Reading in Middle and High School
ED 371 Children's Literature
ENG 364 Middle Grades Literature

The International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE)
ED 310 Instructional Technology addresses the ISTE standards. Please see the current edition of the program syllabi.

11. It is not clear what specific knowledge and skills related to differentiation of instruction, collaboration, assistive technology, and high leverage teaching practices are addressed within the program.

Differentiation of instruction:
Every education and special education course in the LBD focuses to some degree on the knowledge and skills related to differentiation of instruction to meet students' academic, social, and behavioral goals. Candidates learn to scaffold struggling learners and to challenge advanced learners. They learn to identify and address learning needs through the use of an integrated approach to differentiation and to implement instruction using research-based practices including student choice.

In addition, faculty utilize the Kentucky Department of Education resources on differentiation and accommodations in their respective classes. Resources on that site help candidates utilize students' varying 'background knowledge, readiness, language, preferences in learning, interests, and to react responsively.' Candidates learn to differentiate content, process, and product for diverse student needs. They learn to use a variety of differentiation strategies, including tiered activities, small group instruction,

graphic organizers, compact assignments, jigsaw, and learning centers (recommended by Tomlinson).

When the LBD program was originally submitted, the KTS standards were the basis for program alignment to state standards and key assessments/rubrics. Many KTS indicators focused on diverse student needs. Since then, the EPP has identified several KTPS/InTASC indicators that pertain more specifically to diverse student needs as illustrated in the table below, from a sample ED 359 syllabus, which necessitate varied types of differentiation. The last column identifies the course assignments that pertain to the diversity indicator.

KTPS/InTASC Diversity Indicators		Course Assignments
1B	The teacher creates developmentally appropriate instruction that takes into account individual learners' strengths, interests, and needs and that enables each learner to advance and accelerate his/her learning.	1, 2, 4, 5
IG	The teacher understands the role of language and culture in learning and knows how to modify instruction to make language comprehension and instruction relevant, accessible, and challenging.	2, 4, 5
2H	The teacher understands students with exceptional needs, including those associated with disabilities and giftedness, and knows how to use strategies and resources to address these needs.	2, 4, 5
2N	The teacher makes learners feel valued and helps them to learn to value each other.	2, 4, 5
3F	The teacher communicates verbally and nonverbally in ways that demonstrate respect for and responsiveness to the cultural backgrounds and differing perspectives learners bring to the learning environment.	2, 4, 5
4M	The teacher knows how to integrate culturally relevant content to build on learners' background knowledge.	2, 4
6G	The teacher effectively uses multiple and appropriate types of assessment data to identify each student's learning needs and to develop differentiated learning experiences.	2, 3, 4
7B	The teacher plans how to achieve each student's learning goals, choosing appropriate strategies and accommodations, resources, and materials to differentiate instruction for individual and groups of learners.	3
9H	The teacher knows how to use learner data to analyze practice and differentiate instruction accordingly.	2
10Q	The teacher respects families' beliefs, norms, and expectations and seeks to work collaboratively with learners and families in setting and meeting challenging goals.	1-5

With the identification of these diversity indicators, the rubrics used for key assessments at CAP 3 (student teaching approval) and CAP 4 exit portfolios and the scores reflect

the candidates' ability to differentiate instruction (please see evidence 1.1.6). Their lessons, units, and assessments particularly reflect those capabilities.

Collaboration:
At the time of program submission, all of the EPP programs were aligned to the Kentucky Teacher Standards, one of which was KTS 8, Collaboration, which was distributed throughout the preparation program in a variety of ways. In ED 210, students collaborated with P-12 teachers to develop their first lesson to teach. In other courses, candidates developed projects that would demonstrate collaboration. For both the CAP 3 (approval for student teaching) and CAP 4 exit portfolios, candidates had to document their experiences with collaboration. At the CAP 4 level, candidates were expected to collaborate with one of their placement teachers to identify a student whose learning could be enhanced by collaboration and to develop a plan to help that student over a period of time by collaborating with the P-12 teacher and others so identified.

Since program submission, the EPP programs have been aligned to KTPS/InTASC standards which no longer have a separate standard on collaboration but include collaboration with leadership in Standard 10. This expectation of this standard is that candidates learn '…to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession'. During their program, candidates learn the importance of collaboration with all stakeholders for MTSS, RTI and PBIS and especially with teachers and parents when developing and monitoring IEPs. Collaboration is interspersed throughout the other KTPS/InTASC standards as well. For instance, sample KTPS/InTASC indicators state that

1C The teacher collaborates with families, communities, colleagues, and other professionals to promote learner growth and development.

1(k) The teacher values the input and contributions of families, colleagues, and other professionals in understanding and supporting each learner's development.

7(m) The teacher knows when and how to access resources and collaborate with others to support student learning (e.g., special educators, related service providers, language learner specialists, librarians, media specialists, community organizations).

7(o) The teacher values planning as a collegial activity that takes into consideration the input of learners, colleagues, families, and the larger community.

10(n) The teacher knows how to work with other adults and has developed skills in collaborative interaction appropriate for both face-to-face and virtual contexts.

10(q) The teacher respects families' beliefs, norms, and expectations and seeks to work collaboratively with learners and families in setting and meeting challenging goals.

All EPP programs align to and assess the KTPS/InTASC standards now. Rubrics have been developed to assess the key assignments and include the applicable indicators.

The high leverage teaching practices in special education include three practices categorized as collaboration, which focus on 1) collaboration with professionals, 2) the ability for candidates to organize and facilitate meetings with professionals and families and 3) collaboration with families to support student learning and secure needed services. Before this terminology became widespread, the LBD program focused on candidates organizing meetings and collaborating with stakeholders as well as facilitating ARC meetings.

The LBD program syllabi include alignment matrices illustrating how the course objectives and assignment support Standard 10.

Assistive Technology:
Assistive technology is first addressed in ED 310, Instructional Technology. The textbook used for the class addresses assistive technology in the chapter on Integrating Technology in the Special Education Classroom. Students also create an Assistive Technology page on their required Classroom Website. This page requires a minimum of 10 assistive technologies used in a classroom in their declared area. The students present their websites to the entire class and discuss the assistive technologies included. Students also are required to visit a classroom where assistive technology is being used. Their reflection must include a thorough explanation of the assistive technology and its integration.

At the time of program submission, the LBD program was aligned to the Kentucky Teacher Standards which included on focused on technology, KTS 6 which included several indicators that could include assistive technology. 6.3 states that candidates integrate student use of technology into instruction to enhance learning outcomes and meet diverse student needs. For candidates' CAP 3 (approval for student teaching) and CAP 4 exit portfolios, they had to demonstrate they met KTS 6.

All EPP programs align to and assess the KTPS/InTASC standards now. Rubrics have been developed to assess the key assignments and include the applicable indicators. Though there is no longer a separate standard, technology is interspersed throughout the KTPS/ InTASC standards. For instance,

2(f) states that 'The teacher accesses resources, supports, and specialized assistance and services to meet particular learning differences or needs'.

3(m) states that 'The teacher knows how to use technologies and how to guide learners to apply them in appropriate, safe, and effective ways.'

6(i) The teacher continually seeks appropriate ways to employ technology to support assessment practice both to engage learners more fully and to assess and address learner needs.

6(p) The teacher understands how to prepare learners for assessments and how to make accommodations in assessments and testing conditions, especially for learners with disabilities and language learning needs.

7(k) The teacher knows a range of evidence-based instructional strategies, resources, and technological tools and how to use them effectively to plan instruction that meets diverse learning needs.

8(n) The teacher knows how to use a wide variety of resources, including human and technological, to engage students in learning.

Throughout candidates' preparation, they learn to plan and implement lessons and units that are aligned to the KTPS/InTASC standards. At key points in the CAP system (Candidate Assessment Points), candidates are required to select and present documentation they have met the standards in their CAP 3 (Student Teaching approval) and CAP 4 exit portfolios.

Additionally, one of the high leverage practices in special education requires candidates to use assistive and instructional technologies in instruction (#19).

High Leverage Teaching Practices (HLPs)

When the LBD program was submitted in the fall of 2017, the high leverage teaching practices were just becoming well known. The Council for Exceptional Children had organized a team to develop high leverage practices in 2015 and that group submitted them to the CEC board in July of 2016. Some of the documents about high leverage practices were published in 2017 and 2018.

Therefore, at that time, the program submission documents for the LBD program included focused on all four categories of what would become known as the high leverage teaching practices: collaboration, assessment, social emotional behavior needs and instruction (19 HLPs). Then, the program was based on the Kentucky Teacher Standards, which included separate standards for each of these areas, except social emotional behavior. They referenced and included focus on differentiation, collaboration and research based practices and best practice. Key assessments and rubrics at that time focused on the KTS as well.

Current syllabi for the LBD program are aligned to and assessed by the KTPS/InTASC standards. Collectively, the new KTPS/InTASC standards include the best practice and research based practices included in the high leverage teaching practices. These include Multiple tiered system of supports (MTSS) stemming from the 2015 ESSA law which focuses on RTI for academic needs and PBIS for behavior, both of which address diverse needs of students.

Please see samples of the most recent editions of the program syllabi.