

**Campbellsville University**  
**School of Education**  
**Program Rejoinder**  
**4/28/19**

**TEACHER LEADER MASTERS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION (Master's (3124))**

- 1) See applicable concerns identified in the advanced LBD and MSD programs and TL endorsement program.
- 2) The curriculum contract does not identify the resulting LBD P-12 certification, nor all the required admission and exit criteria.

Please see the latest 2018-19 edition of the curriculum contract/guide for this program. The contract has been combined with the CAP forms that list both admission and exit criteria and includes the resulting certification in the heading, if candidates opt to get certification in LBD.

**Advanced LBD**

- 1) The curriculum contract does not identify the resulting certification(s) and rank, and the complete admission and exit criteria for the program.

See #2 above.

- 2) Validity and reliability information was not provided for Assessment #2: Professional Growth Plan.

This Professional Growth Plan assessment has been removed from this program due to duplication of use in the P-12 setting. It is, therefore, no longer a key assessment for this program.

- 3) Data Analysis summary information was not provided for either the Praxis II, PGP, or Disposition data in the Summary Analysis section of the template.

Below is a revised summary of the data summary for the key assessments and the explanation of how the data were/are used for program improvement as identified in the program template. The PGP has since been removed as a key assessment.

The overall quality assurance plan currently in place involves faculty in monthly data analysis sessions that focus on the CAP data. For advanced programs, that process includes CAPs 5-7. Faculty analyze data from all key assessments, including these, and identify strengths and growth areas. In preparation for these monthly data analysis sessions, the data entry specialists prepare data reports from all key assessments listed on the CAP forms for each program. Areas of concern become part of the overall improvement plan for the year and part of the Student Learning Outcomes for SACS annual reports to the Academic Dean. The key assessments

included in this section represent some, not all, of the data analyzed on a monthly basis now. Previously, the faculty analyzed all data from the last three cycles at annual retreats.

The Praxis data for the TL-MASE candidates show an overall 100% pass rate. The passing score is 158 but the means range from 171.71 to 166.43, well above the national means. Currently, the faculty can use the category data to identify areas that might need more focus in the program. They can also compare the means to the national means and stanines to determine the stanine levels compared to the nation.

The consistently high GPAs for this program demonstrate that candidates academically have the ability to perform well on the standards consistently. The MARP demonstrate that candidates' lowest performance was on KTS 1 and KTS 4 which both have to do with the application of content and pedagogical knowledge. As a result, these standards were the focus of program improvement for the following year. Goals, objectives, and activities have been implemented into the EPP SACS Program Improvement Plan and the EPP Selected Improvement Plan 2016-2020 which specifically addressed and sought to improve candidate performance on KTS 1.5 and 4.2.

The disposition data for this program show that the candidates had strong dispositions but that the revisions to the instrument necessitated training for the evaluators. Areas of concern were added to the Selected Improvement Plan. Since this program was originally submitted in the fall of 2017, the School of Education has adopted the Niagara Disposition instrument and has been collecting data on those dispositions identified state-wide. The validity of the instrument has been established by the Niagara instrument developers. Reliability continues to be a focus as evaluators become acclimated to the instrument. The more recent disposition data can identify more specific areas that might be included on an improvement plan.

The overall goal of the new quality assurance plan, still based on the CAP criteria, is to continuously identify areas of concern, via the monthly data analysis sessions, and address them promptly rather than waiting until annual retreats. The respective, monthly data analysis groups report back to the faculty after analysis of data and submit their reports, currently saved in a Google drive so that faculty can have continual access to analyzed data with action plans for each program.

- 4) The program template identifies 6 clinical field hours for ED 670. The spreadsheet (Courses tab) shows 3 hours.

Attached is an edition of the TL-MASE clinical matrix showing that both of the practica require three clinical hours rather than six, so the six hours was entered incorrectly.

Program template submitted as below is correct:

ED 670 Action Research Project Practicum I	3 Write a reflection	Letter of consent informing parents of study and IRB approval. <b>(2 hours)</b>  Begin implementation of an Action Research Project in a school setting. <b>(1 hour)</b>
--	----------------------------	--

The spreadsheet for ED 670 has been corrected:

ED 670	TLMASE, TLMASE/MSD	3124, 387, 2891, 2892,	This course provides a broad overview of the legal and ethical dimensions of professional practice in American public education. The course offers educators the opportunity to develop a working knowledge of the American legal system and professional ethics and develop an understanding of how these interface. The course highlights selected key issues facing the public school system with special attention given to school-based decision making.	3
-----------	-----------------------	---------------------------	---	---

- 5) The program template identifies one of the program assessments as the PGP. The assessments identified on the spreadsheet do not identify the PGP.

This Professional Growth Plan assessment has been removed from the program due to duplication of its use in the P-12 setting.

The instructions on the spreadsheet stated **“Include the key or signature assessments only, does not need to be a list of all the assessments”**. The rationale for not including the PGP was that each candidate submitted a different format from his/her respective school and, therefore, this PGP assessment was subject to substantial variations. That reality led to removing it as an authentic program key assessment. Below are the key assessments selected for this section of the program submission.

Praxis 5344 (*only for those desiring certification in LBD)
GPA
Master's Action Research Project; Behavior Intervention Plan

Master's Action Research Project; Behavior Intervention Plan
Master's Action Research Project; Behavior Intervention Plan
Dispositional Assessment

- 6) The alignment of the specific CEC standards are not demonstrated on the spreadsheet.

Please see the attached CEC alignment spreadsheet for the TL-MASE program. The respective syllabi will be revised over the summer during regular revisions at the indicator level.

- 7) It is not clear how the CEC standards are addressed and aligned to the objectives and/or course tasks for SED 697.

Please see the attached CEC alignment spreadsheet for the TL-MASE program. The respective syllabi will be revised over the summer during regular revisions at the indicator level.

- 8) It is not clear how the ILA and CEC standards are addressed and aligned to the objectives and/or course tasks for SED 699.

Please see the attached CEC alignment spreadsheet for the TL-MASE program. The respective syllabi will be revised over the summer during regular revisions at the indicator level.

The CEC standards are listed separately in the syllabus and the ILA standards are identified in the matrix which shows the objectives met by the various course assignments.

### **MSD Program**

- 1) The template does not identify all the attributes for this program (see Program Identification section of the template).

Please see #1 for the TL-MASE and the most recent edition of the curriculum contract for the TL-MASE.

- 2) The curriculum contracts (Cert only, Rank I Master's, Rank II TL Master's) do not clearly identify all the admission and exit criteria for the program.

Please see the most recent edition of the curriculum guide/contract/CAP form for the TL-MASE in #1 above. It includes both the curriculum contract and the CAP requirements, which are the admission, mid-point and exit requirements.

- 3) The number of hours required for the field/clinical experience in SED 760 and SED 780 are not identified in the program template (pages 7-8).

These courses are not part of the TL-MASE curriculum so this concern does not apply to this program.

- 4) It is not clear how the performance data on the PGP is analyzed and used for program improvement.

The PGP is no longer a key program assessment. See # 2 and #5 above for the preceding program.

- 5) Additional information is needed to describe how the reliability and validity for the IEP rubric has been established and supported. Also, it is not clear how the performance data on this assessment is used for continuous improvement of these programs.

The MSD rejoinder includes this response:

Following an analysis of the effectiveness of our Graduate programs at meeting the Advanced CAEP Standard One expectations, the results revealed areas for improvement that are outlined in the Graduate Improvement Plan. Items within this plan include reviewing all program syllabi, standards alignment, objectives, clinical hour requirements, and assessments, as well as piloting and further revision of updated documents. The reliability and validity for the IEP rubric and the MSD program/certification in general was established within the timeline determined by the plan and Graduate Committee members and is set to begin in the fall of 2019. Instructors within the MSD certification courses will collaborate to review and update the IEP assessment and rubric, ensuring appropriate alignment to objectives and standards. The Graduate Committee members will then complete a validity review using the Lawshe Method. The results will be shared with all committee members and items for removal will be addressed. Following the revisions to the assessment/Rubric, multiple MSD instructors will score the same assessment with the rubric to ensure results are reliable. Furthermore, any future additional instructors added to the course will be trained on use of the rubric.

Following the revision of the assessment rubric, the IEP scoring results will be reviewed by the Graduate committee and Faculty member groups within our data analysis sessions (data for all CAPs throughout the School of Education are placed for analysis on a pre-determined yearly cycle). Generally, an Advanced program committee analyzes the results of assessments within CAP 7 requirements for each program or certification, and findings are shared during monthly faculty meetings.

- 6) It is unclear why in the Summary Analysis section of the template there is a reference to the IECE KTS standards.

The key assessments of the program are noted in the CAP 7 exit requirements and are aligned with the Kentucky Teacher Performance Standards. Mention of the IECE standards in the Summary Analysis section pertain to other activities and assessment embedded within coursework for the MSD certification, such as creating a lesson plan, which may involve candidates incorporating IECE standards as needed. Specifically, for candidates teaching within the early childhood setting, IECE standards may be identified within a lesson plan they create for their MSD coursework. However, these standards are not specifically covered within the objectives and are not applicable to educators teaching students outside of that age group.

- 7) Additional information is needed to describe how the program assessment data were used to improve these programs. The information provided in the response describe a generic process but do not provide a specific example.

Below is a revised summary of the data summary for the key assessments and the explanation of how the data were/are used for program improvement as identified in the program template. The PGP has since been removed as a key assessment.

The overall quality assurance system currently in place involves faculty in monthly data analysis sessions that focus on the CAP data. For advanced programs, that process includes CAPs 5-7. Faculty analyze data from all key assessments, including these, and identify strengths and growth areas. In preparation for these monthly data analysis sessions, the data entry specialists prepare data reports from all key assessments listed on the CAP forms for each program. Areas of concern become part of the overall improvement plan for the year and part of the Student Learning Outcomes for SACS annual reports to the Academic Dean. The key assessments included in this section represent some, not all, of the data analyzed on a monthly basis now. Previously, the faculty analyzed all data from the last three cycles at annual retreats.

The Praxis data for the TL-MASE candidates show an overall 100% pass rate. The passing score is 158 but the means range from 171.71 to 166.43, well above the national means. Currently, the faculty can use the category data to identify areas that might need more focus in the program. They can also compare the means to the national means and stanines to determine the stanine levels compared to the nation.

The consistently high GPAs for this program demonstrate that candidates academically have the ability to perform well on the standards consistently. The MARP demonstrate that candidates' lowest performance was on KTS 1 and KTS 4 which both have to do with the application of content and pedagogical knowledge. As a result, these standards were the focus of program improvement for the following year. Goals, objectives, and activities have been implemented into the EPP SACS Program Improvement Plan and the EPP Selected Improvement Plan 2016-2020 which specifically addressed and sought to improve candidate performance on KTS 1.5 and 4.2.

The disposition data for this program show that the candidates had strong dispositions but that the revisions to the instrument necessitated training for the evaluators. Areas of concern were added to the Selected Improvement Plan. Since this program was originally submitted in the fall of 2017, the School of Education has adopted the Niagara Disposition instrument and has been collecting data on those dispositions identified state-wide. The validity of the instrument has been established by the Niagara instrument developers. Reliability continues to be a focus as evaluators become acclimated to the instrument. The more recent disposition data can identify more specific areas that might be included on an improvement plan.

The overall goal of the new quality assurance plan, still based on the CAP criteria, is to continuously identify areas of concern, via the monthly data analysis sessions, and address them promptly rather than waiting until annual retreats. The respective, monthly data analysis groups report back to the faculty after analysis of data and submit their reports, currently saved in a Google drive so that faculty can have continual access to analyzed data with action plans for each program.

- 9) Clinical educators are not identified for SED 720, 740, 750, 770. Information for Sonya Anglin is incomplete.

These courses are not included in the TL-MASE program and therefore, do not apply.

- 10) The assessments identified on the spreadsheet do not match those identified in the program template.

The only difference for the TL-MASE program was that the PGP was omitted in the spreadsheet but it is no longer a program requirement. Please see #5 in the preceding program response.

- 11) While the ILA standards are indicated on the spreadsheet, there are no courses in the MSD coursework included.

This concern does not apply to the TL-MASE program which has a separate course, SED 699, Reading Theories and Practice required that does address the ILA standards.

- 12) The spreadsheet does not demonstrate alignment between the courses and the KTS except SED 720.

This course is not included in the TL-MASE program and therefore does not apply. The KTS have been replaced by the KTPS and most recently by the Teacher Leader Model Standards for the teacher leader programs. Syllabi will be revised over the summer to reflect the current teacher leader standards.

- 13) The CEC standards are not identified on the spreadsheet demonstrating alignment with the courses in the MSD program.

Please see #6, #7 and #8 in the preceding program responses.

- 14) It is unclear how the CEC standards identified on the table in the syllabus are aligned with the course tasks. Rubrics provided in the syllabus do not demonstrate alignment with the standards. How will their performance data be used to determine candidate progress on the standards?

It is not clear to which syllabus this concern is referring. However, the CEC standards identified in many of the syllabi for this program are matched to tasks that also list the respective objectives in the same table. Rubrics for the tasks will be re-evaluated and refined in the next round of syllabi revisions for the 1920 academic year.

- 14) The syllabi for SED 740, 750, 760, 770 do not clearly demonstrate alignment with the CEC standards. Standards are listed but neither the course objectives or the course requirements demonstrate alignment with the CEC standards.

These courses do not apply to the TL-MASE. However, the courses required for the TL-MASE include alignment to the CEC advanced standards. The next edition of the syllabi will include alignment to the standards at indicator level, however.

### **TL Endorsement Program**

- 1) The certification only option for this certificate is not identified on the curriculum contract.

Please see #2 for the TL-MASE.

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

Please see preceding response for the TL-MASE.

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

Please see preceding response for the TL-MASE.

- 4) The program template identifies 3 hours of required field experience for ED 670 while the spreadsheet identifies 6 hours.

This appears to have been entered incorrectly and now has been corrected on the TL-MASE spreadsheet. Please see previous response.



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

The core classes for the TL-MAE and the TL-MASE have been aligned with the Teacher Leader Model Standards. Please see syllabi for ED 655, ED 665, ED 670, ED 675, ED 690 and ED 656.