**WKU EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROVIDER (EPP) CAEP ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT (APR)**

**Your Program Name – Initial Preparation (IP)**

**Academic Year (AY) 2016-17**

**Report Date**

Completed each fall semester, this APR reflects on program level educator preparation candidate data from the previous academic year, as well as, when appropriate, two additional years prior in order to review trends in candidate demographics and performance. The APR uses the current CAEP Standard 3 – Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity Indicator as an outline. It also includes elements of CAEP Standard 1 – Content and Pedagogical Knowledge; Standard 5 – EPP Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity; and CAEP Cross-Cutting Theme – Diversity.

 **CAEP 3.1**: The EPP (a) presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from diverse backgrounds and populations; and (b) demonstrates efforts to address community needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields (STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities).

1. **Data**

Table 3.1 provides a comparison of the race/ethnicity (related to CAEP Cross-Cutting Theme – Diversity) of our program versus EPP-wide candidates approved by the Professional Education Council (PEC) for admission into initial educator preparation programs during this academic year. Before the Office of Teacher Services submits their names for review and approval by the PEC, candidates must meet minimum requirements established by the state or WKU as an Educator Preparation Provider (EPP).

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3.1 EPP Admitted Candidate Diversity** |
| **Academic Year** | **Program** | **Race/Ethnicity\*** |
| **N** | **A/PI** | **B/AA** | **HISP** | **OTHER** | **UNKN** | **WH** | **DIV%** |
| **AY 2014-15** | **Your Program** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **EPP-Wide** | **333** | 3 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 317 | **4.5%** |
| **AY 2015-16** | **Your Program** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **EPP-Wide** | **329** | 3 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 317 | **4.6%** |
| **AY 2016-17** | **Your Program** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **EPP-Wide** | **248** | **1** |  | **2** |  | **5** | 240 | **1.2%** |

\*A/PI – Asian/Pacific Islander; B/AA – Black/African-American; HISP – Hispanic; OTHER – Other;

UNK – Unknown; WH – White; DIV% - Diversity Percentage calculated as (N – (WH + UNKN))/N.

1. **Program Reflection**

Respond to how your program is doing related to CAEP 3.1a.

**CAEP 3.2** (REQUIRED): The EPP (a) sets and monitors admissions requirements based on the state’s minimum criteria; and (b) ensures each cohort GPA meets or exceeds the CAEP minimum of 3.0, with an average performance on ACT in the top 50 percent from 2016-2017.

1. **Data**

Table 3.2 provides the grade point average (GPA) and ACT scores of our program candidates approved by the Professional Education Council (PEC) for admission into initial educator preparation programs during this academic year. Before the Office of Teacher Services submits their names for review and approval by the PEC, candidates must meet minimum requirements established by the state or WKU as an Educator Preparation Provider (EPP).

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3.2 Candidate Average Admission GPA and ACT Scores** |
| **Major** | **AY 2014-15** | **AY 2015-16** | **AY 2016-17** |
| N | GPA | ACT | N | GPA | ACT | N | GPA | ACT |
| **Your Program** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **EPP-Wide** | **333** | **3.59** | **23** | **329** | **3.38** | **23** | **248** | **3.47** | **23** |

1. **Program Reflection**

Respond to how your program is doing related to CAEP 3.1a.

**CAEP 3.3**: The EPP (a) establishes and monitor non-academic dispositions and attributes that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program; and (b) provides criteria, measures, and evidence of reliability and validity, and data that show how academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance.

1. **Data**

Table 3.3 reports how our program candidates performed on dispositions as they entered and progressed through their program and during their student teaching experience. Students are considered “proficient” who average at 3 or higher on each disposition category.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3.3 Candidate Averages on EPP-Wide Dispositions** |
|  |  | **WKU Professional Education Dispositions** |
| **Period** | **N** | **Values Learning** | **Values****Personal Integrity** | **Values Diversity** | **Values Collaboration** | **Values Professionalism** |
| **Prior to Student Teaching** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **During Student Teaching** |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Program Reflection**

Respond to how your program is doing related to CAEP 3.3a.

**CAEP 3.4**: The EPP (a) creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates’ advancement from admissions through completion; (b) monitors their ability to teach to college- and career-ready (CCR) standards; and (c) presents multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates’ developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology.

As described in the current WKU EPP Quality Assessment Plan, the WKU EPP collects data related to ten Key Assessments (KA) across all programs. Table 3.4a delineates the assessment area, Key Assessment name, and alignment to Kentucky Teacher (KTS) and InTASC standards.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3.4a Key Assessments – Initial Preparation** |
| **KEY ASSESSMENTS** |
| **AREA** | **NAME** | **STANDARD ALIGNMENT** |
| **KTS** | **InTASC** |
| 1 | Content Assessment | Praxis II | (1)\* | (4,5) |
| 2 | Other Content Assessment  | Major GPA | (1) | (4) |
| 3 | Assessment of Professional Capabilities | Praxis PLT | (2-10) | (1-3,6-10) |
| 4 | Clinical Experiences Measure of Teaching Proficiency | Student Teacher Evaluation | 1-10 | 1-10 |
| 5 | Measure of Assessment Proficiencies | A: Learning Goals & Pre/Post AssessmentB: Analysis of Student Learning | 1-3,5-7 | 1-10 |
| 6 | Ability to Diagnose and Prescribe for Personalized Student Learning | Design for Instruction | 1,2,5,6 | 1,4-10 |
| 7 | Application of Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Skills | Teacher Work Sample | 1-3,5-7,9 | 1-10 |
| 8 | Assessment of Literacy Outcomes | Operational Stance Concerning Content-Area and Discipline-Specific Literacies | 1,2,5 | 1,4-7 |
| 9 | Dispositions | Dispositions Form | NA | NA |
| 10 | KTS Exit Survey | KTS Exit Survey | 1-10 | 1-10 |

It should be noted that the elements of CAEP Standard 1 – Content and Pedagogical Knowledge fall within CAEP Standard 3; 3.4, in particular. Table 3.4b shows the alignment between the two CAEP standards, EPP key assessments, and data collection points. Data reported following the table reflect the data collection “flow” as candidates progress through the program.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3.4b CAEP Standards 1 and 3 Alignment and Data Collection Points** |
| **S1 Elements** | **S3 Alignment** | **KA** | **Collection Point** |
| **Admission** | **Prior to ST**  | **ST** | **Exit** |
| 1.1: Understanding InTASC Standards | 3.4 | All | X | X | X | X |
| 1.2: Teaching Process, Student Progress, Professional Practice | 3.4 | 5,6 |  | X |  |  |
| 3.3 | 9 | X | X | X |  |
| 3.4 | 4,7,10 |  |  | X |  |
| 3.5 | 3 |  |  |  | X |
| 1.3: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge | 3.5 | 2 |  | X |  | X |
| 3.4 | 5,6 |  | X |  |  |
| 3.4 | 4,7,10 |  |  | X |  |
| 3.5 | 1,3 |  |  |  | X |
| 1.4: Preparing College and Career P-12 Students | 3.4 | 4,7,10 |  |  | X |  |
| 1.5 Technology Standards | 3.4 | 5,6 |  | X |  |  |
| 3.4 | 4,7,10 |  |  | X |  |

1. **Data**
	1. Prior to Student Teaching – Key Assessments 5 (A: Learning Goals & Pre/Post Assessment; B: Analysis of Student Learning), 6 (Design for Instruction), and 8 (Assessment of Literacy Outcomes)

Tables 3.4c-e report the percentage of program candidates scoring at each rubric level: 1 – Beginning, 2 – Developing, 3 – Proficient, and 4 – Exemplary for Key Assessments that take place prior to Student Teaching.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3.4c KA 5A: Learning Goals and Pre/Post Assessment Results (Candidate N = #)** |
| **KTS** | **Criteria** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **AVG SCORE** |
| **2.1** | **LGA 1:** List 2 to 3 learning goals |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3.1** | **LGA 2:** Levels of learning goals |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2.1** | **LGA 3:** Alignment of Learning Goals with standards  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **1.2, 2.2** | **LGA 4:** Appropriateness of Learning Goals |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3.1** | **LGA 5:** Mastery levels for each Learning Goal |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5.1, 5.3** | **LGA 6:** Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Learning Goals |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2.2** | **LGA 7:** Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Adaptations |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5.1, 5.3** | **LGA 8:** Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Modes of Assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5.1** | **LGA 9:** Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Scoring Criteria |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3.4d KA 5B: Analysis of Student Learning Results (Candidate N = #)** |
| **KTS** | **Criteria** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **AVG SCORE** |
| **6.4** | **ASL 1:** Visual Representation of Student Performance |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5.4, 7.1** | **ASL 2:** Analysis of Student Performance |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2.4,7.2** | **ASL 3:** Instructional Implications from Data |  |  |  |  |  |
| **1.5** | **ASL 4:** Analysis of an Individual Student |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3.4e KA 6: Design for Instruction Results (Candidate N = #)** |
| **KTS** | **Criteria** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **AVG SCORE** |
| **1.1-3, 2.1, 2.5** | **DFI 2:** Unit Overview |  |  |  |  |  |
| **6.1** | **DFI 3:** Integration of Technology |  |  |  |  |  |
| **1.1-3, 2.4, 2.5** | **DFI 4:** Instructional Strategies |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2.3, 5.4** | **DFI 5:** Formative Assessments |  |  |  |  |  |

* 1. During Student Teaching – Key Assessment 7 (Teacher Work Sample), 4 (Student Teaching Evaluation), and 10 (KTS Exit Survey)

Table 3.4f reports the percentage of program candidates scoring at each rubric level: 1 – Beginning, 2 – Developing, 3 – Proficient, and 4 – Exemplary for KA 7 – Teacher Work Sample.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3.4f KA 7: Teacher Work Sample Results (Candidate N = #)** |
| **KTS** | **Criteria** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **AVG SCORE** |
| **2.2, 3.3** | **CF 1:** School Information |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2.2, 3.3** | **CF 2:** Knowledge of Classroom Information |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2.2, 3.3** | **CF 3:** Knowledge of Student Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2.1** | **LGA 1:** List 2 to 3 Learning Goals |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3.1** | **LGA 2:** Levels of Learning Goals |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2.1** | **LGA 3:** Alignment of Learning Goals with standards  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **1.2, 2.2** | **LGA 4:** Appropriateness of Learning Goals |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3.1** | **LGA 5:** Mastery Levels for Each Learning Goal |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5.1, 5.3** | **LGA 6:** Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Learning Goals |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2.2** | **LGA 7:** Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Adaptations |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5.1, 5.3** | **LGA 8:** Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Modes of Assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5.1** | **LGA 9:** Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Scoring Criteria |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2.2, 5.4** | **DFI 1:** Results of Pre-Assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| **1.1-3, 2.1, 2.5** | **DFI 2:** Unit Overview |  |  |  |  |  |
| **6.1** | **DFI 3:** Integration of Technology |  |  |  |  |  |
| **1.1-3, 2.4, 2.5** | **DFI 4:** Instructional Strategies |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2.3, 5.4** | **DFI 5:** Formative Assessments |  |  |  |  |  |
| **6.4** | **ASL 1:** Visual Representation of Student Performance |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5.4, 7.1** | **ASL 2:** Analysis of Student Performance |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2.4,7.2** | **ASL 3:** Instructional Implications from Data |  |  |  |  |  |
| **1.5** | **ASL 4:** Analysis of an Individual Student |  |  |  |  |  |
| **9.1** | **ROT 1:** Self-assessment of KTS |  |  |  |  |  |
| **7.2-3, 9.1** | **ROT 2:** Identify Teaching Strengths |  |  |  |  |  |
| **7.2-3. 9.1-2** | **ROT 3:** Identify Areas of Professional Development |  |  |  |  |  |

Additionally, candidates are assessed during their student teaching experience using KA 4 – Student Teaching Evaluation. Table 3.4g reports averages of student teachers on each standard. For program evaluation purposes, candidates are considered successful who average at least 2.5 on a three point scale (1 – Not Met, 2 – Partially Met, and 3 – Met) on indicators aligned to each KTS.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3.4g Average Student Teaching Evaluation by KTS (Candidate N = #)** |
| **Program** | **Kentucky Teacher Standards** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |
| Your Program |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Unit-Wide** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Finally, candidates complete KA 10 – KTS Exit Survey where they indicate how well the WKU EPP has prepared them to meet all KTS and indicators on the following 4-point scale: 1 – Poor, 2 – Fair, 3 – Good, and 4 – Excellent. Table 3.4h reports student teacher average preparation ratings on each standard.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3.4h Average Exit Survey Preparation Ratings by KTS (Candidate N = #)** |
| **Program** | **Kentucky Teacher Standards** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |
| Your Program |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Unit-Wide** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Program Reflection**

Respond to how your program is doing related to CAEP 3.4.

**CAEP 3.5**: The EPP documents before certification that the candidate (a) has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and (b) can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development.

1. **Data**

Regarding EPP documentation prior to certification of candidates’ content knowledge, KA 2 – Major GAP provides evidence of candidate proficiency. Tables 3.5a-b report three-year Major GPA for program candidates as well three years’ comparison of education candidate versus non-education student overall GPA performance on KA 2 – Major GPA as a measure of content knowledge.

(DELETE THE ROWS THAT DO NOT APPLY TO YOUR PROGRAM)

**Table 3.5a Major GPAs of Education Candidates Prior to Student Teaching**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Major** | **AY 2014-15** | **AY 2015-16** | **AY 2016-17** |
|  | N | GPA | N | GPA | N | GPA |
| ***ELED*** | **124** | **3.63** | **155** | **3.63** | **133** | **3.59** |
| ***MGE*** | **53** | **3.35** | **52** | **3.27** | **48** | **3.44** |
| ***SECED*** | **47** | **3.31** | **40** | **3.42** | **31** | **3.30** |
| BIO |  |  | 4 | 2.98 | 3 | 3.21 |
| CHEM | 2 | 3.75 | 1 | 2.77 | 2 | 3.42 |
| ENG | 16 | 3.33 | 17 | 3.60 | 11 | 3.44 |
| MATH | 7 | 3.19 | 5 | 3.45 | 3 | 3.35 |
| PHYS | 1 | 3.20 |  |  |  |  |
| SS | 20 | 3.32 | 13 | 3.34 | 12 | 3.15 |
| ***P-12*** | **39** | **3.56** | **45** | **3.51** | **40** | **3.48** |
| ART | 2 | 3.56 | 5 | 3.57 | 7 | 3.30 |
| FREN |  |  | 1 | 3.92 | 1 | 2.87 |
| MUS | 22 | 3.57 | 22 | 3.56 | 19 | 3.55 |
| PE | 10 | 3.55 | 13 | 3.41 | 9 | 3.49 |
| SPAN | 5 | 3.50 | 4 | 3.54 | 4 | 3.58 |
| ***5-12*** | **11** | **3.51** | **11** | **3.66** | **5** | **3.35** |
| AGR | 4 | 3.35 | 5 | 3.62 | 2 | 3.17 |
| BME | 3 | 3.48 | 3 | 3.57 | 1 | 3.32 |
| FCS | 4 | 3.69 | 3 | 3.79 | 2 | 3.53 |
| ***SPED*** | **19** | **3.67** | **12** | **3.68** | **11** | **3.58** |
| ***IECE*** | **10** | **3.52** | **10** | **3.48** | **5** | **3.26** |
| **EPP-Wide** | **303** | **3.52** | **325** | **3.53** | **275** | **3.50** |

**Table 3.5b Comparison of Overall GPAs of Education Candidates and Non-Education Students**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Major** | **AY 2014-15** | **AY 2015-16** | **AY 2016-17** |
| **ED** | **Non-ED** | **ED** | **Non-ED** | **ED** | **None-ED** |
| N | GPA | N | GPA | N | GPA | N | GPA | N | GPA | N | GPA |
| ***ELED*** | **124** | **3.45** | **NA** | **NA** | **155** | **3.47** | **NA** | **NA** | **133** | **3.59** | **NA** | **NA** |
| ***MGE*** | **53** | **3.32** | **NA** | **NA** | **52** | **3.28** | **NA** | **NA** | **48** | **3.44** | **NA** | **NA** |
| ***SECED*** | **47** | **3.42** |  |  | **40** | **3.47** |  |  | **31** | **3.30** |  |  |
| BIO |  |  |  |  | 4 | 3.20 |  |  | 3 | 3.21 |  |  |
| CHEM | 2 | 3.68 |  |  | 1 | 3.28 |  |  | 2 | 3.42 |  |  |
| ENG | 16 | 3.07 |  |  | 17 | 3.58 |  |  | 11 | 3.44 |  |  |
| MATH | 7 | 3.39 |  |  | 5 | 3.66 |  |  | 3 | 3.35 |  |  |
| PHYS | 1 | 3.47 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SS | 20 | 3.72 |  |  | 13 | 3.36 |  |  | 12 | 3.15 |  |  |
| ***P-12*** | **39** | **3.40** |  |  | **45** | **3.35** |  |  | **40** | **3.48** |  |  |
| ART | 2 | 3.33 |  |  | 5 | 3.31 |  |  | 7 | 3.30 |  |  |
| FREN |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3.92 |  |  | 1 | 2.87 |  |  |
| MUS | 22 | 3.47 |  |  | 22 | 3.56 |  |  | 19 | 3.55 |  |  |
| PE | 10 | 3.32 |  |  | 13 | 3.41 |  |  | 9 | 3.49 |  |  |
| SPAN | 5 | 3.50 |  |  | 4 | 3.54 |  |  | 4 | 3.58 |  |  |
| ***5-12*** | **11** | **3.40** |  |  | **11** | **3.66** |  |  | **5** | **3.35** |  |  |
| AGR | 4 | 3.25 |  |  | 5 | 3.62 |  |  | 2 | 3.17 |  |  |
| BME | 3 | 3.34 | NA | NA | 3 | 3.57 | NA | NA | 1 | 3.32 |  |  |
| FCS | 4 | 3.61 |  |  | 3 | 3.79 |  |  | 2 | 3.53 |  |  |
| ***SPED*** | **19** | **3.43** | **NA** | **NA** | **12** | **3.68** | **NA** | **NA** | **11** | **3.58** | **NA** | **NA** |
| ***IECE*** | **10** | **3.34** | **NA** | **NA** | **10** | **3.48** | **NA** | **NA** | **5** | **3.26** | **NA** | **NA** |
| **EPP-Wide** | **303** | **3.41** |  |  | **325** | **3.53** |  |  | **275** | **3.50** |  |  |

Table 3.5c delineates the Educational Testing Services reports of the candidate pass rates on the Praxis II content and Principles of Learning and Teaching exams for the three most recent years with complete data).

| **Table 3.5c Pass Rates on Praxis II and PLT Tests** |
| --- |
| ***Type of Assessment*** | ***InstitutionalPass Rate******(2013-14)*** | ***InstitutionalPass Rate******(2014-15)*** | ***InstitutionalPass Rate******(2015-16)*** | ***N Taking Assessment******(2015-16)*** |
| **Your Program’s Praxis II Test (1)** |  |  |  |  |
| **Your Program’s Praxis II Test (2)** |  |  |  |  |
| **PLT: Grades K-6** | 97% | 97% | 98% | 169 |
| **PLT: Grades 5-9** | 96% | 96% | 91% | 58 |
| **PLT: Grades 7-12** | 100% | 100% | 100% | 63 |

1. **Program Reflection**

Respond to how your program is doing related to CAEP 3.5.

**CAEP 5.3** (REQUIRED): The EPP regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

1. **Overall Data Trends**

Describe overall three-year patterns in candidate performance data worth noting and what they suggest about your program and/or candidates. (**Note.** CAEP expects program assessment to be “aspirational;” thus, if all candidates are performing well on an assessment, these assessments should be modified to create more candidate variability in performance.)

1. **Program Reflection**

Describe program, curricular, or assessment/data collection adjustments as they relate to CAEP 5.3.

**CAEP 5.4** (REQUIRED): Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.

1. **Overall Data Trends**

Describe three-year patterns in completer impact data worth noting and what they suggest about your program and/or candidates. (**Note.** CAEP expects program assessment to be “aspirational;” thus, if all candidates are performing well on an assessment, these assessments should be modified to create more candidate variability in performance.)

1. **Program Reflection**

Describe program, curricular, or assessment/data collection adjustments as they relate to CAEP 5.4.

**CAEP 5.5**: The EPP assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.

Describe efforts to disseminate the results of this report in view of CAEP 5.5.