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Mindset shifts...

• From continuous assessment to quality assurance plan
• From multiple of varying quality to a few targeted and defensible assessments
• For initial preparation, from program specific to EPP-wide assessments
Quality Assurance

CAEP

- Continuous Assessment

Capture Everything

- Limited number of data points
- Must have Validity/Reliability
- Across all programs (IP)

Meet Proficiency

- All students can be moved to acceptable levels
- Must meet proficiency to move on

Candidates look the same

- No variability in the data

Fewer “Key” Assessments

- Limited number of data points
- Must have Validity/Reliability
- Across all programs (IP)

Aspirational

- Students should be scored “where they are”
- May be below proficiency

Predictability

- Increases variability in the data

NCATE

- Large amounts of data
- Collect it, we might need it

Meet Proficiency

- All students can be moved to acceptable levels
- Must meet proficiency to move on

Candidates look the same

- No variability in the data

NCATE

- Large amounts of data
- Collect it, we might need it

Meet Proficiency

- All students can be moved to acceptable levels
- Must meet proficiency to move on

Candidates look the same

- No variability in the data

NCATE

- Large amounts of data
- Collect it, we might need it

Meet Proficiency

- All students can be moved to acceptable levels
- Must meet proficiency to move on

Candidates look the same

- No variability in the data
So what fits under the Quality Assurance System Plan (QASP)?
Standard 5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity

Quality and Strategic Evaluation
5.1 The provider’s quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP standards.

5.2 The provider’s quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

Continuous Improvement
5.3 REQUIRED COMPONENT The provider 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.

5.4 REQUIRED COMPONENT 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.

5.5 The provider 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STANDARD ALIGNMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Content Assessment</td>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td>(1)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Other Content Assessment</td>
<td>Major GPA</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Assessment of Professional Capabilities</td>
<td>Praxis PLT</td>
<td>(2-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Clinical Experiences Measure of Teaching Proficiency</td>
<td>Student Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Measure of Assessment Proficiencies</td>
<td>A: Learning Goals &amp; Pre/Post Assessment</td>
<td>1-3,5,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: Analysis of Student Learning</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ability to Diagnose and Prescribe for Personalized</td>
<td>Design for Instruction</td>
<td>1,2,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Application of Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Skills</td>
<td>Teacher Work Sample</td>
<td>1-3,5,7,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Assessment of Literacy Outcomes</td>
<td>Operational Stance Concerning Content-Area and Discipline-</td>
<td>1,2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific Literacies</td>
<td>1,4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Dispositions</td>
<td>Dispositions Form</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 KTS Exit Survey</td>
<td>KTS Exit Survey</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The numbers in parentheses correspond to the standard alignment codes.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ELED</th>
<th>MGE</th>
<th>SECED</th>
<th>P-12</th>
<th>5-12</th>
<th>SPED</th>
<th>IECE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praxis PLT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>EDU 490</td>
<td>MGE 490</td>
<td>MGE 490</td>
<td>SEC 490</td>
<td>SEC 490</td>
<td>EDU 490</td>
<td>ELED 490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Learning Goals &amp; Pre/Post Assessment</td>
<td>ELED 465</td>
<td>MGE 475</td>
<td>MGE 481</td>
<td>SMED 320</td>
<td>SEC 475</td>
<td>SMED 320</td>
<td>SEC 481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Analysis of Student Learning</td>
<td>ELED 405</td>
<td>MGE 475</td>
<td>MGE 481</td>
<td>SMED 320</td>
<td>SEC 475</td>
<td>SMED 320</td>
<td>SEC 481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design for Instruction</td>
<td>EDU 489</td>
<td>EDU 489</td>
<td>SMED 489</td>
<td>EDU 489</td>
<td>SMED 489</td>
<td>EDU 489</td>
<td>EDU 489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Work Sample</td>
<td>EDU 489</td>
<td>EDU 489</td>
<td>SMED 489</td>
<td>EDU 489</td>
<td>SMED 489</td>
<td>EDU 489</td>
<td>EDU 489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content-Area and Discipline-Specific Literacies</td>
<td>LTCY 420</td>
<td>LTCY 421</td>
<td>LTCY 421</td>
<td>LTCY 421</td>
<td>LTCY 421</td>
<td>LTCY 421</td>
<td>LTCY 421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions Form*</td>
<td>ELED 345</td>
<td>MGE 385</td>
<td>MGE 475</td>
<td>SMED 102</td>
<td>SEC 350</td>
<td>SMED 320</td>
<td>SEC 475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block I</td>
<td>EDU 490</td>
<td>MGE 481</td>
<td>MGE 490</td>
<td>EDU 490</td>
<td>SEC 475</td>
<td>EDU 490</td>
<td>SEC 490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block II</td>
<td>EDU 490</td>
<td>MGE 481</td>
<td>MGE 490</td>
<td>EDU 490</td>
<td>SEC 475</td>
<td>EDU 490</td>
<td>SEC 490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*At the Admissions stage, the WKU EPP collects Dispositions observed early in programs (Level 1) as part of the Faculty Recommendation process. Level 1 dispositions are Values Learning (attendance, class participation, and class preparation) and Values Personal Integrity (emotional control and ethical behavior). The courses listed above are where both Level 1 and Level 2 Dispositions are collected, typically, as students engage in field experiences. Level 2 dispositions are Values Diversity, Values Collaboration, and Values Professionalism (respect for school rules, policies, and norms; commitment to self-reflection and growth; professional development and involvement; and professional responsibility).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1: Content &amp; Indicator</th>
<th>Standard 2: Candidate Quality</th>
<th>Standard 3: Provider Quality</th>
<th>Diversity</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COUNT**: 7 14 12 6 11 8 2 3 1 1 1 3 4 5 2 1 1 5 2 3 7 6 5 1 13 12 5
Avoiding getting lost in the assessment validity and reliability “weeds”
• Develop a systematic (and system-wide) approach to V/R
• Avoid assessment level processes to determine V/R
• Document the process as part of the QAS
• Look for assessments with previous V/R
• Focus on “high stakes” assessments first
• Determine the process “status” of each assessment
Helping Programs/Faculty with using data
WKU EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROVIDER (EPP) CAEP ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT (APR)

Your Program Name - Initial Preparation (IP)
Academic Year (AY) 2016-17

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).

A. 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity*</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A/PI</th>
<th>B/AA</th>
<th>HISP</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>UNKN</th>
<th>WH</th>
<th>DIV%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014-15</td>
<td>Your Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>333</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2015-16</td>
<td>EPP-Wide</td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2016-17</td>
<td>Your Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*B/A PI – Asian/Pacific Islander; B/AA – Black/African-American; HISP – Hispanic; OTHER – Other; UNKN – Unknown; WH – White; DIV% – Diversity Percentage calculated as (N – (WH + UNKN))/N.

B. Program Reflection

Explain how your program is doing related to CAEP 3.1b.

CAEP 3.2 (REQUIRED): The EPP (a) sets and monitors admission 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.
Appendix B: WKU EPP Annual Reporting Process

1. Scorer Training August 2017
   - Key Assessment Data Collection by Programs as Described in PRDs August-December 2017
   - Data entered into E-PASS by December 2017
   - EPP-wide data generated December 2017

   - Changes Needed
     - Propose and Document Changes
     - Changes to Key Assessment

   - Yes: Follow Assessment Development Process
     - Change to Key Assessment
   - No: EPP-Wide Report Developed and Distributed January 2018

   - Program Level Data Provided to Program Reps January, 2018
     - Program Level Reports (APR) Completed by February, 2018
     - APR and data shared with program faculty by Program Reps March 2018
Building on your best assessments
TWS DEVELOPMENT

• Originally developed by the Renaissance Partnership, as part of a six-year Title II Improving Teacher Quality Program grant, to assess growth of teacher candidates, as well as their ability to affect student learning.

• During TWS development, university education and education-related content faculty and P-12 partners (teachers and administrators) from 11 higher education institutions worked together to create the teaching standards, prompts, and rubrics. Semi-annual meetings occurred over six years to develop, pilot, score, and continually refine the TWS.
TWS VALIDITY

• As described in Denner, Norman, Salzman, Pankratz, and Evans (2004), TWS validity was established following a panel of expert raters process (Crocker, 1997) for judging content representativeness on four criteria: (1) frequency of TWS teaching behaviors to actual teaching, (2) criticality (importance) of TWS tasks to actual teaching, (3) authenticity (realism) of TWS tasks to actual teaching, and (4) representativeness of TWS tasks to target standards.

• Other studies have measured the concurrent and predictive relationships between TWS performance and other measures of quality teaching. Furthermore, Denner, Norman, and Linn (2008) delineate research at two institutions using the TWS (WKU and Idaho State University) that provides evidence that the TWS is adequately free from bias (consequential validity and disparate impact analysis).
TWS RELIABILITY

• Since as early as 2005 special attention has been given to assuring and reporting that the TWS is scored fairly, accurately, and consistently (see Denner et al., 2008; Denner et al., 2004; Kirchner, Evans, & Norman, 2010; Norman, Evans, & Pankratz, 2011; Stobaugh, Tassell, & Norman, 2010).

• In fall 2009, a unit-wide TWS taskforce was formed to revisit all aspects of the Teacher Work Sample to address various faculty concerns in order to improve this instrument. The current TWS rendition reflects changes last made to the instrument in 2011.
Key Assessment 5A: Learning Goals and Pre/Post Assessment
Key Assessment 5B: Analysis of Student Learning

Student Instructions for Learning Goals and Pre/Post Assessment leading to the Teacher Work Sample:

Administration Point: The Key Assessment 5 Committee revisits assessments 5A and 5B prior to the content methods course(s) within the program unit prior to student teaching. Assessments 5A and 5B are two separate assessments that may be split into two courses or may be used together within the same semester, along with Key Assessment 6: Design for Instruction.

Purpose: The pieces of the WKU Teacher Work Sample (TWS) included in this Assessment Knowledge package — Learning Goals & Pre/Post Assessment and Analysis of Student Learning — are performance-based assessment tools for teacher candidates to demonstrate their ability to plan, administer a standards-based instructional assessment sequence, and analyze student learning. WKU teacher candidates are required to show proficiency in designing learning goals with a corresponding pre/post-assessment, and analyze pre/post and formative assessment data. Standards specifically related to this assessment (and scoring rubric) are listed below.

This key assessment enhances teacher candidates’ ability to accomplish the following:
- Learn to set appropriate learning outcomes for a unit.
- Create an assessment that is directly connected to learning goals in order to measure student learning.

Through this process, teacher candidates can further develop their skills to prepare themselves for a successful first year of teaching. While beginning candidates may not replicate all portions of this key assessment when designing every unit during their first year of teaching, the TWS from which this assessment was derived is a research-based model that, if followed, assists teachers in developing sound instructional experiences.

Use: The key components in the “Assessment Knowledge” package are used to measure candidates’ formative knowledge, specifically on learning goals development, assessment design, and analysis of data. At this and other key assessments are leading up to student teaching, candidates will apply this knowledge to their student-teaching experience. The key components will be applied again through the TWS and will determine whether candidates are ready to exit the WKU educator preparation program and be recommended for certification. For key assessments prior to student teaching, candidates receiving a holistic score of “1” will be required to repeat the key assessment until successful (scoring at least “2”); or will be advised out of the program; Candidates scoring “2” will be allowed to continue into the next level of the program.

---

Key Assessment 6: Design for Instruction

Note: Teacher Candidates are to complete Key Assessment 6 prior to the student teaching semester.

Kentucky Teacher Standards Addressed:
1.1 Communicates concepts, processes and knowledge
1.2 Connects content to life experiences of students
1.3 Demonstrates instructional strategies that are appropriate for content and contribute to student learning
1.4 States learning objectives that reflect key concepts of the discipline and are aligned with local or state standards.
1.2 Plans and designs instruction based on contextual (i.e., student, community, and/or cultural) and pre-assessment data.
2.4 Aligns instructional strategies and activities with learning objectives for all students.
2.5 Plan instructional strategies and activities that facilitate multiple levels of learning.
2.6 Describe, analyze and evaluate student performance data.
6.1 Use available technology to design and plan instruction.

Purpose: The purpose of this assignment is to learn to design instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.

Task:
- Results of pre-assessment
  - After administering the pre-assessment, analyze student performance relative to the learning goals. Depict the results of the pre-assessment in a format that shows patterns of student performance relative to each Learning Goal. Describe the patterns that will guide instruction or modification of the learning goals.
  - How many students mastered each learning goal?
  - What types of questions/tasks were missed the most?
  - What is the content/skill within the incorrect responses?
  - For each of the above discussion, note implications for instruction for the Learning Goal.

*As per determined data set may be used in place of pre-assessment results should the teacher candidate have limited or no access to authentic student data.
Our rationale for building on our best

• Portions of culminating assessment are now “pre-assessments” in earlier courses
• Provides exposure to required exit skills earlier in each program
• Leverages previous V/R work and evidence
• Combines future V/R efforts
• Leverages inherent predictive relationships between earlier “pre-assessments” and culminating assessment
• Buys time!
So YOU “get it”...
now getting all other EPP members on board
Shake the foundation

- Outside consultant
- Avoid top-down directives (as much as possible)
- Find allies among faculty peers to share message and lead work
- Leverage state requirements (e.g., Kentucky Program Review Process)
- Use CAEP rubrics and tools
- Encourage others to seek training as CAEP evaluators
QUESTIONS?
TWS V/R References


