

2020 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10456	AACTE SID:	5165
Institution:	Northern Kentucky University		
Unit:	College of Education and Human Services		

Section 1. EPP Profile

After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate.

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1.2 [For EPPs seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation]. Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial-Licensure Level and/or Advanced-Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).

<https://www.nku.edu/academics/coe/about/collegeaccreditation.html>

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2018-2019 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)²

Total number of program completers 278

¹ For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

² For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2018-2019 academic year?

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP _____
- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP. _____
- 3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited _____
- 3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited _____
- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements _____

Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4 A.5.4)	
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3 A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4 A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

4.1 Provide a link or links that demonstrate data relevant to each of the Annual Reporting Measures are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's website.

1

Link: <https://www.nku.edu/academics/coe/about/collegeaccreditation/caep.html>

Description of data accessible via link: This is the 2019 CAEP Accreditation website that displays CAEP reports and evidence files.

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?

Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?

Are benchmarks available for comparison?

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

Current data indicate the following about the EPP: 1. program completers are successful teachers who are positively impacting P-12 student learning and development through their first 3 years of teaching; 2. program completers are meeting the Kentucky teacher performance standards; 3. employers are satisfied with the quality of EPP program completers; 4. program completers are satisfied with the quality of EPP program; 5. close to a 100% graduation rate once candidates have been admitted to an education program; 6. a large percentage of program completers apply for teacher certification; 7. the student loan default rate for education candidates is lower than the institution student loan default rate.

Benchmarks are available for comparison and are stated in various evidence documents on the CAEP Accreditation website listed above.

A wide variety of appropriate stakeholders including candidates, alumni, employers, practitioners, and school and community partners are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence. For example, at the program level of the continuous improvement cycle, program advisory committees, comprised of P-12 clinical educators, administrators, program completers, and current candidates meet with program faculty 1-2 times a year as part of the ongoing decision-making process required for program monitoring and evaluation.

In addition to program level stakeholder involvement, the Teacher Education Committee (TEC) meets monthly as a part of the ongoing EPP-wide decision-making processes. The TEC, comprised of internal and external stakeholders of P-12 clinical educators and university clinical educators, including College of Arts and Sciences faculty and administrators, reviews data and inputs from programs, and makes decisions that impact the entire system. The TEC is also the final EPP decision-making body on all program curriculum items. Additionally, P-12 clinical educators complete a survey at the end of each semester giving feedback on how candidates perform on each standard and the strengths and challenges of the programs that prepared teacher candidates.

At the end of the academic year, program representatives serve on the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) to review and discuss the data from each program. Each program develops a Quality Assurance Report which is then reviewed by the QAC during its annual meeting. Based on the most current data, the QAC discusses findings across programs, and makes recommendations for program changes, with the ultimate goal of developing candidates who will positively impact P-12 students.

An example of diverse stakeholder involvement in EPP decision-making was developing and validating three main EPP-wide assessment rubrics (dispositions, lesson plan, and lesson implementation). The lesson plan and implementation evaluation rubrics were developed by a group of P-12 and university clinical educators during summer 2015. Once developed, they were piloted during the 2015-16 academic year. During fall 2015 the new rubrics were also reviewed by various stakeholders, using the Lawshe method, to determine content validity. During summer 2016 the piloted lesson plan and implementation rubrics were reviewed again by a group of P-12 and university clinical educators. The group provided feedback and made changes to many of the components and evaluation statements on the rubrics. The revised rubrics were then implemented during the fall semester of the 2016-17 academic year. During the same semester the revised lesson plan and implementation rubrics were reviewed by PK-12 clinical educators and university clinical educators to determine content validity using the Lawshe method.

This summer, a group of faculty and partners worked together to review two key assessments that will be used across the advanced programs aligned to the new CAEP standards for advanced programs. We plan to pilot those assessments beginning in the Fall 2019 semester and meet with our advisory committee to review the assessments and determine content validity using the Lawshe method. The piloted assessments will be scored by two or more faculty members and the data will be compared to establish inter-rater reliability. We will continue to collect data on the assessments and make changes based on a review of the data obtained.

Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

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.

6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloguing continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?

- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

Each year, program facilitators develop a Quality Assurance Report that discusses the strengths and challenges identified by the EPP assessments, such as the Praxis exams, dispositions survey, or lesson plan. The report is completed and discussed at the annual QAC meeting. To ensure that results of program modifications are monitored and adjusted, the first question on the form asks the program to review and discuss program changes that were identified in the previous year's Quality Assurance Report. It also asks the program to identify changes that were previously initiated and the impact of those changes on teacher candidates and/or the program.

5.5 As indicated in previous sections, a wide variety of appropriate stakeholders including candidates, alumni, employers, practitioners, and school and community partners are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence. For example, at the program level of the continuous improvement cycle, program advisory committees, comprised of P-12 clinical educators, administrators, program completers, and current candidates meet with program faculty twice a year as part of the ongoing decision-making process required for program monitoring and evaluation.

In addition to program level stakeholder involvement, the Teacher Education Committee (TEC) (5.2.2) meets monthly as a part of the ongoing EPP-wide decision-making processes (5.5.1). The TEC, comprised of internal and external stakeholders of P-12 clinical educators and university clinical educators, including College of Arts and Sciences faculty and administrators, reviews data and inputs from programs, and makes decisions that impact the entire system. The TEC is also the final EPP decision-making body on all program curriculum items. All program curriculum changes must be discussed and approved by the TEC before it leaves the EPP and moves to the university level. Additionally, P-12 clinical educators complete a survey at the end of each semester giving feedback on how candidates perform on each standard and the strengths and challenges of the programs that prepared teacher candidates (2.1.10).

Finally, at the end of the academic year, program representatives serve on the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) to review and discuss the data from each program (5.2.3). Each program develops a Quality Assurance Report which is then reviewed by QAC during its annual meeting.

Based on the most current data, the QAC discusses findings across programs, and makes recommendations for program changes, with the ultimate goal of developing candidates who will positively impact P-12 students.

Patterns of strength across all programs include strong dispositions ratings, effective lesson planning and implementation of those lessons, and the ability to use technology. A common weakness found across programs was the lack of our teacher candidates to emphasize P-12 student self-assessment.

Although this apparent weakness did not affect the overall effective ratings our candidates received on lesson implementation, it did stimulate discussion at our Quality Assurance Meeting and at the Program Advisory Committee meetings. Discussion centered on how we could model for our candidates ways to encourage self-assessment in their students. We will provide additional models for our candidates in their methods and field experience classes and continue to monitor candidate performance on P-12 student assessment.

We continue to provide innovative preparation for our candidates. Currently we have portions of two of our preparation programs embedded into local schools. In the elementary program, candidates complete professional semester I (Pro I) at a local elementary school. This Pro I block has an emphasis on literacy. Candidates report to the school each day and have class time with professors from NKU and then take what they have learned directly into the elementary classrooms. Candidates are supervised by program faculty and regularly reflect on their experiences. Candidates indicate this experience is valuable and prepares them for the "real life" of teaching. Similarly, our middle grades program has also begun embedding courses into a local middle school. As this is a new initiative, data are needed to assess the effectiveness of the embedded partnership and professional growth presentations for the middle grades program. Anecdotal focus group data were collected from cooperating teachers on the effectiveness of the field experience component of the partnership. Most recommendations focused on structural and scheduling issues. When possible, these were addressed and/or changed the following semester.

Data from the teacher work sample completed in clinical experience reviewed by the quality assurance committee last year revealed a that a more standardized teacher work sample (TWS) with refined pre- and post- testing, may provide data that are more easily compared across age and subject levels. This discovery provides a specific example of how data were used to modify our program. A departmental team met in summer 2018 to revise the TWS. Although candidates were performing well on the TWS, the elements of the assignment needed to be revised. Revised elements included clearer directions, clearly defined gap groups, and a revised data sheet. These changes were made to help candidates collect, evaluate, and use student data to make instructional decisions. More emphasis was placed on pre- and post-test development and alignment to better demonstrate student growth to target students who need reteaching. Additionally, candidates now complete two teacher work samples, one in each 8-

week placement, or two in a sixteen-week placement, to allow candidates more practice. The revised TWS was implemented in fall 2018. The quality assurance committee reviewed two cycles of data from the revised TWS this spring; concluding that the changes made to the assessment showed improvements in the pre- and post-tests developed for the TWS, allowing candidates to better identify gap groups, in order to develop remediation. Data from the revised TWS are located at the COE Data Dashboard link provided previously. The revised TWS template, scoring rubric, and data sheet were provided in last year's report.

There are three transition points in the candidates' program. The first one is at admission to the education program. The second one is at the entrance to the clinical experience. The third transition point is at program completion. Data are kept on candidates at each transition point for each program. Those data are reviewed as part of the quality assurance system. Each semester, the Teacher Education department chair works with the technology coordinator to ensure that PCEs and UCEs have submitted their required assessments in the Foliotek system. These assessments include the lesson plan, lesson implementation, and dispositions evaluations, as well as the semester reflection, cumulative progress report, and other required Foliotek documentation. At the end of the academic year, the technology coordinator downloads the data from Foliotek, and begins the Quality Assurance System for another year. Representative PCEs, UCEs, and other stakeholders periodically review evaluation practices and teacher candidate assessments to minimize bias and ensure fairness. As part of the TEC and TEAC processes, two evaluators (P-12 and university clinical educators) are used to reduce bias and ensure fairness. Both evaluations are used to determine candidate's grade and movement to the next transition point. Field and clinical experience assessments are independently completed by both PCEs and UCEs. The data from the independent evaluations are then aggregated and compared as part of the annual data review and analysis. Additionally, assessments are aligned with state and national standards, resulting in outcomes that are fair, accurate, and consistent. Review sessions are also held at the beginning of each semester to train PCEs and UCEs in the use of the identified scoring instruments.

The EPP Quality Assurance System ensures that data are systematically collected, analyzed, monitored, and reported throughout the academic year. Program faculty and TEC members review data during their monthly meetings, P-12 advisory boards review data twice each year, and the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) reviews program and EPP-wide data annually. Each year, program facilitators develop a Quality Assurance Report that discusses the strengths and challenges identified by the data from the program. The report is completed and discussed at the annual QAC meeting. To ensure that results of program modifications are monitored and adjusted, the first question on the form asks the program to review and discuss program changes that were identified in the previous year's Quality Assurance Report. It also asks the program to identify changes that were previously initiated and the impact of those changes on teacher candidates and/or the program. The Quality Assurance Report Summary was developed to systematically review the data and program modifications during the last three Quality Assurance Committee meetings. The summary documents the priorities established by each program and the results of the changes (if available) on programs, candidates, and P-12 students. The summary identifies that 100% of program and EPP-wide changes were based on identified data. All data included within the continuous improvement process are tracked over time. Assessment data included in Standards 1 to 4 are shared annually with faculty and are posted on the EPP Data Dashboard to ensure monitoring and review of data and to give stakeholders the ability to track results over time. The EPP collaborates closely with two partner school districts (one urban and one suburban) to identify selected program completers' teaching performance and impact.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the data or changes apply.

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or s activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2020 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Steven A. Crites

Position: Associate Dean

Phone: 859-572-5621

E-mail: critess1@nku.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completer data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site visit report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

Acknowledge