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The College of Education and Professional Studies (COEPS) at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater (UW-W) is committed to the development of professionals who are lifelong learners, creators of knowledge, and leaders for character and integrity. Responding to the changing needs within our global society, our programs prepare professionals to actively engage in an open democratic society inclusive of diverse populations. The College's focus on depth of learning and academic excellence provides our students with the requisites to be leaders dedicated to change in their communities.

This conceptual framework of the College reflects the goal of our Education Preparation Program (EPP), which is to ensure that our initial educators possess the essential knowledge required to be effective in today’s classrooms. The EPP uses the InTASC standards to guide these efforts and understands the importance of a clear assessment system that demonstrates how candidates’ meet the requirements of their respective program.

1. Reflecting on your currently approved EPP under old PI 34, what is the EPP learning from its assessment system? What are you doing in response to this information?

 Preparing high quality teachers to meet the needs of PK-12 students guides the policies and practices of the EPP at the UW-W. To ensure meeting this goal, the Wisconsin Assessment System for Education Preparation Programs is used to evaluate teacher candidates’ progress in their programs (see Appendix A). The college evaluates candidates’ progress toward the InTASC standards at three points: admission to professional education, methods block, and student teaching. The following section provides an overview of how data are collected at these points, and summarizes candidates’ performance in five categories: communication skills, human relations and professional dispositions, content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge and performance in their clinical program.

 To meet the **communication skills (InTASC 5 and 8)** category, teacher candidates enroll in Communication 110 (COM 110) and complete specific components of the edTPA. First, teacher candidates are required to pass COM 110 with a C or better prior to admission to professional education. This course is designed to help students increase their effectiveness in public speaking. Since successful completion of COM 110 is a requirement for admission, all candidates have met this milestone. While public speaking is an important skill, the teacher education faculty recognize the need to evaluate other areas of communication skills. For example, faculty and staff have identified written communication as an area they would like to see growth in teacher candidates. The new admission requirements will include a requisite for candidates to pass both COM 110 and English 102. These two courses address the following content: public speaking, organization and delivery of content, clear and coherent oral communication skills, research, and written language.

 Second, students are expected to pass the edTPA with a 38 or above. The rubrics on the edTPA most aligned with this category are those in task two, instructing and engaging students in learning. The College has a pass rate of roughly 88% on the edTPA, and averages 14 points in task two (using 15-rubric handbook scores). The College continues to support the work of programs in this domain. For example, the edTPA Coordinator met with each program in fall of 2018 to share and analyze the most recent year’s data. These “data-retreats” resulted in conversations related to creating opportunities at the program level for candidates’ to improve skills, such as assessment, reflection, and academic language across multiple domains. See edTPA data tables and a sample document from the data-retreat in the Electronic Document room.

 To meet the **human relations and** **professional dispositions (InTASC 2, 9, 10)** skills category, there are course requirements and a formal evaluation of teacher candidates during their student teaching semester. The college requirements address human relations by identifying a series of general education courses that support the candidates chosen program of study. Candidates are required to pass each course with a C or better. The OFE reports that the majority of candidates successfully complete this requirement prior to student teaching. This suggests our candidates demonstrate sufficient skills in communication, interpersonal relationships, and decision making prior to endorsement for licensure.

 Regarding professional dispositions, the Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors complete the Initial Programs Dispositions Inventory (IPDI) at the end of a candidate’s student teaching semester. There are seven areas included on the survey: 1) evidence-based practice, 2) collaboration, 3) self-management, 4) professional interactions, 5) commitment to life-long learning, 6) legal and ethical norms, and 7) equitable treatment. Supervisors evaluate candidates on a four-point scale from minimal (1) to advanced (4). Successful candidates perform at the proficient level (three or above). The COEPS Office of Field Experience tracks the number of students who successfully meet student teaching expectations. In the past year, 98% of candidates met expectations and successfully completed their student teaching semesters.

 The assessments of candidates’ **content and pedagogical knowledge (INTASC 1-8)** occur at two points, 1) during Admission to Professional Education, and 2) the Methods block. For admission to professional education, candidates take the Praxis CORE, ACT, or meet a GPA requirement. During the methods block, candidates complete a portfolio aligned with the INTASC standards, are encouraged to take the Wisconsin Foundations of Reading Test (FORT), and either take the Praxis II subject area assessment or meet a 3.0 content GPA requirement. These two evaluation periods serve as checkpoints on the progress of teacher candidates.

 Prior to admission to the College, students are required to demonstrate content knowledge in the areas of reading, mathematics, and writing as evidenced by passing the Praxis CORE exam, ACT, or achieving a 2.75 cumulative GPA. In addition, they must have successfully completed Foundations Block courses with a C or better, which include the Phase 2 Portfolio. The majority of teacher candidates are admitted with a qualifying GPA of 2.75 or above, roughly 90%. The remaining candidates are admitted with a qualifying ACT score or attempt the Praxis CORE. For those who do not meet the GPA requirement at admission, they meet with the College Advising Coordinator and create a plan in order to ensure meeting the 2.75 requirement for endorsement. Roughly, 95% of candidates pass the Phase 2 portfolio. Professional education admission has increased with the new admission standards (see Table 1). This growth is expected to continue with revised admission standards, innovative programs such as the Teacher Residency Program, and a fully online Special Education initial licensure program designed for teacher candidates entering with an associate’s degree.

Table 1. Admission rates since spring 2016

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Term | Admitted | % Acceptance rate |
| Summer 2018 | 74 | 95 |
| Spring 2018 | 227 | 94 |
| Fall 2017 | 171 | 100 |
| Summer 2017 | 45 | 98 |
| Spring 2017 | 101 | 89 |
| Fall 2016 | 115 | 84 |
| Summer 2016 | 36 | 77 |
| Spring 2016 | 112 | 81 |

 During the Methods Block, candidates complete a program specific portfolio, take the FORT (if specified as a licensure requirement), and take the Praxis II or meet a 3.0 content GPA requirement. Teacher candidates’ portfolios align with the InTASC standards and demonstrate their readiness for student teaching. Faculty in programs review portfolio data at the student level. The programs use portfolio data to make instructional decisions and curricular changes.

 Candidates in Early Childhood, Elementary Education, and Special Education are encouraged to take the FORT prior to student teaching. This past academic year (2017-2018), 210 candidates took the exam with a mean score of 240 and 64% pass rate. Since 2014, the FORT data for COEPS has averaged a 75% pass rate and mean score of 244. Table 2 provides data on the number of candidates taking the exam, mean score, percent that passed the exam in that academic year, and percent that passed on their first attempt. The most recent year’s decline in mean score and pass rate is likely due to a smaller number of students taking the exam multiple times. The COEPS stopped requiring passing the FORT as a student teaching requirement last year and it is possible students are choosing not to take the exam expecting to begin teaching with a Tier I license. The COEPS faculty and staff will need to work more diligently to inform teacher candidates that passing is a requirement for institutional endorsement.

 Additionally, data were reviewed in the subdomains of this exam: (1) Foundations of Reading Development, (2) Development of Reading Comprehension, (3) Reading Assessment and Instruction, and (4) Integration of Knowledge and Understanding. The domain in which candidates consistently received the lowest score was four. The domain in which candidates consistently scored the highest was three. Faculty continue to review the FORT data and use it to strengthen curriculum to assist student in passing this exam. As past reports described, there have been curricular revisions over the years to include content from the test in courses.

Table 2. FORT scores and pass rate from 2014

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **# taking** | **Mean** | **Pass rate** | **1st Attempt** |
| 2017-18 | 210 | 240 | 64% | 58% |
| 2016-17 | 253 | 244 | 74% | 58% |
| 2015-16 | 271 | 244 | 75% | 63% |
| 2014-15 | 276 | 244 | 76% | 58% |

 In fall 2017, the College approved new standards to evaluate student performance in licensure courses. Candidates have the option of passing the Praxis II subject assessment in their content area or maintain a 3.0 GPA in the courses of their subject area. During the 2017-18 academic year, there was a significant reduction in the number of candidates taking the Praxis II assessments. For example, 14 individuals took the Middle School Content exam (5146) in 2017-18 with a 71% pass rate, when 154 took the same exam in 2016-17 with an 87% pass rate. The decreased pass rate was likely due to the small number of test takers. Similarly, the number of test takers declined in other content area tests. Table 3 includes the mean score and pass rate data for the Praxis II over the past five years.

 The most recent subject GPA calculation available is for spring 2018. The COEPS Student Status Examiner records this data during candidates’ student teaching semester when they apply for endorsement. From the available data, only one candidate took the Praxis II due to not meeting the 3.0 subject GPA requirement. The College is working on processes to track subject GPA and create lists of courses that make up each subject GPA calculation.

Table 3. Praxis II Subject area scores

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Praxis Subject Assessment** | **Year** | **# Exams taken** | **Mean Score** | **% Passing** |
| *Art (1534)* | 2013-2014 | 10 | 159.43 | 71.43% |
| 2014-2015 | 9 | 175 | 100 |
| 2015-2016 | 3 | N/A | N/A |
| 2016-2017 | 6 | N/A | N/A |
| 2017-2018 | 1 | N/A | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Praxis Subject Assessment** | **Year** | **# Exams taken** | **Mean Score** | **% Passing** |
| *Business (5101)* | 2013-2014 | 6 | 175.5 | 100% |
| 2014-2015 | 10 | 175.10 | 100% |
| 2015-2016 | 13 | 171 | 100% |
| 2016-2017 | 6 | 181.67 | 100% |
| 2017-2018 | 3 | N/A | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Praxis Subject Assessment**  | **Year** | **# Exams taken** | **Mean Score** | **% Passing** |
| *Elementary Ed. (5014)* | 2013-2014 | 63 | 162.93 | 87.27 |
| 2014-2015 | 73 | 162.78 | 93.75 |
| 2015-2016 | 76 | 163.13 | 84.38 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Praxis Subject Assessment** | **Year** | **# Exams taken** | **Mean Score** | **% Passing** |
| *English Language Arts (5038)* | 2014-2015 | 14 | 175.92 | 84.62 |
| 2015-2016 | 22 | 178.91 | 95.45 |
| 2016-2017 | 21 | 182.11 | 100 |
| 2017-2018 | 2 | N/A | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Praxis Subject Assessment** | **Year** | **# Exams taken** | **Mean Score** | **% Passing** |
| *English to Speakers of Other Languages (5361)* | 2013-2014 | 12 | 159.58 | 91.67 |
| 2014-2015 | 19 | 161.61 | 100 |
| 2015-2016 | 10 | 171.13 | 100 |
| 2016-2017 | 2 | N/A | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Praxis Subject Assessment** | **Year** | **# Exams taken** | **Mean Score** | **% Passing** |
| *General Science (5435)* | 2013-2014 | 8 | 167.83 | 83.33 |
| 2014-2015 | 11 | 165.63 | 87.50 |
| 2015-2016 | 4 | N/A | N/A |
| 2016-2017 | 15 | 167.55 | 81.82 |
| 2017-2018 | 6 | 163.83 | 83.33 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Praxis Subject Assessment** | **Year** | **# Exams taken** | **Mean Score** | **% Passing** |
| *Health Education (5551)* | 2013-2014 | 20 | 164.58 | 94.74 |
| 2014-2015 | 27 | 161.73 | 92.31 |
| 2015-2016 | 14 | 161.93 | 92.86 |
| 2016-2017 | 25 | 162.87 | 100 |
| 2017-2018 | 4 | N/A | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Praxis Subject Assessment** | **Year** | **# Exams taken** | **Mean Score** | **% Passing** |
| *Marketing Education (5561)* | 2014-2015 | 6 | 167.5 | 100 |
| 2015-2016 | 9 | 168.13 | 100 |
| 2016-2017 | 4 | N/A | N/A |
| 2017-2018 | 3 | N/A | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Praxis Subject Assessment** | **Year** | **# Exams taken** | **Mean Score** | **% Passing** |
| *Mathematics (5161)* | 2014-2015 | 23 | 156.88 | 62.5 |
| 2015-2016 | 61 | 157.77 | 46.15 |
| 2016-2017 | 42 | 155.75 | 48.33 |
| 2017-2018 | 30 | 149.38 | 31.25 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Praxis Subject Assessment** | **Year** | **# Exams taken** | **Mean Score** | **% Passing** |
| *Middle School (5146)* | 2013-2014 | 214 | 157.59 | 84.02 |
| 2014-2015 | 235 | 156.97 | 91.01 |
| 2015-2016 | 175 | 158.01 | 82.86 |
| 2016-2017 | 208 | 156.31 | 87.01 |
| 2017-2018 | 15 | 154.43 | 74.43 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Praxis Subject Assessment*** | **Year** | **# Exams taken** | **Mean Score** | **% Passing** |
| *Music (5113)* | 2013-2014 | 21 | 171.33 | 100 |
| 2014-2015 | 16 | 170.94 | 100 |
| 2015-2016 | 17 | 176.29 | 100 |
| 2016-2017 | 8 | 176.13 | 100 |
| 2017-2018 | 1 | N/A | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Praxis Subject Assessment** | **Year** | **# Exams taken** | **Mean Score** | **% Passing** |
| *Physical Education (5091)* | 2013-2014 | 25 | 157.42 | 95.83 |
| 2014-2015 | 31 | 159.10 | 96.67 |
| 2015-2016 | 26 | 155.90 | 95 |
| 2016-2017 | 22 | 158.18 | 95.45 |
| 2017-2018 | 2 | N/A | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Praxis Subject Assessment** | **Year** | **# Exams taken** | **Mean Score** | **% Passing** |
| *School Guidance and Counseling (5421)* | 2013-2014 | 4 | N/A | N/A |
| 2014-2015 | 14 | 177.43 | 100 |
| 2015-2016 | 5 | 176.60 | 100 |
| 2016-2017 | 8 | 177.50 | 100 |
| 2017-2018 | 6 | 171.83 | 100 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Praxis Subject Assessment** | **Year** | **# Exams taken** | **Mean Score** | **% Passing** |
| *School Psychologist (5402)* | 2014-2015 | 8 | 175.38 | 100 |
| 2015-2016 | 10 | 174.4 | 100 |
| 2016-2017 | 10 | 172.6 | 100 |
| 2017-2018 | 7 | 175.14 | 100 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Praxis Subject Assessment** | **Year** | **# Exams taken** | **Mean Score** | **% Passing** |
| *Social Studies (5081)* | 2013-2014 | 25 | 166.84 | 89.47 |
| 2014-2015 | 15 | 170.47 | 100 |
| 2015-2016 | 14 | 168.54 | 100 |
| 2016-2017 | 15 | 163.14 | 85.71 |
| 2017-2018 | 3 | N/A | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Praxis Subject Assessment** | **Year** | **# Exams taken** | **Mean Score** | **% Passing** |
| *Speech-Language Pathology (5331)* | 2014-2015 | 1 | N/A | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Praxis Subject Assessment** | **Year** | **# Exams taken** | **Mean Score** | **% Passing** |
| *Theater (5641)* | 2013-2014 | 1 | N/A | N/A |
| 2014-2015 | 3 | N/A | N/A |
| 2015-2016 | 3 | N/A | N/A |

 Teacher candidates’ performance in their **clinical program (InTASC 1-10)** is evaluated during the student teaching semester by completion of the edTPA and surveys completed by Cooperating Teachers (CT) and University Supervisors (US). The College has maintained a near 90% pass rate on the edTPA in the last few years. The edTPA Coordinator manages, analyzes, and shares data from this assessment with chairs and program coordinators each semester. It is the most widely used data source in the teacher preparation programs. This past year, student teaching seminar instructors met with the college coordinator for guidance and support related to successful completion of the edTPA (see data retreat sample in the electronic document room). Based on information shared during the edTPA data-retreats in fall 2018, faculty and staff discussed ways to provide candidates’ with more opportunities to video tape and reflect on their instruction. While the majority of COEPS candidates earn a 38 or above before completing student teaching, the areas in which they required the most support was in tasks two and three. Specifically, analyzing teacher effectiveness and assessment.

 University Supervisors (US) and Cooperating Teachers (CT) complete surveys of teacher candidates’ skills on the standards during their student teaching semester. Data were analyzed on a small sample of evaluations from spring 2016 to spring 2018 in the following programs: Middle Childhood/Early Adolescence (*n*= 132), Secondary (*n*= 78), Special Education (*n*= 110), Early Childhood (*n*= 40), Physical Education (*n*= 21), Art (*n*= 5), and Music (*n*= 15). Overall, candidates perform at proficient levels (mean of three on a four-point scale) across all ten standards. There were not any consistent areas of strength or opportunities for growth across programs. What the College learned from this analysis is that there is there is little variation overall in the ratings by CT and US across programs and standards. In addition, the college would benefit from a measure that allows for comparisons across programs and an evaluation of candidates’ after completing their preparation programs. See the CT and US survey data available in the electronic document room.

 The college will implement two initiatives based on this data analysis. First, it is important to know how the candidates who complete student teaching perceive their program and perform after they leave. To achieve this goal, a series of surveys were distributed starting spring 2018. The first survey is the “Exit Survey” which is distributed to candidates in the student teaching semester. The survey includes items related to the candidates’ perceptions of advising, field placements, and preparation related to planning, teaching, managing a classroom, and evaluating the learning of their students. The survey was distributed two times, in spring and fall 2018. The second survey is the “Next Survey” which is distributed to those candidates who completed the “Exit Survey” and are teaching. This survey will give us data on our graduates’ perceptions of their preparation after one year of teaching. The first “Next Survey” will be distributed spring 2019. The final survey is the “Supervisor Survey” which is distributed to the candidates’ direct supervisors. This survey will give us data on our employers’ perception of our candidates’ level of preparation after one year of teaching. The first “Next Survey” will be distributed summer 2019. The College will have collected one complete set of candidate cohort data by fall 2019.

 The COEPS will use the information gathered from this series of surveys to assess our educator preparation programs. The Assistant Dean is responsible for managing the distribution, collection, and analysis of the data from the surveys. The faculty and staff in those programs will use the data for program improvement purposes. The College will review and manage the data, identifying any trends in programs’ performance that warrant support, such as professional development or curricular review or procedural processes that might be improved (e.g., how the Office of Field Experiences places student teachers in the field).

 The second initiative is related to how data are organized and analyzed at the college level. In particular, there is interest in standardizing our US and CT evaluations of teacher candidates’ in their pre-student teaching and student teaching placements in order to measure growth in our candidates over time. The college will work to adopt a common survey that reflects the InTASC standards and Danielson Framework for Teaching. The College’s regional Cooperative Educational Service Agency (CESA 2) Professional Advisory Committee (PAC) recommended incorporating the Danielson Framework more clearly in our preparation program.

 Recently, College administration, faculty and staff created an updated unit assessment framework, streamlining data collection into five decision points (see Appendix B). The College is working to align the framework to supplemental and post-baccalaureate programs. Further, the College Assessment Committee created assessment-planning documents to assist programs in their work to collect and use data for program improvement. Data requests are made to the Assistant Dean, who works with numerous staff in the COEPS to distribute accurate and timely information to program coordinators. For example, the reading faculty request FORT data regularly and use that data to track the progress of their candidates and inform instructional methods.

1. What changes are you planning to make to implement new PI 34?

 The COEPS Education Preparation Program submitted its application for approval under the recreated PI 34 Administrative Rule in January 2019. The application provides a detailed review of necessary changes. Our DPI consultant provided feedback on the application, and college leaders will work to submit the additional information by the April 1st deadline. Once approved, the EPP will work to align all licensure programs with the new rule. The administrative team will meet to discuss a realistic timeline to have programs approved by 2023.

1. How can your liaison support you with completing the requirements to gain initial approval as an Educator Preparation Program under the new PI 34?

We have appreciated the continued support from our liaison. The regularly scheduled phone calls are beneficial to our work on the EPP application. There is nothing additional needed at this time.

 UWW has completed the fifth year of the Continuous Review Process. The programs with reports in year five include Computer Science, Middle Childhood/Early Adolescence (MCEA), Physical and Health Education, School Business Management, and Speech and Language Pathology. These reports are available in the electronic document room. Social Studies will not submit a report this year. The program coordinator is on sabbatical and was unable to complete this work. In addition, The Dance licensure program decided to continue its minor without a licensure option. The COEPS will complete the process of discontinuing this licensure program.
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