

2017 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10698	AACTE SID:	4805
Institution:	Washburn University		
Unit:	Department of Education		

Section 1. AIMS 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"/>

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 2015-2016 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

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.)

Total number of program completers 84

**2.2 Indicate whether the EPP is currently offering a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure.*

Yes, a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification is currently being offered.

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2015-2016 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the published mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
No Change / Not Applicable

3.2 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited
No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 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
No Change / Not Applicable

3.4 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements
No Change / Not Applicable

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

3.5 Change in regional accreditation status
No Change / Not Applicable

3.6 Change in state program approval
No Change / Not Applicable

Section 4. Display of candidate performance data.

Provide a link that demonstrates candidate performance data are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the school, college, or department of education homepage.

Program Completers, Annual Reports, Impact on Student Learning (non-academic), Follow-up Survey, Candidate Self-Assessment Survey:

<http://www.washburn.edu/academics/college-schools/arts-sciences/departments/education/data-summaries.html>

Section 6. 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.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 1 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1. The unit does not ensure that all candidates in all advanced programs demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills, professional dispositions, and the ability to create positive environments for student learning.	(ADV)
--	-------

The primary focus of this AFI was on assessing the professional dispositions of candidates in the advanced programs. We presented data on their professional knowledge and skills and on the ability to create positive learning environments. In the spring 2011 semester we implemented a procedure wherein all advanced level candidates are assessed on their professional dispositions in the same way. An assessment form was implemented in all the advanced programs and we maintain an on-going file of that data.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1. The unit does not regularly and systematically conduct graduate and employer follow-up surveys.	(ITP)	(ADV)
--	-------	-------

We follow up on program completers each year including job placement rates and follow-up surveys with building principals regarding their effectiveness as teachers. In Dec. 2013 & Dec. 2014 we conducted a survey specifically regarding advanced program completers with school staff attending Ed Interview Day on campus. In the spring of 2010, 2012, and 2014 we conducted a follow-up survey on both undergraduate and graduate completers. In the spring of 2014 – we sent an electronic survey to 55 school principals in 17 school districts and had a response rate of 49%. We have summary data on the responses to 10 specific questions regarding our candidates who were rated very well. In the spring of 2015 we conducted a follow-up survey on initial licensure candidates who graduated in 2013-2014 and are in their first year of teaching. We sent a survey to 30 school principals in 13 school districts where these first year teachers are employed. Our overall response rate was 50% and the average score on the 10-item survey was 3.10 on a 4-point scale of Very Good (4), Good (3), Fair (2), or Poor (1). In the 2015-2016 academic year we conducted two separate follow-up surveys. One was targeted at program completers at the initial level and the second at program completers at the advanced level. The follow-up survey itself has been revised slightly based on a quality assurance review in the fall 2015 semester. We are currently finalizing a list of email addresses for principals based on a random sampling of program completer and job retention data we maintain.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1. The unit does not ensure that all candidates have field and clinical experiences in settings with students with disabilities or students from diverse ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic groups.	(ADV)
--	-------

We maintain a file of all field placements for advanced candidates. We have information for field placements for candidates in the Reading, Special Education, C & I and Educational Administration programs. During this time candidates have had field experiences in a wide variety of area school districts. This includes placements in urban districts, semi-urban school districts, rural districts and densely-settled rural districts. Nearly one half of placements were conducted in USD 501 Topeka schools. USD 501 has the largest diverse student population in our immediate area.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 5 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1. The unit does not ensure that school faculty are licensed in the field in which they teach.	(ITP)	(ADV)
--	-------	-------

We have collected data on the qualifications of school personnel who work with and supervise our candidates. We requested information from the Kansas State Department of Education as a part of their licensure look-up data-base. We have accessed data from this data-base. We have also been working on collecting this information in the university Banner computer system. As noted in our Institutional Report, we do have policies in place to help ensure that school personnel are qualified in the areas in which they teach. When the Unit field placement coordinator has contacted a school district outside the usual four (USD 501, USD 437, USD 450, and USD 345), the principals consider the criteria for selection of a cooperating teacher. The Unit requests that cooperating teachers should have taught a minimum of three years. The coordinator requests cooperating teachers based on preferences of

candidates or faculty, who request a classroom in a certain school, specific content area, grade level, and then the school district contact will send that request to the principals who contact the teachers. Personal contact between faculty and the coordinator with Cooperating Teachers provide insight into whether the criteria for choosing a cooperating teacher has been followed in a district. We compiled a list of field placements for candidates which also included the name of the cooperating or supervising teacher. This list included names of teachers or supervisors (although some were listed more than once because of different placements) for 23 different courses at both the initial and advanced levels. We compared these names to those obtained on our licensure look-up from the state to be sure they matched. For names of teachers not listed in the data-base we took steps to check on their qualifications by contacting school districts or collecting demographic data on staff for placements such as Art or Early Childhood.

In the fall of 2013 we matched the list of names of teachers serving as cooperating teachers or supervisors to information provided by the state and our own efforts to identify licensure. Based on this analysis we were able to verify that 89% of the cooperating teachers or supervisors were qualified for the positions they hold. Of the 11% that were not immediately matched, we are confident that a significant percentage of those teachers are also qualified.

In the spring of 2015 we conducted an analysis of cooperating teachers for the fall 2013 and spring 2014 semesters. We compiled a list of names and positions of 234 cooperating teachers who had been involved in supervising methods courses or student teaching. We reviewed the KSDE licensure info we already on file, called area school districts, and reviewed our own past records. Of the 234 teachers identified we were able to verify that 208 or 88% of the teachers had the appropriate licensure. Of the 12% that were not immediately matched, we are confident that a significant percentage of those teachers are also qualified. In the spring semester of 2016 we accessed data from the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) on Teacher Quality for the most recent year available. The KSDE data base indicated that 97% of teachers in the state were fully licensed. For high poverty elementary the percentage was 96%, for high poverty secondary the percentage was 96%. For low poverty elementary schools the percentage was 97% and for low poverty secondary schools the percentage of fully licensed teachers was 98%. In the elementary schools, only 5.5% of core content classes were not taught by highly qualified teachers. At the secondary level 10% of core content classes were not taught by highly qualified teachers. Core Content Classes are defined as elementary, English/language arts, reading, mathematics, science, foreign language, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography. We also accessed data on area school districts where we have the greatest number of field placements. Information on teacher licensure in these districts is summarized below:

USD 501 Topeka schools shows that 95% of elementary teachers are fully licensed while 3% are teaching with an emergency licensure. At the secondary level this percentage is 98% and 1% are teaching with an emergency license.

For USD 450 Shawnee Heights – 90% of elementary teachers are fully licensed and 6% of core content classes are not taught by highly qualified teachers. At the secondary level 97% of teachers are fully certified.

For USD 437 Auburn-Washburn, 99% of elementary teachers are fully certified and 100% of secondary teachers are fully certified. Only 2% of core content classes are not taught by highly qualified teachers.

For USD 345 Seaman 96% of teachers are fully licensed and at the secondary level 100% of teachers are fully licensed. Only 4% of core content classes in the district are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified.

For USD 497 Lawrence – 96% of elementary teachers are fully licensed and 97% of secondary teachers.

Section 7. Accreditation Pathway

Selected Improvement. *Summarize progress on the Selected Improvement plan for the standard(s) or component(s) selected.*

We had previously identified NCATE Standard 3 Field Experiences as our area for continuous improvement. We continue to work to ensure that field experiences are conducted in diverse settings with qualified teachers and administrators. Depending on the specific licensure program candidates at the initial level range from 695 hours to 985 hours in field placements prior to the completion of their programs. At least one placement is required of all candidates to be in the USD 501 Topeka school district, which has the most diversity of any district in our area.

One of the strengths of our programs is the number of field experiences candidates get and the quality of those experiences. Each licensure program contains opportunities for field experiences in the schools at the grade level most appropriate to the specific licensure program. We maintain MOU's with each participating school or school district. We work with school district staff in regards to placement of our candidates and school district staff are involved in the assessment and evaluation of our candidates. We have taken steps to move up the date in which student teaching applications are submitted so that we can better plan for the placements we need.

We hired a new field placement coordinator in the summer of 2016 who has considerable experience in the schools. We have taken this change as an opportunity to review and revise the job description for this important position. We changed this position from a 9-month to a 10-month position.

We collect data on the placement of each candidate and incorporate these data into our unit database. We collect information on the candidate, course, school district (used to track urban, rural, etc), specific school, grade level (using a code system of lftd, infant/toddler, PreK – preschool, Prim – grades K-3, Intm – grades 4-6, Mid – grades 6 -8, or Sec – 9-12), and cooperating teacher. Our current system allows us to create spreadsheets of candidates enrolled in a specific class which is provided to instructors to complete with specific placement information. We are hoping to develop a system to track cooperating teachers based on the feedback we get from candidates and university supervisors to determine if these are cooperating teachers we want to use again. We established a field placement committee several years ago to enhance communication with school staff. It only met periodically due to inconsistent leadership, but we established an Advisory Board to fill this void. We also have a Unit Assessment Committee, which includes school district staff, so there is a mechanism in place for discussion of assessment-related field experience issues or concerns.

We have knowledgeable and experienced university supervisors who assist the unit in supervision of field experiences. University supervisors complete the same assessments as cooperating teachers. As a part of the Quality Assurance focus of CAEP we are working to develop a new training module that university supervisors will have to complete prior to their observations of candidates in the schools. We have collected data on the inter-rater reliability between university supervisors and cooperating teachers for two key assessments – Student Teaching Summary Evaluation and the Professional Conduct and Dispositions evaluation. We are having annual interviews for University Supervisors for the upcoming year. This allows us to make University Supervisor placements with students and to set expectations and changes for the candidates that are selected. Ongoing training with University Supervisors is conducted during regular monthly meetings during the academic year.

There are meetings conducted with the student teachers during the semester. The coordinator of field experiences meets with candidates twice a month as a large group. Candidates also meet as small groups with their university supervisors once a month to address issues or concerns and to help assist the student teachers in general. Candidates also take ED 405 Classroom Management during the student teaching semester which provides another level of support.

Cooperating teachers are invited to come to campus each semester to discuss the program, our conceptual framework, expectations for field experiences, student teacher dispositions, cooperating teacher responsibilities, and the need for our candidates to be reflective professionals.

School districts are requiring more information on our candidates before placements are made. For example, school districts often require background checks and TB checks and other information or paperwork on our candidates prior to their placements. Students are writing letters of introduction to the districts, along with a brief resume, which provides additional information in making placement decisions. School districts have different requirements and/or forms that need to be completed regarding candidates and we work with them to make sure that all required paperwork is completed properly.

We have continued to review and revise evaluation forms used in field experiences based on discussions we've had with cooperating teachers, information on changes in the field, changes in licensure standards, and our own reflection on the specific indicators.

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 2017 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Michael Rettig, Ph.d

Position: Professor, CAEP Coordinator

Phone: 785-670-1424

E-mail: michael.rettig@washburn.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, going forward 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.