

AGENDA
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION COUNCIL
3:30 - Wednesday, February 9, 2011
Gary Ransdell Hall 3073

- I. Consideration of the Minutes from the December 8, 2010 meeting (Minutes can be found on the CEBS Main Web Page – click on Faculty & Staff and then Meetings Minutes and Agendas).

- II. New Business
 - A. Office of Teacher Services-CEBS**
 - Presentation of Candidates Completing Requirements for Admission to the Professional Education Unit December 9, 2010 to February 9, 2011

 - Student Teacher Candidates List for Spring, 2011

 - B. College of Education and Behavioral Sciences Office of the Dean – NCATE Information**
 - 1. Professional Education Unit Graphic
 - 2. WKU Professional Education Unit Assessment System-Logic Model
 - 3. Professional Education Unit – NCATE IR Addendum

 - C. Educational Leadership Doctoral Program**
 - 1. Revise Course Prerequisites/Corequisites EDLD 720, IND/GRP Issues in Lead
 - 2. Revise Course Prerequisites/Corequisites EDLD 730, Leading the Organization

 - D. School of Teacher Education**
 - 1. Revise Program – 0433, MAE: Elementary Education for Teacher Leaders
 - 2. Revise Program – 0434, MAE: Middle Grades Education for Teacher Leaders
 - 3. Revise Program – 0435, MAE: Secondary Education for Teacher Leaders

 - E. Ogden College of Science and Engineering**
 - Dept. of Mathematics and Computer Science
 - 1. Revise Course Number – CS 230, Introduction to Programming

 - Department of Biology
 - 2. Revise a Program – 525, Major in Biology (without a minor)
 - 3. Revise a Program – 617, Major in Biology (with a minor)

F. Potter College of Arts and Letters

Department of Music

1. Revise Course Catalog Listing - MUS 500, Theory Seminar
2. Revise Course Catalog Listing - MUS 511, Investigations of Music Education
3. Create a New Course – MUS 519, Conducting Seminar
4. Create a New Course – MUS 520, Advanced Pedagogy
5. Create a New Course – MUS 625, Graduate Capstone Project
6. Create a New Academic Degree Type – Master of Music

III. Other Business

Information –

New Teacher Survey Results 2009-2010

**CANDIDATES COMPLETING REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMISSION TO
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT**

December 9, 2010 – February 9, 2011

Elementary P-5

Ashley, Le' Andrea
Barnett, Bethany
Belcher, Jessica
Bentley, Kiki
Blevins, Brandy
Brewer, Jennifer
Byers, Austin
Calhoun, Karri
Calvert, Chris
Cardwell, Kayla
Cardwell, Kaylyn
Case, Angela
Collins, Breanna
Copass, Katie
Cox, Tara
Darst, Jessica
Gilpin, Lindsay
Grider, Allison
Hoover, Heather
Jones, Angela
King, Alexandra
Laney, Brittani
Latham, Ashley
Lawrence, Joseph
Lewis, Tammy
Mattingly, Carl
McCloud, Matthew
McGahan, Darrell
Meyer, Kelsey
Miller, Natalie
Millhof, Kelsey
Mitchell, Megan
Moehlmann, Jaclyn
Moore, Gregory
Morgan, Stephen
Nottingham, Jonni
Page, Kacey
Parrish, Elizabeth

Patton, Kimberly
Payne, Audra
Pointer, Aleah
Roach, Amanda
Sauer, Jenna
Smith, Alysha
Sumner, Kristi
Tackett, Jamie
Vincent, Lisa
Wainscott, Logan
Warren, Michael
Webb, Kaitlyn
Whited, James
Wilson, Erica
Winders, Paige

Middle Grades

Bell, Kimberley	Math
Brasser, Mara	Science/SS
Bunch, Teia	Math
Corbin, Cybile	Eng/SS
Earnhart, Shannon	Eng/SS
Finn, Valerie	Math/SS
Hudson, Virginia	Eng/SS
Kitchens, Kelli	Math
Lamont, Jason	Math/ Science
Latham, Laura	Eng/SS
Ledoux, Heather	Math/SS
McCubbins, Kayla	Math/Science
Meadows, Mattia	Eng/SS
Miller, Stephanie	Math/SS
Mullen, Shawna	Eng/SS
Nelson, Kathleen	Math
Richeson, Hannah	Math
Sykes, Hilary	Eng/SS
Todd, Alexandria	Math/SS
Wilson, Curtis	Math/SS

5-12

Ashby, Jeffery	Industrial Technology Education
Harlow, Kira	FCS
Morrow, Seth	Industrial Technology Education
Wilson, Mary	FCS

P-12

Crabtree, Laura	EXED
Isenberg, Samantha	Spanish
Kobbeman, Anna	EXED
Paschetto, Kelsey	Music
Reno, Whitney	Spanish
Timberlake, Jennifer	EXED
Volkerding, Kathryn	Art

Secondary

Anderson, Jennifer	Social Studies
Barker, Caitlin	Spring 2009
Brown, Kasey	English
Carpenter, Kathryn	Biology
Crabtree, Adam	Math
DeWitt, Sara	English
Embry, Bret	Math
Marsh, Elizabeth	Chemistry
Robinson, Jennifer	Social Studies
Spinks, Joye Beth	Biology
Wiseman, Joshua	English
Wright, Mallory	English

IECE

Sprinkle, Sarah

Masters

Clark, Melissa	LME
Claywell, Kahli	IECE
Geary, Whitney	LBD
Hart, Kelli	LBD
Harmon, Misty	EXED
Moore, Samantha	LBD
Slovenski, Trena	CD
Smith, Meredith	CD
Spalding, Catherine	LBD
Vincent, Tiffany	LBD

If there are any questions or concerns about the status of any candidate, the person with the question or concern should contact Dr. Fred Carter, Teacher Services (745-4611 or fred.carter@wku.edu) prior to the PEC meeting.

STUDENT TEACHER CANDIDATES FOR SPRING 2011
*****STUDENT TEACHING APPLICATION ACCEPTED***2/9/11*****

WKU ID	First	Last	MAJOR
	MARK	BOWMAN	5-12/AGRICULTURE
	KIRA	HARLOW	5-12/FCS
	SARAH	SPRINKLE	IECE
	KELSEY	PASCHETTO	P-12/MUSIC
	EMILY	RAYMER	SEC/BIOLOGY
	MORGAN	CHEATHAM	SEC/ENGLISH

SPRING 2011 STUDENT TEACHING APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED = 279

APPLICATIONS ACCEPTED = 246

APPLICATIONS WITHDRAWN PER STUDENT OR DENIED DUE TO REQUIREMENT DEFICIENCIES = 33

STUDENT TEACHER CANDIDATES FOR SPRING 2011

*****STUDENT TEACHING APPLICATION WITHDRAWN OR DENIED – 2/9/11*****

WKU ID	First	Last	MAJOR
	JORDAN	CRADDOCK	ELEMENTARY
	HEATHER	IVORY	ELEMENTARY
	KELLI	JENKINS	ELEMENTARY
	CHARITY	RICHARDSON	ELEMENTARY
	SHALAYNA	SKAGGS	ELEMENTARY
	JOSHUA	VIBBERT	ELEMENTARY
	SARA	WHITESIDE	IECE
	ADAM	BRITT	MGE/MATH/S.STUDIES
	AMBER	BYRNS	MGE/MATH
	KAYLA	CECIL	MGE/S.STUDIES/MATH
	ANDREA	MILLAY	MGE/LA/S.STUDIES
	KOURTNEY	SOLES	MGE/MATH/LA
	KAYLEE	TAYLOR	MGE/MATH
	LESLIE	WHITAKER	MGE/S.STUDIES/LA
	JOSHUA	WOODS	MGE/SCIENCE
	JEREMY	ADCOCK	SEC/SOCIAL STUDIES
	BRANDY	MOORE	SEC/SOCIAL STUDIES
	KEVIN	PASSAGLIA	SEC/SOCIAL STUDIES
	LINDSEY	RIGDON	SEC/SOCIAL STUDIES
	DAVID	ROGERS	SEC/MATH

1. Children and Schools

All children can learn.
All children have the right to a quality education.

2. Education Professionals

Essential Professional Values

- Diversity
- Home community/interaction
- Technology

Essential Professional Qualities

- High Ability
- Training/Ongoing PD
- Theories/Modeling/Strategies
- Content Knowledge (KTS 1)
- Professional Knowledge & Skills (KTS 2-10)
- Dispositions

3. Assessment and Accountability

Assessment of Candidate Progress
Accountability for P-12 Student Learning

WKU PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM – LOGIC MODEL

WKU Conceptual Framework (CF)

(<http://edtech.wku.edu/peu/2010-program-review-submissions.htm>)

- Provides the **Mission** and **Vision** of the WKU Professional Education Unit
- Includes **10 Key Beliefs** about Children, Schools, Educational Professionals, and Assessment and Accountability
- For each Belief, CF describes **Key Ideas** and **Unit Implications**
- Incorporates the **10 Kentucky Teacher Standards (KTS)** and shared WKU Professional Education **Dispositions**
- Includes an **Alignment Matrix** of NCATE Standards, CF Standards/Values (including KTS and Dispositions) and Beliefs, WKU Academic Affairs Objectives, and WKU Strategic Plan



WKU Continuous Assessment Plan

(<http://edtech.wku.edu/peu/2010-program-review-submissions.htm>)

- Describes the WKU Professional Education Unit plan to collect data to ensure candidates are being equipped to live out the **Conceptual Framework Beliefs, KTS, and Dispositions**
- Includes **Initial Preparation and Advanced Preparation Matrices** to show how all data we plan to collect align to CF Standards/Values
- Includes overview of how we collect data in our **Electronic Accountability System (WKU E-PASS)**
- Describes **Transition Points** where we evaluate students for **continuation** and **Feedback Loops** for Students, Faculty, and Programs to monitor progress
- Describes annual **Unit Wide Assessment Report** that CEBS Associate Dean will complete and **Annual Program Reports** that program coordinators will complete



Program Review Documents (PRD)

(http://edtech.wku.edu/peu/prd-3_program-experiences-submissions.htm)

- Submitted **once every NCATE review cycle** to Kentucky EPSB
- Describes program courses; alignment to KTS and learned society standards; plans for program assessment; faculty; and syllabi
- **Substantive program changes** requires either EPSB notification or resubmission of PRDs



Program Assessment Plans (PAP)

(<http://edtech.wku.edu/peu/program-assessment-plans.htm>)

- Submitted **one time** to CEBS Associate Dean
- Describes how education program will **live out WKU Continuous Assessment Plan**
- Was included as part of our **PRD submissions**
- **Substantive program changes** should be reported to CEBS Associate Dean
- Assessments included in PAP should be part of **WKU E-PASS**



Annual Program Reports (APR)

(<http://edtech.wku.edu/peu/reports/annual-program-reports.htm>)

- Completed **each year** by **program coordinators** following outline attached to **PAP**
- The **CEBS Associate Dean** provides **most** data needed for APR
- Program coordinators **insert data** and **work with program faculty to reflect on data**

NCATE

The Standard of Excellence
in Teacher Preparation



Professional Education Unit

NCATE IR Addendum

**Based on
Academic Year 2008-09
With 2009-10 Update Information**

**For
Continuing Accreditation Visit
Bowling Green, KY
Spring 2011**

Electronic Document Room Homepage Link: <http://edtech.wku.edu/peu/index.htm>

Final Version: February 4, 2011

Note: Any questions or comments regarding the contents of this report should be directed to Tony Norman (tony.norman@wku.edu), CEBS Associate Dean, Accountability & Research.

This addendum addresses the areas (in italics below) that the Offsite BOE Team identified during its electronic visit on November 12, 2010 in the document, *Offsite BOE Report: Western Kentucky University* to be validated during its upcoming on-site visit to ensure that each NCATE standard continues to be met. Although the *Offsite BOE Report* indicates that “this validation will occur as the team interviews faculty, administrators, school-based partners, and other members of the professional community” and “could also occur in the visits to schools and observations on campus,” it also provides some specific documentation that the team plans to review during the onsite visit. Wherever possible, this addendum directs the on-site team to specific documents, sections in the original WKU IR, or additional evidence that should validate that each standard continues to be met. Additionally, this addendum seeks to make a stronger case for why the Areas for Improvement listed under Standard 2.3 should be removed.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

1.4 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) Clarification of endorsements offered. Tables in the IR do not include endorsements such as English as a second language. What endorsements are offered and approved by the state?

Based on conversations with Allison Bell at the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB), the IR tables have been revised below to indicate more clearly the initial, advanced, and endorsement programs we offer.

IR Table 2. Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and Their Review Status

Program Name	Award Level	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (2008-09)	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs	Program Report Submitted for Review	State Approval Status	National Recognition Status by NCATE**
Interdisc. Early Child. Ed.	Bachelor’s & Master’s	61	State	No	Approved	NA
Elementary Ed.	Bachelor’s	1115	State	No	Approved	NA
Middle Grades Ed.	Bachelor’s	279	State	No	Approved	NA
<i>Secondary School for Grades 8-12</i>						
Biological Science	Bachelor’s	37	State	No	Approved	NA
Chemistry	Bachelor’s	8	State	No	Approved	NA
Earth Science	Bachelor’s	5	State	No	Approved	NA
English	Bachelor’s	129	State	No	Approved	NA
Mathematics	Bachelor’s	68	State	No	Approved	NA
Physics	Bachelor’s	2	State	No	Approved	NA
Social Studies	Bachelor’s	172	State	No	Approved	NA
<i>Certificates for Grades 5-12</i>						
Agriculture	Bachelor’s	40	State	No	Approved	NA
Business/Market Ed.	Bachelor’s	51	State	No	Approved	NA
Family/Cons. Science	Bachelor’s	43	State	No	Approved	NA
Occupation-Based Career & Technical Education (formerly Industrial Education)	Bachelor’s	20	State	No	Approved	NA
Engineering & Tech. Ed.	Bachelor’s	1	State	No	Approved	NA
<i>Certificates for All Grade Levels</i>						
Art	Bachelor’s	28	State	No	Approved	NA

French	Bachelor's	3	State	No	Approved	NA
German	Bachelor's	1	State	No	Approved	NA
Health Ed.	Minor within a Certifiable Bachelor's	3	State	No	Approved	NA
Music Ed. (Instrumental, Integrated, & Vocal)	Bachelor's	99	NASM/State	Yes	Approved	Recognized
Physical Ed.	Bachelor's	90	State	No	Approved	NA
Spanish	Bachelor's	25	State	No	Approved	NA
<i>Exceptional Children Grades P-12</i>						
Comm. Disorders	Master's	175	ASHA/State	Yes	Approved	Recognized
Exceptional Ed. (LBD/MSD)	Bachelor's & Master's	143	State	No	Approved	NA
<i>Other School Personnel</i>						
Sch. Media Librarian	Master's	4	State	Yes	Approved	Recognized
<i>Alternative Certification Programs (Option 6) – Available in all certification areas except Elementary Education, Exceptional Education-MSD, and Physical Education</i>						
Alternative Certification	Master's	64	State	No	Approved	NA

IR Table 3. Advanced Preparation and Endorsement Programs and Their Review Status

Program Name	Award Level	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (2008-09)	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs	Program Report Submitted for Review	State Approval Status	National Recognition Status by NCATE**
Comm. Disorders	Planned 6 th Yr	5	ASHA/State	Yes	Approved	Recognized
Interdisc. Early Child. Ed.	Master's	6	State	No	Approved	NA
<i>Endorsements</i>						
English as a Second Language	Endorsement	6	State	No	Approved	NA
Environmental Education	Endorsement	0	State	No	Under Review	NA
Gifted Education	Endorsement	10	State	No	Approved	NA
Instructional Computer Technology	Endorsement	8	State	No	Approved	NA
Individual Intellectual Assessment	Endorsement	1	State	No	Approved	NA
Literacy (Read/Write)	Master's	19	State	No	Approved	NA
Teacher Leader	Endorsement	(See below)	State	No	Approved	NA
<i>Teacher Leader Master's Programs** (First Students to be Admitted January, 2011)</i>						
Elementary Education	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
Middle Grades Ed.	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
Secondary Education	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
5-12 Education	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
P-12 Education	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
Learning Behavior Dis.	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
Moderate Severe Dis.	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
English	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
Mathematics	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
Physical Ed.	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA

<i>Other School Personnel Certification Programs</i>						
Sch. Media Librarian	Master's	193	ALA/State	Yes	Approved	Recognized
School Counseling	Master's & Specialist	171	State	No	Approved	NA
School Psychology	Specialist	27	NASP/State	Yes	Approved	Recognized
<i>Educational Leadership Programs – Include the following: Director of Pupil Personnel Services, Director of Special Education, School Principal (Traditional & Alternate Route), School Superintendent (Traditional & Alternate Route), Supervisor of Instruction, and Career & Technical School Principal</i>						
Educational Leadership	Master's, Specialist, Doctorate	225	State	No	Approved*	NA
<i>Education Specialist and Planned 6th Year Programs</i>						
Elementary Education	EdS/Planned 6 th Yr	22	State	No	Approved	NA
Middle Grades Ed.	Planned 6 th Yr	3	State	No	Approved	NA
Secondary Education	EdS/Planned 6 th Yr	6	State	No	Approved	NA

*The Educational Leadership Doctorate program is approved by Kentucky's Council on Postsecondary Education rather than by Kentucky's Education Professional Standards Board.

**Teacher Leader programs may be configured as Master's, Planned Fifth Year/Rank II, or Planned Sixth Year/Rank I (as a second Master's) programs.

(2) Follow-up data for advanced teaching and other school professional programs. What follow-up studies are conducted? What has the unit learned from the follow-up data?

Follow-up data for advanced teaching and other school professional programs were reported in the WKU IR under the following heading and table: 1e.3 and Table I. Also, each program reports what has been learned from survey results in [Annual Program Reports](#) (See Communication Disorders, School Psychology, Educational Administration, Leadership, and Research, School Counseling, Library Media Education, and School Psychology). As can be seen, all other school professional programs complete some combination of exit, employer, or alumni survey on an annual basis. Until recently, alumni surveys for advanced teaching programs were conducted every two years. However, once we began work on the Teacher Leader master's program and collected data in Table I to guide curriculum development, no further follow-up studies were conducted as these "old programs" were to be discontinued by December, 2010. In the future, we will administer exit or alumni surveys to the graduates from our Teacher Leader programs in a manner similar to what all our other advanced preparation programs do.

Although all other school professional programs can demonstrate alignment between their program standards and build on the Kentucky Teacher Standards, because of the unique qualities and goals of these programs, exit/follow-up surveys results are not comparable across programs. However, each program's Annual Program Report indicates what has been learned from survey data.

(3) Results of follow-up data on initial teacher completers that was collected by the state for 2009-2010. These surveys were conducted by the state, but were not available to the offsite team during its meeting.

The report on this state survey was not available at the time of the writing of the WKU IR. Please follow this link, [2009-10 EPSB Teacher Survey Results](#), to see the results, which indicate that on all Kentucky Standards and indicators, WKU students average at least 3 or higher on a scale of 1= Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, and 4 = Excellent.

(4) *Data on initial and advanced programs for teachers. What do the student learning data show about candidates' impact on student learning?*

In our Institutional Report, Standard 1, sections 1d and 1f, and Standard 3, section 3c, describe how we measure our candidates' impact on student learning. Most of these measures are indirect, in that as we assess our candidates' proficiency in developing assessment plans and analyzing student learning within Teacher Work Samples or other critical performances, we assume that we are assessing their ability to positively impact student learning. However, in [Developing an "In-House" Web-Based Accountability System](#), we report early work to measure impact on student learning within the Teacher Work Sample. Also, as reported on pages 17-18 ("Teacher Work Sample Results: Impact on P-12 Student Learning") of the [WKU 2009-10 Unit Wide Assessment Report](#), we have developed a process to collect and analyze these data. Clearly, both early and more recent results show that our candidates make positive impact on student learning. However, more time and thought must be invested in how best to use such results to make judgments about the quality of our programs.

What are the scales for the assessments identified in Table J and elsewhere? What is the scale and range for scores that are presented as mean scores?

For all tables with assessment results throughout the IR, a brief description regarding the scale for each assessment is provided. But for the most part, assessment and surveys follow a 4-point scale of 1 = Poor, Not Met, or Beginning, 2 = Fair, Partially Met, or Developing, 3 = Good, At Standard, or Proficient, and 4 = Excellent, Above Standard, or Exemplary. The only exception to this rule is that *indicators* within the Teacher Work Sample components are on a 3 point scale of 1 = Not Met, 2 = Partially Met, and 3 = Met. This exception is described in the appropriate sections of the IR. In some data tables, percentages are presented. In these cases, the percentages represent the number of candidates who achieved some target level on a particular assessment. The target level is always provided in the paragraphs preceding each table.

What data exist for 2009-2010?

As in earlier years, the [WKU 2009-10 Unit Wide Assessment Report](#) summarizes all data for initial preparation programs. Additionally, [Annual Program Report](#) data for the 2009-10 academic year are available for each program. To make finding these data simpler, the following tables are provided with "Y" indicating that a link to an annual report is available at the [Annual Program Report](#) website, "N" indicating no annual report is available, and "IP" indicating that the report is in progress. The comments section provides an explanation for programs with missing or no reports or with special reports.

Table A1. Initial Teacher Preparation Programs

Program Name	2009-10 APR	2008-09 APR	2007-08 APR	Comments
Interdisc. Early Child. Ed.	Y	Y	Y	Reports available for both UG and GR IP programs.
Elementary Ed.	Y	Y	Y	
Middle Grades Ed.	Y	Y	Y	
<i>Secondary School for Grades 8-12</i>				
Biological Science	Y	N	N	2009-10 is the first report for this program.
Chemistry	Y	Y	N	2008-09 is the first report for this program.
Earth Science	N	N	N	Insufficient candidate numbers for reporting purposes. However, candidates are reported within the larger Secondary Education Annual Program Report.
English	Y	Y	Y	
Mathematics	Y	Y	N	2008-09 is the first report for this program.

Physics	N	N	N	Insufficient candidate numbers for reporting purposes. However, candidates are reported within the larger Secondary Education Annual Program Report.
Social Studies	Y	Y	N	2008-09 is the first report for this program.
<i>Certificates for Grades 5-12</i>				
Agriculture	IP	N	N	2009-10 is the first report for this program. It is "in progress" because of a recent faculty resignation.
Business/Market Ed.	Y	Y	Y	
Family/Cons. Science	Y	N	N	2009-10 is the first report for this program.
Occupation-Based Career & Technical Education (formerly Industrial Education)	N	N	N	Insufficient candidate numbers for reporting purposes.
Technology Education	N	N	N	Insufficient candidate numbers for reporting purposes.
<i>Certificates for All Grade Levels</i>				
Art	Y	N	N	2009-10 is the first report for this program.
French	Y	Y	N	2008-09 is the first report for this program (under Modern Languages).
German	Y	Y	N	2008-09 is the first report for this program (under Modern Languages).
Health Ed.	N	Y	N	Insufficient 2009-10 candidate numbers for reporting purposes.
Music Ed. (Instrumental, Integrated, & Vocal)	Y	Y	Y	
Physical Ed.	Y	Y	N	2008-09 is the first report for this program.
Sch. Media Librarian	Y	Y	Y	
Spanish	Y	Y	N	2008-09 is the first report for this program (under Modern Languages).
<i>Exceptional Children Grades P-12</i>				
Comm. Disorders	Y	Y	Y	
Exceptional Ed. (LBD/MSD)	Y	Y	Y	

Table A2. Advanced Preparation and Endorsement Programs

Program Name	2009-10 APR	2008-09 APR	2007-08 APR	Comments
<i>Endorsements</i>				
English as a Second Language	N	N	N	As this is a 12 hour endorsement, we have not required an annual report.
Environmental Education	N	N	N	As this is a 12 hour endorsement, we have not required an annual report.
Gifted Education	N	N	N	As this is a 12 hour endorsement, we have not required an annual report.
Instructional Computer Technology	N	N	N	As this is a 12 hour endorsement, we have not required an annual report.
Literacy (Read/Write)	IP	Y	Y	As this endorsement includes a WKU Master's program, we require an annual report.
<i>Teacher Leader Master's Programs</i>				
Elementary Education	N	N	N	All of these programs are new as of January, 2011. Critical performance and other program measures are under development.
Middle Grades Ed.	N	N	N	
Secondary Education	N	N	N	

5-12 Education	N	N	N	All of these programs are new as of January, 2011. Critical performance and other program measures are under development.
P-12 Education	N	N	N	
Learning Behavior Dis.	N	N	N	
Moderate Severe Dis.	N	N	N	
English	N	N	N	
Mathematics	N	N	N	
Physical Ed.	N	N	N	
<i>Other Advanced Programs</i>				
Sch. Media Librarian	Y	Y	Y	
Educational Leadership	Y	Y	Y	
<i>Other Instructional Services</i>				
Individual Intellectual Assessment	N	N	N	As this is a 12 hour endorsement, we have not required an annual report.
School Counseling	Y	Y	Y	
School Psychology	Y	Y	Y	

Why are data not presented for consecutive years for each program?

Tables A1 and A2 provide a clearer indication of when Annual Program Reports have been completed for each program. As our NCATE Annual Reports reveal, since our last NCATE on-site visit, programs have been collecting and reporting assessment data to the CEBS Associate Dean assigned as the NCATE Coordinator as he compiled these reports. Much of these data were gathered within an early version of the WKU E-PASS electronic accountability system developed in the late 1990's. However, when a new associate dean arrived in 2007 and wrote that year's NCATE Annual Report (PEDS Part C) as well as the first [Unit Wide Assessment Report](#) for Initial Preparation Programs, it became clear that although all programs were collecting some assessment data, there was no systematic process in place to ensure all programs were collected all the assessment data the unit envisioned in its Conceptual Framework. Thus, in fall 2007, the associate dean crafted the WKU Professional Education Unit Continuous Assessment Plan (CAP) that was then reviewed and adopted by the WKU Professional Education Council. He then began working with individual program coordinators to develop [Program Assessment Plans](#) that lived out the CAP. He also then developed an annual process whereby program coordinators, along with program faculty, wrote the Annual Program Reports delineated in Tables A1 and A2. As with all new processes, some programs, especially those with large numbers of candidates and several program faculty, were more prepared to lead the way in these efforts; programs with smaller candidate numbers and fewer faculty needed more time to identify assessment points and, in particular, had to deal with the potential for disclosing students' identities in reporting, as well as how to make data-based decisions on the assessment of so few students. Regardless, even for programs that did not prepare an annual report, program level data have been collected and provided to program coordinators for analysis and reflection since 2008. And it should be noted that even for initial programs that have not completed annual reports, their data have been aggregated at the unit level within the yearly [Unit-Wide Assessment Reports](#), as well as disaggregated at the program type level (Elementary, Middle Grades, Secondary, P-12, 5-12, IECE, and Exceptional Education) within these reports. Furthermore, advanced preparation programs have consistently provided program data within either the Annual Program Reports and/or for the NCATE Annual Reports.

What evidence indicates that candidates learn to be reflective?

Every program has developed assessments related to Kentucky Teacher Standard 7 – Reflection. Also programs collect dispositions evidence on candidates related to “Professionalism - Commitment to Reflection and Growth.” Evidence related to candidate development of reflection is reported in the following places in the WKU IR:

- Tables H1-2 – WKU New Teacher Survey Results (KTS 7)
- Table I – Advanced Teacher Preparation Survey Results (KTS 7)
- 1a.3 – Describes the EDU 501 and EDU 596/598 portfolio process that would include KTS 7
- Tables K1-3 – Teacher Work Sample Results (KTS 7)
- Tables L1-2 – Student Teaching Evaluation Results (KTS 7)
- Tables M1-3 – Teacher Work Sample Results (TWS Component “Reflection and Self-Evaluation”)
- Tables O1-2 – Education Professional Standards Board New Teacher Survey (Reflection)
- 3c.3 – Describes candidate reflection as part of field and clinical experiences
- 3c.5 – Describes candidate reflection related to student learning
- Tables S1-4 – Initial Preparation Dispositions Data (Professionalism)
- Table T – Advanced Preparation Dispositions Data (Professionalism)

How does the unit know that candidates have developed proficiencies in the use of technology; considering school, family, and community contexts; and other areas at the target level?

For technology, every program has developed assessments related to Kentucky Teacher Standard 6 – Technology. For school, family, and community contexts, every program has developed assessments related to Kentucky Teacher Standard 1 – Content Knowledge, which includes indicators 1.2: Connects content to life experiences of students and 1.4: Guides students to understand content from various perspectives, Kentucky Teacher Standard 2 – Designs and Plans Instruction, which includes indicators 2.2: Uses contextual data to design instruction relevant to students and 2.4: Plans instructional strategies and activities that address learning objectives for all students, and Kentucky Teacher Standard 8 – Collaboration. Evidence related to candidate development in these areas is reported in the following places in the WKU IR:

- Tables H1-2 – WKU New Teacher Survey Results (KTS 1,2,6, & 8)
- Table I – Advanced Teacher Preparation Survey Results (KTS 1,2,6, & 8)
- 1a.3 – Describes the EDU 501 and EDU 596/598 portfolio process that would include KTS 1,2,6, and 8)
- Tables K1-3 – Teacher Work Sample Results (KTS 1,2, & 6)
- Tables L1-2 – Student Teaching Evaluation Results (KTS 1,2,6, & 8)
- Tables M1-3 – Teacher Work Sample Results (TWS Components “Contextual Factors,” “Learning Goals,” and “Design for Instruction”)
- Tables O1-2 – Education Professional Standards Board New Teacher Survey (In particular, Contextual Information, Connecting to Real Life, and Collaboration)

In addition, the [WKU 2009-10 Unit Wide Assessment Report](#) includes more current information regarding candidate performance on Kentucky Teacher Standards 1, 2, 6, and 8, as measured by the WKU New Teacher Survey Results and Student Teacher Evaluation. Furthermore, this report indicates that nearly 100% of candidates are scoring proficient on Teacher Work Samples components associated with KTS 1, 2, and 6 (e.g., see [WKU 2009-10 Unit Wide Assessment Report](#), Table 12).

What happens to candidates when assessments are incomplete or candidates are not performing at acceptable levels?

Because critical performance (CP) assessments are embedded within courses, students who do not complete them receive a course grade of “Incomplete” until they upload the CP. Every CP prompt and rubric informs students that “completion and uploading of this performance into the electronic portfolio is

a requirement for a passing grade.” It is at the each faculty member’s discretion whether the student must earn a passing grade on the CP in order to pass the course. However, the Professional Education Council adopted a [Transitions Points](#) document in spring 2008 that delineates levels of proficiency that candidates must achieve in order to move through programs. Then, program coordinators worked with program faculty to adopt and/or adapt these transition points based on the unique qualities of their program. For each major transition, they also delineated “remediation opportunities” (See individual [Program Assessment Plans](#) for descriptions of these opportunities.). For the most part, candidates who were not successful on CPs were encouraged to reach proficiency before completing each course. Those who did not could move forward but would be stopped at the next transition point if their average performance on CPS associated with each Kentucky Teacher Standard or average disposition ratings were below the acceptable level. Because of the size of our initial preparation program and consequences once the Transition Points document was put into effect, the PEC revised the [Transitions Points](#) document in fall 2010 to provide the Professional Education Unit a more consistent and systematic way to remediate candidates who were nearing the student teaching phase of their program but were below proficiency on one or more Kentucky Teacher Standards. In essence, candidates develop a remediation plan where they delineate how they plan to improve their proficiency during the student teaching experience. For dispositions, the Director of Teacher Services continues to work one-on-one with candidates who have only few low dispositions ratings, but calls on program faculty and the Professional Education Council for advice or a final decision for those candidates with a consistent record of low dispositions ratings.

(5) Annual Program reports on other school professional programs. What is being learned from these data?

Each program reports what has been learned in [Annual Program Reports](#) (See Communication Disorders, School Psychology, Educational Administration, Leadership, and Research, School Counseling, Library Media Education, and School Psychology).

(6) Assessment plan and critical performance measures for the redesigned master’s program. What are the Critical Performance measures for this master’s program?

The following [Critical Performances](#) were proposed when WKU presented its Teacher Leader proposal to the Education Professional Standards Board. Although these original CPs have continued to inform the development of the actual CPs, faculty concluded that the originals did not really assess advanced levels of the Kentucky Teacher Standards. Thus, the [TCHL 500 CP](#) that has been adopted and added to WKU E-PASS requires advanced teacher preparation candidates to assess and plan professional development through the lens of the Kentucky Teacher Standards at the advanced level. The CPs for [TCHL 540](#), [TCHL 544](#), and [TCHL 548](#) have been similarly improved. The other CPs associated with the Teacher Leader Program will be finalized and added to WKU E-PASS when these courses are taught for the first time.

(7) Follow-up on IECE program assessments and pass rate. What assessments are used for this program? How are candidates performing on these assessments?

Three years of [Annual Program Reports](#) are available for the IECE Initial Preparation program at other the Undergraduate and Graduate Levels. The BOE team would benefit by meeting with Vicki Stayton and Sylvia Dietrich about this program.

(8) *Data system for indicating that initial teacher candidates and advanced teaching candidates are meeting the 10 Kentucky Teacher Standards and the dispositions articulated in the conceptual framework. What assessments are used? How and when are data collected? How are the data used?*

Please see [PowerPoint presentations](#) on our website that describe aspects of the WKU E-PASS system. We also plan to demonstrate the system on the Sunday, March 27, 2011 once the on-site BOE team arrives.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

2.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs corrected from last visit:

AFI	Apply to	AFI Rationale
Assessment system data are not used to inform unit operations.	ADV	Documentation from agendas and minutes of faculty meetings and Annual Program and Annual Unit-Wide Assessment Reports provide evidence that the unit regularly and systematically uses data to evaluate and make changes in courses, programs, and clinical experiences.

AFIs continued from last visit:

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
Not all programs use the unit assessment system to aggregate, analyze, and report candidate data.	ADV	Evidence not found that this AFI has been corrected.
Inconsistencies exist in providing feedback to inform programs across the unit.	ITP,ADV	Evidence not found that this AFI has been corrected.

Again, Tables A1 and A2 provide a clearer indication of when [Annual Program Reports](#) have been completed for each program. As our NCATE Annual Reports reveal, since our last NCATE on-site visit, programs have been collecting and reporting assessment data to the CEBS Associate Dean assigned as the NCATE Coordinator as he compiled these reports. Much of these data were gathered within an early version of the WKU E-PASS electronic accountability system developed in the late 1990’s. However, when a new associate dean arrived in 2007 and wrote that year’s NCATE Annual Report (PEDS Part C) as well as the first [Unit Wide Assessment Report](#) for Initial Preparation Programs, it became clear that although all programs were collecting some assessment data, there was no systematic process in place to ensure all programs were collected all the assessment data the unit envisioned in its Conceptual Framework. Thus, in fall 2007, the associate dean crafted the WKU Professional Education Unit Continuous Assessment Plan (CAP) that was then reviewed and adopted by the WKU Professional Education Council. He then began working with individual program coordinators to develop [Program Assessment Plans](#) that lived out the CAP. He also then developed an annual process whereby program coordinators, along with program faculty, wrote the Annual Program Reports delineated in Tables A1 and A2. As with all new processes, some programs, especially those with large numbers of candidates and several program faculty, were more prepared to lead the way in these efforts; programs with smaller candidate numbers and fewer faculty needed more time to identify assessment points and, in particular, had to deal with the potential for disclosing students’ identities in reporting, as well as how to make data-based decisions on the assessment of so few students. Regardless, even for programs that did not prepare an annual reports, program level data have been collected and provided to program coordinators for

analysis and reflection since 2008. And it should be noted that even for initial programs that have not completed annual reports, their data have been aggregated at the unit level within the yearly [Unit-Wide Assessment Reports](#), as well as disaggregated at the program type level (Elementary, Middle Grades, Secondary, P-12, 5-12, IECE, and Exceptional Education) within these reports. Furthermore, advanced preparation programs have consistently provided program data within either the Annual Program Reports above and/or for the NCATE Annual Reports.

The annual reporting process is now cyclical and systematic, with the CEBS Associate Dean for Accountability and Research and the Manager of the Education Technology Center (and developer of WKU E-PASS) working together each summer to extract all the assessment data from the previous year. The associate dean then disaggregates the various datasets by program type (Elementary, Music, etc.) and level (Initial Preparation or Advanced Preparation) and provides these to each education program coordinator. The coordinator works with other program faculty to report the data within the [Annual Program Reports](#), as well as reflect on the data for program evaluation and decisions about program improvement.

2.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) *System for collecting, aggregating and reporting data at transition points. Why are data for each standard/values of each component not reported by all programs for consecutive years? Are programs on different reporting cycles? Is there a report that compiles the data at a unit level?*

See the information provided under 2.3 above.

- (2) *Process and procedures for ensuring “consistency in assessment” and “fairness in assessment.” How are these verified across the range of assessments used at both the initial and advanced preparation levels? (also relates to Standard 1)*

In our [Continuous Assessment Plan](#), we describe our process for ensuring consistency and fairness in assessment. As described in that document,

To ensure accuracy and fairness of assessments, critical performances are developed by all faculty members who frequently teach a particular course. They also work together to develop descriptive scoring rubrics and to determine which Kentucky Teacher Standard(s) the assessment measures. Use of descriptive rubrics represents best educational practice for consistent scoring of performance assessments in that behaviors or skills for each performance level are fully described so that assessors are less likely to use extraneous behaviors or “impressions” to score candidate performance. The use of multiple assessments and evaluation tools ensures that candidates are given every opportunity to demonstrate proficiency.

An example of WKU’s commitment to “accuracy, fairness, and consistency” has been the resources and research it has invested to ensure that these qualities exist in its development and scoring of the TWS, the culminating performance for initial preparation programs. Historically, research (Denner et al., 2004) has determined that educators view the TWS as a valid measure of key skills that prospective teachers need to be successful and that, with training, even raters from different institutions can independently reach agreement on the level of candidate proficiency. Currently, WKU has instituted a yearly process by which all TWS are scored by two additional independent trained scorers beyond the faculty of record. Research at WKU and other TWS institutions consistently demonstrate the validity of the TWS instrument and the ability of scorers to reach acceptable levels of agreement regarding candidate performance (Denner, Norman, & Lin, 2007; Norman, 2007).

Since that document was written the professional education faculty have continued to conduct additional TWS research related to validity and reliability (Kirchner, Evans, & Norman, 2010; Norman, Evans, & Pankratz, 2011; Stobaugh, Tassell, & Norman, 2010). These studies have led professional education faculty from across campus and in conjunction with P-12 practitioners and administrators to revise the TWS in the fall 2010. Faculty review of data from the fall led to additional modifications this spring.

A similar process of broad professional education faculty and P-12 practitioner involvement in developing the new Teacher Leader program also demonstrates our commitment to accuracy, fairness, and consistency. This program and proposed assessments were developed based on data collected from teachers and administrators in our service region, many of whom also worked alongside faculty during actual development of the program. Furthermore, the EPSB review committee that approved our Teacher Leader framework had strong representation from the P-12 community. As we have begun developing the critical performances for this program, teams of faculty across subject areas and grade levels have worked on each, and these teams have used the Kentucky Teacher Standards (Advanced Level Preparation Indicators) to create the criteria by which to assess each critical performance.

We also ensure fairness in that program faculty and/or the Professional Education Council work toward consensus regarding the continued progress of students. Opportunities for remediation at major transition points allow candidates to make their case that they are making progress to standards and values outlined in our Conceptual Framework. Thus, no one faculty member or poor CP performance and disposition assessment is able to stop a candidates' progress without consensus from other program faculty or program representatives on the Professional Education Council.

(3) Exit, alumni, and employer surveys. Where are follow-up data for each program? How generic are the data collected across programs? What are the differences across programs? (Tables 5 and 6 suggest that different assessments are required by different programs.) What is the unit learning from employers about the competence of completers?

Follow up survey for initial programs are conducted annually both internally and at the state level. State level surveys not only include alumni but also mentor teachers and university supervisors who worked with alumni as they complete the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program. These first year teachers are also assessed on all Kentucky Teacher Standards during their internship. Results from these assessments are reported in Tables Q1-2 of the WKU IR. All program completers receive the same survey that is based on the Kentucky Teacher Standards. In fact, last year the state changed its survey to align with the Kentucky Teacher Standards so we can more easily compare our internal results with state results. As reported earlier, [2009-10 EPSB Teacher Survey Results](#) indicate that on all Kentucky Standards and indicators WKU students average at least 3 or higher on a scale of 1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, and 4 = Excellent.

Follow-up data for advanced teaching and other school professional programs were reported in the WKU IR under the following heading and table: 1e.3 and Table I. Also, each program reports what has been learned from survey results in [Annual Program Reports](#) (See Communication Disorders, School Psychology, Educational Administration, Leadership, and Research, School Counseling, Library Media Education, and School Psychology). As can be seen, all other school professional programs complete some combination of exit, employer, or alumni survey on an annual basis. Year to year results indicate that survey respondents believe that our candidates are meeting program standards. Until recently, alumni surveys for advanced teaching programs were conducted every two years. However, once we began work on the Teacher Leader master's program and collected data in Table I to guide curriculum development, no further follow-up studies were conducted as these "old programs" were to be discontinued by

December 2010. In the future, we will administer exit or alumni surveys to the graduates from our Teacher Leader programs in a manner similar to what all our other advanced preparation programs do.

Although all other school professional programs can demonstrate alignment between their program standards and the Kentucky Teacher Standards, because of the unique qualities and goals of these programs, exit/follow-up surveys results are not comparable across programs. However, each program's Annual Program Report indicates what has been learned from survey data.

Table 5 indicates the various Praxis content exams required by the state for each program, so these assessments logically could not be the same. Although Table 6 indicates some differences in program requirements across advanced program, these reflect unique programs (especially other school professionals) that are not easily comparable. However, all initial preparation programs have similar transition points. At the advanced teacher preparation level, what differences may have existed have been replaced by common entrance, program progress, and exit standards for all the programs under the Teacher Leader framework.

(4) Instrument(s) used to evaluate unit operations. What evaluations of unit operations have been conducted over the past few years? What has the unit learned from these evaluations?

Each year, the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences (CEBS) as a whole, as well as education programs both within CEBS or housed elsewhere, develops [Action Plans](#) based on the goals and indicators of the WKU Strategic Plan. These plans require identifying annual goals, criteria for success, measures of success, and targets/benchmarks of success. At the end of the year, CEBS and other programs “close the loop” by reporting and reflecting on collected data to establish goals for improvement. As can be seen in the each [Action Plan](#), because the CEBS Dean is the head of the WKU Professional Education Unit, the CEBS action plans include goals and their evaluation related to professional education. Professional education data collected within these plans and used to improve unit operations have included surveys of faculty needs related to education technology and faculty satisfaction related to services and support provided by the CEBS Associate Dean/NCATE Coordinator.

Additionally, since fall 2007 the CEBS Associate Dean/NCATE Coordinator presents data from and provides a copy of the [Annual Unit-Wide Assessment Reports](#) to the Professional Education Council (PEC) and the WKU deans from colleges that house professional education programs. He encourages the PEC and deans to share these data with faculty. Although, these reports consist mostly of assessment data, the CEBS Associate Dean also includes a section entitled, “Key Decisions Made and to be Considered” (only available in unabridged copies of the reports on campus) that discuss issues related to unit operations that need to be addressed.

(5) Annual Unit-Wide Assessment Reports for advanced preparation. What reports exist for advanced teaching and other school professionals?

An annual unit-wide assessment report has not been developed for advanced teacher preparation programs beyond what is reported in the NCATE Annual Reports. A unit-wide report for other school professionals does not seem feasible because each program focuses more specifically on program level standards, and programs produce candidates who serve such different roles in schools. Also, these programs have unique courses, CP assessments, and faculty. Thus, we have focused on Annual Program Reports that allow other school professional programs to focus on their program standards (that are aligned to the Kentucky Teacher Standards).

- (6) *Operation of the unit assessment system. What evidence documents that all programs at the initial and advanced preparation levels collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data? What evidence documents that all programs at the initial and advanced preparation levels use the unit assessment system to aggregate, analyze, and report candidate data?*

Please see [PowerPoint presentations](#) on our website that describe aspects of the WKU E-PASS system. We also plan to demonstrate the system on the Sunday, March 27, 2011 once the on-site BOE team arrives.

- (7) *Use of data to inform all programs at both the initial and advanced preparation levels. What data are reviewed by faculty? How often? What changes have resulted from the review of assessment data at the advanced level?*

Please see [PowerPoint presentations](#) on our website that describe aspects of the WKU E-PASS system. We also plan to demonstrate the system on the Sunday, March 27, 2011 once the on-site BOE team arrives. But in summary, faculty members have instant electronic access via the internet to all assessment data with the Accountability System portion of WKU E-PASS. However, program level data are provided to each program coordinator on an annual basis. They work with other program faculty to reflect on data for program evaluation and improvement, written up in the [Annual Program Reports](#).

- (8) *Disaggregated data for online and alternate route programs. What data indicates how candidates in these programs are performing on assessments? What has the unit learned from the data?*

Unlike some institutions, we have no parallel programs where some candidates might complete an on-line version of a program while others complete a campus version. Programs that are completely on-line are only offered in this venue; other programs that are partially on-line typically have some courses that students complete on line with other courses taken on-campus by students. Thus, there are no two versions of programs where students can be disaggregated for comparison. Assessment information about alternate route candidates is described in 1a.3. Furthermore, 2b.2 describes the challenges we have had disaggregating data, especially at the graduate level, and steps we are taking to resolve these challenges.

However, we are able to disaggregate candidate performance based on those who enroll in a particular course on-line versus face-to-face. Table A3 below presents the 2009-10 candidate proficiency rates by Kentucky Teacher Standards on critical performances in each course venue. It should be noted that regardless of course type all candidates complete the same critical performance for any given course. For each critical performance, standards-based rubrics are used to evaluate candidate performance at four levels: 1 – Beginning, 2 – Developing, 3 – Proficient, and 4 – Exemplary. Candidates receiving an overall rating of 3 or 4 on a CP are considered to have “passed” the standards associated with the CP. Clearly, candidates in both course venues are scoring equally well.

Table A3. Percent of Students by Course Venue Scoring Proficient on CPs by KTS (2009-10)

Course Venue	Kentucky Teacher Standards*									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Face-to-Face	97%	98%	100%	97%	98%	98%	98%	100%	97%	--
On-line	97%	98%	100%	96%	98%	99%	99%	96%	100%	94%

*KTS Key: 1 – Content Knowledge, 2 – Designs/Plans Instruction, 3 – Maintains Learning Climate, 4 – Implements/Manages Instruction, 5 – Assessment/Evaluation, 6 – Technology, 7 – Reflection, 8 – Collaboration, 9 – Professional Development, 10 – Leadership

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

3.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) *Preparation of candidates for their field experiences. How do instructors prepare candidates to “use a variety of scenarios to orient candidates to the classroom prior to actual field experiences?” What are some examples? How does the unit ensure that all candidates have access to these scenarios?*

In early field experiences, candidates mainly observe or provide minor aid to teachers as requested. All students are prepared for these experiences by being reminded of expectations of professional behavior. Additionally, in the introductory course for all undergraduate initial preparation programs, EDU 250/MGE 275, a common textbook has been adopted for all sections of the course. The textbook contains a variety of scenarios that apply to the P-12 classroom (both written and on DVD). Instructors also use the supplemental videos to facilitate class discussion of current issues in the P-12 classroom, including ones from the KTIP program and YouTube (e.g. "Power Teaching"). Teacher candidates read or view the scenarios and engage in small and whole group discussions where they critique the scenario and make connections to the Kentucky Teacher Standards. Since all instructors of the course are educators, they are also able to use scenarios from their personal experiences to enrich and clarify issues in education. Additionally, teacher candidates are encouraged to share their personal experiences related to the topic being discussed. For example, students are asked to identify the characteristics of their most effective teachers, and these characteristics are used as a springboard to discuss the Kentucky Teacher Standards and what they should be observing in the field setting. This cross-referencing among text/video, storytelling and personal experiences of teacher candidates enables them to view the topic from different perspectives and gain a deeper understanding of educational issues that affect teachers and students.

For specific field experiences identified by each program in its Program Assessment Plan, faculty go over the dispositions form and alert candidates of behavioral expectations that will be rated using the dispositions forms. As candidates progress into later field experiences where they are expected to teach lessons, faculty provide candidates opportunities to develop lessons using templates and other guides and then provide classroom time for such activities as peer/group teaching, coaching, and presentations to acclimate candidates to the responsibilities they will encounter in the classroom.

In terms of actual student teaching placement, the Director of Teacher Services conducts an Orientation to Student Teaching for all student teachers each semester prior to our students going out into their assigned schools the following semester. He also meets each semester with the university supervisors of student teaching to ensure their understanding of the needs and responsibilities of the student teachers.

- (2) *Field experiences and clinical practice with students from diverse groups. How does the unit systematically verify, validate, and record candidate participation in diverse and multiple settings? How does the unit track these placements? What are the requirements for advanced programs? What are the requirements for advanced teaching? What is the status of the SKyTeach program? What are the required field experiences and clinical practice for Sky Teach?*

As stated in WKU IR 3c.6, to ensure that all our program candidates work with diverse students, every program has identified in its [Program Assessment Plan](#) at least one clinical field placement or other related experience as the designated experience where candidates are placed in diverse settings. Typically, this field placement is associated with a core course that all candidates in that program are required to take. To provide guidance for programs to choose sites, we determined our most diverse settings by averaging the ethnic diversity of the schools in our service area (about 11%) and designating schools that exceed this percentage as “diverse.” These schools also include students with

exceptionalities and students from diverse linguistic and socioeconomic groups. The diversity of these placements is ensured because the identified courses have been reported to the Office of Teacher Services Field Placement Coordinator, who places students in these courses only in schools that have been designated “diverse.” For students who enroll in these courses at our off-site campuses, field coordinators have been provided a least of the most diverse schools surrounding these campuses for student placement.

Other school professional programs were required to make the same determination of at least one diverse placement/experience. The new Teacher Leader advanced teaching programs have also been designed to address the issue of diversity through Professional Learning Communities where teachers in less diverse schools will collaborate and communicate with teachers in more diverse schools.

Within WKU E-PASS records are kept of designated student field experience placements and their self-report in terms of the diversity of the experience. However, the very reason that programs identified a core “diverse” placement was because it was otherwise nearly impossible to track the diversity of placements at an individual level. Although we believe that, as WKU IR Table Y attests, that candidates are provided multiple opportunities to learn about diversity and work in diverse settings, the above “at least one diverse setting” policy was our way to guarantee that all candidates have diverse experiences prior to program completion.

The SKyTeach program has been fully approved through the WKU university curriculum process and has been approved by the state. It is now the program for all middle and secondary education candidates who choose to pursue math or science for certification. From its inception, SKyTeach was designed with early and diverse field placements in mind. As with all our programs, SKyTeach has identified the required core course, SMED 320, as its “diverse” placement. However, even its introductory courses, SMED 101 and SMED 102, where students learn how to conduct a lesson and actually teach the lesson in schools under supervision by SKyTeach master teachers (associated with WKU) and the cooperating teacher, these candidates are teaching these lessons in our most diverse schools.

(3) Sample of the “field summary report” form and field experience “guidelines” that the OTS and course instructor prepare for the cooperating teachers. Are the same guidelines used across courses and programs? If not, why not? Who reviews these forms and guidelines? How is the information used?

The Field Summary Report Form can be viewed at our [Unit Wide Forms](#) webpage. Forms and guidelines provided to cooperating teachers and university supervisors can be found in the [Student Teaching Handbook](#). All initial preparation programs use the same handbook. These forms are periodically reviewed by the Director of Teacher Services, the Director of the School of Teachers, the Professional Education Council, and faculty to improve the quality of the guidelines and forms and to strengthen the teacher preparation programs.

(4) Procedure if a candidate has an unsuccessful field or clinical experience. How does the unit monitor success? What steps are taken if a candidate is not being successful?

Formally, many field experiences include the assessment of student dispositions. Dispositions are reviewed at each program transition point with candidates having to demonstrate established levels in order to continue in the program. As was described earlier, because of the size of our initial preparation program and consequences once the Transition Points document was put into effect, the PEC revised the [Transitions Points](#) document in fall 2010 to provide the Professional Education Unit a more consistent and systematic way to remediate candidates who were nearing the student teaching phase of their program but were below proficiency on one or more Kentucky Teacher Standards or dispositions. In essence, candidates develop a remediation plan where they delineate how they plan to improve their proficiency

during the student teaching experience. For dispositions, the Director of Teacher Services continues to work one-on-one with candidates who have only few low dispositions ratings, but calls on program faculty and the Professional Education Council for advice or a final decision for those candidates with a consistent record of low dispositions ratings. Additionally, candidates who do not have an initially successful student teaching or clinical experience have the opportunity to work with program coordinators and/or the Director of Teacher Services to attempt the clinical experience a second time with stronger monitoring and support systems in place. Candidates who continue to be unsuccessful are removed from the experience and advised out of the education preparation program.

- (5) *Orientation sessions for supervising teachers. What orientations are provided? What is the content of those orientation sessions?*

Following selection of outstanding individuals who are experienced educators to serve as university supervisors for student teachers, the Director of Teacher Services meets individually with these new hires to introduce the process, provide and explain the forms used, and to orient them to the process. As indicated earlier, the Director also provides an update orientation every semester for our supervising teachers. This involves about 50 retired P-12 teachers and administrators as well as a good sampling of university professors. [Agendas](#) for university supervisors and student teachers are available for review in the NCATE document room.

- (6) *Development of technology skills by candidates in alternate route programs. How does the unit ensure that these candidates are using technology in their field experiences and clinical practice?*

Candidates are only admitted into the alternate route program if they have been hired as the teacher of record in a school setting. As the Alternate Route [Program Assessment Plan](#) indicates, during their program students complete a Kentucky Teacher Standards based Professional Growth Plan during EDU 501 and then create a portfolio indicating their proficiency on all ten standards in EDU 596. Kentucky Teacher Standard 6 is dedicated to teachers using technology in the classroom. Furthermore, all candidates begin a Teacher Work Sample in EDU 520 that they complete and implement in EDU 590, which includes how candidates use technology in instruction, as well as how they analyze student learning results to improve instruction.

- (7) *Understandings between advanced teacher leader programs and their P-12 or community professional partners. What written understandings exist?*

WKU's [Teacher Leader Proposal](#), submitted to the Kentucky EPSB, includes Table J1. Memorandum of Agreement District List (p. 72) that identifies all the agreements we have on file from the various school districts in our service area.

- (8) *Samples of advanced teacher leader candidate's professional growth plan. What are the requirements for these growth plans? How are they being used by programs?*

As our Teacher Leader programs will have only begun in spring 2011, few professional growth plans may have been uploaded into WKU E-PASS by the time of the BOE team visit. However, the [TCHL 500 CP](#) has been adopted and was added to WKU E-PASS for the winter 2011 semester. This critical performance requires advanced teacher preparation candidates to assess and plan professional development through the lens of the Kentucky Teacher Standards at the advanced level. A review of this CP will show the requirements of the professional growth plan and how this plan will be used to guide each candidate's program of study.

Standard 4: Diversity

4.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) Links to the institution's diversity plan and recruitment/retention practices. These links were not working at the time of the offsite meeting. What information do those sites contain related to this standard?

As WKU IR 4c.3 describes, Goals 2 and 3 of WKU's strategic plan, [Challenging the Spirit](#), are to “grow a high quality, diverse, and engaged student body” and “enhance academic excellence through premier faculty and staff (which includes efforts to diversify faculty and staff). The university’s Chief Diversity Officer, Dr. Richard Miller, has promoted these goals through hiring policies and financial incentives. However, a specific diversity plan is still in development. The BOE team would benefit by meeting with Dr. Miller and members of the diversity plan committee to discuss WKU’s progress in developing this plan and particular policies, activities, and incentives that will be provided to help WKU reach its diversity goals.

(2) Goals and activities of the following groups that contribute to addressing diversity: International Committee, Male Leadership Academy, Multicultural Cadet Corp, and Future Education Association. How does the dual credit introduction to education course contribute to increasing candidate diversity?

The BOE team would benefit by meeting with Dr. Fred Carter and Denise Hardesty in the Office of Teacher Services to learning more about these activities.

(3) The MERR director's recruitment and retention efforts. What efforts are underway? How effective have the efforts been over the past few years?

These efforts, conducted every year, are described in WKU IR 4c.3:

To promote the state’s Minority Educator Recruitment and Retention (MERR) Program, throughout the year the Center coordinator visits middle and high schools, as well as community colleges, to discuss education careers and make students aware of available scholarship dollars. The coordinator also participates in college fairs, open houses, and “Focus on Western” events, and hosts student groups on campus. The coordinator also works on a special project within the Young Male Leadership Academy, with a local high school on the Multicultural Cadet Corp, and with local Future Educator of America groups in an effort to “grow our own” future educators from diverse backgrounds. Such efforts typically bring in additional 12 or more diverse students per year.

To retain students, the coordinator offers support through ACT/PPST, Praxis II, résumé writing, and interview workshops (open to all, but targeted for these students), involving students in professional development, and meeting with them regularly. Furthermore, school district administrative personnel are invited to talk to students about their districts and what their districts have to offer them upon program completion. At any given time, about 30-35 WKU students are involved in the MERR program.

However, the BOE team would benefit by meeting with Denise Hardesty in the Office of Teacher Services to learning more about these activities.

(4) The incorporation of diversity in the Professional Certificate for Principals and GSKYTeach programs. What proficiencies related to diversity do candidates develop in these programs?

Within all of the Department of Educational Administration, Leadership, and Research [Program Review Documents](#), including the Professional Certificate for Principals documents, matrices show the alignment of the program to standards related to diversity. For example, candidates develop proficiencies in designing and monitoring programs based on diverse student needs, applying laws assuring equal education opportunities for all students, developing school community profiles in order to meet diverse student and community needs, and recruiting, selecting and retaining personnel to meet the needs of a diverse society.

The most focused attention to diversity in GSKyTeach is in the course SMED 530, Designing Instructions for Students with Special Needs and Promoting Literacy. In this course, candidates learn about the diverse needs of students and develop concepts of vocabulary, reading comprehension, and study skills for diverse populations. Teachers prepare and teach inquiry lessons with imbedded reading experiences that challenge, motivate, and involve diverse sets of students. Students investigate cooperative learning, cultural diversity, and use innovative technology that address diverse needs. Specific course objectives include:

1. Design instruction that will meet the literacy needs of diverse learners
2. Develop concepts of vocabulary, especially as it relates to specific math and science content for diverse learners
3. Develop the ability to promote reading/study skills in secondary science and math for diverse learners
4. Develop instructional strategies in the content areas of math and science that promote student achievement for all subgroups
5. Submit lesson plans and revise them using best practice in reading instruction for diverse learners in math and science

While completing this course, candidates teach four days a week in high school classes with more than 30 percent students from diverse backgrounds and practice various elements of instruction.

(5) The roles of the Administrative Leadership Institute, Green River Region initiative, Project TREE, and the Bowling Green After School initiatives in addressing diversity issues. How does the unit work with these initiatives to increase and retain diverse candidates and faculty in the unit?

The Department of Educational Administration, Leadership, and Research (EALR) is running the 12th consecutive cohort of the Administrative Leadership Institute (ALI), making a total of 154 minority participants over twelve years. ALI is a collaborative project between the Kentucky Department of Education, the Kentucky Alliance of Black School Educators, and Western Kentucky University, which pays tuition and related costs for minority educators working on leadership certifications.

EALR department faculty worked with two minority candidates in the Kentucky Department of Education's Superintendent Internship Program to complete certification. In both cases the participants received superintendent certification and went on to earn an Ed. D. degree in school leadership.

Finally, in collaboration with the Green River Region Educational Cooperative, the EALR department ran the Aspiring Principal Program for two years. The pilot program focused on methods to recruit and support diverse aspiring principals in rural districts, through tuition scholarships, school district commitment, and various approaches to course delivery leading to certification.

Project TREE was a “grow your own” project funded for four years by the Kentucky Department of Education. This project increased WKU’s presence in communities with large populations of underrepresented groups. WKU ran camps for middle school African-American males, with the first of these students coming to college in fall 2011. The camps were intended to encourage these students to pursue teaching careers, which many of them have stated as their intent. Although only time will tell, we believe that many of these students will choose to pursue education at WKU.

As mentioned in the WKU NCATE IR, the literacy program faculty has developed relationships with associations and organizations that are geared toward working with underrepresented groups, especially the Housing Authority of Bowling Green’s (HABG) Learning Center, which serves a population that represents 9 major ethnic groups with an overall 98% diverse population being served in the After School and Summer School programs. The HABG sets a goal of 100% postsecondary education for all learners it serves. Thus, not only do these programs allow WKU candidates to interact with and tutor students from diverse backgrounds, it also allows candidates to serve as role models and mentors for these diverse students and to encourage them to continue their pursuit of education beyond high school, and, of course, to consider WKU as a welcoming place to reach their educational goals.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

5.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) Reflection of the conceptual framework in instruction. How is the CF incorporated into instruction as shown in syllabi, assessments, or other sources?

As described in WKU IR 5b.1 and as illustrated in [course syllabi](#), faculty members incorporate key values, beliefs, and standards within their course descriptions, objectives, and assignments. Furthermore, based on program alignment processes, specific courses have core assessments, called critical performances, that are aligned to the Kentucky Teacher Standards (KTS). As can be seen by viewing any critical performance on the [Electronic Portfolio](#) portion of WKU E-PASS, the alignment of critical performance to KTS is clearly delineated on each CP. Program Assessment Plans also ensure that program faculty members coordinate their instruction and assessments so that every candidate learns about and has opportunity to demonstrate proficiency on each Kentucky Teacher Standard.

Although faculty are free to include CF and KTS language on their syllabi, and many do, we made a conscious decision not to require faculty to do so because of a sense that this would lead to a minimum compliance mentality. Instead we have focused efforts on actual evidence of each course’s contribution to the CF and KTS through the development of the Program Assessment Plans where the experiences and associates assessments for the course and their alignment to the KTS and/or other CF values are clearly articulated. The plans allow for verification that CF values and KTS are actually being addressed and assessed because we can go to the WKU E-PASS system to see the student uploads and faculty scores associated with them.

(2) Faculty scholarship. In what types of scholarship are faculty involved? How actively involved in scholarship are faculty members? How is the information on scholarly development being collected digitally? What is the unit learning from these data? How does this information inform the growth and improvement of faculty?

WKU IR 5c.2 and [Faculty Summary Information](#) describe faculty scholarship. As can be seen, faculty members are involved in publication of books and articles and various presentations. Within one calendar year, 70% of faculty reported scholarship activities. Although all faculty members must enter data into the Digital Measures system for their annual review, faculty can voluntarily choose to put in all their data

or some portion of it. Thus, 70% likely underestimates the portion of faculty involved in scholarship. It is hard to determine what the “unit” is learning from these data, but clearly growth in faculty scholarship is a requirement for tenure and promotion within the university. Clear procedures and policies are in place to inform faculty that they are meeting scholarship standards developed by each department. If faculty members fall below these standards, they develop growth plans that are reviewed and approved by department heads and deans (WKU IR 5e.2 and 5e.3).

Additionally, CEBS academic units have revised their tenure and promotion standards and have increased or refined expectations in these areas. Furthermore, WKU has placed greater emphasis on scholarship across the university, evidenced by the hiring of a Vice President for Research who will in coming weeks unveil a plan to encourage and support greater faculty activity in the areas of research, grant writing, and other forms of scholarship/creative activity.

As mentioned earlier, faculty involvement in research related to the Teacher Work Sample has guided recent efforts to refine/revise the process to ensure greater validity and reliability (Kirchner, Evans, & Norman, 2010; Norman, Evans, & Pankratz, 2011; Stobaugh, Tassell, & Norman, 2010). Other professional education faculty conduct research or lead grants, such as the Math Science Project work with Middle Schools, SKyTeach/GSKyTeach, College Readiness, Sextant, and several Kentucky Collaborative Center for Literacy Development, just to name a few, that study similar practical issues affecting schools, students, or professional education in general. These, as well as other faculty research and grant initiatives, certainly lead to faculty, program, and unit growth and improvement.

(3) Faculty service to and participation in public schools. In what types of service to public schools are faculty engaged? What information is being collected in Digital Measures? How do faculty members participate in P-12 schools? To what extent do faculty provide service and are engaged in schools?

WKU IR 5d.2 and [Faculty Service Summary](#) describe faculty service to public schools, as well as other organizations.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

6.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) Roles of Associate Deans. Is the Director of the School of Teacher Education also an Associate Dean for curriculum and academic programs? Or are these separate positions? What are the responsibilities of the other Associate Dean who appears to oversee research (web information/directory title compared to title in the IR) and structures for oversight and support of grants management in the unit and outside of the unit?

As described in WKU IR 6a.1, the WKU College of Education and Behavioral Sciences has three Associate Deans:

Tony Norman (Accountability and Research) – Responsibilities include unit-wide and program accountability efforts; developing/updating Program Assessment Plans; approving faculty developed CPs; ensuring collection of assessment data and other data associated with CF values; overseeing changes to WKU E-PASS; providing annual data to program coordinators for Annual Program Reports; writing and disseminating Unit Wide Assessment Report; writing NCATE Annual Report, PEDS and Title II reporting; supporting faculty research and grant writing efforts as needed; reviewing theses and education specialist projects

Retta Poe (Academic Programs) – Responsibilities include overseeing programs; chairing CEBS Curriculum Committee; overseeing advising/student issues (e.g., schedule exception requests, grade appeals, admission); approving CEBS recruitment materials; coordinating new faculty activities and faculty professional development activities; overseeing graduate admissions/comprehensive exams

Sherry Powers (Director of the School of Teacher Education) – Responsibilities include day to day oversight of school of teacher education faculty and programs

(2) Candidates' access to faculty advisement. Do all candidates have access to faculty advisement? It appears that some program candidates have access only to advisors through the Office of Teacher Services. How adequate is the advisement for candidates? How do faculty advisement assignments affect faculty loads?

WKU IR 6a.4 provides this information. At the initial preparation level, all teacher education candidates have access to faculty advisement. In addition to specific subject matter advisors for those seeking secondary certification, two full time student advisors, Ms. Denise Garner and Ms. Deborah Sloss, have regular office hours and advise elementary and middle grades majors. Specialty areas such as exceptional education, IECE, and Communication Disorders have faculty members who serve as advisors for individual students. Also, Ms. Michelle Kahler advises those students who are seeking alternative certification as well as serving as another resource for those students who plan to major in secondary education.

Through the use of face to face advising, Blackboard activities, web-based informational sources, email, etc., all of our students have the opportunity to be fully prepared to navigate successfully the instructional programs leading to teacher certification.

Advanced preparation and other school professional program candidates are individually advised by program faculty. Faculty advising is considered as part of the service portion of the faculty workload.

(3) Specific data and fiscal information related to off-campus sites including Glasgow, Elizabethtown and Owensboro campuses.

Dennis George, Dean of the University College, which houses the regional campuses, will be prepared to provide data as needed about each site. Also, websites for [Glasgow](#), [Elizabethtown](#), and [Owensboro](#) campuses are available for review.

(4) Comparative budget information . How does the budget for CEBS compare with other university units, especially units with clinical components?

Comparison budgets for CEBS and the College of Health and Human Services are available [here](#). In nearly all categories, CEBS is faring as well or better in budgeted funds.

(5) Resources and support for the school psychology program (condition from last visit). How have these changed since the previous visit?

By the time the BOE members come to the WKU campus, the school psychology program will have submitted its SPA report that delineates program improvements to address the conditions.

(6) Resources for online programs. How do these compare to online programs in other academic and professional areas? How adequate are the resources?

WKU has excellent IT and Distance learning infrastructure and licenses a current version of BlackBoard (BB) as the course management system for its online and F2F courses. Online courses are distributed through the WKU's Internet server using the BB System and are available to students by password. All registered students are provided with a WKU account, allowing online access to WKU electronic services including: email, online registration and tuition payment, student records, financial aid, and more.

The Department of Academic Technology (AT) has three full-time staff specifically for Faculty Blackboard support. The online courses web site includes a help desk phone number available 7 days a week. WKU also licenses Tegrity, class capture software that automatically captures stores and indexes multimedia content for replay. The multimedia content can then be accessed online, on an iPod, or by a variety of other mobile devices

The WKU Office of Distance Learning (ODL) assists and supports Faculty developing and teaching distance learning courses by providing training and technical support. The WKU Office of Distance Learning has a full- and part-time staff of 32, including five full-time instructional designers, several Graduate Assistants, a Student Support Specialist, and a Testing Specialist all dedicated to supporting faculty and students involved in distance learning courses.

The Office of Distance Learning 's Testing Center provides proctored Exams nationwide and is a member of The Consortium of College Testing Centers (CCTC) , an organization of testing professionals in post-secondary institutions and testing companies. It provides a free referral service to facilitate distance learning. The Testing Center assists faculty and both resident and out-of state students in scheduling and administering proctored exams. These services are provided in traditional paper-pencil formats as well as by on-line, web-based servers at some sites.

The WKU Office of Distance Learning maintains a website listing all online courses at and provides potential online students a skills assessment while introducing them to WKU online services and resources. The website also includes an introduction to online learning and information on software and hardware requirements necessary for successful course completion.

Proposal Date: 12/13/2010

**College of Education & Behavioral Sciences
Educational Leadership Doctoral Program
Proposal to Revise Course Prerequisites/Corequisites
(Consent Item)**

Contact Person: Tony Norman, tony.norman@wku.edu, 745-3061

- 1. Identification of course:**
 - 1.1 Course prefix (subject area) and number: EDLD 720
 - 1.2 Course title: IND/GRP ISSUES IN LEAD
 - 1.3 Credit hours: 3

- 2. Current prerequisites/corequisites/special requirements:** None.

- 3. Proposed prerequisites/corequisites/special requirements:** EDLD 710 or permission of both instructor and Director of Educational Leadership Doctoral Program

- 4. Rationale for the revision of prerequisites/corequisites/special requirements:** The Educational Leadership doctoral program was designed as a cohort program with students working together in core leadership courses. "Cohort hopping" by some students interferes with this intended structure. However, "permission of instructor" will allow for exceptions for student with extenuating circumstances.

- 5. Effect on completion of major/minor sequence:** None.

- 6. Proposed term for implementation:** Summer 2011

- 7. Dates of prior committee approvals:**

EDD Leadership Council	1-7-2011
CEBS Curriculum Committee	2-1-2011
Professional Education Council	_____
Graduate Council	_____
University Senate	_____

Attachment: Course Inventory Form

Proposal Date: 12/13/2010

**College of Education & Behavioral Sciences
Educational Leadership Doctoral Program
Proposal to Revise Course Prerequisites/Corequisites
(Consent Item)**

Contact Person: Tony Norman, tony.norman@wku.edu, 745-3061

- 1. Identification of course:**
 - 1.1 Course prefix (subject area) and number: EDLD 730
 - 1.2 Course title: LEADING THE ORGANIZATION
 - 1.3 Credit hours: 3

- 2. Current prerequisites/corequisites/special requirements:** None.

- 3. Proposed prerequisites/corequisites/special requirements:** EDLD 720 or permission of both instructor and Director of Educational Leadership Doctoral Program

- 4. Rationale for the revision of prerequisites/corequisites/special requirements:** The Educational Leadership doctoral program was designed as a cohort program with students working together in core leadership courses. "Cohort hopping" by some students interferes with this intended structure. However, "permission of instructor" will allow for exceptions for student with extenuating circumstances.

- 5. Effect on completion of major/minor sequence:** None.

- 6. Proposed term for implementation:** Summer 2011

- 7. Dates of prior committee approvals:**

EDD Leadership Council	_____1-7-2011_____
CEBS Curriculum Committee	_____2-1-2011_____
Professional Education Council	_____
Graduate Council	_____
University Senate	_____

Attachment: Course Inventory Form

**College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
School of Teacher Education
Proposal to Revise a Program
(Action Item)**

Contact Person: Dr. Lisa Murley, lisa.murley@wku.edu, 5-8822

1. Identification of program:

- 1.1 Current program reference number: #0433
- 1.2 Current program title: Master of Arts in Education: Elementary Education for Teacher Leaders
- 1.3 Credit hours: 30-31

2. Identification of the proposed program changes:

- Revise admission policy for graduates of WKU teacher preparation programs

3. Detailed program description:

Current Program Admission Policy	Proposed Program Admission Policy
<p>Admission Requirements: (<i>Criteria vary, depending on the student's undergraduate institution and GPA</i>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No GRE qualifying score will be required for graduates of the WKU B. S. in Elementary Education program, as long as they hold or are eligible to hold a valid teaching certificate for elementary education. A copy of the certificate must be submitted with the application. • Applicants with undergraduate degrees from all other accredited universities will be admitted without a qualifying GRE score if they have a minimum 2.75 GPA for all previous coursework (undergraduate and graduate) and a valid teaching certificate for elementary education. A copy of the certificate must be submitted with the application. • Applicants with undergraduate degrees from all other accredited universities with a GPA lower than 2.75 (undergraduate and graduate) must achieve a GAP (GRE score multiplied by the undergraduate GPA) score of 2200 or higher and a GRE Analytical Writing score of 3.5 or higher and have a valid teaching certificate for elementary education. A copy of the 	<p>Admission Requirements: (<i>Criteria vary, depending on the student's undergraduate institution and GPA</i>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicants who are alumni of WKU teacher preparation programs must submit a current, valid teaching certificate or Statement of Eligibility* for Elementary (Grades P-5). • Applicants with undergraduate degrees from all other accredited universities will be admitted without a qualifying GRE score if they have a minimum 2.75 GPA for all previous coursework (undergraduate and graduate) and a valid teaching certificate for elementary education. A copy of the certificate must be submitted with the application. • Applicants with undergraduate degrees from all other accredited universities with a GPA lower than 2.75 (undergraduate and graduate) must achieve a GAP (GRE score multiplied by the undergraduate GPA) score of 2200 or higher and a GRE Analytical Writing score of 3.5 or higher and have a valid teaching certificate for elementary education. A copy of the certificate must be submitted with the application. • Applicants to the MAE program in Elementary Education must hold or be eligible to hold a teaching certificate at the elementary level OR

<p>certificate must be submitted with the application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicants to the MAE program in Elementary Education must hold or be eligible to hold a teaching certificate at the elementary level OR have a valid elementary program on file with the Office of Teacher Services. (Note: Conversion program must be completed prior to or simultaneously with the MAE.) <p>*Applicants whose certificates have expired may be admitted, but they may enroll for only six hours before they must apply to the EPSB for re-issued certificates. After completion of six hours, a student admitted with an expired certificate must submit a copy of the re-issued certificate before being allowed to register for any additional courses.</p>	<p>have a valid elementary program on file with the Office of Teacher Services. (Note: Conversion program must be completed prior to or simultaneously with the MAE.)</p> <p>*Applicants whose certificates have expired may be admitted, but they may enroll for only six hours before they must apply to the EPSB for re-issued certificates. After completion of six hours, a student admitted with an expired certificate must submit a copy of the re-issued certificate before being allowed to register for any additional courses.</p>

4. Rationale for the proposed program change:

- The proposed change is to make the admission policy for this program consistent with the admission policies of the other Teacher Leader master's degree programs. In addition, the revised wording will permit the admission (without qualifying GRE/GAP scores) of WKU alumni who complete requirements for initial certification in Elementary Education through the post-baccalaureate certification-only program.

5. Proposed term for implementation and special provisions (if applicable): Fall 2011

6. Dates of prior committee approvals:

School of Teacher Education	01/31/2011
CEBS Curriculum Committee	02/01/2011
Professional Education Council	_____
Graduate Council	_____
University Senate	_____

Attachment: Program Inventory Form

**College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
School of Teacher Education
Proposal to Revise a Program
(Action Item)**

Contact Person: Rebecca Stobaugh, Rebecca.stobaugh@wku.edu, 745-4497

1. Identification of program:

- 1.1 Current program reference number: #0434
- 1.2 Current program title: Master of Arts in Education: Middle Grades Education for Teacher Leaders
- 1.3 Credit hours: 30-37

2. Identification of the proposed program changes:

- Revise admission policy for graduates of WKU teacher preparation programs

3. Detailed program description:

Current Program Admission Policy	Proposed Program Admission Policy
<p>Admission Requirements: <i>(Criteria vary, depending on the student's undergraduate institution and GPA):</i></p> <p>1. <u>WKU Graduate: Admission</u> No qualifying GRE/GAP** score will be required for graduates of the WKU B.S. in Middle Grades Education program, as long as they have or are eligible for a teaching certificate for Middle Grades Education (Grades 5-9). A copy of the certificate or statement of eligibility must be submitted with the application.</p> <p>2. <u>Graduate of a Kentucky Higher Education Institute other than WKU:</u> Applicants with undergraduate degrees from Kentucky higher education accredited universities must have a 2.75 GPA for all previous undergraduate coursework and a 3.0 GPA for previous graduate coursework or qualifying GAP/GRE** scores and must have or be eligible for a teaching certificate* for Middle Grades (Grades 5-9). A copy of the certificate or statement of eligibility must be submitted with the application.</p> <p>3. <u>Graduate of an Out-of-State Institution of Higher Education</u> Applicants with undergraduate degrees from all other higher education accredited universities must have a 2.75 GPA for all previous undergraduate coursework and a 3.0 GPA for previous graduate coursework or qualifying GRE/GAP** scores and</p>	<p>Admission Requirements: <i>(Criteria vary, depending on the student's undergraduate institution and GPA):</i></p> <p>1. <u>WKU Graduate: Admission</u> Applicants who are alumni of WKU teacher preparation programs must submit a current, valid teaching certificate or Statement of Eligibility* for Middle Grades (Grades 5-9).</p> <p>2. <u>Graduate of a Kentucky Higher Education Institute other than WKU:</u> Applicants with undergraduate degrees from Kentucky higher education accredited universities must have a 2.75 GPA for all previous undergraduate coursework and a 3.0 GPA for previous graduate coursework or qualifying GAP/GRE** scores and must have or be eligible for a teaching certificate* for Middle Grades (Grades 5-9). A copy of the certificate or statement of eligibility must be submitted with the application.</p> <p>3. <u>Graduate of an Out-of-State Institution of Higher Education</u> Applicants with undergraduate degrees from all other higher education accredited universities must have a 2.75 GPA for all previous undergraduate coursework and a 3.0 GPA for previous graduate coursework or qualifying GRE/GAP** scores and must have or be eligible for a teaching certificate* for Middle Grades (Grades 5-9). A copy of the certificate or statement of eligibility must be submitted with the application.</p> <p>*Kentucky applicants whose certificates have expired may</p>

<p>must have or be eligible for a teaching certificate* for Middle Grades (Grades 5-9). A copy of the certificate or statement of eligibility must be submitted with the application.</p> <p>*Kentucky applicants whose certificates have expired may be admitted, but they may enroll for only six hours before they must apply to the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board for re-issued certificates. After completion of six hours, a student admitted with an expired certificate must submit a copy of the re-issued certificate before being allowed to register for any additional courses. Applicants from out-of-state with expired certificates must complete the requirements for their respective states to renew their certificates and submit a copy of the reissued certificate.</p> <p>**Qualifying GAP Score: 2200 or higher (GRE score multiplied by the undergraduate GPA for a score) and a GRE Analytical Writing score of 3.5 or higher</p>	<p>be admitted, but they may enroll for only six hours before they must apply to the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board for re-issued certificates. After completion of six hours, a student admitted with an expired certificate must submit a copy of the re-issued certificate before being allowed to register for any additional courses. Applicants from out-of-state with expired certificates must complete the requirements for their respective states to renew their certificates and submit a copy of the reissued certificate.</p> <p>**Qualifying GAP Score: 2200 or higher (GRE score multiplied by the undergraduate GPA for a score) and a GRE Analytical Writing score of 3.5 or higher</p>

4. Rationale for the proposed program change:

- The proposed change is to correct an editing error that occurred during the program approval process. The proposed policy wording is what was actually approved by the faculty in the School of Teacher Education on 4/22/10, by the CEBS Curriculum Committee on 5/4/10, and by the Professional Education Council on 5/12/10. An error occurred in the preparation of the agenda materials submitted to Graduate Council, such that incorrect language was inserted. No one noticed the error until after Graduate Council, University Senate, and Provost approval had occurred.

5. Proposed term for implementation and special provisions (if applicable): Fall 2011

6. Dates of prior committee approvals:

School of Teacher Education	01/31/2011
CEBS Curriculum Committee	02/01/2011
Professional Education Council	_____
Graduate Council	_____
University Senate	_____

Attachment: Program Inventory Form

**College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
School of Teacher Education
Proposal to Revise a Program
(Action Item)**

Contact Person: Rebecca Stobaugh, Rebecca.stobaugh@wku.edu, 745-4497

1. Identification of program:

- 1.1 Current program reference number: #0435
- 1.2 Current program title: Master of Arts in Education: Secondary Education for Teacher Leaders
- 1.3 Credit hours: 30-37

2. Identification of the proposed program changes:

- Revise admission policy for graduates of WKU teacher preparation programs

3. Detailed program description:

Current Program Admission Policy	Proposed Program Admission Policy
<p>Admission Requirements: <i>(Criteria vary, depending on the student's undergraduate institution and GPA):</i></p> <p>1. <u>WKU Graduate: Admission</u> No qualifying GRE/GAP** score will be required for graduates of the WKU B.S. in Secondary Education program, as long as they have or are eligible for a teaching certificate for Secondary Education (Grades 8-12, 5-12, or P-12). A copy of the certificate or statement of eligibility must be submitted with the application.</p> <p>2. <u>Graduate of a Kentucky Higher Education Institute other than WKU:</u> Applicants with undergraduate degrees from Kentucky higher education accredited universities must have a 2.75 GPA for all previous undergraduate coursework and a 3.0 GPA for previous graduate coursework or qualifying GAP/GRE** scores and must have or be eligible for a teaching certificate* for Secondary (Grades 8-12, 5-12, or P-12). A copy of the certificate or statement of eligibility must be submitted with the application.</p> <p>3. <u>Graduate of an Out-of-State Institution of Higher Education</u> Applicants with undergraduate degrees from all other higher education accredited universities must have a 2.75 GPA for all previous undergraduate coursework and a 3.0 GPA for previous graduate coursework or qualifying GRE/GAP** scores and must have or be eligible for a teaching certificate*</p>	<p>Admission Requirements: <i>(Criteria vary, depending on the student's undergraduate institution and GPA):</i></p> <p>1. <u>WKU Graduate: Admission</u> Applicants who are alumni of WKU teacher preparation programs must submit a current, valid teaching certificate or Statement of Eligibility* for Secondary (Grades 8-12, 5-12, or P-12).</p> <p>2. <u>Graduate of a Kentucky Higher Education Institute other than WKU:</u> Applicants with undergraduate degrees from Kentucky higher education accredited universities must have a 2.75 GPA for all previous undergraduate coursework and a 3.0 GPA for previous graduate coursework or qualifying GAP/GRE** scores and must have or be eligible for a teaching certificate* for Secondary (Grades 8-12, 5-12, or P-12). A copy of the certificate or statement of eligibility must be submitted with the application.</p> <p>3. <u>Graduate of an Out-of-State Institution of Higher Education</u> Applicants with undergraduate degrees from all other higher education accredited universities must have a 2.75 GPA for all previous undergraduate coursework and a 3.0 GPA for previous graduate coursework or qualifying GRE/GAP** scores and must have or be eligible for a teaching certificate* for Secondary (Grades 8-12, 5-12, or P-12). A copy of the certificate or statement of eligibility must be submitted with the application.</p> <p>*Kentucky applicants whose certificates have expired may</p>

<p>for Secondary (Grades 8-12, 5-12, or P-12). A copy of the certificate or statement of eligibility must be submitted with the application.</p> <p>*Kentucky applicants whose certificates have expired may be admitted, but they may enroll for only six hours before they must apply to the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board for re-issued certificates. After completion of six hours, a student admitted with an expired certificate must submit a copy of the re-issued certificate before being allowed to register for any additional courses. Applicants from out-of-state with expired certificates must complete the requirements for their respective states to renew their certificates and submit a copy of the reissued certificate.</p> <p>**Qualifying GAP Score: 2200 or higher (GRE score multiplied by the undergraduate GPA for a score) and a GRE Analytical Writing score of 3.5 or higher</p>	<p>be admitted, but they may enroll for only six hours before they must apply to the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board for re-issued certificates. After completion of six hours, a student admitted with an expired certificate must submit a copy of the re-issued certificate before being allowed to register for any additional courses. Applicants from out-of-state with expired certificates must complete the requirements for their respective states to renew their certificates and submit a copy of the reissued certificate.</p> <p>**Qualifying GAP Score: 2200 or higher (GRE score multiplied by the undergraduate GPA for a score) and a GRE Analytical Writing score of 3.5 or higher</p>

4. Rationale for the proposed program change:

- The proposed change is to correct an editing error that occurred during the program approval process. The proposed policy wording is what was actually approved by the faculty in the School of Teacher Education on 4/22/10, by the CEBS Curriculum Committee on 5/4/10, and by the Professional Education Council on 5/12/10. An error occurred in the preparation of the agenda materials submitted to Graduate Council, such that incorrect language was inserted. No one noticed the error until after Graduate Council, University Senate, and Provost approval had occurred. WKU does not offer a B.S. in Secondary Education.

5. Proposed term for implementation and special provisions (if applicable): Fall 2011

6. Dates of prior committee approvals:

School of Teacher Education	01/31/2011
CEBS Curriculum Committee	02/01/2011
Professional Education Council	_____
Graduate Council	_____
University Senate	_____

Attachment: Program Inventory Form

Proposal Date: 12/3/2010

**Ogden College of Science and Engineering
Department of Mathematics and Computer Science
Proposal to Revise Course Number
(Consent Item)**

Contact Person: Zhonghang Xia, zhonghang.xia@wku.edu, 745-6459

1. Identification of course:

- 1.1 Current course prefix (subject area) and number: CS 230
- 1.2 Title: Introduction to Programming
- 1.3 Credit hours: 3.0

2. Proposed course number: CS 146

3. Rationale for the revision of course number:

The revision of the course number provides consistency with the ongoing restructuring of the computer science undergraduate program. The new number is more appropriate for the level of the course.

4. Proposed term for implementation: Fall 2011

5. Dates of prior committee approvals:

Math and CS Department 12/3/2010

Ogden College Curriculum Committee 2/3/2011

Professional Education Council _____

University Curriculum Committee _____

University Senate _____

Attachment: Course Inventory Form

Ogden College of Science and Engineering
Department of Biology
Proposal to Revise a Program
(Action Item)

Contact Person: Scott Grubbs, scott.grubbs@wku.edu, 745-5048

1. Identification of program:

- 1.1 Current program reference number: 525
- 1.2 Current program title: Major in Biology (without a minor)
- 1.3 Credit hours: 48.0

2. Identification of the proposed program changes:

- Addition of new supporting course options in agronomy.
- Limiting the number of credits earned in BIOL 485 that can be counted towards this major.

3. Detailed program description:

Current:

The option for a major in biology (reference number 525) requires a minimum of 48 hours in biology with 24 hours at the 300 level or higher. No minor is required. Several areas of emphasis are available including ecology and evolutionary biology, molecular and cellular biology, plant biology, animal biology and microbiology. All students are required to complete BIOL 120-121 and BIOL 122-123, and at least one course from each of the following three groups: (A) BIOL 222-223 or BIOL 224-225 or BIOL 226-227 (B) BIOL 319 & 322 or BIOL 327 (C) BIOL 315 or BIOL 430. Students, with the aid of their advisor, select additional 300- and 400-level courses to focus their studies on specific areas within biology. Because an understanding of the principles of mathematics, physics and chemistry is essential to the study of biology, majors are required to complete supporting courses as follows: (1) MATH 116 & 117 or MATH 118 or higher, (2) PHYS 231-232 or 255-256, (3) CHEM 120-121, and (4) two courses from the following list: BIOL 283,

Proposed:

The option for a major in biology (reference number 525) requires a minimum of 48 hours in biology with 24 hours at the 300 level or higher. No minor is required. Several areas of emphasis are available including ecology and evolutionary biology, molecular and cellular biology, plant biology, animal biology and microbiology. All students are required to complete BIOL 120-121 and BIOL 122-123, and at least one course from each of the following three groups: (A) BIOL 222-223 or BIOL 224-225 or BIOL 226-227 (B) BIOL 319 & 322 or BIOL 327 (C) BIOL 315 or BIOL 430. Students, with the aid of their advisor, select additional 300- and 400-level courses to focus their studies on specific areas within biology. Because an understanding of the principles of mathematics, physics and chemistry is essential to the study of biology, majors are required to complete supporting courses as follows: (1) MATH 116 & 117 or MATH 118 or higher, (2) PHYS 231-232 or 255-256, (3) CHEM 120-121, and (4) two courses from the following list: **AGRO 350**

CHEM 222-223, CHEM 314 or CHEM 340-341, CHEM 330, CIS 343, CIS 226 or CS 226 or CS 230, GEOG 317, GEOG 328, GEOG 416, GEOG 417, MATH 136, MATH 137, MATH 142, MATH 305, MATH 307, PHYS 332-233 or PHYS 265-266, SOCL 302. Students may count a maximum of 6 credit hours of BIOL 369, 389, or 399 toward this major.

and AGRO 452 or AGRO 454 or AGRO 455/456 or AGRO 457/458, BIOL 283, CHEM 222-223, CHEM 314 or CHEM 340-341, CHEM 330, CIS 343, CIS 226 or CS 226 or CS 230, GEOG 317, GEOG 328, GEOG 416, GEOG 417, MATH 227, MATH 305, MATH 307, PHYS 332-233. Students may count **up to 6 credit hours of BIOL 369, 389, or 399 and up to 6 credit hours of BIOL 485** toward this major.

4. Rationale for the proposed program change: The interdisciplinary nature of biology continues to evolve. Providing a broader variety of supporting course options has become necessary to keep this major both modern and reflective of other disciplines that students need in order to remain competitive for graduate school and employment opportunities. In addition, the Biology Department has redefined BIOL 485, and, for the first time, we are placing a restriction on the total number of credits from that course that a student can apply towards the major to make certain that students enroll in a sufficient number of traditional lecture and lecture/lab courses.

5. Proposed term for implementation and special provisions (if applicable): Fall 2011

6. Dates of prior committee approvals:

Department of Biology: January 21, 2011

OCSE Curriculum Committee: February 3, 2011

Professional Education Council: _____

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: _____

University Senate: _____

Attachment: Program Inventory Form

Proposal Date: 17 November 2010

Ogden College of Science and Engineering
Department of Biology
Proposal to Revise a Program
(Action Item)

Contact Person: Scott Grubbs, scott.grubbs@wku.edu, 745-5048

1. Identification of program:

- 1.1 Current program reference number: 617
- 1.2 Current program title: Major in Biology (with a minor)
- 1.3 Credit hours: 36.0

2. Identification of the proposed program changes:

- Addition of new supporting course options in agronomy.
- Limiting the number of credits earned in BIOL 485 that can be counted towards this major.

3. Detailed program description:

Current:

This option for a major in biology (reference number 617) requires a minimum of 36 hours in biology with 18 hours at the 300 level or higher plus the requirements of a minor area. The major-minor area must be at least 54 semester hours. All students are required to complete BIOL 120-121 and BIOL 122-123, and at least one course from each of the following three groups: (A) BIOL 222-223 or BIOL 224-225 or BIOL 226-227 (B) BIOL 319 & 322 or BIOL 327 (C) BIOL 315 or BIOL 430. Students with the aid of their advisor, select additional 300- and 400-level courses to focus their studies on specific areas within biology. Because an understanding of the principles of mathematics, physics and chemistry is essential to the study of biology, majors are required to complete supporting courses as follows: (1) MATH 116 & 117 or MATH 118 or higher, (2) PHYS 231-232 or 255-256, (3) CHEM 120-121, and (4) two courses from the following list: BIOL 283, CHEM 222-223, CHEM 314 or CHEM 340-341, CHEM 330, CIS 343, CIS 226 or CS 226

Proposed:

This option for a major in biology (reference number 617) requires a minimum of 36 hours in biology with 18 hours at the 300 level or higher plus the requirements of a minor area. The major-minor area must be at least 54 semester hours. All students are required to complete BIOL 120-121 and BIOL 122-123, and at least one course from each of the following three groups: (A) BIOL 222-223 or BIOL 224-225 or BIOL 226-227 (B) BIOL 319 & 322 or BIOL 327 (C) BIOL 315 or BIOL 430. Students with the aid of their advisor, select additional 300- and 400-level courses to focus their studies on specific areas within biology. Because an understanding of the principles of mathematics, physics and chemistry is essential to the study of biology, majors are required to complete supporting courses as follows: (1) MATH 116 & 117 or MATH 118 or higher, (2) PHYS 231-232 or 255-256, (3) CHEM 120-121, and (4) two courses from the following list: **AGRO 350 and AGRO 452 or AGRO 454 or AGRO 455/456 or AGRO 457/458**, BIOL 283,

or CS 230, GEOG 317, GEOG 328, GEOG 416, GEOG 417, MATH 136, MATH 137, MATH 142, MATH 305, MATH 307, PHYS 332-233 or PHYS 265-266, SOCL 302. Students may count a maximum of 3 credit hours of BIOL 369, 389, or 399 toward this major.

CHEM 222-223, CHEM 314 or CHEM 340-341, CHEM 330, CIS 343, CIS 226 or CS 226 or CS 230, GEOG 317, GEOG 328, GEOG 416, GEOG 417, MATH 136, MATH 137, MATH 142, MATH 305, MATH 307, PHYS 332-233 or PHYS 265-266, SOCL 302. Students may count **up to 3** credit hours of BIOL 369, 389, or 399 **and up to 4 credit hours of BIOL 485** toward this major.

4. Rationale for the proposed program change: The interdisciplinary nature of biology continues to evolve. Providing a broader variety of supporting course options has become necessary to keep this major both modern and reflective of other disciplines that students need in order to remain competitive for graduate school and employment opportunities. In addition, the Biology Department has redefined BIOL 485, and, for the first time, we are placing a restriction on the total number of credits from that course that a student can apply towards the major to make certain that students enroll in a sufficient number of traditional lecture and lecture/lab courses.

5. Proposed term for implementation and special provisions (if applicable): Fall 2011

6. Dates of prior committee approvals:

Department of Biology:	January 21, 2011
OCSE Curriculum Committee:	February 3, 2011
Professional Education Council:	_____
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee:	_____
University Senate:	_____

Attachment: Program Inventory Form

Proposal Date: 12-07-10

**Potter College of Arts and Letters
Department of Music
Proposal to Revise Course Catalog Listing
(Consent Item)**

Contact Person: Michael Kallstrom, michael.kallstrom@wku.edu, 745-5400

1. Identification of course:

- 1.1 Course prefix (subject area) and number: MUS 500
- 1.2 Course title: Theory Seminar
- 1.3 Credit hours: 3

2. Current course catalog listing:

MUS 500 THEORY SEMINAR 3 hours

3. Proposed course catalog listing:

MUS 500 THEORY SEMINAR 3 hours

Study and application of analytical techniques as they apply to the formal structure of music.

4. Rationale for revision of the course catalog listing:

There is currently no course description for MUS 500 in the Graduate Catalog.

5. Proposed term for implementation:

Fall 2011

6. Dates of prior committee approvals:

Department of Music Graduate Faculty	1-24-11
PCAL Curriculum Committee	_____
Professional Education Council	_____
Graduate Council	_____
University Senate	_____

Attachment: Course Inventory Form

Proposal Date: 12-08-10

**Potter College of Arts and Letters
Department of Music
Proposal to Revise Course Catalog Listing
(Consent Item)**

Contact Person: Jeff Bright, jeff.bright@wku.edu , 745-4024

1. Identification of course:

- 1.1 Course prefix (subject area) and number: MUS 511
- 1.2 Course title: Investigations of Music Education
- 1.3 Credit hours: 3

2. Current course catalog listing:

Problems and methods of research in music education. Includes application of pure and action research and investigation of published research in music education.

3. Proposed course catalog listing:

The philosophical, historical and experimental research methods in music education and its application within 21st century teaching-learning contexts.

4. Rationale for revision of the course catalog listing:

Provide an accurate description of current course contents.

5. Proposed term for implementation: Fall, 2011

6. Dates of prior committee approvals:

Department of Music Graduate Faculty	1-24-11
PCAL Curriculum Committee	_____
Professional Education Council	_____
Gradate Council	_____
University Senate	_____

Attachment: Course Inventory Form

Proposal Date: December 6, 2010

Potter College of Arts and Letters
Department of Music
Proposal to Create a New Course
(Action Item)

Contact Person: Paul Hondorp, paul.hondorp@wku.edu, 745-5923

1. Identification of proposed course:

- 1.1 Course prefix (subject area) and number: MUS 519
- 1.2 Course title: Conducting Seminar
- 1.3 Abbreviated course title: Conducting Seminar
- 1.4 Credit hours and contact hours: 3 (may be repeated up to a total of 6 hours)
- 1.5 Type of course: Seminar
- 1.6 Prerequisites: None
- 1.7 Course catalog listing: A survey of topics and materials related to the analytical and pedagogical aspects of instrumental or choral conducting.

2. Rationale:

- 2.1 Reason for developing the proposed course: This course is being created to serve as a core component of the conducting track for the new Master of Music degree. Topics covered in this course will serve to develop the complete conductor.
- 2.2 Projected enrollment in the proposed course: Enrollment will come from students in the conducting track of the proposed Master of Music degree and from the MAETL. Projected enrollment for the class is 6-10 students per year.
- 2.3 Relationship of the proposed course to courses now offered by the department: This course will serve to address NASM requirements for an MM curriculum not addressed in other courses.
- 2.4 Relationship of the proposed course to courses offered in other departments: This course is unique to the Department of Music and the conducting track of the Master of Music degree. The course will not have any impact on other programs.
- 2.5 Relationship of the proposed course to courses offered in other institutions: Most institutions offering graduate conducting degrees include a seminar course of this nature, including University of Kentucky, Morehead State University, Eastern Kentucky University, Michigan State University, Temple University, University of Northern Colorado

3. Discussion of proposed course:

- 3.1 Course objectives: Students will learn about topics and materials related to the analytical and pedagogical aspects of instrumental or choral conducting.

- 3.2 Content outline: Vocal: Choral music literature, vocal diction (French, Latin, German, English) using the International Phonetic Alphabet, group vocal pedagogy **or** Instrumental: History and literature of the wind band, study of chamber repertoire for six to sixteen players, conducting orchestra and band
- 3.3 Student expectations and requirements: Student learning will be evaluated through recognition of selected listening examples, class discussion of reading assignments, repertoire projects, midterm exam, final exam, (Vocal only: weekly diction assignments)
- 3.4 Tentative texts and course materials:
 - Choral:
 - Shrock, Dennis. Choral Repertoire. Oxford University Press, 2009.
 - Ulrich, Homer. A Survey of Choral Music. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishing. 1973.
 - Moriarty, John. Diction. Schirmer Music Publishing, 1975.
 - NAXOS music library
cpdl.org
 - or**
 - Instrumental:
 - Rhodes, Stephen L. History of the Wind Band
www.lipscomb.edu/windbandhistory
 - Battisti, Frank L. The Winds of Change. Meredith Music
 - NAXOS music library

4. Resources:

- 4.1 Library resources: Current library resources are adequate.
- 4.2 Computer resources: None

5. Budget implications:

- 5.1 Proposed method of staffing: Existing Faculty
- 5.2 Special equipment needed: None
- 5.3 Expendable materials needed: None
- 5.4 Laboratory materials needed: None

6. Proposed term for implementation: Spring 2012

7. Dates of prior committee approvals:

Music Department Graduate Faculty:	1-24-11
PCAL Curriculum Committee	2-3-11
Professional Education Council	_____
Graduate Council	_____

University Senate



Attachment: Program Inventory Form

Proposal date: October 1, 2010

Potter College of Arts and letters
Department of Music
Proposal to Create a New Course
(Action Item)

Contact Person: Dr. Donald Speer; donald.speer@wku.edu, 745-5918

1. Identification of proposed course:

- 1.1 Course prefix (subject area) and number: MUS 520
- 1.2 Course title: Advanced Pedagogy
- 1.3 Abbreviated course title: Advanced Pedagogy
- 1.4 Credit hours and contact hours: 3.0
- 1.5 Type of course: Independent Study
- 1.6 Prerequisites/corequisites: none
- 1.7 Course catalog listing: In-depth study and application of pedagogical principles for the applied music teacher in a private studio setting.

2. Rationale:

- 2.1 Reason for developing the proposed course: This course addresses pedagogy for studio teaching in music (as opposed to class and ensemble settings).
- 2.2 Projected enrollment in the proposed course: Enrollment will come from students in the pedagogy track of the proposed Master of Music degree and MM students (pursuing other tracks) who choose MUS 510 as an elective course. Projected enrollment for the class is 3-5 students per year.
- 2.3 Relationship of the proposed course to courses now offered by the department: This course will serve as one of the initial courses in the curriculum for the pedagogy track, and is intended to be a foundation for subsequent course work toward the degree.
- 2.4 Relationship of the proposed course to courses offered in other departments: This course will not be related to courses outside of the Master of Music curriculum.
- 2.5 Relationship of the proposed course to courses offered in other institutions: A review of WKU benchmark institutions found that the following universities offer a course in advanced pedagogy: Ball State University, University of Central Missouri, Eastern Michigan University, Missouri State University, Western Illinois University, and Wichita State University.

3. Discussion of proposed course:

- 3.1 Course objectives: Students will explore and apply pedagogical principles related to applied music study and the development and maintenance of a private music studio.
- 3.2 Content outline:
 - A. Philosophical Issues and the Applied Music Teacher
 - B. Motivation and the Applied Music Student: Discussion of Madsen/Madsen text (see 3.4)
 - C. Observation, application, and evaluation of teaching principles
 - D. Establishing and maintaining an independent music studio
 - E. Certification requirements for the independent music teacher

- 3.3 Student expectations and requirements: Students will be expected to complete the following requirements from the MTNA Teacher Profile Project, including:
 - A. Writing a teaching philosophy specific to private music teaching
 - B. Analysis of four teaching pieces
 - C. Video analysis of at least one student over three lessons, including a complete self-evaluation
 - D. Creation of a studio policy.
- 3.4 Tentative texts and course materials:
 - A. Making music and enriching lives: A guide for all music teachers, Blanchard, B. & Acree, C., Indiana University Press, 2007.
 - B. Teaching/Discipline, 4th ed., Clifford Madsen and Charles Madsen, Contemporary Publishing Company of Raleigh, 1998, 317 pp.
 - C. Teacher Profile Projects Workbook, Certification Requirements of the Music Teachers National Association: mtnacertification.org (online materials), 2010.
 - D. Various technology-generated resources and online sources, including MTNA Code of Ethics and the American String Teachers Association Certificate Achievement Program (ASTACAP) repertoire list, among others.

4. Resources:

- 4.1 Library resources: This course can be taught with the library resources currently available.
- 4.2 Computer resources: No special requirements necessary.

5. Budget implications:

- 5.1 Proposed method of staffing: Existing Faculty
- 5.2 Special equipment needed: None
- 5.3 Expendable materials needed: None
- 5.4 Laboratory materials needed: None

6. Proposed term for implementation: Fall 2011

7. Date of prior committee approvals:

Department of Music Graduate Faculty	1-24-11
PCAL Curriculum committee	2-3-11
Professional Education Council	_____
Graduate Council	_____
University Senate	_____

Proposal Date: September 29, 2010

Potter College of Arts and Letters
Department of Music
Proposal to Create a New Course
(Action Item)

Contact Person: Dr. Robyn Swanson, robyn.swanson@wku.edu, 745-5925

1. Identification of proposed course:

- 1.1 Course prefix (subject area) and number: MUS 625
- 1.2 Course title: Graduate CAPSTONE project
- 1.3 Abbreviated course title: Grad Capstone Project
- 1.4 Credit hours and contact hours: 3
- 1.5 Type of course: Independent Study
- 1.6 Prerequisites: MUS 511 (for all concentrations), MUS 518 (for Conducting), MUS 520 (for pedagogy)
- 1.7 Course catalog listing: Independent study and preparation for the Graduate Capstone Project in either music education, conducting or pedagogy.

2. Rationale:

- 2.1 Reason for developing the proposed course: This course is being created to serve as a culminating project and students will enroll in the last semester of their course work.
- 2.2 Projected enrollment in the proposed course:
Projected enrollment for the MM capstone project will be 6-10 students per year.
- 2.3 Relationship of the proposed course to courses now offered by the department:
This is a new graduate level course for the Department of Music.
- 2.4 Relationship of the proposed course to courses offered in other departments:
The capstone requirement for the conducting and pedagogy concentrations is unique to the Department of Music. The capstone action research project for the education concentration is required for all graduate students who will receive certification/rank changes through the Kentucky Department of Education. The course will not have any impact on other programs.
- 2.5 Relationship of the proposed course to courses offered in other institutions: Most institutions offering Master of Music degrees require a final culminating project or recital as part of the degree program.

3. Discussion of proposed course:

- 3.1 Course objectives: Students will complete a summative experience appropriate to their concentration. These are: Conducting - project and

program notes, Music Education - Action Research Project, Pedagogy -
Lecture recital and corresponding research paper.

3.2 Content outline:

Conducting Concentration(s)

- Selection of appropriate repertoire to be approved by the conducting faculty mentor
- Score analysis and rehearsal preparation
- Concert planning to include facilities, personnel, rehearsal schedule, equipment needs, program and program notes
- Successful completion of summative concert event by jury Research Project
- Selection of appropriate research topic with approval from the conducting faculty mentor via a research proposal
- Score analysis and research of historical context of the repertoire
- Written research document demonstrating a thorough understanding of biographical, analytical and historical findings of selected repertoire
- Scholarly presentation of research findings

Music Education Concentration

Music Education Action Research Project
Presentation of Research Findings to the Graduate Music
Education Faculty

Pedagogy Concentration

Lecture recital and corresponding research paper

OR

Pedagogy Action Research Project
Presentation of Research Findings to the Graduate Music
Pedagogy Faculty

3.3 Student expectations and requirements:

Students will work closely with the respective faculty to design a final
culminating project.

3.4 Tentative texts and course materials:

Course materials to be chosen by student and approved by the faculty mentor

4. Resources:

- 4.1 Library resources: This class can be taught with the current library
resources available.
- 4.2 Computer resources: No special requirements necessary

5. Budget implications:

- 5.1 Proposed method of staffing: Existing Faculty

- 5.2 Special equipment needed: None
- 5.3 Expendable materials needed: None
- 5.4 Laboratory materials needed: None

6. Proposed term for implementation: Fall 2011

7. Dates of prior committee approvals:

Department of Music Graduate Faculty	1-24-11
PCAL Curriculum Committee	2-3-11
Professional Education Council	_____
Graduate Council	_____
University Senate	_____

Attachment: Bibliography, Library Resources Form, Course Inventory Form

**Potter College Arts and Letters
Department of Music
Proposal to Create a New Academic Degree Type
(Action Item)**

Contact Person: Robyn Swanson, robyn.swanson@wku.edu, 745-5925

1 Identification of Academic Degree Type:

- 1.1 Academic degree type name: Master of Music
- 1.2 Standard degree type abbreviation: MM
- 1.3 Catalog description of academic degree type:

The Master of Music graduate program has three areas of concentration: Music Education, Conducting (teacher licensure rank change/non-rank), or Pedagogy. These provide continued development of (1) individual students which will result in enrichment of their personal lives and will enable them to preserve and extend cultural and diverse heritages; and (2) professional and scholarly competence in organization, interpretation, evaluation, communication, and dissemination of knowledge in the discipline.

The music education and conducting (teacher licensure rank change option) concentrations would further enable the teacher/practitioner to meet certification renewal requirements and rank changes mandated by the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Graduates in the pedagogy specialization would meet requirements for national certification through the Music Teachers National Association (MTNA).

Title of Degree: Master of Music with concentrations in conducting (teacher licensure rank-change or non teacher licensure rank change), music education, or pedagogy
30-37 Hour degree program

Admission Requirements:

University Admission Requirements:

- 1. Baccalaureate degree in music
(Candidates for the music education and conducting (those obtaining a rank change) concentrations, must have P-12 music certification or eligibility for certification.)
Music certification or eligibility for certification is not required for the pedagogy and conducting (non-certification) tracks.
- 2. No GRE qualifying score will be required for applicants who are graduates of WKU music programs.
- 3. Applicants who have undergraduate degrees from all other accredited universities will be admitted without a qualifying GRE score if they have a minimum 2.75 GPA for all previous coursework (undergraduate and graduate) and if required for the concentration, have or are eligible for a teaching certificate. A copy of the certificate or statement of eligibility must be submitted with the application if applicable.

Department of Music Admission Requirements:

- 1) Prior to entrance: Audition on primary instrument or voice

- 2) Prior to completion of 9-12 graduate hours: students are required to take placement exams in music theory and music history

Program Exit Requirements:

1. Comprehensive CAPSTONE MM Project: MUS 625

Conducting: Conducting project and program notes

Music Education: Action Research Project

Pedagogy: Lecture recital and corresponding research paper

2. Oral comprehensive exam

A comprehensive approach to problem solving in the discipline of music, which includes historical, analytical and pedagogical applications.

MUSIC Core: Required for all 3 concentrations: 12 hrs.

(Level 2 content core for the music education/conducting teacher licensure rank change programs).

MUS 500: Theory 3hrs.

MUS 530: Music Literature 3hrs.

MUS 511: Research Methods in Music 3 hrs.

or TCHL 560: Action Research for Teacher Leaders

MUS 525: Music and Human Experience 3 hrs.

1. Music Education Teacher Licensure Rank-Change Concentration: 12-19 hrs.

(Level 1) Professional Music Education Core

Required music education courses (9 hours)

MUS 509- Music Curriculum in the Elementary and Middle Schools (3 hours)

MUS 514 – Secondary Music Curriculum (3 hours)

MUS 625: Culminating Capstone Project either Conducting or the Music Education (To be completed as an exit requirement.) (3 hours)

Professional Education Courses 3-10 hours

*TCHL 500 – Foundations of Teacher Leadership (3 hours)

Based on student assessment, the outcomes of TCHL 500 and advisor recommendation, the following courses may be required.

TCHL 540 – Classroom Instruction: Instructional Strategies (1 hour)

TCHL 544 – Classroom Instruction: Equitable School and Community Partnerships (1 hour)

TCHL 548 – Classroom Instruction: Managing the Learning Environment (1 hour)

TCHL 550 – Student Assessment I: Fundamentals of Student Assessment (1 hour)

TCHL 554 – Student Assessment II: Standardized Testing (1 hour)

TCHL 558 – Student Assessment III: Classroom Tests and Instruments (2 hours)

*(Required the first semester of admission to the program.)

Elective Hours: (6)

Elective hours must be music courses selected from the other graduate offerings: workshops, ensembles, lessons, independent studies etc. A 3-hour MUS 512 workshop is required for the music education concentration and MUS 519: Conducting Seminar is required for the conducting concentration.

2. Conducting Teacher Licensure Rank-Change Concentration: 12-19 hrs.

(Level 1) Professional Music Education Core

Required music education courses (9 hours)

MUS 518: Conducting (3 hours)

Either MUS 509- Music Curriculum in the Elementary and Middle Schools (3 hours)
or MUS 514 – Secondary Music Curriculum (3 hours)

MUS 625: Culminating Capstone Project either Conducting or the Music Education (To be completed as an exit requirement.) (3 hours)

Professional Education Courses 3-10 hours

TCHL 500 – Foundations of Teacher Leadership (3 hours)

Based on student assessment, the outcomes of TCHL 500 and advisor recommendation, the following courses may be required.

TCHL 540 – Classroom Instruction: Instructional Strategies (1 hour)

TCHL 544 – Classroom Instruction: Equitable School and Community Partnerships (1 hour)

TCHL 548 – Classroom Instruction: Managing the Learning Environment (1 hour)

TCHL 550 – Student Assessment I: Fundamentals of Student Assessment (1 hour)

TCHL 554 – Student Assessment II: Standardized Testing (1 hour)

TCHL 558 – Student Assessment III: Classroom Tests and Instruments (2 hours)

*(Required the first semester of admission to the program.)

Elective Hours: (6)

Elective hours must be music courses selected from the other graduate offerings: workshops, ensembles, lessons, independent studies etc. A 3-hours MUS 512 workshop is required for the music education concentration and MUS 519: Conducting Seminar is required for the conducting concentration. MUS 519 may be taken for a total of 6 hours.

Total teacher licensure rank change program hours: 30-37

3. Conducting Concentration: 12hrs.

MUS 518: Advanced Conducting 3 hrs.

MUS 519: Conducting Seminar 3-6 hrs.

Ensemble 1 hr.

Applied Lessons In conducting 2 hrs

MUS 625: Comprehensive Capstone Project 3 hrs.

Elective Hours: (6)

Elective hours must be music courses selected from the other graduate offerings: workshops, ensembles, lessons, independent studies etc. MUS 519 may be taken for a total of 6 hours.

Total Program hours: 30 hrs.

4. Pedagogy Concentration: 12 hrs.

(Leads to MTNA National Certification)

MUS 520: Advanced Pedagogy 3 hrs.

MUS 513: DIS in Pedagogy 3 hrs.

Ensemble 1 hr.

Applied Lessons	2 hrs.
MUS 625: Comprehensive Capstone Project	3 hrs.
Elective Hours: (6)	
Elective hours must be music courses selected from the other graduate offerings: workshops, ensembles, lessons, independent studies etc.	
Total Program hours:	30 hrs.

2 **Rationale:**

2.1 Reason for developing the proposed academic degree type:

Currently, the only graduate-level degree program that is offered by the department is the Master of Arts in Education (089). It is common for a Department of Music with the current enrollment numbers (201 students: 181 undergraduate, 20 graduate) to offer a Master of Music degree with multiple areas of concentration. Since 2001, the enrollment in the baccalaureate music programs (Bachelor of Music Education, Bachelor of Music in Performance and Bachelor of Arts in Music) has increased 21.8%. The average ACT composite scores have increased from 22.2 to 24 and the number of graduate and undergraduate degrees awarded has increased from 26 to 45.

The WKU Department of Music has an established reputation for preparing quality music educators. Most music educators within the region earn the MAE, Rank II non-degree and Rank I (Music) programs at WKU. According to the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board, changes in teacher licensure for music education can be acquired through a Master of Music Degree. Currently, the Department of Music has qualified and internationally recognized faculty to teach the required courses in each concentration of the degree program.

2.2 Document need for academic degree type for professional certification, program accreditation, licensure, career advancement, and/or higher education in the academic field:

Recent WKU alumni have inquired why we do not offer a MM degree with concentrations in conducting, music education and pedagogy. Several of the WKU undergraduate students seek graduate study in conducting and pedagogy at other universities because currently it is unavailable at WKU. In 2009-2010, graduate-level music education faculty surveyed 104 undergraduate students about a MM being offered at WKU with the specialization areas in conducting and music education. Of the 104 students, 97 indicated they are interested (yes and maybe) in pursuing a Master of Music in conducting or music education at WKU. Twenty-three undergraduate students were surveyed regarding a MM in pedagogy in which 22 students indicated they would pursue the MM in pedagogy at WKU.

2.3 List other universities in Kentucky and in other states (including programs at benchmark institutions) offering this academic degree type:

Kentucky universities that offer MM degree programs with these areas of specialization include University of Kentucky, University of Louisville, Eastern Kentucky University

and Murray State University. Our current CIP code for the MAE is 13.1312. The CIP codes for the listed Kentucky universities is the same.

KY Programs	Degree KY	Benchmark Institutions	Degree: Benchmark Institutions
U K	MM (Music Teacher)	Florida State Univ	MM
UL	MME/MAT	University of Indiana	MM
EKU	MME	Eastern Michigan U	MM
MSU	MME	Arizona State Univ	MM
Private KY Programs		Arkansas State Univ	MM
Campbellsville Univ	MM	Northwestern Univ	MM
Asbury College	MM	Univ of Tennessee	MM

2.4 Evidence that this academic degree type is recognized by relevant professional organization(s), regional accreditor(s), and/or the Department of Education:

The WKU Department of Music is fully accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). The proposed MM degree program with the 3 areas of concentrations aligns with the learned society guidelines. The Kentucky EPSB and NCATE comply with NASM standards for teacher certification. The Master of Music (MM) Degree Program is the preferred graduate program title by NASM. Numerous music specializations are NASM accredited and it is a common practice by college/universities worldwide to have a MM degree with music education, conducting and pedagogy as a professional education emphasis.

2.5 Relationship of the proposed degree type to other academic degree types now offered by the university:

Due to KY EPSB regulations, the existing MAE/Music Major Degree Program (089) will be deleted in January of 2011. The Master of Arts in Education Teacher Leader Music Program (MAETL/Music) will replace the (089) program. All music education components of the MAETL/Music will remain the same within the MM/Music Education/Conducting (rank change) concentrations. Currently, the Department of Music has the Bachelor of Music Degree with two areas of specialization: music education and performance.

2.6 Current WKU major(s) qualifying for this degree type:
Approximately 175

2.7 Projected number of annual graduates in the proposed degree type:
15-20 annually

3 Proposed term for implementation: Fall 2011

4 Dates of prior committee approvals:

Music Department Graduate Faculty:	1-24-11
PCAL Curriculum Committee	2-3-11
Professional Education Council	_____
Graduate Council	_____
Consultation with CPE through Provost's Office	_____
University Senate	_____
Board of Regents	_____

Attachment: Degree Inventory Form

**Kentucky's
Education Professional
Standards Board**

**New Teacher Survey Results
2009-2010**

Western Kentucky University

**Kentucky's Education Professional Standards Board
New Teacher Survey Results 2009-2010
Standard Summary for Western Kentucky University**

Case Summaries

	STDV-standard deviation														
	Cooperating Teacher			Intern			Resource Teacher			Student Teacher			Total		
	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV
Standard 1: The Teacher Demonstrates Applied Content Knowledge. 1.1 Communicate concepts, processes, and knowledge.	266	3.36	.672	94	3.23	.694	167	3.38	.665	148	3.45	.620	675	3.37	.664
1.2 Connect content to life experiences of student.	266	3.26	.744	94	3.20	.784	167	3.25	.732	148	3.36	.756	675	3.27	.749
1.3 Demonstrate instructional strategies that are appropriate for content and contribute to student learning.	266	3.30	.781	94	3.17	.743	167	3.29	.769	148	3.38	.674	675	3.29	.751
1.4 Guide students to understand content from various perspectives.	266	3.17	.744	94	3.02	.829	167	3.17	.768	148	3.30	.753	675	3.18	.767
1.5 Identify and address students' misconceptions of content.	266	3.12	.763	94	3.06	.814	167	3.19	.773	148	3.28	.756	675	3.16	.773
Standard 2: The Teacher Designs and Plans Instruction. 2.1 Develop significant objectives aligned with standards.	266	3.40	.781	94	3.39	.736	167	3.46	.718	148	3.53	.633	675	3.44	.729

*No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

**Kentucky's Education Professional Standards Board
New Teacher Survey Results 2009-2010
Standard Summary for Western Kentucky University**

Case Summaries

	STDV-standard deviation														
	Cooperating Teacher			Intern			Resource Teacher			Student Teacher			Total		
	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV
2.2 Use contextual data to design instruction relevant to students.	266	3.27	.775	94	3.28	.782	167	3.23	.799	148	3.37	.722	675	3.29	.770
2.3 Plan assessments to guide instruction and measure learning objectives.	266	3.20	.791	94	3.27	.819	167	3.20	.847	148	3.36	.720	675	3.24	.796
2.4 Plan instructional strategies and activities that address learning objectives for all students.	266	3.23	.795	94	3.24	.799	167	3.25	.832	148	3.32	.712	675	3.26	.787
2.5 Plan instructional strategies and activities that facilitate multiple levels of learning.	266	3.09	.816	94	3.16	.820	167	3.05	.877	148	3.26	.748	675	3.13	.820
Standard 3: The Teacher Creates & Maintains Learning Climate. 3.1 Communicate high expectations.	266	3.41	.702	94	3.39	.751	167	3.43	.690	148	3.51	.655	675	3.44	.696
3.2 Establish a positive learning environment.	266	3.47	.722	94	3.40	.780	167	3.48	.675	148	3.58	.628	675	3.49	.700
3.3 Value and support student diversity and address individual needs.	266	3.35	.717	94	3.31	.776	167	3.31	.774	148	3.49	.724	675	3.36	.743

*No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

**Kentucky's Education Professional Standards Board
New Teacher Survey Results 2009-2010
Standard Summary for Western Kentucky University**

Case Summaries

	STDV-standard deviation														
	Cooperating Teacher			Intern			Resource Teacher			Student Teacher			Total		
	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV
3.4 Foster mutual respect between teacher and students and among students.	266	3.51	.685	94	3.36	.774	167	3.49	.684	148	3.54	.674	675	3.49	.696
3.5 Provide a safe environment for learning.	266	3.56	.625	94	3.36	.788	167	3.57	.634	148	3.61	.601	675	3.55	.650
Standard 4: The Teacher Implements and Manages Instruction. 4.1 Use a variety of instructional strategies that align with learning objectives and actively engage students.	266	3.23	.814	94	3.20	.756	167	3.26	.793	148	3.38	.654	675	3.27	.769
4.2 Implement instruction based on diverse student needs and assessment data.	266	3.11	.812	94	3.04	.815	167	3.11	.843	148	3.22	.724	675	3.12	.802
4.3 Use time effectively.	266	3.15	.839	94	3.21	.788	167	3.29	.737	148	3.18	.825	675	3.20	.805
4.4 Use space and materials effectively.	266	3.33	.740	94	3.24	.799	167	3.34	.774	148	3.38	.732	675	3.33	.755
4.5 Implement and manage instruction in ways that facilitate higher order thinking.	266	3.09	.851	94	3.02	.855	167	3.05	.866	148	3.29	.749	675	3.12	.838

*No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

**Kentucky's Education Professional Standards Board
New Teacher Survey Results 2009-2010
Standard Summary for Western Kentucky University**

Case Summaries

	STDV-standard deviation														
	Cooperating Teacher			Intern			Resource Teacher			Student Teacher			Total		
	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV
Standard 5: The Teacher Assesses & Communicates Learning Results. 5.1 Use pre-assessments.	266	3.08	.802	94	3.13	.883	167	2.96	.944	148	3.20	.791	675	3.08	.850
5.2 Use formative assessments.	266	3.19	.725	94	3.30	.865	167	3.16	.838	148	3.45	.683	675	3.25	.772
5.3 Use summative assessments.	266	3.26	.693	94	3.30	.878	167	3.23	.821	148	3.39	.685	675	3.29	.753
5.4 Describe, analyze, and evaluate student performance data.	266	3.13	.761	94	3.17	.875	167	3.11	.867	148	3.28	.791	675	3.16	.812
5.5 Communicate learning results to students and parents.	266	3.06	.780	94	3.09	.876	167	3.19	.765	148	3.01	.857	675	3.08	.808
5.6 Allow opportunity for student self-assessment.	266	2.94	.803	94	3.01	.849	167	2.92	.888	148	3.04	.864	675	2.97	.844
Standard 6: The Teacher Demonstrates the Implementation of Technology. 6.1 Use available technology to design and plan instruction.	266	3.48	.663	94	3.28	.822	167	3.43	.663	148	3.49	.760	675	3.44	.711

*No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

**Kentucky's Education Professional Standards Board
New Teacher Survey Results 2009-2010
Standard Summary for Western Kentucky University**

Case Summaries

	STDV-standard deviation														
	Cooperating Teacher			Intern			Resource Teacher			Student Teacher			Total		
	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV
6.2 Use available technology to implement instruction that facilitates student learning.	266	3.42	.698	94	3.24	.838	167	3.46	.683	148	3.41	.754	675	3.40	.729
6.3 Integrate student use of available technology into instruction.	266	3.26	.786	94	3.07	.953	167	3.31	.812	148	3.23	.850	675	3.24	.833
6.4 Use available technology to assess and communicate student learning.	266	3.24	.806	94	3.10	.893	167	3.35	.752	148	3.26	.811	675	3.25	.809
6.5 Demonstrate ethical and legal use of technology.	266	3.55	.626	94	3.27	.918	167	3.56	.636	148	3.47	.723	675	3.49	.703
Standard 7: Reflects on and Evaluates Teaching and Learning. 7.1 Use data to reflect on and evaluate student learning.	266	3.20	.777	94	3.28	.848	167	3.26	.816	148	3.34	.743	675	3.25	.790
7.2 Use data to reflect on and evaluate instructional practice.	266	3.17	.798	94	3.26	.854	167	3.21	.863	148	3.28	.765	675	3.21	.815
7.3 Use data to reflect on and identify areas for professional growth.	266	3.13	.820	94	3.22	.857	167	3.25	.810	148	3.30	.778	675	3.21	.815

*No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

**Kentucky's Education Professional Standards Board
New Teacher Survey Results 2009-2010
Standard Summary for Western Kentucky University**

Case Summaries

	STDV-standard deviation														
	Cooperating Teacher			Intern			Resource Teacher			Student Teacher			Total		
	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV
Standard 8: Collaborates with Colleagues/Parents/ Other. 8.1 Identify students whose learning could be enhanced by collaboration.	266	3.19	.725	94	3.22	.844	167	3.38	.701	148	3.20	.873	675	3.25	.773
8.2 Design a plan to enhance student learning that includes all parties in the collaborative effort.	266	3.11	.780	94	3.18	.789	167	3.28	.744	148	3.14	.846	675	3.17	.789
8.3 Implement planned activities that enhance student learning and engage all parties.	266	3.17	.788	94	3.16	.807	167	3.27	.756	148	3.18	.800	675	3.19	.785
8.4 Analyze data to evaluate the outcomes of collaborative efforts.	266	3.09	.783	94	3.09	.888	167	3.23	.791	148	3.03	.836	675	3.11	.814
Standard 9: Evaluates and Implements Professional Development. 9.1 Self assess performance relative to Kentucky's Teacher Standards.	266	3.27	.782	94	3.28	.754	167	3.34	.759	148	3.41	.755	675	3.32	.767

*No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

**Kentucky's Education Professional Standards Board
New Teacher Survey Results 2009-2010
Standard Summary for Western Kentucky University**

Case Summaries

	STDV-standard deviation														
	Cooperating Teacher			Intern			Resource Teacher			Student Teacher			Total		
	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV
9.2 Identify priorities for professional development based on data from self-assessment, student performance and feedback from colleagues.	266	3.21	.753	94	3.32	.736	167	3.29	.747	148	3.34	.726	675	3.28	.744
9.3 Design a professional growth plan that addresses identified priorities.	266	3.15	.820	94	3.24	.799	167	3.28	.783	148	3.29	.802	675	3.23	.805
9.4 Show evidence of professional growth and reflection on the identified priority areas and impact on instructional effectiveness and student learning.	266	3.18	.775	94	3.20	.837	167	3.30	.749	148	3.28	.756	675	3.24	.774
Standard 10: Provides Leadership within School/Community/Profession. 10.1 Identify leadership opportunities that enhance student learning and/or professional environment of the school.	266	3.10	.837	94	3.11	.823	167	3.30	.707	148	3.22	.745	675	3.18	.788

*No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

**Kentucky's Education Professional Standards Board
New Teacher Survey Results 2009-2010
Standard Summary for Western Kentucky University**

Case Summaries

	STDV-standard deviation														
	Cooperating Teacher			Intern			Resource Teacher			Student Teacher			Total		
	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV	N	Mean	STDV
10.2 Develop a plan for engaging in leadership activities.	266	3.05	.839	94	3.06	.878	167	3.29	.755	148	3.15	.820	675	3.13	.824
10.3 Implement a plan for engaging in leadership activities.	266	3.05	.846	94	3.05	.872	167	3.29	.745	148	3.16	.814	675	3.13	.823
10.4 Analyze data to evaluate the results of planned and executed leadership efforts.	266	3.01	.838	94	2.99	.874	167	3.21	.767	148	3.05	.836	675	3.06	.828

*No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

Standard 1: The Teacher Demonstrates Applied Content Knowledge. 1.1 Communicate concepts, processes, and knowledge.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	123	35	81	76	315
	% within ROLE	46.2%	37.2%	48.5%	51.4%	46.7%
Good	Count	120	47	69	62	298
	% within ROLE	45.1%	50.0%	41.3%	41.9%	44.1%
Fair	Count	20	11	17	10	58
	% within ROLE	7.5%	11.7%	10.2%	6.8%	8.6%
Poor	Count	*	*	*	*	*
	% within ROLE	*	*	*	*	*
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 1: The Teacher Demonstrates Applied Content Knowledge. 1.2 Connect content to life experiences of student.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	113	38	67	76	294
	% within ROLE	42.5%	40.4%	40.1%	51.4%	43.6%
Good	Count	111	39	77	51	278
	% within ROLE	41.7%	41.5%	46.1%	34.5%	41.2%
Fair	Count	39	15	20	19	93
	% within ROLE	14.7%	16.0%	12.0%	12.8%	13.8%
Poor	Count	*	*	*	*	10
	% within ROLE	*	*	*	*	1.5%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 1: The Teacher Demonstrates Applied Content Knowledge. 1.3 Demonstrate instructional strategies that are appropriate for content and contribute to student learning.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	125	33	75	71	304
	% within ROLE	47.0%	35.1%	44.9%	48.0%	45.0%
Good	Count	102	46	70	63	281
	% within ROLE	38.3%	48.9%	41.9%	42.6%	41.6%
Fair	Count	32	13	17	13	75
	% within ROLE	12.0%	13.8%	10.2%	8.8%	11.1%
Poor	Count	7	*	5	*	15
	% within ROLE	2.6%	*	3.0%	*	2.2%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rating Scale is Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor.
 *No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
 Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

Standard 1: The Teacher Demonstrates Applied Content Knowledge. 1.4 Guide students to understand content from various perspectives.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	93	28	61	68	250
	% within ROLE	35.0%	29.8%	36.5%	45.9%	37.0%
Good	Count	130	45	79	60	314
	% within ROLE	48.9%	47.9%	47.3%	40.5%	46.5%
Fair	Count	37	16	22	17	92
	% within ROLE	13.9%	17.0%	13.2%	11.5%	13.6%
Poor	Count	6	5	5	*	19
	% within ROLE	2.3%	5.3%	3.0%	*	2.8%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 1: The Teacher Demonstrates Applied Content Knowledge. 1.5 Identify and address students' misconceptions of content.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	88	30	64	67	249
	% within ROLE	33.1%	31.9%	38.3%	45.3%	36.9%
Good	Count	129	44	74	58	305
	% within ROLE	48.5%	46.8%	44.3%	39.2%	45.2%
Fair	Count	42	16	25	21	104
	% within ROLE	15.8%	17.0%	15.0%	14.2%	15.4%
Poor	Count	7	*	*	*	17
	% within ROLE	2.6%	*	*	*	2.5%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 2: The Teacher Designs and Plans Instruction. 2.1 Develop significant objectives aligned with standards.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	146	50	96	89	381
	% within ROLE	54.9%	53.2%	57.5%	60.1%	56.4%
Good	Count	89	32	55	50	226
	% within ROLE	33.5%	34.0%	32.9%	33.8%	33.5%
Fair	Count	22	11	13	8	54
	% within ROLE	8.3%	11.7%	7.8%	5.4%	8.0%
Poor	Count	9	*	*	*	14
	% within ROLE	3.4%	*	*	*	2.1%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rating Scale is Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor.

*No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.

Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

Standard 2: The Teacher Designs and Plans Instruction. 2.2 Use contextual data to design instruction relevant to students.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	121	43	73	74	311
	% within ROLE	45.5%	45.7%	43.7%	50.0%	46.1%
Good	Count	102	36	64	57	259
	% within ROLE	38.3%	38.3%	38.3%	38.5%	38.4%
Fair	Count	38	13	26	15	92
	% within ROLE	14.3%	13.8%	15.6%	10.1%	13.6%
Poor	Count	5	*	*	*	13
	% within ROLE	1.9%	*	*	*	1.9%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 2: The Teacher Designs and Plans Instruction. 2.3 Plan assessments to guide instruction and measure learning objectives.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	107	44	74	72	297
	% within ROLE	40.2%	46.8%	44.3%	48.6%	44.0%
Good	Count	111	34	59	61	265
	% within ROLE	41.7%	36.2%	35.3%	41.2%	39.3%
Fair	Count	41	13	28	12	94
	% within ROLE	15.4%	13.8%	16.8%	8.1%	13.9%
Poor	Count	7	*	6	*	19
	% within ROLE	2.6%	*	3.6%	*	2.8%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 2: The Teacher Designs and Plans Instruction. 2.4 Plan instructional strategies and activities that address learning objectives for all students.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	116	42	76	67	301
	% within ROLE	43.6%	44.7%	45.5%	45.3%	44.6%
Good	Count	102	35	63	64	264
	% within ROLE	38.3%	37.2%	37.7%	43.2%	39.1%
Fair	Count	42	15	21	15	93
	% within ROLE	15.8%	16.0%	12.6%	10.1%	13.8%
Poor	Count	6	*	7	*	17
	% within ROLE	2.3%	*	4.2%	*	2.5%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rating Scale is Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor.
 *No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
 Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

Standard 2: The Teacher Designs and Plans Instruction. 2.5 Plan instructional strategies and activities that facilitate multiple levels of learning.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	93	37	59	62	251
	% within ROLE	35.0%	39.4%	35.3%	41.9%	37.2%
Good	Count	114	38	66	65	283
	% within ROLE	42.9%	40.4%	39.5%	43.9%	41.9%
Fair	Count	50	16	33	18	117
	% within ROLE	18.8%	17.0%	19.8%	12.2%	17.3%
Poor	Count	9	*	9	*	24
	% within ROLE	3.4%	*	5.4%	*	3.6%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 3: The Teacher Creates & Maintains Learning Climate. 3.1 Communicate high expectations.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	142	51	90	88	371
	% within ROLE	53.4%	54.3%	53.9%	59.5%	55.0%
Good	Count	93	30	60	49	232
	% within ROLE	35.0%	31.9%	35.9%	33.1%	34.4%
Fair	Count	30	12	16	10	68
	% within ROLE	11.3%	12.8%	9.6%	6.8%	10.1%
Poor	Count	*	*	*	*	*
	% within ROLE	*	*	*	*	*
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 3: The Teacher Creates & Maintains Learning Climate. 3.2 Establish a positive learning environment.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	155	53	96	96	400
	% within ROLE	58.3%	56.4%	57.5%	64.9%	59.3%
Good	Count	89	28	56	43	216
	% within ROLE	33.5%	29.8%	33.5%	29.1%	32.0%
Fair	Count	15	11	14	8	48
	% within ROLE	5.6%	11.7%	8.4%	5.4%	7.1%
Poor	Count	7	*	*	*	11
	% within ROLE	2.6%	*	*	*	1.6%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rating Scale is Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor.
 *No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
 Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

Standard 3: The Teacher Creates & Maintains Learning Climate. 3.3 Value and support student diversity and address individual needs.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	125	45	78	91	339
	% within ROLE	47.0%	47.9%	46.7%	61.5%	50.2%
Good	Count	113	35	67	41	256
	% within ROLE	42.5%	37.2%	40.1%	27.7%	37.9%
Fair	Count	23	12	17	14	66
	% within ROLE	8.6%	12.8%	10.2%	9.5%	9.8%
Poor	Count	5	*	5	*	14
	% within ROLE	1.9%	*	3.0%	*	2.1%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 3: The Teacher Creates & Maintains Learning Climate. 3.4 Foster mutual respect between teacher and students and among students.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	160	50	99	94	403
	% within ROLE	60.2%	53.2%	59.3%	63.5%	59.7%
Good	Count	87	29	52	41	209
	% within ROLE	32.7%	30.9%	31.1%	27.7%	31.0%
Fair	Count	14	14	15	12	55
	% within ROLE	5.3%	14.9%	9.0%	8.1%	8.1%
Poor	Count	5	*	*	*	8
	% within ROLE	1.9%	*	*	*	1.2%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 3: The Teacher Creates & Maintains Learning Climate. 3.5 Provide a safe environment for learning.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	165	50	108	99	422
	% within ROLE	62.0%	53.2%	64.7%	66.9%	62.5%
Good	Count	88	30	48	42	208
	% within ROLE	33.1%	31.9%	28.7%	28.4%	30.8%
Fair	Count	10	12	10	6	38
	% within ROLE	3.8%	12.8%	6.0%	4.1%	5.6%
Poor	Count	*	*	*	*	7
	% within ROLE	*	*	*	*	1.0%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rating Scale is Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor.
 *No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
 Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

Standard 4: The Teacher Implements and Manages Instruction. 4.1 Use a variety of instructional strategies that align with learning objectives and actively engage students.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	117	37	75	69	298
	% within ROLE	44.0%	39.4%	44.9%	46.6%	44.1%
Good	Count	103	40	66	67	276
	% within ROLE	38.7%	42.6%	39.5%	45.3%	40.9%
Fair	Count	37	16	21	11	85
	% within ROLE	13.9%	17.0%	12.6%	7.4%	12.6%
Poor	Count	9	*	5	*	16
	% within ROLE	3.4%	*	3.0%	*	2.4%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 4: The Teacher Implements and Manages Instruction. 4.2 Implement instruction based on diverse student needs and assessment data.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	95	30	63	57	245
	% within ROLE	35.7%	31.9%	37.7%	38.5%	36.3%
Good	Count	115	41	65	67	288
	% within ROLE	43.2%	43.6%	38.9%	45.3%	42.7%
Fair	Count	47	20	33	23	123
	% within ROLE	17.7%	21.3%	19.8%	15.5%	18.2%
Poor	Count	9	*	6	*	19
	% within ROLE	3.4%	*	3.6%	*	2.8%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 4: The Teacher Implements and Manages Instruction. 4.3 Use time effectively.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	107	39	74	63	283
	% within ROLE	40.2%	41.5%	44.3%	42.6%	41.9%
Good	Count	103	38	69	52	262
	% within ROLE	38.7%	40.4%	41.3%	35.1%	38.8%
Fair	Count	46	15	22	30	113
	% within ROLE	17.3%	16.0%	13.2%	20.3%	16.7%
Poor	Count	10	*	*	*	17
	% within ROLE	3.8%	*	*	*	2.5%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rating Scale is Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor.
 *No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
 Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

Standard 4: The Teacher Implements and Manages Instruction. 4.4 Use space and materials effectively.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	127	43	84	77	331
	% within ROLE	47.7%	45.7%	50.3%	52.0%	49.0%
Good	Count	106	32	60	51	249
	% within ROLE	39.8%	34.0%	35.9%	34.5%	36.9%
Fair	Count	28	18	19	19	84
	% within ROLE	10.5%	19.1%	11.4%	12.8%	12.4%
Poor	Count	5	*	*	*	11
	% within ROLE	1.9%	*	*	*	1.6%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 4: The Teacher Implements and Manages Instruction. 4.5 Implement and manage instruction in ways that facilitate higher order thinking.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	96	32	59	67	254
	% within ROLE	36.1%	34.0%	35.3%	45.3%	37.6%
Good	Count	111	35	66	59	271
	% within ROLE	41.7%	37.2%	39.5%	39.9%	40.1%
Fair	Count	46	24	34	20	124
	% within ROLE	17.3%	25.5%	20.4%	13.5%	18.4%
Poor	Count	13	*	8	*	26
	% within ROLE	4.9%	*	4.8%	*	3.9%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 5: The Teacher Assesses & Communicates Learning Results. 5.1 Use pre-assessments.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	90	37	58	61	246
	% within ROLE	33.8%	39.4%	34.7%	41.2%	36.4%
Good	Count	112	38	58	59	267
	% within ROLE	42.1%	40.4%	34.7%	39.9%	39.6%
Fair	Count	58	13	38	25	134
	% within ROLE	21.8%	13.8%	22.8%	16.9%	19.9%
Poor	Count	6	6	13	*	28
	% within ROLE	2.3%	6.4%	7.8%	*	4.1%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rating Scale is Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor.
 *No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
 Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

Standard 5: The Teacher Assesses & Communicates Learning Results. 5.2 Use formative assessments.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	98	48	69	80	295
	% within ROLE	36.8%	51.1%	41.3%	54.1%	43.7%
Good	Count	123	31	61	56	271
	% within ROLE	46.2%	33.0%	36.5%	37.8%	40.1%
Fair	Count	43	10	32	10	95
	% within ROLE	16.2%	10.6%	19.2%	6.8%	14.1%
Poor	Count	*	5	5	*	14
	% within ROLE	*	5.3%	3.0%	*	2.1%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 5: The Teacher Assesses & Communicates Learning Results. 5.3 Use summative assessments.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	105	49	76	72	302
	% within ROLE	39.5%	52.1%	45.5%	48.6%	44.7%
Good	Count	127	29	58	63	277
	% within ROLE	47.7%	30.9%	34.7%	42.6%	41.0%
Fair	Count	32	11	29	11	83
	% within ROLE	12.0%	11.7%	17.4%	7.4%	12.3%
Poor	Count	*	5	*	*	13
	% within ROLE	*	5.3%	*	*	1.9%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 5: The Teacher Assesses & Communicates Learning Results. 5.4 Describe, analyze, and evaluate student performance data.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	90	41	65	69	265
	% within ROLE	33.8%	43.6%	38.9%	46.6%	39.3%
Good	Count	126	32	64	56	278
	% within ROLE	47.4%	34.0%	38.3%	37.8%	41.2%
Fair	Count	44	17	30	19	110
	% within ROLE	16.5%	18.1%	18.0%	12.8%	16.3%
Poor	Count	6	*	8	*	22
	% within ROLE	2.3%	*	4.8%	*	3.3%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rating Scale is Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor.
 *No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
 Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

Standard 5: The Teacher Assesses & Communicates Learning Results. 5.5 Communicate learning results to students and parents.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	81	35	65	47	228
	% within ROLE	30.5%	37.2%	38.9%	31.8%	33.8%
Good	Count	128	37	70	64	299
	% within ROLE	48.1%	39.4%	41.9%	43.2%	44.3%
Fair	Count	49	17	30	29	125
	% within ROLE	18.4%	18.1%	18.0%	19.6%	18.5%
Poor	Count	8	5	*	8	23
	% within ROLE	3.0%	5.3%	*	5.4%	3.4%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 5: The Teacher Assesses & Communicates Learning Results. 5.6 Allow opportunity for student self-assessment.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	68	29	47	52	196
	% within ROLE	25.6%	30.9%	28.1%	35.1%	29.0%
Good	Count	124	42	71	56	293
	% within ROLE	46.6%	44.7%	42.5%	37.8%	43.4%
Fair	Count	64	18	37	34	153
	% within ROLE	24.1%	19.1%	22.2%	23.0%	22.7%
Poor	Count	10	5	12	6	33
	% within ROLE	3.8%	5.3%	7.2%	4.1%	4.9%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 6: The Teacher Demonstrates the Implementation of Technology. 6.1 Use available technology to design and plan instruction.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	151	45	87	92	375
	% within ROLE	56.8%	47.9%	52.1%	62.2%	55.6%
Good	Count	96	33	66	42	237
	% within ROLE	36.1%	35.1%	39.5%	28.4%	35.1%
Fair	Count	16	13	13	9	51
	% within ROLE	6.0%	13.8%	7.8%	6.1%	7.6%
Poor	Count	*	*	*	5	12
	% within ROLE	*	*	*	3.4%	1.8%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rating Scale is Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor.
 *No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
 Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

Standard 6: The Teacher Demonstrates the Implementation of Technology. 6.2 Use available technology to implement instruction that facilitates student learning.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	141	43	93	81	358
	% within ROLE	53.0%	45.7%	55.7%	54.7%	53.0%
Good	Count	101	35	58	49	243
	% within ROLE	38.0%	37.2%	34.7%	33.1%	36.0%
Fair	Count	20	12	15	15	62
	% within ROLE	7.5%	12.8%	9.0%	10.1%	9.2%
Poor	Count	*	*	*	*	12
	% within ROLE	*	*	*	*	1.8%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 6: The Teacher Demonstrates the Implementation of Technology. 6.3 Integrate student use of available technology into instruction.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	120	39	83	69	311
	% within ROLE	45.1%	41.5%	49.7%	46.6%	46.1%
Good	Count	102	30	57	49	238
	% within ROLE	38.3%	31.9%	34.1%	33.1%	35.3%
Fair	Count	38	18	22	25	103
	% within ROLE	14.3%	19.1%	13.2%	16.9%	15.3%
Poor	Count	6	7	5	5	23
	% within ROLE	2.3%	7.4%	3.0%	3.4%	3.4%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 6: The Teacher Demonstrates the Implementation of Technology. 6.4 Use available technology to assess and communicate student learning.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	118	37	84	68	307
	% within ROLE	44.4%	39.4%	50.3%	45.9%	45.5%
Good	Count	100	34	59	56	249
	% within ROLE	37.6%	36.2%	35.3%	37.8%	36.9%
Fair	Count	41	18	22	19	100
	% within ROLE	15.4%	19.1%	13.2%	12.8%	14.8%
Poor	Count	7	5	*	5	19
	% within ROLE	2.6%	5.3%	*	3.4%	2.8%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rating Scale is Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor.
 *No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
 Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

Standard 6: The Teacher Demonstrates the Implementation of Technology. 6.5 Demonstrate ethical and legal use of technology.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	163	49	106	86	404
	% within ROLE	61.3%	52.1%	63.5%	58.1%	59.9%
Good	Count	88	27	50	48	213
	% within ROLE	33.1%	28.7%	29.9%	32.4%	31.6%
Fair	Count	13	12	10	11	46
	% within ROLE	4.9%	12.8%	6.0%	7.4%	6.8%
Poor	Count	*	6	*	*	12
	% within ROLE	*	6.4%	*	*	1.8%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 7: Reflects on and Evaluates Teaching and Learning. 7.1 Use data to reflect on and evaluate student learning.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	106	46	77	70	299
	% within ROLE	39.8%	48.9%	46.1%	47.3%	44.3%
Good	Count	111	32	63	62	268
	% within ROLE	41.7%	34.0%	37.7%	41.9%	39.7%
Fair	Count	44	12	21	12	89
	% within ROLE	16.5%	12.8%	12.6%	8.1%	13.2%
Poor	Count	5	*	6	*	19
	% within ROLE	1.9%	*	3.6%	*	2.8%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 7: Reflects on and Evaluates Teaching and Learning. 7.2 Use data to reflect on and evaluate instructional practice.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	103	45	74	66	288
	% within ROLE	38.7%	47.9%	44.3%	44.6%	42.7%
Good	Count	111	32	63	62	268
	% within ROLE	41.7%	34.0%	37.7%	41.9%	39.7%
Fair	Count	45	13	21	16	95
	% within ROLE	16.9%	13.8%	12.6%	10.8%	14.1%
Poor	Count	7	*	9	*	24
	% within ROLE	2.6%	*	5.4%	*	3.6%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rating Scale is Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor.
 *No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
 Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

Standard 7: Reflects on and Evaluates Teaching and Learning. 7.3 Use data to reflect on and identify areas for professional growth.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	96	43	76	69	284
	% within ROLE	36.1%	45.7%	45.5%	46.6%	42.1%
Good	Count	122	33	60	58	273
	% within ROLE	45.9%	35.1%	35.9%	39.2%	40.4%
Fair	Count	35	14	27	17	93
	% within ROLE	13.2%	14.9%	16.2%	11.5%	13.8%
Poor	Count	13	*	*	*	25
	% within ROLE	4.9%	*	*	*	3.7%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 8: Collaborates with Colleagues/Parents/Other. 8.1 Identify students whose learning could be enhanced by collaboration.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	95	43	83	68	289
	% within ROLE	35.7%	45.7%	49.7%	45.9%	42.8%
Good	Count	132	32	67	48	279
	% within ROLE	49.6%	34.0%	40.1%	32.4%	41.3%
Fair	Count	34	16	15	26	91
	% within ROLE	12.8%	17.0%	9.0%	17.6%	13.5%
Poor	Count	5	*	*	6	16
	% within ROLE	1.9%	*	*	4.1%	2.4%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 8: Collaborates with Colleagues/Parents/Other. 8.2 Design a plan to enhance student learning that includes all parties in the collaborative effort.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	88	37	73	56	254
	% within ROLE	33.1%	39.4%	43.7%	37.8%	37.6%
Good	Count	126	39	71	64	300
	% within ROLE	47.4%	41.5%	42.5%	43.2%	44.4%
Fair	Count	44	16	20	20	100
	% within ROLE	16.5%	17.0%	12.0%	13.5%	14.8%
Poor	Count	8	*	*	8	21
	% within ROLE	3.0%	*	*	5.4%	3.1%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rating Scale is Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor.
 *No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
 Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

Standard 8: Collaborates with Colleagues/Parents/Other. 8.3 Implement planned activities that enhance student learning and engage all parties.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	101	37	73	56	267
	% within ROLE	38.0%	39.4%	43.7%	37.8%	39.6%
Good	Count	115	37	69	70	291
	% within ROLE	43.2%	39.4%	41.3%	47.3%	43.1%
Fair	Count	43	18	22	15	98
	% within ROLE	16.2%	19.1%	13.2%	10.1%	14.5%
Poor	Count	7	*	*	7	19
	% within ROLE	2.6%	*	*	4.7%	2.8%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 8: Collaborates with Colleagues/Parents/Other. 8.4 Analyze data to evaluate the outcomes of collaborative efforts.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	88	36	72	47	243
	% within ROLE	33.1%	38.3%	43.1%	31.8%	36.0%
Good	Count	122	35	66	66	289
	% within ROLE	45.9%	37.2%	39.5%	44.6%	42.8%
Fair	Count	49	18	25	28	120
	% within ROLE	18.4%	19.1%	15.0%	18.9%	17.8%
Poor	Count	7	5	*	7	23
	% within ROLE	2.6%	5.3%	*	4.7%	3.4%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 9: Evaluates and Implements Professional Development. 9.1 Self assess performance relative to Kentucky's Teacher Standards.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	118	41	83	81	323
	% within ROLE	44.4%	43.6%	49.7%	54.7%	47.9%
Good	Count	109	40	61	51	261
	% within ROLE	41.0%	42.6%	36.5%	34.5%	38.7%
Fair	Count	31	11	20	12	74
	% within ROLE	11.7%	11.7%	12.0%	8.1%	11.0%
Poor	Count	8	*	*	*	17
	% within ROLE	3.0%	*	*	*	2.5%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rating Scale is Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor.
 *No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
 Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

Standard 9: Evaluates and Implements Professional Development. 9.2 Identify priorities for professional development based on data from self-assessment, student performance and feedback from colleagues.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	103	44	74	69	290
	% within ROLE	38.7%	46.8%	44.3%	46.6%	43.0%
Good	Count	122	37	72	65	296
	% within ROLE	45.9%	39.4%	43.1%	43.9%	43.9%
Fair	Count	35	12	17	10	74
	% within ROLE	13.2%	12.8%	10.2%	6.8%	11.0%
Poor	Count	6	*	*	*	15
	% within ROLE	2.3%	*	*	*	2.2%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 9: Evaluates and Implements Professional Development. 9.3 Design a professional growth plan that addresses identified priorities.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	102	41	75	69	287
	% within ROLE	38.3%	43.6%	44.9%	46.6%	42.5%
Good	Count	112	38	70	59	279
	% within ROLE	42.1%	40.4%	41.9%	39.9%	41.3%
Fair	Count	42	12	16	14	84
	% within ROLE	15.8%	12.8%	9.6%	9.5%	12.4%
Poor	Count	10	*	6	6	25
	% within ROLE	3.8%	*	3.6%	4.1%	3.7%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 9: Evaluates and Implements Professional Development. 9.4 Show evidence of professional growth and reflection on the identified priority areas and impact on instructional effectiveness and student learning.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	101	40	74	65	280
	% within ROLE	38.0%	42.6%	44.3%	43.9%	41.5%
Good	Count	119	37	74	64	294
	% within ROLE	44.7%	39.4%	44.3%	43.2%	43.6%
Fair	Count	39	13	14	15	81
	% within ROLE	14.7%	13.8%	8.4%	10.1%	12.0%
Poor	Count	7	*	5	*	20
	% within ROLE	2.6%	*	3.0%	*	3.0%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rating Scale is Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor.
 *No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
 Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

Standard 10: Provides Leadership within School/Community/Profession. 10.1 Identify leadership opportunities that enhance student learning and/or professional environment of the school.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	97	34	72	59	262
	% within ROLE	36.5%	36.2%	43.1%	39.9%	38.8%
Good	Count	108	39	75	65	287
	% within ROLE	40.6%	41.5%	44.9%	43.9%	42.5%
Fair	Count	51	18	18	22	109
	% within ROLE	19.2%	19.1%	10.8%	14.9%	16.1%
Poor	Count	10	*	*	*	17
	% within ROLE	3.8%	*	*	*	2.5%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 10: Provides Leadership within School/Community/Profession. 10.2 Develop a plan for engaging in leadership activities.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	89	33	76	57	255
	% within ROLE	33.5%	35.1%	45.5%	38.5%	37.8%
Good	Count	112	40	67	61	280
	% within ROLE	42.1%	42.6%	40.1%	41.2%	41.5%
Fair	Count	54	15	21	25	115
	% within ROLE	20.3%	16.0%	12.6%	16.9%	17.0%
Poor	Count	11	6	*	5	25
	% within ROLE	4.1%	6.4%	*	3.4%	3.7%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Standard 10: Provides Leadership within School/Community/Profession. 10.3 Implement a plan for engaging in leadership activities.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	89	32	74	58	253
	% within ROLE	33.5%	34.0%	44.3%	39.2%	37.5%
Good	Count	112	41	70	59	282
	% within ROLE	42.1%	43.6%	41.9%	39.9%	41.8%
Fair	Count	53	15	20	27	115
	% within ROLE	19.9%	16.0%	12.0%	18.2%	17.0%
Poor	Count	12	6	*	*	25
	% within ROLE	4.5%	6.4%	*	*	3.7%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rating Scale is Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor.
 *No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
 Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov

Standard 10: Provides Leadership within School/Community/Profession. 10.4 Analyze data to evaluate the results of planned and executed leadership efforts.

		ROLE				Total
		Cooperating Teacher	Intern	Resource Teacher	Student Teacher	
Excellent	Count	82	29	66	48	225
	% within ROLE	30.8%	30.9%	39.5%	32.4%	33.3%
Good	Count	116	41	74	66	297
	% within ROLE	43.6%	43.6%	44.3%	44.6%	44.0%
Fair	Count	56	18	23	27	124
	% within ROLE	21.1%	19.1%	13.8%	18.2%	18.4%
Poor	Count	12	6	*	7	29
	% within ROLE	4.5%	6.4%	*	4.7%	4.3%
Total	Count	266	94	167	148	675
	% within ROLE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rating Scale is Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor.
 *No calculations are performed for cells with less than five respondents.
 Source: EPSB, contact Jaime Rice at jaime.rice@ky.gov