

# 2021 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	10456	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	5165
<b>Institution:</b>	Northern Kentucky University		
<b>Unit:</b>	College of Education		

## Section 1. EPP Profile

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

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

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

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

## Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2019-2020 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure<sup>1</sup>

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

**Total number of program completers** 273

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

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

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

**Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2019-2020 academic year?**

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP

In the Fall semester 2018, the College of Education and Human Services (COEHS) was reorganized. Programs for Counseling, Social Work, Human Services, and PE and Health left the COEHS to the College of Health and Human Services. The teacher preparation programs remained. The college was renamed the College of Education.

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited

3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

## Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

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

**Description of data accessible via link:** This is the main page for CAEP accreditation. Evidence files may be accessed here. The data dashboard link will take the viewer to the current 19-20 data and consumer information

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

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

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

*What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?*  
*Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?*  
*Are benchmarks available for comparison?*  
*Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?*

Current data indicate the following about the EPP:

1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.11).

The Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) is a state mandated teacher evaluation program begun in 2014. The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) suspended the program around 2018. Until the suspension, Kentucky provided outcome to EPP's on their completers. However, since its suspension, school districts now use their own evaluation system. While some districts still use the PGES system, they are not required to, nor does the state provide data to the EPP's. We are currently exploring alternate sources of data to demonstrate our completers have a positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. We plan to have data on impact on P-12 learners in 2022. Previous data show completers are successful teachers who are positively impacting P-12 student learning and development through their first 3 years of teaching.

2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)

As state above, the PGES evaluation system provided data on our completers teaching effectiveness. In addition, the Kentucky teacher internship program (K-TIP) new teachers complete in their first year of teaching also provided data on teaching

effectiveness. The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) as suspended both of these programs so data are unavailable. The EPP is developing a system to collect data on completers teaching effectiveness. NKU send The Destination Survey to completers the year after graduation. Data either indicate completers are "on target" (71%) or "accomplished" (29%) regarding each of the Kentucky Teacher Performance Standards. Previous data indicate program completers are meeting the Kentucky teacher performance standards

### 3. Employer satisfaction and completer persistence

The EPP routinely surveys principals in schools where our completers go to work. The EPP sends surveys at the end of each spring semester. However, due to the move to remote learning in the middle of the Spring 202 semester, the principal survey was not distributed. Previous principal surveys indicate employers are satisfied with the quality of EPP program completers. According to the Kentucky Center of Statistics, 61% of completers were employed as Public K-12 teachers or in the education field, non-Public K-12 teachers, within one year of completion. For those completers who begin a teaching career in Kentucky within one year of completion, 74% persist in the field in year five.

### 4. Completer satisfaction

Data from the Kentucky EPSB New Teacher Survey (Spring 2018) which is the latest data available from the state indicate completers find their preparation to be effective. Questions rated on a 10-point scale, indicate completers found their preparation effective. Specifically, completers answered the questions on preparation with a "7" or above at least 65% of the time. Additionally, the Destination Survey (January 7, 2019) compiled by the NKU Office of Institutional Research found completers were "on target" (71%) or "accomplished" (29%) regarding each of the Kentucky Teacher Performance Standards, indicating that they were satisfied with their training.

### 5. Completer/ graduation rate

Completers of initial programs two-year graduation rate (from admission to teacher education to completion of program) is 99.99%. In 2019-20, 167 candidates graduated, 1 did not. The NKU Office of Institutional Research indicated the 2014 cohort of undergraduate teacher education candidates had a 4-year graduation rate of 34.5%, a five-year graduate rate of 50%, and a 6-year graduation rate of 54.65%. It seems that education majors who are admitted to the program graduate at a much higher rate than those who do not.

The graduation rate for those in advanced programs, according to the NKU Office of Institutional Research indicated a 2-year graduate rate of 32.92% and a 3-year graduation rate of 68.56%.

### 6. Licensure rate

According to Kentucky Center for Statistics (KYSTATS), initial program completers in 2018 received certification at a rate ranging from 25% to 100%. The mean rate of receiving certification was 75%. These data may underrepresent those who receive certification as many completers establish certification in neighboring states and do not apply for Kentucky certification.

Advanced program completers who opt to add an additional endorsement or certification areas are just as successful.

### 7. Employment rate

Data from the Kentucky Center for Statistics indicate that completers in the 2014 cohort (finishing in 2018) were employed as Public K-12 teachers in Kentucky (50%), and in the education field, excluding K-12 Public schools (11%) one year after completion. These data may not capture all of our completers as our location in Kentucky borders on Indiana and Ohio and some completers go to work in those states.

### 8. Consumer information, including student loan default rate

The NSLDS loan default rate for all education majors is 4.8%. This is much lower than the overall NKU NSLDS loan default rate of 7.5%

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

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

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

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

An example of diverse stakeholder involvement in EPP decision-making was developing and validating the instrument used to

score the action research project that is the capstone project for those earning an MAED or Education Specialist Degree. In the summer of 2019, a group of faculty and partners worked together to review two key assessments used across the advanced programs aligned to the new CAEP standards for advanced programs. We piloted those assessments beginning in the Fall 2019 semester and meet with our advisory committee to review the assessments and determine content validity using the Lawshe method. We had planned to convene the advisory committee again in the Spring of 2020, however, the COVID pandemic interfered with those plans. The advisory committee convened in the Fall 2020 to complete the Lawshe validation method based on the revisions suggested in the first round. The data indicate that the new assessment has content validity. In order to establish reliability, the instrument will be used to score the capstone project. Two faculty members will score the capstone and the data will be compared to establish inter-rater reliability. We will continue to collect data on the assessments and make changes based on a review of the data obtained.

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

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

## Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

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

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

*The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.*

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

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

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

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

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

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

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

the ongoing decision-making process required for program monitoring and evaluation.

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

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

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

Patterns of strength across all programs include strong dispositions ratings, effective lesson planning and implementation of those lessons, and the ability to use technology. However, program faculty conclude that it may be time to examine and possibly revise the lesson evaluation and disposition forms.

Specifically, the lesson evaluation form is quite long and cumbersome and does not specifically incorporate high-leverage practices. Incorporation of this framework may remind candidates to utilize the practices, enhancing P-12 learning. Additionally, program faculty suggest the disposition form, midpoint checks, and the process for responding to dispositional problems may need some revision as well. These changes may help to identify and correct any dispositional issues early in the program ensuring the success of candidates.

We continue to provide innovative preparation for our candidates. Currently we have portions of two of our preparation programs embedded into local schools. In the elementary program, candidates complete professional semester I (Pro I) at a local elementary school. This Pro I block has an emphasis on literacy. Candidates report to the school each day for class time with professors from NKU and then take what they have learned directly into the elementary classrooms. Program faculty supervise candidates are encourage regular reflection on their experiences. Candidates indicate this experience is valuable and prepares them for the "real life" of teaching. Similarly, our middle grades program has also begun embedding courses into a local middle school. As this is a new initiative, the EPP will need additional data to assess the effectiveness of the embedded partnership and professional growth presentations for the middle grades program. Cooperating teachers participated in anecdotal focus groups to examine the effectiveness of the field experience component of the partnership. Most recommendations focused on structural and scheduling issues. When possible, faculty and school personnel made changes that addressed the issues the following semester. The EPP suspended the embedded programs in the Spring semester of 2020 as the P-12 schools and the University moved to on-line learning due to COVID 19.

Data from the teacher work sample completed in clinical experience reviewed by the quality assurance committee last year revealed a that a more standardized teacher work sample (TWS) with refined pre- and post- testing, may provide data that are more easily compared across age and subject levels. This discovery provides a specific example of how data were used to modify our program. A departmental team met in summer 2018 to revise the TWS. Although candidates were performing well on the TWS, the elements of the assignment needed to be revised. Revised elements included clearer directions, clearly defined gap groups, and a revised data sheet. These changes were made to help candidates collect, evaluate, and use student data to make instructional decisions. More emphasis was placed on pre- and post-test development and alignment to better demonstrate student growth to target students who need reteaching. Additionally, candidates now complete two teacher work samples, one in each 8-week placement, or two in a sixteen-week placement, to allow candidates more practice. The revised TWS was implemented in fall 2018. The quality assurance committee reviewed two cycles of data from the revised TWS this spring; concluding that the changes made to the assessment showed improvements in the pre- and post-tests developed for the TWS; allowing candidates to better identify gap groups, in order to develop remediation. Data from the revised TWS are located at the COE Data Dashboard link provided previously.

There are three transition points in the candidates' program. The first one is at admission to the education program. The second one is at the entrance to the clinical experience. The third transition point is at program completion. At each transition point, the EPP collects data on candidates for each program. Those data are reviewed as part of the quality assurance system. Each semester, the Teacher Education department chair works with the technology coordinator to ensure that PCEs and UCEs have submitted their required assessments in the Foliotek system. These assessments include the lesson plan, lesson implementation, and dispositions evaluations, as well as the semester reflection, cumulative progress report, and other required

Foliotek documentation. At the end of the academic year, the technology coordinator downloads the data from Foliotek, and begins the Quality Assurance System for another year. Representative PCEs, UCEs, and other stakeholders periodically review evaluation practices and teacher candidate assessments to minimize bias and ensure fairness. As part of the TEC and TEAC processes, two evaluators (P-12 and university clinical educators) score the candidate to reduce bias and ensure fairness. Results of both evaluations help determine candidate's grade and movement to the next transition point. Both PCEs and UCEs independently complete assessment in field and clinical experience. Program faculty review and analyze the aggregated data from the independent evaluations as part of the annual data review and analysis. Additionally, assessments align to state and national standards, resulting in outcomes that are fair, accurate, and consistent. The Director of Educational Placements conducts review sessions at the beginning of each semester to train PCEs and UCEs in the use of the identified scoring instruments.

The EPP Quality Assurance System ensures the systematic collection, analysis, monitoring of and reporting of data throughout the academic year. Program faculty and TEC members review data during their monthly meetings, P-12 advisory boards review data twice each year, and the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) reviews program and EPP-wide data annually. Each year, program facilitators develop a Quality Assurance Report that discusses the strengths and challenges identified by the data from the program. The report is completed and discussed at the annual QAC meeting. To ensure that results of program modifications are monitored and adjusted, program faculty review and discuss identified program changes that in the previous year's Quality Assurance Report. It also asks the program to identify initiated changes and the impact of those changes on teacher candidates and/or the program. Assessment data included in Standards 1 to 4 are shared annually with faculty and are posted on the EPP Data Dashboard to ensure monitoring and review of data and to give stakeholders the ability to track results over time.

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

4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning  
4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

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

Yes  No

6.3 Optional Comments

---

## Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

**Preparer's authorization.** By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2021 EPP Annual Report.

**I am authorized to complete this report.**

### Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

### Policy 6.01 Annual Report

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

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

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site reviews.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.

3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completer data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

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

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

#### **Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements**

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

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

 **Acknowledge**