Policies 5100 & 5202—

- **Both policies are expected to open in May or June.** If you have suggestions pertaining to a particular section of policy 5100, please email the section to me in the format/language you are suggesting (not just the idea), preferably in strike-through/underline format so that misinterpretations and misunderstandings can be eliminated.

- **In May 2016, the SAT was redesigned. With that change, the scores also changed. Listed below are the date progressions and scores that are allowed in lieu of Praxis CORE/CASE:**

  o 1035 on the Scholastic Achievement Test (SAT) –Oldest test
  o 1125 on the re-centered SAT (effective April 1995 through March 2005)
  o 1170 on the revised SAT using the combined Critical Reading and Math score (effective March 2005 until May 2016) OR
  o *1240 on the New SAT using the combined Evidence-Based Reading and Writing + Math (Effective May 2016—Present)*

The *ACT Enhanced* **continues to be 26 or higher for exemption (effective November 1989). Prior to 1989, a score of 25 on the ACT is required for exemption.**

We will include this testing information in the revisions of 5202 and 5100 as well as in the next revision of the testing directory.

- **REMINDER:** Effective July 11, 2016, the following sections were placed into policy providing definitive timelines for passing the WVBE- required Praxis exams for content:

10.4. f. Content test requirement as a requirement of program completion: Effective January 1, 2017, candidates shall obtain passing scores on grade-level appropriate, WVBE-adopted Praxis II content test(s) as described in the WV Licensure Testing Directory on the WVDE website as a requirement of program completion.

10.4. g. Content test requirement as a requirement for clinical experience: Effective July 1, 2017, candidates shall obtain passing scores on grade-level appropriate, WVBE-adopted Praxis II content test(s) as described in the West Virginia Licensure Testing Directory of this policy in order to complete the student teaching/clinical experience component of the WVBE-approved program.

Praxis Changes--
- The WVBE has adopted the following Praxis assessments:
  o **Algebra I (5162) assessment for the "General, Integrated Mathematics" endorsement at a current cut score of 157. Effective now.**
  o **Deaf and Hard of Hearing (5272) for the "Deaf and Hard of Hearing" endorsement at a current cut score of 160. (Effective date September 1, 2017 so that EPPs may begin the transition).**
  o *Reminder that the Braille Assessment (0633) became effective July 1, 2016 for the "Visual Impairment" endorsement at the current score of 169.*

Teacher in Residence (TIR) –

- The West Virginia Board of Education (WVBE) is encouraging every EPP to obtain TIR agreements with each school district in West Virginia.
- Regarding the TIR credential issued by the Office of Educator Effectiveness & Licensure:
    - A TIR permit must be issued by the WVDE **before** Placement: The Office of Educator Effectiveness & Licensure must issue the TIR a credential **before** placement in the public school classroom as a TIR.
    - If the clinical experience will be completed in the TIR placement, it is not necessary to obtain a clinical placement permit. Instead, just a teacher-in-residence permit is needed.
    - A background check is required with the TIR application. The background check completed for a clinical placement permit **cannot be used** for the TIR permit; however, the TIR background check can be used for the Initial Professional Teaching License.
    - The OEEL requires the job posting documentation with each TIR application.
    - Suggestion: Because some counties (rather than the IHE) end up submitting the TIR applications, it is recommended that the IHE develop a checklist to be attached to help assure that all components are submitted to move the application forward. Doing so would help eliminate delays in the issuance of the TIR permit.

Special Education Programs—
- *Policy 5100 no longer requires candidates enrolled in a special education program to hold qualify for or simultaneously complete a core/subject area content (such as math, English, general science, elementary education, etc.).* Instead, policy 5100 has added reading requirements. *Requiring core/subject area coursework is now at the discretion of the EPP.* Therefore, EPPs with the core content requirement still in the curriculum may recommend their candidates for licensure "at which time they have met to the satisfaction of institutional officials for all content requirements for the special education endorsement.
- GUIDANCE REGARDING REVISING AND REFILING PROGRAMS TO MEET THE NEW POLICY REQUIREMENTS: The WVDE will provide guidance soon about how to refile the special education programs to reflect the new reading requirements and to obtain the decision of each EPP about whether to continue to address core/subject area content along with preparation for the special education endorsement.

General ETS-Praxis Information
About Scoring/Score Reporting Time
One overarching reason it takes several weeks to score Praxis tests is the large volume of different tests administered during a computer-delivered testing window and the careful, complex process.
The Scoring Process and Quality Control
The scoring process begins when upon receipt of the test file, and then the multiple-choice scores are verified independently. A test must undergo equating if a new test form was introduced. (Equating is a statistical process used to ensure that scores for new forms of the test are comparable with scores from previously used forms). Some tests require a reading to score constructed response questions. Preparation tasks and conducting a reading takes time (tasks such as sorting responses, hiring readers, and training them).
Availability of Test Scores
As noted on the ETS website, test scores from a particular window are available 10 – 16 business days after the testing window closes, regardless of the specific testing date within that window. This is because before reporting official test scores, the ETS stat analysis team must be able to gather enough data to conduct the analyses necessary to equate and report the test results. Full analyses cannot be done until the window closes and all test-taker data for each test title have been received.
About the 21-day Waiting Period before a Test May Be Retaken

The 21-day waiting period is a way of ensuring the security of the test and minimizing the possibility of a test-taker earning a score on the test due to having had prior experience with that same test version during a previous administration. By taking the test back-to-back, it is likely that a test taker would receive the same version of the test and might know what specific questions to expect. Knowing what questions to expect could give a test-taker an unfair advantage over all other test takers, who have not had prior experience with that version of the test and therefore, were not privy to the same information.

The Praxis tests are intended to help state agencies and professional organizations ensure that beginning teachers have an adequate level of knowledge, and these organizations rely on ETS to report valid test scores. To ensure the validity of test scores (and fairness to all test-takers), Praxis cannot report scores, unless they are absolutely certain that those scores accurately reflect the knowledge and abilities of the test-taker. Any testing condition (such as overexposure to the test questions) that might either positively or negatively affect the performance of any test-taker to the extent that it would contribute to either inflated or lowered test scores, invalidates those test scores.

Information about Testing Windows

This link lists the dates for the 2016-2017 testing year through August 2017. The dates are also listed below:

- 2/13/17-3/25/17
- 3/13/17-3/25/17
- 5/8/17-5/20/17
- 6/12/17-6/24/17
- 7/10/17-7/22/17
- 8/14/17-8/26/17

Guidance about Program Review as Part of the Accreditation Process—
Initial licensure programs are reviewed with the CAEP Initial Program Standards, regardless of whether they are undergraduate or graduate.

1. Program Review through Specialized Professional Associations (SPA):

SPA Reports are used as evidence in meeting CAEP Standard 1 (and other areas covered by CAEP, such as diversity and technology). Site visitors use the recognition reports as evidence that indicate whether programs of study are of high quality, have achieved recognition or approval status, and produce successful candidates. Program review occurs prior to the self-study in preparation for the onsite visit.

Per the CAEP Agreement with the West Virginia Board of Education (WVBE), every licensure program of study for which there is a SPA is reviewed by a SPA, including low-enrollment programs.

Programs for which there is a SPA, but may be limited in scope and/or programs that are not a direct match for the SPA requirements in that specialty area (i.e.add-on programs, some post-baccalaureate and MAT programs, etc.) will require the following process:
   A. Consultation with a SPA representative regarding the specific configuration of the program.
   B. Obtain documentation (in writing) from the SPA representative stating why the program cannot be reviewed via SPA method.
   C. Prepare the program for review via the Program Review with Feedback Option (see information below).

EPPs should find the drop-down menu in the AIMS platform for the appropriate place for populating evidence/program reports.

Questions about SPA timelines, SPA reporting and other communication should also be directed to the SPA contact or to CAEP Associates.

Program Review Regarding Low Enrollment or Suspended Admission of Candidates (Dormancy)--
West Virginia requires submission to the Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) even for programs with low enrollment so that all aspects of the program can be reviewed by the SPA. We often hear that CAEP associates have suggested that EPPs request a waiver from the state or CAEP says that the SPA "will not review." WV's position is to submit to SPA unless the EPP receives an official communication from the SPA stating that the SPA will not review it.

SPA reports will not only reveal conditions caused by low enrollment, but also report about other program circumstances as well. The dilemma arises when low enrollment remains an issue, and the conditions cannot be met because enrollment is too low to produce the necessary data. Because the state is also interested in SPA *conclusions and revelations* about other aspects of the programs, the following guidance is offered: If the reported conditions are only about low enrollment and no other areas of the program of study are identified with conditions, then the educator preparation provider (EPP) may resubmit via the Program Review with Feedback process because the conditions cannot be met.

**Please note--SPA reports that reflect conditions in areas other than lack of data must be resubmitted to the SPA regardless of enrollment. Also, if a program of study has a CAEP-accepted national organization that reviews, the same state position is taken.

Further guidance for your consideration: If program(s) are not currently enrolling candidates and currently have no candidates in the pipeline for completion of those particular programs, then a SPA submission will not be required. Instead, because those programs are listed as part of the EPP, the EPP will be required to submit through the Review with Feedback process. When the institution decides to open the programs for enrollment once again, a SPA report must be submitted immediately after the data collection of the first implementation of the assessments.

Decision to Eliminate the Program:
If the educator preparation provider (EPP) decides to eliminate programs that are no longer admitting candidates and there are no candidates in the pipeline for completion, SPA submissions are not required. If elimination is decided, the Office of Educator Effectiveness and Licensure will need official correspondence from the EPP stating the decision to eliminate the program(s). If the EPP, at a later time, decides to offer the program of study again, it must resubmit a program proposal to the West Virginia Educator Preparation Program Review Board (EPPRB) for review and seeking approval. Upon EPPRB and West Virginia Board of Education approval, the EPP will follow CAEP's direction in submitting a SPA report as appropriate.

2. Program Review with Feedback (PRw/F):

PRw/F programs are reviewed with the state standards provided in Policy 5100, Appendix E. The data entered there becomes part of the Institutional Self-Study Report (mostly as evidence to meet CAEP Standard 1 or Advanced Level Programs Standard A1). The evidence becomes part of the self-study process. EPPs submit the self-study report nine months before the scheduled site visit.

The Program Review with Feedback process provides feedback to the state, institutions, and site visiting team on program-level data without delivering a program evaluation/recognition report. Information (disaggregated data) from the Program Review with Feedback (PRw/F) option is used as part of the accreditation decision-making process at the institution level and does not lead to national recognition of

those programs of study. In AIMS, EPPs should find the drop-down menu in the AIMS platform for the appropriate place for populating evidence/program reports.

In preparation for a CAEP review, EPPS should submit evidence specific to how these "specialty license areas" use their data for continuous improvement. Consider the following thought process:

> 1. Based on the analysis of the disaggregated data, how have the results of specialty licensure area been used to inform decision-making and improve instruction and candidate learning outcomes?

> 2. How does the specialty licensure area data align with and provide evidence for meeting the state-selected standards?

> CAEP has provided a *Technical Guide* to Program Review with Feedback.

3. Advanced Programs:
   A. Add-On--If the admissions criteria require candidates to already hold licensure, regardless of whether the programs are graduate, master's or undergraduate, they are considered advanced programs and will be reviewed under the *CAEP Standards for Advanced Level Preparation Programs, Component 1.1.* EPPs are only required to submit evidence of candidate content knowledge documented by state licensure test scores or other proficiency measures.
   B. Programs part of M.Ed., M.S., M.A., Ed.D., Ph.D. or specific to the preparation of specialists for the P-12 school districts (educational technology, curriculum and instruction, reading specialist, school librarians, school psychology, school administrators, etc.) must be submitted to CAEP for review using the CAEP Standards for Advanced Level Preparation Programs

SPA Program Review Cycle

Spring Cycle	Fall Cycle
Due March 15	Due September 15
Reviewers assigned by April 15 and review completed by June 1	Reviewers assigned by October 15 and review completed by November 15
CEC audit team reviews reports by July 1	CEC audit team reviews reports by January 4
CAEP staff tech edits reports and returns the recognition reports to the institution by August 1	CAEP staff tech edits reports and returns the recognition reports to the institution by February 1

CAEP   CONNECT WITH CAEP www.CAEPnet.org twitter: @CAEPupdates

REMINDERS:

1. Title II data entry due by April 30.

2. If you have not already done so, please send a letter via email to Linda Bragg lnbragg@k12.wv.us declaring the Teacher Performance Assessment that your institution has chosen.

Goals and Objectives for MU COEPD Candidates with Regard to English Language Learners

Realizing that we need to train educators who can help all students reach their highest potential, we have identified a population who are candidates may not be as well prepared to help, English Language Learners (ELL). ELL are a diverse group with unique needs. MU COEPD wants to train candidates so they are prepared to work with ELL. In order to achieve this goal, our candidates will be able to:

- Define key TESOL terms and acronyms
- Outline English Language Learners' unique learning needs
    - o Recognize diversity among ELLs
    - o Recall key concepts in Second Language Acquisition
- Be aware of what it is like to be an ELL in school
- Explain where to turn for resources and help

BEGINNING SPRING 2017...

<u>NEW</u> MULTI-CATEGORICAL UNDERGRADUATE SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM IN K-6

Once finished, students will be <u>**fully**</u> certified to teach elementary education K-6 **and** multicategorical special education K-6.

Have questions or need more information?

Contact Dr. Lockwood by email

<u>conner4@marshall.edu</u>

Multicategorical Undergraduate Course Rotation

Fall	Hours
CISP 320 Survey of Exceptional Children I	3
CISP 420 Survey of Exceptional Children II	3 .
CISP 438 Characteristics and Behavior Mild/Moderate	3
CISP 440 Undergraduate Multicategorical Student Teaching	12 hours

Spring	Hours
CISP 320 Survey of Exceptional Children I	3
CISP 420 Survey of Exceptional Children II	3
CISP 439-Assessment in Special Education	3
CISP 453-Curriculum and Methods of Multicategorical Instruction	3
CISP 440 Undergraduate Multicategorical Student Teaching	12 hours

Evaluation Scores for Elementary Education Teacher Candidates – Fall 2016

Standard 1: Curriculum and Planning	Distinguished	Accomplished	Emerging	Unsatisfactory
1.1 Content Knowledge	8	38	2	0
1.2 Standard Driven Instruction	5	36	7	0
1.3 Assessment Approach	6	35	7	0
Standard 2: The Learner and the Learning Environment				
2.1 Characteristics of Learners	11	33	4	0
2.2 Appropriate Learning Environment	13	33	2	0
2.3 Learner-Centered Culture	8	39	1	0
Standard 3: Teaching				
3.1 Instructional Strategies	13	33	2	0
3.2 Learning Activities	10	35	3	0
3.3 Assessment Driven Instruction	10	34	4	0
Standard 4: Professional Responsibilities for Self-Renewal				
4.1 Professional Development	5	39	4	0
4.2 Collaboration with Colleagues	5	32	11	0
Standard 5: Professional Responsibilities for School and Community				
5.1 School-Wide Collaboration	3	33	12	0
5.2 Working with Community	4	28	16	0
5.3 Practices and Policies	4	31	13	0
Standard 6: Student Learning				
6.1 Measurable Progress	13	35	0	0
Standard 7: Professional Conduct				
Policy and Procedure	45	3	0	0
Attendance	44	4	0	0
Schedule	46	2	0	0
Respect	46	2	0	0
Appearance	46	2	0	0
Attitude/Composure	46	2	0	0
Confidentiality	46	2	0	0
Critical Thinking	42	6	0	0
Commitment to Students	45	3	0	0
Commitment to Diversity	45	3	0	0
Commitment to Technology	45	3	0	0
Commitment to Profession	42	6	0	0

Evaluation Scores for Secondary Education Teacher Candidates – Fall 2016

Standard 1: Curriculum and Planning	Distinguished	Accomplished	Emerging	Unsatisfactory
1.1 Content Knowledge	6	17	0	0
1.2 Standard Driven Instruction	11	8	4	0
1.3 Assessment Approach	6	15	2	0
Standard 2: The Learner and the Learning Environment				
2.1 Characteristics of Learners	7	10	6	0
2.2 Appropriate Learning Environment	9	12	2	0
2.3 Learner-Centered Culture	10	10	3	0
Standard 3: Teaching				
3.1 Instructional Strategies	5	18	0	0
3.2 Learning Activities	8	12	3	0
3.3 Assessment Driven Instruction	8	12	3	0
Standard 4: Professional Responsibilities for Self-Renewal				
4.1 Professional Development	6	13	4	0
4.2 Collaboration with Colleagues	6	11	6	0
Standard 5: Professional Responsibilities for School and Community				
5.1 School-Wide Collaboration	4	13	6	0
5.2 Working with Community	4	9	7	0
5.3 Practices and Policies	4	11	4	0
Standard 6: Student Learning				
6.1 Measurable Progress	10	13	0	0
Standard 7: Professional Conduct				
Policy and Procedure	22	1	0	0
Attendance	22	1	0	0
Schedule	22	1	0	0
Respect	22	1	0	0
Appearance	23	0	0	0
Attitude/Composure	22	1	0	0
Confidentiality	22	1	0	0
Critical Thinking	20	3	0	0
Commitment to Students	22	1	0	0
Commitment to Diversity	21	2	0	0
Commitment to Technology	22	1	0	0
Commitment to Profession	21	2	0	0