

Elementary Math Specialist Responses to OELE Feedback

Responses may take three general approaches:

- Please see x where this concern was previously addressed
- The following changes have been made to address this area of feedback...
- Changes have not been made to address this area of feedback, but a response will be forthcoming, because....

| | Feedback from OELE | Response | Additional Questions |
|---|---|---|----------------------|
| 1 | The program (course table) does not demonstrate alignment of the courses to the elements of either the NCTM Elementary or Kentucky Teacher Performance Standards. How does the program ensure the elements/components of the standards are addressed? | On P. 2, there is a course standard alignment chart to the KTPS standards. On. P. 3, there is a course/standard alignment to NCTM CAEP Standards 2012 Elementary Level. Both sets of standards are embedded and explained as to how measured in the attached syllabi as well. | |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| 2 | <p>The course alignment table does not demonstrate how many field/clinical experiences are required throughout the program. The syllabi for ELED 571, 572, and 573 do not demonstrate field/clinical experiences. There is no evidence that field/clinical experiences are required in this program. If so, how does the program plan on generating evidence of meeting CAEP Standard A.2.2?</p> | <p>Revised to say on p. 13:</p> <p>All candidates are required to complete clinical experiences related to their courses. To ensure that the candidates are immersed in experiences that have the appropriate depth and breadth, the assignments are established around threads/themes. Each pedagogy course has mathematics content, technology content, and then the content per that specific course: leadership, instruction of diverse learners, and assessment.</p> <p>The original design of courses and assignments was vetted by a pilot group of teacher participants. From that feedback, the course continues to evolve. We are having external review by our district partners for the courses/program in January 2021. From this future feedback, we can modify or continue valuable assignments and partner further with our districts and incorporate their involvement further in the clinical setting.</p> <p>The pedagogy courses require the following amount of hours tied to clinical experiences (see course syllabi):</p> <p>ELED 571: 24 hours via three Key Assessments AND Discussion Board/Blog Journal ELED 572: 28 hours via three Key Assessments AND Discussion Board/Blog Journal ELED 573: 28 hours via three Key Assessments AND Discussion Board/Blog Journal</p> <p>*Total Hours connected to and assessed via Clinical Setting: 80 hours</p> | |
|---|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| 3 | <p>It appears there is one assessment used to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. The advanced standards indicate a need for multiple measures. The spreadsheet table does not reflect the assessment information provided in the narrative (key assessments within courses). Additional information is needed to identify what teacher candidate performance data is used to evaluate the program's effectiveness. Validity and reliability of the assessment(s) are not addressed.</p> | <p>A key assessment is used in each course.</p> <p>We have added in more key assessment for multiple measures. Also, common assessments are included.</p> <p>See p. 11 and p. 14-15 for data collection assessments.</p> <p>Added a statement to address validity and reliability on p. 14.</p> <p>"Each pedagogy course, ELED 571, ELED 572, and ELED 573, includes a clinical experience in which a key assessments are generated with a score of 4 points possible on each standard indicator of which they are aligned. The target score for monitoring success is 3 or 4 out of a possible 4. The key assessments are outlined in the earlier chart. One major assessment is to continue adding to a Math and Technology Growth Plan – adding the areas per the classes, leadership, instruction of diverse learners, and assessment – which focuses on assessing the Student Learning Outcomes and KTPS, NCTM/CAEP, AMTE, and ISTE standards. Other threads of assignments key to the courses: Math Coaching assignment in all three courses, Lesson Plan/Redesign in the mid and end course. There is a minimum of TWO assignment/assessments for EACH of the three pedagogy courses to apply to the clinical setting.</p> <p>Validity and reliability will be a continued goal to establish for each key assessment. "</p> <p>Exit criteria are also added that address rubric scores required for components aligned to standards on p. 14.</p> <p>"To align with CAEP 3.5 and 3.6 standards, the following must be in place for exit assessment:</p> | |
|---|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| 4 | <p>It is not clear how the MTL Growth Plan components are assessed within each ELED course. For example, the Professional Growth Plan is created in ELED 571, but the syllabus does not clearly identify detailed information about this key assessment. How is it evaluated? What standards are being assessed?</p> | <p>The MTL Growth Plan is used in each course to focus on different NCTM and AMTE standards each time – there is a progression. There is also a different focus each time for ISTE technology standards. We are including an addition of the focus on what standards are the focus in each of the syllabi and the template for each of the key assessment courses.</p> <p>The Math and Technology Growth Plan has a different focus in each course with different standards being highlighted – leadership, diverse learners/instruction, and assessment.</p> <p>EACH syllabus includes an alignment for which NCTM/ CAEP EMS <u>AND</u> KTPS standards are aligned and assessed to the Growth Plan EACH time.</p> <p>AND ALL Key Assessments are shown with alignment.</p> | |
|---|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 5 | <p>Additional information is needed to demonstrate how the program collaborates with the districts to provide input on the design and evaluation of the clinical experiences as well as participate in the continuous improvement process for the program.</p> | <p>We collaborate with our graduates of our program and ask them to serve as mentors and give us feedback for improvement.</p> <p>We collaborate with GRREC and connect with our local districts through continuous conversations.</p> <p>On p. 12 – I state: “Participants/students in the Elementary Math Specialist coursework courses are involved in clinical partnerships through their school districts by the design of the coursework itself. Each of the pedagogy courses includes assignments that involves leadership and application components for the participants to exercise growth in the standards to exhibit their knowledge of the Elementary Math Specialist content.</p> <p>The relationship for participants taking courses and the districts benefitting by the person taking the course is mutually beneficial. For example, as a “clinical-based” partnership, a recurring assignment is for the participant/student to coach/mentor a colleague in mathematics learning environment, instruction of diverse learning, and assessment cycle. By observing and cognitively coaching the teacher through making chosen improvements to the lesson, both the EMS candidate AND the teacher in the clinical setting benefit. The chosen teacher benefits by mentoring, while the EMS candidate benefits from practicing skills in mentoring/coaching, and the district benefits from a “built-in” math coaching opportunity that will hopefully grow into a lasting impact.</p> <p>Clinical partners are involved in a review of design of program. Community partners were involved in the design of the courses, as the development came from a grant involving K-6 teachers. An upcoming session with</p> | |
|---|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 6 | <p>The narrative does not describe how each of the five required assessment areas are measured by the program assessment(s). How is the assessment aligned to the applicable standards related to the assessment area? What standards are being assessed by each measure? How is the data collected and used for continuous improvement?</p> | <p>Added in charts and details on ELED 571, 572, and 573 to show alignment of assessments to SPA and KTPS standards. P. 12-13</p> <p>ALSO, added in more detail to the 5 required areas. P. 11</p> | |
|---|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| 7 | <p>The summary analysis section does not provide a summary of the program data on each of the assessment areas. What did the program learn from the results of the program data analysis? How do the results of this analysis link to program improvement. Specifics about the program analysis was not provided. A general explanation of the EPPs process was provided, but additional information is needed to demonstrate the application of this process specific to this program.</p> | <p>On p. 20-21, added in the following details:</p> <p>“Data analysis is in the beginning stages:</p> <p>For the three Key Assessments, data collection has been in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math and Technology Growth Plan: Leadership, • Math and Technology Growth Plan: Diverse Learners, • Math and Technology Growth Plan: Assessment: <p>Data analysis has been collected for the MT Growth plan for each area focus, and the running average is 3 or above 100% of the time in each standard area for each student, on the 4-point rubric. The target is 3 of 4 on the rubric for each indicator. This data has been collected for the past 5 years.</p> <p>Data collection for the next two categories of Key Assessments has yet to happen as these Key Assessments have just been added as areas of data collection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson Planning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Differentiated CREATE Math Lesson Plan (Key Assessment) AND ○ Math Lesson Plan Redesign: Assessment (Key Assessment) • Math Coaching; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Math Coaching Interview Part 1: Leadership (Key Assessment); ○ Math Coaching Interview Part 2: Leadership (Key Assessment); • Math Coaching: Instruction (Key Assessment)” | |
|---|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|----|---|---|--|
| 8 | The curriculum contract/guidesheet identifies one midpoint and one exit assessment – 3.0 GPA. The curriculum contract/guidesheet does not confirm there are multiple measures at each transition point. | Revised – p. 24 | |
| 9 | It is unclear how the components of the MTL Growth Plan are assessed throughout the coursework. Is there an overall or comprehensive evaluation made at program completion? How is the data from each component and the overall assessment used for program analysis? | <p>Each course – ELED 571, 572 and 573 – has a component that is adding to the overall product of the Math and Technology Growth Plan. The three components are:</p> <p>Leadership Divers Learners/Instruction Assessment</p> <p>Throughout, I have added in several charts and pages to describe how each course has a unique piece with unique standards for the candidate to exhibit.</p> <p>See p. 11-13 See p. 18-19</p> | |
| 10 | The narrative description of the admission and exit requirements do not match the admission and exit criteria identified on the curriculum contract/guidesheet. | revised | |
| 11 | The syllabi for ELED 571, 572, and 573 indicate that the courses are aligned to AMTE Elementary Mathematics Specialist Standards as well as other (e.g. ISTE) standards. The course/SPA alignment table does not reflect the same information. | <p>The AMTE EMS standards and ISTE standards are above and beyond the required alignment of the PRD. I do that in my syllabi to give students extra support and understanding of the many sets of standards we are addressing.</p> <p>They see this alignment in each syllabus.</p> | |

| | | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 12 | While the syllabi for ELED 571, 572, and 573 list the standards, they do not demonstrate how the SPA (NCTM Elementary) standards are linked/aligned to either the course objectives or assessments. | Charts have been added to show alignment of each assessment to student learning outcome to SPA to KTPS. See each syllabus AND See p. 12-13 charts that have been added. | |
| 13 | EDEL 572 and 573 syllabi reference FTC. What is FTC? | FTC stood for Framework for Teaching Components of which we were at one time asked to align. This has been deleted. | |