

EPSB Advanced Program Review Feedback
Agriculture Grades 5-12 (Updated 3-04-20 [See Round 2](#)) (Master's for Rank II
 (3630); Rank I non-degree

[Click to view Round 3 \(8-27-20\)](#)

[Click to Review Round 4 \(11-23-20\)](#)

[Click to Review Round 5 \(1-13-21\)](#)

[Original Submission Document](#)

Below you will find the EPSB concerns and the program responses to each concern. Where appropriate, new links are provided to demonstrate revised submissions. Also, all new information on EPSB documents is available on the MSU website.

EPSB feedback	Program Response	New links
A curriculum contract/ guidesheet was not submitted for this program. The link to the Curriculum Map links to a syllabus (CTE 698). The link provided in the program template goes to a catalog page.	This issue has been addressed.	See Agriculture Education Adv Programs Curriculum Map
The Clinical Educators identified do not appear to have assignments in these programs.	The issued has been addressed.	Agriculture Education Adv Program Review Clinical Educators REV
The courses spreadsheet does not identify all the courses for the programs. The spreadsheet only identifies 9 credit hours for five courses. There is not enough coursework identified to make a candidate eligible for the rank change.	This issue has been addressed by revising the courses spreadsheet to include all information.	Agriculture Education Adv Program Review Courses Spreadsheet REV
No assessment linked to clinical practice was identified.	This information has been added.	See Agriculture Education Program Review Assessments .
Only was syllabus was provided (CTE 698).	Additional syllabi have been added.	See: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CTE 630 Syllabus REV • CTE 660 Syllabus REV • CTE 698 Syllabus REV • AGR 603 Syllabus

<p>It is not clear where candidates have clinical experiences to demonstrate linking theory to practice.</p>	<p>These teachers are already certified and teaching. This is for a rank change not initial certification as the 16 KAR 5:020 references.</p>	
<p>The landing page indicates that field/ clinical experiences for these programs are addressed in the Section III template; however, the Section III template indicates "NA" in the applicable section.</p>	<p>These teachers are teaching and do not have to complete field experience or clinical practice such as student teaching. They do have clinical practice in CTE 660 course.</p>	
<p>The admission criteria identified in Section III does not meet the criteria of 16 KAR 5:020.</p>	<p>These are certified teachers they do not fit under 16 KAR 5:020 to be admitted into a teacher preparation program. This program is not for initial certification only rank change.</p>	
<p>It is not clear how the programs ensure candidates have sufficient knowledge of the KAS. The narrative does not indicate how the programs assess that knowledge.</p>	<p>The candidates gain knowledge in their area through the program content courses.</p>	
<p>It is not clear how the program ensures candidates have skills and commitment to creating supportive environments that afford all 5-12 students access to rigorous college and career ready standards.</p>	<p>The candidate takes the knowledge gained through content course work and apply it in the classrooms they teach in.</p>	
<p>It is not clear what candidates have to do to demonstrate their abilities to create and use formative and summative assessments for these programs.</p>	<p>Course CTE 698 covers this concern.</p>	

It is not clear why these programs demonstrate alignment with the ISLLC standards instead of the KTPS or Teacher Leader Model Standards.	These courses align with ISLLC standards and the KTPS as administrative students take these as well and meets the requirements for them.	
The Data Analysis portions of the Section III template identify the InTASC (aka KTPS) standards; however, the spreadsheet aligning courses with standards use different standards.	When the initial paperwork was completed the old teacher standards were still in place and had not switched to the InTASC as the new teacher standards. Those have been rectified.	
Information regarding the Evidence and Analysis of program assessment data is not specific for these programs.		
There is no link between the program data analysis and the continuous improvement plan for these programs.		

Concerns Across All Programs		
EPSB feedback	Program Response	New links
It does not appear there are partnership agreements relative to the advanced programs.	The program has an advisory board that meets twice a year to review curriculum and program offerings. The advisory board gives input on what they believe should be covered. The advisory board is comprised of teachers in the discipline and business and industry. Surveys are also used to analyze the program from students and employers of the student.	
It is not clear how the advanced programs collect program feedback from P-12 partners.	The CAEP QAS for initial programs includes focus groups and leadership meetings with regional	

	<p>district personnel who provide feedback regarding our candidates, both at initial and advanced levels. The two-way communication regarding suggestions, changes to be considered, needs, effectiveness, and concerns is in place and is regularly scheduled.</p>	
<p>There is no description of the co-construction of field / clinical experiences with the P-12 partners.</p>	<p>At this time, there is no co-construction of field / clinical experiences with P-12 partners relative to this program. Candidates who participate in this program are responsible for locating their own students for assessing, teaching, etc., often in their own classrooms.</p>	
<p>It is not clear how P-12 partners are involved in the review of program effectiveness data and are included in the program's continuous improvement processes.</p>	<p>The CAEP QAS for initial programs includes focus groups and leadership meetings with regional district personnel who provide feedback regarding our candidates, both at initial and advanced levels. The two-way communication regarding suggestions, changes to be considered, needs, effectiveness, and concerns is in place and is regularly scheduled.</p> <p>Again, the program has an advisory board that meets twice a year to review curriculum and program offerings. The advisory board gives input on what they believe should be covered.</p>	

	The advisory board is comprised of teachers in the discipline and business and industry. Surveys are also used to analyze the program from students and employers of the student.	
The QAS provided does not include a description of the transition points for the program.	This issue has been addressed by providing both a narrative and graphic presentation of transition points for the Agriculture Education Grades 5-12 program.	See: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture Education 5-12 Transition Points Narrative • Agriculture Education Advanced Programs Transition Points Graphic.

ROUND 2
EPSB Advanced Program Review Feedback (Updated 03-4-20)
Agriculture Grades 5-12
(Master's for Rank II (3630); Rank I non-degree (567))

Below you will find the EPSB concerns and the program responses to each concern. Where appropriate, new links are provided to demonstrate revised submissions. Also, all new information on EPSB documents is available on the MSU website.

EPSB feedback	Program Response	New links
The curriculum contract does not identify the required GPA for admission.	This issue has been addressed.	See Agriculture Education Adv Programs Curriculum Map REV.
It does not appear all the InTASC/KTPS standards are addressed within the five required courses. How does the program ensure KTPS 4 and 5 are sufficiently demonstrated within the program?	This issue has been addressed. Standards 4 and 5 are now represented in course syllabi for the program.	See <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AGR 603 Syllabus REV2, • CTE 630 Syllabus REV2, • CTE 660 Syllabus REV2, • CTE 685 Syllabus REV2, • CTE 698 Syllabus REV2.
It is not clear what InTASC/KTPS are aligned with the Data Analysis and Decision Making Project. The spreadsheet has question marks in the	This issue has been addressed.	See Agriculture Education Program Review Assessments REV2.

space where the standards alignment should be identified.		
The Syllabus for CTE 685 was not provided.	This issue has been addressed.	See CTE 685 Syllabus REV2.
There is no information provided in the syllabus on the Data Analysis and Decision Making Project (a program assessment) that occurs in AGR 602. [Should be AGR 603]	This issue has been addressed.	See AGR 603 Syllabus REV2.
It is not clear where candidates have clinical experiences to demonstrate linking theory to practice. What opportunities are required in the program for candidates to practice or apply what they are learning in the program to their practice as professional educators?	CTE 660 has a requirement to complete an assignment, Personal Information.” This experience is described as: “The candidate will create a posting containing personal information. The research will include working with appropriate school/district personnel. The candidate will then prepare a report on the issue including a possible solution, the amount of time spent working with the school/district personnel will be reported.” This involves linking theory to practice at many levels and addresses the concern.	See CTE 660 Syllabus REV2.
Information provided in the rejoinder is inconsistent. In one section it indicates there are no clinical experiences and in another section it states that “they do have clinical practice in CTE 660 course.”	The disparity between the Program Review Section III and the spreadsheet have been addressed. Field/clinical experiences were added to the revised syllabus.	See <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture Education Grades 5-12 Adv Program Review Template Section III REV • CTE 660 Syllabus REV2.
The admission criteria identified in Section III does not meet the criteria of 16 KAR 5:020. 16 KAR 5:020 does include admission criteria	This has been addressed.	See Agriculture Education Grades 5-12 Adv Program Review Template Section III REV

<p>for advanced programs. See Section 1(4) (a-c) and (5) (a-c).</p>		
<p>It is not clear how the programs ensure candidates have sufficient knowledge of the KAS. The narrative does not indicate how the programs assess that knowledge. Is there an assessment or measure that is ensured by the program before completion? Has the content coursework been aligned with the KAS? If candidates choose the program content courses via elective hours, how does the program ensure the candidate has sufficient knowledge?</p>	<p>The alignment to KAS and course assessments is provided in each syllabus on the table.</p>	<p>See</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AGR 603 Syllabus REV2, • CTE 630 Syllabus REV2, • CTE 660 Syllabus REV2, • CTE 685 Syllabus REV2, • CTE 698 Syllabus REV2.
<p>It is not clear how the programs ensure candidates apply the KAS. Narrative provided in the Section III template does not describe what the candidates have to do to demonstrate the KAS application and assessment skills.</p> <p>The rejoinder indicates that candidates apply the knowledge in their classrooms. How is this ensured by the program?</p>	<p>The link to KAS and course assessments is provided in each syllabus on the table.</p>	<p>See</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AGR 603 Syllabus REV2, • CTE 630 Syllabus REV2, • CTE 660 Syllabus REV2, • CTE 685 Syllabus REV2, • CTE 698 Syllabus REV2.
<p>It is not clear how the program ensures candidates have skills and commitment to creating supportive environments</p>	<p>Students in the program must take CTE 698 – Career Guidance and Development. This course includes numerous</p>	

<p>that afford all 5-12 students access to rigorous college and career ready standards. How does the program ensure the candidates have these skills? How are they evaluated?</p>	<p>discussion boards and a research paper on College and Career Ready. All of these items are accessed by rubrics and objective exams.</p>	
<p>It is not clear what candidates have to do to demonstrate their abilities to create and use formative and summative assessments for these programs.</p> <p>What assessment is used in CTE 698 to determine candidates' skills in creating and using formative and summative assessments?</p>	<p>Students in the program must take CTE 630 – Evaluation Techniques. This course includes numerous discussion boards, a research paper on testing standards, and test construction which covers numerous types of assessments. All of these items are accessed by rubrics and objective exams.</p>	
<p>It is not clear why these programs demonstrate alignment with the ISLLC standards instead of the KTPS or Teacher Leader Model Standards. Syllabi do not provide sufficient evidence that all the KTPS are aligned with the program coursework. CTE 630 is the only syllabus provided that addresses the Kentucky Teacher Standards. It does not demonstrate alignment with all the standards.</p> <p>NOTE: Revisions to courses addressing the ISLLC standards should be occurring since the EPSB</p>	<p>The syllabi for the core courses, the courses spreadsheet, and the key assessments have all been aligned with the ISLLC Standards, KTPS/InTASC standards, the CAEP Standards, American Association for Agricultural Education Standards, and the International Technology Education Standards. These programs are provided across multiple programs and have to meet various SPAs' standards.</p> <p>Revisions to address the newer version of the ISLLC Standards are in process.</p>	

<p>adopted the PSEL Standards beginning in July 2019.</p>		
<p>The Data Analysis portions of the Section III template identify the InTASC (aka KTPS) standards; however, the spreadsheet aligning courses with standards use different standards.</p> <p>The spreadsheet does not demonstrate alignment of the program courses with the InTASC (KTPS) standards. The standards identified on the spreadsheet do not match the standards identified in the syllabus for CTE 630.</p> <p>NOTE: Revisions to courses identified on the spreadsheet should be occurring since the EPSB adopted the PSEL Standards beginning in July 2019.</p>	<p>The concerns about alignment of spreadsheets, course syllabi, key assessments and Program Review Section III have been addressed.</p> <p>Revisions to address the newer version of the ISLLC Standards are in process.</p>	
<p>Information regarding the Evidence and Analysis of program assessment data is not specific for these programs. Not addressed in rejoinder.</p>	<p>This has been addressed in the Program Review Section III document.</p>	<p>See Agriculture Education Grades 5-12 Adv Program Review Template Section III REV</p>
<p>There is no link between the program data analysis and the continuous improvement plan for these programs. Not addressed in rejoinder.</p>	<p>This has been addressed in the Program Review Section III document.</p>	<p>See Agriculture Education Grades 5-12 Adv Program Review Template Section III REV</p>

ROUND 2
Concerns Across All Programs

EPSB feedback	Program Response
<p>It does not appear there are partnership agreements relative to the advanced programs.</p> <p>What evidence in each of the advanced programs could be provided to demonstrate that “Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of advanced program candidate preparation”? What evidence in each of the advanced programs could be provided that identifies the partners are involved in developing “mutually agreeable expectations for advanced candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked”?</p> <p>There is no description of the co-construction of field/ clinical experiences with the P-12 partners.</p> <p>The rejoinder reported that focus groups and leadership meetings made up of district representatives provide MSU with program feedback. Does this feedback include</p>	<p>At this time, there are three groups which meeting regularly to address concerns and needs across both initial and advanced programs: the Teacher Education Council (TEC), College of Education Focus groups, and College of Education Executive Leadership meetings.</p> <p>The TEC is a standing university committee that oversees all curriculum changes, admission requirements, and exit requirements that involve any education program. Its constituency includes faculty representatives across programs, student representatives, and P-12 representatives (teachers and administrators). This body meets monthly and is an avenue for providing feedback for both initial certification and advanced programs which include all aspects of programs – technology integration, clinical preparation, field experience, curriculum, admissions and exit requirements, assessment, quality control, etc.</p> <p>As part of the College of Education’s Quality Assurance Plan there is a four-year rotation of COE/P-12 collaborative meetings that helps inform programs of needed changes. The first year of the cycle incorporated a survey sent out to district leadership (Superintendents and Principals). The remaining three years incorporates the College of Education Focus groups meeting on a rotating basis with superintendents, principals, and other district leadership in all 22 counties within MSU’s service region.</p> <p>The agendas for these meetings include gathering information regarding our candidates’ performances for both initial and advanced programs, as well as upcoming needs that each district currently has or will likely face in the foreseeable future. While there has not been a specific inquiry regarding each individual program, this can certainly be added to both the surveys and discussions in future focus group meetings. The next cycle (beginning in the 2020-2021 academic year) will include a new survey in which responses regarding advanced programs will be included and separately distributed to personnel who supervise/direct these programs, i.e. gifted, literacy specialist, ESL, etc.</p>

<p>field/clinical experiences relative to advanced programs?</p>	<p>In addition to the survey and focus group cycle each semester, the College of Education hosts an Executive Leadership meeting that is held on MSU's campus. The group consists of representatives of MSU COE administrators, faculty, and students; all superintendents within the service region and additional personnel they select (principals, administrative personnel, teachers, etc.) are also invited. Each session focuses on a specific topic: initial certification, clinical experiences and clinical practices, etc. The spring 2020 session will focus on advanced programs and will result in feedback and identification of future co-construction and collaborative experiences that can occur in the future. Discussions regarding field/clinical experiences and intentional linking of theory and practice will occur.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------