

EPSB Advanced Program Review Feedback
Engineering and Technology Education Grades 5-12 (Updated 3-09-20 See Round 2)

Master's for Rank II (3631); Rank I non-degree (936)

[Updated 8-27-20, See Round 3](#) [Updated 10-23-20, See Round 4](#) [Updated 11-23-20, See Round 5](#)
[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.	The curriculum map for the programs has been developed with all required components.	See Eng and Tech Ed 5-12 Curriculum Map REV.
The Clinical Educators identified do not appear to have assignments in these programs.	These issues have been addressed.	See Eng and Tech Education Grades 5-12 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.	These issues have been addressed.	See Eng and Tech Education Grades 5-12 Adv Progr Rev Courses Spreadsheet.
No assessment linked to clinical practice was identified.	This issue has been addressed.	See Eng and Tech Education Grades 5-12 Adv Program Review Assessments REV.
Only was syllabus was provided (CTE 698).	All syllabi for core courses are available.	See: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CTE 630 Syllabus REV • CTE 660 Syllabus REV • CTE 685 Syllabus REV • CTE 698 Syllabus REV • IET 603 Syllabus REV
It is not clear where candidates have clinical experiences to demonstrate linking theory to practice	These teachers are already certified and teaching. This is for a rank change not initial certification as the 16 KAR 5:020 references.	
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.	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.	
The admission criteria identified in Section III does not meet the criteria of 16 KAR 5:020.	This has been addressed.	See Eng and Tech Ed 5-12 Curriculum Map REV.
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	The candidates gain knowledge in their area through the program content courses.	

knowledge.		
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.	The candidate takes the knowledge gained through content course work and apply it in the classrooms they teach in.	
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.	Course CTE 698 covers this concern.	See CTE 698 Syllabus REV.
It is not clear what candidates have to do to demonstrate their abilities to create and use formative and summative assessments for these programs.	Course CTE 630 covers this concern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See CTE 630 Syllabus REV.
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.	The courses spreadsheet now includes the InTASC / KTPS standards.	See Eng and Tech Education Grades 5-12 Adv Progr Rev Courses Spreadsheet.
Information regarding the Evidence and Analysis of program assessment data is not specific for these programs.	There are surveys that are administered to students and their employer about the program and how it has improved the candidate and how.	
There is no link between the program data analysis and the continuous improvement plan for these programs.	The program has an advisory board that meets twice a year to go over curriculum and program offerings. The advisory board gives input on what they feel should be covered. The advisory board is comprised of teachers in the discipline and business and industry. Surveys are also used to analysis the program from students and employers of the student.	

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 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.	
There is no description of the co-construction of field / clinical experiences with the P-12 partners.	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.	
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.	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. 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. 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 Engineering and Technology Education Grades 5-12 program.	See: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eng and Tech Education 5-12 Transition Points Narrative • Eng and Tech Education Advanced Programs Transition Points Graphic

ROUND 2
EPSB Advanced Program Review Feedback (Updated 03-9-20)
Engineering and Technology Education Grades 5-12
 Master’s for Rank II (3631); Rank I non-degree (936)

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 map identifies a 2.5 GPA instead of the required 2.75.	This has been addressed.	See Eng and Tech Ed 5-12 Curriculum Map 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
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. Is there an assessment or measure that is ensured by the program before completion?	The link to KAS and course assessments is provided in each syllabus on the table.	See <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CTE 630 Syllabus REV2 • CTE 660 Syllabus REV2 • CTE 685 Syllabus REV2 • CTE 698 Syllabus REV2 • IET 603 Syllabus REV2
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. How does the program ensure the candidates have these skills?	Students in the program must take CTE 698 – Career Guidance and Development. This course includes numerous discussion boards and a research paper on College and Career Ready. All of these items are accessed by rubrics and objective exams.	

How are they evaluated?		
The courses spreadsheet indicates alignment of the required courses with KTPS 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. How does the program ensure KTPS 4 and 5 are addressed?	The concerns about alignment of spreadsheets, course syllabi, key assessments and Program Review Section III have been addressed.	See <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eng and Tech Education Grades 5-12 Adv Program Review Assessments REV2 • Engineering and Technology Education Grades 5-12 Adv Program Review Template Section III REV • CTE 630 Syllabus REV2 • CTE 660 Syllabus REV2 • CTE 685 Syllabus REV2 • CTE 698 Syllabus REV2 • IET 603 Syllabus REV2
According to the Assessments spreadsheet, it does not appear that KTPS 4 and 5 are being assessed.	This issue has been addressed. Standards 4 and 5 are now consistently represented in the Assessment spreadsheet, Program Review Section III, and course syllabi for the program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Eng and Tech Education Grades 5-12 Adv Program Review Assessments REV2
Information regarding the Evidence and Analysis of program assessment data is not specific for these programs. What has the review of the program data indicated about the effectiveness of this program?	This has been addressed in the Program Review Section III document.	See Engineering and Technology Education Grades 5-12 Adv Program Review Template Section III REV .
There is no link between the program data analysis and the continuous improvement plan for these programs. How does the review of the program effectiveness data connect to the continuous improvement of the program?	This has been addressed in the Program Review Section III document.	See Engineering and Technology Education Grades 5-12 Adv Program Review Template Section III REV .

**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</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</p>

<p>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 field/clinical experiences relative to advanced programs?</p>	<p>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>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>
---	---