Self-Study Report

MONMOUTH UNIVERSITY

400 Cedar Avenue

West Long Branch, NJ 07764

April 14, 2019 12:00 a.m.

Type of Visit:
Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation

CAEP Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

CAEP Self-Study Report

I. EPP Overview

Guide to the Self-Study Report

a. Context and Unique Characteristics

Monmouth University has enjoyed a history of dynamic growth and development. It has progressively become a first-choice destination school by expanding and enhancing the quality of its academic programs and steadily raising admission criteria for incoming students. Currently, Monmouth University is the fourth ranked college in New Jersey and 28th in the Northeast region. The university offers 32 undergraduate, 24 graduate degree programs, and a multitude of certificate programs to over 6,000 students, including 4,500 undergraduate students and 1,700 graduate students. The student body has representatives from 31 states and 34 foreign nations. More than 1,600 undergraduate resident students enjoy a challenging, technological-rich, learning environment on a traditional campus.

The university's beginning was relatively modest, starting in 1933 as a two-year institution limited to evening classes. Its purpose was to provide an opportunity for higher education to Depression-era, local high school graduates who could not afford to go away to college. In 1956, Monmouth College was accredited by the state to offer four-year programs leading to the baccalaureate degree. Less than a decade later, it was authorized to offer master's degree programs, and in March, 1995, the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education granted Monmouth University status.

In 1995, the School of Education (SOE) was formed from the previous Department of Education in Monmouth College. In 2002, McAllan Hall, the current home of the SOE was constructed. In 2005, the newly formed SOE Assessment Committee created an initial unit assessment plan, program faculty created core (SPA) assessments, and the School created the University Teacher Education Advisory Council; which is comprised of members from the School of Education, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, and the School of Science. School partnerships began in 2007 with the Middle Road, Hazlet partnership. Professional development academies, including the Superintendents', Principals', and Special Services Academies, and the Central Jersey Consortium for Equity and Excellence were formed between 2009 - 2012. The EPP began collecting program and unit survey data electronically in 2008, which increased efficiency and accuracy in the data collection and analysis process. The EPP received NCATE accreditation in 2007 and 2012. During 2015 - 2018, student teaching was expanded to yearlong clinical practice through a three year pilot. In spring 2017, the EPP received an Exemplary Partnership Award from the National Association of Professional Development Schools. In fall 2017, the SOE opened the second doctoral program on campus, the EdD in Educational Leadership.

b. Description of Organizational Structure

Monmouth University is organized into six academic schools with 27 academic departments and two additional schools (Graduate Studies and Honors):
. Leon Hess Business School
. The School of Education
. Marjorie K. Unterberg School of Nursing and Health Studies
. School of Science
. School of Social Work
. Wayne D. McMurray School of Humanities and Social Sciences
. Graduate Studies
. Honors School

The organizational chart for Monmouth University is included as Exhibit A Monmouth University Organizational Chart.
The SOE has two offices, the Dean's office and the Office of Certification, Field Placements and School Partnerships. The EPP is organized into four departments, including the Departments of Speech Language Pathology, Educational Counseling and Leadership, Special Education, and Curriculum and Instruction. The School has seven program directors in Counseling, Educational Leadership, Literacy, the Masters of Arts in Teaching, the ESL M.ED., the Early Childhood M.ED., and Interdisciplinary Studies for Elementary Educators. Teacher Preparation takes place in the Departments of Curriculum and Instruction and Special Education under the leadership of two department chairs and four program directors. The SOE has approximately 400 undergraduate students and 60 graduate students in the teacher preparation program. The organizational chart for the EPP is included as Exhibit 5.3.C EPP Organizational Chart.
The SOE infrastructure includes committees, advisory groups, and the other processes that occur in the SOE. Exhibit 5.3.D EPP Operational Chart illustrates the operational structure of the EPP.

The EPP prepares teacher candidates outside of the SOE in collaboration with other programs including Health and Physical Education, Music, Art, English, Foreign Language, Biology, Chemistry, and Social Studies (i.e., History, Political Science or History/Political Science interdisciplinary). Monmouth University offers over 25 initial professional teacher education degree and endorsements in Elementary Education, Teacher of Students with Disabilities, Early Childhood (P-3), Supplemental Reading and Mathematics, English as a Second Language, and Middle School. Additionally, advanced programs are offered in School Leadership (i.e., Principal Cert., Supervisor Cert.), Reading Specialist, and Learning Disabilities Teacher Consultant. The SOE conducts University Teacher Education Advisory Council meetings three times per academic year to collaborate with university faculty in all Schools across campus to review data, discuss state and federal mandates and changes, review proposed programs and changes to programs as a part of continuous improvement and a vibrant Quality Assurance System. This is one of many internal constituency groups in which stakeholders are involved. It complements the numerous external constituencies in which school improvement is the focus.

c. Vision, Mission, and Goals

The Monmouth University Mission Statement is located on the institution's website at www.monmouth.edu/university/our-mission-and-story.aspx.
Monmouth University is an independent, comprehensive institution of higher education committed to excellence and integrity in teaching, scholarship, and service. Through its offerings in liberal arts, science, and professional programs, Monmouth University educates and prepares students to realize their potential as leaders and to become engaged citizens in a diverse and increasingly interdependent world.

CORE VALUES
. Excellence in Teaching and Learning
. Caring Campus Characterized by Mutual Respect
. Personal and Professional Integrity
. Diversity
. Service
. Empowerment of University Community
The Monmouth University Plan: Our Commitment to Transformative Learning
In October 2015, the Board of Trustees endorsed the strategic plan that was developed by the campus community. The Monmouth University Plan: Our Commitment to Transformative Learning expresses a clear vision and strategy for Monmouth's future, reflecting the input of faculty, administrators, staff, students, alumni, and other stakeholders. The strategic plan introduces three core elements through which we will achieve transformative learning at both the graduate and undergraduate levels: 1) an intellectually challenging and rigorous academic experience built on a strong foundation in the liberal arts; 2) high impact and immersive learning experiences that extend beyond the classroom; and 3) preparation for life after Monmouth. The strategic plan is included as Exhibit B. The Monmouth Plan.

The School of Education Strategic Plan is included as Exhibit 5.3.E The Monmouth School of Education Strategic Plan. The School of Education's vision for achieving personal and professional transformation is well aligned with the university's emphasis on transformational learning by emphasizing rigorous academic work, immersion in clinical experiences, and life after Monmouth. Below are the six primary SOE goals. Goals 1 and 2 illustrate our commitment to rigorous academic work; Goals 3 and 4 demonstrate our commitment to immersive experiences; Goal 5 shows teacher candidates how to become leaders in their profession; and Goal 6 will foster connections with Monmouth University after graduation.
Goal 1: To maintain and develop processes that foster continuous program improvement.
Goal 2: To develop new programs and initiatives for the purpose of enhancing competitiveness.
Goal 3: To promote an enhanced awareness and practice of social justice.
Goal 4: To further develop school and community partnerships for the purpose of providing outstanding professional education while serving the community.
Goal 5: To enhance leadership development and the capacity to effect positive school change.
Goal 6: To develop a state and national reputation for innovative teaching and learning for the School of Education.

d. EPP's Shared Values and Beliefs for Educator Preparation

The shared values and beliefs of the SOE are reflected in the School of Education Mission Statement and Strategic Plan. The SOE's mission is to be a leader in the preparation and professional development of highly competent, reflective teachers, speech-language pathologists, school counselors and administrators. We are committed to social justice initiatives that better all students and other persons from diverse backgrounds in terms of abilities, age, gender, culture, race, ethnicity, family, and socioeconomic status. Our candidates learn the exigencies of their profession by practicing and

demonstrating their skills through clinical experiences in a wide range of local school and community settings. Our accredited programs link theory and practice, foster lifelong learning and reflection, and improve the quality of life for students and clients through innovation, research, and scholarship. School of Education graduates have the practical skills, the commitment to service, and the theoretical knowledge necessary to enhance living and learning in academic and professional settings.

The School of Education will become nationally recognized as a leader in developing program innovations in education. To do so, we will develop program innovations that emphasize:
1. Personal and professional transformation
2. The integration of social justice awareness into every aspect of our work
3. Enhanced school and community partnerships that provide well designed and innovative clinical internships
4. Leadership development and the capacity to enact school change

To accomplish these goals, our academic programs will be leaders in preparing and developing reflective, critical practitioners who are committed to equity and positive social justice; who have been engaged in extensive clinical preparation; and who are accomplished in enacting personal, professional, and institutional change. We will place a special emphasis on developing cutting-edge approaches to social justice awareness and clinical preparation.

These goals will be achieved by establishing a personalized, collaborative learning environment recognized for its diversity, known for its innovative practices and programs, committed to transforming local and global communities, and distinguished by its research and scholarship. Our goal will be to develop cutting-edge programs that foster the preparation and professional development of scholar-practitioners and leaders who can inspire personal and institutional transformation to meet worldwide learning opportunities and challenges in education.

This plan was developed collaboratively by faculty and staff in the School of Education over the academic year 2017-18. It has been reviewed by partners, by faculty, and by Monmouth University administration.

EPP Accreditation Status

e. Is the EPP regionally or institutionally accredited?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No. the EPP is ineligible for regional/institutional accreditation or such accreditation is not available

EPP is regionally or institutionally accredited

a. If your institution/EPP is regionally accredited, please upload a PDF copy of the award of regional accreditation here. If your institution/EPP is NOT regional accredited, please move to the next page.

Middle States Reaffirmation of Accreditation

See Attachment panel below.

Table 2. Program Characteristics

a. Complete this table of program characteristics by entering the information requested for every program or program option offered by the EPP. Cross check the list with the programs listed in the EPP's academic catalog, if any, as well as the list of state-approved registered programs, if applicable. Site Visitors will reference this list in AIMS during the accreditation review process.
Note: EPP is responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the data imported into this table.

Name of Program/specialty area	Enrollment in current fall cycle	Enrollment in last fall cycle	Degree level	Certificate or licensure level	Method of Delivery	State(s) in which program is approved	Date of state approval(s)
Spanish K-12	4	5	Initial	Baccalaureate	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Spanish K-12 or Chinese K-12, MAT	2	2	Initial	Master's	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Secondary Sciences: Biology, Chemistry, Physical Science	9	6	Initial	Baccalaureate	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Secondary Sciences: Biology, Chemistry, Physical Science, MAT	4	4	Initial	Master's	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Secondary Mathematics	26	26	Initial	Baccalaureate	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Secondary Mathematics, MAT	1	0	Initial	Master's	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Secondary Social Studies	32	36	Initial	Baccalaureate	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Secondary Social Studies, MAT	4	1	Initial	Master's	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Early Childhood P-3 and Teacher of Students with Disabilities	32	27	Initial	Baccalaureate	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Elementary Education K-6	162	145	Initial	Baccalaureate	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Elementary Education K-6, MAT	11	7	Initial	Master's	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Secondary English	41	42	Initial	Baccalaureate	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Secondary English, MAT	9	4	Initial	Master's	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Art Education K-12	14	10	Initial	Baccalaureate	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Art Education K-12 MAT	4	4	Initial	Master's	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Music, K-12	12	12	Initial	Baccalaureate	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Music K-12, MAT	0	0	Initial	Master's	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Health and Physical Education K-12	20	21	Initial	Baccalaureate	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Health and Physical Education K-12, MAT	2	2	Initial	Master's	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Early Childhood P-3 and Elementary K-6, MAT	2	1	Initial	Master's	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17
Elementary K-6 and Teacher of Students with Disabilities. MAT	31	30	Initial	Master's	in-person	New Jersey	8/10/17

NOTE FOR IMPORTING SPECIALTY AREA PROGRAM INFORMATION
Appending: Will add the selected program(s) to the table
Replacing: Will clear out all information currently entered in the table and will repopulate the table with the selected program(s)

Table 3. EPP Characteristics

Complete this table of EPP characteristics in AIMS to provide an expanded profile by which the accreditation process is managed by CAEP staff. This AIMS version of this table, in which the data are actually entered, has drop-down menus by which characteristics are selected and the table is completed.

Control of Institution	Private/Independent
Student Body	Coed
Carnegie Class	Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)
Location	Suburban
Teacher Preparation Levels	Currently offering initial teacher preparation programs Currently offering advanced educator preparation programs
EPP Type	Institution of Higher Education: Private Institution of Higher Education: State/Regional
Religious Affiliations	Undenominational
Language of Instruction	English
Institutional Accreditation (Affiliations)	Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools

Table 4. Qualification Table for EPP-based Clinical Educators

a. The clinical educator (EPP-based clinical faculty & supervisors) qualifications table is completed by providing information for each of the EPP-based clinical educators.

Name	Highest degree earned	Field or specialty area of highest degree	Program Assignment(s)	Teaching assignment or role within the program (s)	P-12 certificates or licensures held	P-12 experiences including teaching or administration dates of engagement in these roles, last five years

If EPP is not using Table 4a, upload the clinical educator qualifications table being used below.

Monmouth University Clinical Supervisor Qualifications Table

See Attachment panel below.

Table 5. The Parity Table

a. The parity table of curricular, fiscal, facility, and administrative and support capacity for quality is used to satisfy requirements of the U.S. Department of Education and is completed by providing data relevant for the EPP and making a comparison to an EPP-determined comparative entity. The comparative entity might be another clinical EPP within a university structure, a national organization, the college or university as a whole or another entity identified as a benchmark by the EPP. This chart is an example of a chart that the EPP can complete.

Capacity Dimension	EPP description of metric (s)	EPP data	Comparative entity data	Title and description of supplemental evidence/documentation of quality for each dimension
Facilities	Number of classrooms and dedicated facilities Number of classrooms and dedicated facilities	Initial programs are housed at McAllan Hall floors 1 and 2. Courses are scheduled throughout McAllan Hall. Faculty offices are on Floors 1 and 2 of MacAllan Hall	The Social Work Program is housed at McAllan Hall on floors 3, 4 and basement. Courses are scheduled throughout McAllan Hall.	Monmouth University Map https://www.monmouth.edu/map/ Monmouth University Map https://www.monmouth.edu/map/
Fiscal Support	Annual Operating Budget (Academic Affairs budget 57,786,176)	Total FY17 Operating Budget: $3,627,710 (6.28%)	Total FY17 Operating Budget: $1,612,593 (2.79%)	Original Approved Operating Budget FY17
Administrative support Candidate support services	Salary, wages, and benefits for administrators and staff-FY17 List of services available to candidates	$950,315 for administrators and staff salaries (4.02%) Supports given to all MU students And First year advisement, Faculty Advisement, SOE advisement, certification Officer, Director of Field Placements, Academic Advising Liaison, Graduate Advising Coordinator, Program Advisors, edTPA writing days, Praxis II support	$423,186 for administrators and staff salaries (1.79%) Supports given to all MU students And First year advisement, Director of Field and Professional Education, Assistant Director of Field Education, Assist Director of Professional Education and Special Projects	FY17 Budget Monmouth University Undergraduate and Graduate catalog
Candidate feedback, formal and informal	Evaluations and surveys	Faculty evaluations (SIRS and IDEA) Exit/completer surveys Alumni surveys	Faculty Evaluations (SIRS and IDEA) Alumni Surveys	Aggregated summary of responses rating faculty teaching quality, summary of results from exit and alumni surveys

Upload your self-developed parity table below

Table 6. Off Campus, Satellite, Branch

a. The Accreditation Plan is an educator preparation provider's (EPP's) identification of the sites outside of the main campus or administrative headquarters and the programs offered at each site that will be included in the EPP's accreditation review. This information, in combination with the table of program characteristics, is used by CAEP staff and lead site visitor to plan the site visit, including the sites that will be visited by the site team.

Geographic Site(s) administered by the EPP	Program offered at each site	Is the program to be included in accreditation review? (Y or N)	Is the program approved by state in which program is offered? (Y or N or approval not required)	Notes/Comments

Table 7. Proprietary Assessments

Please list proprietary assessments used by the EPP (no more than 10):

Proprietary Assessment No.	Title of Assessment	Validity & Reliability information if available & applicable
Proprietary Assessment No.1	Praxis II Subject Assessments	not needed
Proprietary Assessment No.2	Candidate Pre-service Assessment of Student Teaching	Conducted by Ohio State Univ. Content and Construct Validity Inter-rater reliability. Internal consistency reliability
Proprietary Assessment No.3	edTPA	not needed
Proprietary Assessment No.4	NJDOE Education Provider Preparation Reports (3 in total: 2015, 2016, 2017)	not needed
Proprietary Assessment No.5		
Proprietary Assessment No.6		
Proprietary Assessment No.7		
Proprietary Assessment No.8		
Proprietary Assessment No.9		
Proprietary Assessment No.10		

Please map above proprietary assessments to the appropriate CAEP Standards:

	CAEP Standard 1 Ini.	CAEP Standard 1 Adv.	CAEP Standard 2 Ini.	CAEP Standard 2 Adv.	CAEP Standard 3 Ini.	CAEP Standard 3 Adv.	CAEP Standard 4 Ini.	CAEP Standard 4 Adv	CAEP Standard 5 Ini.	CAEP Standard 5 Adv.	State
Proprietary Assessment No.1	☑	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐
Proprietary Assessment No.2	☑	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Proprietary Assessment No.3	☑	☐	☑	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐
Proprietary Assessment No.4	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑	☐	☐
Proprietary Assessment No.5	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Proprietary Assessment No.6	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Proprietary Assessment No.7	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Proprietary Assessment No.8	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Proprietary Assessment No.9	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Proprietary Assessment No.10	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

II. CAEP Standards and Evidence

This page is intended to be blank

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (Initial Programs)

i. Evidence / data / tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the standard.

1	Exhibit 1.1.A. Praxis II Content Assessments.pdf
	1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
2	Exhibit 1.1.B edTPA.pdf
	1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
3	Exhibit 1.1.C CPAST.pdf
	1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
4	Exhibit 1.1.D. Early Field_High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics.pdf
	1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
5	Exhibit 1.1.E edtpa-connections-to-caep-.pdf
	1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
6	Exhibit 1.2.A P-12 Student progress and Professional Practice.pdf
	1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
7	Exhibit 1.3.A NJDOE Program Approval Letter.pdf
	1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
8	Exhibit 1.3.B. GPA at Program Completion.pdf
	1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
9	Exhibit 1.3.C SPA and Program Approval.pdf
	1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
10	Exhibit 1.4.A College and Career-Ready Evidence.pdf
	1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
11	Exhibit 1.5.A Candidate Model and Use of Technology.pdf
	1.5 Model and apply technology standards
12	Exhibit 1.5.B EPP Technology Crosswalk.pdf
	1.5 Model and apply technology standards
13	Exhibit 1.5.C EPP Parternship Technology Assets.pdf
	1.5 Model and apply technology standards
14	Exhibit 4.3.A 2017 Employer Survey ResultsFinal.pdf
	1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress 1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards. 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
15	Exhibit 4.4.A Exit Survey_Final.pdf
	1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress 1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards. 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
16	Exhibit 4.4.B Alumni Survey Final.pdf
	1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress 1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards. 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
17	Exhibit 5.3.B Data Informed Program Improvements.pdf
	1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

1.1
Monmouth University (MU) candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at appropriate progression levels in the four InTASC Categories of The Learner and Learning; Content

Knowledge; Instructional Practice; and Professional Responsibility. The Educator Preparation Program (EPP) employs the following seven assessments to measure competency in the four InTASC categories: Praxis II (Exhibit 1.1A); edTPA (1.1.B); Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST, 1.1.C), High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics (HLTPPR: 1.1.D); Exit Survey (4.4.A); Alumni Surveys (Exhibit 4.4.B) and the Employer Survey (4.3.A). Each assessment is aligned to CAEP, New Jersey Professional Standards for Teachers (NJPST), and InTASC standards.

Pre-service candidate data includes the Praxis II (content assessments), High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics, edTPA, and CPAST. EPP in-service data includes the Exit Survey, Alumni Survey and Employer Survey. Each of these seven assessments stand strong on their individual merits; however, together they provide depth and breadth in measuring the EPP's strength in relationship to the InTASC categories.
Praxis II (Exhibit 1.1.A): The Praxis© II is a proprietary content knowledge assessment that measures each candidate's knowledge and skills. The New Jersey Department of Education's (NJDOE) mandated assessment was developed and is administered by Educational Testing Services (ETS) and a passing score is required for each teacher certification (license). The passing score of each test/subtest is set by the NJDOE and can be found at http://www.state.nj.us/education/educators/license/gpa.htm.

The EPP requires candidates to pass the Praxis prior to participating in full-time clinical practice. As a result, Monmouth University has a 100% pass rate for the three-year period. The EPP has improved the process for monitoring students until they pass. The supports and improvement efforts are outlined in Exhibit 1.1.A.

High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics (Exhibit1.1.D). The High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics are EPP created, performance-based rubrics used to assess early field experiences in the first semester of the yearlong clinical practice. It was created by the EPP to improve assessments across clinical experiences. The assessment is based on a four point rubric from 1= Does not Meet Expectation to 4= Exceeds Expectation. The first application of data was for the Spring of 2018. The EPP will collect data in the Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 prior to the CAEP site visit. This assessment provides data for the academic and non-academic skills measured for pre-service candidates. The means for Category 1 were the highest for the EPP and across most programs, as rated by university based clinical educators with input in a three way conference with candidates and school-based clinical educators. The High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics EPP means were as follows (out of a possible 4 points):

Category 1 The Learner and Learning: Spring 2018: m=2.82
Category 2: Content Knowledge: Spring 2018: m=2.58
Category 3: Instructional Practice: Spring 2018: m=2.74
Category 4: Professional Responsibility Spring 2018: m=2.74

Exhibit 1.1.D shows the High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubric mean scores across programs and by InTASC standard. The MAT students scored slightly higher than undergraduates in all categories except Professional Responsibility. Elementary candidates scored above the EPP mean in three of the four assessments (i.e., Professional Responsibility was one one-hundredth of a point below the mean score). Category 1 Learner Development was the rubric with the highest mean scores across programs in category 1. Category 2, Content Knowledge had the lowest mean score across programs. This is also consistent with findings in the other two preservice assessments (CPAST and edTPA). Category 3 Instructional Practice was another relative strength for the EPP on this assessment. Candidates scored highest on InTASC standard 7 Planning for Instruction.

The performance-based edTPA (Exhibit 1.1.B) was piloted in the 2016-2017 school year; however, the assessment was primarily scored "in house." In 2017-2018, edTPA was required by the NJ Department of Education (NJDOE). A completed portfolio is considered passing by the NJDOE for the first two applications of data (Fall 2017, Spring 2018). A third application of data will be collected at the end of Fall 2018 and will be shared during the site visit. Alignment to CAEP has been provided by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Evaluation (SCALE) and is included as Exhibit 1.1.E. A five-point rubric is used to score the assessment, which is done by trained evaluators through Pearson. One hundred percent of all candidates passed the New Jersey standard and were recommended for licensing during Fall 2017 and Spring 2018.

edTPA scores by category are as follows:
Category 1: Learner and Learning: Fall 17: m=2.84; Spring 2018: m=2.85
Category 2: Content Knowledge: Fall 17: m=2.82; Spring 2018: m=2.83
Category 3: Instructional Practice: Fall 2017: m=2.85; Spring 2018: m=2.85

Category 4: Professional Responsibility Fall 2017: m=2.65; Spring 2018: m=2.65
Data from edTPA for Spring 18 and Fall 17 demonstrates that EPP candidates are achieving strong scores in InTASC Category 1. Based on results for Fall 17, the EPP's largest program, Elementary Education (n=17) achieved a mean of 2.99, the highest of any EPP program. ECE (n=4) had the next highest mean of 2.82, followed by Physical Education (n=1) at 2.8. Spring 2018 includes data from 92 candidates (n=92). The Elementary Education mean score of 2.89, was slightly above the EPP mean of 2.85. The highest score on Category 1 in this semester came from Visual Arts (n=7) whose candidates achieved a mean score of 3.14. Also of note, History candidates (n=3) averaged a score of 3.09. The three lowest scores relative to the EPP means were in PE (n=4: mean= 2.25), Health (n=1, mean=2.30) and Early Childhood (P-3: n=2, mean 2.35). Also of note, the PE assessment, with an n=4, also had a mean score of 2.82.

edTPA alignment to CAEP standards is provided in Exhibit 1.1.E.

The Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST, Exhibit 1.1.C) assessment is administered during the final full-time clinical practice semester at two points: midpoint and final. The midterm application of the assessment helps to reveal areas in which candidates have yet to be exposed or assessed. The 21-item rubric assesses all InTASC standards. The first 12 items measure pedagogy, with the last 9 items measuring dispositions. The data in Exhibit 1.1.C. is presented by CPAST Category, InTASC four categories and by individual item. The CPAST uses a 4 point rubric with Does not Meet Expectation=0, Emerging=1, Meets Expectation=2, and Exceeds Expectation=3. There are four applications of data given, however the midterm data is really used to assess whether the candidates are being exposed to all standards. The data analysis is primarily focused on the final assessments. Therefore, data for Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 are the primary focus of the analysis and interpretation. A breakdown of scores by category is below:

Category 1: Learner and Learning: Mid Fall 17: m=2.04, Final Fall 17: m=2.38; Mid Spring 2018: m=2.44, Final Spring 2018: m=2.80
Category 2: Content Knowledge: Mid Fall 17: m=1.67, Final Fall 17: m=2.38; Mid Spring 2018: m=1.98, Final Spring 2018: m=2.50
Category 3: Instructional Practice: Mid Fall 17: m=1.94, Final Fall 17: m=2.54; Mid Spring 2018: m=2.22, Final Spring 2018: m=2.65
Category 4: Professional Responsibility: Mid Fall 17: m=2.21, Final Fall 17: m=2.59; Mid Spring 2018: m=2.44, Final Spring 2018: m=2.70

MU candidates meet the expectations of all four InTASC categories on the CPAST. 100% of all programs showed marked improvement from the midterm to final assessments. When reviewing the data, all four terms of data yielded the highest mean scores on Category 1: The Learner and Learning. This is clearly a strength for the EPP. When looking at individual programs for Fall and Spring semester, 77% had the highest mean score for category 1. A relative weakness in scores was in Category 2: Content Knowledge. The EPP mean was lowest for all applications of data in this area. When looking at a program level, 85% of the programs had their lowest means in Content Knowledge. There were only two programs in one application of data that did not have the lowest mean in Content Knowledge: HEPE (SP '18) and Spanish (SP'18). Both student numbers were low for these content areas which may account for these outliers. Disposition rubric subgroups were slightly higher than pedagogy subgroups for the EPP throughout all four applications of data. Strengths for the EPP included the following rubrics: B: Materials and Resources (F17/SP18), S: Collaboration (F17/SP18), I: Safe and Respectful Learning Environments (F 17), and R: Preparation (SP 18).

Post pre-service (at graduation and in-service) measures of the 10 InTASC standards were completed using the Exit Survey (4.4.A), Alumni Survey (4.4.B) and Employer Survey (4.3.A).
Exit Survey: The Exit survey is completed after the full-time clinical practice is completed and the candidate has been approved to graduate. The three applications of data are for Spring 2017, Fall 2017, and Spring 2018. The survey is a 5 point likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree=5 to Strongly Disagree=1. The following are the mean results for the InTASC categories:
Category 1 Learner and Learning: Spring 2018: m=4.50; Fall 17: m=4.43; Spring 2017: m=4.50
Category 2: Content Knowledge: Spring 2018: m=4.40 ; Fall 17: m=4.46; Spring 2017: m=4.46
Category 3: Instructional Practice: Spring 2018: m=4.50; Fall 17: m=4.45; Spring 2017: m=4.46
Category 4: Professional Responsibility: Spring 2018: m=4.41; Fall 17: m=4.39; Spring 2017: m=4.47

The data for the three semester series indicates that Monmouth University completers perceive they can understand how learners grow and develop, can recognize that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across diverse learning groups, and are prepared to design and implement developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences. Additionally, they are able to create

learning environments that are inclusive and supportive of individual and group learning. The mean scores for the consecutive semesters were all above 4.40. Based on the 5 point scale with 5= Strongly agree and 4=Agree, it is clear that Monmouth completers see themselves as ready to address the learner and learning. Additional relative strengths for the EPP include: Spring 2017, "Motivate students to engage in learning" (m= 4.58); Fall 2017, "Establish a positive classroom environment conducive to learning" (m= 4.70); and Spring 2018, "Establish a positive classroom environment conducive to learning" (m=4.5).

The lowest means for each semester (for EPP as a whole) is item #8 "Use strategies to support the learning of ESL/bilingual students" Spring 2017 (m=4.14) and the Fall 2017/Spring 2018 (m=4.03). Although this is still above the "Agree" scoring level, it provided us with data to prompt revisions to our ED 320 course, "Teaching Students with Diverse Needs." This course now has a stronger emphasis on ESL and bilingual learners. Data for the Fall of 2017 and Spring of 2018 indicates our candidates felt they were strongly prepared to "3. Use instruction methods to teach the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards." Mean scores for that item were: Fall 2017 m=4.67, Spring 2018 m=4.64. Spring 2017 candidates perceived their strength in this category to be "4. Plan instruction based on learners' needs, developmental progress, and prior knowledge" in which the EPP reached a mean score of 4.59. Monmouth University completers believe they are prepared for professional learning, ethical practice, leadership, and collaboration. The data for all three series of data reveal the following mean scores: m=4.39 (F 17), m=4.47 (Sp. 17), and m=4.41 (Sp.18). The strongest EPP means came from items 27 (Fall 17 and Spring 17) "Reflect on and develop appropriate teaching dispositions" and item 22 (Spring 18) "Use educational research to make decisions that benefit my teaching."

Employer Survey: The Employer Survey is an EPP created assessment that measures employers' perception of Monmouth University Graduates according to ten InTASC Standards. Also included in the survey are demographics to allow the EPP to disaggregate other important data for improvement. The Survey components are tagged to the InTASC, CAEP and NJPST Standards. The 2017 Survey was revised with the input of partner administrators. The former survey was cumbersome and did not align directly with the revised NJ standards and InTASC. Administrators complained about its length and asked for the EPP to create a streamlined instrument. The revised instrument includes a series of questions that are aligned to InTASC/NJ standards. Data is reported for 2017 and 2018. The newly designed survey will be administered again in January of 2019 with results available prior to the April 2019 site visit. The likert scale items were developed in direct alignment to InTASC/NJPST standards. Therefore, results are reported based on individual items as well as aggregated into the four InTASC Categories of: 1. The Learner and Learning; 2. Content Knowledge; 3. Instructional Practice; and 4. Professional Responsibility. The likert scale was weighted from 4 points (Strongly Agree) to 1 pt (Strongly Disagree).
The data revealed P-12 educational administrators believe Monmouth University graduates meet the 10 InTASC standards assessed. 100% of all items assessed met the 80% requirement at the "strongly agree" and "agree" level for 2017 and 2018. The data are summarized by task below:

Category 1: Learner and Learning: 2017: m=3.40; 2018: m=3.30
Category 2: Content Knowledge: 2017: m=3.23; 2018: m=3.52
Category 3: Instructional Practice: 2017: m=3.33; 2018: m=3.49
Category 4: Professional Responsibility: 2017: m=3.36; 2018: m=3.35

EPP graduates are successful with understanding learner development, knowing individual differences (ability, gender, ethnicity, language) and ensuring an inclusive classroom environment. 100% of all items assessed under the category of The Learner and Learning met the requirement that 80% or more respondents scored the item as "agree" or "strongly agree," thus meeting the standard. Monmouth graduates are regarded by administrators as having content knowledge and are skillful at applying content. 100% of all items assessed under the category of Content Knowledge met the requirement that 80% or more respondents scored the item as "agree" or "strongly agree," thus meeting the standard. EPP graduates are knowledgeable about assessment, know how to use the results of assessment to plan lessons for diverse learners, and are able to utilize a variety of instructional strategies to meet each child in meaningful ways. 100% of all items assessed under the category of Instructional Practice met the requirement that 80% or more respondents scored the item as "agree" or "strongly agree," thus meeting the standard. The mean scores for this category were m=3.33 (2017) and m=3.49 (2018) showing a slight improvement over time. EPP graduates engage in professional learning, ethical practice, leadership and collaboration on an ongoing basis. 100% of all items assessed under the category of Professional Responsibility met the requirement that 80% or more respondents scored the item as "agree" or "strongly agree", thus meeting the standard. The mean scores for the overall category were m=3.36 (2017) and m=3.35 (2018).
Alumni Surveys Original Version (2012 and 2014), and Revised Version (2017-2018); (Exhibit 4.4.B). The Alumni surveys are EPP designed and created assessments which measure the perceptions of graduates of the program in relationship to the four InTASC categories of the learner and learning, content knowledge,

instructional practice, and professional responsibility. As Exhibit 4.4B and Standard 4 demonstrate, data from the Alumni Survey clearly indicate graduates perceive they are prepared in all four categories of InTASC standards. In 2012 and 2014, Instructional Practice were the highest scores of the four. In 2018, the Learner and Learning Development category, on average, had the highest scores across content (with K-6 Art, Music, Health and PE) being the exception. Their highest score was Content Knowledge.
Improvements in assessments for 1.1

The CPAST, edTPA and High Leverage Teaching Skills Proficiency Rubrics are all teacher performance assessments aligned with InTASC. All three assessments were implemented in the past three years (2015 to present) to strengthen the EPP evaluation system to include valid and reliable instruments that meet CAEP's sufficiency standards. The CPAST was adopted and implemented in 2017-2018 in place of an EPP created assessment that did not meet the level of sufficiency for CAEP. The High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics were designed by the EPP in direct alignment with InTASC standards to be administered in the first semester of the candidates' yearlong clinical practice. This is the EPP early field assessment. The first semester for implementation was Spring of 2018. Data for the Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 semesters will be presented at the site visit. Additionally, the Alumni Survey and Employer Survey were redesigned to directly align with InTASC standards in the 2017-2018 school year.

Summary 1.1: Data from all assessments demonstrate that candidates meet EPP, InTASC, CAEP 1.1, and NJPST Standards. Candidates score at the acceptable level across assessments in all four categories. EPP strengths include Category 1 (Standards 1: Learning Development and 3: Learning Environments) and Category 3 (Standards 7: Planning for Instruction & 8: Instructional Strategies). Another strength was Category 4 (Standard 10: Collaboration). A relative weakness across the CPAST, High Leverage Teaching Practices Proficiency Rubrics and edTPA was Standard 4: Content Knowledge. This, however, is a relative weakness, as students still showed strength in this standard. Also, the Praxis II pass rate of 100% demonstrates candidates have the content knowledge required.

Standard 1.2
EPP data reveal candidates are able to use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice. Data shared in Exhibit 1.2.A provides evidence of effectiveness on this standard by triangulating data on three assessments: CPAST, edTPA, and the High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics (early field). Summaries of the assessments used in Exhibit 1.2.A are as follows:

The mean scores of the CPAST rubrics for the two final (summative) assessments are m=2.42 (F 17) and m=2.54 (Sp. 18) (rubric scale of 0-3) on the six rubrics that measure standard 1.2. These data show EPP strength in assessing P-12 learners, checking for understanding and adjusting instruction through formative assessment, data guided instruction, assessment techniques, connections to research and theory and participates in professional development. High Scores for both applications of data were on rubrics G: Checking for Understanding and Adjusting Instruction through Formative Assessments and N: Participates in Professional Development. Although all scores were acceptable, the rubrics with the lowest means relative to EPP strengths include J: Data Guided Instruction and M: Connections to Research and Theory.

The initial use of the High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics show great strengths in 1.2 through the Standard 6: Assessment and Standard 7: Planning for Instruction rubrics. Candidates on the 1-4 scale scored an EPP 2.68 mean on the two standards. Candidates scored particularly high on the Standard 7: Planning for Instruction Rubric, which addresses using research and assessment evidence to measure students' progress.

To further support the EPP strength on CAEP 1.2, the two applications of data on the edTPA revealed EPP means of m=2.82 and m=2.83 on the 15 rubrics that are tagged by SCALE. These means are very strong considering candidates have no cut-score, and were only required to complete the portfolio. Strengths on both applications of data include Rubrics 1 (Planning for Content Understanding), 2 (Planning to Support Varied Student Needs), 3 (Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning), 4 (Identifying and Supporting Language Demands), 5 (Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning), 6 (Learning Environment), and 12 (Providing Feedback to Learners). The lowest rubric means for both applications of data came from Rubric 10 (Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness). Although it was the lowest mean, it was still an acceptable score.

Standard 1.3
MU ensures candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected by Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) and New Jersey standards. Exhibit 1.3.A shows all programs that have been approved by the state through an intensive program review process. The State of NJ does not require National

Recognition through SPAs; however MU has received national recognition on 12 of 16 submitted (75%) for initial programs. The following programs were recognized by their SPAs: elementary undergraduate, elementary graduate, teachers of students with disabilities undergraduate, teachers of students with disabilities graduate, P-3 (early childhood) undergraduate, P-3 (early childhood) graduate, math undergraduate, math graduate, science undergraduate, and science graduate. The following SPAs are recognized with conditions and the EPP is awaiting decisions from the March 2018 submission: English undergraduate, English graduate, ESL undergraduate, ESL graduate. All SPA data is on AIMS, along with the NJ State Addendum. Exhibit 1.3.C lists all SPA nationally recognized programs.

To substantiate the candidates are knowledgeable in their SPA, GPA data at completion is included as Exhibit 1.3.B. This data shows that not only do EPP candidates meet the 3.0 graduation and certification requirement, they exceed them substantially in most content areas. 2017-2018 completers in the EPP MAT programs had a mean content GPA of 3.9 (n=3.5), while undergraduates averaged a 3.5 (n=90). English (n=3) and Science (n=4) MAT candidates averaged a 4.0. Undergraduate programs with the highest GPAs for the 17-18 school year were Science (n=2): 3.8; Art (n=4) 3.8. The elementary education program has the highest enrollment with impressive GPAs of: undergraduate (n=43): 3.5 and MAT (n=16): 3.9. The following is a breakdown for the three years of EPP GPAs at completion
Graduate: 17-18: 3.9; 16-17: 3.8; 15-16: 3.8
Undergraduate: 17-18: 3.5; 16-17: 3.4; 15-16: 3.4

This data clearly demonstrates the strength of candidates the EPP is graduating in programs nationally recognized by their Specialized Professional Associations.

Standard 1.4
Through multiple measures, MU candidates demonstrate skills and commitments that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college-and-career- ready standards. In addition to the SPA report data provided in AIMS, the following triangulated assessments (Exhibit 1.4.A) provide breadth and depth in meeting this standard: CPAST, High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics, and edTPA.

The teacher-performance assessment, edTPA, has 15 competencies assessed on its five-point rubrics (1-5 scale) aligned to assess standard 1.4. The two applications of data show the EPP with strong mean scores of 2.82 (Fall 17) and 2.83 (Spring 18). Strengths on both applications of data include Rubrics 1 (Planning for Content Understanding), 2 (Planning to Support Varied Student Needs), 3 (Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning), 4 (Identifying and Supporting Language Demands), 5 (Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning), 6 (Learning Environment), and 12 (Providing Feedback to Learners). The lowest rubric means for both applications of data came from Rubric 10 (Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness). Although it was the lowest mean, it was still an acceptable score.

The CPAST assessment further strengthens the contention that EPP candidates master this standard with one competency aligning with CAEP 1.4, Rubric A. Focus for Learning: Standards and Objectives/Targets. The four applications of data show growth from midterm to final summative assessment in both semesters on this 4 point (0-3 scale) rubric. Fall 2017: midterm mean: 2.07, final mean: 2.63: Spring 2018: midterm mean: 2.38, final: 2.78. These scores not only show growth throughout the clinical practice, but demonstrate high ratings by university based clinical educators.

The High Leverage Teaching Proficiency Performance Rubrics measures 1.4 using 5 competencies (Rubrics for Standards 1,2,4,7,8). The EPP mean for Spring 2018 was 2.80 (Scale 1-4). The highest score was on Standard 7: Planning for Instruction. This rubric requires candidates to match career and college ready standards outlined by the NJDOE to lesson plans. The lowest means (relative) were in Standard 4 and 5: Content Knowledge and Application of Content.

These three assessments, when triangulated with the 12 Nationally Recognized SPAs, all based on college and career ready standards for their specific content, provides evidence that EPP candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college-and career-ready standards. Program changes are made on an ongoing basis as a result of the data (Exhibit 5.3.B).

Standard 1.5
Through triangulated assessments (Exhibit 1.5.A) , MU candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning and infuse technology in all courses and clinical work (Exhibit 1.5.B). Data are analyzed from the following four sources: CPAST, edTPA, High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics, Alumni Survey (Items 5-8) and the Employer Survey (Items 5-8). In addition, Exhibit 1.5.B (Technology Crosswalk) provides information regarding technology resources EPP candidates are exposed to throughout coursework and clinical practice.

Exhibit 1.5.A triangulates data from four assessments to provide evidence for this component. The teacher performance assessment used by the EPP, edTPA, has 14 competencies aligned to standard 1.5. Means for the two semesters of data are m=2.81 (Fall 2017) and m=2.83 (Spring 2018) on the 14 competencies. The rubrics with the highest means for both semesters are 6: Learning Environment, and 12: Providing Feedback to Guide Learning. Connections between CAEP and edTPA are available in Exhibit 1.1.E.

The CPAST assessment measures one competency, H: Digital Tools and Resources. The four point scale (0-3) reveals strength on this item. Means for the Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 were strong at m=2.10 and m=2.59 respectively. The EPP's largest program, Elementary Education, scored above the EPP mean on both applications of data.
There are five competencies aligned to CAEP 1.5 on the Employer Survey. The 2017 Application of Data m=3.4 out of a 4 point likert scale (1-4 ratings), and 2018, m=3.5 provide evidence that employers perceive EPP candidates have strengths in standard 1.5.

The Alumni survey also has five competencies with measures relating to CAEP 1.5. The first two applications of data show means on the 5 point scale of m=4.08 and m=4.24. On the 4 point likert scale (1-4 pt. range) used in the 2018 revision of the assessment, the EPP m=3.24 on the five competencies measured for CAEP 1.5 demonstrates the positive perceptions alumni who are in-service have regarding technology usage in P-12 settings.

Additionally, our candidates have numerous clinical experiences in districts that are technologically advanced. Most districts are Future Ready-NJ (Exhibit 1.5.C p.3). Exhibit 1.5.C aims to document the technology resources of our top five Partnership districts, where over 50% of our candidates are placed in during early field or clinical practice.
Finally, the technology crosswalk (1.5.B) demonstrates how technology is infused into coursework and clinical experience throughout programs.

Summary of Standard 1
1. EPP strengths relative to the four InTASC Standards includes both The Learner and Learning and Instructional Practice. The relative weakness of Content Knowledge on 4 assessments, is mitigated by the 100% Praxis pass rate. This demonstrates that EPP candidates have mastered content required to be successful educators.
2. The EPP provides depth and breadth of data to demonstrate successful achievement of standards 1.1-1.5. The key assessments provide coherence in data.
3. EPP candidates are particularly strong in the areas of collaboration under Category 4, Professional Responsibility. Collaboration is key for both pre-service and in-service candidates.
4. Employers, alumni and candidates exiting the program perceive candidate/graduate strengths in all four categories.
5. The EPP continues to make improvements to programs as a result of data, as shown in exhibit 5.3.B

Standard A.1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (Advanced Programs)

i. Evidence / data / tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard and answer the following questions for each item.)

No Evidence found.

ii. Analysis Report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

N/A

Specialty Licensure Area Data

Program Review Option (per state partnership agreement)

- [ ] CAEP Program Review with National Recognition (SPA)
- [x] CAEP Program Review with Feedback (State-selected standards)
- [ ] State Program Review (State-selected standards)
- [ ] Answer the following prompts for programs reviewed for National Recognition (SPA) and Program Review with Feedback. Upload state reports for state reviewed programs.

Answer the following prompts for programs reviewed for National Recognition (SPA) and Program Review with Feedback. Upload state reports for state reviewed programs.

1. Based on the analysis of the disaggregated data, how have the results of specialty licensure area or SPA evidence been used to inform decision making and improve instruction and candidate learning outcomes? (Answer this question only if you checked "CAEP Program Review with National Recognition (SPA)" or "CAEP Program Review with Feedback" in the previous question)

Although SPA program recognition in New Jersey is optional, the EPP submitted the following SPAs which are nationally recognized: Elementary UG/Elementary MAT (ACEI), Elementary and TSD (ACEI and CEC), Mathematics UG and MAT (NCTM), Social Studies UG and MAT (NCSS), Science UG and MAT (NCSS), Elementary and P-3 MAT (ACEI and NAEYC), P-3 and TSD UG (NAEYC and CEC). Four additional programs were recognized with conditions and were resubmitted in March 2018 for national recognition: English UG (NCTE), English MAT (NCTE), ESL UG (TESOL), ESL MAT (TESOL). The majority of all initial programs (12/16=75%) are nationally recognized. This is a point of pride for the EPP, as SPA review is optional. It is an example of how the EPP strives for excellence.
Programs with low enrollment were not submitted for SPA (Health and PE, Art, Music, Spanish, Chinese). Advanced programs are not included in this self-study, although Learning Disabilities Teacher Consultant (CEC) and Reading Specialist (IRA) have both been nationally recognized.

All Specific SPA data based changes can be found in Section 5 of each SPA report. Summaries are as follows:
Based on the ACEI feedback, the elementary education programs made several changes to strengthen the program. Data on the Praxis II revealed that candidates were low in the area of Social Studies. This prompted more collaboration with the department of History, Geography and Anthropology which included curriculum changes and additional workshops for teacher candidates to assist in passing the Praxis II assessment. Faculty also consulted regularly with content experts at the UTEAC (University Teacher Education Advisory Committee) in target content areas to address ongoing content topics that need to be addressed and enhanced based on shared data. Additionally, assessments have been updated to meet changes in standards, curriculum and state mandates (e.g. edTPA). Finally, in order to determine if candidates are meeting the ACEI standards through their clinical practice, an ACEI addendum was created to ensure candidates were measured with one-to-one-alignment on SPA standards.
Feedback given from the CEC SPA resulted in embedding increased opportunities for candidates to become engaged in developing and implementing lesson plans for review by peers and faculty in both the classroom and in the field. Additionally, case studies were added throughout course work to increase content knowledge. In examining assessments related to professional and pedagogical skills, faculty have noticed a small percentage of students unable to meet the goal of CEC standard #5 (Instructional Planning & Strategies). Based on the data, additional activities were added to several courses to improve candidates' knowledge of evidence-based instructional strategies and their appropriate use with students with various disabilities. For instance, in several courses, reading and synthesis of current research has been added as a focus in relation to professional practices. Data for Assessment # 8, the Transition Planning and Resources Project, indicate that most candidates are meeting the goals of the standards. For the few students who are not meeting the standards for this assessment, faculty have implemented the following revisions. Faculty have been placing more of an emphasis on locating and using research to support practice in all courses and several course assignments. Further, faculty have been adding more assignments related to CEC Ethical Principle and CEC Content Standards so candidates will have several exposures and more familiarity with these. Faculty will continue to monitor student progress on meeting standards for this assessment. Review of the data for CEC Standards #4 (Assessment) and #5 (Instructional Planning and Strategies) guided faculty toward providing more substantial exposure to a variety of formal and informal assessment practices used to inform instructional decision making for students with various exceptionalities in the field. Specific evidence -based strategies from current research were studied and approved by faculty prior to use in the field. Based on continual data collection, students must use the research to guide their decision-making to adjust strategies and interventions as needed for use during their field work. Assessment #3, the Technology Integration into the Curriculum project, demonstrates an impact on student learning as candidates plan and implement lessons and a unit. They must determine the effectiveness of their instructional strategies and interventions through the use of different types of assessment and data collection. Faculty members have been collaborating with the administrators in the local placement schools on the effectiveness of the candidates' planning and

instructional strategies during field work.

The NCTM SPA data yielded many significant changes. A general need was perceived to alter math content after the NCTM 2012 standards became available, especially in terms of Math History and Geometry. Candidates now take both of these courses as required courses whereas previously they were electives (Geometry) or not offered (Math History). We believe we are seeing an improvement in content knowledge in these areas. Assessment 6 and 7 deal with Math History (Assessment 6) and Geometry (Assessment 7) because of perceived candidate need in these areas. Candidate need in Geometry is consistent with New Jersey results on the PARCC test. Geometry was the only area, from among grade 3 - 8 math as well as Algebra, Geometry, etc., where New Jersey scored below the national average. Many candidates as Monmouth University come from outside New Jersey, but a plurality are from in-state, which makes such analysis relevant. Communication with math department professors who teach MA 317, Geometry has been important for our program, and we believe we are beginning to see an improvement in candidate knowledge in this area. Improvements in Math History are strong, with candidates in previous years knowing little about this topic - now taking an entire semester's course, MA 325 Math History, and good communication between the education department and professors teaching Math History. In addition, assessments 3,4,and 5 were updated to meet the 2012 NCTM and CAEP standards.

The Social Studies SPA review encouraged many data based improvements. Sub-score reviews of the Praxis II demonstrated relative needs in the area of Geography and Economics. The social studies faculty and history/social sciences content faculties gather at the UTEAC meetings and discuss Praxis support and tutoring services for those who struggle with content specific areas on the praxis. Candidates are now provided multiple opportunities to plan and teach Economics and Geography in their clinical placement. The only sub-element in which more than half students did not reach target level was relating to incorporating knowledge of individual differences into classrooms. Candidates are required to take ED 320/550 Teaching Students with Diverse Needs/Teaching Diverse Populations before their methods courses. Additionally, starting the Fall 2018, all candidates will have taken 6 credits in special education, and are required to have diverse field placement.
Science (NSTA) data drove multiple changes. Overall, our faculty continues to grow the program and make adjustments to the assessments where they deem it appropriate. Assessments in the science education program need to encompass both a theoretical understanding and a practical implementation. Since beginning data collection several years ago, the program has made a number of changes to ensure that students gain understanding in all of the science education areas. For example, science tutors have been added for Praxis II. In addition, all assessments have been updated to include the next generation science education standards at this point. All information about the program is discussed in our yearly faculty meeting and bi-yearly UTEAC meeting with science content specialist. STEAM curriculum has also been implemented over the course.

In respect to the NAEYC (P-3) SPA, several program improvements were made. When we disaggregated the data, we have found that some students were not performing as well as we would have like on the Literacy portion of the Praxis II exam. When we compared data from prior cohorts, we noticed that the change in scores occurred when ets.org reconfigured the exam in September of 2015 from Praxis# 0022 to Praxis# 5025. Consequently, we are examining each sub-set of the literacy section to determine our program's strengths and weaknesses. We are also examining the content of our current literacy course, EDL 325 to ensure that it is meeting the needs of our pupils. We also want to make sure that the course is comprehensive. The course was originally designed to focus on Oral Language from birth to K. However, we might need to add subtest items such as literature and informational text, which also appears on the test. Another finding was that some students were not preparing information for parents that was culturally responsive and/or actually meeting the needs of the families and communities in which the candidates were student teaching. Therefore, we now require candidates to share their projects with a parent of an infant, toddler or preschool aged child and elicit feedback from the parents, before handing in their final submissions. These are a few of any program improvements.

Although the TESOL and NCTE are in review, and findings will not be available until after the self-study, the EPP has made several data informed changes through this cycle. NCTE data informed improvements included increased time with Language Arts instructions through observations, evaluations and assessments through clinical experiences. Many additional Praxis II supports have also been added including tutoring through the EPP and university. The English Education Methods courses have been revised to increase time in clinical practice (2016) and to support candidate needs in respect to edTPA. Four edTPA writing days were included in the Fall of 2017, in which faculty presented and supported. Additionally, to meet the changes in digital media, a Literacy Theme Resource Packet Assessment was added to highlight the incorporation of new and burgeoning media including podcasts, web pages, and other forms of multimodal forms of communication.
TESOL data driven changes are ongoing. We conduct an exit survey at the end of the program,

analyze data, and use it to inform decisions about the program. We believe candidates obtain a strong theoretical knowledge underlying ESL instruction. A content analysis has been performed to ensure that textbooks and course materials cover a variety of content knowledge. Our faculty revised the course content, syllabi, and rubrics based on current practice and research. As we continue to revise and improve our program, we are pleased to see that our candidates continue to meet the standards.

2. Based on the analysis of specialty licensure area data, how have individual licensure areas used data for change? (Answer this question only if you checked "CAEP Program Review with National Recognition (SPA)" or "CAEP Program Review with Feedback" in the first question of this page)

Data from all assessments provide evidence of candidate proficiency in the InTASC, NJPTS and CAEP standards. In addition, triangulated data from multiple valid and reliable assessments and surveys (meeting the CAEP standard) demonstrate that candidate use evidence to measure P-12 student academic progress; apply content and professional knowledge as reflected on state and SPA standards; models and applies technology in teaching, and affords P-12 the access to college-and-career-ready standards.

Data from all assessments are disaggregated by EPP, MAT, Undergraduate, Elementary, Secondary, TSD, ART/Music/Health and PE, and Secondary (Math, Science, Social Studies, and English- when possible by larger enough numbers). Individual licensing areas, which are not descriptive of all of our programs, have used data for change as follows (per specific license):

Non-SPA Reviewed initial Programs. The following initial programs are not reviewed by SPAs due to low enrollment: Art(NASAD), Music(NASM), Health(AAHE), PE(NASPE), Foreign Language (Chinese or Spanish: ACTFL). All non-SPA content area program changes have come out of data reviews from UTEAC and faculty meetings. Art faculty paired with Art education faculty meet twice a year at UTEAC and review data. Additionally, there is an annual faculty retreat where data is shared and discussions about program improvements result in changes. Exhibit 5.3.B Data Driven Program Improvements also outlines EPP and program changes made as a result of data analysis.
All initial certification programs, as a result of data, have made the following improvements based on data: 1. Free Praxis II tutoring in all content areas. The EPP has worked with the MU tutoring center to train quality tutors for students in all content areas taking the Praxis. These tutors are full time and adjunct faculty members in each license area. 2. edTPA writing days. The exit survey and edTPA data were analyzed at multiple meetings (UTEAC, faculty meetings, annual retreat) and faculty determined that based on data an implementation of edTPA writing days would be necessary to support candidates in the completion of their edTPA portfolio. Content area faculty are available at the four writing sessions, along with instructional technology department employees. The four writing days are strategically placed to pace students through the three tasks and eventual upload. 3. Change in Key Assessments. A huge improvement made to each program was the shift to valid and reliable assessments to improve data, thus improving instruction. The Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching was added to focus clinical practice on InTASC and NJPST. Although edTPA was a state mandate beginning Fall 2017, the EPP had full edTPA implementation the year prior with in-house scoring. Although the EPP used TWS prior, the edTPA assessment was stronger and aligned with our high standards for clinical practice. Finally, the alumni and exit surveys were revised to have 1:1 alignment with the NJPST and InTASC standards to receive data to help move the EPP forward in specific areas aligned to these standards. Finally, the EPP developed an early field assessment (High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubric) to guide students through their early field experience. This valid and reliable assessment aligns directly with standards (NJPST, CAEP, InTASC).

SPA reviewed Initial Programs
All Specific SPA data based changes can be found in Section 5 of each SPA report. Summaries are included in question #1 for all SPA reviewed content.

3. How does the specialty licensure area data align with and provide evidence for meeting the professional standards in the licensure area at initial and specialty area for advanced? (Answer this question only if you checked "CAEP Program Review with Feedback" in the first question of this page)

All key assessment are directly aligned with the New Jersey Professional Standards for Teaching (NJPST). All Licensure data align and provide evidence that candidates meet all standards (see New Jersey Self-Study Addendum in AIMS). Since the majority of our initial programs are SPA approved, the alignment for each individual SPA can be seen in Section IV Evidence for Meeting Standards.

Data from the CPAST, High Leverage Teaching Skills Proficiency Rubric, Praxis II, edTPA, alumni suvey, exit survey, and employer survey demonstrate that MU meets all 11 NJPST standards (see 1.1.A-1.1.D, 4.3.A, 4.4.A, 4.4.B) in all content areas.

Praxis II: 100% of all candidates have passed their given content of the Praxis II in the three series of

data given in Exhibit 1.1A. The passing of the Praxis II is a requirement of all candidates prior to clinical practice. Therefore, the 100 % pass rate is accurate for all content areas.

edTPA: edTPA has direct alignment with InTASC and NJPST as indicated on exhibit 1.1.B. For the Fall 2017 and Spring 2018, candidates were required to complete a portfolio to be considered passing. 100% of all candidates in all content areas passed edTPA, thus making them eligible for licensure. Specific areas of strength and needs are addressed in exhibit 1.1.B. EPP strengths include Rubrics Rubric 3 (Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning), 4 (Identifying and Supporting Language Demands),7 (Engaging Students in Learning), 9 (Subject-Specific Pedagogy), and 11 (Analysis of Student Learning). Areas of need include Rubric 5 (Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning), Rubric 8 (Deepening Student Learning), Rubric 10 (Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness) and Rubric 15 (Analyzing Students' Language Use and Literacy Learning). Each of these areas averaged a score of 2.88 for the EPP out of a 5-point rubric. Programs varied in tasks in which they showed strengths. In the Fall of 2017, Math scored highest in Task 2 Instruction and lowest in Task 3 Assessment. Elementary scored a solid "3" in all three tasks. History, PE, Music and Biology all scored relative strengths in Task 1 Planning. While Art, Health, Early Childhood, and Spanish data demonstrated these content areas were strongest in Task 3 Assessment. Most importantly, all candidates passed the edTPA for Fall 2017 and Spring 2018.

CPAST (Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching) was implemented in the Fall of 2018 and is aligned to InTASC, NJPST, and CAEP (Exhibit 1.1.C).The assessment is based on two categories: Pedagogy and Dispositions. Each category has multiple items to measure candidate success. Rubrics A-M measure pedagogy (Planning for Instruction and Assessment, Instructional Delivery, Assessment, Analysis of Teaching). Rubrics N-U measure dispositions (Professional Commitment and Behaviors, Professional Relationships, Critical and Reflective Practice). The EPP as a whole demonstrated strengths in Fall of 2017 and Spring 2018 in dispositions. Two Rubrics were strengths for all four data series (F17 midterm, F17 Final, S18 midterm, S18 Final):
S. Collaboration and U. Responds Positively to Feedback and Constructive Criticism. The highest scores for F17 midterm was N. Participates in Professional Development. Rubric S. Collaboration was the highest EPP score for Spring 18 Midterm and Final. These results are trends for programs. Elementary, the EPP's largest program also showed highest scores in the same areas with a mean of 2.94 (out of 3) on S. Collaboration and U. Responds Positively to Feedback. All programs and the EPP showed significant growth in most areas from midterm to final. This is expected as many skills are not demonstrated, nor do the students have the opportunity to demonstrate them at midterm.

High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics (early field) were implemented in the Spring of 2018 to replace early field checklists that were insufficient for program improvements and did not meet CAEP's level of sufficiency required for key assessments. The rubric was tested for validity and reliability by the EPP Assessment Coordinator (exhibit 1.1.D). A direct one-to-one alignment with NJPST and InTASC was established in the development of the assessment. Scores for all programs were above 2.50 (out of 3) in InTASC Category 1: The Learner and Learning, which consisted of rubrics 1-3 (Coinciding with the InTASC Standards 1-3). MAT students (m=2.83) scored slightly higher on Category 1 than Undergraduates (m=2.73). Elementary and TSD programs averaged a score of 2.83, which are the two programs the bulk of our candidates enrolled. On Category 2 Knowledge, the EPP average 2.58, which also matched the Elementary mean. TSD, HEPE and UG category means were 2.50. P-3 (N=3) mean was calculated at 2.0, the lowest of the programs. Category 2 scores were the lowest of the four InTASC categories. On Category 3, Instructional Practice, the EPP mean was strong at 2.74. The MATs (m=2.89) outscored the Undergraduates (m=2.64). Once again, Elementary and TSD candidate means were the same at 2.75. Given the large numbers in these programs, it is encouraging to see such strength in Instructional Practice. Scores for Professional Practice, Category 4, were also solid. The EPP mean was 2.68. The TSD program had a mean of 2.79 edging out the Elementary program whose mean was 2.67. Clearly, candidates in their clinical practice are demonstrating a positive impact on candidate learning.

Entry and Exit: The NJDOE requires EPP candidates to have score in the top third percentile of SAT, ACT, or GRE. If they do not they are required to take and pass the Praxis Core. The admission criteria is included as Exhibit 3.2.A. The EPP requires a 3.0 score for admission. In rare cases, a student may be conditionally accepted if they are above a 2.75, however this is not common practice. The chair, advisor and an administrator must approve any candidate who does not meet the 3.0 GPA. In the rare instances in which students are accepted conditionally, their advisor monitors them closely. If in a semester they do not increase their GPA to a 3.0, they are removed from the education program. Additionally, the NJDOE requires a cohort average of 3.0. MU undergraduate candidate cohorts have scored well above 3.6. MAT cohorts have scored above 3.2 for all three series of data.
Admission- EPP
2015-2016: UG=3.6 MAT= 3.4

2016-2017: UG= 3.6 MAT= 3.2
2017-2018: UG=3.6 MAT= 3.2

Undergraduates have higher GPA's at admission. English, Math, Science, Social Studies Art and Music cohorts average over 3.5 for the three series of data. The 2015-2016 P-3 with Special Education score was 2.9 at acceptance, however this is an n=1. Therefore, that data is not strong enough to show concern. For the other two series of data, the P-3 cohort GPA was 3.6 (16-17, n=4) and 3.4 (17-18, n=5). This data is a representative set for the P-3 program. The numbers for the MAT program are low for most programs, with the exception of Elementary Education candidates who were strong in both number and GPA. For the three series of data, MAT GPA cohorts (Elementary Education) were 3.4 (15-16, n=3.4), 3.4 (16-17, n=17), and 3.2 (17-18, n=3.2). In 2016-2017, a Spanish cohort of two had a 3.7 GPA. Again, one candidate in 17-18 in the P-3 program had a GPA of 2.8. This is not considered significant due to the low n, which is not representative of the program.

At Completion-EPP
2015-2016: UG=3.4 MAT= 3.8
2016-2017: UG=3.5 MAT=3.8
2017-2018: UG=3.5 MAT= 3.9

Exhibit 1.3.B EPP GPA at Completion summarizes the cohort GPAs by program. Overall EPP UG and MAT GPAs for the three-year series are significantly above the 3.0 required cohort minimum. UnderMATuate Science and Art candidates achieved the highest GPA of 3.8 in 17-18. Music (3.8, n=2) and English (3.6, n=8) had the highest cohort scores in 16-17, while the Spanish (GPA 3.7, n=3) cohort was highest among 2015-2016 programs. English MAT cohorts were among the highest for all three series of data, 15-16 & 17-18 cohort GPAs were 4.0. Other notable MAT cohort 4.0 GPAs occurred in 15-16 in Art and Spanish, 16-17 in Mathematics, and 17-18 Science. In 17-18 school year, the lowest Candidate GPA cohort score was 3.8 in Health and Physical Education. The EPP does not look at this as a weakness and believes a cohort 3.8 GPA at the completion of any of its programs shows the quality of candidate selected and retained.

4. How are SPA reports that are not Nationally Recognized being addressed? (Answer this question only if you checked "CAEP Program Review with National Recognition (SPA)" in the first question of this page)

N/A

Upload State Program Reports below

NJDOE Program Review Letter

See Attachment panel below.

Upload CAEP Program Review with Feedback Addendum below
Upload other National Accreditation Agency Documentation below (e.g. NASM, CACREP, NASAD)

CACREP Accreditation Letter 2017
CAA_ Speech Language Initial Observations of Self Study

See Attachment panel below.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnership and Practice (Initial Programs)

i. Evidence / data / tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the standard.)

1 Exhibit 1.1.C CPAST.pdf

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

2 Exhibit 1.1.D. Early Field_High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics.pdf

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

3 Exhibit 1.5.A Candidate Model and Use of Technology.pdf

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

4 Exhibit 1.5.B EPP Technology Crosswalk.pdf

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

5 Exhibit 2.1.A NAPDS AWARD APPLICATION 6 (004).pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

6 Exhibit 2.1.B Monmouth congratulatory email and press release.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

7 Exhibit 2.1.C School-University Partnership Award Article.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

8 Exhibit 2.1.D EPP Partnership Agreement Template.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

9 Exhibit 2.1.E Sample Partnership Agreements.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

10 Exhibit 2.1.F Partnership Advisory Committee Descriptions and Members.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

11 Exhibit 2.1.G Partnership Advisory Committee Minutes _Samples.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

12 Exhibit 2.1.H PDS Committee Agenda and Minutes Sample.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

13 Exhibit 2.1.I UTEAC MINUTES 5.16.18.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

14 Exhibit 2.1.J School of Education Advisory Groups for Individual Programs and Academies.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

15 Exhibit 2.1.K Teacher Residency Press Release.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

16 Exhibit 2.1.L List of Collaborative Conference Presentations.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

17 Exhibit 2.1.M PDS Partners journal article.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

18 Exhibit 2.1.N MU Partnerhips.pdf

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

19 Exhibit 2.2.A NJ 9A-4.4 Clinical Component and Candidate Supervision.pdf

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators

20 Exhibit 2.2.B Clinical Educator Application (002).docx

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators

21 Exhibit 2.2C Mentoring Academy Publications.pdf

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators

22 Exhibit 2.2.D CP HANDBOOK.pdf

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators

23 Exhibit 2.2.E CPAST Training Slides.pdf

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators

24 Exhibit 2.2.G Evaluation of School-based Clinical Educator_Final.pdf

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators

25 Exhibit 2.2.H Mentor Academy Survey Results.pdf

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators

26 Exhibit 2.3.A Clinical Hours.pdf

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

27 Exhibit 2.3.B Data for Diverse Placements.pdf

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

28 Exhibit 2.3.C. SOE Service Learning.pdf

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

29 Exhibit 2.3.D Developmental Curriculum.pdf

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

30 Exhibit 2.3.E Example of teacher candidate remediation plan.pdf

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

31 EXHIBIT 4.1.A MU EPPPR.pdf

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

32 Exhibit 4.3.A 2017 Employer Survey ResultsFinal.pdf

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

ii. Analysis Report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

The Monmouth University (MU) Partnership has distinguished itself nationally by receiving the National Association of Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) Exemplary Partnership Award in 2017. For a full description of the MU Partnership see the NAPDS Exemplary Partnership Award Application in Exhibit 2.1A, the congratulatory email and NAPDS press release in Exhibit 2.1B, and the School-University journal article about the partnership in Exhibit 2.1C. In Exhibit 2.1A, the EPP describes how the PDS is designed around the nine essentials for professional development schools.

2.1 In this section, the MU Partnership provides evidence that partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation, including technology-based collaborations. We share responsibility for the continuous improvement of candidate preparation, and establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.

The EPP has 30 formal partnerships (Exhibit 2.1.N). The shared responsibility for candidate preparation is formally established with a mutually agreed upon document included in Exhibit 2.1.D. Samples of enacted agreements are in Exhibit 2.1E.

The collaboration among MU partners is organized around five primary groups: Dean's Advisory Council (est. 2016), Partnership Advisory Council (est. 2008), Professional Development School Committee (est. 2015), University Teacher Education Advisory Council (UTEAC) (est. 2005) and the Academy Steering Committees (est. 2009-12). Descriptions of the charge of each committee and their members can be found in Exhibit 2.1F, Partnership Advisory Committees and Members. The Dean's Advisory Council meets 2-3 times per year to review the direction of the SOE, discuss special initiatives, consider funding opportunities, and make recommendations on the future direction for the SOE. There are six community members on the council, including one superintendent of schools. See Exhibit 2.1G for sample meeting minutes.

The Partnership Advisory Council meets twice per year to set annual goals, review past work, and develop new initiatives. It consists of P-12 school administrators, university administrators, and faculty members. The Partnership Advisory Council provides recommendations regarding the mission, the long term goals, and the immediate strategic objectives of the partnership.
The Professional Development School (PDS) Committee meets at the beginning of each semester to discuss placements, procedural changes, and the implementation of new strategies. The PDS Committee

consists of school liaisons, MU liaisons, teachers, university and clinical faculty. The role of this committee is to facilitate communication, develop implementation strategies, and to organize and carry out partnership initiatives. School liaisons are P-12 teachers or administrators who serve as contact people for the schools. Their role is to work with the university on clinical placements, teaching assignments, special initiatives, and other matters related to the partnership. MU liaisons are university faculty or staff who serve as contact people for the university. Their role is to work with schools on clinical placements, teaching assignments, special initiatives, and other matters related to the partnership. See Exhibit 2.1H, PDS Committee Minutes. At these meetings, the partners review recent data and have collaborated on the selection of clinical assessments. One recent example is implementation of the CPAST assessment of clinical practice. The procedures for implementing and conducting the assessment were jointly decided upon.

The University Teacher Education Advisory Council (UTEAC) is composed of faculty representatives from teacher preparation and the other academic units across campus. At these meetings, there is collaboration on how to improve the academic experience and preparation of teacher candidates. Typical topics include the Praxis scores, recent teacher education initiatives, and new program development, such as five-year programs. At the May 16, 2018 meeting, EPP faculty and content area faculty discussed scheduling issues related to extended clinical practice. More specifically, the EPP proposed that courses not be scheduled on Wednesdays and Fridays to support current initiatives, such as the Teacher Residency Program. See Exhibit 2.1I for UTEAC agendas and recent meeting minutes.

In addition, the partnership has advisory committees for several smaller advisory groups. These include advisories for the Ed.D program in Educational Leadership, the Principal and Superintendents Academy, the Special Services Academy, and the Central Jersey Consortium for Equity and Excellence. Each of the advisories consists of school and university members who provide guidance for these initiatives. See Exhibit 2.1J for a list of advisory committees and their members.

In addition, a number of SOE classes are conducted onsite in schools, facilitating the collaborative work of professors and teachers. Conducting classes onsite provides an opportunity for professors and classroom teachers to collaborate with each other. School partners, who are also part of the university faculty, also teach courses in their schools.

The Partnership also collaborates through multiple events held throughout the year. These include both university-based and school-based clinical educator orientations. Two especially valuable events have been the Yearlong Experience Dinner (January 25, 2016) and the Teacher Residency Dinner (February 1, 2018). These partnership dinners provided a venue for partners to learn from each other about the initiatives happening in schools across the teacher preparation program. For example, at the Yearlong Experience Dinner, partners shared their work to extend clinical experiences and provided testimonials on the impact on P-12 students and teacher candidates alike. The dinner was a great venue for sharing ideas and providing further momentum to the Yearlong Pilot Project, which has since been fully implemented. At the Teacher Residency Dinner, partners shared their work on the Teacher Residency pilot program. The dinner provided a vehicle for collaboration, reflection, and communication. It has resulted in a number of schools expanding their experience with the Teacher Residency program. The sharing of their work provided a stimulus for further development of clinical experiences in schools. See Exhibit 2.1K for press releases about the event.

MU partners have presented at the New Jersey Professional Development Schools conference at William Paterson University, the National Association of Professional Development School Conferences, and the American Educational Research Association. These presentations reflect numerous initiatives to improve clinical experiences and to encourage innovation in teacher education. Each of these presentations provides an opportunity to celebrate and further develop the work of teacher education. The partners have also developed scholarly pieces resulting in publications. See Exhibit 2.1L for a list of recent conference presentations and a promotional flyer describing presentations at the 2018 AACTE conference and Exhibit 2.1M for a co-authored article on PDS partners increasing P-12 learning.

2.2 In this section, the MU Partnership provides evidence that partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high quality clinical educators, both EPP and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based application to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.

The MU Partnership recruits clinical educators using multiple strategies. Through our partnerships and the Principals', Superintendents' and Special Services' Academies, the EPP is able to recruit clinical educators

through administrators who can identify highly effective teachers. Clinical educators are also selected through our Professional Development Schools (PDS) utilizing liaisons from both the university and the PDS. The SOE is in constant contact with partnership school districts and utilizes designated contacts to ensure placements are made per NJ Code.

The EPP is compliant with NJ State Statute NJ 6A:9A-4.4 (Exhibit 2.2.A) which outlines the requirements for clinical supervision. Each candidate recruited or recommended for employment as a clinical educator completes the Clinical Educator Application (Exhibit 2.2.B). The application includes all required components from NJ Code, along with items indicating how the EPP can provide support to clinical educators. University-based clinical educators of teacher candidates are recruited through our own faculty, partnership districts, adjunct faculty, and other content area faculty. University-based clinical educators who are not employed full time through MU apply through the MU employment site. This application includes submitting an application template, cover letter, resume, letters of recommendation, transcripts, and interview.

The MU Partnership seeks to provide substantial support to provide professional development to school-based clinical educators so they can successfully carry out their role. To serve this purpose, the MU Partnership offers an academy for mentoring teacher candidates. MU's Mentor Academy provides strategies for mentoring teacher candidates during yearlong clinical practice. The Mentoring Academy started in the Spring 2016 and is offered each semester to support the school-based clinical educators who are working with yearlong candidates. Attendance has been strong: Spring 2016: n=72; 16-17 SY: n=36; 17-18 SY: n=72. A special emphasis is placed on engaging teacher candidates to increase P-12 student learning. Participants also learn strategies for facilitating teacher candidate development through co-teaching, providing feedback, and fostering reflection. Over four workshops, instructors address the following learning goals:
. To increase P-12 student learning through co-teaching with teacher candidates
. To manage teacher candidate development through classroom engagement
. To use performance assessments to provide effective feedback
. To improve performance and increase reflection among teacher candidates
. To design experiences for increased student learning and teacher candidate development
The primary focus of the mentoring academy is the use of mentoring tools to facilitate student learning and teacher candidate development. Many of the tools in the academy were inspired by suggestions from clinical educators, designed based on mentor teacher input, and modified after receiving their feedback. These tools include: orientation guides, interview protocols, High Leverage Teaching Practices, the Developmental Curriculum, inquiry tools, performance assessment rubrics, student perception surveys, teacher candidate self-assessments, reflection questions, video recording analysis, and the edTPA.

School partners have been closely involved with the creation and development of the Mentoring Academy. First, the course is taught by a local teacher and administrator with the Dean of the School of Education. Second, clinical educators and teacher candidates serve as guest speakers and panelists to discuss and role play concepts associated with mentoring. Third, teachers in the course with mentoring experience often suggest new ideas or strategies that can be used in future courses. Academy attendees often serve as sounding boards for new initiatives or collaborations for clinical experiences. Fourth, the latest session of the Academy was conducted with Middletown Township School District teachers on site under the direction of an assistant principal who has been highly involved with the Academy instruction. Evidence that these initiatives are succeeding come from the survey data collected at the conclusion of the Academy. Qualitative survey results indicated the attendees found the Academy to be a tremendously valuable aid to mentoring (Exhibit 2.2.H Mentoring Academy Feedback Samples). In Spring 2016, one participant stated, "Great workshop! I love co-teaching. I want to do it!" Another participant in Fall 2017 stated, "It is really evident to see the level of commitment that MU is putting into producing the best student teachers out there. This workshop was helpful and I look forward to the positive change the school is making to improve the experience of those pursuing a teaching career." Other evidence includes the NAPDS award (see Exhibit 2.1A) and two publications (an article and a book) that outline the curriculum and the tools used in the Mentoring Academy (see Exhibit 2.2C).

The Mentoring Academy serves as an excellent resource for developing other means for communicating with school-based clinical educators. Orientations are held each school year for clinical educators. Clinical Faculty Supervisor meetings are held twice each semester (beginning of semester and at mid-term). At these meetings, clinical faculty have been trained in edTPA local scoring, the CPAST evaluation process, and receive updates on all NJ DOE Code changes. Schools are also updated on changes such as the Yearlong placement pilots as well as edTPA pilots and current edTPA requirements for NJ certification. Clinical faculty also receive a handbook that provides information on the processes and evaluations associated with the clinical experiences. See Exhibit 2.2D, Clinical Educator Handbook.

Professional development is also delivered through online formats. For example, online training is provided for the CPAST training (Exhibit 2.2.E). This training consists of a series of slides that explain the evaluation tool and the rationale. These trainings are intended to enhance the reliability of the CPAST tool. In addition, during the first semester of the yearlong experience, clinical educators receive emails that provide weekly updates on the progress their teacher candidates should be making. Brief sessions on mentoring are also provided during clinical educator orientations and meetings.

Additional professional development has been provided for teachers through the Academies, the Literacy Symposium, the Social Studies and English AP seminars, and individual school initiatives. Support for clinical educators has been provided through professional development sessions on the edTPA, yearlong clinical experience, and performance assessments. School-based clinical educators are also invited to SOE events and may take part in the AP Forum meetings.

University-based clinical educators are evaluated each semester by the teacher candidates using Likert surveys that are aligned with standards. Exhibit 2.2F shows that survey with data from three applications (Sp 17, Fall 17 and Sp 18). School-based clinical educators are evaluated each semester by teacher candidates as well as by university-based clinical educators using surveys with Likert scales. Exhibit 2.2G provides the survey and data sets from the 2017-2018 school year for the university-based clinical educator's evaluation of the school-based clinical educator. The data for that semester is combined because the EPP has recently switched from collecting this data on Lime Survey to Foliotek. The exhibit also includes the candidate evaluations of the school-based clinical educators for the Sp 17, Fall 17, and Sp 18. The data is collected and reviewed with administration and the Office of Certification and Clinical Placement to determine effectiveness of each position, professional development offerings, possible supports to implement and retention efforts for highly effective university-based clinical educators.

The MU Partnership seeks to retain clinical educators using several approaches. University-based clinical educators receive a stipend for each teacher candidate they supervise. They also receive a travel stipend each semester. The Coordinator of Early Clinical Placements and the Director of Clinical Placements are available to clinical educators and university-based clinical educators for support each semester. School-based clinical educators receive stipends for their semester of mentoring of teacher candidates and professional development certificates for their early field candidates and teacher candidates. They are also invited to SOE events. AP teachers in English and social studies are invited to AP Teacher Forum meetings each year, where they receive professional development certificates for attending.

2.3 The EPP partnerships offer significant clinical experiences for teacher candidates. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple, performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.

Currently, teacher candidates are required to complete a minimum of 50 hours clinical experience in their sophomore year. In the junior year, they must complete at least 75 hours of clinical practice. Seniors in the program must complete 100-hour experience in the semester preceding full-time clinical practice. EPP candidates are required to complete a minimum of 230 hours prior to full time clinical placement. The NJDOE requires 225 hours prior to full time clinical practice. See Exhibit 2.3A, Clinical Hours.

Each teacher candidate in the EPP must have one or more diverse placements during the EPP's teacher placement program. Diversity is addressed in early clinical placements through several courses which require clinical work that addresses diversity. The EPP has also been working to provide more opportunities for MU students to spend time in the field by becoming involved in community service learning projects. These projects contain a number of benefits, including 1) significant learning for P-12 students, 2) engagement in leadership, relational, and academic skills for teacher candidates, and 3) added resources for schools. Seven service-learning projects completed in cooperation with partnership schools are attached as Exhibit 2.3.C.

The Director of Clinical Placements assesses each teacher candidate's application for clinical practice in order to confirm that each candidate meets the diversity placement requirement prior to the completion of the EPP's teacher preparation program. The Clinical Placement Director obtains diversity placement information by using the Early Field databases, the NJDOE District Factor Grouping (DFG) system, clinical practice resumes, and substitute teaching employment history on each candidate for clinical practice if that is available. This information is placed in a spreadsheet and reviewed each semester. See Exhibit 2.3.B Data for Diverse Placement in Partnership Districts.

The MU Partnership has been redesigning and expanding our clinical experiences to ensure sufficient

depth, breadth, coherence, and duration to ensure candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. At the heart of our recent work to improve our experiences have been the design, piloting, and implementation of the yearlong clinical practice. The yearlong experience has added value to schools, provided better teacher preparation, and created an unprecedented opportunity for schools and universities to work together to improve P-12 student learning. During the first semester, teacher candidates engage for at least 10 hours per week in their clinical placement while they finish their classes.

During the second semester, teacher candidates remain in the same placement while completing their full time clinical practice. In the Fall 2015 at MU, 22 students were invited to be part of a yearlong pilot program and 19 accepted. They received no extra credits, no reduced course load; they were willing to do the extra work to receive the additional benefit. The number of volunteers increased in Spring 2016 to approximately 50 students. The State of NJ requires 175 hours of clinical prior to the full time clinical practice semester (with 100 hours immediately preceding the full time clinical practice semester) beginning the 2018-2019 school year. At MU, we fully implemented the yearlong clinical practice during the 2017-2018 school year.

Teachers and administrators have quickly recognized the added value of the yearlong clinical practice. The single most important benefit is increased P-12 student learning. The increased P-12 student learning can be attributed in part to the changed dynamics of yearlong clinical practice. Spending an entire year in a school enables the candidate to develop stronger relationships with P-12 students, the mentor teacher, other faculty, administration, and staff. The longer experience also enables teacher candidates to be part of in-service days, parent-teacher conferences, and after school events. In short, teacher candidates become members of their schools.

During the past year, the MU Partnership investigated two approaches to assessing the impact of teacher candidates on P-12 student learning. These initiatives were undertaken to increase the impact of teacher candidates during the yearlong experience by assessing student learning and using the data to provide feedback. Since teacher candidates are in the same school for an entire year, their impact on P-12 student learning can be tracked through the existing school data systems in place (See Exhibits 4.1.A, 4.3.A). This data can be used to compare the performance of classrooms with teacher candidates to those without candidates.

The Teacher Residency Program (TRP) is a pilot initiative which began in the Spring of 2017 to expand the current level of clinical experiences, which includes yearlong clinical practice. The Residency involves teacher candidates in a paid internship that requires them to be in schools year round, including semester breaks, the months of May and June, and for specialized programs in the summer. The goals of the TRP are to enhance teacher candidates' practice knowledge, make them fluent in their practice, and to socialize them to working in a school setting. The design of the program engages teacher candidates in an extended apprenticeship in P-12 school settings over a two to three-year period. It includes sophomores, juniors, seniors, and initial licensure graduate students.

Experiences in the TRP include work that has traditionally received compensation in schools, including substitute teaching. Accordingly, the EPP has developed a Substitute Teaching Academy. This workshop provides strategies for substitute teachers during their teacher residency experience. A special emphasis is placed on engaging substitute teachers to increase P-12 student learning. Participants also learn strategies for building relationships, student engagement, and classroom management.

As the partnership expands its clinical experiences, the support for clinical experiences has increased. The first is to clearly articulate the expectations for teacher candidate development in the field from the beginning to the end of the program. Accordingly, we have adopted The Developmental Curriculum for Clinical Experiences, which is an explicit statement of expectations for clinical experiences across the entire teacher preparation program. It uses commonly recognized practitioner language to target the practices that teacher candidates are to learn, establish a map for accomplishing those practices, and identify specific instructional strategies for fostering teacher candidates' development in clinical settings. This document enables stakeholders to refer to one concise document that summarizes program expectations and is expressed in practitioner language. The Developmental Curriculum (Exhibit 2.3D) facilitates communication across programs within individual teacher preparation institutions by helping teachers and professors better understand their role within the larger activities of the teacher candidate and the goals of the program.

The P-12 settings candidates are placed in are technology rich, therefore candidates get direct experience applying the standard when they are in the field. The EPP also has technology for candidates to use in the classroom on campus, and in their clinical practice settings. A few examples include: Smartboards (EPP

has them on campus), I-pads (with educational applications), swivel cameras (for videotaping both in the university classroom and the P-12 field experiences), computer labs, and an array of educational software. Candidates in their final clinical practice semester are also required to videotape multiple lessons for edTPA. Teacher candidate use of technology is assessed using edTPA, CPAST, High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics, and Exit Surveys. This triangulated data (Exhibit 1.5.A), with the technology crosswalk (Exhibit 1.5.B) provides evidence that candidates model and apply technology standards as they implement and assess learning experiences.

The Partnership has recently adopted a new evaluation for the clinical internship called CPAST Assessment (Exhibit 1.1.C), developed at Ohio State University. The partnership chose it because it afforded reliable and valid assessment of teacher candidate performance. Both school and university-based clinical educators benefit by using it. The data from the CPAST indicates that MU candidates have acquired the skills associated with InTASC standards.

The partnership has also developed and adopted a new early field assessment, the High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics (Exhibit 1.1.D). This assessment was designed for clinical educators to evaluate their mentees during the first semester of clinical practice. This assessment is intended to evaluate the teacher candidate's performance of high leverage teaching practices, such as teaching differentiated lessons, working with individuals and small groups, and teaching content.

The university-based supervision of teacher candidates has also been expanded. University-based clinical educators are supervising candidates during the first half of yearlong clinical practice. University-based clinical educators formally observe each teacher candidate at least five times during the full time semester of clinical practice. They also meet with each teacher candidate and the candidate's school-based clinical educator to collaborate and conference on mid-term and final CPAST evaluations.
The implementation of edTPA has resulted in shifting three of five semester focus groups to edTPA support and implementation. Two other focus groups and related seminars are also scheduled during each semester. The EPP is also engaged in discussions to increase supervision during other clinical experiences. One purpose would be to increase the level of expectations for teacher candidates during early clinical experiences by providing more focused observations of teaching performance.
The Partnership has further enhanced the benefit to student learning by utilizing a co-teaching approach in the yearlong experience. When using co-teaching, the mentor teacher and teacher candidate share the teaching responsibilities during the year. During the first semester of the yearlong experience, teacher candidates can engage in differentiating instruction, providing one-on-one instruction, and contributing to the development of new lessons or materials. During the full time teaching experience, the teacher candidate can assume a lead role in team teaching while the mentor teacher provides additional one-on-one support for P-12 students. Throughout the entire year, the P-12 students receive the benefits that come with having two teachers in the room.

We have made considerable strides to improve P-12 student learning through our ongoing implementation of the yearlong teaching experience, by implementing co-teaching into the yearlong experience, and by assessing the impact of teacher candidates on student learning. The longer experience facilitates student learning by allowing candidates to become more confident and fully functioning in their surroundings, to build stronger relationships with students, and to employ a greater variety of more complex teaching strategies. The second positively affects student learning by multiplying the power and influence of a single teacher. The third provides invaluable feedback to the teacher candidate, enabling him or her to identify the successful strategies and to revise the less successful ones.
See Exhibit 2.3B PDS Partners journal article.

Teacher candidates who are not able to meet expectations are identified through the process for assessing dispositions, counseled regarding the need for improvement, and then provided with a remediation plan (Exhibit 2.3.E). In these cases, the teacher candidate's progress is closely monitored and provided with feedback. In the rare case a teacher candidate does not improve, they are counseled out of the program.

Standard A.2. Clinical Partnership and Practice (Advanced Programs)

i. Evidence / data / tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the standard.

No Evidence found.

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

N/A

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity (Initial Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the standard.

1	Exhibit 1.1.A. Praxis II Content Assessments.pdf
	3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
2	Exhibit 1.1.B edTPA.pdf
	3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability 3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
3	Exhibit 1.1.C CPAST.pdf
	3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability 3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
4	Exhibit 1.1.D. Early Field_High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics.pdf
	3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability 3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
5	Exhibit 1.5.B EPP Technology Crosswalk.pdf
	3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
6	Exhibit 3.1.A Recruitment Planrev6_26.pdf
	3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
7	Exhibit 3.1.B SOE Enrollment by Gender and Ethnicity.pdf
	3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
8	Exhibit 3.1.C Sample Meeting Agenda and Minutes.pdf
	3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
9	Exhibit 3.2.A. Admissions Scores for Education Majors.pdf
	3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
10	Exhibit 3.2.B. Teacher Candidate Basic Skills Requirement_ NJDOE.pdf
	3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
11	Exhibit 3.3.A Dispositional Review Process.pdf
	3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
12	Exhibit 3.4.A PRAXIS SUPPORT FOR CANDIDATES 10.3.17.pdf
	3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
13	Exhibit 3.4.B Monitoring Candidate Progress.pdf
	3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
14	Exhibit 3.6.A Expectations of the Profession.pdf
	3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
15	EXHIBIT 4.1.A MU EPPPR.pdf
	3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
16	Exhibit 4.3.A 2017 Employer Survey ResultsFinal.pdf
	3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
17	Exhibit 5.2.B CPAST Evidence for CAEP.pdf
	3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

3.1
The EPP continually works on improving efforts to recruit and support completion of high quality teacher candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations.
Specific requirements for admission to undergraduate and graduate programs at Monmouth can be found at https://www.monmouth.edu/university/admission/requirements-and-forms.aspx . Monmouth University (MU) undergraduate students are admitted into their education major through the SOE at the beginning of their sophomore year when they have met the admissions criteria set by MU in direct alignment with New Jersey State Administrative Code. To summarize, students are required to have achieved a 3.0 (UG) and (MAT) or better GPA, have passed the Praxis Core or SAT, ACT, or GRE Requirement set by the New

Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE), and demonstrate appropriate dispositional skills.

Annual data is provided by the NJDOE to identify "hard-to-staff" schools, and areas of teacher shortages. The SOE administration and faculty review this data on an ongoing basis for specific recruitment of a diverse prospective student body, and to ensure current teacher candidates are exposed to clinical experiences in special education, schools with high ELL populations, and K-12 settings with strong STEM programs in order to meet the needs of the field. The intentional exposure to these varied clinical experiences is intended to encourage students to obtain endorsements in those fields.
Recruitment: MU Office of Admissions employs a variety of strategies to recruit both undergraduate and graduate students as evidenced by Exhibit 3.1.A EPP Recruitment Plan 2017. The plan, driven by the EPP's Five-Year Recruitment Goals, includes initiatives that align with the EPP's mission and strategic plan. It also provides data on teacher shortage area, academic ability, and diversity. The plan differentiates efforts by four categories: undergraduate institutional initiatives, graduate institutional initiatives, and undergraduate and graduate EPP initiatives. Multiple measures were employed to create the recruitment plan: The NJDOE EPP Reports (Exhibit 4.1.B, Classroom Assignment: Teacher Shortage Area section), the EPP's Strategic Plan (Exhibit 5.3.E), Employer Survey (Exhibit 4.3.A, Demographics Item #5), and EPP 2017 Enrollment by Gender and Ethnicity (Exhibit 3.1.B). The EPP's candidate demographics matches that of national trends of initial teaching programs, with the majority being white females. The EPP totals include the following:

% Female Undergraduate (UG): 17-18=85%; 16-17=86%; 15-16=86%
% female MAT: 17-18=87%; 16-17=79%; 15-16=74%
Racial Diversity UG 17-18: White: 82%; African American: 1%; Latina(o): 9%; Asian:1%, other:7%
Racial Diversity MAT 17-18: White: 87%; African American: 2%; Latina(o): 4%; Asian:0%, other:7%

The EPP has increased its racial diversity of undergraduate candidates over the three years of data. In 16-17 the EPP enrollment white candidates accounted for 87% of all enrolled. In 15-16, the percentage of white candidates topped out at 88%. MAT diversity has decreased over the three year period of data presented.
Recruitment Plan Goals: The goals outlined in the Recruitment Plan that pertain specifically to recruiting diverse candidates (Exhibit 3.1.A) are summarized as follows:
1. Increase enrollment in initial teacher preparation programs over 5 years by 2% each year. Enrollment for initial UG and MAT programs 2017-2018 SY: 323 UG; 55:MAT
2. Increase the number of UG initial transfer candidates from two-year institutions by 10% over 5 years. Baseline Data: 22 enrolled F17-Sp18
3. Increase the diversity of students enrolled in initial programs by 5% each year by gender and ethnicity. (17-18 SY: 85% Female, 82% white)

To summarize, UG recruitment is comprehensive and led by the UG Admissions Office, with support and participation by the EPP which employs two full-time and one part-time SOE specific advisors. The Graduate Admissions Office, the SOE MAT Advisor, EPP administration, department chairs and program directors, all lead the graduate recruitment efforts.
Admissions counselors travel to over 800 high schools each year to recruit a diverse body of students; relationships with high school counselors is key. Visits to local high schools and community colleges allows admissions counselors to better understand the community needs. Student names are also purchased through student search website profiles. Targeted outreach is sent via letter, postcard, and email that is both general to the University as well as program-specific. Additionally, students are invited to attend the University's Open House, weekend information sessions, and other events for prospective students and their families. The EPP is present at each of these events with administrators, faculty, advisors, program directors and other staff. Each spring, on-campus visit days called "Mondays at Monmouth" are hosted, where accepted students attend a class of their interest and meet faculty. Faculty also provide in-depth presentations about academic programs at Open House. Recruitment of students includes advertising to potential first-year and transfer students. Advertising in strategic markets to potential first year and transfer students includes student search, advertising and outreach to community college students within the University's set travel territories, the development of articulation agreements, and on-campus visit days for transfers. "Transfer Tuesdays" give instant decisions to transfer students and are held on our campus as well as at select community college campuses.

The SOE has an active presence in the New Jersey Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (NJACTE) and the Garden State Alliance (GSA). Both organizations work directly with the NJDOE and other constituencies to identify hard-to-place areas, diversity trends, enrollment trends, and strategies to recruit teacher candidates. The State of New Jersey provides institutions with statewide data to help identify the diversity of student and staff/faculty populations at the school, district, county and state levels. This data is used to target diverse districts to approach with potential programs, clinical placements and events that

have recruitment components. It is the MU SOE contention that the best recruiting tool is exposure, both to the beautiful MU campus and to teacher candidates and programs that occur in the K-12 and community settings.
School of Education Sponsored Events and Programs with Goals for Targeted Recruitment: Each year the SOE hosts events that draw prospective students to our campus. Additionally, EPP faculty and students participate in programs and events that serve multiple purposes in the community and at local K-12 schools, including recruitment. Exhibit 3.1.A EPP Recruitment Plan represents how the EPP recruits for a high quality, diverse student population.

Recruitment of Candidates Respective of Academic Level: Due to requirements by CAEP and the NJDOE, academic diversity must start at a minimal level. MU follows the guidelines set by both NJDOE and CAEP and admits only students who meet the academic minimums, with 100% compliance. The EPP was approved to offer an honors track to attract students into the field of education during the 2017-2018 School year. There were eight students who participated in the honors program in the 2017-2018 school year. The School of Education offered, for the first time, HO-298 Special Topics in Education. This course is offered to freshman honors students who are considering becoming education majors. This course counts as the entry class ED 250 Psychological and Philosophical Foundations of Education. The goal of this offering is to increase interest and recruitment of honors candidates.

Recruitment Plan as a Tool for Continuous Improvement: The EPP Admissions office, First Year advisors, and the SOE advisors evaluate data on an ongoing basis in order to improve initiatives to increase diversity of candidates. The SOE advising staff meet regularly to review initiatives tied to recruitment. Two of the SOE advisors are also First Year Advisors for the university. They are involved in activities for recruitment at the institution and EPP level. Data on enrollment is shared annually at the university full faculty meeting and strategies for recruitment are discussed. The Office of Planning and Decision Support also provides the SOE with an annual report from the Factbook Exhibit 3.1.B School of Education Enrollment by Gender and Ethnicity. This data is shared with constituency groups including the Dean's Educational Leadership Council (DELC), Deans Advisory Council, Faculty, University Teacher Education Advisory Council (UTEAC), and SOE Advisors meetings. Sample Agenda and minutes for these meetings are included as Exhibit 3.1.C.
3.2
Admissions Requirements: The EPP is compliant with admission criteria set by CAEP, the NJDOE and EPP (Exhibit 3.2.A Admissions Scores for Education Majors). 100% of all candidates meet the requirements for admission (Exhibit 3.2.B. Teacher Candidate Basic Skills Requirement NJDOE). UG students cannot be officially admitted into the SOE until their sophomore year (ED 250). MAT students must meet the criteria prior to admission to the program. Further students must meet the following criteria: 3.0 GPA, must have met the minimum cut scores on the SAT, ACT or GRE or passed the Praxis Core Assessment. The Praxis Core score set by the State of New Jersey is lower than the cohort score released by CAEP in the Fall of 2017 and thus the CAEP standard is used as the standard. However, the SAT and ACT cut scores used are those set by the NJDOE, as they are higher than that required by CAEP. The SOE considers the class of ED 250/ 510 (Psychological and Philosophical Foundations of Education) to be the point of entry for all declared education majors. The following data points are attached as Exhibit 3.2.A. Admissions Scores for Education Majors.

Admissions requirements are shared in multiple ways. University admissions criteria for undergraduate students are posted at https://www.monmouth.edu/university/admission/requirements-and-forms.aspx. University admissions criteria for graduate students are available online at https://www.monmouth.edu/graduate/application-requirements/. Once a candidate is admitted to the University, they receive a welcome education letter that includes information about requirements for entry into their education major. There are also two EPP advisors that dually advise first year UG students. Education majors are assigned to these two EPP advisors who review all requirements (GPA, ACT/SAT/Praxis Core). Candidates have access through advising to the First Year Office's software platform known as SOAR (Support, Orientation, Advising, and Registration). SOAR is an online resource center for advising that includes all requirements set for admission into the education program.

MAT candidates are advised by the MAT program advisor.

SAT/ACT: All teacher candidates are required to meet cut scores set by the NJDOE for the SAT, ACT, or GRE or pass the Praxis Core prior to beginning their education coursework (Monitor Point 1). The most recent three years of SAT cohort data is included in Exhibit 3.2.A. This data displays SAT, ACT, GRE scores of those admitted to the entry course ED 250/510. The data shows that for all three years MU SOE candidates have met or exceeded the 50%ile requirement. If they do not meet that score, they must pass the Praxis Core.

Cohort mean SAT score (Required: NJ 1000; CAEP Reading: 1100)

2015/2016: UG: 1132 MAT: 1229
2016/2017: UG: 1172 MAT: 1266
2017/2018: UG 1188 MAT: none tested

Cohort mean ACT Score: (Required: NJ English: 23; CAEP =24)
2015-2016: UG = 24.5; MAT = no data
2016-2017: UG = 26; MAT = 26
2017-2018: UG = 25; MAT = 23.5

Praxis Core: Prior to September 2017, the only pass rate for the Praxis Core was that set by the NJDOE. (Exhibit 3.2.B). However, at the Fall 2017 CAEPCON, CAEP reviewed the recently implemented average cohort score of Reading: 168.06, Writing: 165, Math 162.14. To address this, the MU SOE is collecting, analyzing and making decisions regarding supports and services offered to those who are not passing at a level that would contribute to the CAEP cohort pass rate. This requirement by CAEP has not changed the EPP's goal of admitting quality candidates, instead it has altered the process of analyzing the data mined in respect to the Praxis Core. This data is used to further determine services and supports made available to our candidates. These scores represent only those who have passed the Praxis Core.

Cohort mean Praxis CORE Score
(CAEP standard: Reading: 168.06, Writing: 165, Math 162.14)
UG
2015-2016: Reading = 185, Writing = 167, Math = 175.5
2016-2017: Reading = 173, Writing = 169, Math = 164
2017-2018: Reading = 176, Writing = 169; Math = 166

MAT
2015-2016: Reading = 180, Writing = 173, Math = 171
2016-2017: Reading = 185, Writing= 173, Math = 169
2017-2018: Reading= 180, Writing= 170; Math= 167

3.0 GPA: The MU SOE requires candidates be admitted with and maintain a 3.0 GPA. A student will not be admitted and registered for the entry ED 250 course if they do not have a 3.0 GPA as an undergraduate. If a student has a 2.75 or better, they may be conditionally accepted if it does not drop the cohort average below 3.0. The EPP measures GPA at entrance to ED 250/510, their first official ED class. The data shows that MU candidates are admitted with a cohort GPA that is above a 3.0 for all three years in the series of reported data:

UG
2015-2016: m= 3.57
2016-2017: m= 3.52
2017-2018: m= 3.21

MAT
2015-2016: m= 3.4
2016-2017: m= 3.2
2017-2018: m= 3.2

3.3
The EPP established and regularly monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. The provider selects criteria, describes the measures used and evidence of the reliability and validity of those measures, and reports data that show how the academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.

The EPP has established a system of monitoring dispositions beyond academic ability at admissions (ED 250/510) and during the program. This was accomplished and is explained in Exhibit 3.3A Disposition Process and summarized in this section. As a part of continuous improvement, the EPP, through a number of constituency meetings, realized an improved process to assess dispositions was required. In the past three academic years the following improvements were made: edTPA implementation (Exhibit 1.1.B), Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST) adoption (Exhibit 1.1.C), EPP Disposition Process (Exhibit 3.3.A) and implementation of the pre-full time clinical practice High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubric (HLTPP) (Exhibit 1.1.D). The following valid and reliable assessments are used to report progress on dispositions: edTPA (Rubrics 1-4,6,7,10), CPAST (Rubrics n-u), High Leverage Teaching Practices Proficiency Rubric (Rubrics 8 and 9), Exit Survey, and Employer Survey.

Professional dispositions are set forth by the State of New Jersey Professional Standards for Teaching (NJPST) (which align to InTASC standards), the Specialty Program Associations (SPAs) of CAEP and the EPP, as well as the university itself (e.g., academic honesty). In order to assist students having difficulty in one or more non-academic criteria, each department has established a procedure to ensure due process (Exhibit 3.3.A.). The new process was designed throughout the 2017-2018 school year and was approved by faculty and administration.

Disposition at Point of Admission to Program: The process at the department and EPP level has been developed collaboratively with feedback from multiple constituency groups. The plans have been vetted and approved by faculty, department chairs, the Dean's Educational Leadership Council (DELC), and at the SOE Deans' meetings. Next, the process will be reviewed and revised based on feedback from MU's General Counsel. The new process will be implemented in the Fall of 2018. The following processes are attached: the Department of Curriculum and Instruction Dispositions and the School of Education Academic and Professional Dispositions Review Committee.

The new process includes a faculty-completed dispositional survey completed for each student in ED 250/510. This is the entry course for education majors for all initial licensing areas. The survey form REAP (Responsibility, Ethics, Attitude, Professionalism) is included as part of Exhibit 3.3.A. This informal assessment is essentially a checklist of behaviors in each domain area of the acronym. The intent is to alert the SOE advisors and faculty of potential dispositional cases.

Dispositions during Clinical Practice: Teacher candidates participate in 100 hours of clinical practice prior to completing their full-time clinical practice. The university-based clinical educators complete the valid and reliable High Leverage Teaching Practices Proficiency Rubrics (Exhibit 1.1.D) with the candidate and their clinical educator.
Teacher candidates participating in full-time clinical practice are evaluated at the midterm and final week of their full time clinical practice using the valid and reliable Candidates' Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST). The validity and reliability measures as well as its alignment with InTASC standards are attached as Exhibit 5.2.B CPAST Evidence for CAEP.
The data from the High Leverage Teaching Practices Proficiency Rubrics and CPAST mid and final assessments are being collected for the Fall 2017, Spring 2018, and Fall 2018 semesters and are included as Exhibit 3.6.A Expectations of the Profession Evidence.

3.4 The EPP creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates' advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach to college- and career ready standards. The EPP presents multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates' developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all of these domains (Exhibit 1.5.B Technology Crosswalk).

For all programs in the SOE, advisors continuously monitor candidate progress. All candidates are required to meet with their advisors prior to registration, and at that time, advisors review audits to ensure that adequate progress is being made. Following is a summary of various monitoring points during a teacher candidate's progression through the program. All assessments used through the monitoring points are described in detail in standard 1.1-1.5.

Monitor Point 1: Admission. At the undergraduate level, candidates must have a 3.0 GPA to major in Education, and they must also select one of the identified content area majors. They also are required to pass the PRAXIS Core assessment if they did not meet the ACT/SAT standard. All new candidates must attend a mandatory SOE orientation where they learn about program requirements, the electronic portfolio, field placements, and the importance of advisement.

MAT candidates are expected to have completed the content discipline prior to beginning the graduate program. Some MAT candidates are admitted to graduate study before a coherent sequence of at least 30 credits in a recognized liberal arts discipline (e.g., art, English, mathematics) has been completed. These candidates are expected to complete all remaining undergraduate coursework before completion of the program. As part of the admission process, candidates must have an undergraduate GPA of 3.0. Candidates are either denied, fully accepted, or conditionally accepted. For those who are conditionally accepted, they must meet regularly with their MAT program advisor until all conditions have been met.

Monitor Point 2: Entry to Clinical Practice. Applications for clinical practice (i.e., student teaching) must be submitted to the Office of Certification, Field Placements, and School Partnerships by January 31st for fall and spring placement of the following year. At this time, candidates are screened to ensure that they meet the academic and professional standards required for state certification. Candidates must complete the appropriate Praxis II subject assessment with a passing score prior to clinical practice and to meet the

requirement for NJ state certification. The Certification Officer receives all Praxis scores on a weekly basis. The scores are entered into a database and data is shared with administration, advisors, and department chairs. Candidates seeking Spanish certification must also earn a passing score on the official OPI prior to clinical practice. Passing Praxis score reports are uploaded into Foliotek. The SOE advisors follow up with each candidate who did not pass to advise them on a course of action. Those who did not pass are given information on resources available to them, which is updated regularly (Exhibit 3.4.A. Praxis Support). They also meet with their advisors to develop a plan and identify which supports they will use. The Assistant Dean generates a report for each program and verifies which core assessments have been completed for each student. This information is entered into the SOE shared drive and is also shared with the appropriate professionals (e.g., advisors, SOE program directors, faculty).

Monitor Point 3: Exit from Clinical Practice. Candidates must receive a passing grade on their clinical practice experience. Clinical Faculty complete the valid and reliable Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST) at midterm and final. In addition, students must also meet the cut score for the edTPA. University Clinical Educators also complete a midterm and final student teaching evaluation. The Credential Officer verifies that the candidate has successfully completed the two final assessments during clinical practice and has the required GPA of 3.0 for licensure.
Monitor Point 4: Program Completion. All candidates must attend a certification meeting at the completion of Clinical Practice prior to graduation. The Credential Officer reviews each candidate's audit and other state licensure requirements to ensure all requirements have been met. The Credential Officer verifies that all final components (3.0 GPA; Audit requirements fulfilled; edTPA, and surveys) have been satisfied and enters this information into the SOE Database. The candidate then completes a state application for certification, which is submitted to the NJDOE. The Credential Officer verifies all program completers for the SOE.

3.5
The data shows that candidates have reached a high level of content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and establishes a strong case that the EPP has met this standard. The primary measures used to document that candidates have reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development include Praxis II Subject Knowledge (Exhibit 1.1.A), edTPA (Exhibit 1.1.B), the High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubric (Exhibit1.1.D) and the Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST, Exhibit 1.1.C).

State Mandates: The EPP employs a Certification Officer who works directly with the NJDOE and teacher candidates to ensure they have met all requirements. The Certification Officer also works closely with faculty, advisors, administrators and other staff to guarantee candidates the best opportunity for success.

The Praxis II Content assessments (Exhibit 1.1.A) have been mandated by the NJDOE who sets cut scores for each assessment. Additionally, the NJDOE mandates that all teacher candidates pass the edTPA (Exhibit 1.1.B) teacher performance assessment for licensure. Although the state mandated the implementation for the 2017-2018 academic school year, MU fully implemented edTPA during the 2016-2017 school year. The implementation of the edTPA was a well-planned process with a smooth implementation as measured by our pilot results. The edTPA aligns with both the NJPTS and the InTASC standards. Finally, the state requires a minimum 3.0 GPA for licensure. The GPA's are monitored by advisors and the Certification Officer to ensure they are eligible for licensure.

3.6
The EPP has documented that candidates understand the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies before recommending any completing candidate for licensure or certification. Exhibit 3.6.A triangulates data from the following assessments to demonstrate candidate understanding of the expectation of the profession: CPAST, High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubric (HLTPP), Exit Survey, Alumni Survey, and Employer Survey.

Pre-service measures:
Data from the edTPA, High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics and the CPAST indicate that candidates have strengths in expectations of the profession. Data from the edTPA reveal EPP candidates have improved over time to demonstrate strong skills and knowledge in InTASC Category 4: Professional Responsibility. There are two rubrics (10,15) that measure Professional Practice. This category was a relative weakness for the EPP, with means at 2.65 for both series of data. Elementary, Spanish and Visual Arts scored among the top programs in Fall 2017. Elementary, Performing Arts and Math presented the highest scores in Spring 2018. Some of the lowest mean scores amongst all categories were for two programs with n=1, Science and Math, both with means= 1.50. In the Spring of 2018, the lowest scores in this area were in Science and Health. MU candidates demonstrate professional learning and ethical practice

as well as leadership and collaboration on the CPAST. The Professional Knowledge section consists of eight rubrics. Every program for both semesters showed significant growth from the midterm to the final application of the assessment each semester. The EPP posted its second highest mean in this category in the Fall of 2017 and Spring of 2018. Programs with the highest scores in the Fall of 2017 include Elementary (2.72) and Spanish (3.0). The EPP scored very high in the majority of programs on Rubric S: Collaboration. HEPE, with small n's for both semesters, scored lowest for Fall 2017 (2.19) and Spring of 2018 (2.25). Rubric M: Connections to Research and Theory was consistently the lowest mean across programs. MU candidates demonstrate professional responsibility in their early field placement on the High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics. The EPP mean of 2.74 was solid. This is the only category where undergraduates outscored MAT candidates. Secondary and TSD candidates scored above the EPP mean. Elementary candidates scored slightly below the EPP mean (one one-hundredth of a point).

Completion to In-service Measures:
EPP completers believe they are prepared for professional learning, ethical practice, leadership, and collaboration as measured by the Exit Survey. The data for all three series reveal the following mean scores: 4.39 (F 17), 4.47 (Sp 17), and 4.41 (Sp18). The strongest EPP means came from items 27 (Fall 17 and Spring 17) " Reflect on and develop appropriate teaching dispositions" and item 22 (Spring 18) "Use education research to make decisions that benefit my teaching." In the 2016-2017 School year, the SOE added research events to showcase research conducted at the undergraduate and graduate levels. This result of this reflected positively on the Spring 2018 completer exit survey. The lowest survey item mean scores came from items #21 (Sp 17 and Sp 18) "Effectively communicate and collaborate with school administration and other school personnel" and #20 (F 18) "Effectively communicate and collaborate with parents, peers, and community members." The 2014 Alumni survey indicated that candidates scored highest on Professional Responsibility (4.27 mean on a 5 point scale). It was also the second highest category on the 2012 application of the survey. In 2012, candidates scored higher on the items dealing with Professional Development and Research, and relatively lower in Communication and Collaboration. In 2018 the mean score for this category was just under the target of "3=Agree." This data could have been slightly skewed by the K-6 art/music/health/PE mean score of 2.06 which is slightly above the "2.0=Disagree" score. Professional Responsibility was the lowest of scores for that discipline. MAT, Elementary, Secondary, P-3 and TSD students all achieved a mean score above "3=Agree." K-6 Art/Music/Health/PE scored a mean of 1.67 on "Collaborates with learners, families, colleagues, and other professionals to ensure learner growth." This was the lowest mean of any criteria across disciplines and the three cycles of data. Employers perceive EPP graduates engage in professional learning, ethical practice, leadership and collaboration on an ongoing basis. 100% of all items assessed under the category of Professional Responsibility met the requirement that 80% or more respondents scored the item as "agree" or "strongly agree", thus meeting the standard. The mean scores for the overall category were 3.36 (2017) and 3.35 (2018). In 2017, the highest scoring category was "Engages in ongoing professional learning" (m=3.48). The lowest item scored had a mean of 3.28, "Seeks appropriate leadership roles." In 2018, the mean score for all categories ranged from 3.20-3.50.

Standard A.3 Candidate Quality and Selectivity (Advanced Programs)

i. Evidence / data / tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the standard.

No Evidence found.

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

N/A

Standard 4: Program Impact (Initial Programs)

i. Evidence / data / tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the standard.

1	EXHIBIT 4.1.A MU EPPPR.pdf
	4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys 4.3 Employer satisfaction
2	EXHIBIT 4.1.B. NJ Performance Report.pdf
	4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning 4.3 Employer satisfaction
3	Exhibit 4.2.A AchieveNJ Overview.pdf
	4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
4	Exhibit 4.3.A 2017 Employer Survey ResultsFinal.pdf
	4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys 4.3 Employer satisfaction
5	Exhibit 4.4.A Exit Survey_Final.pdf
	4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys 4.3 Employer satisfaction 4.4 Completer satisfaction
6	Exhibit 4.4.B Alumni Survey Final.pdf
	4.4 Completer satisfaction
7	Exhibit 4.4.C First Destination Survey.pdf
	4.4 Completer satisfaction

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

Overview of Standard 4. The graduates of Monmouth University's (MU's) initial teacher preparation program have a direct positive impact on P-12 learning (as demonstrated by Student Growth Objective scores and Student Growth Percentile), are regarded as competent by employers, and believe they have been well prepared to teach once they have completed their program at MU. Multiple valid and reliable measures are used to summarize their impact on P-12 learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of employers and completers. These measures include the State of New Jersey Educator Provider Preparation Reports, Employer Surveys, Completer Surveys, Exit Surveys and Alumni Surveys.

New Jersey Educator Preparation Provider Report (EPPPR)
The State of New Jersey Department of Education releases their Educator Preparation Provider Report (EPPPR) each year to share the available state data on novice teachers prepared and recommended for certification by all teacher preparation institutions. Reports from 2017, 2016 and 2015 are included as Exhibit 4.1.A EPP Annual Performance Report. Comparative data is provided through the State EPP reports included as Exhibit 4.1.B New Jersey EPP Annual Performance Report. The data from the 2017 report was based on a 1 year cohort of teachers who were certified in the 2014-2015 SY and/or employed in the 2016-2017 SY in a New Jersey public school as of October 15, 2016. The data from the 2016 school year includes a 2 year cohort of teachers who were certified in 12-13 and 13-14 and are employed in the 2015-2016 SY in New Jersey public schools as of October 15, 2015. The data from the 2015 SY includes a 2 year cohort of teachers who were certified in 11-12 and 12-13 and were employed in the 2014-2015 SY in New Jersey public schools as of October 15, 2014. The report includes the following data points:

1. Certification and Licensure- Number of completers receiving certification, licenses and endorsements through the State of NJ.
2. Hire Rate and Persistence- Number of completers employed in NJ public schools and their persistence in the field of education.
3. AchieveNJ Evaluations- Evaluation and effectiveness of completers employed by public schools in New Jersey
4. Classroom Assignment and School Classification- Districts and subject areas in which completers were hired including focus, reward and priority schools.
5. Other Factors not used in this standard: compensation, other demographics, praxis content

4.1 Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development. EPP graduates of the initial teacher preparation program contribute to an expected level of P-12 growth, meeting standard 4.1. They outscore the New Jersey average in Student Growth Outcomes (SGO) measures and are competitive with state averages in respect to Student Growth Percentiles (SGP). Additionally, administrators regard graduates as competent in two related categories of InTASC standards measured on the employer survey, Cat. 1: The Learner and Learning and Cat. 3: Instructional Practice. The multiple measures used to show depth and breadth in meeting this standard include the measure of SGO (EPP Annual Report, Exhibit 4.1.A), SGP (EPP Performance Reports, Exhibit 4.1.A) and employer satisfaction (Employer Satisfaction Survey, Exhibit 4.3.A).

EPPPR: Student Growth Outcomes and Student Growth Percentiles. Data for teacher effectiveness is reported through AchieveNJ, the educator evaluation and support system proposed to the State Board of Education on March 6, 2013 for implementation throughout New Jersey in 2013-14. Two of those scores directly speak to impact on P-12 learning and development, Student Growth Outcomes (SGO) and Student Growth Percentiles (SGP). Both values measure student growth over time, however SGOs are set and measured annually by the teacher and their supervisor. SGPs are calculated based on standard scores using the PARCC assessment. Not all grade levels are assessed in the State of New Jersey, therefore there may not be scores available for candidates. Each score is presented and explained below.

SGO score: SGOs are annual, specific and measurable academic goals for groups of students that are locally developed and assessed. They are created by the teacher and supervisor and can be based on appropriate national, state or LEA-developed assessments. They are measured on a 4 point rubric: 4= 90% or more students met goal; 3= 80% or more students met goal; 2=70% or more students met the goal; 1= Less than 70% of students met the goal. The teacher's summative score for SGOs are based on the average score and presented in the four bands below (with 4 being the target score). Teacher's attainment of SGOs are scored as follows: 4= Exceptional, 90% or more students met the SGO; 3= Full, 80% or more met SGO;2= Partial, 70% or more met SGO;1= insufficient, Less than 70% met SGO

2017 EPPPR report scores for MU are compared to the State of NJ:
Insufficient (1.0-1.84): MU= 0%, NJ= .028%
Partial (1.85-2.64): MU= 1%, NJ= 1.48%
Full (2.65-3.49): MU= 16%, NJ= 15.31%
Exceptional (3.5-7.0): MU= 48%, NJ= 45.45%
NE (Not evaluated) : MU= 34%, NJ= 37.38%

As compared to the State of NJ, MU scored 2.55% higher in the "Exceptional" category and approximately 1% higher in "Full." MU also had 0% scored "Insufficient" and was .52% less that the state average in the "Partial" category (70% or more in the class met the goal). SGO scores clearly demonstrate that the majority of the EPP graduates who had available scores, (98%) scored at the "Full" level or higher. Only 1% (1 graduate) scored at "Partial." There were zero (0) graduates at the "Insufficient" level.

SGP score: The SGP score is an individual student growth measure by comparing the change in his or her achievement on the state standardized assessment from one year to the student's peers (all other students in the state who had similar historical test results). The comparative change in achievement is reported on a 1-99 scale. SGP scores are then converted to a 1.0-4.0 score according to the median student growth percentile conversion chart, then weighted and included in the teachers' summative evaluation. 4.0 is the desired high score. There were very few scores available for the Teacher SGP score. Of the six (6) scores available, 5 scored in the target range of 2.65 or higher and only one score was in the 1.85-2.64 range. Given the results on both SGO and SGPs, it is clear that EPP graduates are having a positive impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development.

SGP Scores for MU Compared to NJ:
1.0-1.84: MU= .42%, NJ= .42%
1.85-2.64: MU= 1%, NJ= 1.48%
2.65-3.49: MU= 5%, NJ= 6.54%
3.5-4.0: MU= 0%, NJ= 1.67%
Not Evaluated: MU= 93%, NJ= 89.89%

Employer Survey: Category 1: The Learner and Learning, and Category 3: Instructional Practice. EPP graduates are regarded as competent by P-12 administrators as demonstrated by the Employer Surveys (Exhibit 4.3.A). 100% of components measured on the employer survey demonstrated administrators Strongly Agree or Agree that graduates achieved the components of Categories 1 and 3 of the InTASC standards as measured in 2017. In 2018, 100% of all participants selected Agree or Strongly Agree on all

four categories of the inTASC standards. The mean score for all participants increased from 2017 to 2018 from 3.32 to 3.53 on the four point Likert scale. There are 8 items that measure Category 1 and 10 items measuring Category 3. The survey was designed using a 4 point weighted Likert scale with the following criteria: Strongly Agree (4 points), Agree (3 points), Disagree (2 points), and Strongly Disagree (1 point). A category is considered passed if the component includes at least 80% of responses in the Agree and Strongly Agree. The means of each component are calculated individually and are further aggregated by InTASC category.
The survey is administered each year to target P-12 school administrators. The sample surveyed includes Principals, Superintendents and other district and building level administrators from our Partnership school districts. Partnership school districts were selected because the majority of graduates are hired by these districts. Scores are presented for each component within the two categories by mean and by percentage of responses that were rated Agree or Disagree. The following summarizes the scores for Categories 1 and 3, along with response rates.
Response Rates: 2017: n= 46, response rate 30%; 2018 n= 10, response rate 25 %, 2019 (scheduled to be administered January 2019)
Results from the Employer Survey for Categories 1 and 3:

Category 1: The Learner and Learning
2017: m= 3.4; 100% of all components met the standard (80% or better responses are Agree or Strongly Agree)
2018: m= 3.30. ; 100% of all components met the standard (80% or better responses are Agree or Strongly Agree)
2019: Scheduled for January 2019

Category 3: Instructional Practice
2017: m= 3.33; 100% of all components met the standard (80% or better responses Agree or Strongly Agree)
2018: m=3.49. ; 100% of all components met the standard (80% or better responses are Agree or Strongly Agree)
Although the data and implications of the data are described in Exhibit 4.3.A, it can be summarized that the employers in partnership districts agree that EPP graduates meet the professional standards of (Cat. 1) The Learner and Learning and (Cat. 3) Instructional Practice. That data along with SGO and SGP data gleaned from the 2015-2017 EPP Annual Reports provides breadth and coherence of evidence presented for Standard 4.1.
4.2 . Graduates of the EPP are effective in their P-12 settings. MU prepared teachers score above the New Jersey averages in both the Highly Effective and Effective Categories of the Teacher Evaluation Summative Rating (Exhibit 4.1.A). Conversely, 0% of EPP graduates scored at Partially Effective or Ineffective, which also compares favorably to that of the New Jersey average. On the Teacher Practice score, 96% (77/80) scored at 2.65 or higher. Both results indicate EPP graduates are effective in the classroom. Finally, Partnership school district administrators agree that EPP graduates are effective on the four categories of InTASC standards. 100% of the teaching behaviors measured in the four categories met the criteria for passing (80% responses Agree or Strongly Agree) on the Employer Survey. These results demonstrate that MU trained teachers, through valid and reliable measures and student surveys, apply the professional knowledge skills and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve. These assessments are described in detail below.

Teacher Practice and Teacher Evaluation: EPPPR based on Achieve NJ. Data for teacher effectiveness is reported through AchieveNJ (Exhibit 4.2.A)

Teacher practice is measured by the use of a state approved evaluation instrument (e.g. Danielson, Marzano) aimed to gather evidence through observations. Tenured teachers have a minimum of two observations each year for a minimum of 20 minutes each. Non-tenured teachers have a minimum of three required observations of 20 minutes each by multiple observers. All observers are trained on the rubric instrument before evaluating teachers, and participate in an annual "refresher."
Teacher Practice Score: The teacher practice score is based on classroom observation conducted by the supervising administrator. It takes into consideration multiple elements of instruction including planning, environment, instruction, and professionalism. Teachers are measured on a four point scale with 4.0 being the desired high score.
1.0-1.84: MU= 0%, NJ= 0.09%
1.85-2.64: MU= 3%, NJ= 5.98%
2.65-3.49: MU= 77%, NJ= 69.85%
3.5-4.0: MU= 8%, NJ= 11.6%
Not Evaluated: MU= 12%, NJ= 12.48%

Teacher Evaluation (Summative Rating): Teachers are evaluated on a four (4) point rubric with the following summative ratings: Highly Effective, Effective, Partially Effective, and Ineffective. The summative teacher evaluation score is calculated using a state formula that includes: Teacher Practice (classroom observation), Student Growth Objectives (SGO), and Student Growth Percentiles (SGP). Teachers of state tested grades and subjects are evaluated on three measures: SGP (30%), SGO (15%), and Teacher Practice (55%). Those in areas that are non-tested are evaluated on two measures: Teacher Practice (85%) and SGO (15%). Based on their overall rating, teachers work towards a specific professional growth plan. Those who score at "Partially Effective" or "Ineffective" work to complete a Corrective Action Plan with their school leadership that contains targeted professional development actions for the following year.

Teacher Evaluation Data provided by the 2017 EPPPR and compare MU to the NJ mean.
Highly Effective: MU= 7.7%; NJ= 5.5%
Effective: MU=58.2%; NJ= 55.84%
Partially Effective: MU= 0%, NJ= 1.07%
Ineffective: MU= 0%, NJ= 0.05%
Not Evaluated: MU= 34.1%, NJ= 37.48%

The data shows that MU prepared teachers score above the New Jersey areas in both the Highly Effective and Effective Categories, which are the desired targets. Conversely, 0% of EPP graduates scored at Partially Effective or Ineffective, which also compares favorably to that of the New Jersey average. These results substantiate the effectiveness in the quality of teachers trained at the EPP.
The charts and tables on both the Teacher Practice Score and the Teacher Summative score show the vast majority of graduates scoring at the Effective level or higher. On the Teacher Evaluation, 100% (60/60) teachers scored at "Effective" or Higher. On the Teacher Practice score, 96% (77/80) scored at 2.65 or higher. Both results indicate EPP graduates are effective in the classroom.

Employer Satisfaction Survey: The EPP has created an Employer Survey (Exhibit 4.3.A) that aligns directly to CAEP, InTASC and NJPST standards. The survey is for all initial programs and is administered by email link to a Qualtrics survey to P-12 administrators from partnership districts where the majority of EPP graduates are employed. In the Fall of 2017, the survey was revised to align directly with InTASC, NJPST and CAEP standards. The instrument contains five demographic questions and 29 likert items in the four InTASC categories of Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction and Professionalism. The weighted ratings of Strongly Agree (4 points), Agree (3 points). Disagree (2 points), and Strongly Disagree (1 point) are used to measure components on the Likert scale. Individual item and category means are calculated along with the percentage of Agree and Strongly Agree responses. An item is considered passed if 80% or greater has Agree or Strongly Agree ratings. Response rates and mean scores are as follows:

Employer Satisfaction Survey Response Rates: 2017: n=46, response rate 30%; 2018 n=10, response rate 25%.
Category 1: The: Learner and Learning: 2017 m= 3.4; 2018 m= 3.3
Category 2: Content Knowledge: 2017 m= 3.23; 2018 m= 3.52
Category 3: Instructional Practice: 2017 m= 3.33; 2018 m= 3.49
Category 4: Professional Responsibility: 2017 m= 3.36; 2018 m= 3.35

In 2017, 100% of all individual components met the passing criteria of 80% or more Agree or Strongly Agree responses. In 2018, 100% of all individual components met the passing criteria of 80% or more Agree or Strongly Agree responses. Mean scores on all categories were above 3.0 (Agree) in 2017 and 2018. Data will be available at the time of the site visit for 2019.
The results of these measures demonstrate that EPP completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills and dispositions that the preparation experience was designed to achieve, thus meeting standard 4.2.
4.3. Hire rates, employment rates, persistence rates, and employer surveys indicate employers are satisfied with completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities working with P-12 schools.100% of employers surveyed regarding the quality on EPP graduates indicated they are satisfied with their preparation (Exhibit 4.3.A). In addition, EPP graduates with two or three endorsements are hired at percentages significantly higher than the average for the State of New Jersey. Hire rates for 15-16 and 16-17 exceed the state of New Jersey Average for EPPs. These are the key pieces of data that provide depth and breadth to indicate employers are satisfied with EPP trained teachers.

The EPP uses multiple valid and reliable measures that substantiate employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students. The data

presented include the EPPPR Measures from 2015-2017 (Exhibit 4.1.A) and emphasizes hire rates, persistence rates, and employment percentage given number of endorsements. Also included is data from the Employer Survey administered in 2017-2019. This data speaks directly to the employer satisfaction of EPP graduates in relationship to the InTASC, CAEP and NJPST standards.
Hire Rates, Persistence Rates, Employment Rates by # of Endorsements: EPPPR 15-17. Hire Rates are presented in the EPPPR (Exhibit 4.1.A) and are presented comparing MU to the State of NJ (Exhibit 4.1.B). The full data can be seen on the reports, and employment percentages are summarized:
A. Employed Certified Completer in 16-17: MU 68%, NJ: 65%
B. Employed Certified Completer in 15-16: MU 65%, NJ: 64%
C. Employed Certified Completer in 14-15: MU 57%, NJ: 56%

EPP graduates are employed at a slightly higher rate than that of the NJ state average. Certification Endorsement Area and Employment data is shared on the EPPPR as well. On page 6 of the 2017 report (Exhibit 4.1.A), the range of employed teachers (%) varies from 29% (Teacher of Art) to 100% (Elementary Math, Chemistry, Spanish, Supplemental Instruction: reading and Math K-8). The highest number of those employed are certified as Teachers of Students with Disabilities (55 graduates employed, 74%) and Elementary School Teachers in K-6 (48 employed, 74%). Statewide, 74% of those certified as Teachers of Students with Disabilities are employed and 66% are employed who are certified Elementary School K-6.

Another measure of employer satisfaction is the retention or persistence rate. The NJDOE EPPPR included persistence rates. The following data includes EPP's data alongside the State persistence levels for 16-17
A. Persisted in State in 16-17: MU: 90.1%; NJ: 90.4 %;15-16: MU: 90.5%; NJ: 91.5%; 14-15: MU: 92.8%; NJ: 91.8 %
B. Persisted in District 16-17: MU: 64.8%; NJ: 62.89 %; 15-16: MU: 66.3%; NJ: 65.1%
C. Persisted in School in 16-17: MU: 51.6%; NJ: 56.7%;15-16: MU: 57.8%; NJ: 59%

The persistence rates are competitive with state averages. In the 2016 and 2017 EPPPR reports, the rates of persistence in the state, district and school are all within 3% points of the state average. In the 2015 report (State data only), EPP graduates scored 1 percentage point higher than the state average.
Finally, the EPPPR also gives data regarding number of endorsements obtained and employment. This data is presented as percentages of those employed as teachers with one, two, or three or more endorsements as compared to the State of NJ. To summarize 2017, the following data clearly suggests graduates from MU with 2 or more endorsements are employed at a rate higher than the State of New Jersey average.
A. One endorsement: MU= 51%, NJ= 62%
B. Two Endorsements: MU= 76%, NJ= 70%
C. Three or more endorsements: MU= 100%, NJ= 80%

The data clearly demonstrates that EPP graduates with two or more certifications are employed at a higher (2 endorsements) to significantly higher rates (3 endorsements) than the state average.
Employer Satisfaction Survey (Exhibit 4.3.A): The EPP also surveys employers regarding their satisfaction of candidates. The survey is distributed to administrators in partner schools and districts where candidates have been employed. In the Fall of 2017, the survey was revised to align directly with InTASC standards. The 2017 survey was distributed to principals through our Principal Academy Partnership. The 2018 Survey was distributed to Superintendents and District level Administration. The 2019 Survey will be targeted to both and will expand to County Administrators. That data will be available during the site visit.
Respondents are asked to rate each of the InTASC skills using a four point (Strongly Agree=4, Agree=3, Disagree=2, Strongly Disagree=1) Likert scale to rate MU graduates.. The data was disaggregated by InTASC standard and aligned to CAEP and New Jersey Professional Standards for Teaching. A standard is considered met if 80% of the responses were Agree or Strongly Disagree.
The EPP has created an Employer Survey that aligns to CAEP, InTASC and NJ State standards. The initial survey is for all initial programs and is sent to a sample of principals in Monmouth, Middlesex and Ocean Counties where the majority of EPP candidates are placed for clinical practice. In the Fall of 2017, the survey was reconstructed to align directly with InTASC standards. The instrument itself contains five demographic questions and a series of four sections with multiple Likert items in the categories of Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction and Professionalism. The assessment takes about 10 minutes to complete. The instrument and data are attached.

In 2017, 100% of all standards met the InTASC standards with a score above 90%. The mean score for each category is below for 2017 and 2018. 2019 Scores will be added in January 2019 prior to the site visit.
Category 1: Learner and Learning: 2017 m= 3.4; 2018 m=3.30
Category 2: Content Knowledge: 2017 m= 3.23; 2018 m= 3.52
Category 3: Instructional Practice: 2017 m= 3.33; 2018 m=3.49

Category 4: Professional Responsibility: 2017 m= 3.36; 2018 m= 3.35

In 2017 and 2018, 100% of all categories met the standard of achieving an "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" on the individual rubric criteria. The mean scores for each category in 2017 is above 3.2. Category 1 and 4 show our graduates have a strong grasp of the Learner and Learning and Professional Responsibility. Content Knowledge, although the lowest mean score in 2017, still stands above a 3.0, which is quite remarkable. MU is proud to have input from partner administrators that is so favorable.

4.4. EPP graduates are satisfied with their experiences and perceive they have been trained to be effective classroom teachers and are prepared to address responsibilities they confront on the job. The instruments used to provide depth and breadth to show the EPP has met this standard are Exit Survey (Exhibit4.4.A), Alumni Survey (Exhibit 4.4.B), and First Destination Survey (Exhibit 4.4.C). These surveys give the EPP data for operational effectiveness. For example, the First Destination Survey provides evidence for graduate employment and postsecondary enrollment, as well as satisfaction with EPP operations in terms of advisement, resources, academic services and placement.

Exit Survey (Exhibit 4.4.A): EPP graduates believe there are prepared to meet the diverse needs of learners and report a strong perception in their ability to meet the tasks outlined in the four categories of InTASC teaching standards. The Exit Survey is an EPP created assessment that measures completers' perceptions of their preparation at MU upon graduation. The Exit survey is aligned with the 10 InTASC standards, New Jersey Professional Standards for Teaching (NJPST) and CAEP. The survey is intended to measure how candidates perceive their readiness to teach upon completion. It is also used to gain student feedback for program improvement. The 29 likert items, along with the open ended questions and demographic items provide the EPP with valuable information about our most important stakeholders, our candidates.
In the Spring of 2018 (n=89), all mean scores were above 4.0 on a 5 point scale (5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree), for all content areas in each category, with only one exception. The P-3 (n=3) respondent mean score for Instructional Practice was 3.84. Fall 2017 scores were above a 4.0 mean with the exception of the following: Secondary Education, Category 2 (m=3.89, n=2); K-12 Art/Music/Health/PE, Category 4 (m=3.80, n=3); and P-3, Category 1 (m=3.89, n=3). The n's in these content areas are minimal; however, the data is important in terms of tracking for trends. In Spring 2017 (n=77) all content areas in each category scored a mean of over 4.08 or higher. Elementary majors (n=37) scored the highest on Category 1 with a score of 4.71. The results of this survey are encouraging, and helpful in making program improvements.

Alumni Survey: The Alumni surveys are EPP designed and created assessments which measure the perceptions of graduates of the program in relationship to the four InTASC categories of the Learner and Learning, Content Knowledge, Instructional Practice, and Professional Responsibility. There are two surveys used, the original (2012 and 2014) and the revised version in 2017 (administered in 2018) to more closely align to InTASC and the NJPST. The response rate for each were 2012: 21%; 2014: 23%; and 2018: 23%. A third survey, The First-Destination Survey, is a proprietary assessment from the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) administered by the EPP's Office of Planning and Decision Support to gain information about graduate careers within six months of graduation. There are three alumni survey applications of data, with the third from a revised survey.

To summarize, the data clearly indicate that graduates of the EPP perceive they are prepared in all four categories of InTASC standards. In 2012 and 2014 Instructional Practice were the highest scores of the four. In 2018, the Learner and Learning Development category, on average, had the highest scores across content (with K-6 Art, Music, Health and PE being the exception).
In The Learner and Learning category, 100% of all survey responses were in "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" in the three series of data, with the exception of K-6 Music/Art/Health/PE (n=3) where only 75% were scored at the target. The low "n" could be the contributing factor. On that survey, there were not qualitative comments to further explain this low perception. The mean score for all 2012 alumni, although the mean score was just under 4 (4=Agree), as a whole the responses that were rated at "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" was over 80%. In 2018, the Learner and Development scores were the highest of the four categories for elementary majors. There were no programs in which this was the lowest perceived score.

Content knowledge was a strength for the 2014 and 2012 applications of data, with both means being over the "Agree" point value of 4, 4.02 and 4.17, respectively. For the 2018 series of data, this category was the lowest mean for the EPP as a whole with a mean of 2.96. That was more likely due to the below-3 mean of 2.87 for all undergraduates.

Instructional Practice: 2012 and 2014 data suggest Instructional Practice is a strength with it being the

highest scores for both series of data, 4.11 and 4.27, respectively. In 2018, Instructional Practice was slightly below the Learner and Learning category at 3.01. This is a relative strength across all applications of data. Below 3.00 were elementary (2.91), Secondary (2.93), K-6 Music/art/health/PE (2.80), and TSD (2.85).

Professional Responsibility: The 2014 survey indicated that candidates scored highest on Professional Responsibility (4.27 mean on a 5 point scale). It was also the second highest category on the 2012 application of the survey. In 2012, candidates scored higher on the items dealing with Professional Development and Research, and relatively lower in Communication and Collaboration. In 2018, the mean score for this category was just under the target of "3=Agree." This data could have been slightly skewed by the K-6 Art/Music/Health/PE mean score of 2.06 which is slightly above the "2.0=Disagree" score. Professional Responsibility was the lowest score for that discipline. Graduate, Elementary, Secondary, P-3 and TSD students all achieved a mean score above "3=Agree." K-6 Art/Music/Health/PE scored a mean of 1.67 on "Collaborates with learners, families, colleagues, and other professionals to ensure learner growth." This was the lowest mean of any criteria across disciplines and the three cycles of data.

Implications of Data Provided for Standard 4: MU is successful across all data points included on the NJDOE EPPPR. Although EPP scores are above or commensurate with those across the state, we have identified areas of further development that can only strengthen our teacher preparation programs. As stated in the EPP's mission statement, our goal is to "... be a leader in the preparation and professional development of highly competent, reflective teachers, speech-language pathologists, school counselors and administrators. We are committed to social justice initiatives that better all students and other persons from diverse backgrounds in terms of abilities, age, gender, culture, race, ethnicity, family, and socioeconomic status."
(EPP Mission Statement).
1. Graduates of MU's teacher education program consistently feel prepared to teach upon program completion (Exhibit 4.4.A Exit Survey Data)
2. EPP graduates have a positive impact on P-12 student learning as evidenced on SGO and SGP scores.
3. Employers are satisfied with the quality of candidates produced through the EPP teacher education program. Hire rates, persistence, teacher evaluations, and employer surveys are all indicators of employer satisfaction.
4. EPP graduates are effective in the classroom based on their annual evaluation data presented in the EPP Annual Report.

Standard A.4. Program Impact (Advanced Programs)

i. Evidence / data / tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the standard.

No Evidence found.

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

N/A

Standards 5 and A.5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement and Capacity

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the standard.

1 Exhibit 1.1.A. Praxis II Content Assessments.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

2 Exhibit 1.1.B edTPA.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

3 Exhibit 1.1.C CPAST.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

4 Exhibit 1.1.D. Early Field_High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

5 Exhibit 1.3.A NJDOE Program Approval Letter.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

6 Exhibit 1.3.B. GPA at Program Completion.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

7 Exhibit 3.4.B Monitoring Candidate Progress.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

8 EXHIBIT 4.1.A MU EPPPR.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

9 Exhibit 4.3.A 2017 Employer Survey ResultsFinal.pdf

5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

10 Exhibit 4.4.A Exit Survey_Final.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

11 Exhibit 4.4.B Alumni Survey Final.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

12 Exhibit 4.4.C First Destination Survey.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

13 Exhibit 5.1.A Quality Assurance System_Operational Effectiveness.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

14 Exhibit 5.2.A Technical Manual for Praxis Series and Related Assessment.pdf

5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

15 Exhibit 5.2.B CPAST Evidence for CAEP.pdf

5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

16 Exhibit 5.3.A Innovations.pdf

5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

17 Exhibit 5.3.B Data Informed Program Improvements.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

18 Exhibit 5.3.C. EPP Org. Chart 17.18.pdf

5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

19 Exhibit 5.3.D. EPP Operational Chart.pdf

5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

20 Exhibit 5.3.E EPP Strategic Plan.pdf

5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

21 Exhibit 5.3.F Sample DAC Meeting Minutes.pdf

5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

22 Exhibit 5.3.G edTPA Field Test Summary.pdf

5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

23 Exhibit 5.5.A Stakeholder input.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

24 Exhibit 5.5.B Teacher Residency Study.pdf

5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

25 Exhibit 5.5.C My Student Survey (003).pdf

5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

At the time of the NCATE site visit in 2012, the EPP had an effective system for assessing candidate success and P-12 impact. The system focused on the assessment of students through four transition points using proprietary standardized assessments: Praxis, the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) and EPP created surveys and measures. With changes in accreditation requirements (NCATE to CAEP) along with changes in State Code, the EPP recognized the need for an improved structure to achieve a highly effective, continuous improvement process. The Quality Assurance System (QAS) was revised to ensure the recruitment, preparation, retention and P-12 impact standards were maintained from recruitment through employment.

The current QAS is comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The EPP supports continuous improvement that is sustained, evidence-based, and evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The EPP 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. The evidence provided in this self-study indicates that the EPP meets all standards and components outlined by CAEP as a direct result of a strong QAS. The strength of the QAS was integral in the university's successful regional accreditation through Middle States. The EPP has a shared belief that assessment must be on-going and purposeful to improve instruction, curricula, K-12 impact, research based strategies in pedagogy, and outcomes and satisfaction of all MU graduates and community stakeholders.

5.1
The EPP's QAS (Exhibit 5.1.A) is comprised of multiple measures that monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and operational effectiveness. Candidate progress and completer achievements are organized by CAEP standards into four categories. Organizing by the InTASC categories helps ensure that all aspects of teacher candidates' development are considered in depth. Competencies associated with the first category, Learner and Learning (InTASC standards 1-3), are evaluated with the early field assessment (Exhibit 1.1.D) the CPAST evaluation (Exhibit 1.1.C), and the edTPA (Exhibit 1.1.B). The evidence from these measures demonstrates that the EPP teacher candidates understand how learners grow and develop. Competencies associated with the second category, Content Knowledge (InTASC standards 4-5), are evaluated with the Praxis II (Exhibit 1.1.A), the SPA reports (Exhibit 1.3.A) and teacher candidate GPA's (Exhibit 1.3.B). The evidence from these measures demonstrates that MU teacher candidates understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, & structures of the disciplines they teach and create learning experiences that assure mastery of the content. Competencies associated with the third category, Instructional Practice, (InTASC standards 6-8), are evaluated with the early clinical experience

evaluation, CPAST, observations of teaching effectiveness, and the growth in SGO's (Exhibit 4.1.A). The evidence from these measures demonstrates that MU teacher candidates are skilled with instructional practices such as planning to support every student, executing instructional practices, and using multiple methods of assessment. Competencies associated with the fourth category, Professional Responsibilities (InTASC standards 9-10), are evaluated with the early clinical experiences and CPAST. Evidence from these assessments demonstrates that MU teacher candidates acquire a strong sense of their professional responsibilities during their preparation program. After teacher candidates complete the program their impact is assessed through an exit survey (4.4.A), an alumni survey (4.4.B), the First Destination Survey (4.4.C), and the annual EPP report (4.1.A) prepared by the State Department of Education.

The above described data is reviewed at the institution and EPP levels on a regular ongoing basis. As candidates progress through the program, their individual data is monitored to assure they are acquiring the skills necessary to meet the state requirements for licensure. This data is monitored by the certification officer, advisors, faculty and administrators. Teacher candidates are assessed through the core praxis and the GPA at entrance (Exhibit 3.2.A) to the program. Decisions are made regarding admission, retention and program completion using multiple sources of valid, reliable data. As teacher candidates progress through the program, their GPA continues to be monitored, and early clinical experience evaluations are reviewed for developmentally appropriate dispositions performance and dispositions in clinical experiences. Prior to the yearlong clinical internship during the senior year, teacher candidates are assessed with the Praxis II for content knowledge. Each time a candidate reports Praxis II scores to Monmouth University, the Certification Officer receives a report, which typically occurs bi-monthly. Teacher candidates who do not pass their Praxis meet with advisors to solidify a plan to retake the assessment. A list of teacher candidates who have not passed prior to clinical internship is shared with the Deans, Advisors, and the Clinical Practice Placement team.

The systematic compilation and analysis of data for program improvement is shared across constituencies (Exhibit 5.5.A) with the ultimate goal of improving P-12 student learning. The deans work to organize the data to be shared with the other constituents. Then, data is distributed across various constituency groups and each uses the data to engage in specific improvement (Exhibit 5.3.B) efforts. Data is collected internally through Foliotek, an accessible data system that allows the data to be disaggregated to serve specific purposes. For example, dispositional data was shared with the Dean's Educational Leadership Council in spring, 2018; dashboard data was shared at the April 25th meeting of the Dean's Advisory Council; Core Praxis and Praxis II data was shared at the May 16th University Teacher Education Advisory Council (UTEAC) meeting; and data was disaggregated for the Teacher Education retreat on May 21, 2018, to illustrate recent initiatives regarding diversity and technology integration, and data concerning the Teacher Residency program was shared at the Dean's Advisory Council and the Professional Development Committee meetings. Exhibit 3.1.C gives examples of meeting agendas and minutes from three constituency group meetings. Feedback concerning the Academy presentations are regularly shared with the Academy committees.

Whether new changes are initiated by EPP data, by new state requirements, national trends, faculty research, or stakeholder input; the EPP takes a deliberate approach to include all stakeholders. Data driven decisions are coordinated through the Dean's Office, which is informed by the Dean's Advisory Council and the Dean's Educational Leadership Council. Goals, timelines and procedures are articulated to efficiently and effectively move the initiative through various Departments, Offices and Centers, Committees, and Advisories. It is through the work of these groups the initiatives are grounded, implemented, evaluated and maintained. Multiple partners and stakeholders participate in a shared decision-making process as evidenced by strong committee participation and survey completion (EPP Report). In addition, program faculty continuously collect and review Specialized Program Area (SPA) data or through CAEP program review. Data used for program improvement is shared with all branches of the Operational Chart on an ongoing basis.

5.2
The EPP's QAS relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable quality assessment measures. These assessments produce empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent. Each of the primary program assessments is discussed below.

1. GPA (1.3.B) requirement of 3.0 is assessed at admission, at each transition point, and at the end of semester for all education majors. GPA is obtained through ecampus by advisors each semester and through the Office of Planning and Decision Making for formal GPA and SAT data at enrollment and prior to full time clinical practice.
2. Praxis II (I.1.A) - The validity and reliability measures are found on pages 37-40 and page 52-59 in the Technical Manual for The Praxis Series © and Related Assessments book included as evidence.
3. Early Clinical Experience Evaluation: High Leverage Teaching Proficiency Rubrics (1.1.D). The purpose of

this assessment is to evaluate the skills and dispositions of teacher candidates during early clinical experiences. Validity and reliability measures are found on page 2-3 on Exhibit 1.1.D.
4. CPAST (Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching Form, 1.1.C) is a proprietary assessment designed and tested for validity and reliability by Ohio State University and measures clinical practice skills, knowledge and dispositions aligned to the inTASC standards. This instrument is required for Monitoring Point 3 (Completion of Clinical Practice) and is completed at midterm and completion of the clinical practice experience. Validity and reliability of the CPAST is discussed in the CPAST Document for CAEP (5.3.B) on pages 12-14. The CPAST used content, construct and concurrent measures to establish validity. Reliability was measured using internal consistency and inter-rater reliability.
5. edTPA provides evidence for standards 1 and 3 (1.1.B). The summary report reviews the process and results of the content and construct validity measures used (Exhibit 5.3.G). On page 23 of the same report, reliability of edTPA scores was analyzed in two ways: using agreement rates between different scorers evaluating the same candidate's submission were analyzed; and by using a Cohen Kappa statistical procedure to assess the overall variability in a candidate's scores due to chance measurement error. Approximately 10% of all edTPA submissions are randomly selected to be scored by a second, independent scorer. This provides a way to study how reliable edTPA scores are across different scorers. Ideally, a candidate would receive the same score from two different scorers. In practice, the high complexity of the edTPA makes this unlikely. However, if differences across scorers are small, this supports the consistency of edTPA scores.
6. The New Jersey Department of Education provides each EPP with a Provider Report annually. It includes data on P-12 student growth that externally benchmarks MU (4.1.A) students against other institutions in the State of New Jersey (4.1.B). The report analyzes cohort data regarding hire rates, persistence, race, gender, school classification, classroom assignment, number of endorsements, completer P-12 impact measures, Praxis scaled scores, and classroom assignments. The report also contains information regarding candidate impact, hire rate, persistence rate, candidate gender and race, compensation, teacher shortage area, EPP endorsement completer data, completer effectiveness (based on evaluations and Student Growth Percentile and Student Growth Objective scores), along with Praxis II successful completion data.
7. Exit Survey (4.4.A) - Teacher candidates are surveyed at the time they complete the program. They are asked about their preparation in regards to the acquisition of skills. The exit survey is aligned directly to InTASC/NJPST and CAEP standards.
8. Alumni Survey (4.4.B) - Graduates are asked about their preparation after they have been engaged in teaching for a sustained period of time. The exit survey is aligned directly to InTASC/NJPST and CAEP standards.
9. Employer Survey (4.3.A) - Partner administrators are asked about their perceptions on a one-to-one InTASC/NJPST aligned survey of EPP graduates.

5.3
The EPP regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks the 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. All program changes (Exhibit 5.3.B) and innovations (Exhibit 5.3.A) are undertaken to improve teacher candidate performance as indicated by data from program evaluations. The inspiration for changes comes from multiple sources, including the need to improve administrative functioning; national trends, such as the movement to expand clinical experiences; new state level requirements for teacher preparation, the importance of serving our constituents and increasing enrollment, and from data that indicates low performance.

Changes resulted from Data: Exhibit 5.3.B outlines numerous changes that were the direct result of analyzed data. 100 % of the changes listed were a direct result of data at the EPP level. Examples of these changes include the Teacher Residency Program, edTPA writing day implementation, Praxis II completion support, edTHENA pilot, Inter-professional Research Exhibition, and adoption of a new clinical practice summative evaluation (CPAST). Program Level changes are also addressed by SPAs in Exhibit 5.3.B. These changes include implementation of writing days for edTPA, curriculum revisions, case study inclusion in coursework, and a change of assessments to improve measures of candidate learning. Every program change listed was directly linked to data.

Operational Effectiveness has been improved in many ways. Because there are fewer changes not resulting directly from data, they are explained in this narrative. The changes prompted by data was too substantive to include in the narrative, therefore was included as Exhibit 5.3.B.

Changes in administration: On July 1, 2015, MU hired a new Dean of the EPP. The Dean worked with staff, faculty, and administration to evaluate the current organizational structure and to create a new one that would improve an already effective EPP. The changes included adding an Assistant Dean position to oversee accreditation, data management, edTPA implementation, partnerships, advising, and clinical

practice. The Assistant Dean is charged to work closely with the University's Department of Planning and Decision Support on data management and accreditation. The second significant addition was a Director of Leadership Programs. This position is charged with friend building, fund raising, and grant support. A direct result of this hire was the creation of the Dean's Advisory Council. The Dean's Advisory is currently composed of six members, who provide financial support, counsel, and networking opportunities.

Changes in EPP organization (Exhibit 5.3.C): The EPP reorganized from two to four departments. The four Departments are Curriculum and Instruction, Special Education, Speech and Language Pathology (CAA accreditation candidate), and Counseling and Educational Leadership. In addition, the university added eight graduate and undergraduate program director positions to oversee the following programs: Counseling, Educational Leadership, Literacy, Masters of Arts in Teaching, Master of Education (P-3), Masters of Education (ESL), Special Education, and Interdisciplinary Studies in Elementary Education. In the Fall of 2017, the provider launched an Ed.D in Educational Leadership Program.

School of Education Operational Chart (Exhibit 5.3.D): The reorganization of the EPP led to a reconceptualization of the school's decision-making processes. These processes are described on the EPP's operational chart. The operational chart clearly shows the multiple levels of influence on the decision-making process and the high level of communication that occurs among stakeholders. The distributed nature of decision-making and the constant flow of communication encourages autonomy, innovation, and creative thinking. Evidence for the effectiveness of the EPP reorganization can be found in the number and scope of the change initiatives listed below and in the newly developed EPP strategic plan.

School of Education Strategic Plan (Exhibit 5.3.E): The reorganized EPP developed a 5-year strategic plan for 2018-2023 during the academic year 2017-18. The strategic plan includes a mission statement, vision statement, a SWOT analysis, six strategic goals, and individual strategic plans for each of the departments. The six school goals are related to 1) continuous program improvement, 2) program innovation, 3) social justice, 4) school and community partnerships, 5) leadership, and 6) national recognition. The School's strategic plan is aligned with the University plan. The strategic plan drew heavily from faculty input during the SWOT analysis. It has been discussed at the Dean's Educational Leadership Council, the Dean's Advisory Council, Department Meetings, the Partnership Advisory Committee, and the Professional Development Advisory Committee. It has also been approved by the MU Administration.

Dean's Advisory Council plays a unique role because they provide financial support for initiatives. One of the most important is the Autism MVP improvement project. The purpose of the project is to provide behavioral analysis training for teachers so they can better serve students on the autism spectrum. The award is sponsored by the MVP foundation, which has contributed over $40,000 to the improvement project. The Dean's Advisory Council also sponsored the School of Education's first ever annual review. The Dean's Advisory Council has also discussed and provided feedback on the strategic plan. Sample minutes are included as Exhibit 5.3.F.

Partnership Advisory and Professional Development Committees - These two committees have been involved with moving forward multiple initiatives associated with clinical experiences. One facet of this effort has been to extend clinical experiences. Since the arrival of the new dean, the EPP has striven to extend teacher candidate experience in clinical settings. The discussion on extending clinical experiences began with local school superintendents during the first week of the dean's tenure. It has continued across the program at every level of advisory council and committee on the EPP's operational chart, plus some additional ad hoc committees, such as the implementation committee. This effort was inspired by current national trends, increased state requirements for clinical experience, and data that shows that teacher candidates need to improve their skill levels in assessment, differentiation, and classroom management. The number of clinical experience hours has increased. A second facet of this effort has been to increase the diversity of clinical experiences. This has resulted in a service-learning project in the Long Branch Schools, a bridging service-learning project in the Asbury Park, and the Future Monmouth Scholars initiative, a service-learning project to help first generation students become aware of college opportunities. Placement data indicates the number of clinical hours in clinical experiences is increasing.

Faculty Initiatives - The EPP faculty have undertaken several new program initiatives. Based on both new state requirements, exit survey data that indicated teacher candidates were not proficient with developing IEP's, and based on CPAST scores that indicated clinical interns scored lower with differentiating instruction, the faculty revised core components of the teacher preparation program to add two special education classes. This required a multidisciplinary approach that involved a team of Department Chairs (Curriculum and Instruction, Special Education), Administrators, the Certification Officer, faculty and School of Education Advisors. As a result, these two special education courses will be implemented in the Fall of 2018. The EPP has also initiated new graduate programs at the master's level in Applied Behavior Analysis and Autism, Supervision in Special Education, and at the doctoral level in Educational Leadership.

The Ed.D. program was implemented at the request of partners and is currently advised by a committee composed of both School faculty, deans, and School superintendents and leaders. Two new events were added to the School of Education calendar for the purpose of increasing student performance in research and leadership. The first is the Interprofessional Research Exhibition. This initiative was introduced to increase teacher candidate understanding of theory and research. Teacher candidates exhibited posters of their research projects. The first Leadership Conference was conducted on March 28th, 2018, in response for the need to strengthen our teaching of advocacy and leadership.

5.4
Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction. The EPP considers four sources of completer impact. One, the Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report, (4.1.A) is compiled by the state Department of Education. The other three are an Exit Survey (4.4.A), Employer Survey (4.3.A) and Alumni Survey (4.4.B) developed by the School of Education. All four data sources indicate that EPP graduates have a positive impact on their students and schools. The data indicates that EPP graduates are hired at slightly above the state average. All EPP graduates with three endorsements have been hired, those with two or more endorsements have a 76% employment rate. Another important source of data from the EPP Annual report is the evaluation of the Teachers' Student Growth Objective (SGO) score. The scores of Monmouth graduates data clearly demonstrates the strength of the program. Of the 144 individuals assessed, 143 scored at "Effective" or "Highly Effective." Only one (1) candidate was rated as "Partially Effective" while zero (0) were rated "Ineffective." The teacher practice score represents EPP's employed completer's available scores from local observations. The range of scores go from 1.00- 4.00, with 4.00 being the high score (desired). Of the 146 graduates evaluated, 144 scored at the desired 2.65 range and higher. The survey data (employer, exit and alumni) also indicates the strength of the teacher preparation program. On a five-point scale, most scores are well above 4. The data trends are discussed in each of the key assessments used in 1.1 along with the EPP Performance Reports (4.1.A).

A summary of available outcome data can be found on the School of Education dashboard https://www.monmouth.edu/school-of-education/about/mission/caep-accreditation-dashboard/.The dashboard includes the results of exit surveys and the state report on SGO's and SGE's. These data are shared at UTEAC, partnership advisory, professional development, and faculty meetings. In addition, they are posted on the EPP website (https://www.monmouth.edu/school-of-education/about/mission/student-performance-data/).

5.5.
The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence. Stakeholders are engaged by giving feedback via surveys such as the alumni survey and employer survey. Partners are also actively engaged in the review of data through the Advisory committees.

The EPP regularly and systematically collects, aggregates, analyzes and publicizes data as shown. The goal of this data collection is to drive decision making by the EPP to improve programs and the EPP. The EPP has identified various types of data that enable it to evaluate operations, along with inclusive practices that encourage stakeholder input (5.5.A) in the school improvement process. Data is shared regularly with multiple constituency groups on an ongoing basis to drive positive changes. Data can be accessed by all faculty and staff, as well as university and school partners on our website (https://www.monmouth.edu/school-of-education/about/mission/student-performance-data/). Regular meetings with constituency groups include data review and discussions driving program change (5.3.B). These meetings are held at regular intervals.
Innovations (5.3.A) are designed, implemented and evaluated by multiple constituencies. Samples of innovations presented on Exhibit 5.3.A are the Teacher Residency Program, Increased Clinical Practice (yearlong), MyStudent Survey data collection, and the High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics (Exhibit 1.1.D)

Teacher Residency Program (TRP) - The TRP was developed in response to program and completer data that revealed several weak areas, including differentiated instruction, assessment, and differentiated instruction. The TRP is a pilot program designed to extend clinical experiences. A key component of the program is to compensate teacher candidates for their work. As part of the program, teacher candidates will perform functions traditionally given to substitute teachers, paraprofessionals, and tutors. In turn, monies from school budgets to compensate these positions will be invested into the TRP. Other sources of funds include professional development monies and summer enrichment programs. Our approach to compensating teacher candidates continues to evolve as it becomes increasingly clear that each day

teacher candidates spend in a P-12 school increases their value to the school. In addition to the increased value of their experience, teacher candidates bring their passion, a career commitment, and a daily determination to invest in learning about their profession.

The program is designed to engage sophomores through seniors, and initial licensure graduate students in an extended apprenticeship in P-12 school settings over a two- to three-year period. The design principles for the program include 1) increasing P-12 student learning, 2) fostering teacher candidate development, 3) promoting outstanding mentoring by clinical educators, and 4) fostering innovative practices. The implementation of the TRP is an expansion of the current program, which includes a yearlong clinical experience. In the teacher residency program, teacher candidates will work in the school more days per week, during breaks, and beyond the end of the semester.

This initiative has been discussed across all the councils and committees in the School of Education. The Partnership Advisory and Professional Development committees have been fully engaged in implementation. The partners involved have created their own initiatives in order to more fully engage teacher candidates and compensate them for their work. They shared their ideas at the advisory meetings, the Yearlong Experience Dinner on January 25, 2016 and the TRP dinner on February 1, 2018. These opportunities for sharing help spread ideas quickly. Evidence that the initiative is working comes from interview and survey data collected in the first year of implementation. This data was published in the summer 2018 issue of School-University Partnerships. It was also presented nationally at the AACTE and NAPDS conferences.

Extending clinical experiences provides an opportunity to provide more extensive feedback to increase teacher candidate performance in the classroom. Mentor teachers and methods professors are currently experimenting with an array of tools for providing feedback. One of these is video recordings. To improve their ability to impact student learning, teacher candidates participated in a pilot in which they were asked to complete four different performances or tasks. The four tasks are teaching an individual or small group, leading a discussion, eliciting student thinking, and preparing a video. Mentor teachers provided opportunities for the teacher candidate to practice the four tasks and provided continuing feedback and encouragement to the teacher candidate. When candidates attain a sufficient level of performance, they develop videos of their performances and submit them to their methods instructor. The instructors view the video and provide feedback to the candidate, but even more importantly, they observe the video as feedback to inform their instructional strategies for teaching methods.

The EPP is also piloting a commercial survey to provide more feedback to teacher candidates. The student survey collects P-12 student perceptions of the teacher candidate. This assessment is a commercial instrument produced by MyStudent Survey (Exhibit 5.5.C). It assesses P-12 students' perceptions of the teacher candidate according to six constructs: presenter, manager, counselor, coach, motivator, and manager. Student surveys have been shown to be correlated with both teacher effectiveness and increases in student learning.

As part of our initiatives to provide more structured learning experiences in clinical settings, we are currently piloting a new set of performance assessments for clinical experiences based on high leverage teaching practices. Teacher candidates will practice designated high leverage teaching tasks under the supervision of a mentor teacher.

III. Cross-cutting themes

a. Diversity

1. Exhibit 1.1.B edTPA.pdf
2. Exhibit 1.1.C CPAST.pdf
3. Exhibit 1.1.D. Early Field_High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics.pdf
4. Exhibit 2.1.J School of Education Advisory Groups for Individual Programs and Academies.pdf
5. Exhibit 2.3.B Data for Diverse Placements.pdf
6. Exhibit 2.3.C. SOE Service Learning.pdf
7. Exhibit 3.1.A Recruitment Planrev6_26.pdf
8. Exhibit 3.1.B SOE Enrollment by Gender and Ethnicity.pdf
9. EXHIBIT 4.1.A MU EPPPR.pdf
10. Exhibit 4.3.A 2017 Employer Survey ResultsFinal.pdf
11. Exhibit 4.4.A Exit Survey_Final.pdf
12. Exhibit 4.4.B Alumni Survey Final.pdf

i. Summarize the evidence that demonstrates that diversity is integrated across all standards.

The EPP has identified diversity proficiencies that align with CAEP standards: candidates are committed to provide all students access to rigorous college and career ready standards; candidates are prepared in clinical settings to work with all students; the EPP is committed to recruitment efforts to recruit a more able and diverse candidate pool. These proficiencies are documented in exhibits throughout this self study, such as the strategic plan, common assessments, and recruitment plan.

The EPP's commitment to diversity is demonstrated in the following statement from the newly revised mission statement from the strategic plan, "The School of Education's mission is to be a leader in the preparation and professional development of highly competent, reflective teachers, speech-language pathologists, school counselors and administrators. We are committed to social justice initiatives that better all students and other persons from diverse backgrounds in terms of abilities, age, gender, culture, race, ethnicity, family, and socioeconomic status." To promote an advanced awareness of social justice, the School of Education has provided ongoing faculty development; invited guest speakers through the Central Jersey Consortium for Equity and Excellence; reviewed hiring, promotion, recruitment, and promotional materials, developed and implemented service learning projects, like the Securing Educational Partnerships and Alliances (S.E.A.L.), and My Buddy and Me, and submitted grant proposals.

Teacher candidates demonstrate the skills and commitment that provide all P-12 students access to rigorous college and career standards. The High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics, Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST) and edTPA are performance assessments with rubric criteria that measure diversity. In addition, the exit survey, employer survey and alumni survey all have items that further demonstrate program strengths in diversity.

The CPAST has three items that contribute to the measure of diversity: D. Differentiated Methods (Fall 17 Final mean: 2.38 out of 3; Spring 18 Final mean: 2.69), I. Safe and Respectful Learning Environments (EPP Fall 17 mean: 2.75/3; Spr 18: 2.82, and T. Advocacy to Meet the Needs of Learners or for the Teaching Profession (Fall 17 m=2.44; Spring 18 m=2.65). The newly created early field assessment titled "High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics" has five standards assessed that consider diversity 1: Learner Development (EPP mean= 2.89/4); 2. Learning Differences (EPP mean=2.84); 7. Planning for instruction (EPP Mean 2.95); and 8. Instructional Strategies (EPP mean 2.84). In addition, there are five rubrics that consider diversity directly are:

Rubric 2 Planning to support varied student needs: Fall 17 mean: 2.9; Spring 18 m=2.8
Rubric 3. Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning: Fall 17 mean: 2.9; Spring 18 m=2.8
Rubric 4. Identifying and Supporting Language Demands: Fall 17 mean: 2.9; Spring 18 m=2.8
Rubric 6. Learning Environment: Fall 17 mean: 2.9; Spring 18 m=2.8
Rubric 14. Analyzing Student's Language Use and Content Learning. Fall 17 mean: 2.9; Spring 18 m=2.8

Completers(4.4.A) , employers(4.3A) and alumni (4.4.B) have also provided data to demonstrate diversity. The alumni survey triangulated with the employer and completer surveys support evidence from the performance assessments discussed above. There are two versions of the alumni survey. All show

means at 80% or higher for those items tied to diversity.

Clinical experiences prepare candidates to work with all students. Each teacher candidate in the EPP must have one or more diverse placements during the EPP's teacher placement program. Diversity is addressed in early clinical placements through several courses which require clinical work that addresses diversity. Program improvements include the addition to diversity statements to course descriptions and syllabi, the addition of six (6) special education credits required of all initial programs (starting Fall 2018), and the addition of new programs in highly diverse schools. The EPP has also been working to provide more opportunities for MU students to spend time in the field by becoming involved in community service learning projects.

The EPP also continues to track the diversity of the cooperating teachers. Therefore we are able to strategically assign placements to students so they are exposed to diverse P-12 faculty. The New Jersey Department of Education introduced the District Factor Grouping system (DFG) in 1975. This system provides a means of ranking school districts in New Jersey by their socioeconomic status (SES). The system includes these seven indices: percent of population with no high school diploma, percent with some college, occupation, population density, income, unemployment, and poverty.

The EPP is committed to outreach efforts to recruit a more able and diverse candidate pool. The Recruitment Plan (Exhibit 3.1.A) outlines the efforts taken, activities to recruit undergraduate and MAT candidates, and 5 year recruitment goals. Presently, the EPP's initial teacher program candidates consist of 85% female and 82% white. Our EPP goal is to increase each data point by 2% each year for five years. The institution and EPP have targeted recruitment of a diverse student pool. MU was the first institution in the State of NJ to conduct campus tours in Spanish. Admissions counselors attend several events that attract diverse students including the National Hispanic College Fair, National TRIO Day, Newark Public School Fairs and Summit High School Planning Night (conducted in Spanish).

The Office of Undergraduate Admission hosts several Pre-College Programming groups and group visits consisting of under-represented students every year. These events include NJIT Project GEAR UP, the Source of Red Bank, Asbury Park Boys and Girls club, University Charter High School, and Malcolm

b. Technology
(Places in which the cross-cutting themes of diversity and technology must be explicitly addressed through evidence)

1. Exhibit 1.1.B edTPA.pdf
2. Exhibit 1.1.C CPAST.pdf
3. Exhibit 1.5.A Candidate Model and Use of Technology.pdf
4. Exhibit 1.5.B EPP Technology Crosswalk.pdf
5. Exhibit 1.5.C EPP Parternship Technology Assets.pdf
6. Exhibit 4.3.A 2017 Employer Survey ResultsFinal.pdf
7. Exhibit 4.4.A Exit Survey_Final.pdf
8. Exhibit 4.4.B Alumni Survey Final.pdf

i. Summarize the evidence that demonstrates that technology is integrated across all standards.

The Monmouth University School of Education incorporates technology to improve teaching effectiveness, enhance instruction, and manage student and assessment data while engaging students in the application of technology to enhance their learning experiences. The technology proficiencies include technology utilization to endorse InTASC teacher standards; the modeling and application of technology standards by candidates as they design, implement and assess learning experiences and to engage students; provide technology-enhanced learning opportunities; have appropriate technology-based application, have technology-based collaborations with partners; and the integration of technology by candidates into all learning domains.
The EPP endorses InTASC teaching standards and ensures that teacher candidates model and apply technology standards. Evidence for teacher candidate proficiency in technology is demonstrated by the completer survey which has an item that assesses perceived ability in "Use of educational technology effectively for instruction." EPP means of 4.51 (out of 5). 4.53, and 4.53 over the three applications of data suggest candidates agree that they able to use technology effectively for instruction. Alumni survey data in the Spring 2012 and Summer 2014 indicates candidates also feel they can "Use technology effectively for instruction" As supported by mean scores of 3.97 and 4.14 (out of 5). The employer survey is completed by superintendents and school administrators who work in technology advanced schools. Although an explicit technology item is not included in the current survey, it is implied that graduates are using technologies available to them in their schools (Exhibit 1.5.C). The Spring 2019 application of the

survey will include explicit items regarding technology. Other assessments with technology items include the edTPA (exhibit 1.1.B), candidate preservice assessment of student teaching (CPAST, 1.1.C), High Level Teaching Proficiency Rubrics (1.1.D), Employer Survey (4.3.A), Exit Survey (4.4.A), and Alumni Survey (4.4.B). The triangulated data indicates candidates use technology to endorse InTASC standards; model and apply technology as they assess, design, plan and implement instruction; and integrate technology into all learning domains.

The EPP provides technology-enhanced learning opportunities throughout the curriculum. The technology infused in candidate coursework is illustrated in Exhibit 1.5.B. The technology crosswalk in this exhibit identifies the technology activities and assessments that take place across twenty-eight courses. Examples include foliotek, ecampus, ipads, video recording, powerpoints, blogging, discussion boards, digital gradebooks, and assistive technology, among numerous others. The coursework emphasizes innovative approaches that use technology to increase the engagement of P-12 students.

EPP candidates also have numerous opportunities to demonstrate the use of technology-based application during their clinical experiences. For example, Exhibit 1.5.C aims to document the technology resources of our top five Partnership districts, where over 50% of our candidates are placed in during early field or clinical practice. It identifies the district assets and includes excerpts from their district materials indicating technology assets and infusion. Each district provided a small narrative about technology as it relates to what EPP candidates experience. For example, Eatontown Public Schools has 1:1 computing from grades 2-8, every teacher has a Microsoft Surface and SMARTboard (classroom), and more (see Exhibit 1.5.C, page 1).

The EPP has numerous opportunities to collaborate with school partners who are very advanced in their use of educational technology. Most districts are Future Ready-NJ (Exhibit 1.5.C p.3), including largest placement districts, Middletown, Hazlet, and Long Branch, are all Future Ready Schools-NJ. The program is a coalition of the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE), the New Jersey School Boards Association (NJSBA) and New Jersey Institute of Technology (NJIT). It is based on the work of the national Future Ready Schools initiative, and the structure and success of the Sustainable Jersey for Schools Certification Program. School partners speak regularly speak to teacher candidates at EPP gatherings about new technology developments in schools and invite teacher candidates to local professional development sessions.

"The national Future Ready Framework, developed by the Alliance for Excellent Education, serves as an organizational umbrella for all discussions and decisions related to the use of technology in the classroom and the technical, professional, and leadership support needed to ensure the most effective and efficient Future Ready practices." - Future Ready Schools-New Jersey.

Finally, EPP data indicates that teacher candidates integrate technology into all the learning domains. For example, the edTPA designers, Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Evaluation (SCALE), contend that all 15 rubrics align with technology. SCALE has indicated edTPA includes commentary prompts and rubric language that are strongly aligned with the constructs measured for technology. Exhibit 1.1.B concludes with the crosswalk. The data indicate candidates are competent on these 15 rubrics (Fall 2017 EPP mean: 2.82, Spring 2018 EPP mean: 2.83 out of 5). Means of 2.59 and 2.68 (out of 3) on item " Digital Tools and Resources" provide further evidence of technology skills. The High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics are completed during the candidates first hundred hours of their yearlong clinical placement. It is expected that candidates will be using technology during their lessons, however it isn't explicitly stated in the rubric. The EPP will improve the rubric to ensure explicit references to technology prior to the Fall 2018 assessment.

IV. Areas for Improvement (AFIs) from previous accreditation decisions, if any

Previous AFI(s)

(1) [NCATE STD4]Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with unit and P-12 school faculty from diverse backgrounds. [Both]

a. Statement of progress and supporting evidence for removing the AFI(s)

In an attempt to expose our candidates to diverse P-12 faculty, the unit continues to track the diversity of the cooperating teachers. Therefore we are able to strategically assign placements to students so they are exposed to diverse P-12 faculty. The New Jersey Department of Education introduced the District Factor Grouping system (DFG) in 1975. This system provides a means of ranking school districts in New Jersey by their socioeconomic status (SES). The system includes these seven indices: percent of population with no high school diploma, percent with some college, occupation, population density, income, unemployment, and poverty.
These seven indices were utilized in a principal components analysis to produce a statistical score, which was used to rank the districts. Districts that rank A-E are considered diverse districts for the purpose of placement. The Director of Field Placements assesses each student teacher's application for student teaching in order to confirm that each student teacher meets the diversity placement requirement prior to the completion of the unit's teacher preparation program. The Field Placement Director obtains diversity placement information by using the Early Field data bases, the New Jersey Department of Education District Factor Grouping (DFG) system, student teaching resumes, and substitute teaching employment history on each candidate for student teaching if that is available. The unit also strives to hire racially diverse educators by continuing to recruit faculty of diverse racial groups. For at least 10 years, the EPP has encouraged racially diverse applicants to apply by either physically mailing or electronically submitting every external posting to all of the following community agencies: Second Baptist Church in Long Branch,NJ, Hispanic Affairs & Resource Center, Spherion in Tinton Falls, NJ, Monmouth County Employment & Training, Monmouth County Division of Social Services, Puerto Rican Congress, Freehold Learning Center, Labor & Workforce Development, Arc in Red Bank, NJ, and many others. Monmouth Universities Policies on hiring can be found at http://www.monmouth.edu/resources/HR/AAction/eeo.asp. These strategies have led to the hiring of an African American woman, an African American man, a Turkish male, and a Hispanic American man in the past three years.

b. Overview of evidence in support of removing the AFI(s)

No Evidence found.

State Standard(s) Evidence

Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard and answer any questions provided by the state.)

1 Exhibit 1.1.A. Praxis II Content Assessments.pdf

x.5.NJ04 NJ Standard 4. Content Knowledge
x.5.NJ05 NJ Standard 5. Application of Content

2 Exhibit 1.1.B edTPA.pdf

x.5.NJ01 NJ Standard 1. Learner Development
x.5.NJ02 NJ Standard 2. Learning Differences
x.5.NJ03 NJ Standard 3. Learning Environments
x.5.NJ04 NJ Standard 4. Content Knowledge
x.5.NJ05 NJ Standard 5. Application of Content
x.5.NJ06 NJ Standard 6. Assessment
x.5.NJ07 NJ Standard 7. Planning for Instruction
x.5.NJ08 NJ Standard 8. Instructional Strategies
x.5.NJ09 NJ Standard 9. Professional Learning
x.5.NJ11 NJ Standard 11. Ethical Practice

3 Exhibit 1.1.C CPAST.pdf

x.5.NJ01 NJ Standard 1. Learner Development
x.5.NJ02 NJ Standard 2. Learning Differences
x.5.NJ03 NJ Standard 3. Learning Environments
x.5.NJ04 NJ Standard 4. Content Knowledge
x.5.NJ05 NJ Standard 5. Application of Content
x.5.NJ06 NJ Standard 6. Assessment
x.5.NJ07 NJ Standard 7. Planning for Instruction
x.5.NJ08 NJ Standard 8. Instructional Strategies
x.5.NJ09 NJ Standard 9. Professional Learning
x.5.NJ11 NJ Standard 11. Ethical Practice

4 Exhibit 1.1.E edtpa-connections-to-caep-.pdf

x.5.NJ06 NJ Standard 6. Assessment
x.5.NJ09 NJ Standard 9. Professional Learning

5 Exhibit 1.4.A College and Career-Ready Evidence.pdf

x.5.NJ04 NJ Standard 4. Content Knowledge
x.5.NJ05 NJ Standard 5. Application of Content

6 Exhibit 1.5.A Candidate Model and Use of Technology.pdf

x.5.NJ07 NJ Standard 7. Planning for Instruction
x.5.NJ08 NJ Standard 8. Instructional Strategies
x.5.NJ09 NJ Standard 9. Professional Learning

7 Exhibit 3.6.A Expectations of the Profession.pdf

x.5.NJ09 NJ Standard 9. Professional Learning
x.5.NJ11 NJ Standard 11. Ethical Practice

8 Exhibit 4.3.A 2017 Employer Survey ResultsFinal.pdf

x.5.NJ01 NJ Standard 1. Learner Development
x.5.NJ02 NJ Standard 2. Learning Differences
x.5.NJ03 NJ Standard 3. Learning Environments
x.5.NJ04 NJ Standard 4. Content Knowledge
x.5.NJ05 NJ Standard 5. Application of Content
x.5.NJ06 NJ Standard 6. Assessment
x.5.NJ07 NJ Standard 7. Planning for Instruction
x.5.NJ08 NJ Standard 8. Instructional Strategies
x.5.NJ09 NJ Standard 9. Professional Learning
x.5.NJ10 NJ Standard 10. Leadership and Collaboration

9 Exhibit 4.4.A Exit Survey_Final.pdf

x.5.NJ01 NJ Standard 1. Learner Development
x.5.NJ02 NJ Standard 2. Learning Differences
x.5.NJ03 NJ Standard 3. Learning Environments
x.5.NJ04 NJ Standard 4. Content Knowledge

x.5.NJ05 NJ Standard 5. Application of Content
x.5.NJ06 NJ Standard 6. Assessment
x.5.NJ07 NJ Standard 7. Planning for Instruction
x.5.NJ08 NJ Standard 8. Instructional Strategies
x.5.NJ09 NJ Standard 9. Professional Learning
x.5.NJ10 NJ Standard 10. Leadership and Collaboration

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the Self-Study Report. You may log out at any time and come back to continue; your report will be saved.

When you are ready to submit the report click "Next" below. This will take you to the submit button on the next page. Once you click on "Submit" you will not be able to make changes to the report and evidence.