Site Visit Report

CAEP Site Visit Team:
Dr. Anne M. Bauer
Dr. Amy M. Barrios
Dr. Mitra Fallahi
Dr. DJ Kaiser
Dr. Sean C. Kottke

State Consultant:
Elizabeth Fernandez-Vina

NEA or AFT Representative:
N/A

Selected Improvement Pathway

MONMOUTH UNIVERSITY

School of Education
400 Cedar Avenue
West Long Branch, NJ 07764
April 14, 2019 12:00 a.m.

CONFIDENTIAL

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation
1140 19th Street, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036
Website: caepnet.org
Phone: 202.223-0077

Site Visit Report

Section I Introduction

Overview of the EPP and program offerings: (focus on differences between what was stated in the Formative Feedback Report and what was verified on the site visit.)

Monmouth University's School of Education (SOE) has two offices, the Dean's office and the Office of Certification, Field Placements and School Partnerships. There are 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, and the Masters of Arts in Teaching, the ESL M.ED., the Early Childhood M.ED., and Interdisciplinary Studies for Elementary Educators. 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).

The School of Education's vision for achieving personal and professional transformation is aligned with the university's emphasis on rigorous academic work, immersion in clinical experiences, and life after Monmouth. 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. The SOE states that it is committed to social justice initiatives and examining unconcious bias.

The Speech and Language Pathology program is accredited by the Counsel on Academic Accreditation (CAA) of Audiology and Speech and Language Pathology, and the counselor education program is approved by CACREP.

Comparison with the School of Social Work shows parity in student services, staff, and funding.

Summary of state partnership that guided the visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or a CAEP-only visit)

This was a CAEP only visit.

Special circumstances of the site visit review, if any. (Example: No unusual circumstances affected the visit.)

No unusual circumstances affected the visit.

Section II.1: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Initial)

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:
Task(s)

Task 1: Please provide results of the third application of the edTPA and Candidate Pre-service Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST) for fall of 2018.

1.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Based on information on pages 14 and 15 of the SSR and related exhibits, data from the 3rd cycle of the two assessments, edTPA and CPAST will become available after fall 2018. The EPP needs to provide these data and analysis of those either in the addendum or during the site visit.

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

(1) SSR page 14: A third application of data will be collected at the end of Fall 2018 and will be shared during the site visit."
SSR page 15: "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."

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

---

Task 2: Show how special education or learning disability candidates meet all InTASC standards.

2.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

(1) Exhibit 1.1.A and 1.1.B state that special education majors do not take Praxis II and edTPA. On page 15 of the SSR, data and scores from edTPA have been used to indicate candidates meet Category 4 of InTASC standard. How does the EPP ensure that special education candidates meet all categories of InTASC, especially category 4?

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

---

Task 3: Show a comparison of candidates' performance to non-candidates' performance in content courses.

3.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Could not find evidence showing a comparison of the teacher candidates with not candidates enrolled in content courses.

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

4.

Task 4: Provide direct measures indicating candidates' use of research for planning, instruction, and assessment.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Evidence provided in SSR, page 17, EPP uses data triangulating from 3 assessments, edTPA, CPAST, and HLTPPR, which is a good start but need additional direct measures indicating candidates' use of research, especially because special ed candidates do not take edTPA.

5.

Task 5: Provide results of the re-submission of the SPAs for English and ESL at the graduate and undergraduate level.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

(1) SSR page 18, First paragraph, provide mainly of the resubmitted SPAS in English and ESL (graduate and Undergraduate level).

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

6.

Task 6: Provide evidence that candidates use data from students' performance to reflect on teaching effectiveness and their professional practice.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

(1) Page 17 paragraph 7 EPP uses the data results from edTPA to show candidates' understanding of planning, and assessment but does not provide direct evidence of how candidates use data to reflect teaching effectiveness and their professional practice, especially in the area of special education candidates who do not take edTPA.

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

7.

Task 7:Demonstrate if and how the year-long clinical practice or the residency program has improved candidates' ability to differentiate instruction, teach transfer of knowledge, and improve collaboration and communication skills among candidates.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Change to the year-long clinical experience was based on "triangulation of data from valid and reliable assessments" stated in exhibit 5.3.B. This change was piloted in fall 2016 and went into effect in fall 2017. Does the EPP have any data showing measurable improvement in candidates' differentiated instructions, assessment, and collaboration with P-12 administrators, colleagues, and parents?

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

Task 8: Data collected by EPP showed that candidates performance was the weakest in the area of content area. What is the EPP's plan to improve content area?

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

8. **B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed**

   (1) On page 15 paragraph 3 EPP states that analysis of data showed that EPP mean was lowest for content knowledge for all applicants. What is the EPP's plan to improve candidates' performance in the content area?

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

Action:

1. The EPP has provided detailed response to Task 1. Results of the edTPA and CPAST assessments for fall of 2018 were provided and analyzed in the addendum. 17 teacher candidates have taken the edTPA assessment in fall of 2018. The addendum included analysis of InTASC standards and various rubrics of the edTPA. The EPP stated areas of strength but also areas for improvement in relation to various rubrics. Data are provided in Appendix 1.1a. The EPP also provided and analyzed data for CPAST test for fall 2018 midterm and final. The EPP implemented mandatory yearlong student teaching during 2017-18 academic year. Data indicates that candidates have performed stronger in all four categories of the CPAST assessment (Learning and the learner, content knowledge, instructional practice, and professional responsibility). Data can be found in Appendix 1.1b. The EPP stated that data is dis-aggregated and shared with the related departments. Analyzed data is used for continuous improvement.

2. The EPP explained in the addendum (Appendix 1.2a) and during the presentation by the assistant dean and the state consultant at the visit that Teaching of Students with Disability licensure is an add on to initial licensure program. Candidates already have completed edTPA and other assessments in their content or area of licensure. However, the EPP uses other forms of assessment such as the Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching, High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics and other EPP created types of assessment to evaluate candidates' performance in special education.

3. The EPP provided data in the addendum in response to Task 3, which required a comparison of candidates' performance in the content area courses to non-education majors. Random sampling of education candidates performance compared to non-education students in the areas of Anthropology, Archeology, Chemistry, English, History/Geography, and Mathematics were provided. Number of courses used for comparison varied from 1 to 5 courses. Comparison of the content mean for various subjects showed percent number of education majors who performed better in the content courses. Education candidates performed 100% better in the areas of Anthropology, Archeology, and Chemistry. Comparison of education candidates to non-education students in the areas of English, History and Geography, and Mathematics were 72%, 75%, and 67% respectively. Appendix 1.3a Education majors are required to double major in a content area and education. Elementary education majors must have 30 S.H. in liberal arts

4. In response to task 4, the EPP has updated evidence in exhibit 1.2. A to include a third set of data from edTPA and CPAST and the second set of data for HLTPPR and included it in Appendix 1.4 a. Areas of strength related to edTPA and those in need of improvement are stated. The EPP triangulated the data from the three assessments, CPAST, edTPA, and HLTPPR. Data analyzed showed that teacher candidates have performed well in edTPA rubrics addressing assessment and instruction and in HLTPPR standard 7 Planning for Instruction Rubric, which addressed using research and assessment data to measure students' progress. Candidates' means in edTPA have been 2.82 (Fall 17), 2.83 spring 18, and 2.75 fall 2018 respectively. The mean has decreased in fall of 2018 but the number of teacher candidates also decreased. Interview of mentor teachers, supervisors, student teachers, and alumni corroborated that candidates are expected to incorporate research to support their assignments, especially reflections.

5. English program has been recognized nationally for undergraduate and graduate program by the NCTE organization. The two conditions for the TEOSL program remained from previous submission. However, the TESOL program is an add on to licensure. Candidates must have a licensure to teach before seeking TESOL licensure. The program is recognized by the state. The EPP has described how they are addressing the two conditions. They are revising the rubrics to make them better aligned with performance and make assessment descriptions aligned with standards. TESOL organization has recommended that the EPP resubmit the SPA report in three years.

6. In response to Task 6 the EPP has analyzed scores of candidates' edTPA for the 3 consecutive semesters of fall 17, spring 18, and fall 18. Data can be found in Appendix 1.4a. Means of candidates performance on various rubrics of edTPA range from 2.0 to 2.99, which is at or above average performance. The EPP also analyzed data from HLTPPR assessment, especially standards 6 and 7, which focuses on assessment and planning. Candidates performed at an overall GPA of 2.53, which is again an indication of data integration in instruction and assessment. The strongest evidence was present during the interview of the student teachers and alumni who stated how they observed data from assessments being used for planning and instruction so they learned to analyze and use data from their assessment in their planning, instruction, and subsequent assessments.

7. Year-long student teacher became a requirement in the 2017-18 academic year. In the addendum EPP described that they conducted a pilot study with a school district and placed student teachers who completed a paid partnership. Data from CPSAT assessment were analyzed, which showed positive results. Appendix 1.7 shows the result. EPP also interviewed student teachers and clinical faculty. Testimonials gathered from student teachers, recent alumni who had completed yearlong clinical practice, mentor teachers, and University supervisors supported the benefits of the yearlong clinical practice. Statements expressed by recent and current student teachers also indicated positive results such as: Developing positive rapport with the mentor teacher, practicing co-teaching, becoming member of the community, being evident when taking over the teaching, using data from assessment instead of being given data, progressing into teaching, confidence building, learning the culture, and so on.

8. The EPP has addressed Task 8 by analyzing data from edTPA, as well as the exit, completer, and employer surveys. Participants' responses analyzed in all data are positive. Additionally the addendum explains how the EPP has developed tutoring services for preparation for Praxis II and edTPA. Faculty have infused edTPA activities into coursework. Professional developments have been offered for faculty members during the year that edTPA was piloted. There is also a comparison of candidates passing rate of 100% on praxis II before student teaching compared to the performance of the candidates statewide, which is at 96% to 97% in 3 consecutive years. An interview of the department chairs, the dean, and the assistant dean was conducted. The University Teacher Education Advisory Council meets regularly, share and analyze data and plan improvements. Appendices 1.8a and 1.8b.

2. Analysis regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 1 :

a. Narrative analysis of findings

There were eight tasks related to standard 1. Tasks varied from providing results of the recent edTPA assessment to providing evidence in support of the year-long student teaching, and strategies to enhance content knowledge instruction for candidates. The EPP developed an organized addendum that addressed every Task and provided ample amount of data and data analysis to support their statements.

Documents related to one original exhibit were also upgraded that included the last set of assessment scores. The updated scores were analyzed with the fall 2018 edTPA scores included. Interviews were conducted of various constituents from current candidates, recent graduates, clinical faculty, mentor teachers, department

chairs, faculty members, the dean, the associate dean, and the assistant dean. Interviewees reiterated and confirmed responses provided in the addendum.

Overall, it became clear that the EPP has the processes in place to prepare candidates who are ready to assume teaching responsibilities when they complete their educator preparation program.

b. Analysis of Program-Level data

The SSR described the programs offered leading to initial licensure to teach and the assessment system. The assessment system includes proprietary assessments, such as Praxis II and edTPA, as well as EPP created assessments. It is stated that each assessment is aligned to CAEP, New Jersey Professional Standards for Teachers, and InTASC standards.
The EPP has established and responded to a series of questions related to each assessment such as: When is the assessment used during candidates' experience? How is the candidate informed about the assessment? Who uses the assessment? What is the intention of the assessment? How is the validity and reliability established? How is the data derived from the assessment used?

Four components of the InTASC standards were aligned to various standards. On page 17 of the SSR, the EPP states that data from all assessments demonstrate that candidates meet EPP, InTASC, CAEP 1.1, and NJPST standards. The EPP stated that New Jersey does not require candidates for the special education program to take Praxis II or edTPA. The addendum and the presentations during the site visit revealed that teaching students with disability licensure is not an initial licensure at Monmouth. Candidates complete that licensure in addition to an initial licensure and the EPP uses non-proprietary EPP created assessments to assess knowledge and performance of the special education candidates.

The EPP has provided analysis of candidates' performance on various assessments. The addendum is clear in providing additional data from assessments conducted in fall or 2018 and presenting more completed data analysis. Assessment results have been disaggregated when needed. Interviews conducted during the site visit indicated that administration regularly shares assessment results and the assistant dean attends meetings of the Teacher Education Advisory Council and department meetings to discuss assessment results and make decisions for improvement.
There was one area in the formative assessment stating "The EPP needs to demonstrate how future candidates will be able to design and facilitate digital learning." The addendum included ample amount on the application of technology describing the 3rd application of HLTPPR and a new online module for clinical educators and better preparation of teacher candidates in areas related to technology. During site visit and interview with candidates and alumni it became apparent that candidates are exposed and learn to use technology applications during their content and methods courses. Candidates discussed in detail how they felt good about their ability to use promethean board when they started their student teaching. Onsite exhibit addendum explained the processes extensively.

c. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

The following evidence were consistently in support of the standard 1 prior to the formative report.
EPP has analyzed the available data in a consistent manner by answering the same

questions for all available cycles of data.
Epp has reported on the programs that have approved SPAs and they are more than 51% (Actual number is 75%).
EPP has reported on what they have learned about various programs from disaggregated data.

There were eight tasks assigned to EPP after the formative visit. The EPP provided detailed response to each task in the addendum. Evidence provided in the addendum related to standard 1, analysis of assessment data responding to tasks stated in the formative reports are consistent with meeting the standard.

Consistent evidence are included in the addendum and the appendices 1.1a, 1.1b, 1.2a, 1.3a, 1.4a, 1.7a, 1.8a, 1.8b, 1.8c. 1.8d, 4.3a, 1.9a, 1.9b, and 1.9c. Interviews of the candidates, student teachers, recent alumni, clinical faculty, mentor teachers, program chairs, the assistant and associate deans, and the dean.
The 1.5 Instructional Technology Update of the onsite addendum and the attachments 1f, 2a, provide consistent evidence related to technology.

d. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

There was no evidence that was inconsistent with meeting the standard.

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement

Area for Improvement	Rationale
none	none

Stipulation:

Stipulation	Rationale
none	none

Section II.1A: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Advanced)

Standard A.1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:
Task(s)

Action:
2. Analysis regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 1 :
a. Narrative analysis of findings

b. Analysis of Program-Level data

c. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

d. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement

Area for Improvement	Rationale

Stipulation:

Stipulation	Rationale

Section II.2: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Initial)

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice
The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:
Task(s)

1.

Shared responsibilities of partnerships

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) Confirm MOUs and partners understanding of those MOU's

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) What are school-based faculty members' perceptions of the partnership?

2.

Assessments and Data

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) What additional cycles of data are available for the CPAST?

(2) What additional cycles of data are available for the edTPA?

(3) What additional evidence is now available to support the shift to the year long intersnhip?

Action:

1. Confirm MOUs and partners understanding of those MOU's. MOU samples were provided in the Addendum (2.1a). Stakeholders questioned about partnerships with the EPP via interviews verified their understanding of MOU components.

2. What are school-based faculty members' perceptions of the partnership? Interviews with superintendents, mentors, and clinical faculty confirmed that there are multiple opportunities for stakeholders to form mutually beneficial relationships, including ongoing communication to and from the EPP, input into EPP programming, and participation in professional development requested by partner districts.

<table>
<tr><td>3.</td><td>What additional cycles of data are available for the CPAST? The EPP provided additional cycles of data (2017-2018) for the CPAST in the Addendum (1.1b). MU candidates meet the expectations of all four InTASC categories. 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.</td></tr>
<tr><td>4.</td><td>What additional cycles of data are available for the EdTPA? The EPP provided additional cycles of data for the EdTPA in the Addendum (2017-2018). Mean scores for each INTASC standard ranged from 2.7-2.9.</td></tr>
<tr><td>5.</td><td>What additional evidence is now available to support the shift to the year-long internship? Interviews with school partners confirmed the preparedness of candidates and the marked difference that a year-long internship has made on their readiness for hire. The EPP implemented mandatory yearlong clinical practice for all students during the 2017-18 school year; therefore the Spring 2018 and Fall 2018 final CPAST scores include yearlong students. When compared to the Fall 2017 Final Scores, 100% of the highest overall means over the applications of data occurred either during the Spring 18 or Fall 18 (1.1b).</td></tr>
</table>

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 2 :

a. Summary of findings

Clinical practice is at the core of the EPP's programs. Partnerships are maintained and improved through ongoing communication and collaboration with school districts. Field based opportunities ensure a transfer of theory to practice for candidates. According to interviews with the stakeholders, reflection on practice is a marked benefit to the structure of the EPP's programs.

As indicated in the SSR and FFR reports, the Dean's Advisory Council, Partnership Advisory Council, the Professional Development School Committee, the Academy Steering Committee, and the University Teacher Education Advisory Council are composed of various stakeholders from the local P12 districts and the EPP. Meetings provided an opportunity for sharing experiences, learning from data, and improving the preparation of candidates. On campus interviews with various stakeholders confirmed the content and usefulness of these meetings for the development of relevant professional development opportunities for candidates and partners alike.

Stakeholders confirmed through on campus interviews that they feel their partnership with the EPP is extremely collaborative. In addition, they confirmed that faculty and administration within the EPP are constantly communicating with them, asking for input, meeting with them, and supporting their growth. According to one superintendent, both the EPP and the partner districts share responsibility for student learning. Student growth objectives and professional development plans are a collaborative effort between candidates and district supervisors and mentors. Stakeholders feel that the EPP is progressively changing for the sake of improvement at all times. In addition, the partnership is seen as a leverage point for professional development, as confirmed by campus interviews.

One hallmark of the program, as confirmed through interviews with various stakeholders, is the Mentor Academy. Participants who complete the program are expected to return to their campuses and share their learning with campus colleagues. Mentors, supervisors, clinical faculty, principals, and superintendent partners confirmed in interviews that candidates of the EPP can be described as "meticulous, passionate, well -prepared, thoughtful learners, who are confident and competent." Clinical faculty meet several times per year to provide feedback on programs, at which time programmatic data are also shared with them. With the help of clinical faculty, candidates are able to take classes at district school campuses and gain experience working with students early in their program. All programs work closely with nearby school districts, as well as districts around the state. Select P-12 district leaders who meet university qualifications teach some of the courses as part-time instructors and collaborate in designing,
implementing, and evaluating program coursework and artifacts. The EPP has 30 formal partnerships (Exhibit 2.1.N) and has won a national award for it's Professional Development Schools. MOU's are used to document the shared responsibility for

candidate preparation.

Extensive exhibits document clearly defined criteria for partnership schools, as well as MOU expectations. Key program assessments for entering and exiting clinical practice are referenced within the SSR and assessment results are documented in the exhibits. According to the SSR and exhibit documents, multiple assessments are used to determine candidate mastery of content areas and pedagogical and professional knowledge before, during, and for completion of clinical practice.

The district partnerships have enhanced student learning by utilizing a co-teaching approach in the yearlong experience. When using co-teaching, the mentor teachers and teacher candidates share the teaching responsibilities during the year; the P-12 students have two teachers. The creation of the Teacher Residency Academy as well as the Substitute Academy are both examples of initiatives that were created as a direct result of stakeholder feedback and that also reflect the level of collaboration that is ongoing between the EPP and its district partners.

The P-12 settings candidates are placed in are technology-rich, and the EPP also has the technology for candidates to use in the classroom on campus and clinical practice settings. Clinical experiences are structured to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions, reflecting a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

Exhibit 1.1 C CPAST data
Exhibit 1.1D Early Field High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubric
Exhibit 2.1B Monmouth Congratulatory Email and Press Release
Exhibit 2.1C School-University Partnership Award Article
Exhibit 2.1F Partnership Advisory Committee
Exhibit 2.2A NJ 9A-4.4 Clinical Component and Candidate Supervision
Exhibit 2.3A Clinical Hours
Exhibit 2.3D Developmental Curriculum

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

None

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each
Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale
none	none

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale
none	none

Section II.2A: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Advanced)

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice
The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

Task(s)

Action:

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 2 :

a. Summary of findings

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale

Section II.3: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Initial)

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 4.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

Task(s)

1.

Plan to Recruit Teacher Candidates
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
(1) Please clarify what is meant in Exhibit 3.1.A by "Due to requirements by CAEP and the NJDOE, academic diversity must start at a minimum level" (p. 2)
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
(1) What specific plans, goals, or initiatives does the EPP have that will specifically address increasing the diversity of teacher candidates admitted into programs?

(2) What specific plans, goals, or initiatives does the EPP have that will specifically address preparing teacher candidates to teach in hard-to-staff schools and address shortage fields?

Admission Requirements

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

2.

(1) The SSR notes that "100% of all candidates meet the requirements for admission" yet later states that "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." These statements appear to be contradictory. Is each candidate held to admission standards or are admission standards based on cohort averages?

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Where are the GPA ranges for MAT candidates in Exhibit 3.2.A?

(2) Will sample welcome education letters with information about requirements for entry into their education major be available in the addendum or onsite?

(3) Could someone from the EPP provide an onsite demonstration of the First Year Office's software platform known as SOAR (Support, Orientation, Advising, and Registration)?

Dispositions Process

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

3.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Will samples from this dispositions process (e.g., forms) be available on site for the team to review?

Monitoring Progression

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) The SSR notes: "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" (p. 38). These statements appear to be contradictory. Please clarify the process.

4.

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) The SSR notes times when candidates received additional assistance: "For those who are conditionally accepted, they must meet regularly with their MAT program advisor until all conditions have been met" (Monitor Point 1) and "They also meet with their advisors to develop a plan and identify which supports they will use" (Monitor Point 2). Will there be evidence in the addendum or onsite to provide more details or documentation on these processes?

The SSR mentions four Monitor Points but Exhibit 3.4.B Candidate Monitoring is not

(2) labeled consistently to match these four points. Please confirm if these are the same or add a consistent set of labels.

Selection at Completion

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

5. **B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed**

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Was Exhibit 6.6.A Expectations of the Profession Measures a one-time report or is there a process to do this at some kind of regular interval?

Action:

1. Task 1. Verified. Appendices 3.1a and 3.2a include recruitment and strategic plans with initiatives and a focus on increasing diversity. Interviews with faculty also confirm a commitment to social justice and diversity, with new initiatives focused on recruiting more diverse teacher candidates.

2. Task 2. Verified. The addendum includes entrance GPAs for MAT candidates. The cohort mean for the past three academic years for MAT candidates has been from 3.2 to 3.4 (with the undergraduate mean from from 3.3 to 3.6). All candidates for the past three years have had at least a 2.77 GPA and the EPP has a documented process for admitting candidates conditionally. Appendices 3.6a and 3.9a show ways that the EPP communicates requirements to candidates (3.6a) and how they communicate with students that have been conditionally admitted (3.9a). Onsite, the EPP provided a demo of SOAR (Support, Orientation, Advisement and Registration), which gives multiple supports for new undergraduate and transfer students, and also documents EPP program requirements.

3. Task 3. Verified. Appendix 3.7a provides several documents and details on the EPP's process for assessing dispositions. Candidates are assessed in ED 320/624 using the REAP Dispositional Evaluation Form and in other education courses using the CARE form. The CARE form and process were shared onsite. The CPAST is also used as part of clinical experience to assess dispositions.

4. Task 4. Verified. Appendix 3.10a provides charts on Candidate Monitoring, which make clear the process for monitoring candidates, including who in the EPP is responsible. Additional evidence on how the EPP communicates with MAT candidates that are conditionally admitted is included in Appendix 3.9a. Interviews with EPP advisors provided more details on this process and the multiple measures used to track and monitor candidate progress.

5. Task 5. Verified. Appendices 3.11a and 3.11b provide additional evidence (in addition to the originally submitted Exhibit 3.6.A) that the EPP systematically reviews candidate data as they progress through their programs. Onsite interviews with EPP leaders and advisors revealed that data related to candidate recruitment and selectivity are reviewed in an ongoing manner by EPP faculty and advisors and during the dean's education leadership council.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 3:

a. Summary of findings

The EPP provided additional documentation on their recruitment plan (Appendix 3.1a) and the development of their strategic plan (Appendix 3.1b). The strategic plan includes mission and vision statements, a SWOT analysis, five year goals, and department-specific strategic plans. These plans include a special focus on social justice and diversity. The addendum provided more details on how members of the EPP are involved in recruitment efforts that seek to increase the diversity of the candidates being admitted (e.g., through scholarships) and to address state shortage areas. This plan includes baseline data and the goal to "increase the percentage of teachers employed in hard to fill shortage areas by 10% over 5 years." Interviews with EPP leaders and faculty detailed several additional ongoing and new recruitment initiatives that directly involved members of the EPP in collaboration with the institution's admissions office, with area P-12 partners, and more recently with the local community college.

The addendum clarified how the EPP ensures that teacher candidates meet the state requirements for entrance to the program. The mean GPA for cohorts at both the undergraduate and MAT levels exceed the 3.0 CAEP minimum (with reported means between 3.2 and 3.6). Additionally, all admitted candidates for the past three years have had an entrance GPA of 2.77 or greater. The EPP has a process for conditionally admitting candidates with a GPA between 2.75 and 3.00 (see Appendix 3.9a). The undergraduate handbook (online) and catalog (reviewed onsite) clearly outline the process for probation and sample messages to students who are put on probation were also provided. The MAT handbook (online) provides details on the requirements for the program and certification.

The EPP clarified their dispositions process with additional documentation (Appendix 3.7a). Dispositions are measured through surveys in designated courses, which are then reviewed by faculty and chairs. A process for addressing concerns with dispositions is also included in the addendum documents. This is in addition to the detailed process of the SOE's Academic and Professional Dispositions Review Committee (APDRC), which was highlighted in the FFR as a strength. The candidate monitoring charts (Appendix 3.10a) also show when dispositions are assessed for both undergraduate and MAT candidates. The CPAST (Candidates' Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching) is also used during clinical practice (Exhibits 5.2.B and 3.6.A). Interviews with EPP faculty and advisors revealed that dispositions are now being assessed in all education courses using a new CARE form (provided onsite) and advisors follow up with candidates whenever there are concerns. The EPP works with the Director of Assessment for the institutions to ensure the validity and reliability of these instruments.

The addendum included more details on Candidate Monitoring (Appendix 3.10a) to support selectivity during preparation, adding to evidence in the SSR, which included a clear outline of the four different Monitor Points (Exhibit 3.4.B) and numerous supports for candidates (Exhibit 3.4.A). Interviews with current candidates and recent program completers provided numerous details on the multiple methods that the EPP uses to communicate with candidates and ensure that they make progress through their program, including e-mails, the academic audit through Web Advisor, Foliotek, and a lot of personal one-on-one attention. Candidate supports outlined in Exhibit 3.4.A were verified in interviews with candidates and completers. EPP advisors also outlined many of the multiple measures used to track and monitor candidates (e.g., passing the Praxis II exam, the high-leverage teaching practice proficiency rubric, CPAST, edTPA). Data retreats at the end of each year are used by EPP faculty to review data from these assessments and monitor points.

Several sample documents were provided onsite to demonstrate how the EPP communicates with candidates and documents conditional admissions and cases when a candidate fall below the 3.0 GPA requirement. Documentation includes a form that candidates must sign to demonstrate that they understand the requirements for their conditional admittance. Candidate expectations are also embedded into EPP coursework, assessments, and CPAST.

To demonstrate how the EPP addresses the selection of candidates at program completion, the addendum clarified the documentation provided with the SSR (Exhibit 6.6.A). Appendix 3.11a documents how the EPP ensures that candidates have reached a high standard for content knowledge and teaching effectiveness with a chart on data sources used, responsible EPP members, and frequency for review. Meeting minutes (Appendix 3.11b) provide additional evidence of how and when the EPP reviews these sources.

Interviews with advisors detailed the multiple measures used by both the institution and the EPP to track and ensure that candidates make adequate progress during their program, meet requirements before student teaching, and complete requirements for certification. The EPP employs a certification officer and holds a certification event for

program completers, after which the certification officer hand delivers documentation to the state certification office. Copies of the undergraduate and MAT handbooks were provided onsite to demonstrate how the EPP makes clear the requirements and expectations for candidates.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

Appendix 3.1a Recruitment Plan
Appendix 3.1b Strategic Plan
Appendix 3.1c SOE Meeting Minutes (highlighting social justice and diversity training)
Appendix 3.4a Admission Scores
Appendix 3.6a UG and MAT Acceptance Letters
Appendix 3.7a Dispositions Review
Appendix 3.9a Process for Conditional Acceptance
Appendix 3.10a Candidate Monitoring
Appendix 3.11a Quality Assurance System
Appendix 3.11b Minutes from Meetings Showing Shared Decision Making
Student CARE Disposition Review Process (provided onsite)
2018-2019 Monmouth University UG Catalog
Monmouth University School of Education Undergraduate Handbook
Monmouth University School of Education MAT Handbook
Sample Conditional Admission Letters
Sample Letters for When GPAs Fall Below a 3.0
Sample Graduate Admission Conditional Acceptance Evaluation Forms

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

None cited

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale
none	none

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale
none	none

Section II.3A: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Advanced)

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity
The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 4.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:
Task(s)

Action:
2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 3:
a. Summary of findings

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each
Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale

Section II.4: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Initial)

Standard 4: Program Impact
The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:
Task(s)

1.

Clarification of available data

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1)	What additional employment milestones (tenure, NBPTS certification) are available?
(2)	What is the response rate for the First Destination Survey?
(3)	What data are available from the latest cycle of the Employer Satisfaction Survey? What is the response rate?

Action:

1. What additional employment milestones (tenure, NBPTS certification) are available? In the addendum, further information was provided regarding employment milestones. Evidence was provided related to two employment milestones: persistence rates and percentage of teachers employed in teacher shortage areas. Persistence rates are consistent with state averages (within three percentage points). Evidence from the state of New Jersey indicates that the EPP has consistently outperformed other institutions in the percent of certified

2. Whaty is the response rate for the First Destination Survey? The addendum clarified the source and application of the First Destination Survey. The survey is distributed by the university. Response rate was eight percent. This survey is currently being refined to provide improved data for the programs. An additional candidate satisfaction survey is used to augment this information.

3. What data are available from the latest cycle of the employer satisfaction survey? The third cycle of employer satisfaction data gathered 2/19. Response rate from directors of special services, principals, and superintendents from partnership schools was 52 percent. In all four of the InTASC categories mean scores were rated as agree-strongly agree.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 4 :
a. Summary of findings

Reviewing the state generated evidence for completer impact on p-12 student learning affirmed that MU candidates exceed state means. Student Growth Outcomes

and Student Growth Percentile, a measure of growth over time-based on standard scores using the PARCC assessment, demonstrate that completers score better than the New Jersey average in Student Growth Outcomes (SGO) measures and are competitive with state averages in respect to Student Growth Percentiles (SGP). As compared to the State of NJ, this EPP scored 2.55% higher in the "Exceptional" category and approximately 1% higher in "Full." MU also had 0% scored "Insufficient" and was .52% less than the state average in the "Partial" category (70% or more in the class met the goal). SGO scores 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.

A review of the evidence during the onsite affirmed that the "Teacher Practice Scores," based on classroom observations, indicated that MU completers exceeded the state means.

Evidence provided by the state indicates high retention, within three percentage points of state rates. Evidence from the state of New Jersey indicates that the EPP has consistently outperformed other institutions in the percent of certified completers' retention in teaching positions. Though completers appear to move between schools and less frequently among districts, this is not unusual for first-year teachers with little seniority. Slightly over half of the candidates are employed in shortage areas. MU completers are hired at a slighter higher rate than preparation programs across the state. The addendum provided additional evidence of outcome measures, with strong retention in teaching and hiring in high needs areas.

In the addendum, an additional cycle of data was provided on the employer satisfaction survey. This more-detailed survey, which included items about each of the ten InTASC standards indicated that 100% of all categories met the EPP established a standard of achieving an agree or strongly agree for each of the items. Response rates on theall three cycles of data 20%. In interviews superintendents expressed strong satisfaction with completers.

Component 4.4 Three tools are used to demonstrate completer satisfaction with the program: Exit survey, Alumni Survey, and First Destination Survey. The Exit Survey is an EPP created an 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. Three cycles of data are provided, with a response rate from 94%-98%. All mean scores have been above 4.0 on a 5 point scale (5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree), for most content areas in each category.

The alumni survey is also an EPP developed assessment. Response rates exceed 20% for all cycles of data. Data for both the previous survey and the revised InTASC aligned standard are available. On the revised survey, the mean for all four InTASC categories was at least at the "agree" rating. The 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. Of those who responded, 91% were "Very Satisfied" with their current career, and only 9% were somewhat unsatisfied. 89% were somewhat satisfied (22%) or Very Satisfied (67%) with their undergraduate education and support services, with 11% being unsure. The respondents believed they were prepared to be competitive from graduates from other institutions (89%). When asked about clinical experiences, graduates indicated they were "Very Satisfied" (66.7%) or "Somewhat Satisfied" (22%). Finally, 90% of graduates stated they were "Somewhat Satisfied" or "Very Satisfied" with support services (admissions, bursar's office, career services, financial aid, bookstore, library, IT, campus safety).

For each piece of evidence, following the presentation of data, the EPP summarized the application of the results to continuous program improvement. Onsite interviews confirmed that these results are analyzed for program improvement.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

4.1.A MU EPPPR
4.1.B NJ Performance Report
4.2.A A AchieveNJ Overview
4.4.A Exit Survey Final
4.4.B Alumni Survey Final
4.4.C Fist Destination Survey
Addendum Appendix 4.1A Education Preparation Provider Performance Report 2015, 2016, 2017

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

None

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale
None	None

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale
None	None

Section II.4A: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Advancedl)

Standard 4: Program Impact
The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:
Task(s)

Action:
2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 4 :
a. Summary of findings

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale

Section II.5: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Initial)

Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement
The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider 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.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

Task(s)

1.

Standard 5 Task 1 Establish multiple cycles of data, validity and reliability for key assessments

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Data from Early Field Experience High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) "[A]s the rubric is applied to future student cohorts and as existing student cohorts evaluated by tool persist in the TPP, the School of Education will continue to analyze the validity of the rubric and will seek to establish both construct and predictive validity when applicable. The processes of establishing the construct and predictive validity of the High Leverage Teaching Practice Rubric will include the comparison of rubric outcomes to other assessment outcomes."

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) What information on candidate proficiencies have additional cycles of data on this assessment yielded?

(2) What insights, particularly regarding construct and predictive validity, has comparison of data from this instrument with other assessment outcomes yielded?

(3) What new continuous improvement measures have been implemented, or ongoing continuous improvement measures been validated, as a result of analysis of data from this instrument?

Standard 5 Task 2 Establish evidence of programmatic improvements in response to key assessment data

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Data from Early Field Experience High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) "Although the n was low, P-3 candidates scored lowest in three of the four categories. This information was shared with the P-3 program director and will also be triangulated with other data to see trends"

2.

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Has comparison of this dataset for P-3 candidates with other datasets yielded actionable findings?

(2) What have program advisory committee constituents discussed about this finding?

(3) Have subsequent cycles of data increased the n significantly in this program area?

(4) What new continuous improvement measures have been implemented, or ongoing continuous improvement measures been validated, as a result of stakeholder feedback on these data?

Standard 5 Task 3 Establish evidence of co-construction of clinical experience assessment tools

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Data Informed Program Improvements

(2) Early Field Experience High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

3.

(1) "The HLTPP rubrics were created with 1:1 alignment with the InTASC and NJPST standards. Stakeholder feedback was given and it was adopted for implementation the Spring of 2018."

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Please describe the creation of this assessment in detail. How was source language from InTASC and NJPST adapted to create the instrument and establish 1:1 alignment?

(2) Considering the similar nomenclature, to what extent were the TeachingWorks' High Leverage Practices factored into this work?

Standard 5 Task 4 Establish evidence of wide sharing of completer outcome data

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Survey results

(2) Program dashboard

4.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) "The dashboard includes the results of exit surveys and the state report on SGO's and SGE's"

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Program reviewer was not able to find exit survey data on the dashboard. Please clarify where these data may be found.

Standard 5 Task 5 Establish evidence of consistent process for developing and piloting new assessments for the quality assurance system

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) None

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

5.

(1) "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."

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) What progress has been made on this initiative?

Standard 5 Task 6 Establish evidence of consistent process for piloting new assessments for the quality assurance system

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) MyStudentSurvey

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

6.

(1) "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"

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Has implementation of this assessment yielded actionable feedback to candidates?

(2) Do data from this assessment complement other data sources favorably?

Action:

1. Task 1: Verified; Evidence provided in Addendum: Appendices 5.1a, 5.2a; Site Visit evidence: Site Visit Addendum (Attachment 2a) EPP provided data from three administrations of the Early Field Rubric, demonstrating consistent proficiency across all four InTASC categories & across all three administrations. As a formative assessment tool administered in the semester immediately prior to the student teaching experience, well-prepared candidates would be expected to perform within the range of Approaching Expectations and Meets Expectations, and the data demonstrate that candidates on the whole perform solidly within that range and with small standard deviations. Longitudinal comparisons of rubric standards with corresponding elements CPAST assessment administered during the final student

teaching semester demonstrate that the vast majority of candidates improve or remain consistent in their demonstration of the competencies embodied across the two instruments. Examples of program changes were shared (HEPE, P3).

2.	Task 2: Verified; Evidence provided in Addendum: Appendices 1.1a, 1.1b, 5.2a, 5.4.a; Site Visit evidence: Site Visit Addendum (Attachment 2a), Standard 5 interviews Complementary data from subsequent key assessments demonstrated that P-3 candidates experienced significant growth in the semester after the HLTPP was administered. Minutes from P-3 Program Advisory Meeting & Clinical Educator Orientation demonstrated analysis of the data & plans for program improvements in response. Interviews confirmed identification of a need to improve mentor training on the HLTPP. Subsequent administrations with new cohorts demonstrated significant improvement. "Because the rubrics are so specific to INTASC standards, [University Clinical Supervisors] were able to provide feedback to candidates about areas of strengths and needs. They could also collaborate with the school based clinical educators to ensure the candidate has numerous opportunities to improve the specific tasks associated with corresponding areas of need."
3.	Task 3: Verified; Evidence provided in Addendum: Appendices 5.1a, 5.2a; Site Visit evidence: Site Visit Addendum (Attachment 2a), Henning, J. E., Gut, D.M., & Beam, P.C. (2019) Building mentoring capacity in teacher education: A guide to clinically-based practice. New York: Routledge. (esp. Chapter 3 & Appendices), interviews with school partners, stakeholders & EPP decision makers EPP detailed three rounds of design leading to implementation to demonstrate co-construction of this instrument in collaboration with multiple stakeholders. Multiple scholarly publications & presentations documented the details of alignment of this instrument to High Leverage Teaching Practices, and interviews with EPP and PK-12 representatives confirmed a high degree of collaboration and co-construction in the design, adoption and implementation of the instrument. Evolution of the instrument across iterations from its original draft was guided by feedback from multiple stakeholders.
4.	Task 4: Verified; Evidence provided in the Addendum: Link to new data site (https://www.monmouth.edu/school-of-education/about/mission/caep-accreditation-data/); Site Visit evidence: interviews with school partners & stakeholders The Addendum notes that "the dashboard is inactive as it is being reconstructed. A new data site has been active and is available. ... The data is presented on this site by the following categories: Annual Reports, Content and Pedagogy (Fall 2017, Spring 2018, Fall 18), Partnerships, Clinical Practice Survey Data, Quality of Candidates, and Program Impact and Outcomes Data." The website provides a comprehensive, public-facing inventory of assessment data, including three administrations of each survey. Each data source is presented in a concise, easily consumable report, & the survey data demonstrate consistently strong positive outcomes across administrations, programs, and populations surveyed. PK-12 partners affirmed the EPP's transparency in widely sharing data & its value.
5.	Task 5: Verified; Evidence provided in Addendum: Appendices 5.1a, 5.2a; Site Visit evidence: Site Visit Addendum (Attachment 2a), Henning, J. E., Gut, D.M., & Beam, P.C. (2019) Building mentoring capacity in teacher education: A guide to clinically-based practice. New York: Routledge. (esp. Chapter 3 & Appendices), interviews with school partners, stakeholders & EPP decision makers As noted in Tasks 1 and 3, the HLTPP Rubrics have undergone further refinement since the first administration, culminating in a formal publication by Routledge. PK-12 partners described its utility in helping candidates bridge pre-service and in-service performance assessment and evaluation expectations, due to its clear language. PK-12 partners singled out a co-planned Clinical Summit with multiple EPPs as a prime opportunity for other EPPs with whom they have collaborated to learn effective practices and assessment tools (like HLTPP & edTPA) from this EPP.
6.	Task 6: Verified; Evidence provided in the Addendum: Appendix 5.6a; Site Visit evidence: N/A Although not being used as a key assessment, the EPP piloted use of the Student Perception Survey (SPS) developed by the Colorado Education Initiative (https://www.coloradoedinitiative.org/studentsurvey/) as a formative feedback tool for 17 volunteer candidates in Fall 2018. Data were shared with both candidates and clinical educators along with a reflection guide. The data from this pilot favorably complement the overall portrait of strength of the EPP's candidates revealed through other metrics, although it is not intended to be explicitly aligned to other tools. 100% of candidates in the pilot administration had a total mean score of all items that was above 3.0 (on a 4-point scale), with a range of between 3.01 and 3.71. The overall mean across all 34 SPS items and all candidates in the pilot was 3.39. The EPP is considering whether to elevate this instrument to a key assessment in the future.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 5:

a. Summary of findings

5.1

The EPP utilizes a robust and elegant quality assurance system comprised of multiple measures to monitor candidate progress and provider operational effectiveness in the four broad categories of InTASC Standards: Learner and Learning, Content Knowledge, Instructional Practice, and Professional Responsibilities. In each category, the EPP triangulates data from multiple externally administered and benchmarked assessments (e.g., edTPA, Praxis II, SPA reports), externally developed and locally administered assessments (e.g., CPAST), and locally developed and locally administered instruments (e.g., Early Field Experience High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubric, exit surveys). One-to-one alignment of assessments to InTASC Standards and New Jersey Professional Standards for Teachers across all locally developed assessments allows the program to draw strong conclusions about candidate performance in the four InTASC categories.

The EPP quality assurance system for monitoring completer achievements is as robust as its system for monitoring candidate progress. Triangulation of data gathered and reported by the State on completer achievements with data gathered by the EPP yields a consistent portrait of completer quality, with actionable feedback to support continuous improvement efforts.

Evidence clearly demonstrates that data on candidates and completers are regularly and systematically reviewed by multiple internal and external constituencies with a lens of improving P-12 student achievement, and that converging findings from these assessments (e.g., that candidates would benefit from stronger clinical experiences) are used by the EPP to guide continuous improvement activities at the curriculum and program of study levels. P-12 stakeholders interviewed at the Site Visit praised the perspicacity of the EPP's quality assurance system and have promoted elements of it to other EPPs with which they collaborate via a Clinical Summit, hoping that other EPPs will learn from Monmouth University's example.

5.2
The EPP's quality assurance system relies on several measures that are relevant, verifiable, representative, and actionable. EPP-developed assessments used to monitor candidate progress and completer achievements (e.g., Early Field Experience High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubric) meet or exceed CAEP criteria for adequacy, and the EPP provides evidence for establishing validity and reliability. The majority of measures included in the EPP's quality assurance system are externally developed instruments for which validity and reliability have been established in the research literature (e.g., CPAST, edTPA, Praxis). Three cycles of data demonstrating consistent outcomes across cohorts are available for almost all of the EPP-developed assessments, including the Early Field Experience High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubric, for which two additional cycles beyond the one provided in the Self-Study Report were provided in the Self-Study Addendum and Site Visit Addendum. Data from this assessment are congruent with data from complementary assessments. The EPP has piloted measuring student perceptions of its candidates' teaching performance via the Student Perception Survey (SPS) developed by the Colorado Education Intiative, for which validity and reliability have been established. While explicitly not a key assessment for accreditation purposes, as it is restricted to grades 3-12, data provided from a pilot implementation reinforce the already strong portrait of candidate competencies and performance established in other data sources. Data on completer achievements provided in New Jersey Department of Education reports support the EPP's interpretations of data on its candidates. The sequence of assessment instruments is carefully articulated to provide candidates and the mentors who support them with actionable formative feedback leading up to summative assessments for licensure. The high degree of success that completers experience on the summative assessments is a testament to the quality of the formative feedback and support system.

5.3
The EPP regularly and systematically assesses candidate and completer performance against InTASC Standards, New Jersey Professional Standards for Teachers and SPA standards, triangulating data from multiple assessment sources to inform continuous improvement efforts. Extensive evidence is provided of program changes implemented as a result of such analysis, including the addition of special education courses to the core teacher preparation curriculum. The SSR notes that "changes prompted by data [were] too substantive to include in the narrative, [and] therefore [were] included as Exhibit 5.3.B," and this exhibit clearly demonstrates explicit links to assessment data. Multiple constituencies of internal and external stakeholders meet regularly to review formative and summative data yielded by multiple local and external assessments, and the EPP provides ample evidence that progress toward meeting EPP goals is assessed at regularly scheduled meetings throughout the academic year. The Teacher Residency program is a notable example of an innovation implemented as a result of data analysis and stakeholder feedback, and tested through the EPP's quality assurance system. Documentation provided in the Self-Study Addendum and Site Visit Addendum exemplify a clear trajectory of continuous improvement and candidate and mentor support activities in the P-3 preparation program in response to data gathered on the first administration of the Early Field Experience High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubric. Data from

subsequent administrations of this assessment with the next cohorts of candidates, as well as from subsequent administrations of other key assessments with the original cohort, demonstrate the positive impact of these efforts over a remarkably brief time span.

5.4

Measures of completer impact are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely and acted upon in EPP decision making. The EPP considers four sources of completer impact: the New Jersey Department of Education's Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report, and EPP-developed and -administered surveys of exiting candidates, alumni, and employers. All four data sources indicate that EPP graduates have a positive impact on their students and schools. The State EPP report provides extensive data on completer employment outcomes and performance, including student growth information. The quality assurance system includes multiple feedback loops in which these data are reviewed by internal and external stakeholders, and evidence provided with the SSR demonstrates implementation of multiple continuous improvement and strategic planning initiatives based on these data. Completer survey results and performance data, including student growth data, are shared publicly on the EPP's website, and interviews with P-12 partners confirmed that the data shared in these reports are clearly and concisely presented and have value in supporting their collaborations with the EPP. Partners affirmed that collaborations between the EPP and P-12 are truly two-way, affording both parties the opportunity to co-construct assessment tools, processes, and clinical experiences and effect positive improvements to each other's systems.

5.5

The EPP regularly and systematically involves stakeholders in program evaluation and continuous improvement. External stakeholders have included P-12 teachers, P-12 administrators, employers and alumni. The EPP provides ample evidence that P-12 stakeholders were significant partners in co-constructing major clinical experience initiatives (e.g., Teacher Residency Program) and designing and/or implementing assessments of candidate and completer classroom performance (e.g., Student Perception Survey, High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics). Multiple overlapping constituent assemblies are highly engaged in analysis of data for program improvement, design of continuous improvement initiatives, and implementation and dissemination of innovative practices. Interviews with EPP leadership and P-12 partners affirmed the depth of mutually beneficial engagement between both parties. One partner described the relationship as "seamless ... albeit it [sic] appears casual, it's continual and keeps moving" as both parties leverage talent for continuous improvement. Partner professional development school representatives noted the strong responsiveness of the EPP to local needs, praising the EPP's willingness to embed faculty in P-12 schools to expand supports beyond those necessary to meet the needs of pre-service teachers to include professional learning and mentorship development for in-service teachers. P-12 partners are able to use their collaboration with the EPP for pre-service leaning as a leverage point for in-service professional learning. Interviews with EPP leadership confirmed that this seamlessness is by design and is the result of considerable investment in building relationships between the EPP and P-12 partners.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. SSR Exhibit 1.1.A Praxis II Content Assessments
2. SSR Exhibit 1.1.B edTPA
3. SSR Exhibit 1.1.C CPAST
4. SSR Exhibit 1.1.D Early Field High Leverage Teaching Practices Proficiency Rubrics
5. SSR Exhibit 1.3.C SPA and Program Approval
6. SSR Exhibit 2.1.L List of Collaborative Conference Presentations
7. SSR Exhibit 2.1.M PDS Partners journal article
8. SSR Exhibit 4.1.B NJ Performance Report
9. SSR Exhibit 5.1.A Quality Assurance System Operational Effectiveness
10. SSR Exhibit 5.3.A Innovations
11. SSR Exhibit 5.3.B Data Informed Program Improvements
12. SSR Exhibit 5.3.E EPP Strategic Plan
13. SSR Exhibit 5.3.F Sample DAC Meeting Minutes
14. SSR Exhibit 5.5.A Stakeholder Input
15. SSR Exhibit 5.5.B Teacher Residency Study
16. FFR Addendum Appendix 5.1a Early Field Rubric (High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics)
17. FFR Addendum Appendix 5.2a Early Childhood Program Advisory Council Summation of Minutes
18. FFR Addendum Appendix 5.6a Student Perception Survey
19. EPP CAEP Accreditation webpage (https://www.monmouth.edu/school-of-education/about/mission/caep-accreditation-data/; multiple reports)
20. Henning, J. E., Gut, D.M., & Beam, P.C. (2019) Building mentoring capacity in teacher education: A guide to clinically-based practice. New York: Routledge.
21. Site Visit Addendum Attachment 2a Early Field Rubric (High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics)
22. Site Visit interviews with school partners & PK-12 stakeholders
23. Site Visit interviews with members of decision-making group for teacher preparation
24. Teacher Residency Program Video
25. Site Visit interviews with Standard 5 team

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

None

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement

Area for Improvement	Rationale
None	N/A

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale
None	N/A

Section II.5A: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Advanced)

Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement
The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider 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.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

Task(s)

Action:

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 5:

a. Summary of findings

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement

Area for Improvement	Rationale

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale

Section III: Cross-cutting Themes of Diversity and Technology

1. DIVERSITY

a. Summary regarding adequacy and accuracy of evidence related to diversity

The EPP has identified diversity proficiencies aligned with the CAEP standards. The mission statement emphasizes addressing diversity, and faculty development activities for The EPP has identified diversity proficiencies aligned with the CAEP standards. The mission statement emphasizes addressing diversity, and faculty development activities for faculty about social justice have been held. Items from the edTPA and CPAST provide evidence that students are able to plan, implement, and evaluate their instruction for all students. Employers and alumni also highly rate the program's preparation of candidates to address diversity.

The EPP ensures that all candidates have diverse field and clinical experiences, and is putting forth an effort to increase the diversity of cooperating teachers. The program has implemented a recruitment plan, but goals for the program are not clear. In interviews, candidates, student teachers, and program completers were able to provide ample evidence related to their ability to addres the individual diversity of their students. They described placements in a series of diverse placements, culminating in the residency in a diverse school.

b. Evidence that adequately and accurately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of diversity

1.1B edTPA
1.1C CPAST
1.1D Early field high leverage teaching rubrics
2.1.J SOE Advisory Groups
3.1.A. Recruitment plan

3.1.B SOE enrollment by gender and ethnicity
4.1.A MU EPPPR
4.3.A Employer survey results
4.4A Exit survey
4.4.B Alumni survey

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of diversity

None

Note: Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each are cited under the relevant standard(s)

2. TECHNOLOGY

a. Summary regarding adequacy and accuracy of evidence related to technology

To respond to tasks generated in the formative feedback report, an instructional technology work group has been formed and is currently working to ensure that there are multiple sources of evidence demonstrating teacher candidates complete their program with the ability to design and facilitate digital learning. In addition, the group was charged to provide sites for candidates to useto support their teaching using technology.In addition, the EPP has developed an assessment to measure Instructional Technology Skills, adapted from one located on the ASCD website framed by the Danielson model Framework, developed by and for educators. Faculty input directed streamlining the assessment. Faculty members voted on the releance and inclusion of items for the assessment. A description of the pilot results were provided on site.

To provide a uniform experience for candidates, every teacher candidate is now required to complete early field and service learning hours in Long Branch School District, a Future Ready NJ school district. In this way, 100% of EPP candidate are placed in a Future Ready NJ District for at least one field placement. In interviews candidates described strong preparation in the infusion of technology, and provided several examples of the infusion of technology in their practice.

b. Evidence that adequately and accurately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of technology.

Appendix 1.9a Reports from two meetings of the Technology Work Group
Appendix 1.9b Assessment of Instructional Technology Skills.
Appendix 1.9c Discussion of technology assessment minutes
Appendix 1.9d Technology field site
1.1B ed TPA
1.1C CPAST
1.5A Candidate model and use of technology
1.5.B Technology crosswalk
1.5C Partner technology asset
4.3 Employer survey results
4.4A Exit Survey
4.4B Alumni survey

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of technology.

Note: Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each are cited under the relevant standard(s)

Section IV: Area(s) for Improvement cited from previous accreditation review, if any

Area(s) for Improvement cited from previous accreditation review, if any

Area for Improvement:	Rationale:
[NCATE STD4]Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with unit and P-12 school faculty from diverse backgrounds. [Both]	REMOVED: The EPP has made a good faither effort in increasing the diversity of the EPP faculty as well as partner school-based faculty.

Sources of Evidence

List of interviews and participants

Bill Gorman
Christine Grabowski
Gina Gileti
Greg Duffy
Heidi Bludau
Jaclyn Stinziano
James Falco
John Borman
Kristin Valinotti
Mary Brennan
Matt Yard
Alex Romagnoli
Mike Salvatore
Paula Kelberman
Rich Veit
Ruth Morris
Samantha Papa
Stacy Frazee
Tara Micciulla
Tracy Mulvaney
Wendy Harriot
William George
Kerry Carley-Rissuto
Radek Ostrowski
Sarah Moore
Danielle Schrama
Jennifer Joyce
Janis Marcus
Lauren Vento Cifelli

List of exhibits reviewed /List additional sources consulted (website, etc.)

1.1 C CPAST data
1.1D Early Field High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubric
1.3.C SPA and Program Approval
2.1B Monmouth Congratulatory Email and Press Release
2.1C School-University Partnership Award Article
2.1F Partnership Advisory Committee
2.2A NJ 9A-4.4 Clinical Component and Candidate Supervision
2.3A Clinical Hours
2.3D Developmental Curriculum

1.1.A Praxis II Content Assessments
1.1.B edTPA
1.1.C CPAST
1.1.D Early Field High Leverage Teaching Practices Proficiency Rubrics
1.1B ed TPA
1.1B edTPA
1.1C CPAST
1.1D Early field high leverage teaching rubrics
1.5.B Technology crosswalk
1.5A Candidate model and use of technology
1.5C Partner technology asset
2.1.J SOE Advisory Groups
2.1.L List of Collaborative Conference Presentations
2.1.M PDS Partners journal article
2018-2019 Monmouth University UG Catalog
3.1.A. Recruitment plan
3.1.B SOE enrollment by gender and ethnicity
3.A Innovations
4.1.A MU EPPPR
4.1.B NJ Performance Report
4.2.A A AchieveNJ Overview
4.3 Employer survey results
4.3.A Employer survey results
4.4 B Alumni survey
4.4.A Exit Survey Final
4.4.B Alumni Survey Final
4.4.C Fist Destination Survey
4.4A Exit survey
4.4B Alumni survey
5.1.A Quality Assurance System Operational Effectiveness
5.3.B Data Informed Program Improvements
5.3.E EPP Strategic Plan
5.3.F Sample DAC Meeting Minutes
5.5.A Stakeholder Input
5.5.B Teacher Residency Study
75% of programs are approved by SPAS
Addendum and the appendices 1.1a, 1.1b, 1.2a, 1.3a, 1.4a, 1.7a, 1.8a, 1.8b, 1.8c. 1.8d, 4.3a, 1.9a, 1.9b, and 1.9c.
Addendum Appendix 4.1A Education Preparation Provider Performance Report 2015, 2016, 2017
Addendum Appendix 5.1a Early Field Rubric (High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics)
Addendum Appendix 5.2a Early Childhood Program Advisory Council Summation of Minutes
Addendum Appendix 5.6a Student Perception Survey
Addendum Attachment 2a Early Field Rubric (High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics)
Appendix 1.9b Assessment of Instructional Technology Skills.
Appendix 1.9c Discussion of technology assessment minutes

Appendix 1.9d Technology field site
Appendix 3.10a Candidate Monitoring
Appendix 3.11a Quality Assurance System
Appendix 3.11b Minutes from Meetings Showing Shared Decision Making
Appendix 3.1a Recruitment Plan
Appendix 3.1b Strategic Plan
Appendix 3.1c SOE Meeting Minutes (highlighting social justice and diversity training)
Appendix 3.4a Admission Scores
Appendix 3.6a UG and MAT Acceptance Letters
Appendix 3.7a Dispositions Review
Appendix 3.9a Process for Conditional Acceptance
EPP CAEP Accreditation webpage (https://www.monmouth.edu/school-of-education/about/mission/caep-accreditation-data/; multiple reports)
EPP has reported on what they have learned about various programs from disaggregated data.
Henning, J. E., Gut, D.M., & Beam, P.C. (2019) Building mentoring capacity in teacher education: A guide to clinically-based practice. New York: Routledge.
Monmouth University School of Education MAT Handbook
Monmouth University School of Education Undergraduate Handbook
pendix 1.9a Reports from two meetings of the Technology Work Group
PP has analyzed the available data in a consistent manner by answering the same questions for all available cycles of data.
Sample Conditional Admission Letters
Sample Graduate Admission Conditional Acceptance Evaluation Forms
Sample Letters for When GPAs Fall Below a 3.0
Site Visit interviews with Standard 5 team
Student CARE Disposition Review Process (provided onsite)
Teacher Residency Program Video
The 1.5 Instructional Technology Update of the onsite addendum and the attachments 1f, 2a, provide consistent evidence related to technology.

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.