

2018 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	14843	AACTE SID:	
Institution:	Caldwell University		
Unit:	Professional Education Unit		

Section 1. AIMS Profile

After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate.

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2016-2017 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹ 48

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)² 92

Total number of program completers 140

¹ For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

² For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2016-2017 academic year?

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
No Change / Not Applicable
- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.
No Change / Not Applicable
- 3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited
No Change / Not Applicable
- 3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited
No Change / Not Applicable
- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements
No Change / Not Applicable

Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4 A.5.4)	
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3 A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4 A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

4.1 Provide a link or links that demonstrate data relevant to each of the Annual Reporting Measures are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's website.

1

Link: <https://caldwell-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/NJDoE2017Report.pdf>

Description of data accessible via link: This data has been provided by the NJ Department of Education to report on Novice Teachers from Caldwell University that have completed program and recommended for certification. The report only covers Public School and NJ Charter Schools. It does not account for students in Graduate School or moved out of state.

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?
 Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?
 Are benchmarks available for comparison?
 Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

This data shows a decline in education students with 100 completers in 2011 to 46 completers in 2016 -2017 - a trend of decreasing number of students, The climate has been difficult for teachers but another factor can be the Introduction of the Praxis Academic Core test to be passed in order to be accepted into Education. This test has created unintended barriers for students - especially minority students. For example, students take the different sections of the test multiple times. This has increased cost to the students as well as an increased difficulty to complete the program in four years.

The NJ data indicates that only 27.02% of the African American students pass the Math section compared to 54.95 % rate for total population. Similarly, students have a low performance on Writing with 57.85% pass rate for total and 30.55% rate for African American students.

Students are more successful on the Writing and Reading sections. For Reading the Total population have an 81.27 % pass rate for Total Population and 60% for African American Students.

The NJ School Report Card highlights the performance of the graduates of the preparation program with a 57% employment rate

withing 2 years of graduation. These numbers do not include all teachers in parochial schools, charter schools, students that moved out of state or attend graduate schools. The students that have two endorsements have a 77% employment rate as a teacher. This includes the Teacher of Student with Disabilities(TOSD) endorsement.

The students performed above the cut scores for the Praxis II Exit tests in their content area and withing a significant range of the NJ statewide performance.

The emerging trend of higher employ-ability with the TOSD endorsement suggests this be highly encouraged. Faculty will explore if this should be required for the students.

The university loan default rate is 6.8% and this rate is not disaggregated among majors. The Employer satisfaction area is one that needs to be addressed. It is difficult to get the specific reports - but the NJ EPP Report Card does include the effectiveness evaluations of the graduates employed in public schools.

This data is shared on the Education Portal page at the URL link provided above.

Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

TEAC: Weakness

1.5 Evidence of valid interpretations of the assessments

Cooperating teachers are inconsistently trained in the use of the student teaching assessment.

In the academic year 2015 - 2016 all college supervisors received professional development in relation to classroom observations, the academic terms related to the the upcoming edTPA and NJ Clinical Internship requirements. All cooperating teachers and clinical interns also met to hear the same requirements and review the Clinical Internship procedure. This procedure provided consistency among the three parties related to the clinical internship. Cooperating teachers not in attendance, received turn key training to review all observation and evaluation requirements. A Clinical Internship Handbook is online for all supervisors, cooperating teachers and clinical interns to ensure all have access to the same information.

For 2016 - 2017 the same process continued with plans to develop the validity of the instrument as related to teaching. This is being developed during the Spring of 2018 with other universities using the Lawsche Method to test for validity. The Inter Rater Reliability will be determined.

TEAC: Weakness

1.5 Evidence of valid interpretations of the assessments

The validity of assessments used for evidence of claims is not consistent.

As noted in the 2017 reportThe Clinical Inventory for Lesson Plans and Observations has been validated as a reliable as an instrument that is used by six different teacher preparation programs in NJ. Professional Development for Supervisors also included this instrument to insure inter rater reliability of the instrument. An in-depth analysis of the rubric is explained to students to be sure they understand each item as it is presented in the closing e Portfolio and Program Survey This has gone to the next level for validity by using the Lawsche Method to determine the strength of the validity. This is stil in the developing stage to be implemented as reliable and valid among varied teacher preparation programs in New Jersey.

The Educational leadership program is developing an assessment tool related to ethics.

TEAC: Weakness

1.5 Evidence of valid interpretations of the assessments

The reliability and validity of some measures were not presented, and in other cases were not established.

As noted in the 2017 report,In order to ascertain the validity of our measures we turned our EAS program claims into questions and applied the data to respond to the questions. For example, Question 1: Do candidates understand the theories and strategic decision-making of Educational Administration and Supervision (EAS) to meet the learning needs of students? We submit that the GPAs that they attained in their course work supports that understanding. Secondly, the Mentor rubric scores reflect how well our candidates implement their classroom learning during their Internship experience. The implementation is assessed by their mentor, college liaison, and themselves. Finally, the candidates performance on the SLLA exams indicates their knowledge of theory and strategic decision-making as represented therein.

The program leaders are working on developing reliable and valid measures using the Lawsche Method - and will work on presentation of established measures to be piloted in the 2018 - 2019 academic year. These include Action Research projects for

all Master level preparation, Clinical Inventory for Clinical Interns and the development of an ethical project for students at each level. Faculty meetings will be used to practice these steps.

TEAC: Weakness

2.1 Rationale for assessments

The rationale and justification for certain measures as representing certain instructional goals and program claims are not explicitly aligned. This alignment is especially underdeveloped with regard to the cross-cutting themes.

As noted in earlier reports, mentor rubrics for 2015-16 were reported. The results of these ratings demonstrated a 98% agreement among the raters. We have also revised the mentor rubric and used the revised rubric in Spring 2016 Spring 2017. We have included additional references to the cross-cutting themes. In 2014, the Action Research rubric was revised to capture assessment of the cross-cutting themes. We also revised the Annual Program Evaluation Survey. Please note: The question areas of Research Skill, engagement with technology. For example, "How successfully did the EAS Program make you a more independent learner?"

The Cross cutting themes of Diversity and Technology need to be emphasized and aligned with standards. They are embedded in each syllabus and will highlighted in the template for developing each class.

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

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.

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks 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.

6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloging continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

The NJ Department of Education provided Educator Performance Reports.

Over the last three years, students have been employed within the state employment range. In 2016, Caldwell University had a high employment rate of 70%. Students that completed two endorsements had a rate of employment of 77% in 2017 and 80% in 2016. These students had included the Teacher of Student with Disabilities (TOSD) endorsement with their Elementary or Secondary Content Area. This double certification should be stressed with the students be sure they are more qualified to be hired

at the end of the studies. These students are the ones that graduated to the Teacher of Students with Disability certification. Students with this certification had 76 % employment rate in 16 - 17 and 67% employment rate in 17 - 18.

The median GPA for 2016 cohort was 3.42 and 2017 was 3.6. The students performed above the test cut scores on the Praxis and in 2016 were above the NJ state average or within a range of five points, and in 2017 the students were above the NJ state average or within a range of three points.

This report highlights the employment rate and the persistence rate for the students hired in NJ Public Schools and Charter Schools for 15 -16 and just NJ public schools for 16 - 17.

The NJ Department of Education provided the multiple sources of data for the information. This included NJ Smart, TCIS and NJSure.

Caldwell posted this information on the Education Portal Page for the university and professors share the outcomes at faculty meetings and in assessment reports.

Clinical Inventory

This Clinical Inventory used by Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors for six different colleges and universities. Members from different Educational Preparation Programs used the Lawshe Method for measuring validity has been applied to this measure. The preparation steps are documented to determine the validity of the Clinical Intern measure. The form for the expert ratings, the sample of the rating scales for each item and a copy of the instrument. The Clinical Inventory is used to help students grow and development in the Instructional Planning, Delivery of Lessons and Assessments. Students can retain documents to help understand their strengths as well as areas to be developed. This document should be validated for use in the 2018 - 2019 academic year.







Caldwell maintains the recruitment standards to enter the School of Education. Students can have a 2.75 GPA to enter Education but must have a 3.0 to be certified at the end of the program. Students need to also pass the Academic Core Reading, Writing and Math tests to be fully enrolled in Education Courses. This test has been difficult statewide for the many students to pass the Math portion of the test. Only 20% of minority student pass this test and cannot be admitted to a teacher preparation program. Caldwell has initiated a pilot program for students to attend free Math review sessions for tow hours a week each semester. The pilot seems to be helpful for students that attend three or more sessions and are able to meet the cut scores for entrance to Education. more forma data is in preparation as this began in 2017 - 2018.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the data or changes apply.

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
- 3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
- 3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
- 4.4 Completer satisfaction
- 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.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities
- A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
- A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
- A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
- A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
- A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
- A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
- x.1 Diversity
- x.2 Technology
- x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

x.5 State Standards (if applicable)

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  NJDOE_EPP_Report.pdf
-  NJDOE_EPP_Report_2017.pdf
-  EducationEdAdmin_AssmtReport_201617_(8)rev2_(7).docx
-  Sample_CAEP_Rubric_LIST.pdf
-  Ed_Leadership_Assessment_Report.pdf
-  Ed_LEadership_CAEP_687_Rubric.pdf
-  Undergraduate_Assessment.pdf

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or service activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

not yet, when the measures are in excellent shape and not preparation stage, we would be willing to share.

Section 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a successful transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful reflection regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPP's evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progress made on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use the Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level.

If there are no identified gaps, click the box next to "No identified gaps" and proceed to question 7.2.

No identified gaps

If there are identified gaps, please summarize the gaps and any steps planned or taken toward the gap(s) to be fully prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text applies.

4.3 We need to work on Employer Satisfaction Surveys on a planned rotational basis.
5.2 Prepare and update reliable and valid measures for outcomes
A.4.1 We need to work on Employer Satisfaction Surveys on a planned rotational basis.
A5.3 Prepare Continuous Improvement plan based on data results.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the text applies.

1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
4.3 Employer satisfaction
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.5.3 Continuous Improvement

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

Yes No

7.3 If no, please describe any changes that mean that the EPP does not continue to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2018 EPP Annual Report.

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Joan H Moriarty
Position: Associate Dean of Education
Phone: 973-618-3394
E-mail: jmorarty@caldwell.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completer data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site visit report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

Acknowledge

