2019 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	⊙	○
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	⊙	○
1.1.3 Program listings	⊙	○

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 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure[1]   64

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]   56

Total number of program completers   120

---

[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 2017-2018 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited

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

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

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://eppdata.doe.state.nj.us/report-pdf/Caldwell%20University-All%20Programs.pdf

Description of data accessible via link: New Jersey Department of Education EPP Performance Report

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	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Advanced-Level Programs			☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑

2

Link: https://www.caldwell.edu/academics/academic-departments/department-of-education

Description of data accessible via link: Link of CU Education Website that leads to EPP report.

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	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Advanced-Level Programs			☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑

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?*

1. Impact on P-12 learning and development
(Component 4.1)
P-12 Implications and Effectiveness
Caldwell University candidates from 2015 - 2016 have 72.2% persistence at the school level, 77.8% at the district and 88.9% at the state level. These numbers were lower to trends from the previous year of 2014 - 2015 at both the school and district level but significantly the same at 88. % for the state level. Candidates changes schools or districts but remained employed in the state. Reports from 2016 note that 2% of candidates were employed in priority schools, 10% in focus schools and 2% in rewards school.

In 2018, 100% were employed in Not classified schools and employed as teachers compared to the 88.2% of the state level. Completer demographics for each of these years are primarily white and female. In 2018, this category was specific with 82.8% female and 17.2% male. This same population was 65.6% white, 1.6% black, 9.4% Hispanic, 4.7% Asian/Pacific Islander and 18.8% did not report race. These numbers have raised trends to expand recruitment of candidates to increase diversity of the candidates. The SoE has also worked with state legislators to coordinate efforts to improve the entry rates of candidates into education using the Academic Core Praxis. The Mathematics and Writing Core tests seem to be gatekeepers to many diverse candidates and we would like to suggest flexibility in entry to program and maintain all the rigors to stay in the requirement.

2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness

(Component 4.2)
Caldwell University has reviewed multiple sources of data and candidates demonstrate proficiency for each of the CAEP, InTASC standards and New Jersey Professional Standards for Teaching. The CU candidates perform at the national and state level for the proprietary assessments Praxis II and edTPA. The data also indicates the need to recruit to a diverse population and has been added to the School of Education Five Year Plan.
NJ requires all candidates to have a minimum Grade Point Average (GPA) of 3.0 for certification. The median Grade Point Average for each cohort is above the NJ required 3.0 at the time of certification In 2016 the cohort had 3.4 GPA and in 2017 3.6 was the cohort GPA. Caldwell has a 100% pass rate of candidates up until 2019. All clinical interns have passed the required Praxis II requirements for their clinical area before they complete their clinical internship. This year the required edTPA performance assessment had a status of take and complete to pass. Beginning in the fall 2019, all candidates will be required to take and pass a pre-determined cut score to pass. If this was in place an average of 2 candidates would have had to retake this test for certification. CU candidates performed above the national and NJ pass rates for each of these assessments.
Sharing Data
The annual reports are posted on the Department of Education website and the Caldwell University website. These findings are shared at School of Education faculty meetings, at university meetings and Open House Events for new candidates. The data has raised a concerted effort for CU to look for diverse candidates to enter the teacher preparation program. As part of the College of Professional Studies, we have reached out to local districts in urban areas and invited high school students to visit campus for a tour and take some mini classes in Education, Business and Communication. It is hoped that we would pick up some interested candidates and plant the seed to be a teacher.
The data does suggest that our candidates persist in teaching and recent alumni surveys indicate that the candidates felt prepared to be effective in the classroom. Both employers and alumni note the quality of preparation the alumni and the employers note the quality of the preparation (see Employer and Alumni Surveys).
Data measuring proficiency of candidates include proprietary and EPP measures. For the Undergraduate (UG) Praxis I Academic Core and edTPA are both required for NJ certification. There are also the EPP created assessments Clinical Competency Inventory, (CCI), Observation Feedback Form, Caldwell University (CU) and the Lesson Plan. Each of these assessments demonstrate CU candidates proficiency with the CAEP standards, InTASC standards and NJ Professional Standards for Teacher Education (NJSTE). Results are disaggregated by cohort for each Standard and Certification area.
The School of Education Faculty reviewed results of the varied assessments and made suggestions to enhance or add into sequential curriculum to improve results. For example, the Post Baccalaureate Elementary Education candidates will be introduced to the CU Lesson Plan as they enter to improve their results for Planning and Implementation of lessons.

3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones
(Component 4.3 | A.4.1)
Recent surveys fall 2018 and spring 2019 indicate positive trends fro employers and employment. As noted on the NJ have positive responses.
Spring 2018
The School of Education had 125 Education alumni who graduated between December 2015 and August 2018 and received their initial certification were invited to take the survey. The survey was administered on December 6, 2018,and two reminder emails were sent on December 12, 2018 and December 20,2018. Overall, 34 alumni responded, a 27% response rate.

A little more than half of the alumni were in one of the bachelor's in education programs and a little less than half were in of the Post-baccalaureate program. Specifically, 29% (10 out of 34) were in the Bachelor's in Elementary Education program and 27% (9 out of 34) were in the Bachelor's in Secondary Education. Furthermore, 32% (11 out of 34) were in the Post-BACC elementary education program and 12% (4 out of 34) were in the Post-BACC secondary education program. There was a range of 94% - 100% for each survey questions that the alumni agreed and or strongly agreed that they felt they were prepared to be effective teachers. See Evidence in this report.

Specific_Employer_Survey_Report_for_Undergraduate_Alumni_(01.31.19)_(3).pdf

Surveys were sent to recent employers of Caldwell University candidates. There was a low response rate with an n = 4. There was 100% response rate that each employer agreed or strongly agreed with each question on the survey.

These surveys were sent again in spring 2019.

4. Satisfaction of completers
(Component 4.4 | A.4.2)
Spring 2018
The School of Education had 125 Education alumni who graduated between December 2015 and August 2018 and received their

initial certification were invited to take the survey. The survey was administered on December 6, 2018,and two reminder emails were sent on December 12, 2018 and December 20,2018. Overall, 34 alumni responded, a 27% response rate.

A little more than half of the alumni were in one of the bachelor's in education programs and a little less than half were in of the Post-baccalaureate program. Specifically, 29% (10 out of 34) were in the Bachelor's in Elementary Education program and 27% (9 out of 34) were in the Bachelor's in Secondary Education. Furthermore, 32% (11 out of 34) were in the Post-BACC elementary education program and 12% (4 out of 34) were in the Post-BACC secondary education program. There was a range of 94% - 100% for each survey questions that the alumni agreed and or strongly agreed that they felt they were prepared to be effective teachers. See Evidence in this report.
Undergraduate_Education_Alumni__Initial_Certification_Report_(01.31.19)_(1).pdf

A focus group for Initial completers and Advanced completers were conducted separately for each group in fall 2019. A transcription of the findings was completed and a member of the School of Education that conducted the group is analyzing trends. This was an adaptation of a Focus Group discussed at CAEP CON Fall 2018 from the University of Alaska.

5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)1
Initial A six year graduation rate from cohort of FT Freshman beginning in 2012. Once candidates get admitted to the School of Education after the Praxis I requirement, there is a 100% certification rate of candidates.

The Caldwell University undergraduates have a 58% six year graduation rate for the cohort beginning in the fall 2012. Evidence: Caldwell Fact Book 2018
6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
Initial
Advanced

7. The Initial and Advanced of completers demonstrate evidence to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels). The NJ Department of Education EPP provider report for the last 3 years highlights candidates with two endorsement have a 58.8% employment rate from May graduation to October 15. 100% of these candidates worked in schools not classified as a Focus, Priority or Reward Schools. The candidates were all emplyed under their certification and not as long term subs or para professionals. The 2017 EPP report noted that completes from the previous two cohorts had a 57% employment rate and 69% employment rat from years 2015 - 2016 and 2013 - 2014.
Candidates in employed in Focus Schools was 8 % which is the same as the NJ rate and 3% for Priority Schools which is slightly higher than 2% statewide.
8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)2
The university has a 8.3% loan default rate as noted for 2019 - 2020.

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.

The School of Education shares with engaged stakeholders through the School of Education Advisory Board and the Caldwell University Principals' Roundtable. Topics include changes in the clinical internship with edTPA and the video tape requirement. All clinical clinical intern expectations and experiences in the field are assessed with reliable and valid instruments used by the Clinical Supervisors (CS) and the Cooperating Teachers (CT). CU share instruments and the preparation of Clinical Supervisors (CS) and Cooperating Teachers (CT) prior to each semester to view the instrument and practice using the instrument viewing common scenarios.
History of Clinical Competency Inventory (CCI)
The Critical Competency Inventory (CCI) is a performance assessment tool that is implemented by Educational Preparation Programs (EPP) members of the New Jersey Teacher Assessment Collaborative (NJTAC). Members formed a consortium to design and implement a tool that was aligned to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) and New Jersey Professional Teaching Standards (NJPST). The group has met for more than 10 years to design and continuously revise instrument based on current data. A previous Field Placement Director from Caldwell University videotaped a series of practicing teachers during the 2008 -2009 academic year. The teachers were selected to represent relatively new teachers in the field and represent novice teaching styles and procedures in the school setting. The videotapes represented varied grade levels and content areas in a suburban setting.
The CCI has been developed and adapted to changes for more than ten years. The tool was originally designed by four institutions (including Caldwell University) and a member of the NJDOE. The tool was intended to be a performance- based assessment originally based on the TEAC standards and then adapted to be aligned to the (InTASC) 2011 and NJPST that are required for certification in New Jersey. This tool is designed to identify the competencies each clinical intern should have

mastered in order to be recommended for New Jersey certification. Each of the institutions have a systematic professional development in place to train the clinical supervisors that use this tool. This tool has been validated again with a complete factor analysis for reliability and validity.

There has been a focus to be sure all clinical supervisor (CS) and Cooperating Teachers (CT) have consistent development using the instruments that evaluate clinical internships and classroom observations. Each EPP member of the New Jersey Teacher Assessment Collaborative (NJTAC) agreed to implement a systematic professional development for the CS and CT prior to each semester of clinical internship. A former Field Director from Caldwell University videotaped a wide range of beginning teachers from varied grade levels and content areas. Members of the NJTAC selected the videotapes to use and included a fourth grade math lesson, eighth grade Art lesson and a third grade literacy lesson. These video have no commentary and represent diverse student population of learners. The teachers videotaped new teacher who would represent the range of professional practice.

At the professional development training prior to each new semester, a videotape is shown and the CS complete the CCI form independently. The clinical supervisors then discuss their independent ratings in a small group. When there is a discrepancy in the ratings, the field director tries to bring consensus by discussing what the CS should review from the lesson. This is a valuable part of the training that provides time for discussion of components and indicators that were seen or not seen in the lesson. These discussions affirm important components of the standards and what the indicators look like in a lesson. These systematic steps in professional development helps to establish inter rater reliability of CS with in the institution and in the consortium. Beginning in the spring semester 2019, all CT's will be required to view the videotape and the discussions related to the consensus of the CCI scores. They will complete an online quiz for understanding and opportunity to review. The CS will also help the CT with the understanding of this tool.

Leveraging Data
Each institution develops their inter-rater reliability among the supervisors at the end of the session. If this reliability is low, a future training session is scheduled. An Inter rater reliability is also established between the CS and CT at the end of each semester. Data is disaggregated by program and reviewed in relation to CAEP, InTASC and NJ Professional Standards for Teaching.

Triangulation of Data and Quality of Data
Caldwell University established reliability in Spring 2018, Fall 2018, Spring 2019 by establishing the percentage of agreement between the CS and the CT. The overall near percentage of agreement was 97%. The professional development training indicates that the desired results for CCI. Caldwell will continue to review the inter-rater reliability between the CS and CT. Trends are similar over each semester and candidates demonstrate proficiency for each standard with multiple measures that include CCI, edTPA and Caldwell University Lesson Plans. Each of the EPP created assessment meet the Sufficient level criterion for CAEP Evaluation.

TEAC: Weakness   1.5 Evidence of valid Interpretations of the assessments

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

The School of Education shares with engaged stakeholders through the School of Education Advisory Board and the Caldwell University Principals' Roundtable by sharing clinical intern expectations and experiences in the field. CU share instruments and the preparation of Clinical Supervisors (CS) and Cooperating Teachers (CT). The results are monitored each semester and have similar trends for each subgroup or cohort. The School of Education Faculty review data and adjust curriculum or syllabus to meet the needs of the candidates. The candidates continue to demonstrate proficiency in each area.
The Assessments meet the sufficient level or higher for EPP Created Assessments by demonstrating Administration and Purpose, Content of Assessment, Scoring, Data Reliability, Survey Content and Survey Data Quality. Each of these areas are addressed in the evidence or exhibits for the assessments.

Assessments used for evidence:
1. Praxis II:
The Praxis assessments consist of an extensive array of content knowledge test, pedagogical tests and academic skill test that are used nu states and other credentialing agencies to inform decisions regarding licensure. The validation of credentialing tests depends mainly on content related evidence, often in the form of judgments that the test adequately represents the content domain associated with an occupation or specialty being considered. For example, content being provided about the process y which specifications for the content domain were developed and the expertise of the individuals making the judgments about the content domain. Criterion related evidence is pf limited applicability because the credentialing examinations are not intended to predict performance in a specific job but to provide evidence that the candidates have acquired the knowledge, skills, and judgment required for effective performance (https://www.ets.org/s/praxis/pdf/validity.pdf. p. 1). Candidates perform at or above the state and national means for passing each content related Praxis II.

2. edTPA: This information from Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity states: The validation of teacher licensure assessments for standardized tests and performance assessment traditionally is anchored in establishing a systematic evaluation of the relationship between the theoretical constructs that define effective teaching and the individual characteristics that define successful job performance. Predictive validity studies for licensure assessments with established levels of reliability and validity generally examine the relationship between teacher effectiveness and student learning, as well as teacher effectiveness and instructional practice on the job. T The test is required to take and complete for the academic year 2018 - 2019

and candidates will be required to meet determined cut scores to pass beginning in fall 2019.

The Lawshe Method was established to determine content validity for each assessment that is not proprietary..The Clinical Competency Inventory
(CCI) and the Observation Feedback for feedback in the clinical practice or experiences by Cooperating Teacher and Clinical Supervisor.s. Validity and Inter-rater reliability were established. An initial document was designed that had specific indicators for each competency that was connected to a specific standards. This document was analyzed and reviewed for items not mentioned, improved clarity of wording, and checked for redundancies.
· NJTAC continued the revision process. The instrument was revised again and it was now noted that there were many non observable items that were not represented in the CCI. A separate form was designed to be sure the CS considered these items as part of the final summative assessment but would not have been observable in the lesson. Candidates from each program were proficient in each CAEP standards aligned to the CCI and OFF.
· In 2008, a small group of CS piloted the initial instrument. Revisions were made based on feedback. Then content experts were contacted for validation. These forms were sent to varied populations to provide feedback. Members of the validation team included: a) supervisors who used the form, b) field supervisors/certification officers, c) student teachers from pilot group, d) educational researchers and practitioners representing New Jersey School Administrators, New Jersey Principal and Supervisors Association, the New Jersey Professional TEAC.

Each of these assessments demonstrate candidate proficiency with CAEP standards, each of the InTASC and NJPST to ensure effective candidates to transition to the field of education. The confidence levels increase with the triangulation of the data for each of the standards.Validity and Inter-rater reliability are presented for the Caldwell University Lesson Plan. A technology project rubric is in the process of being validated.

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.

Educational Leadership
Engagement of Stakeholders
The School of Education communicates with engaged stakeholders through the School of Education Advisory Board and the Caldwell University Principals' Roundtable by sharing School Leader expectations and experiences in the field. We share instruments and the preparation of University Supervisors and Principal mentors.
All candidates are monitored for GPA throughout the program that the candidates maintain a 3.0 GPA or higher by the Coordinator of the program and the Associate Dean. A candidate cannot have a grade lower than a B and a letter is sent regarding GPA and progress in each course.
Assessments
Educational Leadership
Praxis II is a proprietary assessment and reliability and validity is established as noted
(https://www.ets.org/s/praxis/pdf/validity.pdf
All School Leaders must pass the Praxis II for School Leaders and in fall 17, spring 18 there was a mean of 92.3% passing this assessment. The n for fall 2018 was too small to report. Candidates meet or surpass the NJ rate for passing this assessment.

Capstone Research Project The rubric for the Capstone research project has been validated and inter-rater reliability established.
Educational Administration Research Project Capstone research. Candidates complete action research that supports Standard 1.1a with applications of data literacy. Candidates complete data analysis on their action research projects and 1.1b) they use data analysis and evidence from their research projects to develop supportive environments.
Internship Experience and Log
Internship Experience: The Internship experience is aligned with the CAEP standards and New Jersey Standards for School Leaders (NJSSL) standards. The candidates complete 300 hour internship and demonstrate a balance of experience with each of the standards in a school setting. Activities include collaborative activities with each of the stakeholders in the school community with proper dispositions and codes of ethics for professional responsibility. Each candidate completes an Internship log recording 300 hours of internship and reflections of their experience for each standard. This rubric has validity established by the Lawshe Method.

Members of the Educational Advisory Board were part of the expert panel asked to rate the rubrics to determine validity for the Educational Leadership program. These members are local Superintendents, Principals and Directors from various districts.

The candidates are monitored throughout their 300 hour internship over two semesters. Candidates are part of the MA Educational Administration or the Post MA Principal Certification. Each program has the same requirements that include maintenance of GPA to be 3.0 or higher, take and pass the Praxis II School Leadership assessment, complete the Internship requirements that span each of the New Jersey School Leaders (NJSSL) standards and complete the Internship documentation and reflection log. The assessment of these experience increase the confidence level that candidates will be effective leaders.

MA Advanced Programs with Certification
MA Literacy Instructions, MA Special Education and LDT- C Certification
The Capstone MA Educational Administration class is an Action Research Project is completed with a rubric that has content validity and inter rater reliability established. All candidates are monitored to insure they meet all the research requirements for

data literacy during the 2 semester research project. Faculty mentors meet as a class and individually during the research project. Each study must be present to the IRB Board for Approval.

All Advanced Master level programs complete a research project from a 2 semester class Ed 610 Educational Research I and Ed 611 Educational Research II. The completed research paper is assessed with a content validated rubric that established inter-rater reliability. This research supports Advanced Standard A.1 1.1a with applications of data literacy. Candidates complete data analysis on their action research projects and 1.1b) they use data analysis and evidence from their research projects to develop supportive environments.

The Rubrics meet the Sufficient Level of Evaluation according to the CAEP Standards.

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.

Measures aligned with Instructional Goals: We claim that candidates are Proficient in the following:
I Research, Data Literacy and Analys
a) Demonstrate mastery research using data to inform instruction and next steps
II Collaboration with Colleagues and Community
b) Are knowledgeable in the application of pedagogical practices, technological strategies, and ethical practices to promote professional development activities
III Reflection and Professional collaboration in the School Community
c) Reflect upon practices and collaborate with other professionals in the school or community.

Caldwell University provides strong evidence in this self study report that candidates meet the Advanced CAEP standards with proficiency or higher at specific progress points in the Advanced Programs for certification. This demonstration includes high Praxis II scores for School Leaders as compared to state and national scores, Proficiency of higher in Capstone Action Research projects, School Leader Internship experiences connected to the NJPSSL standards and NJ Department of Education requirements.

Praxis II
All candidates in the MA Educational Administration and the Post Master Principal certification program must tale the Praxis II School Leaders Licensure Assessment. Over the past three academic years, The mean score of 175.86 was slightly higher than the national mean of 174.6 and the state mean of 174.77 Exhibit Praxis A,1.

Candidates prepared in advanced programs apply their knowledge and skills so that learning and development opportunities for P-12 students are enhanced through data literacy, use of research, data analysis and evidence, collaborations with colleagues and community, appropriate use of technology for the candidate's field, and applications of professional dispositions, laws, and policies.
Historically, these projects have been recognized and presented at New Jersey Standards Boards for the strength and caliber of research for each group. A Problem Based Inquiry group presented for the Archdiocese of Newark and the Educational Administration candidates have presented at the NJ Department of Education for research related to Professional Learning Communities and Teacher Evaluation with Charlotte .Danielson

All Master level Programs that lead to advanced certification require a minimum of two semesters on as a capstone research project related to their field of study. These include a) Literacy Instruction (reading certification) b) Special Education for Teachers of Student with Disability endorsement. and c) Educational Administration (School Leader - Principal) requires three semesters of research are required. These capstone classes required for School Leaders includes Ed 616 Quantitative and Qualitative Research for Educational Administrators and a 2 semesters of Ed 686 Problem Based Inquiry I in Education Administration and Problem Based Inquiry II for Education Administration.
The capstone courses for literacy and special education are Ed 610 Educational Research I and Ed 611 Educational Research II. The Capstone action research projects demonstrate proficiency or higher in the CAEP areas of data literacy, research and analysis aligned with professional standards and ethical standards. As noted, before any data is collected, candidates must submit research proposal to IRB to insure the study is safe for all participants.
The MA candidates complete research in their area of study related to educational administration, Special Education, Literacy Instruction or Curriculum.
The rubric for research projects has been validated by the Lawshe method by 18 experts in the field rated the content validity and needed to be above proportional agreement 0.722 and the rubric exceeded this criteria with a point value of 0.444 for each criterion. Exhibit Rubric ed611.

The cross cutting themes of diversity and technology are embedded in assignments as noted in lesson plan and the advanced level.

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 cataloguing 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?

INITIAL: Caldwell University provides quality assurance evidence from reliable and valid assessments aligned to each standard. Each standard is measured with specific assessments that triangulate the outcomes and increase the confidence of the results. Data results are analyzed at School of Education faculty meetings to analyze what, if any adjustments need to be made within any of the programs. Here are examples of data aligned with components and standards, an analysis among programs and suggestions for improvement after analyzing data. Continuous improvement is demonstrated with analysis of results by School of Education faculty and suggestions to make changes or enhance area of curriculum to help students. For example, throughout the data candidates perform higher at planning tasks than assessments. See evidence to enhance assessment activities across the areas of the program.

Assessments Identified to Measure Competency in CAEP Standards 1.1,1.2,1.3, 1.4 and 1.5
1.Praxis II: To earn New Jersey Teacher certification each candidate is required to pass a Praxis II assessment in the content area they preparing to teach. This test is required and each test has a predetermined cut score for passing as determine. EXHIBIT AR.Evidence Content Knowledge PRAXIS II.docx
2. edTPA: (edTPA 1.1d) is a performance-based, subject-specific assessment and support system used by teacher preparation programs throughout the U.S. to emphasize, measure and support the skills and knowledge that all teachers need from Day 1 in the classroom. For 2017 - 2018 and 2018 - 2019 all students were required to take and complete the required sections in order to pass. The required test scores for passing will be implemented beginning the fall 2019 administration. Of the 44 submissions, 2 candidates would have been required to resubmit to pass for certification. edTPA 1.1b
3. Clinical Competency Inventory (CCI Exhibit 1.1a) is an instrument currently used by a consortium of nine colleges and universities in northern New Jersey to provide formative and summative feedback to candidates in our respective teacher preparation program. The CCI is aligned to the Interstate Teacher Assessment Support Consortium (inTASC) Standards and the New Jersey Professional Standards for Teaching (NJPST). The performance-based instrument was developed in 2007 and is continually reviewed by the consortium, with its most recent revision (version 3.3) completed in the spring of 2018 and included in this report. The previous version (3.2) was the one in use during the spring semester of 2018.
A factor analysis study completed in the summer of 2018 led to minor changes to the CCI reducing the number of indicators from 35 to 34. Studies reviewing the content validity and inter - rater reliability are included in the Exhibit CCI 1.1a. Similar to the OFF, each indicator is rated along a scale of "Emergent", "Novice", "Proficient" and "Advanced Proficient". The CT and CS discuss the findings and review with the clinical interns. Exhibit CCI 1.1a

4 Observation Feedback Form:(OFF 1.1b) Clinical Supervisors (CS) and the Cooperating Teacher (CT) complete the forms when candidates are in the field prior to and during their Clinical Practice. This familiarizes the candidates with the form and helps to

identify areas of strength and areas to emphasize for improvement. The CS observes the candidate four times in the first semester and six times in the second. The CT observes the candidate twice in the first semester and four times in the second. The CS and CT conduct three co-observations during that second semester in order that we may assess inter-rater reliability. Both the CS and the CT have received professional development using the instrument. Exhibit1.1b OFF_____

The OFF reliability and Validity was established at the same time as CCI (CCI 1.1a). All of the NJPST and InTASC Standards are addressed in the OFF form through the alignment of the standard and a rubric that enables the observer to determine the candidate's level of proficiency with the CCI. The progression of the rubric continuously increases from "Emergent" to "Novice", "Proficient' and "Advanced Proficient". The expectation is that at each level the candidate demonstrates increased ability to provide the learners with the depth and breadth of the particular discipline. Evidence OFF 1.1d

5. Caldwell University Lesson Plan:The School of Education designed, validated, implemented and copyrighted a lesson plan since 2008. The Lesson Plan designed originally in two forms, an Introductory Lesson and an Advanced Lesson Plan. The Advanced Lesson Plan is now used for all candidates in each of the courses in Education. This lesson plan was updated to include Academic Language in 2017- 2018 academic year and validation has been updated fall 2018. The artifacts are collected in Live Text for both UG and PB candidates in the final course before the full year Clinical Practice. (Evidence 1.1 e).
A full template, description and rubric is in (Evidence 1.1e) and the carrying weight for each criterion is noted.
6. Alumni Survey: The alumni survey (Fall 2018) asks graduates about the preparation they received to be an effective teacher. The results indicate that 97% of the Initial candidates felt prepared to be an effective teacher and to engage in diverse settings in fall 2018. A disaggregated list of content areas for UG and PB candidate in 1.1f Alumni with detailed data.
7. Employer Survey: The fall 2018 employer survey (n=4) provides further support that our EPP graduates are prepared to be effective teachers and demonstrate effective instructional practices. One response noted to continue to stress differentiation in the classroom. Detailed data and copies of survey are in 1.1 g

Alumni Surveys were sent and reviewed in fall 2018 and spring 2019. There were 26 respondents with a range of 97% - 94 % felt they were prepared to be effective and ethical teachers in the classroom. There were respondents from the Undergraduate and Post Baccalaureate Initial Teacher certification programs as well as representatives from the elementary and secondary programs. There was one respondent not happy and had seems unclear of deadlines. There were suggestions for more Praxis Review opportunities which we did incorporate in the Recruitment and Retention plan for both Initial and Advances programs.

Employer Satisfaction The response for this survey had an n=4 but the responses were 100% for each category the CU had prepared the UG candidates to be effective teachers in the classroom and the school community.

Evidence. AR.edTPA_faculty.docx
Caldwell University provides strong evidence in this self-study report that candidates demonstrate the 10 InTASC standards with proficiency or higher at specific progress checkpoints in the EPP program. This demonstration includes Initial certification candidates from the Undergraduate (UG) and the Post Baccalaureate (PB) cohorts representing both elementary and secondary candidates for each content area. In this self-study, content areas includes K-6 elementary certification or K- 12 secondary certification in Art, English Math, Music, Social Studies and Spanish. Disaggregated evidence is provided for each group for each standard. An analysis of findings and trends is included that highlighted strengths and areas to be strengthened for each standard. Details in evidence 1.1a Clinical Competency, 1.1b AR Evidence Observation Feedback Form, 1.1c AR Factor Analysis Evidence Content Knowledge Praxis, 1.1dAR Evidence edTPA, 1.1e ARCU Lesson Plan, 1.1f AR Undergraduate Alumni Survey and 1.1g Undergraduate Employer Survey.
Three semesters of data are presented and at the end of each semester, data is reviewed for strengths, areas of improvement and implications to the program. For example, reviewing the data for edTPA the Undergraduate and Post Baccalaureate candidates are stronger in planning lessons than in the area of assessment. The faculty reviewed data and planned to incorporate how to give feedback in a conference for formative feedback – to be sure to highlight what was completed correctly and what needs to be changed.
ADVANCED
The programs leading to advanced certification are aligned with standard 1 and each MA program has ab action research project tc complete a data literacy analysis. Each of the Capstones projects have a reliable and valid data for research and as well as practicum and internship experiences.
The assessments created by Caldwell University meet the sufficient level or higher as they monitor progress in the program and information is used for mentoring. The assessments have demonstrated content validity, inter rater reliability, and are aligned to the CAEP, New Jersey Professional Standards for Teaching of NJ Professional Standards for School Leaders.

The School of Education Faculty review the data each semester and provide input for enhancements or changes to the curriculum. For example, adding additional activities to provide feedback to learners in relation to the formative and summative assessments as a result of lower edTPA scores in this area.

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

1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
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
4.3 Employer satisfaction
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
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
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.3.4 Selection at Completion
A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
A.5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
A.5.5 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.

- Undergraduate_Education_Alumni__Initial_Certification_Report_(01.31.19)_(1).pdf
- Specific_Employer_Survey_Report_for_Undergraduate_Alumni_(01.31.19)_(3).pdf
- AR.Evidence_Content_Knowledge_PRAXIS_II.docx
- AR.Evidence_Observation_Feedback_Form.docx
- AR.edTPA_faculty.docx
- AR_Analysis_and_InterpretationedTPA.docx
- Recruitment_Plan.docx

📎 ams_1.1a_CCI13.26.docx
📎 Ed611_VAlidity.docx

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

⊙ Yes ○ No

6.3 Optional Comments

CU also conducted a focus group for both Initial and Advanced Alumni members. This is being transcribed and attached to our CAEP submission in the summer. Thanks to the CAEPcon in Fall 2019 and the sharing of this information, we were able to replicate this activity and gain insight and rich results.

Section 7: Transition
In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a succe transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful r regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the fo 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 m addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use 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 prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text a

One of the areas that we are focusing on will be diversity and retention of candidates. The demographic of completers highlights the demographics of 65.5% White and 1.6% Black,9.4% Hispanic, 4.7% Asian/Pacific Islander. Of these groups 82.8% of the total population is female. Caldwell University designed a recruitment and retention plan to diversity the student population to increase under represented ethnic and gender groups.
Recruitment Plan
a. Provide a description of the selected are for improvement and rationale for selection.
The Caldwell University School of Education has had a declining population for Education majors in each three years. The goal is two prong:
1) School of Education will increase the number of Initial candidates from diverse cultures; increase the number of male applicants. We hope to develop teachers for teaching shortage areas that include math, science and special education.
2) The School of Education will increase the retention of candidates to completion of the program. These goals are aligned with the goals of the New Jersey Department of Education, the Mission of Caldwell University, School of Education 5 year plan and CAEP Standard 3.1 and A 3.1.
b. Identify goals and objectives aligned with the selected area for improvement.
Goal 1: Increase the recruitment and retention of initial and advanced candidates that represent diverse backgrounds and interest in teaching shortage areas.
Initial
Objective 1: To increase the number of initial candidates from diverse backgrounds by 10% and males 10% in five years.
Objective 2: To increase the number of initial candidates in Science, Mathematics (high school and middle school and Special Education by 10% in five years.
Advanced
Objective 3: To increase the number of Advanced candidates from diverse backgrounds by 10% and males 10% in five years.
Goal 1: Increase the recruitment and retention of initial and advanced candidates that represent diverse backgrounds and interest in teaching shortage areas.
Increase the underrepresented initial backgrounds from 15.7% (18.8% did not respond to identity race)From 15.7% to 21%; to increase the number of males from 17.2% to 27% in five years.

Caldwell University School of Education will monitor progress with these goals and adjust accordingly.

Recruitment and Retention Plan is attached.

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

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
1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
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
4.3 Employer satisfaction
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
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
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.3.4 Selection at Completion
A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
A.5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
A.5.5 Continuous Improvement
x.1 Diversity
x.2 Technology
x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC (
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 Stand
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 2019
EPP Annual Report.*

☑ **I am authorized to complete this report.**

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Joan Moriarty

Position: Associate Dean of Education

Phone: 973-618-3394

E-mail: jmoriarty@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**