2018 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	16130	AACTE SID:	3200
Institution:	Monmouth University		
Unit:	School of Education		

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 2016-2017 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to <u>initial</u> teacher certification or licensure[1]

`136`

2.1.2 Number of completers in <u>advanced</u> 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]

`45`

Total number of program completers   181

---

[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

The School of Education added the following advanced programs that will not be reviewed by CAEP this cycle: Ed.D. in Educational Leadership, Masters in Autism and ABA, Supervisor in Special Education. Also added to the School of Education is a masters degree in Speech Language Pathology. This program is seeking accreditation through CAA and will not be submitted for CAEP review.

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://www.monmouth.edu/school-of-education/documents/2018/06/candidate-performance-data-2015.pdf/
Description of data accessible via link:	EPP Annual Reports

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?

Data are analyzed on an ongoing basis to evaluate all EPP programs and the unit as a whole. As a result, the following programs have been Nationally Recognized through their Specialty Professional Associations (SPA): Teacher of Students with Disabilities (UG), Teachers of Students with Disabilities (Grad), P-3 Early Childhood (UG), P-3 Early Childhood (Grad), Learning Disabilities Teacher Consultant, Mathematics (UG), Mathematics (Grad), Social Studies (UG), Social Studies (Grad), Science (UG), and Science (Grad). The following SPA reports were submitted for review on 3/15/18: English (UG and Grad), ESL (UG and Grad), and Reading Specialist. The data submitted on all programs indicate Monmouth University School of Education (MUSoE) teacher candidates are mastering their content and entering the teaching profession prepared. Other measure provided by the New Jersey Department of Education on the annual report indicate that although there is a decline in enrollment nationally, the EPP has an above average completion and retention rate. In the 2017 EPP Annual Report provided by the NJDOE, MUSoE's persistence rate (in state) was over 90%. Also of mention, candidates who graduate from MUSoE's teacher preparation programs with three

endorsements have a 100% employment rate (2016 and 2017 EPP Annual Reports), up from 80% in 2015. Alumni survey results, Employer Satisfaction Survey Results, and the EPP Annual Report (by NJDOE) all indicate the MUSoE continues to graduate effective teachers. Strong school partnerships are continuing to grow as the EPP institutes innovative practices. As reported in the 2017 EPP Annual Report, 100% of MUSoE teacher candidate graduate are evaluated in their summative evaluations as "Effective" and "Highly Effective." State mandates and the EPP's quest to improve programs have driven changes that are continuously evaluated by the EPP. With a focus on innovation and the improvement process, the EPP has created and adopted assessment instruments to ensure our candidates and programs are evaluated using valid and reliable assessments. These assessments include benchmark data used to compare MUSoE candidates to state and national peers. Over the past three years, the New Jersey Department of Education mandated yearlong clinical practice, six mandatory special education credits, and the teacher performance assessment edTPA for all EPPs statewide. The EPP implemented these changes in a pilot phase at least one year before state requirement. The EPP is firmly committed to increasing clinical experiences for candidates as the data shows that the more time candidates are in the field, the better prepared they are. Data are being collected on the yearlong clinical practice as well as a new initiative, the Teacher Residency Program, which supports the effectiveness of increased time in clinical settings. edTPA data is shared and analyzed each semester by faculty, staff, administrators, and stakeholders to improve the effectiveness of support, curriculum integration, and guidance to teacher candidates. As a result of the data analysis, four edTPA support and writing days were implemented and intentional infusion of edTPA rubrics into the curriculum has been achieved. State mandate and data from employer and alumni surveys have driven additional changes to curriculum by exposing teacher candidates to special education populations, strategies for differentiating instruction, and the complex needs of diverse populations of students. Not only have the state mandated six (6) special education credits been added to an already robust curriculum, but course redesign has included the infusion of diversity (multiple diverse populations) in numerous ways. Data are shared with many constituency groups through regular meetings and include faculty, staff, administrators, alumni, school partners, and the community. Data on the performance measures required by CAEP are also included on the MUSoE website. Data on the innovative practices are shared by presentation at state and national conferences.

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.

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with unit and P-12 school faculty from diverse backgrounds.   (ITP) (ADV)

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

These seven indices were utilized in a principal components analysis to produce a statistical score, which was used to rank the districts. Districts that rank A-E are considered diverse districts for the purpose of placement. The Director of Field Placements assesses each student teacher's application for student teaching in order to confirm that each student teacher meets the diversity placement requirement prior to the completion of the unit's teacher preparation program. The Field Placement Director obtains diversity placement information by using the Early Field data bases, the New Jersey Department of Education District Factor Grouping (DFG) system, student teaching resumes, and substitute teaching employment history on each candidate for student teaching if that is available. The unit also strives to hire racially diverse educators by continuing to recruit faculty of diverse racial groups. For at least 10 years, the EPP has encouraged racially diverse applicants to apply by either physically mailing or electronically submitting every external posting to all of the following community agencies: Second Baptist Church in Long Branch,NJ, Hispanic Affairs & Resource Center, Spherion in Tinton Falls, NJ, Monmouth County Employment & Training, Monmouth County Division of Social Services, Puerto Rican Congress, Freehold Learning Center, Labor & Workforce Development, Arc in Red Bank, NJ, and many others. Monmouth Universities Policies on hiring can be found at https://www.monmouth.edu/general-counsel/policies-and-procedures/. These strategies have led to the hiring of an African American woman, an African American man, a Turkish male, and a Hispanic American man in the past three years.

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?

The EPP regularly and systematically assesses its performance against goals and CAEP standards in multiple ways. Data on all key performance measures is analyzed to make improvements to individual programs and to the EPP. The quality assurance system includes reviewing data regularly at multiple constituency group meetings. There are several innovations that have come as a result of improvement and innovation. The three improvements and innovations focused on for this annual report are all in the area of clinical practice and are described below: 1. Adoption of the Candidate Pre-service Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST) The adoption of the CPAST came as a result of reviewing the previous clinical practice assessment rubric and acknowledging that the instrument did not meet sufficiency for CAEP. The data was not aligned to the most updated standards for CAEP and SPA's. The CPAST was presented at the 2017 AACTE National Meeting, which caught the attention of our Assistant Dean and Curriculum and Instruction Department Chair. The alignment with CAEP, InTASC and the Danielson framework was desirable. It was tested for validity and the training modules and assessment ensured reliability. The instruments was reviewed by the following constituencies prior to implementation: Deans (Meeting), Deans Educational Leadership Council, Curriculum and Instruction Department, Special Education Department, Deans Advisory Council, Clinical Supervisors Training, Mentor Teacher Academy, School Partnership Committee, and at a School of Education Meeting. Feedback was overwhelmingly positive and the instrument was implemented in the 2017-2018 School Year. Candidates were provided training on the instrument at their full time clinical practice orientation. To ensure reliability, all clinical supervisors had to achieve an 80% score on a training assessment. If they did not they were given a supplemental set of questions which required the same mastery. The data obtained from the CPAST in the Fall of 2017 was the first series of data shared with constituencies. Progress results are tracked at the midterm and final points in the candidate's full time clinical practice. All 2017-2018 Data will be shared, analyzed and improvements will be suggested at the annual Teacher Retreat in May 2018. 2. EdTPA writing days The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) mandated edTPA as the teacher performance assessment required for certification starting in the 2017-2018 school year. The EPP used the Teacher Writing Sample assessment previously but saw the value of implementing edTPA prior to the mandatory state implementation in order to work out any potential challenges prior to the '17-'18 school year in which passing became consequential. The EPP piloted the edTPA in the '16-'17 school year with all candidates, and used smaller sample pilots for the Spring 2016 semester. Upon receipt of the Fall '16 data, the Implementation Committee formulated strategies to improve candidate performance. Professional development activities were provided for the faculty and candidates. Additionally, three two-hour writing workshops were built into the schedule to allow candidates to receive professional development and focused time to complete their portfolios. A fourth optional workshop was provided to candidates to assist with the upload of the portfolio. Candidates were surveyed and edTPA data was analyzed and shared at multiple constituency meetings such as Deans Meeting, Department meetings, School of Education Meetings, Implementation Committee Meetings, and Partnership Committee Meetings. Due to the data analyzed from the edTPA results as well as the student surveys, the Implementation Committee proposed four full writing days, in which candidates would use four of the clinical practice days, to assist in completing their portfolio. The fourth day included uploading portfolios to Pearson, the administrative body that administers, scores and sends results for portfolios. Staff from the Instructional Technology department at Monmouth University was present for part of every writing day. 3. Teacher Residency Program (innovation from SOE goals) The Teacher Residency program was created to engage sophomores, juniors, seniors, and initial licensure graduate students in an extended apprenticeship in P-12 school settings over a two- to three-year period. As part of the program, teacher candidates perform functions traditionally given to substitute teachers, paraprofessionals, and tutors. In turn,

monies from school budgets to compensate these positions are invested into the teacher residency program. Other sources of funds include professional development monies and summer enrichment programs. The program intended to help decrease the pressure of added clinical hours from State Mandated model. Monmouth piloted yearlong clinical practice prior to the mandated implementation date set by the NJDOE. The TRP assists in adding financial compensation for hours otherwise spent working in student assistant, graduate assistant, or off campus minimum wage positions. Forty-one teacher candidates started the pilot in the Fall of 2017 in six partnership school districts. The program design and implementation was shared with the Deans, Departments, Partnerships, Students/Candidates, and community in multiple meetings. Currently, the SOE is conducting research regarding the current model to assess improvements which can be made to the program. Once data is collected constituency groups will be invited in various meetings (candidates, students, faculty, staff, stakeholders) to analyze and make recommendations to improve the program.

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

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

FA17_MU_EPP_PERFORMANCE_SUMMARY_7.2017_to_12.2017.pdf

1.1_CPAST_Spreadsheet.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

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.

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

Not finished yet

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

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:	Tracy Mulvaney
Position:	Assistant Dean
Phone:	732-263-5572
E-mail:	tmulvane@monmouth.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