

EVIDENCE FOR 1.4 College and Career-Ready Standards

CAEP Standard: 1.4

InTASC/NJPST: 4 and 5

Data: Through multiple measures, MU candidates demonstrate skills and commitments that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college-and-career- ready standards. In addition to the SPA report data provided in AIMS, the following triangulated assessments (exhibit 1.4.A) provide breadth and depth in meeting this standard: CCAST, High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics, and edTPA. These three assessments, when triangulated with the 12 Nationally Recognized SPAs, all based on college and career ready standards for their specific content, provides evidence that EPP candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college-and career-ready standards. Program changes are made on an ongoing basis as a result of the data (Exhibit 5.3.B). It should also be noted that the EPP has received National Recognition from 11 SPAs. These SPAs directly relate standards for college and career-readiness to their specialized content. The EPP believes the SPA success, along with the assessments mentioned in this exhibit provides a strong case for successful achievement of standard 1.4.

Analysis and Interpretation: Data are presented from two administrations of edTPA, four administrations of the CCAST (two semesters with mid and final evaluations), and one administration of the early field assessment called High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics. The edTPA assessment was piloted in the 2016-2017 school year, however portfolios were locally evaluated and could not be used as common assessment data for CAEP. The EPP will, however have a series of data available by the CAEP site visit. The High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics are the new early field assessment which contain 8 indicators directly aligned to this standard. It's inclusion into EPP quality assurance system came in the Fall of 2017, after the EPP realized we needed to strengthen our early field assessment, thus meeting the level of sufficiency and providing the EPP with valid and reliable data that would be an improved tool to measure EPP candidate growth. Data for the Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 will be available at the CAEP site visit.

The teacher-performance assessment, edTPA, has 15 competencies assessed on its five-point rubrics (1-5 scale) aligned to assess standard 1.4 (See edTPA Connections to CAEP https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res_get.php?fid=3571&ref=rl). The two applications of data show the EPP with strong mean scores of 2.82 (Fall 17) and 2.83 (Spring 18) out of a possible 5. Strengths on both applications of data include Rubrics 1 (*Planning for Content Understanding*), 2 (*Planning to Support Varied Student Needs*), 3 (*Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning*), 4 (*Identifying and Supporting Language Demands*), 5 (*Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning*), 6 (*Learning Environment*), 12 (*Providing Feedback to Learners*). The lowest rubric means for both applications of data came from Rubric 10 (*Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness*). Although it was the lowest mean, it was still

an acceptable score. Programs with the highest means on all rubrics in the Fall of 2017 include Elementary (2.99), and Spanish (2.92). Lowest scores on the rubrics in the same application of data include Secondary Science (2.27) and Secondary Math (2.33). In the Spring of 2018, Elementary (2.89) and Art (3.03) candidates were strongest. Lowest scores in this application of data were for P-3 (2.20) and Health and Physical Education (2.27).

The CPAST assessment further strengthens the contention that EPP candidates master this standard with one competency aligning with CAEP 1.4, Rubric A. *Focus for Learning: Standards and Objectives/Targets*. The four applications of data show growth from midterm to final summative assessment in both semesters on this 4 point (0-3 scale) rubric. Fall 2017: midterm mean: 2.07(our of 3), final mean: 2.63: Spring 2018: midterm mean: 2.38, final: 2.78. These scores not only show growth throughout the clinical practice, but demonstrate high ratings by university based clinical educators. In the Fall of 2017, Math (n=1), Spanish (n=1), Elementary and P-3 students had the highest means at 3.0, 2.76 and 2.75 respectively. The lowest means were earned by candidates in the Art/Music and Science at 2.0 and 2 respectively. For the Spring of 2018, Secondary candidates in Science, Social studies and English all scored a mean of 3.0. Health and PE and P-3 were the lowest scoring programs.

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

Use for Continuous Improvement: The EPP continues to strive for excellence in its teacher preparation, assessment of candidates, assessment of P-12 impact, and quality assurance system. As a result of the data, many changes have been made to improve the EPP (outlined in Exhibit 5.3.B). First, 15 programs have been submitted for SPA review. There have been 11/15 Nationally Recognized. The four not recognized were recognized with conditions, revised and resubmitted. The EPP is awaiting data on the four remaining SPAs. All SPA reviews also connect to college and career-ready standards. The revision of the SPAs has helped to guide the EPP on our largest programs. The EPP is also working to increase candidate time in the classroom through the Teacher Residency Program. This increase time in classroom yields more exposure to college and career ready standards.

Data is also shared with multiple constituency groups including the Deans, Council on Academic Advising (CAA), Dean's Educational Leadership Council (DELC), Faculty Meetings, Department meetings, and the University Teacher Education Advisory Council (UTEAC). These committees review aggregate and disaggregated data to discuss findings and program improvements. All data is reviewed at the Annual Teacher Education Retreat where groups of content experts make actionable changes to improve programs based on data.

edTPA FALL 2017 AND SPRING 2018

Fall 2017 Data

INTASC/ NJPST Standards	CAEP Standards	Rubrics		EPP N=32	Elementary N=17	Spanish N=1	History- Secondary N=2	Visual Arts N=1	Science - Secondary N=1	Early Childhood Ed N=4	Mathematics - Secondary N=1	Performing Arts N=3	Health Education N=1	Physical Education N=1	MAT N=7	UG N=25
2, 3, 4, 7, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3	1 Planning for Content Understandings	Mean:	2.8	3	3	2.5	3	2	3	2	2.7	2	3	3.29	2.72
			Std. Dev:	0.6	0.6	0	0.5	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0.70
1, 2, 4, 7, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 3.3, 3.6	2 Planning to Support Varied Student Needs	Mean:	2.9	3	4	3	3	2	2.5	3	2.7	2	2.5	3.29	2.82
			Std. Dev:	0.7	0.7	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0.70
1, 2, 4, 7	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3	3 Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning	Mean:	2.9	3	3	3	3	2	2.8	2	3	2	3	3.14	2.84
			Std. Dev:	0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0.64
1, 2, 4, 5, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.5,	4 Identifying and Supporting Language Demands	Mean:	3	3		2	3	3	2.8	3	2.7	3	3	3.43	2.83
			Std. Dev:	0.6	0.6		0	0	0	0.4	0	0.5	0	0	0	0.43
1, 6, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5	5 Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning	Mean:	2.8	2.9	3	2.5	3	3	2.5	2	3	2	3	3.14	2.68
			Std. Dev:	0.6	0.7	0	0.5	0	0	0.5	0	0.8	0	0	0	0.83
2, 3, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.6	6 Learning Environment	Mean:	3	3.1	3	3	3	3	3.3	3	2.7	3	3	3.14	3.00
			Std. Dev:	0.3	0.2	0	0	0	0	0.4	0	0.5	0	0	0	0.35
2, 3, 4, 5, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6	7 Engaging Students in Learning	Mean:	2.8	3.1	2	2	3	2	3	3	2.3	2	2.5	3.43	2.66
			Std. Dev:	0.7	0.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	0.73	0.54
3, 4, 5, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.5	8 Deepening Student Learning	Mean:	2.8	2.9	3	2	3	2	3	4	2.3	2	3	2.86	2.76
			Std. Dev:	0.5	0.3	0	0	0	0.7	0	0.5	0	0	0	0.35	0.59
3, 4, 5, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.5	9 Subject-Specific Pedagogy	Mean:	2.7	3.1	1	2	3	2	2.3	2	2.7	2	3	3.14	2.60
			Std. Dev:	0.8	0.7	0	0	0	0	0.4	0	0.5	0	0	0	0.64
3	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.6	10 Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness	Mean:	2.6	2.8	3	2.5	3	2	2.8	2	2	2	2	2.86	2.60
			Std. Dev:	0.5	0.3	0	0.5	0	0	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0.35
6	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.6	11 Analysis of Student Learning	Mean:	2.7	3	3	0	3	3	3	2	2	2	2.5	3.29	2.62
			Std. Dev:	0.7	0.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.8	0	0	0	0.70
6	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.6	12 Providing Feedback to Guide Learning	Mean:	3.2	3.4	4	0	4	2	3.5	2	2.5	2	3	3.57	3.14
			Std. Dev:	0.8	0.8	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0.4	0	0	0.73
6	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.6	13 Student Use of Feedback	Mean:	2.7	2.9	3	0.5	3	2	2.5	2	2.3	3	2	3.29	2.56
			Std. Dev:	0.8	1	0	0.5	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0.88
1, 2, 4, 5	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.6	14 Analyzing Students' Language Use and Content Learning	Mean:	2.7	2.8		2	3	3	3	2	2.8	2	2	3.14	2.65
			Std. Dev:	0.6	0.5		1	0	0	0	0	0.6	0	0	0	0.35
6, 7, 8, 9	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6	15 Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	Mean:	2.7	2.9	3	2.5	3	1	3	1	2.2	3	2	2.86	2.66
			Std. Dev:	0.8	0.6	0	0.5	0	0	0.7	0	0.8	0	0	0	0.83
Mean:				2.82	2.93	2.92	1.97	3.07	2.27	2.87	2.33	2.53	2.27	2.63	3.19	2.74
Std. Dev:				0.63	0.60	0.00	0.23	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.43	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.59
Overall Mean				2.66												
Overall Std. Dev.				0.87												

Spring 2018 Data

INTASC/ NJPST Standards	CAEP Standards	Rubrics		EPP N=92	Elementary N=46	Spanish N=2	History- Secondary N=3	Visual Arts N=7	Science - Secondary N=5	Early Childhood Ed N=2	Mathematics - Secondary N=3	Performing Arts N=3	Health Education N=1	Physical Education N=4	English - Secondary N=16	MAT N= 27	UG N= 65
2, 3, 4, 7, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3	1 Planning for Content Understandings	Mean:	2.9	2.8	2	3.3	3.1	2.6	2.5	3.2	2	2	2	3.1	3.07	2.76
			Std. Dev:	0.8	0.8	0	0.5	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.8	2.8	0	0	0.5	0.66
1, 2, 4, 7, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 3.3, 3.6	2 Planning to Support Varied Student Needs	Mean:	2.8	2.9	3	2.7	3.1	2.6	2	2.7	3	3	2.3	2.8	3.07	2.74
			Std. Dev:	0.6	0.6	0	0.5	0.3	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0.8	0.4	0.47
1, 2, 4, 7	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3	3 Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning	Mean:	2.9	3	2.5	3	3.3	2.4	2.5	3.3	3.3	3	2	2.9	3.11	2.86
			Std. Dev:	0.7	0.7	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.2	0	0	0.8	0.68
1, 2, 4, 5, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.5,	4 Identifying and Supporting Language Demands	Mean:	2.8	2.9		3.7	3.3	2	2.5	3	3	2	2	2.8	2.92	2.81
			Std. Dev:	0.6	0.5		0.5	0.5	0.6	0.5	0	0	0	0	0.7	0.7	0.67
1, 6, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5	5 Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning	Mean:	2.9	2.7	2	3.3	3.4	3	1.5	3.3	3.3	2	2.3	3.1	3.04	2.78
			Std. Dev:	0.7	0.7	0	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0.4	0.5	0.58
2, 3, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.6	6 Learning Environment	Mean:	3	3	3	3	3.1	3	3	3	3	3	2.5	3.1	3.02	3.02
			Std. Dev:	0.2	0.2	0	0	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.2	0.29
2, 3, 4, 5, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.5,	7 Engaging Students in Learning	Mean:	2.8	2.9	2.5	3	3	2.6	3	2.3	3	2	2.3	2.9	2.93	2.78
			Std. Dev:	0.5	0.4	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0.4	0.6	0.47
3, 4, 5, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.5	8 Deepening Student Learning	Mean:	2.9	2.9	2.5	3.3	3	2.8	3	2.8	3	2	2.5	2.9	2.81	2.90
			Std. Dev:	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.8	0.7	0	0.2	0	0	0	0.5	0.7	0.55
3, 4, 5, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.5	9 Subject-Specific Pedagogy	Mean:	2.8	3.1	2	3.3	3.1	2	1	3	3	1	2.3	2.8	2.93	2.80
			Std. Dev:	0.8	0.7	0	0.5	0.3	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0.4	0.8	0.86
3	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.6	10 Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness	Mean:	2.6	2.8	2	2.3	2.6	2	3	2.7	2.3	2	2.5	2.6	2.70	2.60
			Std. Dev:	0.6	0.6	0	0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0.7	0.60
6	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.6	11 Analysis of Student Learning	Mean:	3	2.9	2	2.3	3.1	2.2	2	3	2.7	2	1.8	2.8	2.81	2.71
			Std. Dev:	1	0.7	0	0.5	0.6	1.2	0	0	1.2	0	0.8	0.8	0.82	0.84
6	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.6	12 Providing Feedback to Guide Learning	Mean:	3.1	3.2	3	3.3	2.9	2.4	1.5	3.3	4	3	2	3.1	3.07	3.08
			Std. Dev:	0.9	0.7	0	0.5	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.8	0	0.7	0.9	0.86
6	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.6	13 Student Use of Feedback	Mean:	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.7	3	2	1	2	3.3	3	1.8	2.4	2.67	2.49
			Std. Dev:	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	0	0	0.9	0	0.4	0.7	0.77	0.75
1, 2, 4, 5	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.6	14 Analyzing Students' Language Use and Content Learning	Mean:	2.7	2.7		2.3	3	2.6	2.5	3	3	3	2.3	2.7	2.87	2.66
			Std. Dev:	0.6	0.6		0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0.4	0.8	0.51
6, 7, 8, 9	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6	15 Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	Mean:	2.7	2.9	2.5	2.3	2.7	2	2	2.8	3.3	2	2.5	2.6	2.78	2.70
			Std. Dev:	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.9	1	0.2	0.5	0	0.5	0.9	0.74	0.74
Mean:				2.83	2.89	2.42	2.92	3.05	2.41	2.20	2.89	3.01	2.33	2.21	2.84	2.92	2.78
Std. Dev:				0.67	0.61	0.19	0.40	0.53	0.51	0.27	0.28	0.56	0.00	0.47	0.67	0.63	0.66
Overall Mean				2.69													
Overall Std. Dev.				0.46													

CANDIDATE PRESERVICE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT TEACHING (FALL 17 & SPRING 2019)

Fall 2017 Midterm

INTASC	CAEP	Competency Area		EPP	Elementary	Secondary	Art/Music	Health & Physical	P-3 & TSD	Spanish	MAT	UG
				N=30	N=16	N=4	N= 3	N=2	N=4	N=1	N=7	N=23
7	14, 11	A. Focus for Learning: Standards and Objectives /Targets	Mean:	2.07	2.19	2	1.67	2	2	2	2.14	2.00
			Std. Dev:	0.64	0.66	0.82	1.15	0	0	0	0.64	0.62
			Overall Mean	2.07	2.19	2.00	1.67	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.14	2.00
			Overall Std. Dev.	0.64	0.66	0.82	1.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.64	0.62

Fall 2017 Final

INTASC	CAEP	Competency Area		EPP	Elementary	Secondary	Art/ Music	Health & Physical	P-3 & TSD	Spanish	MAT	UG
				N=32	N=17	N=4	N=4	N=2	N=4	N=1	N=7	N=25
7	14, 11	A. Focus for Learning: Standards and Objectives /Targets	Mean:	2.63	2.76	2.5	2.00	2.5	2.75	3	2.71	2.60
			Std. Dev:	0.55	0.44	0.58	0.82	0.71	0.5	0	0.45	0.57
			Overall Mean	2.63	2.76	2.50	2.00	2.50	2.75	3.00	2.71	2.60
			Overall Std. Dev.	0.55	0.44	0.58	0.82	0.71	0.50	0.00	0.45	0.57

Spring 2018 Midterm

INTASC	CAEP	Competency Area		EPP	Elementary	Secondary	English	Spanish	Health & Physical	P-3 & TSD	Art/Music	MAT	UG
				N=84	N=44	N=22	N=12	N=2	N=3	N=2	N=9	N=27	N=64
7	14, 11	A. Focus for Learning: Standards and Objectives /Targets	Mean:	2.38	2.39	2.55	2.67	2.50	1.67	1.50	2.22	1.69	2.18
			Std. Dev:	0.56	0.49	0.51	0.49	0	0.58	0.71	0.67	0.65	0.54
			Overall Mean	2.38	2.39	2.55	2.67	2.50	1.67	1.50	2.22	1.69	2.18
			Overall Std. Dev.	0.56	0.49	0.51	0.49	0.00	0.58	0.71	0.67	0.65	0.54

Spring 2018 Final

INTASC	CAEP	Competency Area		EPP	Elementary	Secondary	Art/Music	Health & Physical	P-3 & TSD	English	MAT	UG
				N=78	N=36	N=25	N=10	N=5	N=2	N= 14	N=28	N=64
7	14, 11	A. Focus for Learning: Standards and Objectives /Targets	Mean:	2.78	2.81	2.92	2.70	2.20	2.50	2.83	2.71	2.81
			Std. Dev:	0.42	0.4	0.28	0.48	0.45	0.71	0.29	0.52	0.39
			Overall Mean	2.78	2.81	2.92	2.70	2.20	2.50	2.83	2.71	2.81
			Overall Std. Dev.	0.42	0.40	0.28	0.48	0.45	0.71	0.29	0.52	0.39

HIGH LEVERAGE TEACHING PRACTICE PROFICIENCY RUBRIC SPRING 2018

Instac Cat	INTASC	CAEP	Criteria	EPP		UG		MAT		Elem		P-3		Secondary:		HEPE		TSD			
				Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
				N = 18		N = 13		N = 6		N = 12		N = 2		N = 1		N = 2		N = 12			
1	1	1.1, 1.4	STANDARD 1: Learner Development	2.89	0.55	2.76	0.69	3.00	2.25	2.92	0.51	2.50	0.71	3.00	0.00	3.00	1.41	3.00	0.60		
1	2	1.1, 1.3, 1.4	STANDARD 2: Learning Differences	2.74	0.44	2.62	0.51	3.00	0.00	2.75	0.45	2.50	0.71	3.00	0.00	2.50	0.71	2.67	0.49		
2	4,5	1.1,1.4	STANDARDS 4 and 5: Content Knowledge and Application of Content	2.58	0.59	2.50	0.52	2.83	0.41	2.58	0.67	2.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	2.50	0.71	2.50	0.52		
3	7	1.1,1.2,1.4	STANDARD 7: Planning for Instruction	2.95	0.60	2.84	0.64	3.00	0.55	2.92	0.67	3.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	1.41	3.00	0.60		
3	8	1.1,1.3,1.4	STANDARD 8: Instructional Strategies	2.84	0.49	2.74	0.48	3.17	0.63	2.83	0.58	3.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	2.50	0.71	2.83	0.39		
				2.8	0.07	2.69	0.09	3.00	0.86	2.80	0.10	2.60	0.39	3.00	0.00	2.70	3.90	2.80	0.09		