2018 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	14021	**AACTE SID:**	4135
Institution:	Salisbury University		
Unit:	Seidel School of Education and Professional Studies		

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 initial teacher certification or licensure[1]

245

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]

24

Total number of program completers 269

---

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

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

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

No Change / Not Applicable

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

No Change / Not Applicable

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

No Change / Not Applicable

3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited

Change: Added Early Childhood and Elementary Education Double Major as a separate program to the list of programs offered:

The Early Childhood and Elementary Education Double Major is not a new program, but it is now included as a separate program because the recently revised curriculum requires the candidates to complete an extra semester.

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:	http://www.salisbury.edu/seidel/accredited_programs.html
Description of data accessible via link:	Data, as available, on: I. Impact Measures, II. Outcome Measures, and III. Other Measures, Reports, and Information

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?

Overview of Data Reporting Website:

The Seidel School of Education Professional Education Unit's data reporting website presents relevant information and findings based on our annual reporting measures, and is updated regularly. As described on the website, our data reporting page is broken down into three primary sections: I. Impact Measures; II. Outcome Measures; and III. Other Measures, Reports, and Information. The first section includes information on the impact of completers on P-12 learning and development, indicators of completers' teaching effectiveness, satisfaction of employers with our completers and related employment milestones, and satisfaction of completers of our programs. The second section includes information on graduation rates, ability of completers to meet licensing requirements, employment outcomes for completers, and other consumer information. The third section contains miscellaneous

reports, including previous CAEP annual reports, Title II reports, and summaries of other unit-level data, of broad interest to our stakeholders.

Discussion of Trends (Strengths):

Review and evaluation of our annual reporting measures has led to the identification of several emerging trends. We first summarize trends that reflect areas of strength. First, our alumni/completers provide positive evaluations of their preparation across a range of standards (e.g., InTASC, MCEE, ISTE) as well as satisfaction with the relevance and extent of their preparation, and these ratings are consistent across time (i.e., 1-3 years). Second and related to the first trend, alumni/completers also provide positive evaluations of the effectiveness of their preparation specifically in areas related to English language learners (e.g., support the development of English proficiency among English language learners, implement strategies to make content accessible to English language learners) and gifted and talented students (implement strategies to address the learning needs of gifted and talented learners). These areas are of specific interest to our evaluation efforts as identified Areas for Improvement (see Section 5, "Areas for Improvement related to Standard 1 cited as a result of the last NCATE review"). Third, our completers continue to be successful in meeting licensing/certification requirements as evidenced by institutional pass rates (i.e., summary institution-level and single assessment institution-level pass rate data) and alumni reports. Fourth, based on cost of attendance information and declining and lower-than-national-average student loan default rates, our candidates and completers continue to realize affordable and sustainable educator preparation. Fifth, the majority of our alumni/completers obtain employment (i.e., approximately 75% of initial program graduates obtained employment as full-time teachers, and 100% of our advanced program graduates obtained employment either as teachers or as educational administrators or reading specialists), and our alumni/completers continue to obtain positions predominantly in Maryland, Virginia, New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania, as examples. Finally, our alumni/completers report an average time-to-employment of 2 months.

Discussion of Trends (Needs/Opportunities), Plans for Benchmarks, and Sharing of Annual Reporting Measures:

Next, we summarize trends that reflect areas of need and improvement. The Seidel School of Education has implemented – or is planning to implement – a number of programmatic changes based on these trends. First and most significant, additional work is needed to revise and finalize our measures of impact on P-12 learning and development, indicators of teaching effectiveness, and satisfaction of employers of our alumni/completers. As described in Section 7, a primary goal of our Unit Assessment and Accreditation Committee over the last academic year has been to construct, revise, and continue to develop measures to assess and demonstrate the impact of our completers on P-12 learning and development as well as the satisfaction of both our completers and their employers. We have made considerable progress in this regard, and have posted plans for our next steps with each of these measures on our data reporting website. It is expected that data based on these measures will be collected, analyzed, and reported by the end of the Fall, 2018 semester.

Second, the Seidel School of Education currently lacks a comprehensive system of benchmarks against which to make meaningful evaluations and comparisons of current data. The development and reporting of comprehensive benchmarks to support meaningful and comparative examinations of our annual report measures results is a current goal for our Unit Assessment and Accreditation Committee. Specifically, because we are currently in the process of constructing and finalizing several of our annual reporting measures supporting demonstration of impact (see also Section 7 for our summary of our identified gaps and plans in the context of CAEP Standard 4: Program Impact), we intend to use data gathered over time to support benchmark-based comparisons. Specifically, we intend to build and maintain a database of annual reporting measure data and information to ground local, comprehensive benchmarks against which specific annual data (i.e., during each data collection period) can be compared. This will afford a historical evaluation and comparison of specific annual performances with overall performance in a way that is contextualized to the Seidel School of Education. It will also ground meaningful programmatic changes to be made as a result of such data. Such benchmarks will be particularly meaningful given the lack of available statewide benchmark data. We have begun to build this database specifically for the Unit Alumni/Completer Survey, and summarized results that are posted to our data reporting website provide direct comparisons between results for the current data collection period and results for the previous three years (i.e., based on alumni graduating within the last three years). As we finalize and implement our measures of impact on P-12 learning and development, indicators of effective teaching, and satisfaction of employers, we will also begin cataloguing and reporting comparisons of the data over time.

Third and finally, the Seidel School of Education needs to both maintain and improve its efforts to involve multiple stakeholders in its program evaluation, implementation, and improvement processes. The Unit Assessment and Accreditation Committee makes an effort to share both our annual reporting measures and relevant findings based on them with various stakeholders, including, as examples, our school and community partners (information about our Regional Professional Development Schools (RPDS) is available here), practitioners, and employers of our completers. For example, in constructing and revising our Intern Evaluation, we solicited feedback from both our mentor teachers/school partners and university/internship supervisors regarding item language, the appropriateness of specific items for covering and addressing specific InTASC standards, and suggestions for revision to the instrument. As another example, in constructing and revising our Unit Employer Survey, we solicited feedback from our local school system (LSS) professional development schools (PDS) liaison council members regarding item language, the appropriateness of specific items for specific educational administrators/raters, and suggestions for revision to the instrument. Efforts to co-construct and share our measures with our stakeholders (i.e., also with the construction and revision of our Seidel School Dispositional Expectations Policy and accompanying assessments) – and to collect their important feedback based on them – are based on in-person, group meetings, informal surveys (e.g., Google forms, brief Qualtrics surveys), and individual conversations. We solicit this feedback at multiple time-points across each academic year. Yet, additional room for improvement in the direct involvement of varied stakeholders exists in all phases and aspects of our accreditation and improvement work. For example, in the next academic year, we intend to include and involve both candidates and completers in the Unit Assessment and Accreditation Committee work we conduct to support program evaluation. Further, we would also benefit from inclusion of

community partners in our various accreditation processes and assessment decisions. As such, increased efforts to involve these key stakeholders reflects a primary goal of ours heading into the next academic year.

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 1 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. Candidate competencies in teaching English language learners and gifted and talented students as required by state standards are not assessed across all initial programs. (ITP)

1. Candidates' competencies in teaching English Language learners and gifted and talented students as required by state standards are now assessed across all initial programs. Analyses of assessment data will continue to be used for program improvement. As described in the previous annual report (2017), the curriculum in the teacher education programs (elementary, early childhood, and dual elementary/early childhood majors) was revised such that the Teaching Diverse Learners course (ELED 320) now includes content and assessment around critical competencies for working with dual language learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with learning disabilities. Data from this course suggest – based on a three-part case study with an established rubric assessing candidate competence in addressing varied learning needs, exceptional needs of learners, and adapting instruction effectively for varied learners – that our candidates successfully attain competencies in a range of critical areas related to teaching English language learners and gifted and talented students. Specifically, the majority (i.e., > 96% of candidates assessed) of our candidates attained proficiency (based on a 0-12 point rubric scale) in the select areas of: learning and influential factors (M=10.86, SD=1.08); different learning needs (M=10.81, SD=1.07); special needs of learners (M=10.81, SD=1.22); interpretation of diagnostic assessment data (M=10.53, SD=1.14); and instructional adaptation (M=10.78, SD=1.36).

We also recently revised our Intern Evaluation to include an item assessing teacher candidates' competence in effectively differentiating instruction based on learners' diverse strengths and needs (including giftedness, disabilities, and second language acquisition) during internship. Available data for this item also suggest competence (based on a 0-4 point rubric scale) in this area as rated by both mentor teachers (M=3.48, SD=0.67) and university supervisors (M=3.42, SD=0.61). Finally, we have also assessed our completers' perceptions of the effectiveness and relevance of their preparation in these areas through our Unit Alumni/Completer Survey. Results based on these data (on a 1-4 point Likert scale) indicate that completers positively evaluate their preparation for and ability to: support inclusive learning environments for diverse learners (M=3.60, SD=0.62); enable diverse learners to meet high standards (M=3.43, SD=0.68); support the development of English proficiency among English language learners (M=3.53, SD=0.72); implement strategies to make content accessible to English language learners (M=3.74, SD=0.52); and implement strategies to address the needs of gifted and talented learners (M=3.66, SD=0.61). Across these evaluations, the Seidel School has made considerable progress in assessing candidate (and completer) competencies in teaching English language learners and gifted and talented students.

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. The unit does not systematically use program data at the unit and department level to evaluate the efficacy of courses, programs, and clinical experiences. (ITP) (ADV)

2. The unit has not taken effective steps to eliminate bias in assessments and establish the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures and unit operations. (ITP) (ADV)

3. The unit does not consistently align program assessments to national specialized professional association standards. (ITP) (ADV)

1. Data from the newly implemented assessment system are gradually being used at the unit and department levels to evaluate the efficacy of courses, programs, and clinical experiences. This will continue in fall 2018.

2. In address of #2, the Seidel School of Education and the Unit Assessment and Accreditation Committee have taken a number of steps to evaluate the performance and psychometric properties of its assessments. These steps have been effective at supporting and improving the precision, accuracy, and, ultimately, the validity of scores and interpretations that are obtained based on our key assessments. Specifically, the assessment specialist, in consultation with members of the Unit Assessment and Accreditation Committee, has conducted a number of analyses to evaluate reliability and validity evidence for scores obtained on select assessments, and has also provided revision to assessments to bolster and inform their administration and purpose, their alignment to relevant standards, the explicitness and description of their indicators, and the actionability of scores obtained. As one example, the revised Intern Evaluation has been evaluated six times (across mid and final evaluations of first and second field experiences for two semesters) for both reliability and validity evidence, and for suggestions for revisions to specific items among our university supervisors and various school partners. Specifically, the Intern Evaluation has been evaluated for evidence of internal consistency reliability and inter-rater reliability as well as validity evidence based on test content (via direct alignment with specific standards) and on relations to other variables (based on correlational analyses and test-criterion relationships). These analyses have yielded strong evidence in support of the assessment and scores obtained based on it (i.e., strong evidence of internal consistency reliability, moderate to strong evidence of inter-rater reliability, moderate to strong convergent evidence among dimensions of teaching performance). Such processes have – where applicable – also been applied to our other assessments, as well as to our surveys and related assessments used to inform CAEP Standard 4. Further, this examination has also been

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

1. The unit lacks a systematic plan for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates.   (ITP) (ADV)

1. The Unit continues to work to establish a systematic plan for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates. One recent effort is Salisbury University's participation in the Teacher Academy of Maryland (TAM) program. Specifically, this program encourages high school students (especially those from underrepresented groups) to enroll in the four-course introduction to teaching program in the 9th grade of high school. The TAM students are required to take one of the four required courses per high school grade. Successful completion of the program merits three college credits in any of the teaching programs at Salisbury University and a $1000.00 per year scholarship if the candidate pursues a teaching degree. This memorandum of understanding exists between the University and 22 of the 24 counties in the state. In fall 2018, we will begin to monitor the impact of this effort on the recruitment and retention of diverse candidates.

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?

A major initiative for the unit both in the previous reporting period and at the present time has been to systematically revise and update our unit-level assessments. This initiative has involved, as described in other sections of this report, school-wide

construction and co-revision of our key assessments (e.g., intern evaluation, completer impact, completer and employer satisfaction, and dispositions assessments) with reference to the CAEP Evaluation Framework. We have also included in this work our school partners and related stakeholders to support co-construction and involvement in our program evaluation processes. The overarching goal has been to develop and maintain a quality system of assessment. Relatedly and in part for this reason, we feel our work toward developing and maintaining a quality system of continuous improvement is in development and has co-developed alongside our assessment work. Our aim is to implement a comprehensive quality assurance system, based on these updated and revised assessments that result in reliable, valid, and actionable data, in the next academic year. Inherent in this aim is the formalization of when and how unit performance will be assessed against our goals and the CAEP standards. We intend to leverage this quality assurance system to ground systematic and data-driven and goal-based improvements to our programs and initiatives.

Despite this work in progress, the unit has made a number of evidence-based or data-driven changes to improve our programs and processes in the previous reporting period. In terms of specific areas of change and improvement put into place as a result of feedback and data, the unit has made a number of key changes in the areas of: field experience and collaboration; implementation of a revised dispositions policy and assessments; assessments of program impact; assessment and integration of technology; and assessment and integration of diversity. We discuss these changes here.

The unit and, in particular, the office of field experience continues its award winning work to directly involve and build upon existing collaboration with regional professional development schools to support improvements to our programs and the clinical experiences offered to our candidates. In the fall of 2016, a needs assessment was conducted with school partners that aimed to gather important feedback on specific interests in and needs with regard to professional development. Based on evidence gathered, this professional development was delivered via a series of professional development schools 'power hour' workshops that were implemented in the fall of 2016 and spring of 2017, and were co-developed and delivered by stellar teachers. As another example, based on feedback obtained in the prior academic year, the unit implemented consecutive 20-day clinical experiences, and further sought input from partners on the implementation of this revised clinical experience as well as on suggestions for improvement(s) to the structure and delivery of these clinical experiences.

In response to evidence gathered from our school partners and program/university faculty, the unit also undertook a systematic revision of its schoolwide dispositional policy and assessments. Specifically, in the previous reporting period, the Seidel School Dispositional Expectations Policy (SSDEP), SSDEP Executive Summary, SSDEP Procedural Flowchart, SSDEP Explication, as well as both student-based and evaluator-based (i.e., instructors and mentor teachers) assessments of candidate dispositions were co-constructed, revised, and finalized. This initiative was in direct response to needs of both the unit and our school partners to improve our assessment of candidates' dispositions and, more broadly, to bolster our ability to both foster and demonstrate candidates' development of professional dispositions at multiple points in our educational programs (i.e. pre-program, during methods coursework, during clinical experiences). Implementation of the revised SSDEP is still underway, and data across and within time-points and programs will be examined.

As mentioned in other sections of this report (see Section 5), the unit also continued to realize a need to improve the development and assessment of candidates' competencies related to teaching English language learners and gifted and talented students. Our work in this regard is based on curricular improvements and revisions to key assessments embedded in select education programs/courses within our unit (i.e. the three-part case study assessing candidate competencies in addressing learning needs, exceptional needs of learners, and adapting instruction effectively for diverse learners). As summarized above, the unit is beginning to better assess and support our candidates' abilities to teach learners with a range of linguistic, cultural, and intellectual backgrounds and, combined with other assessments, is also observing positive appraisals of our candidates' and completers' preparation for teaching varied learners.

In addition to these changes, we have also undertaken changes and improvements related to the cross-cutting themes of technology and diversity. In the area of technology, the unit has begun the process of moving away from the Maryland Teacher Technology Standards (MTTS) and to the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) Standards for Educators. This change, currently underway, involves a systematic review of our existing technology-based key assessments and a developed plan for revising and aligning those assessments with ISTE standards. This change will also impact a number of courses across our unit (e.g., ELED 202, SCED 318, SCED 320, SCED 319, EDUC 415, EDLD 510, EDUC 570, EMAT 538) and, as a result, will involve multiple faculty as well as individuals with expertise in technology in education. We will also plan to consult with our school partners and other stakeholders with interest and expertise in technology and technology-related issues to ensure our revised technology assessments are relevant and maximally afford our candidates' abilities to design, implement, and assess learning experiences with and through technology.

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

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
A.5.5 Continuous Improvement
x.1 Diversity
x.2 Technology
x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

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.

As the Seidel School of Education at Salisbury University transitions to CAEP accreditation and standards, one of its primary goals based on an identified gap area has been to meaningfully address CAEP Standard 4: Program Impact. To this end, the previous academic year for our Unit Assessment and Accreditation Committee has been one of considerable work and development toward addressing this important standard. Specifically, we have constructed, revised, and continue to develop measures to assess and demonstrate the impact of our completers on P-12 learning and development as well as the satisfaction of both our completers and their employers.

These measures include:
- a Completer Impact Case Study to address CAEP Standard 4.1: Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development (based on a teacher action research project/framework);
- Student Surveys of Teaching Effectiveness (based on Marzano's Surveys of Reflective Practice, 2012) to address CAEP Standard 4.2: Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness;
- a Unit Employer Survey to address CAEP Standard 4.3/A.4.1: Satisfaction of Employers;
- and a Unit Alumni/Completer Survey to address CAEP Standard 4.4/A.4.2: Satisfaction of Completers.

The Unit Assessment and Accreditation Committee has collected and will regularly summarize results based on the Unit Alumni/Completer Survey. As described, work on the other measures is in progress and plans have been developed for either finalization of measure development or data collection, to be completed and reported by Fall, 2018. A plan for finalizing and collecting data on each measure has also been posted to our data reporting website; each of these plans is reproduced from the data website here:

Plan For Finalizing And Administering The Completer Impact Case Study:

"In the Spring of 2018, the Unit Assessment and Accreditation Committee in the Seidel School of Education at Salisbury University co-developed plans for implementing a case study approach to the assessment of completers' impact on P-12 learning. Such an approach is particularly fruitful for the Seidel School of Education based on 1) a lack of state-wide or related available data summarizing completer impact on P-12 learning and 2) the collaborative network the Seidel School has established and maintained with surrounding school districts (see the following link for information on our Regional Professional Development Schools (RPDS)). Such an approach also aligns with existing approaches taken by other universities as well as with approaches suggested by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation for the evaluating and improving completer impact (CAEP; see, for example, Anderson & Hagen, 2018 and Tapp, Walters-Parker, & Carinci, 2018).

Currently, the Unit Assessment and Accreditation Committee is developing a teacher action research project (referred to as the Completer Impact Case Study) that will largely parallel existing teacher action research projects employed to evaluate our teacher

candidates' teaching performance during pre-service. As a result, the UAAC's intention is to evaluate and demonstrate completer impact in such a way that 1) aligns with completers' prior experiences assessing and demonstrating their impact and 2) produces meaningful and actionable data on which completers can evaluate and improve their impact as in-service educators. Specific materials comprising the Completer Impact Case Study will be made available on our PEU data site as they become finalized.

We will coordinate with our Regional PDS network, including our site coordinators and school liaisons, to pilot, further develop, and implement our teacher action research approach with a small sample of our completers. We will then expand our assessment of completer impact to other completers within our PDS network iteratively and across time. It is expected that the initial Completer Impact Case Study will be completed in the Fall of 2018; summary results of the first iteration of the study will be posted to our PEU data site (link) in December of 2019 and revised plans for expanding the assessment of completer impact will also be posted."

Plan For Finalizing And Administering The Student Surveys Of Teaching Effectiveness:

"In the Fall of 2017 and the Spring of 2018, the Unit Assessment and Accreditation Committee (UAAC) in the Seidel School of Education at Salisbury University modified and aligned an existing set of items to assess our completers' teaching effectiveness. Specifically, we adopted Marzano and colleagues' (2012) Surveys for Reflective Practice to serve as Student Surveys of Teaching Effectiveness of our completers. Existing research supports the use (e.g., reliability and validity) of these items (Marzano, 2012), and other universities have employed these items as a measure of their completers' teaching effectiveness (Lovett & Stanley, 2017). Further, more broadly, existing research has found that, when used appropriately, student surveys can serve as effective assessments of teaching effectiveness (Brabeck, 2014).

The UAAC recently conducted a review of the items as well as their leveling across grades. Specifically, the UAAC reviewed and made minor revisions to specific survey items to improve language and clarity at each grade-based or developmental level. The UAAC also aligned all survey items to InTASC standards both at the broader category level (i.e., The Learner and Learning, Content Knowledge, Instructional Practice, and Professional Responsibility) and at the specific standard level (i.e., InTASC Standards 1-10). We also adjusted slightly the grade-based leveling to form three sets of items that can be completed by students in: Grades 1-3; Grades 4-6; and Grades 7-12. The items that make up the Seidel School of Education Student Surveys of Teaching Effectiveness at each grade level can be viewed here.

We will next coordinate with our Regional PDS network, including our site coordinators and school liaisons, to identify relevant points of contact for our completers that serve in their schools. This will facilitate initial administration of the Student Surveys of Teaching Effectiveness and will allow for a 'starting point' in gathering data to support examination of the effectiveness of our candidates' teaching. It is expected that the Student Surveys of Teaching Effectiveness will be administered in May to June of 2018; summary results of the first iteration of the survey will be posted to our PEU data site (link) in July of 2018."

Plan For Finalizing And Administering The Unit Employer Survey:

"In the Fall of 2017 and the Spring of 2018, the Unit Assessment and Accreditation Committee (UAAC) in the Seidel School of Education at Salisbury University drafted, revised, and aligned a set of items to assess employers' satisfaction with our completers as well as their evaluation of the preparation of our completers. These items were developed simultaneously with – and work to parallel – the items that make up the Seidel School of Education Alumni/Completer Survey. As a result, the two item sets allow for a direct descriptive comparison of satisfaction and preparation outcomes between our completers and employers of our completers. The items have been aligned with CAEP standards more broadly and with InTASC, ISTE, and MCEE standards and principles more specifically. Specific items have also been developed to address specific areas for improvement (AFIs) noted in our previous unit review. The items that make up the Seidel School of Education Employer Survey can be viewed here.

The Seidel School of Education Alumni/Completer Survey was administered and initial reliability and validity evidence supporting use of the items has been examined and obtained. Findings indicated strong reliability evidence (i.e., αs=0.90 and 0.95 for the items) as well as validity evidence based on relations to other variables and, in particular, test-criterion relationships. At this stage, the UAAC and other members of the Seidel School of Education are preparing to administer the Seidel School of Education Employer Survey to employers of our graduates. Specifically, we have recently (April, 2018) distributed the Employer Survey to our Local School System (LSS) Professional Development Schools (PDS) council members to solicit their feedback and comments on the items, revisions to the survey that may be suggested or needed, and suggestions for administering the survey to relevant educational administrators, supervisors, and human resources personnel. Final revisions to the items based on their feedback are being completed at this time.

We will next coordinate with our Regional PDS network, including our site coordinators and school liaisons, to identify relevant points of contact for our completers that serve in their schools and their employers. This will facilitate initial administration of the Employer Survey and will allow for a 'starting point' in gathering data to support examination of employers' satisfaction with our completers' preparation and performance. It is expected that the Employer Survey will be administered in May of 2018; summary results of the first iteration of the survey will be posted to our PEU data site (link) in June of 2018."

Given the timeline of our next CAEP site visit (i.e., fall of 2021), the Unit Assessment and Accreditation Committee fully expects to have finalized measures for use to meaningfully address CAEP Standard 4 (with supporting reliability and validity evidence for each measure) and to have at least three cycles of data based on each measure to demonstrate our programs' impact.

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

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
A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

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

◉ Yes ○ No

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

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

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

☑ I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name:	Althea Pennerman
Position:	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
Phone:	410 548 2865
E-mail:	ajpennerman@salisbury.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