

Site Visit Report

CAEP Site Visit Team:

Dr. James T. Carroll
Dr. Allison E. Carey
Janet L. Bavonese
Dr. Tahsin Khalid
Dr. Jeanelle B. Day

State Consultant:

N/A

NEA or AFT Representative:

N/A

Selected Improvement Pathway

**ANGELO STATE
UNIVERSITY**

College of Education
2601 West Avenue N

San Angelo, TX 76909

April 23, 2017 12:00 a.m.

CONFIDENTIAL

CAEP Site Visit Report Selected Improvement Pathway

Section I Introduction

Overview of the EPP and program offerings: (focus on differences between what was stated in the Formative Feedback Report and what was verified onsite.)

Angelo State University (ASU) is a member of the Texas Tech University System. It is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The System is lead by a chancellor under the direction of a Board of Regents. Each unit of the System is lead by a president. Angelo State University has seven colleges: Business, Arts and Humanities, Science and Engineering, Health and Human Services, Graduate Studies, Freshman College, and Education, each lead by a dean. The College of Education is divided into two departments. The Department of Teacher Education is responsible for undergraduate education leading to a Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction is responsible for graduate education with two degrees, Master of Education and Master of Arts. The departments are lead by a chair who serves a 3 year, renewable term. The College staffs an Educator Information Center that serves multiple purposes. The 6 member staff consists of advisors, certification specialist, field placement advisor, and CAEP data coordinator. The center serves all of ASU and the surrounding school districts. The College works with departments that certify school personnel through the Teacher Education Council. An Educator Preparation Program Advisory Committee consists of public school principals, teachers, superintendents, regional service center personnel, and community members. The University is accredited by the Texas Education Agency to offer and recommend individuals for certifications.

The EPP offers 15 programs leading to initial certification, 2 in EC-6, 1 in 4-8, 1 in 6-12, 7 in 7-12, and 4 EC-12. The EPP also provides an array of advanced programs that were not subject to this cycle of review.

The information contained in the SRR, FFR, and Addendum was verified during the onsite visit. In addition, during the onsite visit the team was able to verify that the EPP has a system and set of procedures to address concerns related to 3.1, 3.2 and 5.2. The FFR contained a preliminary recommendation for a new AFI related to 3.1, 3.2, and 5.2. However, onsite interviews, EPP-provided documentation, and team discussions verified that the EPP consistently maintains an overall 3.0 GPA for all cohorts (3.1), has ongoing initiatives to attract diverse candidates and maintain or exceed the current level of diversity of 24.1% (3.2), has a system to measure and report reliability and validity of EPP-created assessments. The EPP-created assessments meet the CAEP Sufficient Level (5.2). Please see additional documentation in Standards 3 and 5.

Summary of state partnership that guided the visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or a CAEP-only visit)

CAEP-Visit only

Special circumstances of the onsite review, if any. (Example: No unusual circumstances affected the visit.)

No unusual circumstances affected the visit. The onsite team chair was appointed after the completion of the FFR.

Section II CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

1. Tasks completed by the team:

Task(s)

| | |
|--|--|
| Follow up on TEA Report dated 6/22/2015. | |
| A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration | |
| (1) | The TEA Report, although it indicates that the program is accredited (based on data from AY 2013-14), details a number of compliance issues and recommendations, including one on page nine that relates directly to Standard 1 (the recommendation that the program should "explicitly teach data-driven practice within coursework") and another one on page 12 that relates to field/clinical experiences in Standard 3. |
| B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed | |
| C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews | |
| 1. | |
| (1) | The TEA Report indicated two compliance issues related to the EPP's Advisory Committee: providing training on the Advisory Committee's roles and responsibilities and having the committee meet twice during each academic year. What has the EPP done to address these issues? |
| (2) | The TEA Report indicated (on p. 9) that the EPP should "require the educator standards to be the curricular basis for all coursework for educator preparation that leads to standard certification" (a compliance issue) and that the EPP should "explicitly teach data-driven practice within courses" (a recommendation). What has the EPP done to implement these? |
| (3) | The TEA Report, regarding Component IV, Program Delivery and On-Going Support, indicated (on p. 12) three compliance issues: one regarding maintaining evidence of completion for the 30 clock hours of field-based experiences for each candidate, one regarding requiring and documenting that ongoing and relevant field-based experiences are conducted in a variety of educational settings with diverse student populations, and one regarding having candidates identify by activity the 15 hours of interactions with students in their Field-based Experience Log. How has the EPP addressed these? |

| |
|---|
| Follow up on ACEI Report recommendations and CEC Report |
|---|

recommendations.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

2.

(1) Both the ACEI and CEC Reports (although the programs were accredited) included strong recommendations about the programs' rubrics, alignment with standards, and assessment system in general. How have the programs addressed those concerns?

(2) More specifically, the ACEI Report, in Part E--Areas for Consideration, asks the EPP to address a number of issues related to its assessment system, almost all of which involve providing better alignment between rubrics (or data) and the ACEI Standards, reflecting the language of the ACEI Standards whenever possible. How has the EPP revised its rubrics to better reflect the ACEI Standards?

(3) In the CEC Report, in Part F--Additional Comments, F.1, the SPA notes "that further refinement of the assessment system is essential. Without refinement of assessments the program will not be able to sustain national recognition in its next submission in the next review cycle." What has the EPP done to address these concerns, including refining assessments and rubrics to address the CEC's 2012 Content Standards?

See assessments (including instructions) as given to candidates and their evaluators.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Some items of evidence provided for Standard 1 lacked the actual assignment/instructions given to candidates and the faculty filling out the evaluations, including the dispositions assessments (data attached as Tables 1.1 through 1.3) and the Case Study (rubric attached as Document 1.2, scores in Tables 1.6 through 1.8, and sample as Work Sample 1.1), as well as the EOSL data (provided in Tables 1.5, 1.11, and 1.12-1.14).

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

3. C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Please provide the following assessments and/or information about assessments:
(a) the InTASC dispositions self-assessment (as given to candidates) and questionnaire (as filled out by faculty), whose data are reported in Tables 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4;
(b) the Case Study assignment (data reported in Tables 1.6, 1.7, and 1.8), complete with instructions that candidates would receive;
(c) information about how the Class Background Study (Work Sample 1.2) is assessed, by whom, at what point in Clinical Teaching, and how the results are used to help the candidate; and
(d) the Effects on Student Learning instrument (data reported in Tables 1.5, 1.11, 1.12, 1.13, and 1.14), including instructions or guidelines given to candidates and candidates' evaluators.

Seek additional evidence for Component 1.2.

- A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
 - B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed
 - C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
- 4.

(1) Please see item #4 above under "Evidence that is Inconsistent with Meeting the Standard." Please provide additional evidence for Component 1.2, especially that would indicate that candidates use "research and evidence [...] to measure their P-12 students' progress" and adapt instruction accordingly.

Follow up on ISTE Standards in syllabi.

- A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
 - B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed
 - C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
- 5.

(1) The EPP indicates it "recognizes the need to improve in the area of technology integration" and that it will begin to include ISTE Standards in course syllabi in fall 2016.

(1) Please provide fall 2016 and spring 2017 syllabi that include ISTE Standards.

Seek additional evidence for Component 1.4.

- A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
 - B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed
 - C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
- 6.

(1) The EPP indicates that the alignment of faculty syllabi with state teaching standards and with InTASC Standards serve as evidence for Component 1.4, but the EPP provides only three syllabi as items of evidence (3.8, 3.9, and 3.11). Please provide additional syllabi for support.

(1) Please provide additional evidence for Component 1.4.

Clarify Table 1.9.

- A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
 - B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed
- 7.

(1) Table 1.9, Practicum Summaries, was almost impossible to interpret due to lack of labeling, information about rating scale, etc. Please label data clearly so their significance and value are clear.

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

- (1) The narrative analysis of these data (from Table 1.9) was "Data from each of the three cycles show that CCRS/TEKS are being incorporated into lesson planning." Could the EPP provide a more robust analysis that interprets the data at a more micro level, and that indicates how the data are used to help candidates and/or the programs?

Action:

1. The EPP included, as Addendum 1.1 (TEA Accreditation Letter and Action Plan), documentation that the recommendations from the TEA Accreditation Report of 6/22/15 have been addressed. In all cases, the evidence indicates that the EPP submitted further evidence to the TEA, and that the TEA accepted that evidence.
2. The EPP indicates (in the Addendum) that it has taken the recommendations of ACEI and "has been realigning and fine tuning rubrics and course assessments, based on individual ACEI Standards, to allow for 'cleaner' data collection, and to ensure that the rubrics reflect the language of the ACEI Standards." Furthermore, the EPP indicates (re: the CEC Report) that the special ed faculty have begun realigning assessments and assignments per CEC recommendations; the EPP includes Addendum 1.2 (syllabi for courses that have been newly realigned with CEC and other standards) as evidence.
3. The FFR requested full assessments (plus instructions) as given to the candidates & evaluators: specifically, Dispositions Assessment Instrument, Case Study, and the EOSL. In Addendum, the Case Study instructions were provided (item 1.3). On-site, the Dispositions Self-Assessment and the EOSL were provided. Likewise, onsite interviews (with Clinical Supervisors and with students) clarified how the Class Background Study is assessed, by whom, at what point in Clinical Teaching, and how the results are used to help the candidate. Interviews documented that candidates prepare these in consultation with their Cooperating Teachers and receive commentary from the University Supervisor after candidates teach the lesson.
4. The FFR requested additional (or more robust) evidence for Standard 1.2, specifically for the part of Standard 1.2 that asks candidates to use "research and evidence [...] to measure their P-12 students' progress" and adapt instruction accordingly. In the Addendum, the EPP indicates (in Item #4 of their responses to Standard 1) that candidates use research to plan and adapt instruction, citing both the Case Study & the Classroom Background Study as evidence, plus references to Assessment Portfolio and Case Study (Addendum 1.5) and "Types of Clinical Experiences" (Addendum 1.6).
5. The FFR requested to see examples of Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 syllabi that include ISTE Standards. (The EPP had indicated in the Self-Study Report that it "recognizes the need to improve in the area of technology integration" and that it will begin to include ISTE standards in course syllabi in Fall 2016. The EPP included a number of course syllabi (Fall 2016 & Spring 2017) in the Addendum that documented the inclusion of ISTE standards. In addition, onsite interviews documented current students' familiarity with the ISTE standards; they stated that their professors had introduced them in class and asked them to incorporate them into lesson planning. (Interviews with University Supervisors, Principals, and a Cooperating Teacher further documented that candidates are incorporating technology into their lessons.)
6. The FFR indicated that additional evidence was required to substantiate that the EPP is meeting Standard 1.4, related to candidates' skills and commitment to affording all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-readiness standards (CCRS). In the Addendum and on-site, ample evidence was presented for this. In the Addendum, the EPP indicated that in Texas, the CCRS are incorporated in the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) and are taught as candidates teach the TEKS. Tables 1.9 and 1.10 from the SSR documented candidates' work with the TEKS. The Classroom Background Study (completed by all candidates in Clinical Teaching) demonstrated that candidates plan lessons based on TEKS. Onsite interviews with University Supervisors, current students in the program, and Principals confirmed candidates' knowledge of the TEKS and use of them in lesson planning.
7. The FFR indicated the need to clarify Table 1.9: what the numbers (which are not really labelled) mean, information about the rating scale, etc. This was clarified on-site thanks to interviews and documents provided by the EPP. (On-site, the EPP provided a document (EOSL Dispositions Survey) that clarified the letter/number system used in Table 1.9 (an assessment from the EC-6 Science Block, ED 4314, that uses the same dispositions list.)

2. Analysis regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 1 :

a. Narrative analysis of findings

The following summary is based on evidence and findings in the SSR, FFR, Addendum, and onsite interviews relative to the 5 components related to

Standard 1.

The EPP demonstrated candidates' understanding of the InTASC standards through dispositional assessments (filled out by program faculty and university supervisors) and self-assessments completed at multiple points (at least 3) in the program for all candidates. Documents provided on-site documented the instructions that the faculty and university supervisors would see. Multiple on-site interviews (with program administrators, University Supervisors, current students in the program, and a cooperating teacher) documented that candidates are familiar with the InTASC standards and are reflective about their growth in achievements as they progress through the program. Data (provided with the SSR) indicate that candidates' scores on this dispositional assessment rise as they progress through the program, culminating in scores during Clinical Teaching of 2.8-2.92 on a 3-point scale.

The EPP demonstrated that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice; they demonstrated this through assessments completed by all candidates: a Case Study in EPSY 3303 (Work Sample 1.1 in the SSR) and a Class Background Study (Work Sample 1.2 in the SSR) in Clinical Teaching. The program indicates that case study scores reveal "that students not only understand and recognize the behavioral characteristics in the students they observe) [...] but they are also able to make connections and draw conclusions based on those observations." The program further indicates that the Classroom Background Study--done at the beginning of Clinical Teaching--also ensures "that the candidates apply research and evidence to further their own understanding of the teaching professional while using data to drive instruction." The EPP provided further information about these assessments in the Addendum, including the Case Study directions (Addendum 1.3) as requested. On-site interviews further demonstrated candidates' use of research to guide their practice, especially in Clinical Teaching.

The EPP demonstrated that its candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge in response to the standards of multiple accrediting bodies, including SACS, Texas Education Agency (TEA), and two SPAs: Association for Childhood Education (ACEI) and Council for Exceptional Children (CEC). The EPP was nationally recognized by both SPAs in the most recent program reviews (see Report 1.2 ACEI Report and Report 1.3 CEC Report, included in the SSR). In addition, the EPP is fully in compliance with the TEA as was demonstrated in the Addendum through Addendum item 1.1, the TEA Accreditation Letter and Completed Action Plan. (The EPP received a few compliance issue comments in its TEA report, Report 1.1 TEA Audit & Accreditation, including the caution that it should "explicitly teach data-driven practice within coursework." These issues were all addressed in the action plan included as Addendum 1.1, all of which was completed and approved by TEA.)

The EPP demonstrated that its candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college-and career-ready standards. In the SSR, the Addendum, and on-site, ample evidence was presented for this. In the Addendum, the EPP indicated that in Texas, the CCRS are incorporated in the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) and are taught as candidates teach the TEKS. Tables 1.9 and 1.10 from the SSR (also included in the Addendum) documented candidates' work with the TEKS. The Classroom Background Study (completed by all candidates in Clinical Teaching and included as Work Sample 1.2 in the SSR) demonstrated that candidates plan lessons based on TEKS. Onsite interviews with University Supervisors, current students in the program, and Principals confirmed candidates' knowledge of the TEKS and use of them in lesson planning.

The EPP demonstrated that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice. The EPP indicated in the SSR that its candidates model and apply technology standards through lesson planning (assessed during Clinical Teaching in the Classroom Background Study and the ESOL, Effects on Student Learning, data reported as Tables 1.12-1.14 in the SSR) and by passing the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) exam (which incorporates TExES Technology Standards). The program noted that it feels the need to improve in the area of technology integration, and it plans to include the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) standards in course syllabi beginning in Fall 2016. The EPP included a number of course syllabi (Fall 2016 & Spring 2017) in the Addendum that documented the inclusion of ISTE standards. In addition, onsite interviews documented current students' familiarity with the ISTE standards; they stated that their professors had introduced them in class and asked them to incorporate them into lesson planning. (Interviews with University Supervisors, Principals, and a Cooperating Teacher further documented that candidates are incorporating technology into their lessons.)

b. Analysis of Program-Level data

The following analysis was modified (from that provided in the FFR) based on information provided by means of additional clarification and evidence in the addendum and onsite interviews:

The EPP indicates in the SSR that "data were initially disaggregated at the level of the specialty area; it should be noted that the 4-8 Generalist program is a small program, and data for candidates in that program were aggregated with data from the EC-6 Generalist program to ensure sufficient data for analysis. Because the secondary and all-level programs are small, candidate data from these two programs also were aggregated to ensure sufficient data for analysis." Thus, in some pieces of evidence, data for various initial licensure programs are aggregated, and in others they are disaggregated. For example, the data for all-level or secondary level candidates are included and

disaggregated in the SSR in Table 1.1 EPSY 3303 Dispositions. In contrast, in other spots, such as Tables 1.6-1.8, which report Case Study Averages from the same semesters of EPSY 3303 covered by Table 1.1, the data for all candidates are not disaggregated.

The evidence included with the SSR did not seem to include the dispositional self-assessment that candidates would fill out. (The evidence that was in the SSR labelled as "Document 1.1 INTASC Dispositions" was the InTASC Dispositions but not the self-assessment form that the candidates would see.) However, the EPP provided those documents on-site, thus clarifying several previously unclear items from the SSR (including clearing up confusion over the letters/numbers used to identify components of the InTASC Standards).

The program indicates that the Case Study assignment, and its use by all candidates (regardless of program) in EPSY 3303, ensures that candidates are provided opportunities to demonstrate understanding of the teaching profession and application of research (standard 1.2). Based on a request in the Formative Feedback Report, the EPP provided (in the Addendum, as Addendum 1.3) the Case Study Assignment Instructions, which clarified how this evidence relates to the standard and how the data provided (in Tables 1.6 through 1.8) demonstrate candidates' achievements in this area. (Tables 1.6 through 1.8 indicate that over 90% of all candidates either meet or exceed expectations in all four categories assessed on the rubric.)

The work sample (Work Sample 1.2 from the SSR) of the Class Background Study (done by candidates during Clinical Teaching) is presented by the EPP as additional evidence for standard 1.2. The work sample does demonstrate that candidates are asked to use research and evidence (in this case, action research) in their professional practice. Onsite interviews with University Supervisors and current students in the program (EC-6, Secondary and All-Level, and Post-Bac) clarified how this assessment is used within the program, who gives the candidates feedback about this assessment, and how the assessments' results are used to help candidates grow.

The program provides especially robust data regarding candidates' dispositions (standard 1.1). Candidates are assessed on this (and self-assess) at three points in the program, and data indicate candidates' progression. See Tables 1.1 (EPSY 3303 Dispositions), 1.2 (Math-Science Dispositions), 1.3 (ED 4321 Dispositions), and 1.4 (Clinical Teacher Dispositions).

Summary data from the program's EOSL InTASC measure (completed for all candidates as part of clinical teaching, is presented in aggregate form in Table 1.5 of the SSR (InTASC EOSL Summary) and in a disaggregated version in Tables 1.12-1.14.

Onsite interviews, especially with University Supervisors, as well as documents provided onsite clarified the role and timing of the EOSL in

Clinical Teaching. (It is a comprehensive measure that includes 5 of more separate observations and evaluations, many uploaded through the TaskStream platform.)

Documents provided to the onsite team helped to clarify Table 1.9, Practicum ED 4314 Summary, whose numbers and rating scale were previously difficult to interpret.

The FFR asked the EPP to provide more syllabi, to document the inclusion of CCRS and ISTE standards in program syllabi. The EPP provided those syllabi as part of the Addendum, and those syllabi clearly demonstrate the inclusion of these standards.

c. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

The following points of evidence were identified in the FFR and validated onsite by means of additional clarification and evidence in the addendum and onsite interviews:

1. The program is accredited by TEA (6/22/15). Information in the Addendum (Addendum 1.1, TEA Accreditation Letter and Action Plan) further documented that all issues identified in the 6/22/15 document had been addressed by the EPP and the remedy approved by the TEA.
2. The data regarding candidate dispositions (including assessments from 3 points in each candidate's program) indicate candidates' growth in understanding and applying the InTASC standards. This evidence was further supported by onsite interviews with University Supervisors, current students in the program, Principals, and a cooperating teacher.
3. The program is accredited by the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI 2/1/2015).
4. The program is accredited by the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC, 2/1/15).
5. Program provides candidate data (from clinical teaching) that indicates that candidates are proficient in all area of the InTASC Standards (Table 1.4).
6. The program provides substantial evidence that their candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous CCRS (standard 1.4), including Table 1.9, Table 1.10. In the Addendum and on-site, ample additional evidence was presented for this. In the Addendum, the EPP indicated that in Texas, the CCRS are incorporated in the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) and are taught as candidates teach the TEKS. Tables 1.9 and 1.10 from the SSR documented candidates' work with the TEKS. The Classroom Background Study (completed by all candidates in Clinical Teaching) demonstrated that candidates plan lessons based on TEKS. Onsite interviews with University Supervisors, current students in the program, and Principals confirmed candidates' knowledge of the TEKS and use of them in lesson planning.

d. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

The following points of evidence were noted in the FFR as being inconsistent with meeting the standard. These inconsistencies were addressed through evidence provided in the addendum and through clarification by means of documents obtained and interviews conducted onsite. The resolution of each inconsistency is noted immediately following each one:

1. The TEA Accreditation report (6/22/15) lists a number of compliance issues.

Resolution: Information in the Addendum (Addendum 1.1, TEA Accreditation Letter and Action Plan) documented that all issues identified in the 6/22/15 document had been addressed by the EPP and the remedy approved by the TEA.

2. In the ACEI report, although the program was nationally recognized (without conditions), each individual standard was marked as "Met with conditions," with repeated feedback to make sure that various assessments and rubrics were more closely aligned with individual ACEI standards.

Resolution: In the Addendum ("Addendum Standard 1"), the EPP indicates that it has taken the recommendations of ACEI and "has been realigning and fine tuning rubrics and course assessments, based on individual ACEI Standards, to allow for 'cleaner' data collection, and to ensure that the rubrics reflect the language of the ACEI Standards."

3. 2/1/15 CEC report, although the program was nationally recognized, Additional Cmnts: "While national 'recognition' is being granted the institution and program faculties need to understand that further refinement of the assessment system is essential. Without refinement of assessments the program will not be able to sustain national recognition in its next submission in the next review cycle."

Resolution: The EPP indicates (in the Addendum) that the special ed faculty have begun realigning assessments and assignments per CEC recommendations; the EPP includes Addendum 1.2 (syllabi for courses that have been newly realigned with CEC and other standards) as evidence.

4. In the SSR, there were only 2 pieces of evidence, the Case Study and the Class Background Study (plus associated data, work samples, and a rubric for the Case Study), cited as evidence for standard 1.2.

Resolution: In the Addendum, the EPP explained more thoroughly how/when candidates are taught to use research and data to shape instruction. They also provided the instructions for the Case Study (Addendum 1.3), making more clear how research is a component of that assessment. In the Addendum, the EPP also provided additional evidence that candidates use research to plan and adapt instruction, including the Assessment Portfolio and Case Study (Addendum 1.5) and "Types of Clinical Experiences" (Addendum 1.6).

5. Evidence, and analysis of evidence, for standard 1.4 (CCRS) was very

light.

Resolution: This feedback from the FFR was based on a misunderstanding of the TEKS (Texas version of the CCRS) and of Table 1.9 (cited for this standard in the SSR). In the Addendum and on-site, ample additional evidence was presented for this.

6. In addition, the EPP indicates that ED 4314 (course whose Practicum data were reported in Table 1.9) is taken only by candidates in the EC-6, EC-6 with Special Education, and 4-8 programs. It does not seem that corresponding data for the all-level, secondary-level, and post-bac level candidates have been provided.

Resolution: The EPP provided Table 1.9 as evidence for standard 1.4. Similar evidence for all-level, secondary, and post-bac was verified onsite.

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement

| Area for Improvement | Rationale |
|----------------------|-----------|
| | |

Stipulation:

| Stipulation | Rationale |
|-------------|-----------|
| | |

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.

1. Findings for each offsite report task to be verified onsite:

Task(s)

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|
| | Seek clarification on implementation. | | | | | | | | |
| | A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration | | | | | | | | |
| | B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed | | | | | | | | |
| | C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>(1)</td> <td>How are actions from the EPPAC and Principal Focus Group meetings implemented and documented?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(2)</td> <td>How is candidate placement tracked via a spreadsheet so that the EPP ensures that each candidate has specific and sufficient opportunities for diverse experiences?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(3)</td> <td>What are the descriptors that distinguish between a 3, 2, etc. on the technology alignment document? How are these data collected and used?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4)</td> <td>What work samples exist that distinguish technology use from teacher controlled to P-12 student learning integration?</td> </tr> </table> | (1) | How are actions from the EPPAC and Principal Focus Group meetings implemented and documented? | (2) | How is candidate placement tracked via a spreadsheet so that the EPP ensures that each candidate has specific and sufficient opportunities for diverse experiences? | (3) | What are the descriptors that distinguish between a 3, 2, etc. on the technology alignment document? How are these data collected and used? | (4) | What work samples exist that distinguish technology use from teacher controlled to P-12 student learning integration? |
| (1) | How are actions from the EPPAC and Principal Focus Group meetings implemented and documented? | | | | | | | | |
| (2) | How is candidate placement tracked via a spreadsheet so that the EPP ensures that each candidate has specific and sufficient opportunities for diverse experiences? | | | | | | | | |
| (3) | What are the descriptors that distinguish between a 3, 2, etc. on the technology alignment document? How are these data collected and used? | | | | | | | | |
| (4) | What work samples exist that distinguish technology use from teacher controlled to P-12 student learning integration? | | | | | | | | |

Action:

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | In the SSR, the EPP asserted that P-12 partners participate in co-construction of the teaching preparation programs. The narrative analysis of preliminary findings noted that while these meetings were taking place, the loop of co-construction lacked evidence of how these meetings linked together. Furthermore, action steps for change were not made clear in the SSR. Upon further review of new evidence from the addendums and EPP website, some links can be found that indicate changes were made. Addendum CCT 1 and Addendum CCT2 provide notes from Principal Focus Groups. In each of these documents, principals stated that teacher candidates in early childhood/elementary education are not proficient in using assessment data to drive student learning. According to the Data Day PPT from December 2016, Teacher Ed Update, Slide 7 Innovations, a change was made in the course RDG 3335 to address using assessment data for student learning. |
| 2. | In the SSR, the EPP showed opportunities for diverse placements. However, no consistent tracking system for candidates was evident. In the May 2016 Data Day notes for CAEP Standards Action Plans, this was mentioned. Addendum 1.1 TEA Accreditation Letter and Completed Action Report lists a discrepancy relating to tracking diverse student placements and verification of clinical requirements. In their response to the TEA, the EPP provided a narrative that details how candidate data is housed within the Educator Preparation Information Center. This process was implemented in 2015 to house evidence that clinical experience placement and requirements were met. As evidence of this process to the TEA, the EPP provided three randomly selected candidate records. The TEA accepted the evidence to meet the discrepancy. A student field placement record showing diverse placements was found in exhibit Diversity 1.2. Addendum 1.6 includes a diverse experiences table, but it is blank. |
| 3. | The EPP provided a technology alignment document in the SSR that shows a range of scores from 1-3. Upon further clarification, the document reflects the ESOL Rubric for Evaluation of Standards. This document shows the |

distinct levels of performance that explains the scores reported on the technology alignment document. According

4. Work samples were found within the evidence documents that demonstrate how candidates use technology-integrated lessons (3.6 Technology Lesson Plan and 3.7 Technology Lesson Plan). Furthermore, interviews on-site at the elementary and secondary school locations revealed that candidates know how to integrate technology. Examples of technology integration included Plickers, Kahoot, PowerPoint, and using a 1:1 environment for student research.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 2 :

a. Summary of findings

The following summary is based on evidence and findings in the SSR, FFR, Addendum, and On-site Interviews relative to the three components relating to Standard Two, Clinical Partnerships and Practice.

Partnerships for Clinical Preparation was evident through examples of the mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements. The EPP maintains Field Placement Interagency Affiliation Agreements with each of the districts served. The EPP implements technology integration that supports P-12 partners through scaffolding candidates' preparation for integration in the instructional setting. The EOSL, technology alignment, syllabi, and work samples consistently demonstrate technology use within the partnerships. Furthermore, school site visits revealed that candidates authentically use technology in various grade levels and in different aspects of curriculum. Local school partners provide technology training for teacher candidates. This is done through collaboration with methods professors each semester. The EPP regularly meets with principals through an established Principal Focus Group. Within this focus group, principals are able to freely dialogue with EPP representatives about a myriad of topics, including how the teacher preparation curriculum is structured. For example, suggestions given including increased emphasis on assessment, improving classroom management, and working with students of poverty. Notes from the Data Day activities include action responses or suggestions to Principal Focus Group suggestions. Interviews of principals indicate that they feel that the EPP listens to them and makes changes as indicated by their suggestions. This communication loop suggests an authentic atmosphere of co-construction for clinical experiences, technology, and program requirements. Further evidence from cooperating teacher surveys suggests that the cooperating teachers also have input into the co-construction process thereby broadening the communication to include voices directly from the classroom.

Clinical educators are co-selected, prepared, evaluated, supported, and retained through a two way process that includes P-12 partners and the EPP. On site interviews revealed the clinical educators (university supervisors and cooperating teachers) feel supported and prepared for work with teacher candidates. Both of these groups reported that communication is strong. When issues or questions arise they feel very comfortable in contacting the EPP and are satisfied with the mutual respect shown to them when issues arise. Interviews also revealed that principals feel a strong rapport with the EPP. When queried about co-selecting school-based cooperating teachers,

principals reported that EPP personnel remain in contact with them and are familiar with their school so that selections are mutually beneficial. Professional development for cooperating teachers is provided through internet resources which allows participants to complete training at times that are convenient for them. Applications for cooperating teachers are online through the EPP website, responsibilities are detailed in the field experience manual. Forms for cooperating teachers and university supervisors can be easily accessed through the EPP website, giving everyone opportunity to find materials, forms, checklists, and expectations for the different roles. Cooperating teachers and university supervisors both complete surveys to gather information on the different roles which is then used as data to inform program decisions. When supervisors or cooperating teachers need to be dismissed, the EPP works with the school or individual to implement those changes. Cooperating teachers report that hosting teacher candidates benefits them in multiple ways but technology is at the forefront. The cooperating teachers feel that learning about technology integration from the candidates is one way that they get professionally developed as a benefit of having a candidate in their classroom.

The EPP works with partners to design clinical experiences that demonstrate sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration so that candidates are well-prepared to meet the demands of classroom teaching. Candidate progress in terms of types of clinical placements are managed using technology with the File Maker Pro system along with applications for field experiences and clinical teaching. The EPP provides evidence of technology-enhanced learning by providing the technology alignment document that shows how the Effects on Student Learning rating instrument include technology integration. These documents together illustrate how candidates perform on a three-point rubric (improvement needed, developing, proficient, not applicable) while using technology applications in the classroom. The EOSL also indicates how candidates are impacting student learning while in clinical teaching. The EPP provided Addendum 1.6 Types of Clinical Experiences to illustrate the breadth, depth, and coherence of EPP wide clinical experiences. This document also included assessments for each clinical component. The clinical teaching semester is the capstone experience and includes four observations using the EOSL Checklist, Cooperating Teacher Feedback, Reflections, and completion of the Task Stream Portfolio. Dispositions of candidates are measured three times: beginning of program, middle, and end. The candidate disposition results are compared with cooperating teachers and university supervisors. Candidates are counseled regarding their disposition as needed when discrepancies exist. This process is a way that cooperating teachers and university supervisors contribute to the continuous growth of teacher candidates.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

The following evidence from the SSR, FFR, Addendum, and On-site Interviews is consistent with meeting the three components relating to Standard Two, Clinical Partnerships and Practice.

From the SSR Evidence:

2.1 Field Experience Manual: Evidence from the SSR suggests that the EPP and partners maintain mutually beneficial relationships that include regular (at least twice yearly) EPPAC meetings for the purpose of sharing and receiving information on educator preparation programs.

2.13 Shared responsibility is indicated by the activities of the EPP and partners regarding the depth and breadth of the clinical experiences, including how cooperating teachers provide support and input for candidates in teaching lessons within P-12 classrooms.

2.2 The EPP and partners participate in evaluations to collect feedback on cooperating teachers and university supervisors, and then use these data to strengthen decision making and professional development.

2.2 Online resources for professional development for Clinical Teaching and field experiences are available via YouTube and training documents are found on the College of Education website.

2.13 The SSR indicates that candidates have opportunities for a wide variety of active clinical experiences in diverse settings.

2.13 Clinical experiences include opportunities for focused teaching experiences with specific strategy use.

Diversity 1.1; Tables 1.5, 1.12, and 1.13; and Work Sample 1.1

3.6 Technology Lesson Plan

3.7 Technology Lesson Plan

5.1 File Maker Pro Screenshot

From the Addendum

1.1 TEA Accreditation Letter and Completed Plan of Action

1.6 Types of Clinical Experiences

5.3 Comparison

From the On Site Interviews

Description of how cooperating teachers and university supervisors are selected and retained.

Testimony of principals regarding input into construction of program and clinical experiences.

Testimony of cooperating teachers on levels of support while hosting teacher candidates and participation in professional development offered by the EPP

Testimony of university supervisors on the process for supervision, communication, and collaboration with the EPP.

Discussion regarding purpose of Data Day and how that ties together various surveys, focus groups, advisory councils, and candidate results for

implementing change.

Testimony from faculty regarding how changes are made using information for data day, ways to collaborate with P-12 partners, and how technology integration is implemented with a partnership from local P-12 technology coordinators.

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

N/A

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

| Area for Improvement | Rationale |
|----------------------|-----------|
| | |

Stipulation

| Stipulation | Rationale |
|-------------|-----------|
| | |

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 4.

1. Findings for each offsite report task to be verified onsite:

Task(s)

| | |
|----|--|
| | Determine whether the EPP has a recruitment plan in place. |
| | A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration |
| | (1) All data for progression through all three gates should be reviewed. |
| | (2) Management of processes for admission and monitoring candidates through gates, including counseling and remediation processes, should be verified. |
| | B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed |
| | C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews |
| 1. | (1) What is the plan for ensuring EPP admission criteria meet CAEP requirements? |
| | (2) What is the role of interviews for admission, who is involved in the admission interviews, and what instrument is used? Is the instrument reliable and valid? How are the questions aligned to the state standards and CAEP Standards? |
| | (3) What is the process for data management of admission and gateway data? Are these data entered into Task Stream? Is the application on Task Stream? |
| | (4) What are the TExES results for the past three years? |
| | (5) Verify how the Texas-driven "10% exception rule" is managed and how it will allow the EPP to meet CAEP admission requirements. |
| | (6) What is the "counseling out" process? Is a specific form used? Where are the files kept? Who manages the process? |
| | (7) What are the Texas Success Initiative requirements? |

Action:

Interviews revealed that the EPP, as an HSI, made a conscious decision to set their GPA requirement at 2.75 to

1. encourage Hispanic and other ethnic minority admission. In 2012-2013, the cohort GPA average was 3.18, in 2013-2014, it was 3.22 and in 2014-2015, it was 3.23. The EPP has consistently shown that candidates score well above the 3.0 GPA minimum for each academic year, the time frame of the cohort as defined by the EPP.

2. The term "interviews" was misinterpreted when the SSR was reviewed. A discussion with administrators of the EPP initial programs suggests that the interviews instead are a 1-to-1 meeting with applicants to the initial EPP programs where the checklist of the requirements are reviewed. A counselor from the EPI Center performs all of these initial interviews. Candidates are informally assessed for disposition issues at this point and any disposition issues that have arisen during pre-education courses are addressed at this point. There is a place in drop-box for faculty to enter official disposition issues for review by EPI Center staff. This interview process does not require the process of proving validity or reliability. The State of Texas requested a formal interview process to be implemented and the process of formally introducing dispositions in ED 2302 prior to admission was accepted as remediation by TEA (approved and dated August 12, 2016).

3. Interviews with the Educator Preparation Information Center staff clarified the process for entry data management and gateway data management. Filemaker Pro is used as a general database through which all data is kept that comes from either Banner or from placements. All data from courses (e.g. clinical data, surveys, e-portfolios) are entered by faculty and supervisors into Taskstream. The EPI Center staff monitor all gateway data. If there are issues with candidates involving admission, retention, dismissal and/or dispositions, the faculty committee of the same name (Admission, Retention, Dismissal, & Disposition Committee, ARDD) meets to advise the EPI Center advisors how to proceed.

4. Data for three years (2014-2016) of the TExES test, which is a reliable and valid normed test, was provided in the SSR Addendum. It was noticed, however, that the African American students had a "failing" score in 2014. There was no discussion of remediation procedures or if the students were required to pass the test prior to moving to Gate 3. Overall, there was no information provided that the academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.

5. The 10% Exception Rule, as explained in interviews and in the SSR Addendum, means that EPPs may admit candidates with GPA's below the required GPA in published documents. For this EPP, 15% of the 2012-2013 cohort had GPA's below the 2.75 threshold. In the 2013-2014 cohort, the 14% had GPA's below the 2.75 threshold. And in the 2014-2015 cohort, only 0.04% of candidates had GPA's below the 2.75 threshold. The EPI Center staff monitors the GPA data and make plans for student remediation, if needed.

6. Interviews with the EPI Center staff clarified that counseling out procedures are handled by the EPI Center with faculty input. If a candidate is displaying academic or non-academic characteristics that are of a concern to the EPP faculty, the EPI Center will make a Growth Plan with the candidate, EPI Center staff and the concerned faculty, if necessary, signing off on the plan. If the issue is clinical-based, the candidate will get a second placement in the schools to remediate. If unsuccessful, the candidate is counseled out of their program and switched to a BIS degree, which is an interdisciplinary degree with three minors.

7. As verified in onsite interviews, as a part of entering the EPP for teacher certification, candidates must have their Texas Success Initiative (TSI) scores on file with EPIC. The TSI is a basic test of reading, mathematics and writing skills that must be completed before any college student can enroll in any college-level courses at any Texas IHE.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 3:

a. Summary of findings

The provider has an average of 24.1% diverse candidates (all other than white) accepted to the program from 2012-2015. This data was provided in the SSR, the FFR Addendum and corroborated in interviews. Interviews with administrators also reveal that there are several ongoing initiatives to encourage Hispanic and other ethnic minorities to join Teacher Education programs. TEA provides a yearly bulletin naming official shortage areas. In addition, there is a pipeline between the EPI Center and the school districts where the districts share information about shortage areas that might be unique to specific districts and hard-to-staff schools. The EPI Center shares this information with appropriate candidates.

Interviews with the EPI Center staff, the SSR and the FFR Addendum reveal that the provider meets the CAEP criteria for academic achievement and gathers disaggregated data on enrolled candidates on an academic year basis. The GPA minimum is 2.75 in an effort to attract diverse candidates, but

the cohort averages exceed the 3.0 CAEP minimum requirement. The GPA is monitored throughout a candidate's program by staff in the EPI Center. SAT/ACT scores began to be calculated with the 2014-2015 cohort. All of the gateway data is monitored throughout a candidate's program to ensure that candidates are meeting the standards for remaining in their program.

Dispositions are monitored throughout programs as noted in the Feedback Report. Content validity and inter-rater reliability are calculated for the disposition rubric as used with clinical faculty. Data for three years (2014-2016) TExES, which is a reliable and valid normed test, was provided in the IR Addendum. It was noticed, however, that the African American students had a "failing" score in 2014. For students who don't pass the TExES test, they are given access to an online tutorial software named Certify Teacher by the EPI Center staff. If they do not pass a second time, they are sent to the appropriate area faculty for further remediation. The EPP does use inter-rater reliability and content validity but not do much in the way of predictive analytics. The EPI Center staff use the entire data set to look at trends and use the information to make decisions about programmatic assessments. They share their data with department chairs and the department chairs in turn share the data with the EPP faculty.

The EPI Center staff verified that the EPP monitors dispositions and attributes until the candidate begins clinical practice and again in the evaluations of the teacher candidates throughout clinical practice. During clinical practice, the dispositions and other attributes are monitored and evaluated by university supervisors and cooperating teachers. The EPP has a plan to look at how the attributes predict candidate performance in the PK-12 classroom. The EPP uses content validity and inter-rater reliability to ensure that their clinical forms are valid and reliable.

The candidates submit a lesson plan based upon the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) to show College and Career Readiness Standards (CCRs) are met. This is entered and stored on Taskstream. Interviews with EPP members and data provided onsite ensures there are multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates' developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and integration of technology in all of these domains.

At completion, candidates must receive testing approval prior to taking the Certification Examination. This approval process is state mandated and requires the EPP to ensure that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development. For all candidates, the determination is made by the major content faculty.

At completion, candidates are screened for ability to understand the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional

standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies. These areas are embedded in the field and clinical expectations. Candidates sign a form stating that they know and understand the expectations of the profession before being accepted into their program and again prior to clinical practice.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

The diversity of the entering cohort and within the clinical placement locations is evident, based upon the reported data in the SSR and FFR Addendum. This data was verified on site.

The EPP Admission Policy is published and available for candidates to review. The provider meets the CAEP minimum criteria (e.g. 3.0 GPA minimum) and gathers disaggregated data on the enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during and academic year. The EPP monitors GPA throughout the candidate's program beginning at admission.

The provider has defined criteria for program progression and monitors candidates' from admission through completion.

The provider recommends candidates for licensure or certification only when they have passed the content examinations required by the State of Texas.

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

N/A

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

| Area for Improvement | Rationale |
|----------------------|-----------|
| | |

Stipulation

| Stipulation | Rationale |
|-------------|-----------|
| | |

Standard 4: Program Impact

The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

1. Findings for each offsite report task to be verified onsite:

Task(s)

| | |
|----|--|
| | Seek clarity on the EPP's plan to study the impact of ASU completers on P-12 student learning. |
| | A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration |
| | (1) Interviews with P-12 school faculty and administrators, and district administrators. |
| | (2) Interviews with alumni related to their preparedness and satisfaction. |
| | (3) Demonstration of the CREATE database. |
| | B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed |
| 1. | (1) Please clarify the PEEQ data and their usefulness for the EPP since they are not reliable. |
| | (2) Why is the information repeated in the SSR? |
| | (3) Please provide Exhibit 4.1a related to math scores. |
| | (4) Some evidence described and referenced to the Evidence Room in the SSR have different numbers in the Evidence Room. |
| | (5) On page 24 of the SSR, it states that suggestions from the Principal Day were to be discussed during the fall 2016 Data Day. Please provide any follow up information available from the Data Day meeting. |
| | (6) According to the SSR on page 25, the EPP will begin collecting data in fall 2016 assessing completers who have taught for one year. Making these data available to the team will be helpful. |
| | C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews |
| | (1) How does the EPP know completers impact P-12 student learning? |
| | (2) Who will take responsibility for ensuring the Self-Improvement Plan (SIP) is accomplished; for example, who will administer surveys, who will generate reports, and who will conduct the Value-Added Model (VAM) research studies? |

(3) Who will be involved in the analysis of data collected through the SIP?

(4) How will each program use the data to make changes for improvement?

Action:

A. All the interviews were completed during the onsite visit. The information is provided in the space below under the Summary of Findings. B. Excerpts from the SSR were clarified. The PEEQ questions were discussed and learned that these data are provided by the State of Texas and sometime they are not complete or fully correct. However, the data reveal the performance of the EPP candidates is comparable to other institutions. The EPP provided the correct evidence and missing information. The Data Day information is followed up in the faculty meetings and then faculty members work on to improve their courses based upon the data. C. The EPP uses various measures to determine the impact of student learning. The Director of Educator Support Service, and Accountability is responsible for Self Improvement Plan, its implementation, and the analysis of data collected through the SIP.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 4 :

a. Summary of findings

In order to meet the component 4.1 of the standard the EPP used the data from a research project called Project on Educator Effectiveness and Quality (PEEQ). This project was a Texas Education Agency (TEA) sponsored research project. The evidence collected from the project indicates that the classroom performance of first year teachers from the EPP was comparable to that of veteran teachers. As discussed during the onsite visit conversations, the state of Texas is launching a new teacher evaluation system with a value-added component. However, it is not fully implemented. The information collected during interviews, presentations, and from the offsite addendum, the State of Texas collects data each year from principals related to the quality of first year teachers using a 38-item survey. The EPP provides data for three years, 2012-2014, which indicate that principal perceived the EPP candidates as well prepared for their profession. The team was informed that the state does not provide disaggregated data for various programs to EPPs. During the school visits, the team members met with P-12 faculty and building principals about the candidates who were doing clinical experience and those who were hired by the schools. The principals were very satisfied with performance of both the EPP candidates and the graduates working at their schools. In another interview the district superintendents echoed that opinion by calling the candidates and graduate well qualified.

To meet the requirements of component 4.2, the EPP provides data to demonstrate the teacher candidates' impact on student learning. These data are collected by the clinical teaching candidates from 6-12 students using a 34-item survey from the Colorado Education Initiative. Candidates have high scores on this survey. During the onsite visit, it was described that no data are collected on the candidates' performance from grades 1-5 students because several young students were not able to comprehend and respond to the survey questions. During the onsite visit, the school faculty and administrator praised the EPP candidates' classroom performance and its positive impact on student learning. During the onsite visits, the candidates and graduates described that they determine the impact of their teaching on

P-12 student learning by using various types of assessments including pre- and post-assessment. The candidates described that student learning is observable when P-12 students are engaged in learning and involved in deep class discussion or asking high level thinking questions. From these signs the candidates infer that the students are learning the concepts.

For meeting the component 4.3 requirements, the EPP uses the state data about its graduates from the Consortium for Research and Evaluation in Teacher Education (CREATE). These data show information about the EPP graduates and their roles in public schools. During the onsite visit, the school and district administrators described that they were satisfied with the performance of the EPP graduates and that they had hired the EPP graduates for years. The team members interviewed some of the EPP graduates working at local schools. Some of the graduates have moved up to the administrator positions in P-12 schools. There were no negative comments about any of the EPP graduates from any administrators.

To address the requirements for component 4.4, the EPP uses two sources of program evaluation data on completers. One of them is a state survey the candidates complete to evaluate their programs. The other measure is an EPP created survey which is administered at the end of the clinical experience. The data for the last six semester indicate that the completers were satisfied by their preparation even though they need more professional development in certain areas such as classroom management. The interviews with the EPP graduates at various local schools confirmed that they were satisfied with their preparation, both in content and pedagogy. Some of them did mention their weakness in classroom management, but they were satisfied with overall learning and preparation. During an interview, some EPP graduates wished that they had learned about dealing with exceptional students and accommodations/adaptations for various types of learners.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

The evidence, data, and analysis of impact of program completers in P-12 settings provided in the IR and IR addendum are consistent with meeting the standard. The evidence requested in the formative feedback report was provided by the EPP which clarified the various approaches used to measure program impact. A majority of the EPP completers are employed by public schools in the State of Texas and the completers are monitored by TEA. This externally bench-marked data demonstrates clearly the positive impact of program completers in P-12 settings. The EPP has worked diligently with state officials and EPP technology staff to create software that allows timely and coherent analysis of the data provided by the state.

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

None.

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

| Area for Improvement | Rationale |
|----------------------|-----------|
| | |

Stipulation

| Stipulation | Rationale |
|-------------|-----------|
| | |

Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

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.

1. Findings for each offsite report task to be verified onsite:

Task(s)

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | Confirm that there is a comprehensive quality assurance system. | |
| | A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration | |
| | (1) <table border="1"><tr><td>Diagram 5.1 referenced in the SSR could not be found in the Evidence Room.</td></tr></table> | Diagram 5.1 referenced in the SSR could not be found in the Evidence Room. |
| Diagram 5.1 referenced in the SSR could not be found in the Evidence Room. | | |
| | B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed | |
| 1. | (1) <table border="1"><tr><td>On page 26 of the SSR, it states: "The EPP data system that provides the input for the data summary report can be seen in Diagram 5.1. Data collected from multiple sources forms the basis for data driven decision-making. In Diagram 5.1, the source for the different types of data that are analyzed throughout the year is presented."</td></tr></table> | On page 26 of the SSR, it states: "The EPP data system that provides the input for the data summary report can be seen in Diagram 5.1. Data collected from multiple sources forms the basis for data driven decision-making. In Diagram 5.1, the source for the different types of data that are analyzed throughout the year is presented." |
| On page 26 of the SSR, it states: "The EPP data system that provides the input for the data summary report can be seen in Diagram 5.1. Data collected from multiple sources forms the basis for data driven decision-making. In Diagram 5.1, the source for the different types of data that are analyzed throughout the year is presented." | | |
| | C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews | |
| | (1) <table border="1"><tr><td>What procedures does the EPP follow for data collection, aggregation, disaggregation, analysis, dissemination, and use?</td></tr></table> | What procedures does the EPP follow for data collection, aggregation, disaggregation, analysis, dissemination, and use? |
| What procedures does the EPP follow for data collection, aggregation, disaggregation, analysis, dissemination, and use? | | |
| | (2) <table border="1"><tr><td>What is the timeline followed to ensure the accomplishment of the procedures?</td></tr></table> | What is the timeline followed to ensure the accomplishment of the procedures? |
| What is the timeline followed to ensure the accomplishment of the procedures? | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Ascertain how technology is used to support the quality assurance system. |
| | A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration |
| | B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed |

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

2. (1) How does FileMaker Pro relate to the longitudinal database?
- (2) How does Taskstream relate to the longitudinal database?
- (3) Will the longitudinal database include all of the data needed by the EPP? If not, what electronic platforms complement the longitudinal database?
- (4) Who oversees the database?
- (5) Who enters data?
- (6) Who has access to the database? For what purposes?

Determine the transition points in both the undergraduate and postbaccalaureate initial teacher education programs.

- A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
- B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
3. C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

- (1) What requirements must be met at the three gates in the undergraduate programs?
- (2) How many gates do the postbaccalaureate programs have?
- (3) What requirements must be met at these gates?

Identify all of the EPP-wide assessments that are not proprietary assessments.

- A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
4. B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
- C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

- (1) What assessments are required of all teacher candidates and for which performance data are collected?

Verify that the EPP addresses operational effectiveness.

5. A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
- B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
- C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

- (1) What data have been collected, analyzed, and used to make changes in the EPP's operations?
- (2) What evidence indicates that the changes resulted in improved operational effectiveness?

Seek evidence that the EPP's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

- A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
- B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
6. C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

- (1) How was validity established for each of the assessments developed by the EPP and used across all programs?
- (2) How was reliability established for each of the assessments developed by the EPP and used across all programs?

Confirm that program improvements have been made based on candidate performance.

- A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
- (1) The SSR mentions that each department submits a report that describes program implementation based on data indicating a need for change. Evidence to substantiate this claim would be helpful.
7. B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
- C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

- (1) What evidence indicates that candidate performance on state assessments improved after the implementation of tutorial software?
- (2) What other program changes were made based on candidate performance?

Verify stakeholder involvement in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.

- A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
8. B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
- C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

- (1) Who will serve on the proposed Teacher Impact Group?
- (2) How will this group be distinct from other stakeholder groups?

Action:

1. The EPP provided Diagram 5.1 which details the quality assurance system that is used to monitor candidate progression in the initial teacher preparation programs. The multiple measures analyzed include state test data, TexES Action Plan, comparisons with previous cohorts, and compliance with external bodies, including the State of Texas and CAEP. The data is analyzed every August by a committee consisting of the director of the Educator Preparation Information Center (EPIC) undergraduate advisor, graduate advisor, field experience advisor, and certification advisor. A formal report of all data analyzed is submitted to the dean and teacher education faculty.
2. FileMaker Pro is the longitudinal database used by the EPP. This database includes student demographic information, program information, GPA monitoring, teacher certification information, admission/completion reviews, etc. The TaskStream portal houses student work samples, evaluations of clinical observations, lesson plans, case studies, and other materials relative to course work or clinical practice. The Director of the Educator Preparation Information Center (EPIC) oversees FileMaker Pro and is responsible for overseeing the data systems and insuring accurate posting of information. The TaskStream system is monitored by individual faculty.
3. The EPP has three gates for all candidates in their initial preparation programs: program admission, progression to clinical practice, and program completion. At each gateway a review of candidate GPA, degree progression, dispositions, field placements, and readiness for taking content examinations (in secondary content areas). The third gate (program completion) involves assessment of candidate performance in clinical placement. The dean's presentation included a detailed description of the requirements and expectations of candidate performance at each gate. In addition, it outlined examples of candidate remediation falls below the acceptable expectations of the unit. For example, the EPP has implemented a series of efforts to improve candidate performance on state certification examinations. This change was prompted by an analysis of candidate performance on the state certification examinations and a new state statute that requires candidates to successfully pass these examinations on the second attempt.
4. In addition to the proprietary assessments required by the State of Texas, the following assessments are administered across all programs: dispositions, field experiences/student teaching observations, case studies, content area domain scores, and effects on student learning. This data is analyzed by a EPP committee annually and reported to the dean and faculty in the Data Summary Report (Exhibit 5.1). The EPP has made several improvements based on the data including providing pre-test tutoring and assistance for state exams, purchasing a database to analyze state assessment data, and researching a new dispositions instrument created at the University of Colorado at Boulder.
5. The EPP has used data (both empirical and anecdotal) to make changes in EPP operations. For instance, the graduate and undergraduate programs were structurally separated in the last five years. Each program has its own chairperson and academic advisor; both report to the director of the Educator Preparation Information Center. This improved overall efficiency of program administration and reduced misinformation between the two programs. This change has received very positive feedback from both students and faculty. The EPP has eliminated several programs due to low enrollments, negative market demand, and competition from other institutions.
6. See 2a
7. The EPP acquired Certify Teacher, a software package for test preparation, to improve candidate performance on state certification examinations. Initially, only candidates who failed the exams were offered this remediation opportunity; however, the EPP has extended this to all candidates prior to administrations of the state examinations. The EPP has an overall pass rate of 94% (2014-2015) which exceeds expectations, however, new state regulations will require a pass rate of 90% based on two attempts.
8. The Teacher Impact Group consists of currently employed P-12 classroom teachers who work with candidates in field work and clinical placements. This group will provide the EPP with direct insights regarding demographic changes in public schools, curricular needs and skills, and the reality of teaching from the perspective of classroom teachers. This group differs from other stakeholder groups in that it consists solely of classroom teachers. The EPP works with local school districts to identify potential members of the group. The EPP hopes to match members of the Teacher Impact Group with candidates for purposes of completing action research projects and administering the Student Perception Inventory.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 5:

a. Summary of findings

The following summary is based on evidence and findings in the SSR, FFR, Addendum, and onsite interviews relative to the five components related to Standard 5.

The EPP has an array of measures to monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. The measures include proprietary instruments, EPP-created assessments, and collaborations with P-12 teachers and administrators. The various assessments (teacher certification examinations, field experiences/student teaching evaluations, case studies, content area domain scores, and effects on student learning) generate data that is systematically collected, thoroughly analyzed, and used to insure continuous improvement. The proprietary and EPP-created assessments support that the EPP satisfies all CAEP standards.

The data from the teacher certification examinations and data from CREATE longitudinal database allow the EPP to make comparisons across time and programs using data that is reliable, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures that are valid and reliable. The EPP has identified methods of establishing and maintaining validity and reliability for the two program-wide assessments-Effects on Student Learning (EOSL) and case studies.

To insure reliability both instruments are aligned with the ranking categories of the InTASC standards (parallel form) and those individuals responsible for completing the assessment must complete formal training by the EPP each semester to insure that results are reliable (inter-rater reliability). The training includes exercises (video reviews and analysis of work samples) to monitor inter-rater reliability. In addition, to insure validity all assessments are aligned with state and InTASC standards (content validity) and have well-developed rubrics (construct validity). All of the outcomes are closely correlated and are analyzed on an annual basis. The EPP reviews all assessments annually and conducts a pilot run of any new assessments being considered for future use.

The EPP has an electronic collection system (FileMaker Pro and Taskstream) to assist in the storage and analysis of data, a data coordinator to advise and insure the systematic collection of EPP data, and a committee that analyzes all EPP assessment data on an annual basis. The Data Summary Report (Exhibit 5.1) presents data in a number of formats, including an analysis of correlations with candidate performance on admissions tests (ACT, SAT, THEA) and the basic skills test and candidate performance.

The EPP purchased a longitudinal database (CREATE) which captures data on teachers in the State of Texas. The data includes the following information on the EPP's completers: year of certification, place of employment, areas of certification, and contact information. This allows the EPP to reach out to school administrators to assess the impact of completers on P-12 student growth. The data reaches back ten years and the EPP is currently working with IT experts to extract data at 1,5, and 10 years after program completion. This endeavor allows the EPP to formally track completers. In addition, 10 school districts currently provide data on completer performance and the

State Principal Survey of New Teachers is administered each year. Both sources provide data on completer impact on P-12 student growth (Exhibits 4.1 and 4.4).

The EPP has a robust collaboration with various stakeholders in P-12 schools. The Educator Preparation Advisory Council (EPAC) consists of EPP faculty, superintendents, principals, cooperating teachers who meet twice each year (Spring/Summer) to discuss candidate performance, program changes, and the strengths/weaknesses of program completers. In addition, the Principal's Focus Group meets annually to discuss candidate and completer readiness for P-12 schools.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

The following points of evidence were identified in the FFR and validated onsite by means of additional clarification and evidence in the addendum and onsite interviews:

(1) Table 4.3 CREATE Longitudinal 10 Year Data Base of ASU Teachers-The EPP is working with the institutional IT personnel to develop an in-house database to effectively report candidate data collected by the State of Texas.

(2) Document 5.1 Sample Data Day Agenda-The annual data day held each August analyzes data collected across all programs (both proprietary and EPP-created) and results in a Data Summary Report (Exhibit 5.1) which reports data across all programs, broken down by candidate demographics and cohorts, and candidate performance on state certification examinations. The data is reported in aggregate and disaggregate form.

Document 5.2 TEA Compliance Action Plan-The EPP has successfully responded to "deficiencies" by the TEA and are in full-compliance.

Document 5.3 Populations Served-Provides a clear percentage breakdown of program membership

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

NA

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement

| Area for Improvement | Rationale |
|----------------------|-----------|
| | |

Stipulation

| Stipulation | Rationale |
|-------------|-----------|
| | |

Section 3: Cross-cutting Themes of Diversity and Technology

1. DIVERSITY

a. Summary regarding adequacy and accuracy of evidence related to diversity

The EPP is categorized as a Hispanic Serving Institution which means that more than 25 percent of the student population identify as Hispanic. In addition, the San Angelo region has significant racial, ethnic and socio-economic diversity.

The evidence provided by the EPP included course syllabi, assessments crossing all programs, descriptions of state certification examination and candidate performance, proprietary assessments, demographic data of candidates and P-12 schools, and efforts to attract diverse candidates to the various programs. These exhibits and documents clearly demonstrate that the EPP is focused on the importance of diversity and committed to preparing candidates for diverse P-12 schools.

The evidence was well-organized and appropriately aligned with the CAEP standards.

b. Evidence that adequately and accurately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of diversity

The EPP's preparation of candidates in the area of diversity is compelling and crosses all of the CAEP standards.

Diversity is a central component of content and pedagogical preparation of candidates (Standard 1). The importance of diversity in all forms is deeply embedded in the coursework required of candidates as well as all assessments. All courses are aligned with the EPPs dispositions, InTasc standards, state standards, and requirements of specialized professional associations. Each of these have specific requirements regarding diversity.

The EPP has thoroughly integrated diversity into their clinical partnerships and practice (Standard 2). The EPP has entered into mutually beneficial partnerships with school districts in the region all of which have a high percentage of diverse students. The types of diversity include ELL, ESL, bilingual, Title I, socio-economic, special needs, racial, and ethnic. The San Angelo ISD, where most candidates complete their field placements and clinical practice, is very diverse with 75% of the student falling under Title I. The EPP monitors candidate placements to insure that all have diverse field and clinical placements during the course of their program. The placements are monitored by the director of EPIC and stored on FileMaker Pro (Standard 5). The formal observations of candidates in field placement and clinical practice measure candidate effectiveness in responding to the needs of diverse students in P-12 schools. The effectiveness of completers in meeting the needs of diverse students is measured by the State Principal's Survey of New Teachers which is administered by the Texas Education Agency. The

survey results indicate that completers are "sufficiently prepared" to work in diverse P-12 schools, specifically the instrument assess effectiveness in working with ELL students and students with disabilities. This instrument provides important data on program impact in the area of working with diverse P-12 schools and students (Standard 4).

The challenge of recruiting highly qualified and diverse candidates (Standard 3) is recognized by the EPP and is a major priority given the history and mission of the institution. The cohorts admitted from 2012-2015 were diverse and included candidates who self-identified as Hispanic, African American, Asian or Native American. In 2012-2013, 43 of the 175 candidates admitted in the cohort were Hispanic, African American, Asian or Native American accounting for 25% of the cohort. In 2013-2014, 45 candidates out of 205 admitted were Hispanic, African American, Asian or Native American accounting for 22% of the cohort. In 2014-2015, 31 candidates of 112 admitted were either Hispanic or African American accounting for 28% of the cohort.

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of diversity

NA

Note: Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each are cited under the relevant standard(s)

2. TECHNOLOGY

a. Summary regarding adequacy and accuracy of evidence related to technology

The EPP provided multiple forms of evidence to demonstrate that candidates have a firm grasp of the various types of educational technology available as well as the skills requires to translate knowledge into classroom practice. The evidence identifies numerous points in the curriculum where candidates are exposed to uses of technology in the classroom. All courses are aligned with the InTasc standards (#8), the technology expectations of the appropriate specialized professional organizations, and the Technology Application Standards required by the Texas State Board for Educator Certification. There are clearly identified assessments to measure candidate competencies and data is collected and analyzed with the goal of improving candidate readiness. The centrality of technology is represented in the EPP's dispositions which are formally assessed at three points in the program. In addition, the EPP collaborates with the Director of Educational Technology in the local school district to insure that appropriate instruction in educational technology is being taught in required coursework. This individual makes numerous presentations to EPP faculty and candidates.

In addition, all observation instruments used to assess candidate effectiveness include several prompts on candidate effectiveness in using technology in a live classroom. The university supervisors and clinical faculty in the schools formally assess candidate lessons with several points of

discussion focusing on use of technology. The "Principal's Focus Group" has identified several areas where the EPP can improve candidate readiness in the area of technology--familiarity with specific grade-level software, "flipping" the classroom and allowing students to use technology, uses of social media, etc.-these suggestions were used to make changes to the curriculum.

The EPP candidates performance on state required examinations is quite good. The disaggregated data allows the EPP to review candidate performance on the components of the examinations which measure technology. Candidate performance is generally good and consistent with their counterparts in the state. The "Teacher Preparation Effectiveness Survey" administered by the Texas Education Agency is an assessment completed by school principal's of first year teachers to measure the teaching effectiveness of first-year teachers. The EPP candidates exceed state averages for "Technology Integration."

The EPPs evidence is adequate and accurate and firmly establishes that candidates have a firm grounding in using educational technology.

The evidence was well-organized and appropriately aligned with the CAEP standards.

b. Evidence that adequately and accurately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of technology.

The EPP's preparation of candidates in the area of technology is compelling and crosses all of the CAEP standards.

The uses of technology is a central component of content and pedagogical preparation of candidates (Standard 1). The importance and uses of educational technology is specifically embedded in all required courses and have corresponding assessments. All coursework and required assessments (EOSL and case study) are aligned with the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) standards.

The EPP has thoroughly integrated technology into their clinical partnerships and practice (Standard 2). For instance, the candidates benefit from the expertise of educational technology professionals from local schools who provided hands-on training on the uses of technology in the classroom. The candidates are evaluated on uses of technology during field placements and clinical practice and must demonstrate an high-level ability to integrate technology. Several cooperating teachers report that hosting teacher candidates benefits them in multiple ways but technology is at the forefront. The cooperating teachers feel that learning about technology integration from the candidates is one way that they get professionally developed as a benefit of having a candidate in their classroom.

The EPP has invested in a software package (CREATE) which allows them to

track completers and to gather data related to completer impact on student learning within the State of Texas (Standard 4). This system has already produced important information and the EPP is committed to working with their IT department to develop methods to make the data more accessible and user-friendly.

The EPPs quality assurance system (Standard 5) is managed by FileMaker Pro and Taskstream. The EPP systematically collects and analyzes data in an efficient and coherent system. The system is managed by the director of EPIC and shared with the dean, chairs, advisors, certification specialist, and appropriate faculty members. The EPP generates an annual data report that is reviewed an all constituencies.

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of technology.

NA

Note: Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each are cited under the relevant standard(s)

Section 4: Area(s) for Improvement cited from previous accreditation review, if any

Area(s) for Improvement cited from previous accreditation review, if any

| Area for Improvement: | Rationale: |
|-----------------------|------------|
| | |

Section 5: Response to the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP)

(Use the Rubric for Evaluating the Capacity and Potential in the SIP)

1. Summary of findings and overall evaluation of Selected Improvement Plan

The EPP has selected to research, construct, administer, and analyze a survey instrument of completers to measure the effect of the EPP's preparation program on completers employed in the State of Texas. This is a very appropriate and useful improvement plan since it is closely connected with Standard 4 "Program Impact," clearly aligned with state standards and instruments for teacher assessment (State Principal's Survey of New Teachers"), and well supported by current research on teacher quality. The EPP has a very strong presence in P-12 education in the State of Texas; the CREATE database numbers completers teaching in P-12 schools in Texas at over 3,000 (2,000 classroom teachers and 1,000+ in other P-12 job titles) which provides a very strong base for administering a survey that produces reliable, valid, and valuable data and information.

a. The EPP's capacity for initiating, implementing and complete the SIP.

The EPP has developed a reasonable and coherent plan for creating and administering the survey instrument. The demographic data provided by the CREATE system, the cooperation of the EPP's IT professionals to assist with developing appropriate ways to store and organize data, and the structures currently in place, especially the EPI Center, provides sufficient infrastructure to successfully launch this plan. It is a well reasoned plan with achievable goals guided by a comprehensive plan of action. The plan has a strong possibility of succeeding and it will greatly assist in assessing quality of programs and assessments at the EPP. It might also serve as a model for many other institutions.

This plan is "emerging," but contains some very important elements and objectives that can easily move it to "progressing" in a short period of time.

b. The potential of the SIP to have a positive impact on the EPP and its candidates.

The plan can have a positive impact in a number of areas: (1) survey data that is valid and reliable can be used to improve programs, assessments, clinical placements, EPP operations, etc.; (2) the instrument, over time, could provide important comparison points with other programs preparing P-12 educators; (3) the pilot of the survey and all subsequent revisions may produce a reasonable use of VAM's to improve both teacher preparation and teaching excellence; (4) the development of the survey will foster collaborations among EPP faculty, P-12 professionals, candidates, completers, and state officials; and (5) the plan may allow for research opportunities for EPP faculty members.

c. The proposed use of data and evidence.

The following are preliminary uses of data and evidence generated by the survey instrument: (1) improvement of existing programs offered by the EPP; (2) collect longitudinal data to measure strengths of P-12 professionals at

different career points; (3) engage P-12 educators, especially program completers, to solicit input on best practices and trends in public education; and (4) identify ways that the EPP can assist and collaborate with P-12 schools.

d. The potential of the EPP to demonstrate a higher level of excellence beyond what is required in the standards

In light of the specific characteristics of the EPP noted above, it is a strong possibility that the EPP will demonstrate a higher level of excellence and exceed the expectations of the standards.

Evaluation of the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP)

This rubric is intended to be used as a tool by the site visit team to provide feedback to an EPP on the Selected Improvement plan and its progress, including (a) its capacity for initiating, implementing, and completing a Selected Improvement Plan (SIP); (b) the potential of the SIP to have a positive impact on the EPP and its candidates; (c) the proposed use of data and evidence; (d) the potential of the EPP to demonstrate a higher level of excellence beyond what is required in the standards. An overall evaluation of the SIP is also provided.

Click [here](#) to open the rubric in a new window.

Sources of Evidence

List of interviews and participants

List of exhibits reviewed /List additional sources consulted (website, etc.)

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

| |
|----------------------|
| Sources of Evidence |
| List of Participants |
| Interview Schedule |

See Attachment panel below.