

Fall Retreat 2014

Agenda

- 8:30-9:00: Breakfast & conversation**
- 9:00-9:05: Dean's Welcome**
- 9:05-10:45: LEAP Committee Reports**
- 10:45-11:05 Taskstream Updates & Report on Unit-wide Assessments**
- 11:05-11:15: Break**
- 11:15-12:00: CAEP Committee Update**

Overview for Retreat

- Progress towards continuous improvement of programs - LEAP
 - Closing the improvement loop
 - Program modifications
- TaskStream
- How are we doing as a college with diversity?
- CAEP Discussion

LEAP Committee

TaskStream Update

Dr. John Jabagchourian

Fall 2013

**Unit-Wide Diversity Rubric
Lurie College of Education**

UD.1 Candidate demonstrates the belief that all children can learn.

Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Sets high expectations for students of all levels; consistently holds all accountable for meeting them; and helps students to hold high expectations for themselves and their peers	Sets high expectations for students of all levels and consistently holds all accountable for meeting them	Sets high expectations for students of all levels but is inconsistent in holding all students accountable for meeting them	Has inconsistent or modest expectations for students and does not hold all accountable for meeting goals

UD.2 Candidate cultivates a climate that values diversity.

Exemplary (4)	Proficient	Developing (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Facilitates collaboration by encouraging students to recognize the diverse experiences and achievements of groups and individual students	Actively cultivates a climate of inclusion by building on the diverse experiences of students and recognizing the achievements of groups and individual students	Recognizes the value of diversity but overlooks/misses opportunities to draw on the diverse experiences of students or celebrate the achievements of groups	Disregards the diverse experiences of students and the achievements of groups or individual students

UD.3 Candidate connects instruction/services to students' experiences and cultures

Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Acknowledges the impact of diversity and capitalizes on it by consistently incorporating different points of view as well as having the candidates build upon and incorporate into their own practices the diverse strengths and experiences that students bring to school	Acknowledges the influence of such factors as ethnicity, gender, religion, socioeconomic, and culture on a student's development and attitudes	Demonstrates an awareness of the diversity of students in the classroom	Does not demonstrate an awareness of diversity or its impact on development

UD.4 Candidate understands the needs of all populations including English Language Learners and students with exceptionalities.

Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Effectively adapts instruction/services to engage special needs students and ensures their needs are met	Provides unique opportunities such as inclusion and research-based effective practices for students with special needs	Is knowledgeable of effective practices for students with special needs	Makes no attempt to adjust practices to accommodate for individual differences

AY 13-14 Unit-Wide Diversity Items

Standard Item	N	Mean	SD.
UD1. Candidate demonstrates the belief that all children can learn	344	3.49	0.66
UD2. Candidate cultivates a climate that values diversity	424	3.51	0.67
UD3. Candidate connects instruction/services to students' experiences and cultures	424	3.34	0.73
UD4. Candidate understands the needs of all populations including English Language Learners and students with exceptionalities	424	3.32	0.77
UD5. Candidate utilizes data from assessments to adapt instruction/services for all students	380	3.36	0.73
UD6. Candidate presents students with multiple perspectives	380	3.33	0.74
UD7. Candidate uses a variety of methods and techniques in order to meet the needs of all students and clients	427	3.36	0.71
UD8. Candidate designs learning experiences that reflect the diversity of the students' backgrounds	380	3.35	0.71
UD9. Candidate works collaboratively with families and significant adults from culturally diverse communities	414	3.2	0.75

CAEP Committee



National Accreditation (CAEP) Update

April 3, 2015

Spring Retreat

Lurie College of Education

San José State University

Overview of CAEP

- CAEP Standards
 - Overview
 - How does it compare to NCATE?
- Major Changes
 - CAEP Standard 3.2
 - CAEP Standard 4

CAEP Standards

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

Standard 4: Program Impact

Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

Major Changes

CAEP Standard 3.2: Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement And Ability

- The provider ensures that the average grade point average of its accepted cohort of candidates meets or exceeds the CAEP minimum of 3.0, and the group average performance on nationally normed ability/achievement assessments such as ACT, SAT, or GRE:
 - is in the top 50 percent from 2016-2017;
 - is in the top 40 percent of the distribution from 2018-2019; and
 - is in the top 33 percent of the distribution by 2020

Major Changes (con.)

CAEP Standard 4: PROGRAM IMPACT → The provider (LCOE) 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.

- 4.1: Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development
- 4.2: Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness
- 4.3: Satisfaction of Employers
- 4.4: Satisfaction of Completers

CTC and CAEP

- Revised Draft MOU (February 2015)
- Draft not yet signed
- Commission is working on alignment matrix for CAEP standards and CTC Common Standards
 - EPPs will still have to respond to CTC on any standards not covered in CAEP
 - Accreditation Advisory Panel is currently working on a revision of the CTC Common Standards

Crosswalk of CAEP Standards and CTC Common Standards

CAEP Standard	CTC Standard
1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	9. Assessment of Candidate Competence
2. Clinical Partnerships and Practice	7. Field Experience and Clinical Practice 8. District-employed Supervisors
3. Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity	5. Admission 6. Advice and Assistance
4. Program Impact	No CTC Common Standard
5. Provider Quality and Continuous	2. Unit and Program Assessment and
No CAEP Standard	1. Educational Leadership 3. Resources 4. Faculty and Instructional Personnel

CAEP Process

- Submit self-study for off-site review which includes uploading “evidence” of meeting standards
- Post a call for public comment and distribute third party surveys
- Host a site visit
- Complete approved program review process for all programs of study leading to professional practice in school setting

CTC Process

- CTC still has sole responsibility for initial program approval
- EPPs will still submit program reports for program review process
 - CTC is working to streamline the program review process so that an extensive narrative is no longer required
 - Overview of less than 10 pages plus a matrix of where / how standards are met (i.e. courses, signature assignments, etc.)

CTC Response to CAEP Standard 3

- EPPs that accept ONLY candidates with a BA/BS have met the selection criteria of “high academic achievement and ability”
 - Which is most of the programs in CA
- EPPs that accept candidates that have not yet earned BA/BS must provide data that it’s cohort average meets or exceeds CAEP minimum requirements*

CTC Response to CAEP Standard 4

- CA does not use Value-Added Measures as a statewide measure of teacher effectiveness
 - Therefore CA institutions can not be required to provide VAM data as part of joint CTC-CAEP accreditation
- EPPs must provide some other form of evidence that program completers contribute to expected student learning growth for CAEP accreditation

Areas of CAEP Standards Not Addressed by CTC Common Standards

- **Standard 1 – Content and Pedagogical Knowledge**
 - Completers use research and evidence to measure student progress and own professional practice
 - Completers provide access to college and career ready standards (CCSS, NGSS)
 - Completers model and apply technology to design, implement, and assess learning
- **Standard 3 – Candidate quality, Recruitment, Selectivity**
 - Recruit diverse candidates and address state and local shortages
 - Meet admissions criteria
 - Selectivity at completion

Areas of CAEP Standards Not Addressed by CTC Common Standards

- **Standard 4 – Program Impact**

- Commission is developing / revising program completer and employer surveys that could be used to demonstrate meeting specific parts of this standard

- **Standard 5 – Continuous Improvement**

- EPPs assess performance against its own goals and standards, track results over time (Somewhat done in current CTC Program Assessments)
- Measures of completer impact summarized, analyzed, and acted upon

Budget

What impact will CAEP have on our current budget for accreditation?

Accreditation Costs

AACTE:

Membership: \$8,000
(annual)

NCATE/CAEP

Membership: \$5,000
(annual)

CTC Membership (2015)
\$9,950

Site Visit (Every 7 years) :

\$6,000 costs for combined
visit (food, housing, etc.)

7 Reviewers from CTC

6 Reviewers from NCATE

Preparing for Accreditation (budget)

Assessment System: \$ 40,000

Faculty Coordination: \$ 89, 230

CAEP may require additional coordination, depending on how we (LCOE) propose to present program evaluations.

What programs outside of the LCOE are supported in our accreditation process?

School of Social Work (PPS in Social Work credential) -
College of Applied Sciences and Arts

Adapted PE added authorization - College of Applied
Sciences and Arts

School Librarian - College of Applied Sciences and Arts

Resources:

Informational and Technical Resources

CAEP Accreditation Handbook to be released early 2015

- Expectations for CAEP evidence
- Updated guidelines for completing self-studies
- Explanations for how quality assurance reviews will be conducted...

“...Because CAEP also is committed to working with EPPs and with the field toward meeting the new standards, the handbook will be supplemented by a variety of activities and tools that will become available in 2015 and 2016.”

Resources:

Informational and Technical Resources

CAEPCon Conference (Spring and Fall)

Examples of Break-out Sessions:

Measures of Teacher Impact on P-12 Students: CAEP Standard 4 (CAEP 101)

Emerson Elliott, CAEP

How educator preparation providers (EPPs) can demonstrate meeting CAEP Standard 4, including possible sources of evidence and/or aligned metrics.

Resources:

Informational and Technical Resources

CAEP Con Conference (Spring and Fall)

Examples of Break-out Sessions:

Common Metrics: Completer and Employer Surveys

Mark Baron, University of South Dakota, and colleagues

Presenters will share how 14 EPPs have collaborated to create, test, and refine **common survey metrics** for **candidates at exit, completers after one year, and completers' supervisors**. Experience implementing these instruments and using data for program improvement will also be discussed and used to promote further dialogue.

Resources

Technical

Tripod Student Survey

- Adapted by CAEP
- Gathers student data on teacher effectiveness

Jennifer E. Carinci, *Director
Research, Innovation, and Data
Strategy*

2015 Spring CAEP Conference

Pre-service Tripod Survey Pilot Participation Invitation

CAEP, in partnership with Cambridge Education (CE), is engaged in an exciting research venture to explore possibilities of using the Tripod student surveys with pre-service teachers.



<http://www.camb-ed.com>

The following is a preliminary call for participation in the proposed pilot.

Data sharing will be a part of the pilot agreement. From Cambridge Education, each pilot EPP will receive reports on the survey results for their teacher candidate participants.

Results include information on how each teacher candidate:



1. **Cares about students**
(Encourages and supports)
2. **Controls behavior**
(Presses for cooperation and peer support)
3. **Clarifies lessons**
(Success seems feasible)
4. **Challenges students**
(Presses for efforts, perseverance, and rigor)
5. **Captivates students**
(Learning seems interesting and relevant)
6. **Confers with students**
(Students sense their ideas are respected)
7. **Consolidates knowledge**
(Ideas get connected and integrated)

The Tripod student survey is a classroom-level analysis and reporting system developed as a partnership between CE and Professor Ron Ferguson of Harvard University that has been used with thousands of in-service teachers in more than twenty-five states.

Pre-service to In-service

This pilot will be the first to explore the potential of the Tripod surveys for linking pre-service and in-service teachers' impact on K-12 students!

Resources

Informational and Technical Resources

CTC Accreditation Advisory Panel and Task Groups

Task Group: Outcomes and Survey Data

Review and redesign surveys based on changes in standards, make recommendations regarding useful reporting practices and formats, and standardize the use of this information in accreditation.

Chair: Jon Snyder, Stanford

Update: Program completer surveys:

Two surveys have been reviewed, pared down and are ready to use in Spring 2015 - Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject

Resources

From Revised Draft MOU (February 2015), “Next Step”

Opportunity to provide input

“The Commission staff will make additional revisions based upon the COA’s discussion and gather feedback from California NCATE/CAEP accredited institutions to inform the next iteration of the agreement.”

Nationally Accredited Universities

Azuza Pacific

Cal Lutheran

Cal Poly

Chico State

CSU Bakersfield

CSU Dominguez Hills

CSU East Bay

CSU San Marcos

CSU Fresno

CSU Fullerton

CSU Long Beach

CSU LA

USC

UOP

CSU Northridge

CSU San Bernardino

CSU Stanislaus

LMU

National Univ

Point Loma Nazarene

San Diego State Univ

San Jose State Univ

Sonoma State Univ

Stanford

Univ La Verne

Univ San Diego

Faculty Feedback

From Fall Forum: Factors Influencing CAEP Decision

	Pro	Con
Agreement with CTC and professional organizations	[Pending agreements]	
Task (selectivity, evidence on program impact)	Improving programs	Obtaining evidence, impact on enrollment
Cost		Budget (personnel, time)
Continuous accreditation	Tradition, marketing	

Questions We Still Have ...

- Still looking for clarification from CTC on the MOU - looking forward to having that agreement signed so we know how to proceed
- How can we adjust our current exit surveys to meet our needs toward accreditation as well as better serve our students?
- As we prepare new reports for CAEP, how can we best use them to improve our growth as department / college?
- How might we need to adjust our assessment coordinator roles?

Timeline for LCOE Decision

- Faculty recommendation by late fall
 - More information should be available following CAEP Fall 2015 Conference
- Decision by end of 2015-2016 AY

Faculty Feedback

Questions/Comments?

