

# Governors State University CAEP Self-Study Addendum

April 2019

## Standard 1 – Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

### Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Minutes of meetings addressing validity and reliability unclear about methodology used after initial training.

**EPP Response:** After the initial training held in 2016, two events occurred to address the validity and reliability of the Danielson rubric. An exercise was held to validate inter-rater reliability with DOE faculty as reflected in the May 2018 DOE meeting minutes (ADD 1.1). A subsequent inter-rater reliability exercise occurred in September of 2018 with DOE faculty and a partner P-12 district. An analysis of the Inter-Rater Reliability Exercise was completed (ADD 1.2).

2. **CAEP Feedback:** Evidence 1.9 Meeting minutes are not organized in a way to illustrate the use of the evidence for verifying SSR claims. Some minutes appear to be missing, too many irrelevant documents are included in the binder, and there is no organizing construct.

**EPP Response:** Meeting minutes for the SSR Addendum have now been organized to illustrate the use of the evidence for verifying the SSR claims. We have now provided separate meeting minutes files for each relevant question in the FFR. Additional EPP minutes available during the site visit are housed in the EPP electronic drive by program and by date.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** Post-baccalaureate chemistry education and post-baccalaureate early childhood education are "recognized with conditions", and are not nationally recognized as reported in the SSR (p. 17)

**EPP Response:** The Post-baccalaureate chemistry education is an inactive program due to low enrollment and has been marked as "low enrollment" in AIMS. Post-baccalaureate early childhood education is not seeking national recognition as indicated in AIMS and in the National Program Review Status document (ADD 1.3).

4. **CAEP Feedback:** edTPA CAEP Alignment Data Report (1.12) includes individual candidate records, and summary tables are unclear.

**EPP Response:** The edTPA CAEP Alignment Data Report (ADD 1.4) has been updated to remove the individual candidate records and summary tables have been revised for clarity.

### Standard 1, Task 1 Technology Assessments

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Component 1.5 Do all licensure areas require candidates to complete EDUC 6501 Educational Technology? (per course syllabus in 1.19 Educ Tech Course revision plan) versus 1.17 Education Technology Course Assessment Data Report.

**EPP Response:** Commencing fall 2019, all initial candidates will be required to complete the Educational Technology - EDUC 2101/6101 course (previously listed as EDUC 6501) as outlined in the attached Initial Licensure Program Academic Plans (ADD 1.5). Prior to fall 2019, the

secondary education programs piloted the implementation of integrating technology standards through methods courses in lieu of a stand-alone course. Due to inconsistent and incomplete data from secondary methods courses, the EPP decided to rescind this decision. The Educational Technology Course Assessment Data Report (ADD 1.9) has been updated to reflect disaggregated data by program for the original course aligned to the 2008 ISTE standards and the redesigned course syllabus for Educational Technology EDCP 2101/6101 (ADD 1.14) aligned to the 2017 ISTE standards.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** Please direct site visitors to the rubrics for technology data summaries. (Evidence 1.17 Education Technology Course Assessment Data Report; Evidence 1.18 CAEP 1.5 Technology ISTE Student Standards Pilot Spring 2018).

**EPP Response:** The Educational Technology course rubrics (ADD 1.6), EPP level rubrics (ADD 1.7), and program level rubrics (ADD 1.8) are available via LiveText and are used to collect information for the SSR Educational Technology Course Assessment Data Report (ADD 1.9).

## **Standard 1 Task 2: Programs Included in SSR Review**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please clarify programs included in the report. For example, multicategorical special education is not included in Table 2, yet is included under 1.3 (SPA recognition) and AIMS; programs identified as initial include both baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate degree levels in AIMS, however data are reported in aggregate for the licensure area and only enrollment data reported for post-baccalaureate levels for secondary programs (biology, chemistry English, mathematics); a master's level early childhood program is identified as "ADV" in AIMS, however it is identified as "initial" in Table 2 of the SSR; other programs recognized by other accrediting agencies, such as counseling, could be included under advanced by reporting to Standard A.1, are not included in the report; the Multi-Categorical Special Education, post-bac is identified in AIMS as "not recognized".

**EPP Response:** Below is a list of programs and status to be included in the CAEP review. The National Program Review Status (ADD 1.3) shows a list of active, inactive, and programs approved by other agencies.

- Initial Bachelors
  - Early Childhood (BA), nationally recognized to 2027
  - Elementary Education (BA), nationally recognized to 2027
  - Secondary English, (BA), nationally recognized to 2027
  - Secondary English, (PB), nationally recognized to 2027
  - Secondary Mathematics (BA), nationally recognized to 2027
  - Secondary Mathematics (PB), nationally recognized to 2027
  - Secondary Biology (BA), nationally recognized to 2027
  - Secondary Biology (PB), nationally recognized to 2027
  - Secondary Chemistry (BA), nationally recognized to 2027
- Advanced
  - Educational Administration (Principal), nationally recognized to 2026
- Accredited By Other Accrediting Agency, And Not Included Under CAEP Review:
  - School Counseling (CACREP)
  - School Social Work (CSWE)
  - Speech Language Pathology (NASP)
  - Communication Disorders (ASHA)
- Approved By The State, And Not Included Under CAEP Review (Low Enrollment):
  - Interdisciplinary Leadership (P-12 Superintendent Track)
  - Mathematics Education (MS)

- Secondary Chemistry (PB)
- Discontinued Programs
  - Elementary Education (Post-Bac)
  - Reading And Literacy (MA)
  - Mutli-Categorical Special Education (MA)

### **Standard 1 Task 3: SPA Program Report Updates**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** What are the EPP's plans and progress towards addressing programs not recognized by their SPA?

**EPP Response:** The Multicultural Special Education (MCSE) MA was not recognized and is currently inactive. The MCSE was originally in Teach-out and reinstated by the GSU Board of Trustees in December 2018 (ADD 1.10). A new program will be developed in its place with plans to begin enrollment by fall 2020.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** What are the results of the most recent Recognition Reports?

**EPP Response:** All (100%) of active programs included in this SSR are nationally recognized by their SPAs (see AIMS). Four programs have received national recognition since the submission of the SSR: Early Childhood (BA) recognized 8.1.18; Secondary Math (BA & PB) recognized on 8.1.18, and Educational Leadership (MA) recognized on 2.1.19.

### **Standard 1 Task 4: Rubrics Revisions**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** SSR statement about use of four-point scale (SSR, p. 14) and data tables with eight and ten-point scales (Evidence #9). The EPP notes this inconsistency and a plan to revise rubrics for reporting across programs. What is the progress on revisions?

**EPP Response:** The EPP rubrics' (ADD 1.7) point scales and performance levels have been revised for consistency to four point scales. In addition, program rubrics (ADD 1.8) containing InTASC and CAEP Standards have been revised for consistency within individual programs, making them consistent with regard to the number of performance levels, the performance descriptors, the point values, and overall rows. A summary chart of the findings has been added to the Rubric Consistency Plan (ADD 1.11). The April 2018 DOE meeting minutes (ADD 1.12) will demonstrate discussion of rubrics.

### **Standard 1 Task 5: MCSE Teach-Out**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please provide an update on the MCSE teach-out process.

**EPP Response:** Due to the demand of local partners and in response to the current teacher shortage, the Board of Trustees voted in December 2018 to rescind the decision to eliminate the MCSE program as indicated in the Board minutes (ADD 1.10). The MCSE program SPA was archived with the plans of developing an entirely new program. An overview of the EPP National Program Review Status (ADD 1.3) reflects the changes and condition of the programs.

### **Standard 1 Task 6: Disposition Assessment Updates**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please provide Phase-In Plan updates for dispositions assessments

**EPP Response:** Discussion of a phase-in for the dispositions assessment occurred during the DOE meeting November 2018 (ADD 1.15). The original rubric was separated into three different documents reflected in the EPPU rubrics (ADD 1.7) to allow for three levels of expectations

(early, middle and late), allowing the candidates to be fairly assessed at the intended developmental level based on where they are in the program.

The pilot implementation of the three-level Dispositions rubrics for early, middle, and final sequenced courses had mixed results. The Disposition Assessment updated data (ADD 1.13) for the early and final sequenced courses were 97.1% of candidates in early courses achieving ratings of acceptable or better and 100% of all candidates in the final courses achieving ratings of acceptable or better. The percentage of candidates who achieved ratings of acceptable or better was 77.9%. It should be noted that the “overall dispositional rating” is a row on the rubric itself, and not calculated. Upon analysis it was determined that the overall row criteria for both the middle and final course rubrics both specify that “a preponderance\* of elements were scored at the target level, with no elements scored at the unacceptable level,” with a preponderance being defined as half of the rows plus one. Since the expectations are different at the middle and final course levels, the criteria for the overall row should reflect that difference. The problem is compounded because there are two rows in which candidates are only scored on either the unacceptable or target level. This will be brought to the attention of the EPPU so that the issue can be addressed and a solution found.

## Standard A.1 – Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

### Standard A.1 Task 1: ADV Data Report Updates

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please provide updated data tables for the Advanced Standards Data Report.

**EPP Response:** See updated data tables for CAEP Standard 1 Updated Data Report (ADD A.1.1)

### Standard A.1 Task 2: ADV Dispositions Assessment

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please provide updates to use and investigation of new dispositions instruments

**EPP Response:** The Advanced Rubric for Disposition (ADD 1.7) point scales and performance levels have been revised for consistency. A summary chart of the findings has been added to the Rubric Consistency Plan (ADD 1.11).

### Standard A.1 Task 3: Programs for Inclusion in ADV Review

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please confirm advanced programs for inclusion in the CAEP review, and affirm the EPP does not want to include school counseling, for example.

**EPP Response:** The Educational Administration program for principal preparation is the only advanced program for inclusion in the CAEP review. The four school support programs (School Counseling, School Psychology, School Social Work and Speech Pathology) are not included in this review as they are accredited through other national accreditation agencies as indicated in the National Program Review Status document (ADD 1.3).

## Standard 2 – Clinical Partnerships and Practice

### Standard 2 Task 1: Mentor Teacher Criteria

1. **CAEP Feedback:** In what ways are mentor teachers informed of the criteria for selection?

**EPP Response:** The criteria for student teacher mentor teachers are documented the Student Teaching Placement Contract (ADD 2.1) which is provided to the P-12 student teacher placement designee (i.e. Human Resource, Principal, Vice Principal, etc.) to share with the prospective student mentor teacher. The criteria for student teaching mentor teacher selection are determined by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE). The qualifications for eligibility include: valid IL Professional Educator License (PEL) within the content area, minimum three years teaching experience, and minimum proficient rating on performance evaluations.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** What is the selection process for identifying mentor teachers and placing candidates?

**EPP Response:** To select a student teaching mentor teacher, the EPP sends the Student Teacher Placement Contract (ADD 2.1) to the designated person at the P-12 school district responsible for student teaching placement. The EPP is reliant upon the P-12 district's selection process for identifying student teaching mentor teachers based on ISBE qualifications in assigning them to the student teacher. Once the mentor teacher has been identified the EPP licensure officer, verifies the credentials of the mentor teacher through the ISBE Educator Licensure System.

### Standard 2 Task 2: Co-construction of mutually beneficial field experiences

1. **CAEP Feedback:** What changes have been made based on collaborative review of data?

**EPP Response:** Based on the collaborative review of data across EPP programs and in conversation with district partners, we have established additional MOUs (ADD 2.2) with Crete Monee HS, Warren Township High School, Monee Elementary and Park Forest which have mutual benefits in improving teacher preparation and improvement in teacher instruction. From these collaborative efforts the EPP and P-12 partners have moved towards establishing professional development schools, creating advisory boards, and writing grant proposals (ADD 2.3).

### Standard 2 Task 3: Investigating Validity, Reliability, and Fairness

1. **CAEP Feedback:** EPP includes the survey instrument for collecting panel perspectives and the narrative describes processes. Does the EPP have evidence of the results and ways the EPP reviewed results?

**EPP Response:** The feedback from the panel perspectives were analyzed and the results were placed in the Danielson and Disposition Validation Calculations document (ADD 2.4) and were electronically shared with the EPP faculty. This was done to judge fairness and engage our partners on construction of the rubric. Upon independent review of the results, the EPP faculty accepted the recommended changes to the Dispositions and Danielson rubrics.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** In what ways has the EPP investigated reliability?

**EPP Response:** Please see refer to Standard 1: Description of validity and reliability for trainings after initial training in 2016 (ADD 1.1, 1.2).

## **Standard 2 Task 4: Mentor Teacher Survey, piloted S18**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** What are the EPP's plans for revising and using the mentor teacher survey? (#39, Mentor Teacher Survey S18)

**EPP Response:** There are no plans to revise the Mentor Teacher Survey. The Clinical Mentor Teacher Survey was designed for mentors of candidates in the secondary English education clinical immersion experience (via English methods courses) for the purpose of improving the new clinical immersion model. The Clinical Mentor Teacher survey was administered over two data cycles: (S18 n=4; F18 n=8) (ADD 2.5). The results from the survey will be used to make revisions in the Secondary English Methods Course/Clinical Immersion.

## **Standard 2 Task 5: Technology during Field Experiences**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** In what ways does the EPP ensure candidates address technology criteria for field experiences and technology-based collaborations?

**EPP Response:** In fall 2018, the EPP piloted a Unit level EPPU Initial Program Assessment of Use of Technology in the Field rubric (ADD 2.6) to assess how each initial licensure candidate “responsibly seeks and implements contemporary technologies as instructional tools and resources to meet needs of the classroom and individual students” in field experiences. In April 2019, the DOE implemented the requirement for all candidates to be assessed on technology using the “Use of Technology in the Field rubric” effective fall 2019. A plan to assess technology-based collaboration of our candidates is included in the Technology 2020 Timeline (ADD 2.7).

## **Standard 2 Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP provides limited evidence of partners providing input into the co-construction of field experiences and clinical practice (2.1). The EPP described requesting feedback on key assessments and gateways for monitoring progression, however, it is unclear how the EPP has formalized relationships with field partners for systematic and regular review of EPP practices.

**EPP Response:** The EPP works collaboratively with school partners on a regular basis both formally and informally to continuously improve the programs, however, the EPP has limited documentation i.e. minutes to show collaboration. In response to this feedback, at the March 2019 DOE meeting (ADD 2.8) we addressed our practices in documenting partnership involvement in the construction of field experiences and clinical practices. In addition, the meeting addressed the institution of a formal Advisory Board to include P-12 partners, effective fall 2019 as a means to regularly and systematically review EPP practices. Three recent activities show evidence of partnership involvement in the co-construction of field experiences and clinical practices. For example, the Secondary English Program Mentor Survey (ADD 2.5) was implemented to collect information from clinical mentor teachers for the purpose of revising the clinical immersion course. The Partnership Symposium held in March 15, 2019 (ADD 2.9) was held to establish and strengthen relationships with P-12 partners and build collaborative partnerships around field and clinical experiences and the ISBE CICP initiative (ADD 2.10) included GSU working with a partner school for the purpose of improving and revising assessment instruments used in field and clinical experiences i.e. Danielson Rubric.

## Standard A. 2 – Clinical Partnerships and Practice

### Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. **CAEP Feedback:** A formalized Phase-In Plan related to Standard A.2, as mentioned in the SSR (p. 36) was not found (measures of program effectiveness through additional data points and collaboration with stakeholders in newly approved superintendent program)

**EPP Response:** Please disregard. The inclusion of the Superintendent track was unintended. The advanced level Interdisciplinary Leadership (Superintendent Track) developed and approved by the State three years ago is low enrolled with only one recent completer for the superintendent track.

### Standard A.2 Task 1: Advanced Dispositions Rubric

1. **CAEP Feedback:** In what ways did the EPP investigate validity, reliability, and fairness; and in what ways did the EPP engage field partners in the development of the rubric.

**EPP Response:** A panel of experts in the field were sent the Advanced Disposition Rubric. This was done to judge fairness and engage our partners on construction of the rubric. Feedback from the panel was analyzed and the results contained in the Danielson and Disposition Validation Calculations document (ADD 2.4) were electronically shared with the EPP faculty. Upon independent review of the results, the EPP faculty accepted the recommended changes to the Dispositions rubrics.

Investigation of reliability for the Advanced Disposition Rubric was conducted by the Educational Administration (EDAD) program faculty. The EDAD March 2019 meeting minutes (ADD A.2.1) reflect the process utilized.

### Standard A.2 Task 2: The Principal Mentor Agreement and Superintendent Agreement for Principal Internship (#43)

1. **CAEP Feedback:** As part of this documentation, an eleven-page plan and program form is provided with the "University of St. Francis" identified on the form in multiple places, and a last revised date of 2013. It is unclear if this form has been adopted by the EPP and if the EPP plans to revise for its own use.

**EPP Response:** We inadvertently uploaded the incorrect evidence. The correct evidence Principal Mentor Agreement for Principal Internship (ADD A.2.2) has been provided.

### Standard A.2 Task 3: Memoranda of Understanding

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The MOU, which is intended to support "a dynamic and sustained relationship that will promote benefits to both the EPP and the school district" (SSR, p. 34). Please point to where the MOU is in the evidence files.

**EPP Response:** Several MOUs (ADD 2.2) have been implemented to work closely with P-12 schools/districts to support "a dynamic and sustained relationship that will promote benefits to both the EPP and the school district as in the GSU/Crete-Monee MOU. The Advanced Level MOUs (ADD A.2.3) focus on cohort placement.

**Standard A.2 Task 4: Updates Onsite Meetings for EDAD Program**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please provide an update to the EPP noted EDAD program faculty plan to conduct field experience and class meetings at P-12 school sites.

**EPP Response:** The GSU EDAD program offers cohorts on-campus and at selected HLC and DOE approved off-site P-12 locations via Advanced Level MOUs (ADD A.2.3) as shown in the chart below.

GSU EDAD Cohorts			
Start Date	Location	Start Date	Location
Fall 2016	On-Campus	Fall 2018	On-Campus
Fall 2016	Thornton HS (Harvey)	Fall 2019	On-Campus
Fall 2017	On-Campus	Fall 2019	Lincoln-Way West HS (New Lenox)
Fall 2018	On-Campus (formerly Lansing)	Fall 2019	Other (under discussion in Chicago Public Schools)

**Standard A.2 Task 6: Mentor Administrators**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please verify the qualifications of mentor principals and how they are evaluated

**EPP Response:** The internship is supervised cooperatively by a University supervisor and a Mentor Principal. In Illinois, the qualifications for Mentor Principals are regulated by *23 Illinois Administrative Code 30: Programs For The Preparation Of Principals In Illinois (ADD A.2.4)*. The mentor principal must meet the following GSU expectations (EDAD Handbook and Internship Handbook) (ADD A.2.5) aligned to the regulatory requirements:

- All Mentor Principals are required to pass on-line training to demonstrate their understanding of the internship expectations, including supervisory responsibilities, accounting of tasks completed, and evaluation of candidate.
- All Mentor Principals must hold the appropriate administrative endorsement on their Professional Educator License (PEL).
- All Mentor Principals must have two years of successful experience as a building principal as evidenced by relevant data, which may include data supporting student growth in two of the principal’s previous five years, and formal evaluations or letters of recommendation from current or former supervisors.
- Have no more than (5) candidates assigned during the internship period.

## Standard 3 – Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

### Evidence Inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Evidence related to "group average performance on nationally normed assessments or substantially equivalent state-normed assessments of mathematical, reading, and writing achievement in the top 50% of those assessed

**EPP Response:** Group averages for all programs on the basic skills assessment reflect achievement in the top 50<sup>th</sup> percentile. Illinois teacher candidates must successfully pass the IL TAP (sub-score of 240), ACT (composite score of 22) or SAT (composite score of 1110). The Average ACT composite scores by program show all programs are in the top 50<sup>th</sup> percentile when compared to the [Score Conversion Chart](#).

The Illinois passing score on ACT basic skills of 22 (63<sup>rd</sup> percentile) is above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile margin. Most GSU candidates elect to take the ACT assessment; a few candidates have taken the TAP; no candidates are recorded as having taken the SAT. The respective programs meet this requirement at the following percentiles at the time of admission into the programs: Early Childhood (69<sup>th</sup>); Elementary (74<sup>th</sup>); Secondary Biology (59<sup>th</sup>); Secondary English (75<sup>th</sup>); Secondary Mathematics (71<sup>st</sup>). The data over three terms to include the mean, median, mode and range by program is provided as evidence to support these findings in updated Benchmark I data (ADD 3.1).

### Standard 3 Task 2: Masters of Arts in Teaching

1. **CAEP Response:** Determine status of the Masters of Arts in Teaching referenced in the self-study

**EPP Response:** A Masters of Arts in Teaching is currently being designed for Early Childhood and Elementary. In addition a Master of Arts in English with Teacher Licensure and Master of Science in Biology with Teacher Licensure are currently being designed with plans of implementation by 2020 as outlined in the MAT Framework (ADD 3.4).

### Standard 3 Task 3: 5-Year Recruitment Plan

1. **CAEP Response:** Request status update on the five goals of the 5-Year Recruitment Plan

**EPP Response:** The goals of the Five-Year Recruitment Plan (ADD 3.2) have been updated to include the reinstatement of the Secondary Bachelor programs in Biology, Chemistry, English, and Math. In addition, new program proposals are currently being developed for the following programs: Master of Arts in English with Teacher Licensure, Master of Science in Biology with Teacher Licensure, and Bachelors of Arts in Social Science with Teacher Licensure.

### Standard 3 Task 4: EPP GPA

1. **CAEP Response:** Review updated EPP GPA data disaggregated by program area

**EPP Response:** EPP GPA data have been updated from the PEP database (ADD 3.3) and have been disaggregated by program. Academic Strength data over three years reflect that all programs on average are performing at or above a 3.6 GPA, which is above the national average.

### **Standard 3 Task 5: EPP Disposition**

1. **CAEP Response:** Review updated EPP Disposition data as reported in Exhibits 3.3, 1.3.c, and 3.4

**EPP Response:** The updated EPP Disposition data (ADD 1.13) includes the initial licensure programs' implementation of the three-level Dispositions rubrics for early, middle, and final sequenced courses. The data for the early and final sequenced courses show 97.1% of candidates in early courses achieving ratings of acceptable or better and 100% of all candidates in the final courses achieving ratings of acceptable or better. The percentage of candidates who achieved ratings of acceptable or better in the middle sequence course was 77.9%.

### **Standard 3 Task 6: Group average performance**

1. **CAEP Response:** Review information related to group average performance for math, reading, and writing in the top 50%.

**EPP Response:** Please refer to the above response related to group average scores for basic skills.

### **Standard 3 Task 9: Candidates are in the top 50%**

1. **CAEP Response:** Determine if admitted candidates are in the top 50% of those assessed for math, reading, and writing

**EPP Response:** The respective programs meet this requirement at the following percentiles at the time of admission: Early Childhood (69<sup>th</sup>), Elementary (74<sup>th</sup>), Secondary Biology (59<sup>th</sup>), Secondary English (75<sup>th</sup>), and Secondary Mathematics (71<sup>st</sup>). The data over three terms to include the mean, median, mode and range by program is provided as evidence to support these findings in the updated Benchmark I data (ADD 3.1). Candidates who do not meet the passing requirements at the time of admission are accepted conditionally and must meet the requirements before student teaching as per state law.

### **Standard 3 Task 11: Teacher Licensure Data**

1. **CAEP Response:** Review updated teacher licensure exam data and edTPA data reports

**EPP Response:** The data for licensure Benchmarks III and IV (ADD 3.5) have been updated to include the most recent scores, sub-scores for ILTS content and edTPA licensure exams.

### **Standard 3 Preliminary recommendations for new AFI's including a rationale for each**

1. **CAEP Response:** The EPP did not provide evidence that it meets the requirement that admitted cohorts reach the 50th percentile on a nationally normed test. (3.2). The EPP presented GPA data, however, data reports did not show evidence of a comparative analyses to the 50th percentile.

**EPP Response:** The Average ACT composite scores by program show all programs are in the top 50th percentile when compared to the Score Conversion Chart. The respective programs meet this requirement at the following percentiles at the time of admission: Early Childhood (69<sup>th</sup>), Elementary (74<sup>th</sup>), Secondary Biology (59<sup>th</sup>), Secondary English (75<sup>th</sup>), and Secondary Mathematics (71<sup>st</sup>). The data over three terms to include the mean, median, mode and range by

program is provided as evidence to support these findings in updated Benchmark I data (ADD 3.1).

## **Standard A.3 – Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity**

### **Standard A.3: Task 2 School Psychology**

1. **CAEP Response:** Determine status of the Ed.S in School Psychology and the Ed.D. in interdisciplinary Leadership

**EPP Response:** The four school support programs (School Counseling, School Psychology, School Social Work and Speech Pathology) are also not included in this review as they are accredited through other national accreditation and are not included in this report. The advanced level Interdisciplinary Leadership (Superintendent track) developed and approved by the State three years ago is low enrolled with only one recent completer for the superintendent track.

### **Standard A.3: Task 3 5-Year Recruitment Plan**

1. **CAEP Response:** Request status update on the five goals of the 5-Year Recruitment Plan

**EPP Response:** Please refer to Standard 3 Task 3: 5-Year Recruitment Plan

### **Standard A.3: Task 4 EPP GPA data for EDAD**

1. **CAEP Response:** Review updated EPP GPA data for the EDAD program

**EPP Response:** The average cumulative GPA for EDAD candidates was 3.89 for AY 2017/2018, which remains consistently high as shown in the updated data for Benchmark III and IV (ADD 3.5).

### **Standard A.3: Task 5 EPP Disposition**

1. **CAEP Response:** Review updated EPP Disposition data as reported in Exhibits 3.2, 1.3.d, and 3.3

**EPP Response:** Updated Advanced Disposition data (ADD A.3.1) which includes F18 reflect that 95.5% of candidates in the mid-sequenced courses achieved ratings of 95.5% at target level or better and 95.8 % of candidates in the final-sequenced courses achieved ratings of 95.8% at target level or better.

### **Standard A.3: Task 9 Principal Preparation Technology**

1. **CAEP Response:** Review updated Principal Preparation Technology Portfolio data

**EPP Response:** The Technology Portfolio is assessed during EDAD 7802: Technology Driven Leadership. The Technology Portfolio assessment rubric was updated to align to the ISTE standards for administrators in F17. The first data collection for the revised Technology Portfolio Summative Assessment occurred in F17. In both data collection cycles 100% of candidates achieved a rating of Acceptable or better as described in the EDAD Technology Portfolio data (ADD A.3.2).

## Standard 4 – Program Impact

### Evidence Inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. **CAEP Feedback:** No direct measures of completer impact on P-12 student progress.

**EPP Response:** The EPP has three measures of completer impact on P-12 student progress: the Administrator Survey Part II (2 questions); the ISBE PEP Report; and the Case Study Phase-in.

For a period of two years, the EPP did not have direct access to information pertaining to impact on P-12 student progress due to the discontinuance of the ISBE data collection system in 2015 and due to changes and/or the absence of key personnel who would have been responsible for the collection of data. In fall 2017, the EPP developed and administered two surveys; the Administrator survey with 15 questions, which was sent to administrators of completers (now teachers) via Survey Monkey. Due to low number of available contacts (6) and response (33%), a second more direct survey, Administrator Survey Part II with only two questions, was administered directly to 31 principals via email. The Administrator Survey Part II, yielded a higher rate of response at 42 % and provided positive feedback as shown in the EPP Survey data report (ADD 4.1).

The PEP data (ADD 3.3) representing three years (AY 15, 16 and 17) were made available to the EPP for the first time in summer of 2018. The EPP now relies heaviest on the PEP data to determine the impact on P-12 student progress. The data show how candidates (now teachers) employed in an Illinois public schools impact P-12 students through the teacher performance evaluations, which consist of two components: student growth and professional practice. Student growth means a demonstrable change in a student’s or group of students’ knowledge or skills, as evidenced by gain and/or attainment on two or more assessments, between two or more points in time.

In an effort to have multiple direct sources of information that will help shape the EPP and to determine impact on P-12 student progress, the EPP has implemented a case study of impact on P-12 student learning. The case study is still in the early stages of implementation and no data are available at this time.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** No direct measure of completer teaching effectiveness.

**EPP Response:** As stated above, the EPP relies heavily on the ISBE/PEP report to determine teacher effectiveness. Teacher effectiveness is determined through teacher annual evaluations, which consist of two components: student growth and professional practice. Student growth must comprise at least 30 percent of the evaluation. Districts may also utilize any rubric in evaluations.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** Response rate to most surveys is below 20%. Further, response rates for initial versus advanced programs are often not disaggregated.

**EPP Response:** The attached EPP survey data report (ADD 4.1) separates initial from advanced and disaggregates the data by program.

4. **CAEP Feedback:** Analysis and interpretation of data are limited.

**EPP Response:** The EPP Survey data report (ADD 4.1) show the analysis and interpretation. The interpretation of data are shared through EPP and DOE meetings; however, the evidence of discussion is limited.

- 5. CAEP Feedback:** Plans for case studies and other methods of collecting data related to Standard 4 were still in the early stages of development at the time of the SSR.

**EPP Response:** The research protocol has been submitted to IRB. The final approval was received 4.14.19. We are attaching the Research Protocol for CAEP 3-Year Study (ADD 4.2) to provide complete documentation and narrative of the case study plan, including the MOU form with partners and other required components. Implementation progress has been reported in the timeline. The appendix of Research Protocol includes the IRB approval. Data collection will commence upon approval from IRB.

- 6. CAEP Feedback:** Data for some assessments are not disaggregated by licensure area. The Administrator Survey Part II with two yes/no questions lends itself to minimal in-depth analysis for the purpose of improvement.

**EPP Response:** The attached EPP survey data report (ADD 4.1), which includes the Administrator Survey Part II, disaggregates the data by program.

- 7. CAEP Feedback:** COE Exit Survey is a survey given at end of student teaching; thus, it is not a measure of completers in-service as required by Standard 4. It is unclear if the exit survey is used for Standard 4 evidence.

**EPP Response:** The COE Exit survey is designed to collect candidates' perception of program preparation and not the impact on student learning; therefore, should not have been included in Standard 4.

- 8. CAEP Feedback:** Phase-In Plan for Case Study does not include all components required by CAEP's Guidelines for Plans and lacks sufficient details.

**EPP Response:** The Research Protocol for CAEP 3-Year Study (ADD 4.2) illustrates detailed guidelines to inform investigators on the implementation of the case study, including study procedures, participant selection and rationale, methodology, data collection and instruments, and other study procedures. The protocol includes survey alignment to CAEP and ISBE/IPTS 2013 standards. University resources include representatives from each program, IRB approval, and software. The initial findings will be reported to faculty in Fall 2019. The timeline describes the three-year cycle for the study.

## Tasks

### Standard 4: Task 1: ISBE/Illinois Partnership for Educator Preparation Report (Evidence 4.1)

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Is a copy of the instrument used to collect the data for the ISBE/PEP Report available?

**EPP Response:** There is no single instrument to collect the data for the ISBE/PEP report. The EPP is responsible for completing the Annual ISBE/PEP templates (ADD 4.3), consisting of fields such as names, identification numbers, GPA, ACT, gender, and ethnicity. During the first year, the EPP was responsible for submitting three years' of data. The P-12 School districts are required to submit annual State reports that include teacher performances. Proprietary testing companies such as edTPA submit student teacher portfolio performance data. The state combines the information that is already stored into the State data collection system such as content scores, teacher EPP and K-12 student performance to create full analysis.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** Did the EPP receive more than just the report presented in the Self-Study? Were raw data or other evidence received to assist the EPP in doing a more in-depth analysis?

**EPP Response:** The EPP received one additional ISBE/PEP Survey data since the SSR. The original raw data received directly before the submission of the SSR was from an optional ISBE Completer pilot survey administered to recent completers. Since the submission of the SSR, the EPP has received data from the first mandated ISBE Completer Survey. The ISBE Completer Survey results (ADD 4.4) were summarized, analyzed, interpreted and then shared with the EPP faculty in the November 2018 DOE meeting (ADD 1.15).

3. **CAEP Feedback:** Is it possible to disaggregate the data for the item "demonstrated teaching skills/impact on K-12 students" into two components: "demonstrated teaching skills" and "impact on K-12 students?" Can this specific data be disaggregated by program?

**EPP Response:** No, it is not possible to disaggregate this specific data for the item "demonstrate teaching skills/impact on K-12 students" into two components or by program. Impact on K-12 students reports the performance of candidates (now teachers) who have completed a program at the institution and are employed in an Illinois public school. The teacher performance evaluations consist of two components: student growth and professional practice which are combined. Student growth means a demonstrable change in a student's or group of students' knowledge or skills, as evidenced by gain and/or attainment on two or more assessments, between two or more points in time. The demonstrated teaching skills and impact on K-12 student cannot be disaggregated from professional practice using this report.

4. **CAEP Feedback:** Who provides the data to the state for the ISBE/PEP report? Does this data come directly from the EPP? Do completers provide the data directly to the state?

**EPP Response:** The data to the state for the ISBE/PEP report is provided by several entities. The EPP is responsible for submitting fields such as names, identification numbers, GPA, ACT, gender and ethnicity. The P-12 School districts are required to submit annual State reports to include teacher performance evaluations. Proprietary testing companies such as Pearson submit student teacher portfolio (edTPA) performance data. The state compiles the information that is already within the State data collection system e.g. (content scores, teacher and K-12 student performance) to create full analysis. In addition, completers are mandated to submit an exit survey at the time of licensure application directly to the state.

5. **CAEP Feedback:** At what point are the data for ISBE/PEP provided to the state? Is it at the time of program completion or following start of employment?

**EPP Response:** Two components of the data for the ISBE/PEP are provided at different points: the ISBE/PEP Completer Survey from candidates at the time of licensure as part of the licensure application process and the ISBE/PEP report from the EPP annually by April 30<sup>th</sup>.

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Who reviews these data and how often? With whom are these data shared?

**EPP Feedback:** The EPP receives data reports from ISBE annually at the beginning of the fall term. The Assessment Coordinator analyzes the data. The data are shared and discussed by the EPP faculty by the end of the fall term during a DOE meeting.

#### Standard 4: Task 2 Surveys

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please provide a table related to Standard 4 claims which includes the following: a) name of survey, b) date of administration, c) population surveyed, d) year of population's completion, e) response rate (with sent and received number), and f) use of data. Please differentiate between initial and advanced programs.

**EPP Response:**

**Table 4.2.1: Survey Identification**

Survey Title	Date of Administration	Population	Completion Year	Response Rate	Use of Data
COE /EPP Exit Survey	4/2017 11/2017	Initial Licensure	5/2017 12/2017	84% (n=16/19) 92% (n=23/24)	Candidate perception of quality of program
ISBE Completer Survey	At time of licensure	Initial Licensure	AY 2017 AY 2018	n=32 100% (n=42)	Candidate perception of quality of program
DOE Completer Survey Year 1	1/2018	Completers	AY 2016	16.7% (n=13/78)	Candidate's perception of preparation
DOE Completer Survey Year 3	1/2018 3/2019	Completers Completers	AY 2014 AY 2015	10% (n=6/63) Pending	Candidate's perception of preparation
Administrator Survey	3/2018	P-12 Principals of Completers	AY 2016	33% (n=2/6)	Impact on student learning
Administrator Survey (2 questions)	5/2018	P-12 Principals of Completers	AY 2016	42% (n=13/31)	Impact on student learning
EDAD Completer Survey	7/2018	Principal ADV Candidates	AY 2017	72.7% (n=24/33)	Candidate's perception of preparation

2. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP indicates the McMillan and Schumaker Model was used to create EPP-Created Surveys. Please provide additional information on this model, including how it was implemented, and the outcomes of the analysis done on surveys using this model.

**EPP Response:** The Survey Taskforce (one DOE faculty, one CAS faculty, one COE administrator and one COE data administrator) updated the Validated ISBE 2013-14 Teacher Surveys (ADD 4.6) utilizing the McMillan and Schumacher's text, *Research in Education: A Conceptual Introduction* (7th ed., 2010) which has long been a staple resource in educational research to construct the surveys.

McMillan and Schumacher's Chapter 9, "Nonexperimental Research Designs and Surveys," (pp 313-315) describes the development and procedures for the use of surveys. In judging the adequacy of the descriptive, comparative, correlational, survey, and ex post facto research, it will be helpful to keep the following questions in mind. The questions are organized to focus attention on the most important criteria in designing and evaluating these types of research.

- Are the objectives and purposes of the survey clear?
- Is it likely that the target population and sampling procedures will provide a credible answer to the research question(s)?
- Is the instrument clearly designed and worded? Has it been pilot tested? Is it appropriate for the characteristics of the sample?
- Is there assurance of confidentiality of responses? If not, is this likely to affect results?
- Does the letter of transmittal establish the credibility of the research? Is there any chance that what is said in the letter will bias the responses?
- What is the return rate? If low or borderline, has there been any follow-up with nonrespondents?
- Do the conclusions reflect return rate and other possible limitations?

3. **CAEP Feedback:** What stakeholders were involved in creation of these surveys?

**EPP Response:** The EPP surveys were revised from existing Validated ISBE 2013-14 Teacher Surveys (ADD 4.6). The revisions were done through the Survey Taskforce.

#### **Standard 4: Task 3 COE Exit Surveys (Evidence 2.5)**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please clarify if the EPP is using this survey to meet components of Standard 4 currently, and whether the plan is to continue to use this survey to address Standard 4.

**EPP Response:** The EPP does not plan to continue to use the COE Exit survey to determine candidates' perception or impact on student learning; instead, the EPP will rely on the data from the ISBE PEP report and Case Study.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** Are the COE Exit Survey and EPPU Exit Survey the same survey?

**EPP Response:** The COE Exit Survey and the EPPU Exit Survey are the same survey. The name was changed due to inclusion of programs outside the COE.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** Who reviews these data and how often: With whom are these data shared?

**EPP Response:** The Assessment Coordinator reviews the data each term. The data are shared and discussed among the EPP faculty and staff each term during DOE meetings.

4. **CAEP Feedback:** It appears there are two cycles of these data. How have data been used to impact change?

**EPP Response:** An example of how the data impacted change was the revision of Educational Technology (EDCP 2101/6101) course based on feedback from candidates.

#### **Standard 4: Task 4 DOE Graduate/Completer Survey (Evidence 2.5)**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please provide additional data sets (e.g., Year 3 Completer/Graduate Survey) if available.

**EPP Response:** Responses from Year 3 Completer/Graduate Survey are still being collected. Data will be available by the time of the site visit. Additional data sets from the ISBE/PEP Completer survey has been provided (ADD 4.4).

2. **CAEP Feedback:** Who reviews these data and how often? With whom are these data shared?

**EPP Response:** The Assessment Coordinator reviews the data each term. The data are shared and discussed among the EPP faculty each term during DOE meetings.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** Page 50 of the narrative suggests a fall 2017 response rate of 68.4% for the year 1 survey, while other areas suggest a response rate of 16.7%. Please clarify response rates.

**EPP Response:** The narrative on page 50 of the SSR should refer to the Graduate/Completer Year 1 survey. The correct response rate for this survey is 16.7% (13/78).

4. **CAEP Feedback:** How is the EPP responding to the areas identified for improvement?

**EPP Response:** The low response rate (16.7%) indicates additional cycles of data are required to validate areas for improvement. Initial findings suggests the need for technology experiences; therefore, the technology course was revised and a technology timeline has been implemented.

#### **Standard 4: Task 5 Administrator Survey Part II (Evidence 2.4)**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please provide an updated copy of the survey with milestone questions.

**EPP Response:** The EPP does not plan to continue to use the Administrator Survey Part II to determine candidates' impact on student learning, instead the EPP will rely on the data from the ISBE PEP report and Case Study.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** Can these data be disaggregated by program?

**EPP Response:** Yes, Administrative Survey Part II data (ADD 4.7) have been disaggregated by program.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** How will the EPP use this survey to make targeted improvements in their teacher education programs?

**EPP Response:** The results from this survey were overall very positive. The EPP does not plan to continue to use the Administrator Survey Part II to determine candidates' impact on student learning; instead, the EPP will rely on the data from the ISBE/PEP report and Case Study.

#### **Standard 4: Task 6 ISBE Completer Survey (Evidence 4.4)**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please verify response rate

**EPP Response:** The ISBE Completer Survey is mandatory for candidates who apply for licensure; therefore, 100% who apply for licensure complete the survey.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** Please share progress on the analyses of this survey.

**EPP Response:** An analysis and summary of the ISBE/PEP Completer Survey Data Report (ADD 4.4) have been completed on the ISBE Completer survey and the results were shared with the faculty at the December 2018 DOE meeting.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** Who reviews these data and how often? With whom are these data shared?

**EPP Response:** The EPP receives the data from ISBE annually at the beginning of the fall term. The Assessment Coordinator analyzes the data. The data are shared and discussed by the EPP faculty by the end of the fall term during a DOE meeting.

#### **Standard 4: Task 7 Phase-In Plan for Case Study for Initial Programs**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please provide any additional information or documentation regarding the case study plan (e.g., IRB Narrative, MOU with partners, detailed narrative of the case study plan)

**EPP Response:** The research protocol has been submitted to IRB. The final approval was received 4.14.19. We are attaching the Research Protocol for CAEP 3-Year Study (ADD 4.2) to provide complete documentation and narrative of the case study plan, including the MOU form with partners and other required components. Implementation progress has been reported in the timeline. The appendix of Research Protocol includes the IRB approval. Data collection will commence upon approval from IRB.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** What is the progress on the case study? Are data available?

**EPP Response:** Please refer to the response above.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** Please address capacity for implementing the plan (e.g., resources, timeline, multi-year plan, resources for scaling up)

**EPP Response:** Faculty involved in the Case Study Phase-in are participating as part of their research and service requirement for tenured and tenure-track faculty. The CAEP 3-Year Study (ADD 4.2) provides complete documentation and narrative of the case study plan, including the MOU form to be used with partners, a revised timeline, and all data collection instruments. Resources for scaling up will be determined on an annual basis through the budgeting process.

4. **CAEP Feedback:** What assessments have been identified to collect data on completer impact on PK-12 student progress and completer teaching effectiveness? Are validity/reliability information available on these assessments?

**EPP Response:** Two measures of data will be utilized as valid and reliable information to determine completers' impact on P-12 student progress: ISBE/PEP Report and Case Study Phase-in. The ISBE/PEP progress report provides information on the development of the PEP

report. The Case Study Phase-in is still in the early stages of implementation; therefore, validity/reliability are not available at this time.

#### **Standard 4: Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Response rate for surveys presented for Components 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 are below 20%. Response rate for several surveys presented as evidence is below 20%.

**EPP Response:** The survey response rates for all survey are between 10% and 100% (see Table 4.2.1: Survey Identification). There are only two surveys that yield response rates below 20% (Completer/Graduate Survey Year 1 and Completer/Graduate Survey Year 3). Incentives (i.e. gift cards drawing) will be offered to motivate additional participation.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP does not provide sufficient evidence of collecting data related to components 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4. Most evidence submitted has fewer than 3 cycles. Analysis and interpretation of data/evidence associated with Standard 4 is minimal and mostly limited to summary highlights and selected findings with broad recommendations. Comparison points across programs are not provided.

**EPP Response:** As of F18, the EPP has evidence for Standard 4 representing three cycles of data. The Administrator Surveys (ADD 4.7), representing one cycle of data, and information from the ISBE/PEP data report (ADD 3.3), representing three cycles of data, have been disaggregated by program to show areas of strengths and improvement.

1. Academic Strength data over three years reflect that all programs are performing at or above a 3.6 GPA, which is above the national average.
  2. Candidate and Completer Diversity Race and Pell data over three years reflect the richness in diversity by program with approximately 20 – 50% of candidates being persons of color within the respective programs. In addition, the data reflect that 18% - 54% of candidates are Pell eligible within the respective programs.
  3. edTPA data over three years show that candidates exceed the passing score, and one-third of the time exceed the state scores in the respective rubrics. Other than the case of mathematics, the EPP exceeds the State's pass rate. The EPP is making changes within the curriculum of each program to embed edTPA rubric competencies across courses to allow candidates early access and practice to meet the standards.
  4. The Entry into Teaching data reports reflect that most candidates (72%) obtain employment in Illinois. Candidates who are employed in private schools or in another state are calculated as Not Employed in an Illinois Public School. As a university that is within 10 miles of Indiana, it is understandable that many candidates live and work outside of Illinois.
  5. The Illinois Testing System Content Test Score data reports reflect that all completers exceed the passing scores and that most of the program exceed the State scores.
3. **CAEP Feedback:** Data are not disaggregated by program or criterion for providing actionable feedback related to 4.1 and 4.2. While the ISBE/PEP Report data suggest proficiency on teaching skills and impact on K-12 learning, the data cannot be disaggregated per component 4.1 and 4.2. Additionally, data are not disaggregated by program for the three cycles provided.

**EPP Response:** Please see the response above.

#### **Standard 4: Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP does not provide sufficient evidence that program completers have an impact on student learning. (4.1). Evidence submitted cannot be disaggregated per Component 4.1 and 4.2. Phase-In Plan does not address all required components.

**EPP Response:** Please see response above for 4.1 and 4.2. The update in the Phase-in Plan now addresses all required components in the Research Protocol for CAEP 3-Year Study (ADD 4.2).

2. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP does not provide sufficient evidence that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve. (4.2). The EPP provided no direct measure of completer teaching effectiveness. A Phase-In Plan was submitted with no progress. Phase-In Plan does not address all required components.

**EPP Response:** The ISBE/PEP Report provides evidence that completers effectively apply professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve. Three years of data (AY 15, 16, 17) on teaching effectiveness are provided as a direct measure of completer effectiveness (ADD 3.3). In addition, the Research Protocol for CAEP 3-Year Study Case Study (ADD 4.2) Phase-In meets the required component of the CAEP phase-in guidelines.

**CAEP Feedback:** The EPP did not provide sufficient evidence that employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation. (4.3). While employment data are part of ISBE/PEP Report, employer data are limited with little to no analysis. No employment milestones are provided. Administrator Survey Part II does not meet CAEP Level of Sufficiency.

**EPP Response:** Three years of data have been provided in the ISBE/PEP report (ADD 3.3).

3. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP did not provide sufficient evidence that completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job. (4.4). Only one cycle of ISBE Completer Survey has been provided. No analysis of the data has been conducted.

**EPP Response:** Two cycles of ISBE Completer Surveys are available. The original raw data received directly before the submission of the SSR was from an optional ISBE Completer pilot survey administered to recent completers. Since the submission of the SSR, the EPP has received additional data from the first mandated ISBE Completer Survey. The latest ISBE/PEP Completer Survey (ADD 4.4) results have been summarized, analyzed, interpreted and shared with the EPP faculty in the November 2018 DOE meeting (ADD 1.15).

## Standard A.4 – Program Impact

### Evidence Inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Administrator Survey Part II contains two yes/no questions centered on initial CAEP components 4.1 and 4.2 versus seeking data on employer satisfaction and completer satisfaction.

**EPP Response:** The EPP does not plan to continue to use the Administrator Survey Part II to determine candidates' impact on student learning; instead, the EPP will rely on the data from the ISBE PEP report and Research Protocol for CAEP 3-Year Study (ADD 4.2).

2. **CAEP Feedback:** Response rate to most surveys is below 20%. Often the EPP reports the survey response rates as combined between initial and advanced programs versus disaggregated these numbers.

**EPP Response:** The EPP administered initial and advanced surveys separately. The advanced EDAD Completer Survey yielded a 72.7% response rate (ADD 4.1) and is not combined with any other programs.

**CAEP Feedback:** Exit Surveys are given in the last semester of the program; thus, these are not measures of completers in-service as required by Standard 4.

**EPP Response:** Exit surveys will not be used as measures of completer in-service as required by Standard 4. The EPP will rely on the data from the ISBE/PEP report and Research Protocol for CAEP 3-Year Study. Beginning 2019, the ISBE/PEP report will include data for advanced programs.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** The Administrator Survey Part II with two yes/no questions lends itself to minimal in-depth analysis for the purpose of improvement.

**EPP Response:** The Administrator Survey Part II was used to evaluate initial program completers only.

4. **CAEP Feedback:** Phase-In Plan for Case Study does not include all components required by CAEP's Guidelines for Plans and lacks sufficient details.

**EPP Response:** The Research Protocol for CAEP 3-Year Study (ADD 4.2) illustrates detailed guidelines to inform investigators on the implementation of the case study, including study procedures, participant selection and rationale, methodology, data collection and instruments, and other study procedures. The protocol includes survey alignment to CAEP and ISBE/IPTS 2013 standards. University resources include representatives from each program, IRB approval, and software. The first results will be reported to faculty in Fall 2019. The timeline describes the three-year cycle for the study.

## TASKS

### Standard A.4. Task 1 ISBE/PEP Survey (Evidence 4.1)

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Is a copy of the instrument available?

**EPP Response:** Yes, a copy of the ISBE/PEP Survey (ADD A.4.1) instrument is available; however, the ISBE/PEP survey was for initial candidates only.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** The survey was to be administered fall 2018. Have any data been provided to the EPP?

**EPP Response:** The latest ISBE Completer Survey results have been summarized, analyzed, interpreted (ADD 4.4) and shared with the EPP faculty in the November 2018 DOE meeting (ADD 1.15). However, the ISBE/PEP survey was for initial candidates only.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** Who provides the data to the state for the ISBE/PEP report? Does this data come directly from the EPP? Do completers provide the data directly to the state?

**EPP Response:** The data to the state for the ISBE/PEP report is provided by several entities. The EPP is responsible for submitting fields such as names, identification numbers, GPA, ACT, gender and ethnicity. The P-12 School districts are required to submit annual State reports to include administrator performance evaluations. Proprietary testing companies such as TeachScope submit administrator performance data. The state compiles the information that is already stored in the State data collection system such as content scores, administrator and K-12 student performance to create full analysis. In addition, completers will be mandated to submit an exit survey at the time of licensure application directly to the state. Beginning 2019, the ISBE/PEP report will include data for advanced programs.

4. **CAEP Feedback:** At what point are the data for ISBE/PEP provided to the state? Is it at the time of program completion or following start of employment?

**EPP Response:** Components of the data for the ISBE/PEP are provided at different points: the ISBE PEP Completer Survey by candidates at the time of licensure as part of the licensure application process and the ISBE/PEP report by the EPP annually by April 30th.

5. **CAEP Feedback:** Who reviews these data and how often? With whom are these data shared?

**EPP Response:** The EPP receives the data from ISBE annually at the beginning of the fall term. The Assessment Coordinator analyzes the data. The data are shared and discussed by the EPP faculty by the end of the fall term during a DOE meeting.

### Standard A.4. Task 2 Survey Development

1. **CAEP Feedback:** A. Please provide a table related to Standard 4 claims which includes the following: a) name of survey, b) date of administration, c) population surveyed, d) year of population's completion, e) response rate (with sent and received number and f) use of data. Please differentiate between initial and advanced programs in table.

**EPP Response:** Please refer to Table 4.2.1 CAEP Response: Task 2: Surveys.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed: Page 56, paragraph 3 indicates the McMillan and Schumaker Model was used to create EPP-Created Surveys. Please provide additional information on this model, including how it was implement, and the outcomes of the analysis done on surveys using this model.

**EPP Response:** Please refer to Standard 4 Task 2 Response 2.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** What stakeholders were involved in creation of these surveys?

**EPP Response:** The EPP surveys were revised from existing ISBE validated surveys. The revisions were done through the Survey Taskforce.

4. **CAEP Feedback:** Interviews: individuals responsible for the creation of EPP surveys related to Standard 4, as well as those stakeholders who are responsible for data analysis and interpretation.

**EPP Response:** The Survey taskforce is comprised of two DOE faculty/coordinators, assessment coordinator and the director of educator preparation.

5. **CAEP Feedback:** Interview: Groups with whom Standard 4 data are shared and discussed.

**EPP Response:** Initial coordinators are best to provide information related to Standard 4.

#### **Standard A.4. Task 3 Survey Response Rate**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Survey response rate are sometimes combined for the initial and advanced programs. Please clarify ways the EPP uses disaggregated data for initial and advanced programs.

**EPP Response:** The Disaggregated EPP Survey Data (ADD 4.1) for teachers show candidates' perception of preparation and impact on student learning.

#### **Standard A.4. Task 4 Administrator Survey Part II (Evidence 2.4)**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The survey was to be administered in summer 2018. Are data available?

**EPP Response:** The data for the Administrator Survey Part II (ADD 4.7) are disaggregated by individual and aggregated by program, however the Administrator Survey Part II was used to evaluate initial program completers only.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** Who reviews this data and how often? With whom are these data shared?

**EPP Response:** The Assessment Coordinator analyzes the data annually. The data are shared and discussed by the EPP faculty by the end of the fall term during a DOE meeting.

#### **Standard A.4. Task 5 ISBE Completer Survey**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please clarify response rates

**EPP Response:** The ISBE Completer Survey is mandatory for initial candidates who apply for licensure, therefore 100% who apply for licensure complete the survey. Beginning 2019, the advanced programs will be required to complete an ISBE Completer Survey.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** Please share progress on the analysis of this survey, as well as future plans for survey development and use.

**EPP Response:** There are no data for advanced program completers at this time. Beginning 2019, the advanced programs will be required to complete an ISBE Completer Survey.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** Who reviews these data and how often? With whom are these data shared?

**EPP Response:** Please see response above.

#### **Standard A.4. Task 6 Phase-In Plan for Case Study for Advanced Programs (Evidence 4.2)**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please provide a copy of the MOU and other documents related to case study implementation

**EPP Response:** We are attaching the Research Protocol for CAEP 3-Year Study (ADD 4.2) to provide complete documentation and narrative of the case study plan, including the MOU form used with partners and an updated timeline. The research protocol has been resubmitted to IRB and we are awaiting final approval.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** Please provide an update on case study progress, including data collection and sustainability of future implementation.

**EPP Response:** The Research Protocol for CAEP 3-Year Study (ADD 4.2) illustrates detailed guidelines to inform investigators on the implementation of the case study, including study procedures, participant selection and rationale, methodology, data collection and instruments, and other study procedures. The protocol includes alignment to CAEP and ISBE/IPTS 2013 standards. University resources include representatives from each program, IRB approval, and software. The first results will be reported to faculty in Fall 2019. The timeline describes the three-year cycle for the study.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** What assessments have been identified to collect data on completer impact on PK-12 student progress and completer teaching effectiveness? Are validity/ reliability information available on these assessments?

**EPP Response:** The EPP does not have an advanced program for teachers. The EPP has an advanced program for administrators (principals).

4. **CAEP Feedback:** Please describe how the data from case study will be used to address CAEP 4.1 (employer satisfaction/milestones) and 4.2 (completer satisfaction).

**EPP Response:** The case study will analyze quantitative and qualitative data to incorporate into the EPP's evidence-based, continuous improvement process to guarantee provision of high quality programs for GSU teacher/leadership candidates and Illinois' P-12 students. The data will examine employer and completer satisfaction. By generating a greater understanding of how teacher and leadership preparation programs can influence student learning, we will build theory, inform practice, and influence policy to improve the conditions for teacher and leadership preparation in the EPP. The report will be presented to the faculty at the first faculty meeting of the Fall 2019 semester in August 2019.

5. **CAEP Feedback:** Interview: Individuals on-site involved in design of case study.

**EPP Response:** The following faculty comprise the team: Amy Vujaklija, Ph.D. (initial program faculty/coordinator); Pamela Guimond, Ph.D. (initial program faculty/coordinator) ; Megan McCaffrey, Ph.D. (initial program faculty); Linda Ruhe Marsh, Ed.D. (initial program faculty/coordinator); and David Conrad, Ed.D (advanced program faculty/coordinator).

## Standard A.4. Task 7 EPP Mentor Survey

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please provide an update on progress.

**EPP Response:** The EDAD program is implementing a new mentor administrator survey using the Collaboration for Principal Mentor Survey Development (ADD A.4.2) to coincide with other data collected from mentor principals. The purpose receive stakeholder (mentor principals) input in the development of a mentor administrator survey. Ultimately, the goal is to measure if principal candidates meet the expectations of future job responsibilities as demonstrated by their mentor's observations of candidate performance of those responsibilities as interns.

To create this survey, the EDAD program engaged stakeholders to inform the program on what kinds of information we should collect. First, we created a survey to gather their input to inform the design of the new survey. This survey was emailed in April 2019 to current mentor principals who are supervising candidates. Second, the program will use this stakeholder input to develop a draft survey instrument in April/May 2019. Third, the program plans to disseminate this draft survey to the same mentor principals for their design input in May 2019. Fourth, the program will design the final survey, with the first administration in Summer 2019. This administration and subsequent annual administrations will coincide with other evaluations and surveys required of mentor principals at the conclusion of the final mentoring semester.

In Fall 2019 and annually thereafter, the data will be reviewed by the EDAD program to guide program improvement. Analysis and interpretation of these mentors' evaluations of their interns and their interns' programmatic preparation will provide faculty and other stakeholders with additional descriptive and comparative data to inform the EDAD program's continuing development process. On-line training for the second and subsequent administration of the survey will be incorporated into a revised online training module required for mentor principals. The first administration of the online training module will occur in August 2019 for the new internship cycle commencing Fall 2019. This survey procedure will be added to the 2019-2020 internship handbook

**Standard A.4: Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP provides insufficient evidence of employers' satisfaction with completers' preparation. (A.4.1). Response rates for several surveys presented as evidence are below 20%.

**EPP Response:** The survey response rates for all survey are between 10% and 100%. There are only two surveys that yield response rates below 20% (Completer/Graduate Survey Year 1 and Completer/Graduate Survey Year 3) for initial candidates. Incentives (i.e. gift cards drawing) will be offered to motivate additional participation. The advanced EDAD Completer Survey (ADD 4.1) yielded a 72.7% response rate.

**Standard A.4: Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP provides insufficient evidence of completers' satisfaction with their preparation. Insufficient evidence is provided related to survey development and survey adequacy measures. Although a case study and multi-pronged approach to collecting data are provided, the EPP is still in the early phases of instrument development and protocol design.

**EPP Response:** The EPP provides one cycle of data on completer satisfaction with their preparation and will continue to collect data annually with the EDAD completer survey. In addition, the EPP will collect data on completer satisfaction through the ISBE/PEP Report and case study. Beginning 2019, the ISBE/PEP report will include data for advanced programs. With regards to the case study, the first results will be reported to faculty in Fall 2019.

## Standard 5 – Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity

### Tasks

#### Standard 5: Task 1 ADV Phase In Plan for Additional Evidence

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Please help site visitors locate where they can find evidence of a phase-in plan to collect additional evidence for advanced programs (assumed to be for A.1) as identified in the SSR p. 21, last paragraph.

**EPP Response:** Additional evidence of the phase-in plan can be found in the Case Study Phase-In plan. The attached Research Protocol for CAEP 3-Year Study phase-in plan update (ADD 4.2) provides the status, instruments and evidence collected to date.

#### Standard 5: Task 5 Disposition Updates

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Updates on Dispositions Assessments and Implementation

**EPP Response:** Discussion of a phase-in for the dispositions assessment occurred during the DOE meeting November 2018 (ADD 1.15). The original rubric was separated into three different documents as shown in the EPPU Rubrics document (ADD 1.7) to allow for three levels of expectations (early, middle and late), allowing the candidates to be fairly assessed at the intended developmental level based on where they are in the program. We analyzed the Dispositions data at a DOE meeting on March 1, 2019 (ADD 2.8). As a result of this analysis there was a consensus that having three separate rubrics for the Dispositions rubric met our needs in terms of looking at data by course and program, but also over time.

Programs will review the Dispositions data by program and report findings in their program meeting minutes. Data from the Dispositions data are distributed each semester and the data are discussed by the program level. Overall data are provided by course with no candidate names identified. Program Coordinators may request dispositional data for the individual candidates whose scores are of concern. The Assessment Coordinator can provide data for each candidate across multiple terms and courses to enable Program Coordinators to identify candidates who may need referral to program Student Progress Committees.

#### Standard 5: Task 6 Case Study Updates

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Updates and action steps taken as part of the EPP's multiple instrumental case study to address Standard 4

**EPP Response:** The research protocol has been submitted to IRB and received final approval from IRB on 4.14.19. We are attaching the Research Protocol for CAEP 3-Year Study (ADD 4.2) to provide complete documentation and narrative of the case study plan, including the MOU form to be used with partners, a revised timeline, and all data collection instruments. The appendix includes the IRB approval.

#### Standard 5: Task 7 Updates on Technology Phase-In Plan

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Updates on Technology Phase-In Plan ("Technology Phase-In Plan: and Educational Technology Review on Process (1.19)

**EPP Response:** The Technology 2020 Timeline and Plan (ADD 2.7) provides updates to the process. Prior to the creation of the 2020 timeline and plan, the following actions occurred to precipitate course redesign. In fall 2017, new ISTE standards for educators were released and as a result the Educational Technology EDCP 2101/6101 course, as demonstrated in the revised syllabus (ADD 1.14), was revised accordingly. The data from the surveys below survey indicate that candidates perceived their preparation in the use of technology was inadequate, particularly in the movement from programs directed to younger-aged children (Early Childhood) to high school students (Secondary Education). These data informed the technology course redesign.

### COE Exit Survey Fall 2017

<b>Q9 The dispositions below were enhanced by my Governors State University educator preparation program:</b>							
	Excellent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	N/A	<b>N</b>	Wgt. Avg. <b>4.00 Scale</b>
Equipment necessary (computers, lab equipment, technology for use in the classroom, etc.)	37.50% 6	43.75% 7	6.25% 1	0.00% 0	12.50% 2	16	<b>3.36</b>
<b>Q14 My initial licensure program prepared me to meet the following knowledge and skills competencies:</b>							
	Very Well	Well	Inadequately	Poorly	<b>N</b>	Wgt. Avg. <b>4.00 Scale</b>	
To model appropriate and responsible use of technology and to implement use of technology in instruction when appropriate and effective	60.00% 9	26.67% 4	13.33% 2	0.00% 0	15	<b>3.47</b>	
To understand how to identify individual needs and how to locate and access technology, services, and resources to address those needs	73.33% 11	20.00% 3	6.67% 1	0.00% 0	15	<b>3.67</b>	
<b>Q25 My experience in the Early Childhood Education program was characterized by the following statements:</b>							
	Very Well	Well	Inadequately	Poorly	<b>N</b>	Wgt. Avg. <b>4.00 Scale</b>	
I developed skills in the use of technology.	80.00% 4	20.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	5	<b>3.80</b>	
<b>Q27 My experience in the Elementary Education program prepared me in the following areas:</b>							
	Very Well	Well	Inadequately	Poorly	<b>N</b>	Wgt. Avg. <b>4.00 Scale</b>	
Teaching with technology	57.14% 4	28.57% 2	14.29% 1	0.00% 0	7	<b>3.43</b>	
<b>Q25 My experience in the Early Childhood Education program was characterized by the following statements:</b>							
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	<b>N</b>	Wgt. Avg. <b>4.00 Scale</b>	
I developed skills in the use of technology.	57.14% 4	42.86% 3	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	7	<b>3.57</b>	
<b>Q31 My Secondary Education program prepared me in the following:</b>							
	Very Well	Well	Inadequately	Poorly	<b>N</b>	Wgt. Avg. <b>4.00 Scale</b>	
Educational Technology	33.33% 1	33.33% 1	33.33% 1		3	<b>3.00</b>	
<b>Q35 My experience in the Biology Education program was characterized by the following statements:</b>							
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	<b>N</b>	Wgt. Avg. <b>4.00 Scale</b>	
I developed skills in the use of technology.	0.00% 0	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	2	<b>2.50</b>	
<b>Q43 My experience in the English Education program was characterized by the following statements:</b>							
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	<b>N</b>	Wgt. Avg. <b>4.00 Scale</b>	
I developed skills in the use of technology.	0.00% 0	100% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	1	<b>3.00</b>	

## GSU Division of Education Graduate and Completer Survey Year 1

<b>Q15 My program prepared me to meet the following knowledge and skills competencies:</b>							
	Very well	Well	Adequately	Poorly	Not At All	N	Wgt. Avg. 5.00 Scale
To model appropriate and responsible use of technology and to implement use of technology in instruction when appropriate and effective	30.00% 3	10.00% 1	40.00% 4	0.00% 0	20.00% 2	10	<b>3.30</b>
<b>Q26 My experience in the Early Childhood Education program was characterized by the following statements:</b>							
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N	Wgt. Avg. 5.00 Scale
I developed skills in the use of technology.	100.0% 3	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	3	<b>5.00</b>
<b>Q28 As a result of my experience in the Elementary Education program, I believe I am well prepared in the following areas:</b>							
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N	Wgt. Avg. 5.00 Scale
Teaching with technology	33.33% 1	0.00% 0	33.33% 1	33.33% 1	0.00% 0	3	<b>3.33</b>
<b>Q29 My experience in the Elementary Education program was characterized by the following statements:</b>							
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N	Wgt. Avg. 5.00 Scale
I developed skills in the use of technology.	0.00% 0	33.3% 1	33.33% 1	33.33% 1	0.00% 0	3	<b>3.00</b>
<b>Q48 My experience in the Mathematics Education program was characterized by the following statements:</b>							
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N	Wgt. Avg. 5.00 Scale
I developed skills in the use of technology.	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	100.00% 1	1	<b>1.00</b>

## Administrator Survey

<b>Q3 The GSU-trained classroom teacher in my school/district demonstrates competency in the following knowledge and skills:</b>						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N	Wgt. Avg. 4.00 Scale
Understanding how to identify individual needs and how to locate and access technology, services, and resources to Address those needs	0.00% 0	100.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	1	<b>3.00</b>

## ISBE PEP Completer Survey AY 2017/2018

<b>Q12 How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to:</b>							
	Very Well	Well	Somewhat Well	Not Well	Not Addressed	N	Avg. Score 5.00 Scale
v. Use technology in the classroom to improve learning outcomes	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	9	<b>4.67</b>
Early Childhood	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	9	<b>4.67</b>
Elementary	61%	22%	17%	0%	0%	18	<b>4.44</b>
Secondary English	17%	67%	17%	0%	0%	6	<b>4.00</b>
Secondary Math	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	6	<b>4.50</b>
Secondary Biology	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	3	<b>4.33</b>
Average All Programs	55%	33%	12%	0%	0%	42	<b>4.43</b>

In fall 2018, EDCP 2101/6101 was updated to reflect the new standards, including Adding new assessments. Secondary programs have reinstated the EDCP requirement for all undergraduate programs. In fall of 2018 the EPP piloted an EPPU Initial Program Assessment of Use of Technology in the Field rubric (ADD 2.6) to assess how each initial licensure candidate “responsibly seeks and implements contemporary technologies as instructional tools and resources to meet needs of the classroom and individual students” in field experiences. There are some placements in which technologies are limited or not available so there is an understanding among faculty and candidates that the rubric will be assessed only if some form of technology is available to candidates at the time they are observed and assessed in the field. The pilot data

show that across all programs 75.6% of all candidates were at a target level or above in implementing technology in the field. This is slightly below the CAEP standard of 80%. The data are skewed by the Early Childhood program which achieved only a 35% target level or better.

In August 2018, an inquiry about technology usage was distributed via social media and emails to ascertain the technology competencies most desired of education candidates. The responses and the ISTE standards guided the revision of the educational technology course. In January 2019, the EPP hired an Associate Professor with a Ph.D. and experience in educational technology and expertise in local, national, and global collaboration and digital processes. Moving forward, each year in May, further input about current technology usage will be obtained from district partners via Technology 2020 Survey (ADD 5.1). This survey will ask about professional development needs that might be addressed by university-district collaboration among the educational technology faculty and area teachers. These responses will inform university course design and provide needed information about the districts to the educational technology professor who will serve as a professional development liaison to area schools.

The realigned Educational Technology course was first offered in fall 2018. Student Evaluations of Instruction provided feedback to further inform changes.

For spring 2019, a new professor was hired to fill the needs for educational technology expertise that would further the progress made the previous semester. In response to student feedback and instructor availability, the Spring 2019 course sections were placed online. Student Evaluations of Instruction will be available mid-May to determine the effectiveness of this modality. The new instructor made moderate changes to assignment organization and due dates to more evenly pace instruction. Assessment data and student evaluations of instruction from Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 will be analyzed to further improve the course design and delivery. At the conclusion of one academic year (2018-19) we will poll our stakeholders and education partners (universities, K-12 districts, colleagues) to stay current with technology needs. Additionally, we will chart the progress of student teachers on the implementation of technology with fall 2018 as a benchmark because these student teachers will have completed their educational technology course requirement prior to the standards realignment. The plan for collecting and analyzing data is charted in the [Technology 2020 Timeline and Plan \(ADD 2.7\)](#).

### 1. **Initial**

The newly-hired educational technology professor with expertise in local, national, and global collaboration and digital processes prepares candidates to use technology in various capacities in methods courses and field experiences. The EPPU Initial Program Assessment of Use of Technology in the Field rubric (ADD 2.6) for lesson and unit plans piloted in Fall 2018 assesses candidate use of technology in methods courses and student teaching. The DOE is seeking ways in which candidates can be systematically assessed on their technology implementation in field experiences in schools that have limited technology access. (DOE meeting - make plan to validate technology in the field rubric then make requirement for each candidate to be evaluated at least once in their program.)

### 2. **Advanced**

During program review, the EDAD advanced program found a gap in the technology assessment. This was revised and aligned the Technology Portfolio Summative Assessment (ADD 5.2) to the ISTE standards for school leaders. This Technology Portfolio is assessed during EDAD 7802: Technology Driven Leadership. As one example of the portfolio content, during EDAD 7802, candidates evaluate teachers on their use of the ISTE standards for educators, as well as the teacher's application and integration of the ISTE standards for students. The first data collection for the revised Technology Portfolio Summative Assessment occurred in Fall 2018 and 100% of candidates achieved a rating of Acceptable or better.

## Standard 5: Task 9 Validity and Reliability

### 1. CAEP Feedback: Request documentation of validity and reliability studies

**EPP Response:** The EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative /Summative Rubric was modified based on the 2013 [Danielson Framework](#). The GSU Initial Licensure faculty decided to adapt the Danielson rubric to be able to more accurately and appropriately assess pre-service teachers because the Danielson rubric is designed to assess in-service teachers. The modified rubrics use the exact language from the “critical attributes” which “provide essential guidance for observers in distinguishing between practice at adjacent levels of performance.” (2013 [Danielson Framework](#)). The primary difference relates to the Distinguished performance level. Rather than a preponderance of evidence required for pre-service teachers to achieve the Distinguished level, language was added to indicate that in addition to meeting all of the characteristics of “Proficient,” one or more of “critical attributes” are all that are needed in order to achieve the Distinguished level.

Seventy-three experts from our partner schools rated our amended rubric. Overall, our panel of experts validated our instrument for clinical practice (Danielson and Disposition validation surveys (ADD 5.3). We asked them to rate 21 items as essential, useful, or not necessary. The experts rated these 21 items; 17 of them have a validity index between .34 and .89. (According to Lawshe, when there are 40 or more panelists, the content validity ratio must be between .29 and 1.00) Danielson and Disposition Validation Calculations (ADD 2.4).

On May 9, 2018, thirty-five of GSU’s EPP faculty and staff participated in an inter-rater reliability exercise as shown from meeting minutes (ADD 1.1) and the CICIP Inter-Rater Reliability Exercise Analysis (ADD 1.2) to ensure the accuracy, consistency, and precision of the implementation of the EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative /Summative Rubrics.

In advance of the meeting, participants were asked to review a summary of Charlotte Danielson’s “[Step-by-Step-Approach](#)” for using the Danielson Framework. In addition, participants were also asked to review and assess a 13-minute video of a middle school math lesson using the EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative /Summative Rubric – Domains 2 and 3.

During the meeting participants watched a math lesson video together and tallied their respective scores. Using the inter-rater reliability formula, the outcome resulted in a 58% agreement. After the initial scoring the team had an in-depth discussion regarding the individual interpretation of the tool and lesson. The participants completed a post-discussing scoring which resulted in an overall internal inter-rater reliability agreement of 64%. Note: there were no “expert” scores available to do an external inter-rater reliability comparison.

The overall inter-rater reliability agreement was below the desired 75% goal, however the agreement increased by six percentage points after the group discussion. As a result of the findings, the following strategies were recommended:

- Repeat the exercise using a full-length lesson
- Repeat the exercise using more participants, including supervising teachers
- Take additional time for discussion
- Rate the second round one domain at a time together through threaded discussion
- Allow more time for a similar exercise

On September 6, 2018 the GSU EPP faculty and staff along with partnering school Crete-Monee High School (CMHS) participated in an inter-rater reliability collaborative exercise as shown in the meeting minutes (ADD 1.1) and the CICIP Inter-Rater Reliability Exercise Analysis (ADD 1.2). This exercise was conducted to ensure the accuracy, consistency, and precision of implementing the Danielson Rubric Domains 2 and 3.

In attendance were 34 individuals consisting of 20 English and social science mentor teachers from CMHS, 2 administrators from CMHS, 9 of GSU's EPP faculty/supervisors, 2 GSU EPP administrators, and 1 GSU EPP assessment coordinator. Of the 34 individuals who attended the gathering, only 29 participated in the actual scoring. In preparation of the exercise the following were discussed:

- The significance of using the same rubric
- The significance of using Domains 2 and 3
- Instructions on the use of the original Danielson Framework observation tool (with no modifications)

The video of a full-length 5<sup>th</sup>-grade math lesson was provided using the Talent Ed Calibration Module. This module is ISBE-approved for K-12 evaluator recertification.

Participants were given an opportunity to review the Danielson rubric to acclimate to its design. The participants then watched the video of the lesson together and were subsequently separated into six different discussion groups comprised of combined GSU EPP and CMHS faculty/staff. After the discussions the participants submitted their scores.

The overall internal inter-rater reliability agreement was 82% which was above the anticipated 75% goal. The individual scores of the participants were averaged and compared to the expert scored video results. The average of the expert scorers was 25 compared to the average GSU/CMHS collaborative group assessment of 30.25, showing a 5.25 difference. The valence distance scores show that approximately 59% of the scores were higher than the master scores, 41% were in agreement, and 0.38% (one score) was lower than the master scores. The overall trend was that the majority of internal raters assessed the teacher's performance higher than the master scorers. In an effort to continuously and systematically improve practices to increase the quality of teacher preparation, the following considerations were offered:

- Provide additional training for observers using Talent Ed/Teaching Channel Videos.
- Review and compare the expert's collection of evidence to the individual reviewers' collection of evidence.
- Consider the EPP's use of Domains 2 and 3 for clinical experiences prior to student teaching.
- Consider the EPP's use of the original, unmodified version of the Danielson rubric.
- Repeat similar exercise on an annual basis.
- Use training video of a lesson more closely aligned to grade level and content.
- Establish best practices of an effective observer.

#### **Standard 5: Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each.**

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP provides insufficient evidence of collecting and using verifiable, reliable, and actionable data. (5.2). Rationale: The EPP presented less than three cycles of data for newer assessments. Although the EPP described activities related to engaging partners on content validity for some assessments, it was unclear how the EPP is institutionalizing research-based investigations of validity, reliability, and fairness of its key assessment instruments.

**EPP Response:** The EPP has over three cycles of assessments such as benchmark data, programmatic assessment, technology, dispositions, and Danielson. The ISBE/PEP data (ADD 3.3), representing three years (AY 15, 16 and 17), were made available to the EPP for the first time in summer of 2018. For newer assessments, such as surveys (exit, year 1, year 3 etc.) and data collected through the case study, the EPP has not had enough time to collect three cycles of data. The EPP will continue to collect data by updating and utilizing valid, reliable and fair

measures. For instance, the COE Exit survey will be discontinued and replaced by the ISBE/PEP Exit Survey.

The EPP plans to institutionalize research-based investigations of validity, reliability and fairness of key assessments and EPP assessments using the EPPU Plan for Creating and Updating Key Assessments and EPP Assessments (ADD 5.5) using the following steps:

- Identify in a DOE or EPP meeting the need for a new or revised assessment.
- Bring together stakeholders (school teachers, principals, superintendents, alumni, current candidates, EPP faculty, etc.) to construct or reconstruct instrument
- Submit instrument to stakeholders in the field for review and suggestions
- Reconvene group to finalize instrument.
- Send instrument to stakeholders for validation.
- Pilot instrument for 1 cycle of data.
- Analyze data and conduct reliability evaluation and training.
- After assurance of reliability and validity, full implementation.

## Standard Cross Cutting Themes - Diversity

### Diversity: Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of diversity

1. **CAEP Feedback:** D.3\_CAEP\_Diversity\_alignment\_report (9) -- File was corrupted and would open only in Preview mode.

**EPP Response:** The CAEP/Diversity Alignment Data Report (ADD D.1) which was a corrupted file in the original SSR, provides data about candidate dispositions related to diversity, and their ability to plan lessons to address the spectrum of student diversity (e.g., race and ethnicity, socioeconomic status, special education, gifted, English language learners (ELL), sexual orientation, gender, gender identity) at multiple points in their programs.

### Diversity: Evidence Inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. **CAEP Feedback:** How did the loss of the programs noted in the statement "...the EPPU has suffered the loss of many programs which are currently being phased out." (3.1\_5\_Year\_Strategic\_Recruitment\_Plan) create diversity issues? It was not clear how it might have done this. There were no data provided related to diversity in that document.

**EPP Response:** A review of the updated ISBE/PEP data report disaggregated by program (ADD 3.3) does not show a significant difference in the diversity across programs, therefore, diversity was not impacted by the loss of the secondary bachelor programs and the updated 5-Year Strategic Recruitment Plan (ADD 3.2) was updated accordingly.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** The data from the document D.4\_Chicago\_Southland\_demographics seem focused on only racial/ethnic diversity. Does the EPP have and can they please share other data sources showing diversity in other populations in the Southland of Chicago?

**EPP Response:** The Chicago Southland Demographics artifact has been renamed the Affiliated School Diversity Data Report (ADD D.2). The updated report includes the demographics from the Chicago southland, which reflects that 48% of P-12 students are white and 52% are persons of color. The report also shows that 13% of P-12 students are classified as English Language Learners; 33% are classified with having a special need and 48% are classified as low income.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** In the document dealing with faculty diversity "3.0\_EPP\_Diversity\_Data," it was noted that 69% of faculty were white. What was not mentioned in the diversity area was the tenure status by diversity other than racial/ethnicity. Are these additional diversity data available?

**EPP Response:** The most recent Faculty Diversity Report (ADD D.3) reflects that 79% of faculty are white and 21% are persons of color or unknown. Also, 56% of faculty are tenured or on a tenure track and 43% of faculty have P-12 experience, and 32% of faculty have both P-12 teaching and administrative experience. Faculty without P-12 experience teach content specific courses such as English, mathematics or science.

4. **CAEP Feedback:** It was mentioned that various data reports from EDEC, EDAD, and EMED were to be examined for data trends. Would the EPP please provide the data and its analysis?

**EPP Response:** The EPP continually collects data to monitor trends as part of the continuous improvement process. Diversity data from the EPP reports have been shared with the program faculty and follow-up meetings will occur to discuss data trends.

5. **CAEP Feedback:** Would the EPP please provide further information on how clinical and student placements are handled to ensure the maximal amount of exposure for all candidates related to student diversity?

**EPP Response:** All candidates are required to complete a minimum of 100 field hours prior to student teaching. Elementary and Secondary candidates complete 100 – 120 field hours and Early Childhood candidates, who are prepared to teach ESL and Special Education, complete over 265 field hours prior to student teaching as reflected in the Early Childhood Academic Plan (ADD 1.5). Early field experiences are conducted at schools in which the EPP has Affiliations Agreements. The Affiliated School Diversity Data Report (ADD D.2) reflects that 48% of P-12 students are white and 52% are persons of color. The report also shows that 13% of P-12 students are classified as English Language Learners, 33% are classified with having a special need, and 48% are classified as low income. The majority of the field experience hours are associated with the Lab (clinical) courses.

Each program has a Professional Development P-12 school(s) assigned to each Lab (clinical) course. The Professional Development schools consist of urban, suburban and rural schools to ensure a maximum amount of exposure to diversity for all candidates. The Lab/Clinical Experience Diversity Report (ADD D.4) shows the diversity and types of schools. The Lab/Clinical Diversity Report shows that Early Childhood candidates complete a minimum of 150/265 field hours in combined settings with the following demographics: 61% low SES, 5% ELL, 15% disability, 22% White, 60% African American, 16% Hispanic, and 6% other. At least 100 field hours are conducted in a bilingual setting. Elementary candidates complete a minimum of 80/120 field hours in a combined setting with the following demographics: 70% low SES, 16% ELL, 13% disability, 43% White, 37% African American, 17% Hispanic, and 4% other. Biology candidates complete a minimum of 75/100 field hours in a combined setting with the following demographics: 59% low SES, 7% ELL, 15% disability, 32% White, 39% African American, 26% Hispanic, and 4% other. English candidates complete a minimum of 80/120 field hours in a combined setting with the following demographics: 67% low SES, 1% ELL, 13% disability, 20% White, 66% African American, 10% Hispanic, and 5% other. Mathematics candidates complete a minimum of 80/120 field hours in a combined setting with the following demographics: 56% low SES, 4% ELL, 13% disability, 32% White, 39% African American, 25% Hispanic, and 5% other.

6. **CAEP Feedback:** Please provide a new version of the evidence "D.3\_CAEP\_Diversity\_alignment\_report (9)." Please clarify the "n" for summary tables.

**EPP Response:** The CAEP Diversity Alignment Report, renamed Diversity Alignment Data Report (ADD D.1), has been updated to include N in the summary tables. Overall, all program data together show that 91.4% of initial candidates and 99.8% of advanced candidates met or exceeded the Acceptable criterion for addressing diversity across five semesters.

## Standard Cross Cutting Themes - Technology

### Technology: Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of technology

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The following data pieces were not clearly related to technology: 2.7 CICIP Acceptance Letter Congratulations GSU\_Crete-Monee 201-U and 2.8 CICIP Overview.

**EPP Response:** The CICIP Acceptance Letter / Congratulations GSU Crete-Monee 201-U and the CICIP Overview were inadvertently added to this section.

### Technology Evidence Inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Related to the 2015 Strategic Plan: Have there been other projects undertaken since then for the College of Education? The Strategic Plan was comprehensive but dealt with the entire university, are there other focused activities that have been targeted to the College of Education, its faculty or candidates?

**EPP Response:** The College of Education does not currently have a Technology Strategic Plan in place and relies on the GSU Technology Strategic Plan and EPP annual goals. The COE has been under the direction of an Interim Dean for the past two years. The new Dean is expected to be announced within the next two weeks. The Dean is expected to facilitate the development of a COE Strategic Plan to include technology.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** Could the EPP please provide both the syllabus for EDAD 7802 referenced in the T.2\_Assessment\_of\_ISTE\_Standards\_for\_Administrators\_data\_report" as well as the rubric/test used to determine that all candidates were proficient in portfolio assessment?

**EPP Response:** The EDAD Technology Portfolio Summative Assessment Rubric (ADD 5.2) is found in the EDAD 7802: Technology Driven Leadership syllabus (ADD T.1).

3. **CAEP Feedback:** "2.5\_Survey\_Results\_Combined\_for\_CAEP" document had a number of technology-related data points. Would the EPP please disaggregate the technology data, show composite responses across programs, and include the three cycles of data?

**EPP Response:** The EPP has disaggregated data from multiple EPP surveys and the ISBE Completer Survey to show composite responses across programs (ADD T.2). The EPP does have three cycles of disaggregated technology data overall, however, for newly implemented surveys, we only have one or two cycles of data.

4. **CAEP Feedback:** Evidence "1.19 Educ Tech Course Revision Plan" was provided but it was not clear how widespread the distribution nor the evaluation of this course was handled. Please clarify how this course and its effects were shared with other faculty and shareholders? Was social media used as an ongoing process for making modifications?

**EPP Response:** In August 2018, an inquiry about technology usage was distributed via social media and emails to ascertain the technology competencies most desired of education candidates. This course and its effects were discussed at the September 2018 DOE meeting (ADD T.3) and with P-12 partners during the CICIP meeting agenda (ADD T.4).

5. **CAEP Feedback:** Will the EPP please provide more information on how they plan to implement the professional development process described on p. 73 of the SSR related to technology and the ISTE-S standards and how they are involving their partner districts along with any other relevant stakeholders? Please provide current activities as well as plans for future ones related to technology.

**EPP Response:** The newly hired professor responsible for instructional technology was initially to be hired in fall 2018. The hire was delayed until spring 2019. The new associate professor for Education Technology will provide professional development to EPP faculty and P-12 partners on ISTE-S standards beginning fall 2019.

6. **CAEP Feedback:** This series of questions all relate to the how, where, and when of technology implementation. (1) Would the EPP please elaborate on the discussion related to technology and key assessments along with additional data points that might be pulled from edTPA? (2) How does the EPP manage and analyze candidate field work and feedback systems? (3) In what ways does the EPP ensure candidates address technology criteria for field experiences and technology-based collaborations? (4) In the analysis of common performance assessments and surveys, how are the data collected and used?

**EPP Response:** (1) The EPP will discontinue the use of edTPA to assess technology because it did not directly assess technology. The following assessments will serve as tools to assess technology: the assessment of technology planning in program lesson plan rubrics; the expansion of program lesson plan rubrics to include a category to assess ISTE-S standards, assessment of the Use of Technology in the Field rubric, assessments from the Educational Technology course EDCP 2101/6101 and surveys. (2) The EPP manages technology assessment data via LiveText and Survey Monkey. The Assessment Coordinator is responsible for analyzing the data and sharing with the respective programs during EPP and/or DOE meetings. (3) The EPP will ensure candidates address technology criteria for field experience and technology-based collaborations through the piloted Unit level EPPU Initial Program Assessment of Use of Technology in the Field rubric. A plan to assess technology-based collaboration of our candidates is included in the Technology 2020 Timeline. (4) The EPP manages technology assessment data via LiveText and Survey Monkey. In the analysis of common performance assessments and surveys, the Assessment Coordinator analyzes and shares data with the respective programs during EPP and/or DOE meetings. The programs use the data to make programmatic changes such as update of the Educational Technology course and reinstatement of this course within the secondary programs.