

2017 EPP Annual Report

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

Section 1. AIMS Profile

After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate.

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2015-2016 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)

Total number of program completers 299

***2.2 Indicate whether the EPP is currently offering a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure.**

Yes, a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification is currently being offered.

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2015-2016 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the published mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
No Change / Not Applicable

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

The following is being added as an off-site elementary education program: Elementary Education at Chesapeake College, Wye Mills, Maryland.
The program was in place when we were accredited in 2013. However, it was not listed as a separate off-site program. In the last accreditation report, it was incorporated into the campus program. We understand now that under CAEP, this program should be listed as a separate off-site program.

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

The Teacher Education programs were revised to respond to changes in external demands and local needs. Most of the courses in these programs are now 4 credits instead of 3 credits. Implementation fall 2016. Other significant changes include:

- Technology in Education – moved from in-program to pre-program
- Added three 1-credit diversity courses to curriculum
- First 20 days of internship are now consecutive days in the schools in 1st semester of senior year instead of 1 day per week
- Early Childhood courses reconfigured to change focus
- Addition of Early Childhood course on Play and Creativity

3.4 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

No Change / Not Applicable

Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:

3.5 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.6 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

Section 4. Display of candidate performance data.

Provide a link that demonstrates candidate performance data are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the school, college, or department of education homepage.

Answers to frequently asked questions about program and University information, default rates, time to degree, P-12 connections, survey reports, pass rates, employment rates:

<http://www.salisbury.edu/seidel/peu.html>

Section 6. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 1 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

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

The curriculum in the Teacher Education programs (Elementary, Early Childhood, and Double Education Major), which account for approximately 74% of all candidates in initial programs in the Professional Education Unit (PEU), was revised so that most courses are now 4 credits instead of 3 credits. A major change to the Instructional Techniques for Inclusion course renamed Teaching Diverse Learners, was the additional content and assessment around critical competencies for working successfully with Dual Language Learners, students who are Gifted/Talented, and those with Learning Disabilities.

The key assessment in this course is a three-part case study that includes a specific case for each of the three types of learners. Because candidates are not always in classrooms with students who are Dual Language Learners or Gifted/Talented, these two cases are hypothetical, but the third one (student with a learning disability) is real because it is more common and can be found practically in most classrooms. The rubric to assess the associated competencies was developed using the CAEP Evaluation Framework (CEF) and is now a part of the PEU database. All other initial certification programs have made similar adjustments to include and assess competencies for working with students from all three special groups. Data from the new assessment of the competencies will be available for the next annual report.

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

1. The unit does not systematically use program data at the unit and department level to evaluate the efficacy of courses, programs, and clinical experiences.	(ITP)	(ADV)
2. The unit has not taken effective steps to eliminate bias in assessments and establish the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures and unit operations.	(ITP)	(ADV)
3. The unit does not consistently align program assessments to national specialized professional association standards.	(ITP)	(ADV)

1. After the last NCATE review in 2013, the message was clear---there was a critical need to establish a "culture of inquiry" across the professional Education Unit (PEU) so that all continuous improvement efforts would be evidence based. With the gradual release of CAEP's standards and expectations, we realized that the existing, inefficient, and fragmented assessment structure would never meet the new expectations in terms of validity, reliability and usefulness of unit data. We now believe, like CAEP and others, that the data generated are only as good as the instruments used to collect them. So a deliberate decision was made at the unit level to rebuild a more valid and reliable assessment system rather than continue to rely on patch work as was the practice in the past.

This intentional rebuilding continued in different forms throughout 2015-2016 and is ongoing. We began by first developing a timeline of the major assessment related activities across the unit that will improve our offerings and lead to a successful accreditation visit in 2021. We were recently given an extra year because of the disruptive legislative changes in the state of Maryland regarding the accreditation process. Our next step was to identify and put in place a cadre of key assessment personnel

that included a unit level Assessment/Accreditation Team (AAT) of faculty members.

This AAT meets biweekly since 2016 and leads the rebuilding work around developing quality rubrics at program and unit levels. We also made special efforts to attend all of CAEP’s conferences and brought back and shared with the faculty and our field partners information that justified the need for change not just to meet the new accreditation standards, but more for our own program improvement benefits. These efforts initiated some much-needed changes in the general culture of the school and mindset of the faculty.

As was mentioned above, a critical part of the rebuilding was the development and implementation of an assessment structure with built-in accommodations for systematic use of program data at the unit and department level to evaluate the efficacy of courses, programs, and clinical experiences. This effort also includes revamping the poor quality instruments that were used to gather and provide evidence for the 2013 accreditation visit. Again, this work is ongoing. It is hoped that all assessments used across programs and unit will be at or above CAEP’s “sufficient level” by the end of this spring 2017 semester and ready for full implementation in fall. This will allow us to confidently collect meaningful and useful data going forward.

2. A major understanding developed from attending CAEP’s conferences over the years has been the emphasis placed on the quality of rubrics used to generate evidence. Our EPP-created assessments that were used for the last NCATE visit do not meet the CAEP Evaluation Framework’s (CEF) “sufficient level.” Therefore the data resulting from these instruments were of little true value in terms of informing unit level decisions. Given his background, the major work in the unit, as was mentioned above, is to revise all instruments using the CEF and then use the newly built assessments to collect valid and reliable data that can be used for the upcoming SPA reports, unit self-study, and continuous improvement. We have made progress on these efforts and will have quality instruments in place across the unit by the beginning of fall 2017. All of these efforts are in collaboration with our cross-campus and field partners. We are currently working with them to establish content validity and a high level of inter-rater reliability through ongoing training.

The unit, therefore has done much to address this particular AFI. In 2016, a CAEP consultant was hired to do an overhaul of the unit beginning with a close look at its last accreditation report. The school also hired an assessment specialist who has already attended the 2017 spring CAEP conference for us even though the individual does not begin assessment work officially until July 2017. The new assessment specialist will also attend the LiveText conference in July 2017 before assuming responsibility for reorganizing the LiveText database to more efficiently collect and aggregate data for programs, departments, and unit use. The new assessment specialist will also be responsible for taking necessary steps to eliminate bias and ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures and unit operations. All of this work continued through 2015-2016 and into 2017.

3. The assessment work being led by the unit’s AAT and the CAEP consultant, is not solely focused on unit level standards such as INTASC and CAEP, but also on creating crosswalks and alignment with the different required SPA standards. This ongoing work incorporates CAEP’s guidelines as well as a thorough review of the last SPA reports at the program levels. We are continually working to ensure we generate valid and reliable data across all programs that will help us refine and improve the entire assessment system, both product and process.

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

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

The unit has undertaken some major initiatives aimed at recruiting and retaining diverse candidates. The first was to take a more active role in university level recruitment efforts that target diverse candidates. Faculty members go on tours of local high schools in rural areas and inner cities to recruit along with personnel from the institution’s Admissions Office. Faculty members and current students in educational majors also make personal follow-up phone calls to try to influence the decisions of students from diverse populations who made campus visits or received acceptance from the University.

These efforts were tracked in 2015-2016 and a number of enrolled students from diverse populations attributed their final decision to attend Salisbury University (SU) to the personal recruitment efforts made. Students who are freshmen at SU, especially those from diverse populations, are also provided additional supports that help them to make strong early connections with the SU campus community. When students settle in and become comfortable early in their college experience, they tend to stay.

The second effort demonstrates a more long-term vision through connecting with underrepresented populations in local elementary and middle schools. In addition to working with the teachers in the classrooms to help these students remain on a viable college track, faculty from the PEU have organized campus-based summer camps and campus visits for classes with underrepresented groups from the local elementary, middle, and high schools.

A third effort was developing and implementing what is described as a “diversity ribbon” or a series of diversity courses embedded in the new Teacher Education 4-credit curriculum described earlier. All candidates enrolled in the professional education program must take a 1-credit diversity course in each of the first three semesters in the program. The first of these courses focuses on “Diversity and the Self,” the second covers “Diversity and the Community,” and the third incorporates a broader view and covers “Diversity and Society.” This revised curriculum was implemented in fall 2016. The goal is to help create a more understanding and welcoming Salisbury University environment for and among students at all levels and across the institution.

At the faculty level, a Diversity Special Interest Group was formed in 2016 with faculty members from all departments across the school. The conversations and professional activities, including presentations at conferences, are designed to build and encourage

cultural competencies among all faculty that will positively influence their pedagogical practices as well as their interactions with underrepresented students in other aspects of the school community.

Section 7. Accreditation Pathway

Selected Improvement. *Summarize progress on the Selected Improvement plan for the standard(s) or component(s) selected.*

Standard 3: Field Experiences and clinical practice is the selected standard on which the unit is moving to the target level.

The unit continues to make improvement on this standard. The strong working relationships between the PEU and the 33 Professional Development Schools (PDS) in eight counties in Maryland continues to receive national attention and awards. The University was honored with the 2017 Exemplary PDS Achievement Award from the National Association of Professional Development Schools (NAPDS). The award applauds the outstanding school-university partnerships that shape current and future educators. Only three such efforts nationwide were recognized. Salisbury University earned national recognition for its collaborative partnerships with Snow Hill Elementary School.

Even with this recent award and past accolades for excellent PDS collaboration, there remains work to be done. As we include the partnership in the rebuilding work that is necessary because of changes in the new curriculum and the new requirements of CAEP, gaps are emerging. The following are three current challenges we are working together to address:

1. Family involvement – It is the desire of the unit to provide more opportunities for teacher candidates to interact with student families for obvious beneficial reasons. However, our PDS partners generally view this requirement as “useful, but not essential.” So the plan is to better articulate (with the support of research), the benefits for the students, the candidates, the schools, and the families.
2. The new curriculum includes additional time in the classroom for interns. During this time, faculty from the University will need to visit the candidates in the schools. Scheduling these visits to better synchronize with school activities will ensure a smoother implementation of this aspect of the revised curriculum.
3. The new CAEP requirement around validity and reliability of data evidence requires more collaboration between the PEU and our PDS partners in developing and norming evaluation instruments. This involves extensive training, which can be time-consuming and difficult to fit the tight schedules of many PDS. These are all part of a continuous improvement plan toward the target level for this particular standard.

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2017 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Althea J. Pennerman

Position: Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Phone: 410 548 2865

E-mail: ajpennerman@salisbury.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, going forward accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.