

2019 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 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)²

Total number of program completers 199

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2017-2018 academic year?

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

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

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

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

As described in the previous annual report, the following program change continues to be noted: Added Early Childhood and Elementary Education Double Major as a separate program to the list of programs offered.

The Early Childhood and Elementary Education Double Major is not a new program, but it is now included as a separate program because the revised curriculum requires the candidates to complete an extra semester. Section 4. The state requires that the double major be reported as a separate program. Previously, these candidates were counted as elementary education majors.

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4 A.5.4)	
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3 A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4 A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

4.1 Provide a link or links that demonstrate data relevant to each of the Annual Reporting Measures are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's website.

1

Link: <https://www.salisbury.edu/academic-offices/education/accredited-programs.aspx>

Description of data accessible via link: Updated data, as available, on: I. Impact Measures, II. Outcome Measures, and III. Other Measures, Reports, and Information.

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?

Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?

Are benchmarks available for comparison?

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

Evaluation of satisfaction measures, based on established and psychometrically-supported assessments of completer and employer satisfaction (CAEP Standard 4), revealed a number of themes and trends. First, as reported in the Unit Alumni Survey Report and consistent with previous alumni survey results, alumni in the current data collection period provided, overall, positive evaluations of the effectiveness of their preparation across a range of standard areas, including InTASC standards, dispositional principles, and select technology standards. Similarly, alumni continued to indicate satisfaction with their preparation. As indicated, we will continue our efforts to assess completers' satisfaction as well as perceptions of the relevance of their preparation over time. When compared with existing benchmarks, however, alumni in the current data collection period provided somewhat lower evaluations of the effectiveness of their preparation in areas related to English language learners (e.g., support the development of English proficiency among English language learners, implement strategies to make content accessible to English language learners) and gifted and talented students (implement strategies to address the learning needs of gifted and talented learners). These competencies reflect specific areas of concern for the professional education unit at Salisbury University and were designated as areas for improvement in our prior Accreditation Action/Decision Report. It is unclear whether the slight descriptive decrease in these ratings reflect fluctuations based on response rate and sample size, or whether genuine programmatic and curricular experiences grounded concerns reported by our alumni in the current period. Based in part on these data, we will continue our efforts to both support and assess competencies in teaching English language learners and gifted and talented

students.

In terms of employer satisfaction, employers continued to indicate positive appraisals of our completers' abilities to support and assess student learning. These positive appraisals exist across school sites and time-frames of assessment. When compared against existing benchmarks, employer satisfaction is stronger in the current reporting period than in previous years (see reports at the following link: <https://www.salisbury.edu/academic-offices/education/accredited-programs.aspx>). Relatedly, employers indicated overall satisfaction with and strong ratings of the quality of the preparation of our completers. These satisfaction ratings again persist across school sites. Across our efforts to evaluate satisfaction as an impact measure, the unit needs to continue to take steps to increase both the sample size and representativeness of both alumni/completers as well as employers that are successfully surveyed. In future assessments, more targeted strategies to ensure stronger response and completion rates as well as adequate representativeness of the responses obtained will be pursued.

Evaluation of select outcome measures suggests positive trends. Fiscally, institution-level student loan default rates continue to fall below the 4-year public as well as 4-year private national average. In terms of the ability of completers to meet licensing and state requirements, results from pass rate reports continue to reveal a 98% institution-level pass rate which has been consistent across the previous three years. Next, available data from the alumni survey continue to suggest that completers are able to successfully secure employment in varied education-related positions (e.g., full-time teacher, reading specialist/ interventionist, etc.) and that time-to-employment is brief (M=1.61 months after graduation). Further, many of our graduates obtain positions in public schools in Maryland as well as in states such as Delaware, Virginia, and New Jersey. In general, many to all of our graduates of advanced programs (i.e., educational leadership and reading specialist programs) are successful in either maintaining positions through completion of graduate school or securing new positions after graduation.

Finally, of particular importance is analysis of completer/graduation rate information. Across the previous two years, completer rates have decreased somewhat for both initial (-26) and advanced (-6) programs. Trends in and issues surrounding changes in enrollment reflect a point of focus for our unit as a whole, and local school systems are likewise noting particular concern with teacher shortages and long-term retention of teachers across content areas. Accordingly, based on these and other data/figures, the unit continues to pursue and support a number of initiatives to bolster recruitment, retention, and completer rates (as examples, we have ongoing work with and based on the Teacher Academy of Maryland (TAM) program, Educator's Rising, the Holmes Scholar program, and, recently, an NSF-funded Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship Program focused on the recruitment and induction of secondary STEM teachers).

The Seidel School has articulation agreements with 20 of 24 counties in the state in relation to the Teacher Academy of Maryland program. These agreements continue to grow with the expectation of including at least 2 more counties in each academic year. Regular meetings are scheduled with school district leaders, human resource representatives, and other stakeholder groups (e.g. Local School System PDS liaison meetings, Regional PDS Meetings, etc.) to ensure we seek feedback from our school district partners to ensure we are addressing their needs. During these meetings, participants review data from multiple measures as described above.

Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

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

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

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

(I
TP
)

Candidate competencies in teaching English language learners and gifted and talented students continue to be assessed across initial programs. As an update on reporting from the previous cycle, students continued to engage in the Case Study of a Child with Exceptionalities (CSCE), which is a semester-long capstone project for all teacher candidates completing the ELED 320 Teaching Diverse Learners course. The goal of the case study is to provide evidence of the teacher candidate's competencies in working successfully with a child who has exceptionalities as well as his/her families and service providers. Core competencies emphasized in the project include building positive relationships and supportive interactions with children and their families, identifying existing strengths and challenges and using this information to develop, implement, and monitor developmentally appropriate learning experiences for children through reflective, research-based practices that are aligned with national, state, and professional standards and individual educational goals. In the fall of 2018, 27 students completed the case study in ELED 320. Students continue to perform well overall on this assessment. That is, the majority of students earned scores (on a scale ranging from 1-unacceptable to 4-exemplary) of proficient or higher on items targeting:

- child development (M=3.11; Describe the characteristics of the child with respect to physical, cognitive, social, emotional, language, and aesthetic domains);
- systematic observations (M=3.00; use systematic observations and running records as a method to gather and document useful information about the child's unique qualities);
- literature review (M=2.93; Identify evidence-based principles and theories from review of scholarly literature to support

intervention plan);

- intervention plan (M=2.93; Use knowledge of student to create a developmentally appropriate intervention plan that targets a critical learning goal); and
- reflection on professional practices (M=3.00; Provide a reflection that includes successes and challenges of the experience as well as insights and suggestions for addressing the identified challenges).

Conversely, opportunity for improvement was evidenced on items, as examples, targeting:

- family engagement (M=2.07; Involve families as partners by seeking and using input from child's family to inform educational decisions); and
- progress monitoring (M=2.59; Collaborate with family and professionals to select or design a variety of developmentally appropriate measures that align with the child's learning goal).

Moving into the assessment of our completers, the unit continues to evaluate completers' perceptions of the effectiveness and relevance of their preparation in key areas, including (for the purposes of addressing this section) competencies in understanding the learning needs of diverse learners and implementing instruction and strategies to support English language as well as gifted and talented learners (see Summary Results for 2017-2018 (Comparing 2017-2018 with 2016-2017)). Specifically, select items on the Unit Alumni Survey assess candidates' ratings of their preparation on specific InTASC and CAEP standard (as well as AFI) areas. Strong scores (on a 1-4 scale with 4 representing prepared and 1 representing unprepared) were obtained for items addressing candidates' abilities to:

- Support developmentally appropriate learning experiences (InTASC 1; CAEP 1.1, 4.4/A.4.2): M=3.72, Mdn=4.00;
- Support inclusive learning environments for diverse learners (InTASC 2; CAEP, 1.1, 4.4/A.4.2): M=3.36, Mdn=3.00;
- Enable diverse learners to meet high standards (InTASC 2; CAEP 1.1, 4.4/A.4.2): M=3.48, Mdn=4.00;

and, to a lesser degree:

- Implement strategies to address the learning needs of gifted and talented learners (InTASC 2, CAEP 1.1, 4.4/A.4.2; CAEP/State AFI 1): M=3.20, Mdn=3.00.

However, lower scores were obtained for items addressing candidates' abilities to:

- Support the development of English proficiency among English language learners (InTASC 2, CAEP 1.1, 4.4/A.4.2; CAEP/State AFI 1): M=2.56, Mdn=3.00; and
- Implement strategies to make content accessible to English language learners (InTASC 2, CAEP 1.1, 4.4/A.4.2; CAEP/State AFI 1): M=2.60, Mdn=3.00.

These latter two items reflect a decrease in mean scores compared with scores obtained in the previous reporting cycle (2016-2017, of 3.32 and 3.55, respectively) and suggest areas of continued need and development as reported by our program completers. The unit continues to take steps to support and bolster such development.

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

- 1 The unit does not systematically use program data at the unit and department level to evaluate the efficacy of courses, programs, and clinical experiences.** (I (A TP DV))
- 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.** (I (A TP DV))
- 3 The unit does not consistently align program assessments to national specialized professional association standards.** (I (A TP DV))

1. Since the previous reporting period, data from key unit and programmatic assessments continue to be used both intra- and inter-departmentally to situate program evaluation and continuous improvement. Unit-level efforts to support and maintain continuous improvement are also summarized in Section 6 of this report. One mechanism for the continued, systematic review and use of program data has been the Unit Assessment and Accreditation Committee. In UAAC meetings, varied members of the unit collectively review existing assessment procedures and improvement as well as support continuous improvement efforts. For example, in the fall of 2018, the UAAC evaluated current use of the Seidel dispositions assessments as well as ways for improving the logistics of and procedures for administering the assessments. The UAAC also examined ways for better utilizing dispositional data to inform both CAEP Standards 1-4 (as well as 5 and relevant Model Code of Ethics for Educators principles) and critical candidate recruitment and selectivity decisions. In addition to the dispositions assessment, the UAAC also continued to make data-based improvements to the unit-level intern evaluation as well as develop materials and procedures for effectively evaluating impact on P-12 student learning and development (i.e., to inform CAEP Standard 4.1/A.4.1).

Moving beyond the UAAC, the Seidel School also engaged in several school-wide meetings in the fall of 2018 and spring of 2019 (e.g., with one such meeting occurring on January 11th). These meetings served a variety of program review and continuous improvement purposes, including targeted support for Specialized Professional Association reporting and collaborative school-wide SWOT analyses to identify, as named, unit-wide strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats and, in particular, ways to meaningfully address perceived programmatic threats (e.g., concerns regarding enrollment, ways to continue to improve and address the recruitment and retention of diverse candidates). These school-wide meetings are ongoing, and are likewise scheduled for the fall of 2019.

2. Building on the work of the previous reporting period, the unit continues to critically evaluate its assessments in the support of fairness, accuracy, and consistency. As one example, the unit has recently undertaken a comprehensive evaluation of the Seidel School Dispositional Expectations Policy (SSDEP) Assessment. In this evaluation, critical reliability (i.e., estimates of internal consistency reliability via, for example, Cronbach's alpha) and validity (i.e., evidence based on test content, evidence based on relations to other variables, evidence based on internal structure; see Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, 2014) evidences were obtained and examined.

A portion of the findings of this evaluation, taken from the Evaluation of the Seidel School Dispositional Expectations Policy (SSDEP) Assessment Survey: Student Version Report, is re-presented here:

"Overall, this brief report provides promising support for the psychometric properties and performance of the SSDEP Survey: Student Version. Confirmatory factor analytic evidence supported the proposed structure of the survey instrument, with all respective items/item sets loading cleanly and strongly onto each of the five categories: Commitment to the Ideals of the Teaching Profession (items 1-5); Commitment to Professional Ethical Standards (items 6-10); Commitment to Professional Knowledge (items 11-15); Commitment to the School Community (items 16-20); and Commitment to Professional Colleagues, Faculty, and Fellow Students (items 21-25). Further, scores on the instrument demonstrated adequate reliability, based on internal consistency reliability evidence, both at the category/scale and overall instrument levels.

Descriptively, scores fell at the higher end of the score scale for each dispositions commitment area, indicating perhaps unsurprisingly that students/candidates provided strong ratings of their own dispositions. Importantly, however, scores across the five dispositional commitment areas were positively and moderately (if not strongly) correlated. This, in combination with the results of the confirmatory factor analysis, provides critical validity evidences based on both internal structure and relations to other variables (see Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, AERA, APA, NCME, 2014)."

Throughout such evaluations, a continued emphasis is placed on needed next steps and further examination of unit-level assessments to support ongoing continuous improvement efforts. Further, efforts to ensure consistency are supported through inferential statistical analyses of possible variations in assessment performance and responses by student/candidate groups. Findings across these analyses (e.g., independent samples t-tests and analysis of variance) suggest little evidence of differential assessment performance based on student/candidate background or demographic categories. Continued critical evaluations of unit-level and programmatic assessments are expected into the next reporting cycle.

3. As reported in the previous CAEP Annual Report, the unit has ensured – and continues to support – alignment of program assessments to national specialized professional association standards. As evident elsewhere in this current report, programs in the Seidel School continue to make great strides in aligning and evaluating key or signature assessments (e.g., as in the case of the Early Childhood and Elementary Education (ECED/ELED) program and, in particular, comprehensive revision and re-alignment of Reading Specialist Program (REED) assessments to ILA standards).

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

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

As noted in the previous annual report, the unit continues to work to establish and maintain initiatives for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates. Such initiatives are undergirded by the Seidel School's established priorities as delineated in its strategic plan (see the Attention to Diversity Needs at the following link: <https://www.salisbury.edu/academic-offices/education/strategic-plan.aspx>). Moving beyond the Teacher Academy of Maryland (TAM) program summarized in the previous reporting year, the Seidel School has recently applied and been approved for the establishment of a Holmes Scholar program (link: <https://aacte.org/programs-and-services/holmes-program>). Through this initiative, Seidel intends to co-develop, with students and relevant local stakeholders and constituents, a strong and maintainable program whose aim is to support students from historically underrepresented groups who are pursuing careers in education. Undergirding this initiative is a strong emphasis on equity and diversity through mentorship, peer support mechanisms, as well as opportunities for professional development for students who are racially, linguistically, and ethnically diverse. Notably, this initiative is being developed school-wide (i.e., extending to programs beyond the unit), but maintains a focus on recruiting and retaining diverse candidates in our certification programs. At the present time, faculty nominations of students enrolled in undergraduate and graduate programs are being solicited; concrete program benchmarks and milestones will be provided in subsequent reporting efforts to outline the effects and benefits of this initiative.

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous

improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloguing continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

Programmatically, a number of data-driven as well as standards-based modifications and improvements were implemented across the unit in the Seidel School of Education.

In the early childhood and elementary education program, the following summarizes data-based decisions and improvements grounded in continuous improvement efforts over the previous reporting year:

The assessment team met weekly (across spring and fall semesters) to address issues related to improving consistency and cohesiveness among and between courses and blocks. The team also worked with adjuncts to look at levels of expectations and communicated with the field placement office, supervising teachers, and liaisons to practice scoring using the rubric and discuss scoring issues in an effort to establish and improve inter-rater reliability in scoring and assessments. Such efforts reflect continued initiative to involve local stakeholders and constituents in our decision-making processes.

The assessment team also examined Praxis II scores and administered surveys to identify candidates' areas of strengths and weakness. This led to course collaborative efforts among faculty and teacher candidates in the areas of content realignment, assignment modifications and alignment, and identification and usage of resources to improve candidate content and pedagogical knowledge.

The programs examined signature assessment data as an assessment team and as a whole faculty in order to address issues that emerged from the data regarding rubric scoring and wording, as well as indicators of candidate strengths and areas of instructional or learning improvement within and among courses. Faculty met in targeted teams, with the assistance of the assessment team, to look at the signature assessment data and discuss clarity and expectations regarding the implementation of signature assessments and ways to improve instruction in current and subsequent semesters.

Further, the assessment team assisted faculty in the development and data-based modifications of the signature assessments. They also created a new Block D signature assessment to better meet the needs of teacher candidates in their internship and widen the focus of the assessment to better prepare teacher candidates for the authentic practices of teachers in the field.

Finally, the assessment team developed a content assessment for mentor teachers to evaluate teacher candidates' knowledge in practice. This led to a more robust and holistic evaluation of teacher candidates and lessened the reliance on candidates' self-reported assessments of their knowledge and abilities.

Moving into secondary programs, the following reflect program-specific summaries of modifications and implementations:

Social Studies:

Following the release of the new National Standards for the Preparation of Social Studies Teachers by the National Council for the Social Studies, the History/Secondary Education program made wide-ranging revisions to key assessments. Previous assessments did not yield the data needed to meet the revised standards. The most substantial change was to Assessment 4: Assessment of Student Teaching in Social Studies. This assessment now requests that the mentor teacher and university supervisor assess the teacher candidate based on their ability to plan for and deliver instruction in four areas: technology integration, assessment, collaborative classrooms, and engaging students in ethical deliberations. These elements represent a substantial change from the previous attention to traditional content delivery, and the first round of collected data highlighted a need for increased attention to both technology and ethical deliberations in the social studies classroom. Course changes have been implemented to address those needs.

English:

In the last year, several changes have been made to secondary English education methods courses in order to continuously improve teaching and learning in the program. In SCED 371, the selection of young adult literature novels in the course was updated to reflect recently published material and to address current issues like immigration and LGBTQ student experiences. In SCED 471, the major writing methods text was updated to Smagorinsky, et. al's *The Dynamics of Writing Instruction* (2010) to teach students the Structured Process Approach to writing instruction. This change was made based on students' demonstrated need to have a more practice-based text on writing instruction that is aligned with the Common Core Writing Standards. Further, the Writer's Workshop Activities in class were tailored to the Structured Process Approach, so students were able to practice the pedagogies through micro-teaching experiences in class. In SCED 340, several assignments were adjusted and a text about Black English was added (the documentary *Talking Black in America*) to help fill students' knowledge gap around the histories and politics of African American dialects in the United States. In addition, a micro-teaching experience called *Critical Language Artifacts* was added so students had the opportunity to utilize critical literacy pedagogies and questioning techniques to teach a mini-lesson on a contemporary/digital text. In addition to these changes, in the Fall of 2018 English methods students attended EdCamp Delmarva as a course requirement and professional development opportunity. These curricular and pedagogical changes were made in response to data collected from student course evaluations and instructor analysis of student learning through key assessments like the Unit Plan for Secondary English Teaching.

Mathematics:

Candidates for secondary mathematics certification must pass the Praxis II content knowledge test in order to obtain a teaching license. The Praxis II test 5061 contains a great deal of the mathematics content beginning teachers need to know. Candidates at SU have had difficulty passing the test the first time they take it. This has led to extra work during their student teaching internships, and in some cases, delay of degree completion. To address this issue, the instructors of SCED 373 (Mathematics Teaching Methods I) and MATH 430 (Mathematical Connections for Secondary School Teachers) have coordinated their efforts to prepare students for the Praxis II. In SCED 373, candidates take a final exam that is based on the types of items currently asked on Praxis II. The SCED 373 instructor tabulates candidates' responses to the items and sends a data summary to the MATH 430 instructor. The Math 430 instructor then directly addresses items for which candidates need additional preparation and builds lesson plans accordingly to follow-up the SCED 373 Praxis II preparation efforts. For example, as a result of this collaboration, Math 430 has given greater attention to issues such as the Law of Sines, Law of Cosines, impact of parameter changes on graphs, and real roots of polynomial equations. As this collaboration continues, candidates' Praxis II success rates will continue to be monitored, and the SCED 373 and MATH 430 instructors will refine their collaborative approach as needed to maximize the number of candidates who pass the exam the first time taking it.

World Languages:

In the World Languages Program, data has been used to evaluate the effectiveness of course materials, the pace of the course and the types of assessments given. When I inherited the program in 2015, the course used three books and many articles but it did not require students to practice their own lesson planning. When I examine the data, I see that not all of my interns were achieving proficient in all areas during their methodology courses and during their internships. As a response, I redesigned the course around one textbook and I added more practice assessments before students are evaluated for my SPA report. This semester, I am so impressed by the quality of my two interns. It makes it seem as if the changes I have made over the last four years have been positive. I have not had to alter my main assessments, as they were written to serve as evidence that my students know how to meet the standards; however, I have greatly changed my approach and the types of practice assessments that I assign.

TESOL:

The TESOL program at Salisbury University has revised a number of syllabi outcomes to include technology threads synergized to both the ISTE and CAEP-TESOL technology standards. The seven ISTE standards have been integrated into four courses focused on all four modalities to include: 1. Literacy and ESOL Listening, 2. Literacy and Speaking, 3. Literacy and Reading, and 4. Literacy and Writing respectively. These courses additionally are now more in tune with recent ESSA mandates. This new programmatic modification has also been instigated by Maryland State Department of Education mandates which are now requiring all ESOL certified candidates to additionally take and pass the Praxis II examination on Teaching Reading Elementary Assessment. This ETS-designed standardized measure premised on K-6 aural and oral literacy outcomes will potentially instigate programmatic shifts in our required course compendium in the program. While this mandate is still in its preliminary stages, its adoption might signify a key shift in course requirements especially pertinent to the modalities of listening and speaking, and will potentially require that these two new courses be added to our required course compendium. The qualifying score for this test is currently set at 162 and is set to take effect on July 1, 2020 with validity and reliability site studies set to take place through 2019. We have collected data on six common assessments to date for three complete cycles, and are in the stages of examining how our candidates are performing in salient sub-areas of the Praxis II ESOL Examination relative to performance outcome data on our five other course-linked measures.

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

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
1.5 Model and apply technology standards
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
A.5.5 Continuous Improvement
x.1 Diversity
x.2 Technology
x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses
x.5 State Standards (if applicable)

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

 **DataDriven_Decisions.docx**

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or s activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

Not applicable

Section 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a success transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful r regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the fo information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPP's evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progress in addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level

If there are no identified gaps, click the box next to "No identified gaps" and proceed to question 7.2.

No identified gaps

If there are identified gaps, please summarize the gaps and any steps planned or taken toward the gap(s) to be prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text applies.

An ongoing initiative of the Seidel School, consistent with an identified need in meaningfully addressing key CAEP standards, is to conduct assessments of program impact and teaching effectiveness based on our completers' performance (CAEP Standard 4). As noted in the previous annual report, in the previous reporting year, we constructed, revised, and continued to develop measures to assess and demonstrate the impact of our completers on P-12 learning and development as well as the satisfaction of both our completers and their employers. We have made great progress in the evaluation of satisfaction of both our completers and employers of our completers (see established reports, with associated benchmarks, on our accredited programs site).

At present, we have a need to continue to pilot and implement our work toward evaluating impact on P-12 student learning and development. As previously indicated, we have developed a teacher action research project (referred to as the Completer Impact Case Study) that will largely parallel existing teacher action research projects employed to evaluate our teacher candidates' teaching performance during pre-service. As a result and as noted, it is our intention to evaluate and demonstrate completer impact in such a way that: 1) aligns with completers' prior experiences assessing and demonstrating their impact and 2) produces meaningful and actionable data on which completers can evaluate and improve their impact as in-service educators.

In the upcoming academic year, we will coordinate with our Regional PDS network, including our site coordinators and school liaisons, to pilot and implement our teacher action research approach with a small sample of our completers. We will then expand our assessment of completer impact to other completers within our PDS network iteratively and across time. It is expected that the initial Completer Impact Case Study will be completed in the fall of 2019; summary results of the first iteration of the study will be posted to our PEU data site (link) in the spring of 2020 and revised plans for expanding the assessment of completer impact will also be posted.

We will next coordinate with our Regional PDS network, including our site coordinators and school liaisons, to identify relevant points of contact for our completers that serve in their schools. This will facilitate initial administration of the Student Surveys of Teaching Effectiveness and will allow for a starting point in gathering data to support examination of the effectiveness of our candidates' teaching. It is expected that the Student Surveys of Teaching Effectiveness will be administered by the end of the fall of 2019 so as to allow sufficient time for teacher-student relationships to be developed. A summary of results of the first iteration of the teaching effectiveness surveys will be posted to our PEU data site in the spring of 2020.

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

- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs

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

Yes No

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

Not applicable

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2019 EPP Annual Report.

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Starlin D. Weaver

Position: Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Phone: 410-548-6268

E-mail: sdweaver@salisbury.edu

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completer data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site visit report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

Acknowledge