Attallah College of Educational Studies
CAEP Self-Study Addendum
September 2019

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.

InTASC Standards:
Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

1. **CAEP Feedback**: **InTASC Standards**: Have California Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE) related to InTASC standards in a matrix or crosswalk? If so, where is it located?

EPP Response: *We have a CAEP/CTC Approved InTASC Standards crosswalk.*
   - *[California/InTASC Standards Crosswalk I-001](#).*

Data for Candidates:
Evidence in need of verification or corroboration & Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

1. **CAEP Feedback: Performance Data for Candidates**: Table 1.1 Attallah College Program Characteristics indicates that 48 candidates were enrolled in the SPED program in the 2016 FY, but no performance data are available. Why?

EPP Response:
Across all programs we analyze data yearly in a number of ways through university (WASC-focused) Annual Learning Outcome Assessment Reports (ALAOR)[1] as well college level Annual Reports. Below is the link to the completed ALOAR reports with data. Reviewers can view a template for the annual report and completed reports. Data will be provided on site as allowed by (34 CFR § 99.31) as this data is protected by The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99). In addition, we demonstrate analysis of Key Assignments for each program below.

---

[1] Each year, the faculty of each degree program at Chapman are responsible for completing an Annual Learning Outcomes Assessment Report (ALOAR) in which they describe the processes they have used for assessing their program's learning outcomes, the performance levels they have measured in their students that year, and the progress they have observed in improving student learning over the previous year. For more information about ALOARs.

These data are in the AIMS database codes: I-002-I-0025
- *Teacher Education WASC ALOARs*
- *Teacher Education Annual Reports*

Special Education: Analysis of Key Assignments with multiple cycles of data can be found here: [Key Assignment Impact Analysis](#) I-0026. Some Key assignments do not have three years of data. We intend to have three years of data by fall 2020. The Attallah College of Educational Studies offers Special Education (Education Specialist) preliminary teaching credentials in two disability-related areas: Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe. In addition, we offer a Master of Arts in Special Education. Beginning in the 2017-2018 academic year, we also offer a joint credential Multiple Subject ("General Elementary Education") and Mild/Moderate (Special Education) with a Master of Arts in Special Education. Candidates complete Special Education programs as either full-time or part-time students, and generally complete their program in 5-6 terms (semesters; e.g., Fall, Interterm, Spring, Summer, Fall) depending on the program of choice (e.g., joint credential students complete an additional semester of student teaching along with two additional courses). The Education Specialist Credential (Special Education) and Joint Credential programs are embedded within the Master of Arts in Special Education program, although the MA can be completed without obtaining a teaching credential.

The mild/moderate and moderate/severe programs were revised from 53 credits to 41 credits in 2017-2018 in order to streamline the program and make it more accessible to a wider range of candidates. The new Joint Credential Program is 52 credits.

The "old" course sequences can be viewed here: [2016-2017 Course Sequence](#) I-0027.

The revised course sequences can be found here: [SPECIAL EDUCATION Mild Moderate/Moderate Severe AND JOINT CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SEQUENCE (2017-2018 through current year)](#) I-0028.

Although the program was revised, many of the Key Assignments have remained the same. Therefore, we are able to compare student performance in select key assignments over time. However, please note that some course numbers have changed, and, thus, some course numbers may not align from one year to the next. "old" and "new" course numbers are noted if applicable. Furthermore, rubrics have been revised and a visual representation of revisions can be found here: [Summary of Key Assignments and Notations for when there were rubric changes](#) I-0029.

The program-identified program learning outcomes aligned with the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE) and Program Standards for the Preliminary Education Specialist credentials (Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe) outlined by the California Teaching Commission (CTC). Based on the program learning outcomes, the program faculty developed Key Assignments that address TPEs as outlined by CTC. In an effort to maintain consistent evaluation of student outcomes, we attempted to maintain all possible key assignments despite the revision of

programs and some courses as the programs continue focus preparation of teachers to meet the TPEs outlines by the CTC (see CTC guidelines here (CTC Guidelines) I-0030.

MAT (MS/SS Key Assignment Analysis):

This document below includes the MAT MS and SS analysis of impact on candidate performance assessment. The program was redesigned in 2017 and has been running under the current model and course structure for two years. During the redesign Key Assignments were adjusted and all rubrics were standardized to a four-point scale. Thus, many assignments remained stable, and the rubrics were updated. This resulted in some course key assignment data cycles being fewer than 3 as they have not run for three data cycles. We expect to have three cycles for all Key Assignments by the 2020-2021 academic year given that some courses only run one time per year. Analysis are conducted for three cycles of Teacher Performance Assessments which can be found in the ALOAR[2] reports.

MAT SS & MS Key Assignment Analysis I-0031

MACI (MS & SS) Program

The MACI program is a relatively new accelerated BA to MA + credential program (single or multiple subject) open to Chapman undergraduate students only. It has only graduated two cohorts so far, with a third cohort just beginning the 5th year of study in Summer 2019. Incomplete data sets (2 cycles of data only) reflect the fact that the program is relatively new. In addition, some key assignments and rubrics were updated and implemented in Fall of 2018. This change took place as a result of faculty reflection on practice after launching the program based on both stakeholder discussion and feedback. Aligning some key assignments also helped to bring some cohesion within Teacher Education overall. While MACI students do not share classes with their MAT counterparts, faculty determined that it would make sense to use some key assignments across programs in cases where course content was similar even though the pace of instruction was distinct (undergraduate level versus graduate level workload).

MACI Impact Key Assignment Analysis – I-0032

2. **CAEP Feedback:** The MAT data available are for the MAT Single Subject. Are there data for MAT Multiple Subjects?

EPP Response: *These data were included originally and are disaggregated by courses when applicable. For example, 547 is a multiple subject course, and 567 is a single subject course, and thus data are disaggregated in those courses naturally. In courses where MS and SS candidates are in the same course (e.g., EDUC 571, we have not been differentiating. Starting with the current academic year (2019-20) we are differentiating between MS and SS).*

3. **CAEP Feedback:** Where are multiple performance assessment data for all programs?

   EPP Response: *Multiple performance assessments are used for all programs and data and performance assessment can be found above in response to 1.1.*

Assessment Quality:
Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Where are the data to demonstrate that key assessments are reliable and valid?

   EPP Response: *Attached is a description of the establishment of reliability and validity of instruments.*

   [Reliability and Validity Analysis of Key Assignment Evaluation Rubrics](#) I-0033

2. **CAEP Feedback:** What are key assessments for all programs and across programs?

EPP Response:
- *Key assignments across programs can be found in the program matrices attached here:* [Program Matrices](#)
  - ***MACI MS MATRIX I-0034***
  - ***MACI SS MATRIX I-0035***
  - ***MAT Bilingual MATRIX I-0036***
  - ***MAT MS MATRIX I-0037***
  - ***MAT SS MATIX I-0038***
  - ***SPED MM MATRIX I-0039***
  - ***SPED MS MATRIX I-0040***

  - *Associated Syllabi I-TE-SYL-01 – I-TE-SYL-59*

- *For the MAT and MACI programs we include cycles of Teacher Performance Assessment data (Special Education does not currently have TPAs)*
  - ***TE ALOARs (& Annual Reports[3]) - I-002-I-0025***
- *Our current dispositional assessments (linked below) in addition to our plan for including a new Educator Disposition Assessment (Watermark) that has established reliability and validity. We have purchased this assessment and plan to pilot in student teaching courses in the fall of 2019. The manual provided by Watermark for this tool can be found here:* ***[EDA Manual](#) I-0041***
- ***[TE Dispositions Assessment and Analysis](#) I-0046***
- ***[TE Disposition Statement and Current Measures](#) I-0043-I-0048***

---

[3] These data will be provided to reviewers on site.

Candidate dispositions are reviewed careful by program coordinators and the program director with support from faculty. If candidates are deemed to have concerns regarding dispositions, a remediation plan is developed with a clear timeline and support for addressing the dispositions. If the candidate continues to fail to meet dispositional requirements, they may be counseled out of the program.

*Stipulations ***
This is the most important area that needs corrections

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP does not demonstrate that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice (1.2) *Rationale:* The Annual Learning Outcomes of Assessment Report, template attached as an exhibit by the EPP has the potential to show these data, but data are not provided.

EPP Response: *We have included three cycles of ALOAR reports that include analysis of Teacher Performance Assessments. These require candidates to use research-based or evidence-based practices. Our clinical assessments also require candidates to use evidence-based or research-based practices and show evidence of this use. This is included in the Special Education Portfolio assessment as well, which uses the same Teacher Performance Expectation Aligned rubric used in student teaching (found below).*

   o ***TE ALOARs (& Annual Reports[4]) I-002-I-0025***

● *Clinical Assessments can be found below. Each clinical assessment includes an area where teachers must use research-based or evidence-based practice. For MAT the clinical assessments are used during term 2 (practicum) and term 3 (student teaching). For MACI candidates, the assessments are use during the entire residency year. For special educators, clinical assessments are used during the final term via an e-portfolio and student teaching assessments. Additional description can be found in the clinical analysis section links below.*

● **Special Education: For special education, in TPE 1, candidates must demonstrate use of research-based practices.**
   o ***MM Special Education I-0049***
   o ***MS Special Education I-0050***
● *MAT (MS/SS)*
   o ***MS/SS Clinical Assessment I-0051***
● *MACI*
   o ***MACI Clinical Assessment I-0051***

Analyses of clinical assessments that address this standard can be found here: *Clinical Assessment Analysis I-0053*

---

[4] These data will be provided to reviewers on site.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP does not demonstrate that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge. (1.3) *Rationale*: Although program matrices describe when TPEs are Introduced, Practiced, and Assessed throughout the program. Additional data are not in evidence.

EPP Response:

The programs require that candidates apply content knowledge in a number of ways. For the MACI and MAT programs, this is done through clinical assessments required for student teaching evaluations (see student teaching evaluation rubrics here). Analysis can be found below.

For the MACI program, candidates are evaluated on this measure a minimum of 16 times throughout the one-year residency program. For MAT students, candidates are evaluated two times during their practicum experience, and a minimum of 6 times during the student teaching semester.

For our Special Education programs, this is done via clinical assessment and the portfolio assessment. Special Educators are observed a minimum of 6 times during the student teaching semester and must submit a portfolio demonstrating understanding and application of TPE 3 **(see Portfolio I-0054 and Student Teaching rubric I-0055 in Key Assignments folder).**

Analyses of clinical assessments that address this standard can be found here: Clinical Assessment Analysis -I-0053

3. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP does not show that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students' access to rigorous standards. (1.4) *Rationale:* Beyond course and program matrices showing where instruction and assignments are identified, no evidence is presented.

EPP Response: *The EPP does this through TPE aligned professional standards, via dispositional assessments as well as through clinical evaluations. Candidates are observed throughout the program and evaluated via these clinical assessments found below. The Teacher Performance Expectations and Teacher Performance assessments ensure that this includes all children and youth in schools, including but not limited to, students with disabilities, students who are gifted and students who represent diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, religion, sexual identification, and/or geographic origin.*

An example of candidate placement tracking with identifiers removed can be found here: **Candidate Placement Diversity Tracking – I-1057**

Analyses of clinical assessments that address this standard can be found here: [Clinical Assessment Analysis – I-0053](#)

4. **CAEP Feedback**: The EPP does not demonstrate that candidates' model and apply technology standards as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning as well as to enrich professional practice (1.5) *Rationale:* Evidence provided are descriptions of technology-related assignments, yet no other evidence is provided

EPP Response: *All programs assess the use of technology via clinical assessments. All clinical assessments refer to use of technology and candidates are assessed in multiple ways (e.g., observation, lesson plan review, and portfolio (Special Education/MACI). For MACI and MAT (Single Subject and Multiple Subject Candidates) the newly revised Teacher Performance Assessments which have been implemented in spring 2019, include a technology as an integral part of the requirements and evaluation. We look forward to using the results of the new TPAs in the future. This will influence our program design as we seek to ensure candidates receive the necessary preparation to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and abilities via the TPAs.*

● *In addition to what is currently being done across programs in relation to technology related Key Assignments, we have revised current Key Assignments to reflect the use of ISTE standards (see details below) in the program.*

● **Special Education:** *We added The International Society for Technology in Education[5] (ISTE) standards to the clinical assessment and portfolio requirements*
    o **[MM Special Education I-0049](#)**
    o **[MS Special Education I-0050](#)**
    o **[E-portfolio Assessment I-0054](#)**

● **MAT (Multiple Subject and Single Subject):**

    o *Additional ISTE standards were added to the following Key Assignments (in addition to continuing the application in **EDUC 571, I-TE-SYL-26 EDUC 571***): **EDUC 547/547B I-TE-SYL-14 EDUC 547& 567**; **EDUC 543 I-TE-SYL-12 EDUC 543.***

● **MACI (Multiple Subject and Single Subject):**

● *In the current MACI program, students are introduced to and practice the ISTE standards in the **IES 451 I-TE-SYL-01 EDUC 451-551 KPRevision12-07-17 MSApproval12-11-***

---

[5] The ISTE Standards for Students are designed to empower student voice and ensure that learning is a student-driven process. Connect with other educators in the [ISTE Standards Community](#) and learn how to use the standards in the classroom with the ISTE Standards for Students [ebook](#).

17Educational Technology course, which they take in either Interterm or Spring of their undergraduate senior year. The description for this course is as follows:

This course provides an overview of the uses of the range of educational applications of technology in the classroom. It includes but is not limited to the following content: using technology to communicate with and support students and families; blended and online learning environments, the use and adaptation of a variety of technological resources, including assistive technology; modeling and developing digital literacy in students; promotion of digital citizenship and the associated legal implications for the use of technology (e.g., Creative Commons license, fair use, internet security, etc.); effective teaching strategies aligned with internationally recognized educational technology standards (e.g., ISTE); virtual collaboration; personalized and technology-rich lessons offering students multiple means to demonstrate learning; the use of technology to support assessment administration and data analysis; and the responsible use of social media and digital platforms and tools as a professional educator. Meets the professional clear requirements for classroom application of computers. Some sections of this course are taught online.

● *During the student teaching residency year, teacher candidates continue to develop competency with technological tools and their application with students. They participate in district level and school level trainings when available at their residency site. In addition, Christina Lin, the technology coordinator at Orange Unified School District (OUSD) guest lectured in MACI 600 in Fall 2018 on OUSD tools available to them as student teachers. Our candidate competency with technology is measured by TPA Cycle 2. These scores can be found* here. **I-0062**

• *Our program analysis shows that ISTE standards can be threaded through the program more systematically. Moving forward, the program intends to assess these standards in the context of the fall and spring key assignments in the MACI 600 Professional Seminar course.* ISTE standards can be threaded through the program more systematically. Moving forward, the program intends to assess these standards in the context of the fall and spring key assignments in the MACI 600 Professional Seminar course. Revised descriptions of the fall key assignment can be found here. The spring key assignment revision can be found here I-**0063.** The rubrics for both of these assignments can be found here **I-0064**.

Using Data to Inform Chapman TE Program on Teacher Candidate Progress

The data provided, related to TPE 3.6, informs the program that teacher candidates are engaged in the use of technology within their placement classrooms at individual school sites. The students are offered reasonable opportunity, weaved throughout the curriculum within the TE program, to engage K-12 students with the use of technology. Using UDL and MTSS

strategies are part of the curriculum to help guide teacher candidates as they implement technology into the K-12 classrooms and meet the needs of all learners.

TPE 3.6: Use and adapt resources, standards-aligned instructional materials, and a range of technology is one of the TPEs evaluated as University Supervisors formally observe teacher candidates in their school site classrooms. After reviewing the data, it is evident there is some room for growth in the area of implementing technology. The mean score using a Likert scale of 1- 4 across multiple terms over the last three years, identifies that students are meeting expectations with at least a mean score above 3.0 on all programs; however, it serves the TE program to further review how we can push students to exceed expectations in the use of technology in the classroom to further align with a national agenda to engage all students in multiple technology tools and 21st century skills. It may serve the program to further define the use of technology in classrooms to help teacher candidates provide access to content to all learners.

Data Analysis - One document includes MACI, MAT and SPED data.

MAT Program:
*The **University Supervisor Multiple Subject Evaluations** **I-0065** on TPE 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8 across the previous three terms 208-2019 had a mean of 3.42. This data signifies that while students are scoring as a whole beyond "meets expectations" there is room for growth in moving all students to an "exceeds expectations" status in using technology to enhance classroom instruction.*

*The **University Supervisor Single Subject Evaluation** **I-0065** data on TPE 3.6, 3.7, 3.8 has a mean score of 3.4. This data signifies that single subject teacher candidates are meeting expectations in using technology in the classroom to enhance student learning. The program has further evaluated how to get more teacher candidates to showcase the use of technology while engaging students in learning.*

MACI Program:
*The **University Supervisor Single Subject Evaluation** **I-0065** data on TPE 3.6, 3.7, 3.8 has a mean score of 3.14. This data signifies that while students are scoring as a whole at "meets expectations" further analysis must be conducted as to why more students aren't scoring higher in this area of instruction and as a program we will continue to provide opportunities for growth in implementing the use of technology to K-12 students.*

*The **University Supervisor Multiple Subject Evaluations** **I-0065** on TPE 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8 across the previous three terms 208-2019 had a mean of 3.52. This data signifies that more multiple subject teacher candidates are using technology to engage students in learning. Teacher candidates are offered a wide variety of opportunities to engage students in technology throughout the coursework in the MACI program.*

SPED Program:

Working from the previous TPEs, TPE 4 was selected as part of the data analysis in making content accessible to all students. The **University Supervisor Evaluations Mild-Moderate** **I-0069** *data shows a positive increase from 2016-2017 with a mean of 3, moving to a mean score of 4 (on a 4 point scale) in the 2018-2019 academic year.*

The **University Supervisor Evaluations for Moderate-Severe** **I-0065** *data displays a strong mean score across the last three academic years with a mean score of 3.85 in 2016-2017, and ending with a mean score of 3.75 in 2018-2019. This demonstrates that overall the Ed Specialist candidates are identifying the importance of making all content accessible through a variety of modalities.*

CalTPA 2018-2019 data was also used to help the teacher education program stay informed of the progress of teacher candidates in the use of technology while teaching in the K-12 classroom. The mean score for rubric 2.4 Incorporate educational technology to provide opportunities for students to demonstrate learning goals was 2.7 out of 5 for all teacher candidates, both multiple and single subject. This data indicates a need for growth in the area as we continue to prepare teacher candidates. A review of the CalTPA terms and definitions of what it means to apply the use of educational psychology, as well as attending CalTPA workshops have helped to clarify what assessors are looking for when teacher candidates are identifying the use of technology to assist in guiding student learning. It is clear that as a program we must help teacher candidates implement tools that specifically engage students in the learning process and provide students access to technology. A new Chapman CalTPA coordinator and trainer is leading our efforts with our teacher candidates moving forward and we hope this, along with a thoughtful focus of guiding students in program coursework, will help improve teacher candidates as they work with K-12 students.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

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

Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard
CAEP Feedback:
1. PK-12 Participation Survey (not evident in SS Evidence)
2. Meetings and Trainings setting common expectations with university supervisors and mentor teachers (agendas) (not evident in SS Evidence)
3. PD Sessions with Districts (not evident in SS Evidence)
4. Mentor Teacher Criteria (not evident in SS **Evidence**)
5. Mentor Teacher Feedback (not evident in SS Evidence)
6. University Supervisor Feedback (not evident in SS Evidence)

EPP Response:

For the MAT programs, if courses include both Single Subject and Multiple Single subject
students we have not differentiated between MS and SS regarding this data. However,
any courses that are "shared" demonstrate evidence of MS and SS. Thus, the PK-12
Participation Survey, Meetings and training among university supervisors and mentors,
and PD sessions are combined MS and SS. The mentor teacher selection criteria does
*differentiate slightly and that can be found here***: Clinical Educator Selection Protocol. I-**
0071
*The mentor teacher and university supervisor feedback for MS is located in **EDUC 582 I-***
***TE-SYL-30 EDUC 582,** and for **SS EDUC 583 I-TE-SYL-31 EDUC 583** respectively.*
For the MACI program, all courses are combined. Thus, we will indicate SS or MS selection on
the assignments in order to differentiate moving forward.

List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with
meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as
necessary.

Complete SPed Report:
Evidence in need of verification or corroboration *& Questions for EPP concerning additional*
evidence, data, and/or interviews

1. **CAEP Feedback:** SPED report was not in the SSR for review

EPP Response: Special Education Report

Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

1. CAEP Feedback: SPed Narrative Pending

EPP Response: Special Education Report

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

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Provide evidence and analysis of SPED program; meet with SPED
   candidates and program director; meet with mentor teachers; meet with district
   personnel who arrange placements.

EPP Response: *The Clinical Educator selection protocol for all Teacher Education programs can*
be found here: Clinical Educator Selection Protocol. I-0071 *The programs also hold*
orientations for all candidates, mentor teachers and supervisors. In recent years, we
have begun holding webinars for the mentor teachers in order to increase attendance.
The same orientation slides are used for all stakeholders to ensure consistency in

information provided to candidates, faculty, mentor teachers, and supervisor. The slides for the orientations can be found here: [Student Teaching Orientation](#) I-0072-I-0075

Teacher Performance Expectations*: Evidence in need of verification or corroboration*

1. **CAEP Feedback:** What will this program bring to this standard?

EPP Response: The clinical educator selection protocol and the partnerships will strengthen the programs by providing well-trained mentor teachers in collaboration with school districts.

 Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The new Teacher Performance Expectations (implemented for MAT SS/MS credential candidates in Spring 2019 require application of technology. Thus, we look forward to building this in our program (p. 31)

    EPP Response: *We currently evaluate the use of technology based on the clinical assessments that are aligned with TPE technology use expectations. Below is a description of our current use, as well as improvements made moving forward for incorporating the use of ISTE standards more throughout the program.*

Using Data to Inform Chapman TE Program on Teacher Candidate Progress

The data provided, related to TPE 3.6, informs the program that teacher candidates are engaged in the use of technology within their placement classrooms at individual school sites. The students are offered reasonable opportunity, weaved throughout the curriculum within the TE program, to engage K-12 students with the use of technology. Using UDL and MTSS strategies are part of the curriculum to help guide teacher candidates as they implement technology into the K-12 classrooms and meet the needs of all learners.

TPE 3.6: Use and adapt resources, standards-aligned instructional materials, and a range of technology is one of the TPEs evaluated as University Supervisors formally observe teacher candidates in their school site classrooms. After reviewing the data, it is evident there is some room for growth in the area of implementing technology. The mean score using a Likert scale of 1- 4 across multiple terms over the last three years, identifies that students are meeting expectations with at least a mean score above 3.0 on all programs; however, it serves the TE program to further review how we can push students to exceed expectations in the use of technology in the classroom to further align with a national agenda to engage all students in multiple technology tools and 21st century skills. It may serve the program to further define the use of technology in classrooms to help teacher candidates provide access to content to all learners.

Data Analysis **- One document includes MACI, MAT and SPED data.**

MAT Program:

The University Supervisor Multiple Subject Evaluations I-0065 *on TPE 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8 across the previous three terms 208-2019 had a mean of 3.42. This data signifies that while students are scoring as a whole beyond "meets expectations" there is room for growth in moving all students to an "exceeds expectations" status in using technology to enhance classroom instruction.*

The University Supervisor Single Subject Evaluation I-0065 *data on TPE 3.6, 3.7, 3.8 has a mean score of 3.4. This data signifies that single subject teacher candidates are meeting expectations in using technology in the classroom to enhance student learning. The program has further evaluated how to get more teacher candidates to showcase the use of technology while engaging students in learning.*

MACI Program:

The **University Supervisor Single Subject Evaluation** **I-0065** *data on TPE 3.6, 3.7, 3.8 has a mean score of 3.14. This data signifies that while students are scoring as a whole at "meets expectations" further analysis must be conducted as to why more students aren't scoring higher in this area of instruction and as a program we will continue to provide opportunities for growth in implementing the use of technology to K-12 students.*

The **University Supervisor Multiple Subject Evaluations** **I-0065** *on TPE 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8 across the previous three terms 208-2019 had a mean of 3.52. This data signifies that more multiple subject teacher candidates are using technology to engage students in learning. Teacher candidates are offered a wide variety of opportunities to engage students in technology throughout the coursework in the MACI program.*

SPED Program:

Working from the previous TPEs, TPE 4 was selected as part of the data analysis in making content accessible to all students. The **University Supervisor Evaluations Mild-Moderate** **I-0065** *data shows a positive increase from 2016-2017 with a mean of 3, moving to a mean score of 4 (on a 4 point scale) in the 2018-2019 academic year.*

The data displays a strong mean score across the last three academic years with a mean score of 3.85 in 2016-2017, and ending with a mean score of 3.75 in 2018-2019. This demonstrates that overall the Ed Specialist candidates are identifying the importance of making all content accessible through a variety of modalities.

CalTPA 2018-2019 data was also used to help the teacher education program stay informed of the progress of teacher candidates in the use of technology while teaching in the K-12 classroom. The mean score for rubric 2.4 Incorporate educational technology to provide opportunities for students to demonstrate learning goals was 2.7 out of 5 for all teacher candidates, both multiple and single subject. This data indicates a need for growth in the area as we continue to prepare teacher candidates. A review of the CalTPA terms and definitions of what it means to apply the use of educational psychology, as well as attending CalTPA

workshops have helped to clarify what assessors are looking for when teacher candidates are identifying the use of technology to assist in guiding student learning. It is clear that as a program we must help teacher candidates implement tools that specifically engage students in the learning process and provide students access to technology. A new Chapman CalTPA coordinator and trainer is leading our efforts with our teacher candidates moving forward and we hope this, along with a thoughtful focus of guiding students in program coursework, will help improve teacher candidates as they work with K-12 students.

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

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Who is working on this program, what is the timeline for the implementation of the plan, what is contained in the plan, and what does the EPP hope to gain from this information?

EPP Response: *Programs have revised Key Assignments as described above in order to include additional ISTE technology requirements, including adding the ISTE standards to clinical evaluation assessments. We plan to pilot these changes during the 2019-2020 academic year, collect data, review that data and then make adjustments according to the results.*

P-12 partner collaboration.
Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The P-12 participation survey

EPP Response:
*Across the Teacher Education programs, faculty participate in K-12 as is required via the Teacher Education manual (see link to Program policy in line below). Faculty in the TE program are required to participate in Pk-12 schools. See **Program Policy** I-0082 We have piloted the faculty P-12 participation survey for one cycle of data (This survey currently open for cycle 2 data collection and with an expected close date of 10/25/2019) . The faculty who participate in this survey represent the three major teacher education programs: MAT (SS/MS); MACI (SS/MS), and Special Education.*

[TE Faculty Participating in P-12 Survey results](#) I-0083

[TE Faculty Participation in P-12 Schools Survey](#) I-0084

[TE Faculty Participation Survey Results](#) I-0085

Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

1. **CAEP Feedback:** These include MOUs 1-MOU-01 – 1-MOU-200 with all partner districts, fieldwork and clinical practice handbooks, and a P-12 participation survey (p.32)

EPP Response: The following are included below at the request of the CAEP reviewer in order to demonstrate the EPP meets requirements.

- *MOUs* 1-MOU-01 – 1-MOU-200
- *Fieldwork and Clinical Practice Handbooks I-0087-I-0091*
- *Across the Teacher Education programs, faculty participate in K-12 as is required via the Teacher Education policy. Faculty in the TE program are required to participate in Pk-12 schools. See Program Policy. I-0082 We have one cycle of data regarding a faculty P-12 participation survey pilot. The faculty who participated in the survey represent the three major teacher education programs: MAT (SS/MS); MACI (SS/MS), and Special Education.*
- *TE Faculty Participating in P-12 Survey results I-0083*
- *TE Faculty Participation in P-12 Schools Survey I-0084*
- *TE Faculty Participation Survey Results I-0085*

In addition to participation and surveys, the Attallah College also has a Superintendents and Principal's Advisory Committee (SPAC). The committee members, feedback, and changes made based on feedback can be found below.

Attallah College SPAC I-0086

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

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Provide survey and explain what the survey provided to guide the EPP and District to improve programs offered to teacher candidates. What plan will the EPP develop to gather and analyze data from survey? Meet with designer of survey.

EPP Response: *We have developed an employer survey that will support in obtaining this critical feedback. The survey and description can be found here: Employer Survey I-0093*

Mentor Trainings
Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Trainings for mentor teachers and how they are selected and retained

EPP Response: *The Clinical Educator selection protocol for all Teacher Education programs can be found here: Clinical Educator Selection Protocol. I-0071 The programs also hold orientations for all candidates, mentor teachers and supervisors prior to the beginning of each fall and spring semester. In recent years, we have begun holding webinars for the mentor teachers in order to increase attendance. The same orientation slides are used for all stakeholders to ensure consistency in information provided to candidates, faculty, mentor teachers, and supervisor. The slides for the orientations can be found here: Student Teaching Orientation I-0072-I-0075*

15

Clinical Educator trainings can be found here: ***Mentor Teacher Trainings I-0094-I-0097***

Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

1. **CAEP Feedback:** In order to select well-qualified mentor teachers, we work closely with districts in selection of mentor teachers, and pairing with candidates. We collect data on all mentor teachers and university supervisors to be sure they meet criteria to mentor (see evidence above). We also provide mentor teachers and supervisors with trainings each semester that outline the requirements for mentoring or supervising (p. 33)

EPP Response: *The Clinical Educator selection protocol for all Teacher Education programs can be found here*: ***Clinical Educator Selection Protocol.*** *I-0071 The programs also hold orientations for all candidates, mentor teachers and supervisors. In recent years, we have begun holding webinars for the mentor teachers in order to increase attendance. The same orientation slides are used for all stakeholders to ensure consistency in information provided to candidates, faculty, mentor teachers, and supervisor. The slides for the orientations can be found here:* ***Student Teaching Orientation I-0072-I-0075***

Clinical Educator trainings can be found here including a mentor teacher training plan: ***Mentor Teacher Trainings I-0094-I-0097***

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

1. **CAEP Feedback:** When did the trainings mentioned occur, what data was gained from them, and what did they provide to the EPP to assist the EPP in identifying areas for improvement? How will the EPP collaborate with P-12 partners to determine the best course of action.

   EPP Response: *The Clinical Educator selection protocol for all Teacher Education programs can be found here:* ***Clinical Educator Selection Protocol.*** *I-0071 The programs also hold orientations for all candidates, mentor teachers and supervisors. In recent years, we have begun holding webinars for the mentor teachers in order to increase attendance. The same orientation slides are used for all stakeholders to ensure consistency in information provided to candidates, faculty, mentor teachers, and supervisor. The slides for the orientations can be found here:* ***Student Teaching Orientation I-0071-I-0075***

*Clinical Educator trainings can be found here including a mentor teacher training plan: **Mentor Teacher Trainings I-0094-I-0097***

We have also implemented a survey to assess and improve trainings moving forward: ***Mentor Teacher Training Survey I-0097***

Shared Accountability for Teacher Candidates
Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP does not provide information about how theory and practice are linked nor how there is a shared accountability for candidate outcomes with the EPP and the P-12 partners.

Our Education Preparation Programs employ our research-based literature as a foundation across programs to guide the development and sustainability of authentic university-school partnerships that focus on bi-directional learning. Furthermore, all programs (Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Special Education, School Counseling, and School Psychology) focus on social justice-oriented curriculum that prepares students to act as change agents as they develop their careers in the field of education.

Teacher Education. In seeking specific program design and implementation feedback we meet with our stakeholders. For example, we place many of our Education Specialist, Multiple Subject, and Single Subject candidates in the Santa Ana Unified School District (SAUSD). Dean Grogan, Director of Teacher Education Dr. Meghan Cosier, and Dr. Amy Ardell (MACI Program Coordinator), and program faculty Dr. Cathery Yeh met with the district administration in the Fall of 2018 to discuss modifications in our teacher preparation programs, with a focus on our Education Specialist program to ensure our candidate preparation continued to align with the SAUSD needs for student teachers.

Additionally, to ensure program design includes two-way dialogue and shared program creation we brought in stakeholders to collaborate on our MACI program redesign. Throughout all stages of our MACI program redesign, two OUSD representatives (Raeanne Little, Induction Coordinator and Sara Beggs, principal at Villa Park Elementary) served as integral co-developers. As a result of this redesign, our MACI program now prepares Chapman students for both general education and special education credentials. During this process, Raeanne and Sara gave critical input on the development of a new mission and vision statement for the program, course scope and sequence, and fieldwork models. The redesigned MACI program has been incorporated into the Chapman graduate and undergraduate catalogs, and we look forward to implementing the new program in Spring 2020.

Our faculty also sit on stakeholder advisory boards. As a result of these bidirectional engagement efforts, the colleges make program improvements. Dr. Cosier served as founding Board Chair of Tomorrow's Leadership Collaborative Public Charter School from 2017-2019 and continues to act as a board member after stepping down from her Board Chair role in July 2019. TLC PCS is located in Orange, CA, near the university campus. Amy Ardell serves on the Orange Unified School District Induction Advisory Board, where she provides input on the Induction process for the district.

References
Cochran-Smith, M., Carney, M., Keefe, E., Burton, S., Chang, W., Fernandez, M., Miller, A.,

Sanchez, J., and Baker, M. (2018). Reclaiming accountability in teacher education. New York: Teachers College Press
Cochran-Smith, M., Stern, R., Sanchez, J., Miller, A., Keefe, E., Fernandez, B., and Baker, M. (2016). Holding teacher education accountable: A review of claims and evidence. Boulder CO: National Education Policy Center.
Martin, S., Snow, J., & Franklin Torrez, C. 2011. Navigating the terrain of third space: Tensions with/in relationships in school-university partnerships. Journal of Teacher Education 62(3) 299-311
Zeichner, K. 2016. Advancing social justice and democracy in teacher education: Teacher preparation 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0. Kappa Delta Pi Record, (52): 150-155.
Zimpher, Nancy., & Howey, Kenneth. 2005. The politics of partnerships for teacher education redesign and school renewal. Journal of Teacher Education, 56(3): 266-271.

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

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Provide documents that show how theory and practice are linked and how the P-12 partners collaborate with the EPP.

EPP Response: *This is evidenced by the Faculty P-12 participation survey, the description above regarding collaboration with districts, as well as the advisory board document below.*
*Attallah College Advisory Council description and outcomes: **Attallah College SPAC** I-0086*
We also have a close collaboration with Orange Unified School District and held multiple meetings around program improvement with the support of a CEEDAR center grant. Meeting agendas and materials can be found here: **CEEDAR Meeting Documents.** *I-0099-I-00104*

- *Across the Teacher Education programs, faculty participate in K-12 as is required via the Teacher Education policy. Faculty in the TE program are required to participate in Pk-12 schools. See **Program Policy** I-0082. We have one cycle of data regarding a faculty P-12 participation survey pilot. The faculty who participated in the survey represent the three major teacher education programs: MAT (SS/MS); MACI (SS/MS), and Special Education.*
- **TE Faculty Participating in P-12 Survey results** *I-0083*
- **TE Faculty Participation in P-12 Schools Survey** *I-0084*
- **TE Faculty Participation Survey Results** *I-0085*

Impact on P-12 Learners
Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP did not provide evidence of teacher candidates positive impact on P-12 learners.

EPP Response: Below is our response and plan for addressing this standard.

- Please see **Response to Standard 2 (above and Standard 4.1 (linked here)** 4-001-4-0014

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

1. **CAEP Feedback**: Provide data from P-12 partners and teacher candidate files that show evidence of positive impact on student learners.

- **EPP Response: Please see [Response to Standard 2 above and Standard 4.1 (linked](#) 4-001-4-0014**
- **[here)](#)**

<u>*Mentor Teacher Selection*</u>
Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

1. **CAEP Feedback**: What is the process used to select qualified mentor teachers and how does the EPP and P-12 partners work together to select, train, and retain quality mentors? Meet with P-12 mentor teachers, district facilitators, university placement officers.

EPP Response: *The Clinical Educator selection protocol for all Teacher Education programs can be found here: [Clinical Educator Selection Protocol. I-0071](#) The programs also hold orientations for all candidates, mentor teachers and supervisors. In recent years, we have begun holding webinars for the mentor teachers in order to increase attendance. The same orientation slides are used for all stakeholders to ensure consistency in information provided to candidates, faculty, mentor teachers, and supervisor. The slides for the orientations can be found here***: [Student Teaching Orientation I-0072-75](#)**

Clinical Educator trainings can be found here: *[Mentor Teacher Trainings I-0094-I-0098](#)*

Areas for Improvement

1. **CAEP Feedback**: 2.2: The EPP does not provided clinical experiences allow for the partners and the candidates to employ instructional uses of technology. There is limited information and data to support the EPPs design and use of technology for instructional uses.

EPP Response:

We currently evaluate the use of technology based on the clinical assessments that are aligned with TPE technology use expectations. Below is a description of our current use, as well as improvements made moving forward for incorporating the use of ISTE standards more throughout the program. We also added additional ISTE standards to assignments across programs. These can be viewed in the Key Assignments folder. And include: special education (EDUC 590/591; EDUC 592/593; e-portfolio assessment); Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Special Education (EDUC

500/532/411; EDUC 571); Multiple Subject and Single Subject (EDUC 547/547B/567; EDUC 543; EDUC 517/518; EDUC 577/578).

Using Data to Inform Chapman TE Program on Teacher Candidate Progress

The data provided, related to TPE 3.6, informs the program that teacher candidates are engaged in the use of technology within their placement classrooms at individual school sites. The students are offered reasonable opportunity, weaved throughout the curriculum within the TE program, to engage K-12 students with the use of technology. Using UDL and MTSS strategies are part of the curriculum to help guide teacher candidates as they implement technology into the K-12 classrooms and meet the needs of all learners.

TPE 3.6: Use and adapt resources, standards-aligned instructional materials, and a range of technology is one of the TPEs evaluated as University Supervisors formally observe teacher candidates in their school site classrooms. After reviewing the data, it is evident there is some room for growth in the area of implementing technology. The mean score using a Likert scale of 1- 4 across multiple terms over the last three years, identifies that students are meeting expectations with at least a mean score above 3.0 on all programs; however, it serves the TE program to further review how we can push students to exceed expectations in the use of technology in the classroom to further align with a national agenda to engage all students in multiple technology tools and 21st century skills. It may serve the program to further define the use of technology in classrooms to help teacher candidates provide access to content to all learners.

Data Analysis-

MAT Program:
The University Supervisor Multiple Subject Evaluations *I-0065* *on TPE 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8 across the previous three terms 208-2019 had a mean of 3.42. This data signifies that while students are scoring as a whole beyond "meets expectations" there is room for growth in moving all students to an "exceeds expectations" status in using technology to enhance classroom instruction.*

The University Supervisor Single Subject Evaluation *data I-0065 on TPE 3.6, 3.7, 3.8 has a mean score of 3.4. This data signifies that single subject teacher candidates are meeting expectations in using technology in the classroom to enhance student learning. The program has further evaluated how to get more teacher candidates to showcase the use of technology while engaging students in* learning.

MACI Program:
The University Supervisor Single Subject Evaluation *data I-0065 on TPE 3.6, 3.7, 3.8 has a mean score of 3.14. This data signifies that while students are scoring as a whole at "meets expectations" further analysis must be conducted as to why more students aren't scoring higher in this area of instruction and as a program we will continue to provide opportunities for growth in implementing the use of technology to K-12 students.*

20

The [University Supervisor Multiple Subject Evaluations](#) on I-0065 TPE 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8 across the previous three terms 208-2019 had a mean of 3.52. This data signifies that more multiple subject teacher candidates are using technology to engage students in learning. Teacher candidates are offered a wide variety of opportunities to engage students in technology throughout the coursework in the MACI program.

SPED Program:
Working from the previous TPEs, TPE 4 was selected as part of the data analysis in making content accessible to all students. The [University Supervisor Evaluations Mild-Moderate](#) data I-0065 shows a positive increase from 2016-2017 with a mean of 3, moving to a mean score of 4 (on a 4 point scale) in the 2018-2019 academic year.

The [University Supervisor Evaluations for Moderate-Severe](#) data I-0065 displays a strong mean score across the last three academic years with a mean score of 3.85 in 2016-2017, and ending with a mean score of 3.75 in 2018-2019. This demonstrates that overall the Ed Specialist candidates are identifying the importance of making all content accessible through a variety of modalities.

CalTPA 2018-2019 data was also used to help the teacher education program stay informed of the progress of teacher candidates in the use of technology while teaching in the K-12 classroom. The mean score for rubric 2.4 Incorporate educational technology to provide opportunities for students to demonstrate learning goals was 2.7 out of 5 for all teacher candidates, both multiple and single subject. This data indicates a need for growth in the area as we continue to prepare teacher candidates. A review of the CalTPA terms and definitions of what it means to apply the use of educational psychology, as well as attending CalTPA workshops have helped to clarify what assessors are looking for when teacher candidates are identifying the use of technology to assist in guiding student learning. It is clear that as a program we must help teacher candidates implement tools that specifically engage students in the learning process and provide students access to technology. A new Chapman CalTPA coordinator and trainer is leading our efforts with our teacher candidates moving forward and we hope this, along with a thoughtful focus of guiding students in program coursework, will help improve teacher candidates as they work with K-12 students.

Date for review can be found here: [Tech Data Analysis I-0062, I-0065, I-00106](#)

Stipulations *
This is the most important area that needs corrections

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP does not partner effectively with P-12 partners or share decision making for expectations of candidates, coherence across clinical and academic components, and accountability for results. *Rationale:* The EPP did not provide significant evidence to show that P-12 schools and the EPP have both benefited from

the partnership. Evidence documents do not support that the collaborative process is in place.

EPP Response: Attallah College SPAC, I-0086 *Stakeholder advisory boards (faculty sit on), P-12 activities during the year, MACI redesign team. These engagement activities continuously inform the programs. As we receive feedback, we apply to future iterations of coursework and assignments.*

The standard 5 document also shows how we intend to improve in this area. Standard 5 response document

2. **CAEP Feedback**: The EPP does not share and use evidence of candidate performance to improve clinical preparation continuously. *Rationale:* The EPP did not provide evidence of continual improvement tracks that are being pursued or how the EPP gathers information to make clinical improvements.

    EPP Response: *The EPP uses a number of measures including ALOAR Reports, Annual Reports[6], and analysis of Key Assignment data (see below). We also have a program improvement calendar I-00107 that addresses when we will review this data.*

Special Education: *Analysis of Key Assignments with multiple cycles of data can be found here:* Key Assignment Impact Analysis. I-0026 *Some key assignments have only two cycles of data. We expect to have the circle cycle of data by spring of the 2020 academic year. The Attallah College of Educational Studies offers Special Education (Education Specialist) preliminary teaching credentials in two disability-related areas: Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe. In addition, we offer a Master of Arts in Special Education. Beginning in the 2017-2018 academic year, we also offer a joint credential Multiple Subject ("General Elementary Education") and Mild/Moderate (Special Education) with a Master of Arts in Special Education. Candidates complete Special Education programs as either full-time or part-time students, and generally complete their program in 5-6 terms depending on the program choice (e.g., joint credential students complete an additional semester of student teaching along with two additional courses). The Education Specialist Credential (Special Education) and Joint Credential programs are embedded within the Master of Arts in Special Education program, although the MA can be completed without obtaining a teaching credential.*

The mild/moderate and moderate/severe programs were revised from 53 credits to 41 credits in 2017-2018. The new Joint Credential Program is 52 credits.

The "old" course sequences can be viewed here: 2016-2017 Course Sequence I-00109

The revised course sequences can be found here: SPECIAL EDUCATION AND JOINT CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SEQUENCE (2017-2018 through current year). I-0029

---

[6] These data will be provided to reviewers on site.

Although the program was revised, many of the Key Assignments have remained the same. Therefore, we are able to compare some performance from one year to the next. However, please note that some course numbers have changed, and, thus, some course numbers may not align from one year to the next. "Old" and "new" course numbers are noted if applicable. Furthermore, rubrics have been revised and a visual representation of revisions can be found here: [Summary of Key Assignments and Notations for when there were rubric changes.](#) I-00111

The program-identified program learning outcomes aligned with the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE) and Program Standards for the Preliminary Education Specialist credentials (Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe) outlined by the California Teaching Commission (CTC). Based on the program learning outcomes, the program faculty developed Key Assignments that address TPEs as outlined by CTC. In an effort to maintain consistent evaluation of student outcomes, we attempted to maintain all possible key assignments despite the revision of programs and some courses as the programs continue focus preparation of teachers to meet the TPEs outlines by the CTC (see CTC guidelines here [(CTC Guidelines)](#) . *I-00112*

MAT (MS/SS Key Assignment Analysis):

This document below includes the MAT MS and SS analysis of impact on candidate performance assessment. The program was redesigned in 2017 and has been running under the current model and course structure for two years. During the redesign Key Assignments were adjusted and all rubrics were standardized to a four-point scale. Thus, many assignments remained stables, but the rubrics were changed. This resulted in some unavailable data for some courses as they have not run for three data cycles. Analysis are conducted for three cycles of Teacher Performance Assessments which can be found in the ALOAR reports.

[MAT SS & MS Key Assignment Analysis I-0031](#)

MACI (MS & SS) Program

The MACI program is a relatively new accelerated BA to MA + credential program (single or multiple subject) open to Chapman undergraduate students only. It has only graduated two cohorts so far, with a third cohort just beginning the 5th year of study in Summer 2019. Incomplete data sets (2 cycles of data only) reflect the fact that the program is relatively new. In addition, some key assignments and rubrics were updated and implemented in Fall of 2018. This change took place as a result of faculty reflection on practice after launching the program based on both collective dialogue as well as student feedback. Aligning some key assignments also helped to bring some cohesion within Teacher Education overall. While MACI students do not share classes with MAT counterparts, faculty determined that it would make sense to use some key assignments across programs in cases where course content was similar even though the pace of instruction was distinct (undergraduate level versus graduate level workload).

[MACI Impact Key Assignment Analysis I-0032](#)

3. **CAEP Feedback**: 2.3: The teacher candidates do not have a positive impact on diverse P-12 students' learning. The EPP did not provide data the shows teacher candidate impact on student learning.

● **EPP Response: [Response to Standard 2 (here) and Standard 4.1 (linked here)](#)**

Our candidates have direct access to diverse learners because as a program we focus on placing in diverse schools. Schools must generally meet the diversity requirements of CTC, meaning they must reflect the diversity of the community. We use the spreadsheet below to ensure our candidates experience diverse placements. Further, we track the diversity of each placement. Because this is candidate-level data, we will not share here, but can share with the review committee at the visit.

[Placement Diversity Guide I-00115](#)

We use this placement guide to make decisions about placements. Currently, approximately 94% of candidates are placed in settings that reflect the diversity of the local community in terms of disability, English Language Learners, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status.

4. **CAEP Feedback** 2.2 The EPP does not co-select, prepare, evaluate, support and retain high-quality clinical educators who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development. The EPP did not provide evidence and data of impact on P-12 student learning and development through the selection of high-quality clinical educators.

● **EPP Response:**
● *Our Clinical Educator Selection protocol which outlines the collaborative process can be found here*: [Clinical Educator Selection Protocol. I-0071](#)
● *Our assessment of impact and plan can be found here*: [Response to Standard 2 (here) and Standard 4 (linked here).](#)

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 3.

Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. **CAEP Feedback**: MACI_Faculty_Advisor Load 2017-18

   EPP Response: We removed these data

List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.

Data on all Programs:
Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

1. **CAEP Feedback.** What dispositions are assessed, by whom, and when?

EPP Response: *A complete description of candidate current dispositional assessment and future plans for improving dispositional assessment can be found here for each program:* Candidate Dispositional Assessment Description, Analysis and Future Development. *I-0046*

2. **CAEP Feedback:** Where are the cumulative data for disposition assessment?

CAEP Feedback: Where are 3 cycles of data on disposition, admission, progress, completion for all programs? Some data are available for MAT but usually not three cycles.

EPP Response: *The admissions data for all TE programs can be found here*: TE Admission data - 3 cycles I-00117

In addition, students are tracked through completion using their customized program evaluation on the my.chapman.edu account as well as via a program google document found here: Candidate Tracking. *I-00118-I-00119 Furthermore, candidates are required to develop an Individualized Development Plan (IDP) prior to exiting the program which must be signed by their faculty advisor prior to program exit. The IDP examples can be found here:* TE IDP. *I-00120-I-00121 Evidence of check-ins throughout the program can be found via the "student journey" documents in this folder*: Student Journey Documents I-00121-I-00123
Candidate disposition tracking for each program is described here: Candidate Dispositional Assessment Description, Analysis and Future Development. *I-0046*

Needs and Recruitment Plan:
Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

1. **CAEP Feedback.** Verify internal recruiting plans with faculty and others

   EPP Response:

Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure: Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence."

Chapman University has designed and employs several initiatives for recruitment and faculty development efforts that support the hiring of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence. (See Full Time Chapman Faculty Diversity Data below) When the search for any new faculty line begins, all members of the search committee are required to attend a faculty search training workshop entitled Diversifying the Faculty. The objectives of this workshop include:

1. *Clarity of terms: equity, equality, and diversity.*
2. *Address case for why increased faculty diversity is important to a university.*
3. *Impact of inclusion as it relates to faculty retention.*
4. *Provide strategies for how a search committee can expand the pool of candidates to include more diverse representation.*

In addition to the Diversifying the Faculty workshop, members of the search committee are provided a list of posting options to reach candidates with underrepresented identities that include 40+ job-posting sites.

Diverse faculty recruitment is also embedded in the University's Strategic Plan for Diversity and Inclusion. Under Goal 2 (Recruitment), Initiative 2.B, "Diversify faculty recruitment at Chapman through intentional outreach to underrepresented faculty of difference and provide peer-to-peer education for current faculty search committees on strategies for diversifying faculty searches." This initiative is supported by the following strategies:

1. *Collaborate with an external consultant on a train-the-trainers program for peer-led faculty workshops focused on diversifying faculty searches. A pool of faculty trainers will be continually developed and trained to assist unit search committees in designing strategies to diversify the candidate pool in faculty searches.*
2. *Seek ways to increase the numbers of women and underrepresented minorities serving in the rank of Tenured, Full Professor.*
3. *Explore the feasibility of strengthening best practices such as opportunity hiring with support from the Office of the Provost.*
4. *Post faculty ads by the Office of Faculty Affairs for all open positions on one to two websites with the focus of reaching underrepresented identities each fall.*

Chapman University has the infrastructure designed for recruitment and faculty development efforts that support the retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence. The Institute for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (IETL) helps to continue Chapman University's tradition of teaching excellence with a variety of programs, events, and supports for all full-time and part-time faculty at the university. Part of the efforts of the IETL are dedicated to assisting faculty with understanding and supporting diversity and inclusion. This is evidenced by regular workshops and conferences that address technology usage and diversity in the classroom. The IETL's 2019 Summer Academy theme is "Today's Teaching Toolbox: Diversity, Inclusion, and the 21st Century Learner" and will offer Chapman University faculty the opportunity to engage with speakers who will discuss student mental health, digital disruptions,

accessibility, AR/VR, teaching with an iPad (untethered teaching), Adobe Spark software, and more. In addition to workshops, the IETL facilitates a school/college-specific IETL Faculty Ambassador program, monthly newsletters, 1-on-1 consultations, a First Year Faculty Experience program, IETL "Caffeinars", IETL 20/20 Focus on Teaching series, as well as an annual Summer Academy on Teaching and January Conference on Teaching. IETL is also the administrative center for end of semester course evaluations. Housing this function within IETL signals to faculty that course evaluations are part of each instructor's ongoing professional development feedback loop.

The Office of Diversity & Inclusion situated within the Office of the Provost offers on-going professional development opportunities designed for faculty and staff that focus on skill building regarding diversity, equity and inclusion. The spring 2019 series included some of the following workshops: Evacuation Planning & Accessibility, Supporting Students in Distress, Serving Nonbinary Students & the CA Gender Recognition Act, Diversity and Inclusion in Your Syllabus and Course Plan for Faculty, Introduction to Language Justice and the Creation of Bilingual and Multilingual Spaces, Support for Veterans on Campus, Interfaith Awareness Workshop for Staff & Faculty, Basic Accessibility Training (Word), Advanced Accessibility Training (PDF), Safe Space Faculty & Staff Workshops.

Additionally, the 10 advocacy groups of the Chapman Diversity Project, coordinated by the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, meet regularly to discuss campus-wide issues and concerns raised by members who include faculty, staff, students, alumni, trustees, and community members. The groups meet to discuss institutional change recommendations and concerns about policies, services and programs in order to better serve the needs of a diverse and inclusive campus community. There are over 280 members of the Chapman Diversity Project, and groups include task forces focused on community and curriculum, and advisory groups on the status of women, people of color, LGBTQIA+ communities, international communities, faith/spirituality/secularism, disability/accessibility, socio-economic stratification, and military affiliates.

The Chapman Faculty Senate established Grants for Pedagogical Innovation that prioritize applications related to diversity and inclusion and also promote sustainable and/or personalized education administered by the Faculty Research and Development Council (FRDC). Applications for faculty grants for pedagogical innovation are available each spring and provide up to $6,000 in funding per grant award.

Full Time Chapman Faculty Gender and Race Ethnicity Diversity Data. I-00125

Teacher Education. *The goal to develop a recruitment and faculty development plan has been added to the working* TE Program Improvement Calendar 2019-2020. I-00117

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

1. **CAEP Feedback:** What documentation is available to show needs for educators in areas offered by the EPP?

EPP Response: *Our program contracted with Hanover Research to conduct an evaluation. The evaluation can be found here:* Opportunity Analysis I-00126

2. **CAEP Feedback:** What is the EPP recruitment plan?

   EPP Response: *Our Recruitment and Retention Plan across programs can be found here:* TE Diversity Recruitment and Retention Plan I-00127

Areas for Improvement

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP does not document that all program candidates have reached a high standard of content knowledge and can teach effectively. *Rationale:* Two cycles of data showing summative evaluations by master teachers of student teachers are provided for MACI candidates but no data are provided for other programs.

EPP Response: *Summative Assessment Data for Mentor Teachers and Supervisors across programs can be found here:*

Mentor Teacher Summative Data

Supervisor Summative Data

***Analyses of clinical assessments that address this standard can be found here*: Clinical Assessment Analysis I-00128**

2. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP does not document that all candidates understand the expectations of the profession, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies. While some data are provided for MACI candidates, they are not provided for candidates in other programs.

EPP Response: *These are included in clinical assessments for reach program TPE 6 for MS and SS and TPEs 12 and 13. Clinical Assessment data can be found below.*

Mentor Teacher Summative Data I-00134, I-00138, I-00142, I-00146

Supervisor Summative Data I-00136, I-00140, I-00144, I-00148, I-00150, I-00152

Analyses of clinical assessments that address this standard can be found here: Clinical Assessment Analysis I-0053

*Stipulations ***

This is the most important area that needs corrections

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP has not identified employment opportunities and does not have a recruitment plan. 3.1 *Rationale*: The EPP does not provide evidence of a survey or other source of employment needs and opportunities in the region and a recruitment plan.

   > **EPP Response**: *Please see response above and further, our program contracted with Hanover research to conduct an evaluation. The evaluation can be found here:* Opportunity Analysis. I-00126 *Furthermore, we have regular contacts with a number of local districts in order to collaborate on recruitment and employment. A description of this can be found here:* Chapman University Career Support for TE Student and Alumni. I-00129

2. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP does not identify minimum criteria and does not show that cohorts meet minimum CAEP admission requirements. *Rationale*: 3.2 The EPP does not present minimum CAEP criteria and present cohort data for admission requirements.

   EPP Response: Response to 3.2

3. CAEP Feedback: The EPP does not identify and monitor dispositions data for all candidates. 3.3 *Rationale*: Data for only the MAT and MACI candidates on only one cycle of data are provided.

   EPP Response:

   - *The process for dispositional assessment as well as the analysis can be found here:* Candidate Dispositional Assessment Description, Analysis and Future Development.I-0046

4. **CAEP Feedback**: The EPP has not created criteria for candidate program progression and does not monitor progression from admission through completion. *Rationale*: 3.4 Candidates appear to be monitored mostly on the basis of course completion and grades. Candidates are monitored by faculty based on course performance. No cumulative data are provided to show tracking of candidates by cohort for three cycles of data.

   EPP Response: *The admissions data for all TE programs can be found here*: TE Admission data - 3 cycles I-00117

   In addition, students are tracked through completion using their customized program evaluation on the my.chapman.edu account as well as via a program google document found here: Candidate Tracking. I-00118-I-00119 *Furthermore, candidates are required to*

develop an Individualized Development Plan prior to exiting the program which must be signed by their faculty advisor prior to program exit. The IDP examples can be found here: [TE IDP.](#) I-00120-I-00121 *Candidate disposition tracking for each program is described here:* [Candidate Dispositional Assessment Description, Analysis and Future Development.](#) I-0046

Standard 4: Program Impact

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

List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.

Seek additional program impact evidence:
Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

1. **CAEP Feedback**: The SSR indicates on pages 5-6 that Multiple and Single Subject programs were approved be the Commission on Teacher Credentialing in 2004; Education Specialist programs were approved in 2010.

EPP Response:
[Commission on Teacher Credentialing Approval – I-00131](#)

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

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Given that the EPP has been offering programs leading to California teaching credentials for several years, does the EPP have additional program impact evidence available for review?

EPP Response: [See 4.1 Program Impact Document.](#)

2. **CAEP Feedback:** The SSR includes non-active links to documents that may contain additional P-12 impact data and analyses. Are these reports and evidence available for review?

   EPP Response: *We will ensure all links are working to the best of our ability.*

3. **CAEP Feedback:** What is the status of in-progress studies into the impact of completers on P-12 learning?

- **EPP Response**: [Response to Standard 2 (above) and Standard 4.1 (here)](#)

4. **CAEP Feedback:** What is the status of the research plan for element 4.2, designed to generate evidence that completers effectively apply professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions?

● **EPP Response**: [See 4.2 Response Document](#)

Areas for Improvement

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Provide one cycle of data on initial program completers impact on P-12 student learning. *Rationale*: The EPP describes a plan for a research study to generate evidence of impact of completers on P-12 student learning. Data was not provided in the self-study to show the impact that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. The EPP reports that evidence will be available in the 2019-2020 academic year.

● **EPP Response**: See Standard 4 Folder for Response 4.1-4.4

Stipulations *
This is the most important area that needs corrections

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP does not provide data on how completers effectively apply professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions. *Rationale*: No data was provided in the self-study to show how completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve. The EPP provides instead a plan for a study that is in-progress.

● **EPP Response**: [Response to standard 4.3](#)

1. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP does not provide sufficient evidence to meet Standard 4. *Rationale*: Programs leading to teaching credentials have been offered by the EPP for several years, however three cycles of data were not presented in the SSR or attached documents.

● **EPP Response:** See Standard 4 Folder for Response

Standard 5: Capacity
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.

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

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Are completed ALOARs available for all programs for 2017-2018? How have these been used to make program improvements? How have results been shared with stakeholders.

EPP Response: *Our ALOAR report data for the last three cycles is included in this report multiple times. We will not be able to include student level data in the AIMS portal. As a result, we will make those data available to reviewers on site. We have a number of ways we have shared this information with stakeholders including meeting with our advisory committee* [Attallah College SPAC. I-0086](#)

The programs use multiple measures including dispositional assessments, clinical assessments, TPA pass rates, and student surveys to inform, modify and evaluate process. The ALOAR and Annual Reports include sections that identify specific program improvement steps based on the data analysis.

Through TASK Stream and collaboration with our Assessment Team, we have developed a system to monitor and analyze data as is evidenced with the data provided for this repor.t

In addition, we have collaborated extensively with Orange Unified School District through a CEEDAR center grant. These meetings included sharing data and making decisions about program improvement. Documents including meeting agendas can be found here: [***CEEDAR Collaboration.***](#) ***I-0099-I-00105***

We have also developed a plan to improve in this area: [Standard 5 response document](#)

1. **CAEP Feedback:** Are these reports use to identify patterns, including strengths and weaknesses, across programs? What evidence documents this cycle of analysis, improvements or innovations, data collection, and subsequent analysis?

EPP Response: *Our reports are used to identify patterns associated with candidate outcomes. The ALOAR reports and Annual Reports include next steps and plans based on the analysis of the data as required by the reports. This is also evident in the diversity retention and recruitment plan. Specific examples of program improvement include, but are not limited to: a) development of a "who to go to" advising sheet that is sent to candidates by faculty advisors each semester to ensure clarity in relation to the supports and services we provide (see the diversity recruitment and retention plan for link to this*

*form); b) purchase and implementation of GoReact software (*https://get.goreact.com*),*
which includes opportunities for video analysis and feedback on teaching and is used in
multiple courses and ALL student teaching courses across programs; and c) increasing
the number of Teacher Performance Assessment trainings available across programs in
order to ensure support of all candidates.

Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard
Key Assignments:

1. **CAEP Feedback:** What progress has been made on implementing the key assignments? How has instrument quality for these been assured? What methods has the EPP taken to ensure validity of the instruments?

EPP Response: *A description of the reliability and validity for Key Assignments and Additional Instruments can be found here:* **TE Reliability and Validity of Instruments I-00132.**

As programs across TE are all in the second cohort of newly redesigned programs, the TE team plans to address edits to Key Assignments at the completion of the 3rd cohort cycle (spring 2020, fall 2021). This will allow is to have complete data moving forward with which to make decisions about Key Assignment revisions.

Through TPE aligned rubrics in all Key Assignments, we demonstrate that all assignments are related to standards. Since all Key Assignments are completed by all candidates, the sample is representative of the program. When possible, we provide 3 cycles of data for all surveys and assessments. The ALOAR and Annual Reports demonstrate that the data is used to identify key actionable program improvement steps.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** What data have been collected and analyzed and what have they revealed?

EPP Response: *Analysis of Key Assignment Data cycles for each program can be found below. Across all programs we analyze data yearly in a number of ways through university (WASC-focused) reports as well and college level annual report.*

TE ALOARs I-002, I-003, I-008, I-009, I-0010 I-0014, I-0015, I-0016, I-0020, I-0021, I-0022

Special Education: *Analysis of Key Assignments with multiple cycles of data can be found here:* **Key Assignment Impact Analysis**. *I-00108 Some key assignments do not have three years of data. The Attallah College of Educational Studies offers Special Education (Education Specialist) preliminary teaching credentials in two disability-related areas: Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe. In addition, we offer a Master of Arts in Special Education. Beginning in the 2017-2018 academic year, we also offer a joint credential Multiple Subject ("General Elementary Education") and Mild/Moderate (Special Education) with a Master of Arts in Special*

Education. Candidates complete Special Education programs as either full-time or part-time students, and generally complete their program in 5-6 terms depending on the program choice (e.g., joint credential students complete an additional semester of student teaching along with two additional courses). The Education Specialist Credential (Special Education) and Joint Credential programs are embedded within the Master of Arts in Special Education program, although the MA can be completed without obtaining a teaching credential.

The mild/moderate and moderate/severe programs were revised from 53 credits to 41 credits in 2017-2018. The new Joint Credential Program is 52 credits.

The "old" course sequences can be viewed here: 2016-2017 Course Sequence I-00109

The revised course sequences can be found here: SPECIAL EDUCATION AND JOINT CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SEQUENCE (2017-2018 through current year). I-00110

Although the program was revised, many of the Key Assignments have remained the same. Therefore, we are able to compare some performance from one year to the next. However, please note that some course numbers have changed, and, thus, some course numbers may not align from one year to the next. "Old" and "new" course numbers are noted if applicable. Furthermore, rubrics have been revised and a visual representation of revisions can be found here: Summary of Key Assignments and Notations for when there were rubric changes. I-00111

The program-identified program learning outcomes aligned with the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE) and Program Standards for the Preliminary Education Specialist credentials (Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe) outlined by the California Teaching Commission (CTC). Based on the program learning outcomes, the program faculty developed Key Assignments that address TPEs as outlined by CTC. In an effort to maintain consistent evaluation of student outcomes, we attempted to maintain all possible key assignments despite the revision of programs and some courses as the programs continue focus preparation of teachers to meet the TPEs outlines by the CTC (see CTC guidelines here (CTC Guidelines) I-00112.

MAT (MS/SS Key Assignment Analysis):

This document below includes the MAT MS and SS analysis of impact on candidate performance assessment. The program was redesigned in 2017 and has been running under the current model and course structure for two years. During the redesign Key Assignments were adjusted and all rubrics were standardized to a four-point scale. Thus, many assignments remained stables, but the rubrics were changed. This resulted in some unavailable data for some courses as they have not run for three data cycles. Analysis are conducted for three cycles of Teacher Performance Assessments which can be found in the ALOAR reports.

MAT SS & MS Key Assignment Analysis I-0031

MACI (MS & SS) Program

The MACI program is a relatively new accelerated BA to MA + credential program (single or multiple subject) open to Chapman undergraduate students only. It has only graduated two cohorts so far, with a third cohort just beginning the 5th year of study in Summer 2019. Incomplete data sets (2 cycles of data only) reflect the fact that the program is relatively new. In addition, some key assignments and rubrics were updated and implemented in Fall of 2018. This change took place as a result of faculty reflection on practice after launching the program based on both collective dialogue as well as student feedback. Aligning some key assignments also helped to bring some cohesion within Teacher Education overall. While MACI students do not share classes with MAT counterparts, faculty determined that it would make sense to use some key assignments across programs in cases where course content was similar even though the pace of instruction was distinct (undergraduate level versus graduate level workload).

[MACI Impact Key Assignment Analysis I-0032](#)

3. **CAEP Feedback:** Are these key assignments able to reveal patterns across programs?

EPP Response: *In years past, we have analyzed data per program. Moving forward we plan to identify patterns across programs using the* [program improvement calendar.](#) I-00107 *The calendar demonstrates a strategic process in which program coordinators or the director not only shares data (as we do already), but establishes clear and measurable goals for program improvement based on the data. Although we do this already, we seek to be clearer about the patterns and how we address them across programs.*

Impact Measures:
Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
- CAEP_Section_4.1_data_plan
- CAEP_Annual_Report_Component_4.2_DRAFT_4_20_18
- CAEP_Component_4.3_FINAL_4_20_18
- CAEP_Component_4.4._FINAL_4_20_18,

Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
1. **CAEP Feedback:** What additional evidence has been collected on completer effectiveness, impact on P-12 student growth, employer satisfaction and milestones achieved by completers, and completer satisfaction?

- **EPP Response:** *[See Standard 4 Folder for Response 4.1 – 4.4](#)*

2. **CAEP Feedback:** What have you learned and how do you plan to improve programs as a result?

EPP Response: *As stated in the response, we have found that we have general information associated with impact, however, in order to make more targeted program improvement, we have strengthened our program evaluation systems in this area and looks forward to using the robust data from program assessments in order to identify specific areas for improvement. Specific examples of program improvement include, but are not limited to: a) development of a "who to go to" advising sheet that is sent to candidates by faculty advisors each semester to ensure clarity in relation to the supports and services we provide (see the diversity recruitment and retention plan for link to this form); b) purchase and implementation of GoReact software (*https://get.goreact.com*), which includes opportunities for video analysis and feedback on teaching and is used in multiple courses and ALL student teaching courses across programs; and c) increasing the number of Teacher Performance Assessment trainings available across programs in order to ensure support of all candidates.*

We have learned that our program improvement system has areas of strength including the standardization of rubrics across Key Assignments and a general data management and collection system through TaskStream. Furthermore, the faculty meet regularly to discuss data and identify program improvement.

We have also learned that there are areas of improvement of our systems. These areas include: a) clearer system for identifying areas across programs and then implementing a plan, do, study, act cycle in order to systematically test improvement; and b) developing stronger systems for sharing data with stakeholders and obtaining feedback. We look forward to improving these areas.

3. **CAEP Feedback:** How has this information been shared with stakeholders? What evidence documents this process?

EPP Response: *We have a number of ways we have shared this information with stakeholders including meeting with our advisory committee* **[Attallah College SPAC. I-0086](#)**

In addition, we have collaborated extensively with Orange Unified School District through a CEEDAR center grant. These meetings included sharing data and making decisions about program improvement. Documents including meeting agendas can be found here: **[CEEDAR Collaboration.](#)** *I-0099-1-00105*
The standard 5 document also shows how we intend to improve in this area. **[Standard 5 response document](#)** *5-I-5.4-A-5.4*

Outcome Measures:
Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

1. **CAEP Feedback:** How have data regarding the 4 outcome measures been shared widely with stakeholders? What evidence documents

EPP Response: *See the Standard 5 response document*: ***Standard 5 response document** 5-I-5.4-A-5.4*

Areas for Improvement

1. **CAEP Feedback:** A variety of data are presented, but evidence on data quality, including validity and reliability is not presented. Rationale: There is no evidence provided to support that instruments used for tracking progress and evaluating operational effectiveness are valid and reliable.

EPP Response: *Reliability and Validity of current measures can be found here*: ***TE Reliability and Validity of Instruments I-00132***

[Standard 5 response document](#) 5-I-5.4-A-5.4

2. **CAEP Feedback:** EPP-created assessments do not meet the minimum sufficient criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-created assessments. *Rationale:* The majority of EPP-created assessments uploaded as evidence do not meet the minimum sufficient criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-created assessments. Descriptions of the purpose, use, instructions given to candidates, and criteria

   EPP Response:

We have reviewed all Key Assignments and addresses reliability and validity. Reliability and Validity of current measures can be found here: **[TE Reliability and Validity of Instruments I-00132](#)**

In addition, we have reviewed all Key Assignments to ensure they have the following:

   a. *The point or points when the assessment is administered during the preparation program are explicit.*
   b. *The purpose of the assessment and its use in candidate monitoring or decisions on progression are specified and appropriate.*
   c. *Instructions provided to candidates (or respondents to surveys) about what they are expected to do are informative and unambiguous.*

*Stipulations ***
This is the most important area that needs corrections

1. **CAEP Feedback**: Data on initial programs are presented, but no evidence is provided to demonstrate that the EPP's QAS can disaggregate data by licensure area or other dimensions. *Rationale:* There is insufficient evidence of the EPP's ability to identify patterns across programs or disaggregate data by licensure area.

   EPP Response:

These data were included originally and are disaggregated by courses when applicable. For example, 547 is a multiple subject courses, and 567 is a single subject course, and thus data are disaggregated in those courses naturally. In courses where MS and SS candidates are in the same course (e.g., EDUC 571, we have not been differentiating. Starting with the current academic year (2019-20) we are differentiating between MS and SS). Further, we have provided detailed evidence in the ALOAR and annual reports, which demonstrate differentiation between MS and SS including admissions data and TPA pass rates across all four TPAs that are used to make improvements to the program. These reports indicate specific improvements made based on this data.

2. **CAEP Feedback:** The EPP's quality assurance system does not systematically monitor completer achievements. Further, the use of completer impact and outcome evidence for continuous improvement is not demonstrated.

   EPP Feedback:

This is evidenced in the response below.

[Mentor Teacher Summative Data I-00134, I-00138, I-00142, I-00146](#)

[Supervisor Summative Data I-00136, I-00140, I-00144, I-00148, I-00150, I-00152](#)

Analyses of clinical assessments that address this standard can be found here: *[Clinical Assessment Analysis I-0053](#)*

3. **CAEP Feedback**: Documentation that stakeholders are involved in program evaluation and improvement or informed about the EPP's progress is not presented. Rationale: There is limited evidence provided by the EPP that stakeholders are informed about the EPP's progress toward goals. Further, no evidence is provided

EPP Feedback: See standard 5 response document: **[Standard 5.4/5.5 response document](#) I-5.4 – A-5.4**

III. Cross-Cutting Themes of Diversity and Technology

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

CAEP Feedback: The EPP did not provide evidence for its work in diversity.

Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data and/or interviews, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting a standard (if applicable)

> **CAEP Feedback**: What are the specific plans mentioned in the SSR related to diversity goals?

> **EPP Response:** *TE Diversity Retention and Recruitment Plan can be found here*: *[TE Diversity Retention and Recruitment Plan I-00127](#)*

> **CAEP Feedback**: Can the EPP provide data evidence shows how candidates identify and create curriculum to meet the individual needs of P-12 students during clinical experiences?

> - **EPP Response:** The clinical evaluations address these through the TPEs. The Crosswalk can be found here: *([California/InTASC Standards Crosswalk](#)) I-001*
>
> This is evidenced in the response below.
> - [Mentor Teacher Summative Data I-00134, I-00138, I-00142, I-00146](#)
> - [Supervisor Summative Data I-00136, I-00140, I-00144, I-00148, I-00150, I-00152](#)
> - **Analyses of clinical assessments that address this standard can be found here:** *[Clinical Assessment Analysis I-0053](#)*

CAEP Feedback: What is the plan for recruiting diverse candidates?

EPP Response: *TE Diversity Retention and Recruitment Plan can be found here:* ***[TE Diversity Retention and Recruitment Plan I-00127](#)***

Recommendations for new AFIs and/or stipulations including a rationale for cross-cutting themes are cited under the relevant standard(s)

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

See advanced standards addendum.