

# 2018 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	10719	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	725
<b>Institution:</b>	Clarion University of Pennsylvania		
<b>Unit:</b>	School of Education		

## Section 1. AIMS Profile

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

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

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

## Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2016-2017 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure<sup>1</sup>

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

Total number of program completers 177

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

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

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2016-2017 academic year?

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

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements  
No Change / Not Applicable

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

## Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

**Link:** [http://www.clarion.edu/academics/colleges-and-schools/college-of-arts-education-and-sciences/school-of-education/accreditation\\_data.html](http://www.clarion.edu/academics/colleges-and-schools/college-of-arts-education-and-sciences/school-of-education/accreditation_data.html)

**Description of data accessible via link:** SPA reports, Title II report, 6 yr graduation rate for SOE, University graduation rate, University loan default rate, links to Employer and Alumni surveys

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

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

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

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

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

Are benchmarks available for comparison?

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

**Analysis of Data:** Program assessment data indicates that most students are performing at an acceptable or higher level on a preponderance of standards. In particular in the Middle Level and Reading programs - the recent attainment of full National Recognition indicates that completers of these programs are meeting or exceeding expectations. Though other SPA reports required Responses, the student data within were positive. Many responses hinged on the need for assessment revision. Two factors prohibit extensive analysis of SPA data at this point: (1) Need to disentangle data within rubrics such that one criterion measures only one standard and (2) low N. Numbers in some areas of certification are within the single digits - making analysis difficult. As numbers increase, and responses to conditions are met, further analysis will be completed. Data is monitored annually for all programs at the University in June - as will also be the case for the SOE. The newly formed Assessment Committee will be charged with looking at the data to determine trends for the SOE as a whole.

Student Loan default rate for the University is 7.4% - which is almost equal to the national average. Considering Clarion University is part of the State System of Higher Education - a system which prides itself on a mission of "access" to all students, and considering we have a large percentage of first-generation college students, this number is not surprising.

The University publishes a graduation rate of 49%. Quite low, but again for reasons mentioned above plus others including a large commuter population and high on-campus housing costs, this is not unexpected. For the SOE, we are above the University average at a rate of 57%. This was calculated by taking ANYONE who began at the University as a BSED student and graduated as such. One reason for the lack of persistence through the program is by design and the enforcement of the Program Admission policy. To gain admission into a teacher prep program a student must earn a 2.8, a C or above in all required courses, pass the state's Basic Skills requirements, maintain a professional disposition, and obtain all clearances. Further analysis needs to be completed to determine graduation rate of those formally admitted as well as their subsequent certification rate.

Plans for the future and Section 4:

A new Director of the SOE was hired in June of 2017. Part of the responsibilities of the Director is to focus accreditation efforts. Much of what is asked for here in Section 4 are currently "works in progress". Links have been shared for the Alumni and Employer Satisfaction surveys. These will be sent out for the first time at the end of the Spring 2018 semester. The Alumni survey is scheduled to be sent to graduates 6-9 months after graduation. Employer survey will be sent once a year. These will be triangulated with the Student Teacher completion surveys given at the end of each semester to gain the best possible perspective on satisfaction with our programs. Though these surveys will give some data on Impact on student learning as well as teacher effectiveness, more direct information on both of these is necessary. Therefore, Focus groups are scheduled to convene in Fall 2018 and perhaps also Spring 2019. These focus groups will discuss P-12 learning and development, teacher effectiveness, as well as assessment validity.

As more information about completers is gathered, state identification numbers will aid in finding more distinct information on employment milestones and teacher effectiveness.

We are currently developing plans with our Institutional Research to regularly determine 6 yr. graduation rate for all students, as well as determining both graduation rate and certification rate of those student who earn program admission annually.

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

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

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

1. Data on advanced candidates' impact on student learning were not available in all programs. (ADV)
2. Data on professional dispositions of advanced candidates were not available. (ADV)

A Teacher Work Sample was created and will be implemented to identify the candidates' impact on student learning.

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

1. The unit does not systematically assess dispositions for advanced programs. (ADV)

A Dispositions Committee was created and has begun work on a unit-wide disposition form. This form will be implemented during the fall 2018 semester.

**NCATE:** Areas for Improvement related to Standard 3 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. Not all advanced teacher candidates have a required field experience in their program. (ADV)

All teacher candidates that are working towards certification have a required field experience.

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

1. Not all candidates have opportunities to interact with faculty from diverse backgrounds. (ITP) (ADV)
2. The programs do not have a systematic way to ensure that candidates have the opportunity to work with students from diverse populations. (ITP) (ADV)

1. We are continually working to attract faculty from diverse backgrounds. When searches take place we advertise in a variety of sources to help with diversity.

2. Our candidates work with socioeconomic diverse populations in nearly all of their field placements. We also offer ED 350 (ESL Learners) that every student in the School of Education must take. Within this course we have reached a partnership with the leader of Clarion University's Intensive English Program. He is piloting a research project in plurilingual/pluricultural education, titled the C3 Model. The C3 Model has university students, as part of their curricular experience in the US, provide language/culture content resource support for the teachers and students in Spain. It presents a practical, low-cost model for providing Other Language Support (OLS) to primary, secondary, and university classrooms using videoconferencing and/or flipped classroom strategies. We are currently attempting to identify opportunities for our candidates to work with racially diverse populations.

**NCATE:** Areas for Improvement related to Standard 6 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. The unit does not have adequate personnel to continue to implement the unit's assessment system. (ITP) (ADV)

The Director of Education began employment in June 2017. The Director has taken inventory of the unit's assessment system and devised a plan to meet the CAEP standards. This plan will be discussed in the next section. There is also a faculty member that has been given release time each semester to assist in implementing the unit's assessment system.

## Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

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

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

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

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

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

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

The new Director of Education began in June 2017 and took inventory of the unit's assessment system and devised a plan to meet the CAEP standards. In an effort to ready the University for the Self-Study (due in spring 2019), gaps were identified in our programs that would need to be addressed. The changes that were implemented in the fall 2017 semester were:

- The adoption and implementation of the Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST) Form. CPAST Form is a valid and reliable formative and summative assessment during the student teaching practicum. The assessment has two subscales: Pedagogy (13 rows) and Dispositions (8 rows). And each of the 21 rows contains detailed descriptors of observable, measurable behaviors to guide scoring decisions. (CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.1, 2.3, 3.4)
- Streamlining of the Student Teacher Performance Profile (STPP). These evaluation forms, one for each major, are used to define the teacher candidate's progress throughout the student teaching placement. (CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.3, 3.4)
- The adoption and implementation of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample to identify the impact on student learning. As part of their student teaching experience, teacher candidates are responsible for assessing the impact of their instruction on student learning. In order to do this, candidates will design learning experiences based on the student's current knowledge of the topic and assess the effectiveness of planned instruction for each student. In order to do this, candidates will, with their cooperating teacher, decide on a topic for the unit/project lessons. Candidates will then pre-assess to determine the student's prior/current knowledge of the topic. Using the pre-assessment information, candidates will design an integrated unit/project with a minimum of five learning experiences—including goals, objectives, standards, procedures, and assessments – for the students. After the students have engaged in the unit/project learning experiences, candidates will perform an assessment to determine the impact of their instruction

via the learning experiences. (CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 3.4, 3.5)

- The creation of three committees; Assessment, Dispositions, and Student Teaching. The charge of the Assessment Committee is to continually oversee the unit-wide assessments and how each of the SPA key assessments fit into the Quality Assurance System. There will be much more continuity with the advent of using Chalk and Wire. The focus will also address process and administration of all assessments. The Disposition Committee is currently changing the process of when and where dispositional assessments are completed in the overall program. The Student Teaching Committee is using the data to determine specific areas for continuous improvement. The Student Teaching Committee also is creating university supervisor and cooperating teacher trainings. (CAEP 2.2, 3.3, 5.3)
- Continued, and more focused use of the Chalk & Wire data management system. (CAEP 5.1)
- Creation of a School Law and Ethics course (ED 125). (CAEP 3.6)
- Creation of a Technology Assessment used in ED 417 (Teaching with Technology) and ECH 417 (Teaching with Technology). (CAEP 1.5)
- Creation of a formalized recruitment plan. (CAEP 3.1)
- Updated and implementation of Program Admission. (CAEP 3.2)

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
- 3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
- 3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
- 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

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

Yes  No

6.3 Optional Comments

---

## Section 7: Transition

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

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

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

No identified gaps

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

In the summer of 2017, a new Director of the School of Education was hired and a CAEP gap analysis was conducted. Several gaps were identified and the process of filling those gaps began in Fall 2017 and plans continue to be developed. (1) Unit assessments. Though data was being collected for all programs on all standards for years, there was a need to develop Unit level assessments - the same assessments to be used by all initial programs. This was completed and they were implemented in fall 2017. The CPAST (developed by Ohio State), the STPP and the Teacher Work Sample (Clarion developed/revised) are now all in use during the student teaching experience. A disposition assessment is forthcoming. (2) To meet standard 3, a recruitment plan has been developed for implementation over the next 3-5 years. (3) Unit level Completer, Alumni, and Employer Surveys are

currently being developed to meet gaps in standard 4 for both initial and advanced programs. Plans are still in development for Focus Groups to obtain data on Impact on student learning. (4) Plans are currently in development for obtaining Validity data on all program developed assessments. These plans include the use of a panel of expert stakeholders to employ Lawshe's method for gaining validity.

Other steps already taken toward filling all gaps to meet CAEP standards include: the formation of a stakeholder advisory group; the formation of an Assessment System Committee as well as a Dispositions Committee (currently revising the disposition assessment and setting a dispositions procedure); the adoption of a School of Education Program Admission policy; and the development of new, diverse field experiences as well as new PK-12 partnerships. In addition, to ensure high quality mentors, online training for all mentors is being developed for implementation in fall 2018 with input from relevant stakeholders including past mentors.

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

- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
- 3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 4.4 Completer satisfaction
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
- A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

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

Yes  No

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

---

## Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2018 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data

entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

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

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

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

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

#### Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

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

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

Acknowledge