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I. EPP Overview

a. Context and Unique Characteristics

Founded in 1855 as a Normal School for the public school system of the City of Newark, New Jersey, Kean University today is a comprehensive regional institution of higher education serving approximately 15,500 full-time and part-time students. Of this number, approximately 2,250 are graduate students, the majority of whom attend on a part-time basis. Over half of the students currently at Kean will be the first in their families to obtain a college education. Kean University is the oldest of nine public institutions in the New Jersey State Higher Education system and is recognized as a Hispanic serving institution. The University, two miles from Newark International Airport and 30 minutes from New York City, sits on two adjoining campus sites covering 185 acres in New Jersey and currently offers two additional instructional locations: Kean Ocean on the Ocean County Community College campus in New Jersey, and an international location in Wenzhou, China. Kean formally received University status on September 26, 1997. Kean's mission is to be a comprehensive, interactive teaching university that serves as a national model for other urban/metropolitan state universities.

b. Description of Organizational Structure

Kean University is one of the largest producers of teachers in the state of New Jersey. Currently, there are over 1,300 students enrolled in 14 undergraduate programs and over 563 students enrolled in 8 Masters and post-Masters level graduate programs and one doctoral program in the professional education unit. Included in the professional education unit are 20 Professional Development Schools (PDSs) across 10 central New Jersey school districts that provide for the student teaching experiences. Kean University is committed to continuously improving the quality of its teacher education programs by strengthening its clinical components, providing quality professional development opportunities for clinical faculty, increasing its capacity to prepare effective educators for New Jersey schools through broadening our partnerships and funded initiatives, and positively impacting student learning within those schools through on-going assessment to guide instructional decisions.

In addition to programs housed primarily in the College of Education, our professional education unit prepares educators in collaboration with other colleges. Music, Theatre, and Art educators are from the College of Visual and Performing Arts, and K-12 content area teacher candidates are from the College of Natural Applied and Health Sciences, the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, and the Center for Science, Technology, and Mathematics. The College of Education also works in partnership with the Nathan Weiss School for Graduate Studies in the preparation of school leaders and other school personnel. The College of Education works collaboratively with the faculty from these other units in program development and assessment, data collection, and joint governance and development committees such as the the Administrative Council and Program Coordinator's Committee which meets multiple times a semester.

c. Vision, Mission, and Goals

Kean University is a public cosmopolitan university serving undergraduate and graduate students in the liberal arts, the sciences, and the professions. The University dedicates itself to the intellectual, cultural, and personal growth of all its members — students, faculty, and professional staff. In particular, the University prepares students to think critically, creatively and globally; to adapt to changing social, economic, and technological environments; and to serve as active and contributing members of their communities.
Kean offers a wide range of demanding programs dedicated to excellence in instruction and academic support services necessary to assure its socially, linguistically, and culturally diverse students the means to reach their full potential, including students from academically disadvantaged backgrounds, students with special needs, and adults returning or entering higher education.

Kean is steadfast in its dedication to maintaining a student-centered educational environment in which diversity can flourish and an atmosphere in which mutual respect characterizes relations among the members of a pluralistic community. The University seeks to combine excellence with equity in providing opportunities for all students.

Kean is a teaching university, and Kean faculty dedicate themselves to student learning as well as academic rigor. The focus on teaching excellence is supported by a commitment to research, scholarship, creative work, and innovative uses of technology. The focus includes the advancement of knowledge in the traditional disciplines and the enhancement of skills in professional areas. Kean is committed to providing global educational opportunities for students and faculty and prides itself on ensuring that all graduates receive a world-class education.

d. EPP's Shared Values and Beliefs for Educator Preparation

Kean's College of Education prepares its graduates to be informed, dynamic professionals capable of functioning successfully in diverse settings. Toward this end, our basic curriculum model, the College of Education Conceptual Cornerstones, provides teacher education students with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to make well-informed, sound educational decisions that will positively impact their students' learning. This model is based on the premise that a teacher is first and foremost a committed professional whose primary responsibility is the academic, social, and emotional growth of students. Inherent to the COE Conceptual Cornerstones is our overriding belief that all children are capable of learning given appropriate instruction and positive environmental factors. This model guides the growth of teacher candidates as they learn to identify and analyze factors that impede student progress and develop instructional solutions by applying the key knowledge, skills, and dispositions developed through the model. The framework of the College Conceptual Cornerstones forms the basis of our commitment to continuous improvement whereby we make our programs and our graduates stronger and continually relevant in today's global and technology-rich society. The four cornerstones address the diverse needs of our candidates relative to the schools they will serve: Global Competencies, 21st Century Skills, Equity and Diversity and The Whole Learner.

Under the four cornerstones are domains that address what a teacher candidate will successfully demonstrate upon completion of their preparation program at Kean University. Domain I addresses the Academic Content Knowledge & Planning for Learning. Candidates demonstrate their acquisition of content knowledge, connectivity to the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards, plan instruction that is appropriate and reflects the diversity, skills and needs of the P-12 learners they will serve, articulate clear learner outcomes, utilize evidence-based instruction, organize learning tasks and demonstrate the ability to provide quality academic content. Domain II address the Environments for Learning. All Kean teacher candidates will demonstrate the ability to create a supportive, positive and flexible learning environments that build positive relationship with P-12 learners that is inclusive of their interests, needs and backgrounds. Kean candidates will demonstrate the ability to plan collaboratively with colleagues, demonstrate strong classroom management and establish a culture of learning that promotes respect, independence, and collaboration. Domain III focuses on the Instructional Practices for Learning. Candidates will demonstrate the ability to personalize pedagogical practice to
advance all P-12 learners' understanding, incorporate real-world learning tasks that provide experiences in problem-solving, assist learners to synthesize and transfer their knowledge and skills across disciplines, use multiple and authentic measures to assess all P-12 learners' knowledge of standards and outcomes and to use assessment data purposefully and effectively. Domain IV address the Professional Dispositions and Values for Learning. Candidates will demonstrate the ability to value, collect, and maintain accurate, confidential student assessment data, maintain a commitment to the profession by being a reflective practitioner and model a commitment to educational excellence through reading, research, and other modes of professional development. Finally, Domain V address the Networks for Learning. All candidates will demonstrate the ability to collaborate online and in person with families, school professionals and community organizations to promote learner growth and their own professional development.

Kean University's College of Education is fully committed to preparing teacher candidates that reflect the diversity, needs and commitment required to teach in New Jersey.

e. Is the EPP regionally or institutionally accredited?

☐ Yes
☐ No. the EPP is ineligible for regional/institutional accreditation or such accreditation is not available
a. If your institution/EPP is regionally accredited, please upload a PDF copy of the award of regional accreditation here. If your institution/EPP is NOT regionally accredited, please move to the next page.

See Attachment panel below.
Table 2. Program Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program/specialty area</th>
<th>Enrollment in current fall cycle</th>
<th>Enrollment in last fall cycle</th>
<th>Degree, certificate or licensure level</th>
<th>Method of Delivery</th>
<th>State(s) which program is approved</th>
<th>Date of state approval(s)</th>
<th>Program Review Option (National Recognition, state-only, or Program Review with Feedback)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>In-person</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of Biology</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>In-person</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Review with Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of Chemistry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>In-person</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Review with Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>BA/MA</td>
<td>In-person</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Review with Feedback &amp; Recognized with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of Earth Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>In-person</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Review with Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of Elementary Education</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>In-person</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Review with Feedback &amp; Recognized with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of English</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>In-Person</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>In-Person</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Review with Feedback &amp; Recognized with Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of Mathematics</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>In-Persson</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of Health and Physical Education</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>In-Person</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of Music Education</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>In-Person</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of Spanish</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>In-Person</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Review with Feedback &amp; Recognized with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of Social Studies</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>In-Person</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Review with Feedback &amp; Recognized with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of Theatre Arts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>In-Person</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complete a table of EPP characteristics in AIMS to provide an expanded profile by which the accreditation process is managed by CAEP staff. EPP characteristics are also used by CAEP staff in compiling CAEP’s Annual Report to the public and used as a series of filters for dashboard comparison by the EPP itself. The AIMS version of this table, in which the data are actually entered, has drop-down menus by which characteristics are selected and the table is completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control of Institution</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Body</td>
<td>Coed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Class</td>
<td>Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teacher Preparation Levels | Currently offering initial teacher preparation programs  
                          | Currently offering advanced teacher preparation programs |
| EPP Type               | Hispanic Serving Institution  
                          | Institution of Higher Education: State/Regional |
| Religious Affiliations |         |
| Language of Instruction| English |
| Institutional Accreditation (Affiliations) | Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools |
a. The clinical educator (EPP faculty & supervisors) qualifications table is completed by providing information for each of the EPP-based clinical educators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Highest degree earned</th>
<th>Field or specialty area of highest degree</th>
<th>Program Assignment(s)</th>
<th>Teaching assignment or role within the program(s)</th>
<th>P-12 certificates or licensures held</th>
<th>P-12 experiences including teaching or administration dates of engagement in these roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Upload the clinical educator qualifications table, if not provided in the previous table.

Supervisor Table Kean 2-20-17.xlsx

See Attachment panel below.
Table 5. The Parity Table

a. The parity table of curricular, fiscal, facility, and administrative and support capacity for quality is used to satisfy requirements of the U.S. Department of Education and is completed by providing data relevant for the EPP and making a comparison to an EPP-determined comparative entity. The comparative entity might be another clinical EPP within a university structure, a national organization, the college or university as a whole or another entity identified as a benchmark by the EPP. Again, this chart offers an example of how the chart might be completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Dimension</th>
<th>EPP description of metric(s)</th>
<th>EPP data</th>
<th>Comparative entity data</th>
<th>Title and description of supplemental evidence/documentation of quality for each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>The comparative chart compares the Kean-Union Instructional Location with the Kean-Ocean Instructional Location.</td>
<td>The Kean Union campus is comprised of 150 acres. There are 23 buildings that collectively comprise the following: 1 Library, 5 Auditorium/Lecture halls, 158 Classrooms, 17 conference rooms, 3 Student Labs, 8 Lobbies, 2 Student Lounges, 8 Meeting Rooms, 1 Outdoor Meeting Room, 4 Recreation Spaces, 12 Seminar Rooms, 2 Theaters and 4 Residence Halls.</td>
<td>In the Gateway Building we have 11 classrooms, 1 laptop lab, 2 seminar rooms, a student life resource room, Phys. Ed./Nursing room, Graphic Design lab, 22 faculty/staff offices, 1 conference room, 1 faculty support room, 7 administrative offices. Common space shared with OCC the Lobby, 210 seat Lecture Hall, Student Lounge, Coffee Kiosk, Security Office and Faculty Lounge. Our students can utilize the OCC library, the Larson Student Center, the Counseling and Career Center, the OCC testing center, the OCC Tutoring and Writing centers, the OCC gym and fitness facilities. We also rent classroom space when all of our space is occupied in GATE, as well as lab space for the biology labs. OCC also provides all maintenance/facility staff.</td>
<td><a href="http://events.kean.edu/virtualems/">http://events.kean.edu/virtualems/</a> Link to Kean Union Campus Map: <a href="http://www.kean.edu/campusmap">http://www.kean.edu/campusmap</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Support</td>
<td>The comparative chart compares the Kean-Union Instructional Location with the Kean-Ocean Instructional Location.</td>
<td>Kean University’s estimated budget is based on level appropriations from the State of NJ and a conservative 10,200 FTE enrollment. Total Revenue (State &amp; University)= $203,972,000. Total expenditures &amp; Transfers= $203,972,000.</td>
<td>All adjunct faculty contracts are processed through the Dean’s Office’s, and full time faculty and staff come out of the respective Union offices. All supplies are provided from out office, but it is not broken down by program I’ve attached this year’s budget as well as the OCC charge backs from the Spring and Fall of 2016 for specific numbers. This data can not be disaggregated.</td>
<td>See Fiscal Ch. Union-N Disaggregates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Administrative support | The comparative chart compares the Kean-Union Instructional Location with the Kean-Ocean Instructional Location. | All faculty and related education advisors report to the respective, ED’s and Deans which are currently located on the Union instructional location. | | Leadership & Governance website: http://www.kean.edu/about/leadership-governance | Org Chart: http://www.kean.edu/sites/default
All faculty and related educational advisors report to the respective, EDS and Deans which are currently located on the Union instructional location. The Associate VP’s office provides all Enrollment Management functions (Registrar, Financial Aid, Student Accounting, Transfer Admission and Credit Evaluation, advisement and registration support, Veteran’s Services, Math Tutoring www.kean.edu/keanocean and related pages). The Division of Student Life provides the student life/student groups/student activities functions http://www.kean.edu/offices/kean-ocean-campus-life).

The university has a diverse group of supportive services for students at Kean across all programs. Specific to the COE, currently we have the Praxis Resource Center for all Kean students who need to take/pass/prepare for the Praxis I Core Battery to be admitted; as well as, the Praxis II Content Knowledge exams which are required for licensure issuance in NJ. All Kean students, regardless of location are eligible to use these services. The Kean-Union campus also houses the Teacher Performance Center which handles all clinical experiences. The main operational hub is located in Union; however, all services are made available to Kean-Ocean on scheduled dates and times.

Currently 5 faculty Offices are assigned to Faculty from the College of Education. One classroom has a SmartBoard designated for the College of Education use. One classroom has specific equipment for Physical Education. Attached is the Kean Ocean Fact Sheet and Academic Brochure that gives more specific details of services available etc.

Faculty performance evaluations are conducted across the University using the ETS Student Instructional REport II (SIR II) course evaluation instrument. These SIR II instruments are conducted in every course (Face-to-face and online) each semester to ensure all faculty (both full- and part-time) maintain the highest standards for instructional quality regardless of instructional modality.

Students can also engage in the process of the university regarding feedback through the "Students Right to Know" web page where contact information is provided by topic of inquiry.

All faculty are evaluated using SIR II's the same as Union Instructional Location. Student Life also has specific student groups for Education students, and also solicits student feedback similar to Union. The Associate VP's office sends out periodic informational emails to students, and attends as many of the college of Education Orientations, where I speak and indicate I have an open door for student issues, concerns and feedback. Ms. Patricia Martino and Ms. Maureen Byrne also act as student trouble shooters.

**Upload Parity Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gateway Building fact sheet-Ocean.pdf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kean Ocean Organization Diagram as of 08_01_16.PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KeanOcean_AcademicBrochure_NJEA.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOfactsheet2015_transfer (latest version).pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEP Fiscal Chart Parity Table.docx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See **Attachment** panel below.
Table 6. Accreditation Plan

The Accreditation Plan is an educator preparation provider’s (EPP’s) identification of the sites outside of the main campus or administrative headquarters and the programs offered at each site that will be included in the EPP’s accreditation review. This information, in combination with the table of program characteristics, is used by CAEP staff and site visit team leads to plan the site visit, including the sites that will be visited by site team members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Site(s) administered by the EPP</th>
<th>Program offered at each site</th>
<th>Is the program to be included in accreditation review? (Y or N)</th>
<th>Is the program approved by state in which program is offered? (Y or N or approval not required)</th>
<th>Notes/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kean-Union</td>
<td>All initial licensure programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kean-Ocean</td>
<td>Elementary Education, Special Education, Health and Physical Education, Teacher of English, Teacher of Social Studies and Teacher of Biology</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 7. EPP Assessments

Please list proprietary assessments used by the EPP (no more than 7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proprietary Assessment No.</th>
<th>Title of Assessment</th>
<th>Validity &amp; Reliability information if available &amp; applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.1</td>
<td>ETS Praxis CORE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.2</td>
<td>ETS Praxis II Content Area Exams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.3</td>
<td>Pearson/SCALE edTPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please map above proprietary assessments to the appropriate CAEP Standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proprietary Assessment No.</th>
<th>CAEP Standard 1</th>
<th>CAEP Standard 2</th>
<th>CAEP Standard 3</th>
<th>CAEP Standard 4</th>
<th>CAEP Standard 5</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.2</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.3</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## II. CAEP Standards and Evidence

### Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

#### i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard and answer the following questions for each item.)

1. **Kean Lawshe Protocol**
   - 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards

2. **Pre-Professional Field Assessment**
   - 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
   - 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
   - 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
   - 1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
   - 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
   - A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
   - A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities

3. **Professional Field Assessment**
   - 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
   - 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
   - 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
   - 1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
   - 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
   - A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
   - A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities

4. **Standard 1 Alignment to InTASC Standards**
   - 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards

5. **Teacher Work Sample II and III by program and location**
   - 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
   - 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
   - 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
   - 1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
   - 1.5 Model and apply technology standards

6. **Pre Professional & Professional by program and location**
   - 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
   - 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
   - 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
   - 1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
   - 1.5 Model and apply technology standards

7. **Data Tables for 1.1, 1.2 & 1.5**
   - 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
   - 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
   - 1.5 Model and apply technology standards

8. **Teacher Work Sample II Assessment**
   - 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
   - 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
   - 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
   - 1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
   - 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
   - A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
   - A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities
### Teacher Work Sample III Assessment

1. **Understanding of InTASC Standards**
   1.1 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
   1.2 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
   1.3 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
   1.5 Model and apply technology standards

   **A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions**
   **A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities**

10 **HEOA Title II Summary Pass Rate**

1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge

11 **HEOA Title II Single Assessment Data**

1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge

12 **Findings from Pre Professional Assessments Figure 1a-2d**

   **A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions**
   **A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities**

13 **Findings from Professional Assessment Clinical Exp Figures 3a-6d**

   **A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions**
   **A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities**

* ii. Analysis of evidence (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that makes the case that the standard is met

---

**SCOPE OF STANDARD 1**

The focus of Standard 1 is on the EPP ensuring that candidates develop a comprehensive understanding of the key concepts and principles of their discipline. By completion of their program they are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance their learning of all college- and career-readiness standards ([http://caepnet.org/standards/standard-1](http://caepnet.org/standards/standard-1)). Standard 1 emphasizes the importance for all candidates to have a robust content background and strong foundation of pedagogical knowledge. Teaching is challenging and professional preparation must provide opportunities for candidates to acquire knowledge and skills with a socially significant impact on P-12 students across all areas. They must build independent competence for life-long learning. Both content and pedagogical knowledge are vital components. Programs must include content across disciplines and fully prepare candidates to share knowledge with all P-12 students.

Standard 1 has five primary components ([http://caepnet.org/standards/standard-1](http://caepnet.org/standards/standard-1)) that must be addressed as specifically delineated by CAEP:

**Component 1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions** - Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 INTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

**Component 1.2 Provider Responsibilities** - Providers ensure that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and to use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice.

**Component 1.3 Provider Responsibilities** - Providers ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies (e.g., National Association of Schools of Music - NASM).
Component 1.4 Provider Responsibilities - Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards).

Component 1.5 Utilizes Technology and Media - Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and to enrich professional practice.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE ADDRESSING STANDARD 1
To address Standard 1, information and data are being provided from several sources. Together, these data will be used to establish current practices and results while forming a basis for subsequent program improvements.

Component 1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Component 1.1 examines candidates' knowledge of and classroom practice implementation in four specific areas: deep understanding of the learner and learning, content, instructional practice, and professional responsibility. Each sub-category will be analyzed using the aggregated data for the College of Education. The Lawshe protocol for establishing content validity was followed and documented (Lawshe Protocol Document) for the Pre-professional Field Competency, the Professional Field Competency, and the Teacher Work Sample Assessments.

The scoring rubric is follows:
1 = Unacceptable (Not Competent): Candidate demonstrate little or no competence.

2 = Beginning (Beginning Competence): Candidate demonstrates competence with significant assistance and prompting.
3 = Developing (Developing Competence): Candidate demonstrates developing competence with some assistance and prompting.
4 = Capable (Competent): Candidate consistently demonstrates competence without any assistance or prompting.

5 = Accomplished (Highly Competent): Candidate consistently demonstrates a high degree of competence, functioning independently.

Category 1 - Learner and Learning
The Alignment between Pre-professional and Professional Field Assessments & InTASC 2013 Standards are attached for review (Standard I: Alignment to InTASC Standards). Five elements/competencies were examined: plans and implements instruction, varies instructional strategies, motivates and actively engages learners, manages learner behavior, and assesses student progress. When data for these competencies were analyzed, a total mean was calculated for the Unit as a whole, followed by dis-aggregating the Kean-Union and Ocean County locations data. The candidates were scored by their cooperating teachers and university supervisors across three semesters at the Pre-professional and Professional levels.

Based on many ANOVAs for Repeated Measures, the numbers did not change significantly over the three semester time frame. As a result, from this point forward, the data for the three semesters (spring 2015, fall 2015, and spring 2016) will be pooled to simplify interpretation. For these analyses, the many items measured and tracked over the years
have been combined into "scales." This is an important way to bring the immensely complex set of data into interpretable levels. The several items we used as measures of each competency were simply averaged to give a simple indicator of the overall competency. These "scales" are referred to below as "Total Means." The findings include:

. The majority of candidates met these competencies/indicators scoring in the Capable (Competent) Range.

. Of the five competencies/indicators, we might single out two for further attention: 'Varies instructional strategies' and 'Managing learner behavior.' In the case of the 'Varies instructional strategies' indicator (Total N ranging from 453-540), with a total mean score of 4.30 (Cooperating Teacher) and 4.23 (University Supervisor), one might speculate that this practice improves over time. In fact, Fuller and Brown (1975), Lidstone and Hollingsworth (1992), Tomlinson et al (1994), purport that novice completers demonstrate the ability to vary and/or differentiate instruction after evolving through several stages and/or years in the actual classroom. Although there is improvement at the Professional Level, a contributing factor may be attributed to the current practice of one day per week (90 hour) internship for Pre-Professional Clinical I. Future internship field requirements will be raised to a minimum of 175 hours, over two semesters versus the current mandate of one by the New Jersey Department of Education. It is important to note that the "N" varied due to the current status of data collection within the college which does not allow for the removal of additional observations that may have been requested by the Teacher Performance Center. This redundant issue will be addressed with the new data management system piloting in the late spring 2017 semester that will allow for the stabilization of the data set.

. For the indicator of 'Managing learner behavior' at the Pre-Professional level (Total N= 453), the cooperating teachers' total Mean was 4.36 and Kean-Union Mean was 4.32. Additionally, the University Supervisors' total Mean was 4.33 and the Kean-Union Mean was 4.31. A possible explanation may be attributed to the fact that only the Teacher of Students with Disabilities option offers a dedicated, semester course in Classroom Management. Long recognized as a relative weakness over the remainder of the College of Education certification options, previous attempts to address this deficit involved offering classroom management workshops by PDS instructors and summer seminars led by Harry Wong. However, program revisions will address this short coming as all Early Childhood, Elementary and Elementary with Middle School candidates will be required to complete a dual certification program with special education or bilingual education and will be taking the existing classroom management course that resides in each of those endorsement areas. The college will continue to examine opportunities to provide dual licensure options to those candidates who are pursuing licensure in the secondary education track leading to content expertise.

. There are some differences between the two instructional locations that will merit attention. When comparing the location means (Total N ranging from 453-540) across 12 of the 18 Mean cells (67%), the Kean-Ocean aggregated scores are slightly higher than at Kean-Union. Moreover, a pattern across every indicator seems to be that the Pre-professional scores are lower than the Professional scores by 0.26-0.40 for the Kean-Union data only, while not substantially different between the two for the Kean-Ocean data.

Summary analysis of Learner and Learning aggregated data:

Pre Professional and Professional Internship Competency data are reported by comparing the Cooperating Teacher and the University Supervisor ratings using the 5 point scale listed above over the course of three consecutive semesters (spring 2015, fall 2015, and spring 2016). Candidate ratings fall in the Capable (4.00 - 4.77) category with the exception of two outliers in smaller certification programs. Cronbach's Alpha was performed and used as a (lower-bound) estimate of the reliability of a psychometric test. It has been proposed that can be viewed as the expected correlation of two tests that measure the same construct. Candidates clearly demonstrate an understanding of the Learner and Learning given the alignment of the field competency criteria to the InTASC standards. Revisions to all field performance assessments will more clearly delineate...
developmentally progressive skill acquisition over increased field clinical requirements prior to the candidates Clinical IV final internship experience. These required field changes are addressed substantially in Standard 5.

Category 2 - Content
The alignment between Content and the respective InTASC Standards can be found in the Standard 1: Alignment to InTASC Standards chart. The unit uses the Praxis II, content examinations for licensure, scores as evidence that teacher candidates have in-depth knowledge of the content that they plan to teach. Students are required to take at least one Praxis II Content Knowledge test designed to assess the knowledge and competencies necessary for a beginning teacher. The State of New Jersey sets the minimum score candidates must receive on this test to be certified. Kean candidates are required to take and pass the Praxis II prior to student teaching. If they do not achieve the minimum score, they must retake the test before they can student teach and be certified to teach in New Jersey. The Praxis II has been aligned with the SPA Standards. Each program has carefully examined this alignment and applied it when developing their programs, curriculum and student supports. On January 23, 2017, the College of Education re-visited this policy and will work toward developing an appeal process that provides greater support, equity and parity across locations in support of greater student success and program retention.

Summary analysis of Content Findings and Interpretation
As evidenced in the 2014-15 HEOA Title II Report file, Kean University continues to demonstrate success in the content preparation of candidates. The Summary Institution-Level Pass Rate Data: Traditional Teacher Preparation Program Within IHE report demonstrates that Kean University has outperformed the statewide pass rate on Praxis II consistently over a three-year period. The Single Assessment Institution-Level Pass Rate Data: Traditional Teacher Preparation Program Within IHE further demonstrates the success of our candidates across all content areas and sustained over the three-year reporting period. Although every content area supersedes the required 80% threshold per our professional associations, there were identified exams where candidates met the New Jersey score to pass, but scored below the statewide average for that year. Analysis was conducted by each program by looking at the sub-set data collected for each Praxis II exam that demonstrated the success and areas for improvement of the candidates. As evidenced in Praxis Content Exams for Examination 2012-2105, faculty reviewed scores that met the required cut score for New Jersey, but were lower than the statewide average. These data have been reviewed with programs, and program leaders have developed steps to address changes that can lead to improvement in student performance in the identified areas.

The Title II HEOA data clearly indicates that Kean completers have demonstrated successful content knowledge. As evidenced in the table above, although on average our candidates scored below the statewide comparison group, 100% of the candidates in each of those categories met or exceeded the New Jersey cut-off score and passed the assessment required for licensure. Further, although the statewide average score was higher in the table previously presented, in all cases except Health and Physical Education, the Kean institutional pass-rate exceeded that of the comparison statewide group.

Category 3 - Instructional Practice
The alignment between the Teacher Work Sample (www.wku.edu/rtwsc) and the respective InTASC Standards can be found in the Standard 1: Alignment to InTASC Standards chart. The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) is embedded in the Introductory Field courses, the Pre-professional methods courses, the Capstone courses, and the Professional Field courses. At the Introductory level, Contextual Factors is the only required section and is scored by the faculty. At the Pre-professional level, candidates complete 7 sections of the TWS based on their field experience and are scored by course instructors, while at the Professional level, the entire TWS is completed and scored by Capstone faculty and University field
supervisors. Although data for the TWS is collected from the introductory level forward, only data from the Pre-professional and Professional levels will be analyzed and discussed. Five competencies/indicators were examined: Contextual Factors, Learning Goals Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction, and Instructional Decision Making. Similar to the Learner and Learning competencies/indicators, a total mean was calculated for the Unit, followed by dis-aggregating the Kean-Union and Ocean County location data.

Summary analysis of Instructional Practice Findings and Interpretation

All aggregated data reported for the Teacher Work Sample level II (scored only by course instructor) and Teacher Work Sample level III (scored by course instructor and University supervisor) reveal some interesting comparative differences between the Pre-professional and Professional levels as well as between campuses.

At the Pre-professional level II, the Total Means ranged between 4.21 and 4.36. The Kean-Union Total Means ranged from 4.06 to 4.29 while the Kean-Ocean Total Means ranged from 4.49 to 4.58. The overall comparative lower means may reflect the currently practiced one day per week internship. This trend is expected to improve as field time is increased as indicated in the program revisions currently being reviewed by the NJDOE. A more serious issue is that all Kean-Ocean total Means are higher than Kean-Union Total Means.

The TWS level III data again reveals consistently lower mean scores at Kean-Union ranging from 4.40 to 4.54 with Kean-Ocean means ranging from 4.82 to 4.96.

From a different perspective, the TWS level III Kean-Union instructors consistently rated their candidates lower (4.48 - 4.61) than the University Supervisors (4.69 - 4.82) across all indicators. The inverse was true of the Kean-Ocean Instructors (4.82 - 4.96) where their candidates were given higher ratings than those given from the University Supervisors (4.64 - 4.88).

Candidates clearly demonstrate an understanding of Instructional Practice given the alignment of the Teacher Work Sample criteria to the InTASC standards. However, Kean is in the process of re-tooling all of the critical assessment instruments/rubrics to meet the criteria set forth by CAEP specific to validity, reliability and inter-rater reliability. Since the NJDOE has required all teacher preparation programs to undergo program re-approval, the college faculty has decided to make strategic programming changes that will alter the existing assessments and scoring rubrics. As such, we are currently in the designing phase of these new evaluative instruments which will be aligned to the new programs launching in September, 2018.

Category 4 - Professional Responsibility

The alignment between Professional Responsibility and the respective InTASC Standards can be found in the Standard 1: Alignment to InTASC Standards chart. The Professional Responsibilities are embedded in the Pre-professional and Professional Field Competency Assessments. The three indicators measured by the Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisors at the Level II and Level III Internships include: Respects diverse talents, beliefs, and talents; Presents professional presence; and Maintains professional relationships.

Summary analysis of Professional Responsibility Findings and Interpretation

The majority of candidates met these indicators scoring in the Capable (Competent) range (Total N ranging from 453-540).

There were four relatively low Total Means scores for Professional responsibilities all occurring in the 'Presents Professional Presence' indicator ranging from 4.72 (Cooperating teacher) to 4.78 (University Supervisor) in the Pre-professional Field Internship. By contrast, the Kean-Ocean counterpart Total Mean ratings were higher with Cooperating Teachers scoring candidates at 4.84 and University Supervisors scoring candidates at 4.81.

With the exception of the aforementioned area, candidates generally received higher Mean Totals across all remaining areas but the trend toward higher overall Kean-Ocean ratings was evidenced. Seven out of the ten Total Kean-Ocean Means were higher than the
Kean-Union Total Means.
Candidates clearly demonstrate an understanding of Professional Responsibilities given the alignment of the field competency criteria to the InTASC standards. Revisions to all field performance assessments will delineate developmentally progressive skill acquisition over increased field clinical requirements prior to the candidates Clinical IV final internship experience.

Component 1.2 Professional Reflection and Self-Evaluation
The alignment between Professional Reflection and Self-Evaluation and the respective InTASC Standards can be found in the Standard 1: Alignment to InTASC Standards chart. The sections referenced in the above chart are embedded in the Teacher Work Sample and are assessed only at the Professional Level by the University Supervisor and Capstone Instructor (spring 2015, fall 2015, and spring 2016). Included in this sub-category is evidence that demonstrates the candidate's ability to interpret student learning and provide insight on the effectiveness of their instruction and assessment as well as note the implications for future teaching practice and professional development.

Summary Findings
- The majority of candidates met these competencies/indicators scoring in the Capable (Competent) Range;
- The Kean-Union Course Instructors scored their candidates lower than their Kean-Ocean counterparts with ratings at 4.48 and 4.88 respectively;
- The University Supervisors differed from that pattern and scored the Kean-Ocean candidates slightly lower with 4.68 to Kean-Union’s 4.75.

Going forward these differences will be addressed with an increased emphasis on interrater reliability training.

Component 1.4 Provides effective Instruction (Differentiation of Instruction) and Fosters Critical Thinking
The alignment between Provides Effective Instruction and Fosters Critical Thinking and the respective InTASC Standards can be found in the Standard 1: Alignment to InTASC Standards chart.

Summary Findings
Overall, the majority of candidates met these competencies/indicators scoring in the Capable (Competent) Range (spring 2015, fall 2015, and spring 2016);
- As noted in the Learner and Learning Section, in the case of the 'Varies instructional strategies' indicator, with a total mean score of 4.30 (Cooperating Teacher) and 4.23 (University Supervisor), one might speculate that this practice improves over time. In fact, Fuller and Brown (1975), Lidstone and Hollingsworth (1992), Tomlinson et al (1994), purport that novice completers demonstrate the ability to vary and/or differentiate instruction after evolving through several stages and/or years in the actual classroom. Although there is improvement at the Professional Level, a contributing factor may be attributed to the current practice of the one day per week (90 hour) clinical internship. Revisions currently being submitted to the New Jersey Department of Education for program approval reflect a progressive expansion of clinical practice that will require all Kean programs to have a minimum of four field experiences (50 hrs., 75 hrs., 100 hrs., full-time internship).
- As previously noted, the Kean-Union total Means at the Pre-professional level were somewhat lower than those of the Kean-Ocean total means.
- It can be stated that the majority of candidates met these competencies/indicators scoring in the Capable (Competent) Range;

Component 1.5 Utilizes Technology and Media
The alignment between Utilizes Technology & Media and the respective InTASC Standards can be found in the Standard 1: Alignment to InTASC Standards chart. The sections referenced in the chart above are embedded in the Professional Field Competency Assessment and are assessed only at the Professional Level by the Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor. Included in this sub-category is evidence that demonstrates the
candidate's ability to appropriately integrate and use a variety of technology and media into his or her instruction while reflecting the objectives and needs of the learners.

Summary Findings
The majority of candidates met these competencies/indicators scoring in the Capable (Competent) Range over three semesters of reviewed data (spring 2015, fall 2015, and spring 2016). All scores were relatively high across both location ranging from 4.74 to 4.89 with a total N ranging from 524-540. It is important to note that the "N" varied due to the current status of data collection within the college which does not allow for the removal of additional observations that may have been requested by the Teacher Performance Center. This redundant issue will be addressed with the new data management system piloting in the late spring 2017 semester that will allow for the stabilization of the data set.

Candidates clearly demonstrate an ability to apply technology as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage and improve learning given the data and the alignment of the field competency criteria to the InTASC standards. The training of faculty in the use of technology has been a priority in the College of Education. Candidates in all certification options also complete a 3 credit dedicated course in technology taught in departmental computer labs. However, it will be the intent of the COE to embed more technology in newly developed courses as well as revise all existing technology courses to reflect a more integrated approach for the learner.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS FOR STANDARD 1
The comparative differences between the Kean-Union and Kean-Ocean locations may suggest inconsistent training opportunities particularly since adjuncts and lecturers are primarily assigned to the Kean-Ocean methods courses. These findings have serious implications as the COE moves forward with the TWS being replaced by edTPA (Changes to Traditional Route/CEAS Educator Preparation Programming Requirements) and the updating and revisions to the field performance criteria. The College of Education has collected and maintained data from the Teacher Performance Center Field Competency and Teacher Work Sample Assessments since their COE Administrative Council approval and implementation in 2007. Of equal importance, Kean University implemented a rigorous assessment program in the academic year 2011-2012. Program assessment coordinators were designated and given the task of convening program and unit meetings during Professional Development days in January and June and required to complete yearly targeted data analysis of SLOs measured by SPAs. Routine, consistent data analysis and closing of the loop exercises have become a priority and fully implemented with data being reported annually to the Office of Assessment and Accreditation and archived for Program Review and SPA reports.
Specialty Licensure Area Data

Program Review Option (per state partnership agreement)
- CAEP Program Review with National Recognition (SPA)
- CAEP Program Review with Feedback (State-selected standards)
- State Program Review (State-selected standards)

Answer the following prompts for programs reviewed for National Recognition (SPA) and Program Review with Feedback. Upload state reports for state reviewed programs.

1. Based on the analysis of the disaggregated data, how have the results of specialty licensure area or SPA evidence been used to inform decision making and improve instruction and candidate learning outcomes?

Every initial teacher preparation program across the COE has collected a minimum of three semesters of evidence specific to student learning outcomes and competency in their specialty area standards. Data is systemically collected (COE Unit Assessment Protocol, pp 20-21), analyzed, reported back to the program coordinator and maintained on the COE assessment webpage (http://www.kean.edu/~ncate/CAEP.htm). All data presented on the College of Education Assessment Reports by Area page found on the left hand side of the Table of Contents, provide each program area and faculty the opportunity to critically evaluate the quality, consistency and success of their candidates in a meaningful way. The data collected in this area is consistent with Key Initial Common Unit & Program Assessments chart (COE Unit Assessment Protocol, pp 11-12) and is used to report annual student learning outcome progress by program. Further, the College of Education Student Learning Outcomes for Initial Teacher Certification Programs Crosswalk addresses all initial licensure programs and their alignment to the appropriate Professional Association Standards, Kean University Student Learning Outcomes, the COE Conceptual Cornerstones, New Jersey Standards for Teaching, and InTASC standards.

Additionally, all programs across Kean University are required to submit targeted Student Learning Outcomes to the Office of Assessment (http://www.kean.edu/offices/accreditation-and-assessment/kean-university-assessment-products). This long-standing practice instituted under our Middle States Accreditation protocol supports the continuous development/assessment of all university programs that reside within the COE as well as content majors that support the development of education majors who reside in other colleges across the university.

Provided below are samples of how each program licensure area at Kean has used the data collected and reported through our COE Unit Assessment Protocol to inform decision making and improve instruction (or confirm success of what is being taught and assessed):

Elementary Education (ACEI) - UG/PB Initial
Status of program regarding SPA submission: Recognized with Conditions
Data Source- ETS Praxis II Scores: Before reviewing the data from Praxis II scores that assess teacher candidate's content knowledge, it is important to note that ETS developed two new versions of the test between 2012 and 2015. Therefore, Praxis II scores of Kean teacher candidates were collected from three different adaptations of the test: The Praxis II 0014 Elementary Education Content Knowledge Test, the Praxis II 5031 Multiple Subjects Test, and the Praxis II 5001 Multiple Subjects Test with revised Language Arts and Math sections based on the new Common Core standards. The comparison of the three tests are outlined in detail in the Brief Description of Assessments in the full report for Assessment 1. All Kean Elementary Education teacher candidates attained a 100% passing rate, indicating that the program is successfully guiding students to appropriate content knowledge. In reference to meeting the standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 for Elementary Education Curriculum Standards in Practice Assessment, all 145 students that took the Praxis II 0014 from 2012-2015, 95 students that took the Praxis II 5031 from 2012-2015, and the 3 students that took the revised Praxis II 5001 from 2014-2015.
However, what is most impressive are the data outlined in Table 3 in Brief Analysis of Data Findings in the full report for Assessment 1. When comparing Kean University students' Praxis II scores with national and state passing scores, Kean teacher candidates out performed their state and national counterparts on all three versions of the Praxis II from 2012-2015. This is even more impressive given that Praxis II test scores during the previous 2009-accreditation cycle fell below the national average in Language Arts, Math, Social Studies and Science.

Teacher of English (NCTE) - UG/PB Initial
Status of program regarding SPA submission: Recognized
Data Source- English Supplemental Program Assessment: Data from this assessment indicate that students are generally well prepared and in no areas are students failing to meet standards or consistently reaching only marginal competence. There are, however, three areas which this data brought to our attention for additional consideration. The data did show a weakness in candidates making meaningful creative connections between the ELA curriculum and developments in culture, society and education (2.5); in helping students understand the impact of English language across cultures (3.1.3, 3.1.4); and in using a variety of ways to teach students composing processes that result in creating various forms of oral, visual and written literacy (3.2.3). The course revisions described in Section B above address these standards. In addressing the LA CCSS paradigm shift in conjunction with the NCTE standards, our candidates are also taught to create lesson plans that integrate appropriate technology and content from other disciplines, require students to investigate information of local/global significance, and collaborate in the completion of oral and written activities and projects within and outside of the classroom.

Teacher of Science (NSTA): Biology, Chemistry- UG/PB Initial
Status of program regarding SPA submission: Further development required
Data Source- Praxis II Content Knowledge Assessment: The Biology: Content Knowledge test (#0235/5235), the Chemistry: Content Knowledge test (#0245/5245) and the General Science: Content Knowledge test (#0435/5435) are designed to measure the knowledge and competencies necessary for a beginning teacher of secondary school science. The development of the test questions and the construction of the test reflect the National Science Education Standards (NSES) and the National Science Teacher Association (NSTA) standards and recognize that there are conceptual and procedural schemes that unify the various scientific disciplines. All Biology and Chemistry program completers are required to take and pass their respective content exam AND the General Science Content Knowledge exam prior to beginning their professional internship (student teaching).

The number of biology majors each year since 2012 is 3, 3, and 5 (Data is combined for these two areas so that a larger "n" can be presented and protect the identity of individuals and their performance in the program. The passing rate is 100% and data indicate that completers are near or above the national average and in most cases well above the state average with a passing rate of 100%. During this time, there was only 1 chemistry major that did very well. The students that we teach are very well-prepared in the content area of science and technology, particularly when compared to the state and national average. However, we do need to recruit more students into our science education program. COE also needs more science faculty to recruit students in their classes and to hold seminars related to educational opportunities.

Teacher of Social Studies (NCSS): UG/PB Initial
Status of program regarding SPA submission: Recognized with Conditions
Data Source- Content Knowledge NCSS analysis: The evaluation of our teacher candidates' content knowledge is based on assessments # 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 which indicates that they have learned the required subject matter in their major fields of study. The Kean secondary education program in social studies requires all students to be proficient in the
four social studies content areas of history, civics, geography and economics and also provides content course work in sociology, psychology and anthropology. The above commentary is based on the results of the assessments that are specifically addressed in the principal findings of assessments noted above. The History Department and The Middle and Secondary Education program have instituted a required course, History 3000, which all social studies secondary education majors must take. In addition to Praxis II, this course includes content knowledge as well as instruction in the alignment of the content knowledge with the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards and the National Council for the Social Studies ten thematic ideas into the instructional planning of lesson plans and thematic unit plans. The Middle and Secondary Education Program assesses all social studies students every semester in courses that are part of the Secondary Education program. The results of these assessments are quantified and are discussed at the College of Education MSE program planning meetings and in joint meetings with the History department and other departments including Economics, Geography, Sociology and Psychology.

Health & Physical Education (NASPE) - UG/PB Initial
Status of program regarding SPA submission: Recognized
Data Source- Student Learning Outcomes Data: The addition of "Teaching Team/Individual Sports Skills and Concepts" 3 credit courses has provided further assessment examples. These courses include application of PE Metrics based rubrics. This will provide further practice and understanding of the skills assessment while utilizing assessments that will support student learning appropriate for K-12. It appears that the teacher candidates are having difficulty connecting the Contextual Factors of a class or school with the instructional implications for teaching that particular population. We have shared this finding with the PED 2800 (Sophomore Field) and PED 4610 (Capstone) course instructors. Course updates are in progress to address this weakness. The Fitness (Assessment #7) and Skills (Assessment #6) Assessments are reviewed in PED 2800 Sophomore Field. This provides teacher candidates the opportunity to be proactive in their preparation as they start to meet the requirements of the Physical Education Department. Additionally, providing the NASPE PETE Standards and Elements along with the corresponding rubrics gives concrete examples of how to assess student learning. The review of the data contained in this report has served to improve communications among faculty in the department. It has provided a forum to highlight programmatic strengths as well as areas for improvement. We have also discovered common challenges within the department and college wide. University, college, and departmental trainings and work sessions have been developed to provide a greater focus on student learning. The data from these reports has fueled course updates, guide sheet modifications, and guided instruction.

Early Childhood (NAEYC)-UB/PB/MA Initial
Status of program regarding SPA submission: Recognized with Conditions
Data Source- Praxis II Content Scores for Content Analysis: 1) CONTENT KNOWLEDGE
Analysis and interpretation of data has resulted in the following key changes to the program: (1) greater focus on specific content knowledge in key subject areas, especially science (2) creation of college sponsored Praxis resource and study programs.
In order to continue the progress we have made in the area of improving candidates' content knowledge, departmental faculty need to (1) continue to connect pedagogical instruction to content knowledge, (2) continue to encourage student to take advantage of college sponsored Praxis resource and study programs, and (3) remain aware of current and emerging exemplary teaching practices. Our Departmental Assessment Committee continues to create opportunities for standards-based professional development and pedagogy-based tech integration.

Teacher of Students with Disabilities (CEC) - UG/MA Initial
Status of program regarding SPA submission: Recognized
Data Source- Student Learning Outcomes from identified critical assessments: Student Learning
With the modified embedded Teacher Work Sample assessment that focuses on P-12 student learning (Assessment #5), recent data suggests that our interns have had a moderate effect on the extent of their student learning. While this reflects an increased emphasis on the role of pre, formative, and summative assessment techniques in our SPED 3000(methods) and SPED 4200(Capstone) courses, the data collection efforts need to be improved. The data presented in these tables are inconsistent in that the outcomes are achieved by differing numbers of lessons in each unit, the variety of classroom settings where instruction is delivered, and the extent of student special needs.

Teacher of Spanish (ACTFL) - UG/PB Initial
Status of program regarding SPA submission: Recognized with Conditions
Data Source- Effects on P-12 Student Learning TWS: In order to begin the process of preparing our candidates for the instructional planning portion of the TWS, we initiated the Thematic Unit Project in the Methods course. Practice using the Understanding by Design Model for Outcomes, Assessments and Learning Activities planning is paramount for early skills growth for our candidates. Units on Technology Integration, Materials Design and Global Competencies have only strengthened the methods course. The results of the TWS continue to be exemplary but we did identify some challenges. The first challenge is have how to provide more guidance in the methods course. The second is how to conduct pre-instruction and post-instruction assessments. The third is how to compile and analyze data from these assessments. The fourth is to reflect on the results in terms of student learning and classroom practice. For this reason, we will add the new Methods of Assessment course (EMSE 3255) in spring 2017.

Teacher of Mathematics (NCTM) - UB/PB Initial
Status of program regarding SPA submission: Recognized with Probation
Data Source- Student Learning Outcomes: Pretest/post-test comparison, in all semesters examined, the average gain was for Fall, 2014: 24%; Spring, 2015: 34% and Fall, 2015: 47%. The student learning increased in every semester, and this shows that the program is effective in giving candidates the skills needed to teach P-12 students. Though there are not many completers, the faculty is exploring options for recruiting students into our program. In all areas of content, except Geometry, the data show that our teacher candidates have demonstrated mastery of the content. Additionally, the mathematics faculty will continue to monitor courses, to run Praxis II mathematics review sessions and to help candidates to be better prepared for that test.

Music Education (NASM) - UG Initial
Status of program regarding national association: Accredited (Report filed outside of AIMS)
Data Source-Annual Student Learning Outcomes report: Individual student assessment of sight-singing and ear training skills both during class and during one-on-one sight-singing examinations -MUS 4114 (Sight Singing and Ear Training IV) SSET performance rubric designed to reflect the individual student sight singing and ear training skills is used. Criteria for performance includes rhythmic and pitch accuracy, as well as intonation. A departmental solo and ensemble performance rubric contains 5 criteria and is evaluated on a 5 point Likert scale (5=Exceeds Expectation). A rubric criterion score of 3 or higher indicates that students have either met or exceeded expectations. Since this is an upper level course, the expectation was that 95% of students would achieve a score of 3 or higher on each criterion. The departmental essay rubric contains 5 criteria and is evaluated on a 5 point Likert scale (5=Exceeds Expectation). The data analyzed show that 95% of the students assessed achieved a score of 3 or higher on each criterion and thus, the program does not believe that assessment or instructional support needs to be addressed at this time.
2. Based on the analysis of specialty licensure area data, how have individual licensure areas used data for change?

In 2015, the NJDOE passed new licensure code regulations (http://www.nj.gov/education/educators/license/UpdatedCertChanges.pdf) that required all New Jersey teacher preparation programs to be revised and submitted for program approval by April, 2017. Due to the timing of this CAEP submission, the significant program changes that will impact all licensure areas throughout Kean University will be in large part due to the changes set forth by the NJDOE.

As indicated on our internal Kean COE assessment web page (http://www.kean.edu/~ncate/CAEP.htm), the COE has dutifully collected assessment
data for both the unit as well as the individual programs. Each program has utilized their program data to produce their submissions to their professional associations; as well as, to determine if their program successfully measures actual growth over time of their candidates. Across all licensure areas, the faculty program coordinator's agreed that a few areas of change were necessary based on our data outcomes:

1. Although each program has internal program assessments that address the standards associated with their professional associations, it was very challenging to compare growth of candidates across all licensure areas unless field instruments were used. Based on this review of both program and unit data, the faculty determined that the creation of new course embedded assessments that provided comparative data to the field collection was necessary. As such, each program area will embed a common assessment/rubric which will be aligned to their professional association area, that will enable collection candidate data at the point of entry and at three additional benchmarking points throughout the program. We believe that this additional data collection will provide corroborative data that demonstrates both the strength of each individual licensure program; as well as, the strength of our candidates across the entire unit.

2. The NJDOE has required that all teacher preparation programs ensure that candidates entering the profession spend a minimum amount of time in a clinical experience (50 hours at induction, 175 hours during program of study, full-time clinical internship). For all licensure programs at Kean beginning September 1, 2018, every candidate across licensure programs will meet the following minimal criteria: 50 hours of clinical experience embedded in the gateway course for program admission, a minimum of 75 clinical experience hours in a junior year experience, a minimum of 75 clinical experience hours that is done first semester senior year, and a full-time clinical internship that is done in consecutive semesters and same location as previous clinical experience (full-year placement). All candidates preparing to be teachers at Kean University will spend a minimum of four semesters in clinical experiences and the same field assessment instruments will be used to assist in demonstrating growth-over-time of candidates.

3. The NJDOE has required that all candidates must submit and pass the Pearson edTPA portfolio during their clinical internship experience. Currently, candidates entering their final phase of preparation beginning September 1, 2017 are required to submit a completed portfolio for review; however, the NJDOE has not set a required score for this phase. Only candidates who submit a completed portfolio will be issued their licensure upon recommendation of the university. Beginning September 1, 2018, all candidates will need to submit a completed portfolio and successfully meet or exceed the required cut-off score to be issued their licensure. All areas for licensure are required to participate. Candidates who are receiving an endorsement in Special Education will submit a portfolio in their initial licensure area (early childhood, elementary, middle school or secondary). All licensure areas are currently updating their programs to reflect preparation for the edTPA and have begun standard alignment as well.

3. For Program Review with Feedback only: How does the specialty licensure area data align with and provide evidence for meeting the state-selected standards?

4. For National Recognition only: How are SPA reports that are not Nationally Recognized being addressed?

All programs at Kean University have been submitted for review by the appropriate national associations. Based on feedback, each coordinator has worked with program faculty, the Teacher Performance Center and the Director of Accreditation and Assessment to address the areas that were still outstanding. In every case, recommendations made by the national association have been addressed. If required, field addendums were created to ensure that specific observable measures were taken into account during the clinical experiences that were tied directly to the content or pedagogy of the SPA. Further,
changes were made to scoring rubrics to ensure alignment with SPA standards and a more consistent way of presenting the data was addressed as well for clarity.

As previously noted, the NJDOE has required that all initial licensure programs be re-approved with a submission date of April 1, 2017 and an expected implementation date of September 1, 2018. The required changes for all initial licensure programs in New Jersey is significant and impacts the number of clinical experience hours, topics to be covered during the professional sequence of instruction and the successful submission and passing of edTPA. These changes will require new assessments, scoring rubrics and amend program completion requirements. The current SPA submissions are based on Kean's current programs and all modifications will be done with the intent of continuing national recognition moving forward.

State Review Only: Upload State Program Reports here.
### Standard 2: Clinical Partnership and Practice

**i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher Work Sample II and III by program and location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Partners design high-quality clinical experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pre Professional &amp; Professional by program and location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Partners design high-quality clinical experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clinical Practice Handbook II p 41-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.2.2 Clinical Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clinical Practice Handbook III p 47-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.2.2 Clinical Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clinical Supervisor HII p44-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Partners design high-quality clinical experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.2.2 Clinical Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The Clinical Supervisor/Instructor HIII p52-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Partners design high-quality clinical experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.2.2 Clinical Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pre Professional Students HII p16-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Clinical Practice Internship Exp HIII p 16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Partners design high-quality clinical experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.2.2 Clinical Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Field Exp Special Case HII p 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

10 Professional Internship Video HIII p100

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
A.2.2 Clinical Experiences

11 Partnership for Clinical Preparation Chart

12 Representative Gp of Districts as Clinical Partners

13 Partial List of Current District Sch Partners

14 Findings from Pre Professional Assessments Figure 1a-2d

15 Findings from Professional Assessment Clinical Exp Figures 3a-6d

16 Field Exp Calendar

17 Datatel Course Listing Sample

18 Dean's Letter

19 Directions to submit online assessments

20 Field Exp email to instructors

21 Field Exp Emergency Form

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
Component 2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
As a cornerstone for success, Kean University has a long history of working collaboratively with community members. Founded in 1855 as a teacher training institution for Newark, the administration at Kean worked with the community to develop what eventually became known as Newark State Teacher's College. Today, Kean's College of Education is one of the largest producers of teachers for the State of New Jersey with 37 different state-approved programs in education. Our current leadership within the College of Education (COE) constantly seeks to develop highly effective bridges with districts, individual schools, and other organizations in a meaningful collaboration. Through partnerships, the COE is continuously strengthening relationships through joint focus groups, community planning meetings, and shared governing review sessions. The Partnerships for Clinical Preparation Chart 2.1 provides a list of current partnerships with districts, schools and other agencies. Since the majority of our Professional Development School relationships were established with grant funding starting in 1999, Kean is currently working with updating MOU's to reflect the change in NJDOE requirements for
the preparation of candidates that must be in place by September, 1, 2018.

The goal is to better prepare teachers who can think creatively and critically in developing instruction based on depth of content, learning variables, formative and summative assessment, appreciation for racial, ethnic, cultural and linguistic diversity, facility with the latest technologies for teaching and a commitment to sustained achievement and success for all. The "Clinical Preparation" of candidates evolves in a "360 manner" by placing emphasis on continuous use of information and data collected from all stakeholders. Presented in Representative Group of Districts Used as Clinical Partners 2.2 table is a representative list of joint meetings with current and potential community members to review mutual needs, programs and planning of partnership. These districts and the re-establishment of joint-decision making leadership teams is currently under review as the college prepares to adhere to the changes in NJDOE licensure code.

Clinical Experiences
Clinical Experience begins the three (3) course sequence taken prior to COE entrance. Six-day exploratory experiences, three days in an urban-rim setting, three days in a suburban setting, offer students opportunities to compare and contrast. Organized through the Teaching Performance Center (TPC), introduction of NJ Professional Standards for Teachers, reflective journaling and observational protocols provide course structure and substance. Student feedback is provided informally by clinical educators and formally by University instructors.

The second course in the sequence is Clinical Practice Pre-professional. Total hours of the second experience are 90 hours or 15 full days in the schools. However, the Pre-professional experience may vary by academic major. The length varies from one or two semesters, to three to six hours. Experience arrangements for the clinical sequence are managed by the Teaching Performance Center as are the assignments of University supervisors and clinical instructors who are responsible for the mentoring, modeling, and progress of pre-professionals. Assessment data are submitted online by cooperating teachers and supervisors and analyzed by faculty and staff.

Third in the series of three clinical courses at Kean University, the Internship provides a full-time, five-day-a-week, supervised 15 week semester of instruction and personal reflection on the role of teacher. Under the daily supervision of an experienced, certified teacher, who has demonstrated the capacity to improve student learning, the intern tutors individuals and instructs small and entire classes. A minimum of eight (8) assessments are completed and submitted online by the University supervisor. Daily assessment, offered by the cooperating teacher, precede online assessment submission at mid-term and at the conclusion of the semester. Lesson plans, reflective journal entries, teacher work samples and, where permitted by district policy, a 10-minute videotape are structured assignments during the internship semester.

Placements continue to be finalized by the TPC and students encouraged, program permitting, to return to the pre-professional placements for continuity and professional identity. Districts and schools are urged to interview candidates prior to acceptance. Annually, the Teaching Performance Center updates, edits, and publishes three separate handbooks, one for each of the three courses of the clinical sequence. Contained within the individual handbooks are relevant policies and procedures, responsibilities and assignments, references, nomenclature, and information germane to an intern's certification. Other handbook inclusions are the mission of the College of Education, New Jersey policies and suggestions for best practice. Assessment instruments for use by a student, cooperating teacher or University supervisor also are contained within.
Presented in Partial List of Current District/School Partnership for Clinical Experiences 2.3 is a partial list of current partnerships with districts, schools and other agencies in which joint clinical opportunities have been developed. By working closely with the clinical faculty from each site, information is obtained that helps to continually shape the experiences of the candidates and P-12 students. Similar processes and instructional materials are produced for the PE/Health, Special Education, and Music students.

The Introductory Field Clinical Experience process begins in April by having COE personnel work with partnering districts to develop a joint calendar for the candidates' involvement within the district. By working together, information on school calendars is sought (attachment: Public School Calendar Request) from our partnership districts. This process helps to set the stage for bringing together two "cultures" in an organized manner. The outcome is a blending of two organizations that have the shared goal of facilitating greater success for the candidates. Specific information includes closing dates and half-days which are plotted into a blank Publisher calendar. In April/October, a list is retrieved from Datatel (attachment: Datatel Course Listing Sample) and an Excel chart (attachment: Section Grid) is made outlining the sections offered during the upcoming semester, (including sections, meeting days and times, instructor assignments, room assignments), along with the proposed district assignments for the upcoming semester. Each section visits one urban and one suburban district for a total of six visits. If possible, all sections visit at least one Professional Development School.

Based on joint planning with community partners, a listing of visitation days (attachment: Listing of Visitation Days) is created in Excel that specifies the days each section visits a particular district and school. To reduce the possibility that a particular school may be "overloaded" with visitors, Elementary, Early Childhood, and Elementary/Middle sections alternate visits, meaning half of each class conducts the first three observations at the urban site and the following three visits subsequently occur at the suburban site. The second half of each class starts with three observations in the suburban district. Secondary students visit one district at one time, together. A field observation request (attachment: Field Observation Request) is created for each section and is sent via fax or email (depending on district preferences) to partner districts for their input and approval. The request form is accompanied by a letter to the placement coordinator and/or school principal (attachment: Request Letter Coordinator, Principal) as well as an overview (attachment: Overview Introductory Field) for the expectation for Introductory Field.

To ensure continuity of delivery, both classroom instructors and PDS clinical instructors are informed via email of the pending requests for placement (attachment: Email to Instructors). In addition, each partnering school district completes an individual request form acceptance (attachment: Signed Request Form). If a particular district cannot participate, another placement request is sent to a different partnering district. Follow up contacts with the districts are constant throughout this process in order to facilitate agreements between the partners involved. When requests have been accepted, a field visit schedule/calendar (attachment: Calendar) is jointly created for each class section. Class instructors are sent class calendars and other supporting materials for their classes including a letter from the Dean with College of Education admissions requirements and program information (attachment: Dean's Letter). Other supporting materials include: instructions for submitting online assessments (attachment: Directions to Submit Online Assessments); an emergency information form (attachment: Emergency Form); an assessment worksheet (attachment: Introductory Assessment-Worksheet); and an overview of the experience (attachment: Field Exp. Considerations).

Through the COE- TPC an annually updated Clinical Experience Handbook is published and distributed to all clinical experience introductory students and instructors (see http://www.kean.edu/~tpc/Handbooks/Handbook1-2016.pdf). A primary goal of these materials is to help acclimate the candidates and prepare them as they experience diverse
organizational cultures. Furthermore, through this process and materials, both Kean and partnering districts seek to ensure greater alignment of coursework with field experiences and school expectations while providing rich opportunities for candidates to observe and implement effective teaching strategies linked to coursework.

Component 2.2 Clinical Educators

Through the leadership of the COE at Kean University, there is a strong commitment to have alignment between coursework and field experiences by systematically preparing and involving clinical faculty and site based mentors. Emphasis is not only placed on preparation of clinical faculty and mentors, but also on having them play a major role in program development, implementation, and evaluation of the candidates. Presented below is information and data on the manner in which members of COE leadership at Kean University co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality professionals to serve in key roles as clinical educators and cooperating teachers.

Cooperating Teachers: As a guiding criteria for the selection of cooperating teachers, Kean draws upon the state mandated NJAC Vision for Clinical Component, (June 2015, 3). This document details the "Clarified District/Cooperating Teacher Selection" with teachers rated as either Effective or Highly Effective on most recent summative evaluation to be eligible. Also included in the NJAC.6A:9 Professional Standards for Teachers, the definition of a "cooperating teacher" states a certified, experienced practicing teacher who is assigned responsibility for assessing, supporting, and developing a candidate's knowledge, skills, and/or professional dispositions during clinical experience and/or clinical practice." In addition, NJ DOE requirements include a current NJ teaching certification at the level of teaching and certification; a minimum of four years teaching; currently teaching in the same area of certification as the candidate; has achieved an effective or highly effective rating in last assessment; and has been approved by the district superintendent (Handbook II, p. 41-43; Handbook III p. 47-51).

University Supervisors and Clinical Instructors. Individuals in these roles are hired to mentor each candidate during the clinical component. They are licensed as teachers and administrators with experience in urban-rim and suburban districts. As an important bridge between Kean and community partners, Clinical Instructors spend 2.5 days weekly in PDSs, mentoring and offering professional development and supervising and supporting candidates. (Job descriptions: University Supervisor; Clinical Instructor). These individuals are chosen based on content, experience, and of equal importance, demonstrated skills in supporting people and bridging organizations. University supervisors/Clinical Instructors complete a minimum of eight (8) supervisory visits and written narrative reports, mid-term and final assessments, video assessment(s), and Special Case Reports as necessary. Professional development opportunities are provided each semester through formal seminars at the start of each semester and during the semester (Agendas/Curriculum). Key stakeholders participate in the development of the content for each session. Clinical Educators Training and Coaching is available to cooperating teachers. Through this process, content areas are identified as are University supervisors and Clinical Instructors. Training teams of two (2) University supervisors and cooperating teachers present after-school programs in five (5) geographic areas within NJ schools. Kean University is considering online presentation of this unique curriculum. However, feedback from attending cooperating teachers indicates their in-person enjoyment of learning together. University Supervisors and Clinical Instructors are assessed by students (Handbook II, p. 44-47; Handbook III, p. 52-56). As the official representative of Kean University, the clinical supervisor/clinical instructor must effectively possess the ability to serve as a liaison between the university and the participants in the partnering school or agency. These individuals are evaluated on their performance of orienting, supervising, mentoring, and evaluating candidates. They must attend a pre-semester training, remain up to date on current developments in education, and maintain a positive working relationship with the clinical interns as well as the personnel in the partnering school and at Kean University. Furthermore, given their integral responsibility of overseeing the interns, each
Clinical Instructor must reliably assist in the evaluation process. As part of this evaluation process, reports are generated, reviewed with the clinical intern, and shared with the cooperating teacher and COE leadership.

In addition, an Online Resource Center, created by PDS Clinical Instructors, supports the ongoing work of NJ Professional Standards for Teachers, established in 2015. The resource center offers opportunities for online creation and collaboration among students, cooperating teachers, and University supervisors. Through this portal, participants and stakeholders can have vital information available "24-7" that helps to ensure that a comprehensive support system is in place.

Component 2.3 Clinical Experiences
To provide a rich clinical experience that will complement coursework, the COE at Kean University emphasizes the importance of integrating a diverse set of activities and aligns them with course content. Beginning with the entrance criteria, candidates who apply for clinical practice must meet entry criteria of New Jersey mandated GPA, test scores, credits, and course sequence requirements. Faculty advisors must recommend each candidate after gathering information by reviewing coursework and having multiple discussions in advisement sessions (Handbook II, p. 16-18; Handbook III, p. 16-20).

The COE Curriculum for Clinical Practice is shared with school-based partners in distributed handbooks, assessments, and assignments. As a means of sharing responsibility for initiating a clinical practice, the COE leadership requests that candidate's interview with school administrators prior to the start of clinical practice. After a joint decision is made, the candidate is accepted and both the University Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher are involved in the provision of supervision and evaluation. Regularly scheduled conferences are held with the interns and University supervisors for the dual purpose of evaluation and support. Signatures of cooperating teachers are required on assessments including Special Case Reports (Handbook II, p. 83; Handbook III, p. 100). If an issue arises with a candidate that needs special attention by the team of professionals across the organization, a Special Case Report may be filed by the cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and/or the clinical instructors. This process would allow the aforementioned team to meet with the student to plan a course of action.

Limited options include remediation, re-application, program withdrawal, and counseling for a career other than teaching. The process is discussed in handbooks, orientation, and conferences, and supported by COE Policy.

FINDINGS FROM EVIDENCE
Data have been gathered over three semesters (spring 2015, fall 2015, and spring 2016) on the impact of the clinical experiences on promoting greater performance by the candidates as well as the ultimate outcome on the students within the partnering schools. Separate analyses have been conducted on the data collected during the Pre-Professional Clinical Experiences and the Professional Clinical Experiences. These data are highly consistent with the above information regarding the in-depth process offered to candidates during their clinical experiences. Using a five point Likert scale (Ranging from "1" to "5"), the candidates were rated by both the university supervisors as well as the cooperating teachers during spring 2015, fall 2015 and spring 2016. In addition, data were gathered separately for the Union-Kean location and the Ocean-Kean location. Areas included pertained to the candidates' preparation, proficiency of implementation, and their professional dispositions. In addition, the impact on the P-12 students' learning and development was assessed.

Findings from Assessments of Pre-Professional Clinical Experience

Presented in Figure 1a-2d are the data collected during spring 2015, fall 2015, and spring 2016 including those from the Kean-Union Candidates and Kean-Ocean Candidates.
respectively. Overall, using the five point scale, the candidates were rated very highly. In addition, there was strong correspondence between the university supervisors and the cooperating teachers. As a measure of inter-rater agreement, Pearson (2-tailed) correlations were calculated on the mean scores and all were significant at the 0.01 level.

Similar to collecting data during the pre-professional clinical experience, comparable information has been gathered during candidates' involvement in professional clinical experiences. Data have been gathered using a five point Likert scale (Ranging from "1" to "5"), across 15 key areas. Each candidate was rated by both a university supervisor as well as the cooperating teacher during spring 2015, fall 2015 and spring 2016. In addition, data were gathered separately for the Kean-Union location and the Kean-Ocean location. Areas included pertain to the candidates' preparation, proficiency of implementation, and their professional dispositions. In addition, the impact on the P-12 students' learning and development. The current leadership within the COE will seek to further develop these relationships as a central aspect of better preparing candidates with the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions essential to having a positive impact on all P-12 students.

Presented in Figure 2a-6d are the data collected during spring and fall 2015 as well as spring 2016. Using the five point scale, the candidates were rated as very highly across all categories. In addition, there was a high correspondence between the university supervisors and the cooperating teachers. As a measure of inter-rater agreement, Pearson (2-tailed) correlations were calculated on the mean scores and all were significant at the 0.01 level.

IMPLICATIONS

Based on the findings in relation to Standard 2, there are several implications to address. Implexation 1: Advancing Mutually Beneficial and Accountable Partnerships: A joint leadership council will be created inviting district partners, university personnel, alumni, clinical instructors and current students to ensure that the programs and candidates' being produced at Kean are reflective of the schools they serve.

Implication 2: Refining Criteria for Selection, Preparation, Evaluation and Retention of Clinical Educators: Kean will continue to refine its selection criteria and professional development across several key areas such as: Alignment of all "course content" with P-12 clinical experiences, Mastery of age-appropriate curriculum concepts, Development of collaboratively constructed evaluation methods of candidates to reflect the current Achieve NJ requirements.

Implication 3: Development of an "Implementation to Evaluation Matrix." This is a continuation of the college's work regarding the development of a working matrix that aligns course content, clinical experiences and indicators of acquiring a true working knowledge of the information based on P-12 performance data.

Summary: the data presented in Standard 2 was collected through valid and reliable instruments and have successfully demonstrated inter-rater reliability through the correlative tables which looked at data across cohorts and locations. Kean has and will continue to build highly effective clinical Pre-professional and Professional experiences. By having clinical partnerships build on valued and complementary knowledge, skills and organization culture, the evolution of clinical experiences will continue to rise to a new level of success. The goal of Kean University’s teacher preparation program is to continue to lead with quality preparation for novice professionals that will impact the learning and development
of the P-12 students they will serve.
### Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity

#### i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ETS Praxis Core Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Sets selective admission requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>COE Point of Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Sets selective admission requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Creates and monitors candidate progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transition Point Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Sets selective admission requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Creates and monitors candidate progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Standard 3.6 Assurances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Candidates understand the expectation of the profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HS recruitment initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>COE Plan for Standard 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Sets selective admission requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Creates and monitors candidate progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Candidates understand the expectation of the profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Standard 3 Recruitment of Diverse Populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Standard 3 Plan for Improving the attributes and dispositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Standard 3 Plan for Improving the Criteria for Program Progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Sets selective admission requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Creates and monitors candidate progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Candidates understand the expectation of the profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Standard 3 Plan for Improving the Data Collection in the COE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Table 3.1 COE Point of Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Sets selective admission requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Creates and monitors candidate progress</td>
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3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
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* ii. Analysis of evidence (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that makes the case that the standard is met

**SCOPE OF STANDARD 3

3.1: The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission.

We have recruited, maintained, and graduated a diverse population of teacher candidates representing each of the twenty-one counties in New Jersey. The diversity of this population is enhanced by many University-wide and departmental activities and structures beginning with our admissions process. The University admissions process mirrors that of the College of Education's mission; to provide a diverse population which reflects that of the children attending school in our state and nation. Using a "race-blind" review process, a process that does not consider race and demographic factors, has earned Kean the distinction of being the fifth most diverse university in the nation and has recently been designated as a Hispanic Serving Institution. This has served to populate the College of Education with a student body that represents each of the twenty-one of New Jersey's counties, as well as students from other states.

Kean University and the College of Education have initiatives which involve all departments such as our recruitment activities at the New Jersey Education Association's annual conference where we have a large presence (University Wide Recruitment Document). We have booths, provide brochures and have faculty present to answer questions. We also provide a reception for alumni and invite the New Jersey Teacher of the Year. Additionally, we hold many Open Houses during the year where students learn about the university, meet the President and faculty and attend break-out sessions for the areas which interest them. There is outreach to these students in the weeks following the open house events. Additionally, we have a very robust out-reach and recruitment of New Jersey high school students (High School Recruitment Initiatives). Please see the Plan for Improving Recruitment of Diverse and Representative Populations with a Focus on Critical Shortage Areas for the College of Education.

3.2: The provider sets admissions requirements including CAEP minimum criteria, the state's minimum criteria, or graduate school minimum criteria, whichever is highest, and gathers data to monitor applicants and the selected pool of candidates.

Kean University requires all incoming freshman candidates to the university to provide standardized test scores (SAT/ACT) and allow candidates to utilize a Super Score combination in conjunction with demonstration of academic success on taking required coursework during their high school career (www.kean.edu/admissions/freshman-application-instructions). Students who transfer to Kean University after their first 30 credits at the baccalaureate level, are not required to provide the university with any standardized testing information. Currently, all New Jersey State universities and colleges must accept a completed Associate's degree issued from any of our community colleges and have formally articulated this arrangement through the NJ Transfer process (www.njtransfer.org). Currently, transfer students make up a large portion of the incoming cohorts for teacher education. The entering cohort (candidates who successfully completed
the entry gateway course*) of 2014-15 had 68 transfer candidates out of a cohort of 140 (48%) and 69 out a cohort of 166 (41%) for 2015-2016. These numbers do not take into consideration candidates who attended a community college completing their associate's degree which articulated the gateway course and therefore are not included in the counts presented.

Although CAEP recommends the usage of SAT/ACT measure to determine the average performance on nationally normed ability/achievement assessments; the Kean COE has never used this measure because it would not pertain to a large pool of our candidates. As such, Kean has historically required the admission criteria of the ETS Praxis I Basic Skills Assessment, and more recently, the ETS Praxis Core (www.ets.org/praxis/about/core). Further, the NJDOE required that all candidates entering the professional education unit for teacher preparation must successfully take and pass all three sections of the Praxis Core to demonstrate proficiency (www.state.nj.us/education/educators/rpr/preparation/BasicSkillsExemptionCutScores.pdf). Kean University COE requires that all candidates, both native and transfer student populations, who wish to be considered for admission into the College of Education, must successfully take and pass the Praxis Core Academic Skills for Educators Reading (5712), Core Academic Skills for Educators Writing (5722) and Core Academic Skills for Educators Mathematics (5732).

Table 3.1 Kean COE Point of Entry Table demonstrates a three-year snap shot of what a candidate entering the COE at Kean looks like. Students wishing to enter the education professional sequence of courses are required to take a course during their second semester sophomore year that has an embedded field element in it. As the first column in the chart above stipulates, the course requirements and expectations of "introduction" to the profession; as well as the "retention" of number of candidates further illustrates the selectivity process. The NJDOE requires that all teacher candidates entering the professional sequence of coursework demonstrate a minimum cumulative grade point average of 3.0. As evidenced in the Table 3.1, the cohort average by year exceeds the state minimum considerably and has shown an upward trend of greater success over the past three years. Further, the success of Kean candidates who matriculate into the COE on the Praxis Core exam provides additional support that the data utilized in determining candidates have high academic achievement and ability based against their peers on a nationally recognized assessment. On average, Kean COE admission cohorts have scores approximately 20 points higher in Reading, 7 points higher in Writing and 17 points higher in Mathematics than the required minimum passing score established by the NJDOE. Table 3.2 New Jersey Department of Education Statewide ETS Praxis Core Data is the comparable sample group of all candidates taking the Praxis Core assessment applying for licensure directly through the New Jersey Department of Education. In all three testing areas of Reading, Writing and Mathematics, the Kean candidate cohort average was above that of the state comparison group.

In addition to meeting both external measures set by the NJDOE of cumulative GPA and Praxis Core, candidates as a cohort are required to receive a grade of "C" or better in the gateway introductory course. All three cohorts presented for consideration have averaged between a B+ and A- average. Currently, the NJDOE does not require community colleges to mandate passing the Praxis Core prior to transferring to a four-year institution and thus, candidates transferring into Kean with the intention of being candidates for teacher education are unable to matriculate successfully into the college without scores if they were not aware of this requirement prior to admission. Based on this fact, the COE has worked diligently with our community school partners in sharing the admission criteria information necessary for candidates who wish to enter the professional sequence leading to licensure.
CAEP 3.3 Educators preparation providers establish and monitor attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. Kean University College of Education has established and monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability. Our mission reflects the importance of producing professionals who recognize, respect, and respond appropriately to individual and cultural differences and who can establish professional and collaborative relationships among all educational stakeholders. Candidates have been historically assessed during their Pre-Professional field experience and their Professional Field Internship through the Teacher Work Sample assessment(s). As evidenced in Standard 1.1, candidates are assessed by Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors on the following topics: Respects diverse learners, beliefs and talents; Presents professional presence and maintains professional relationships (InTASC standards 1,2,3,9 & 10). The findings indicated that the majority of candidates met these indicators scoring in the Capable (competent range). Additionally, an analysis of Standard 1.2, addressed the Analysis of Student learning, the Ability to Interpret data and Evidence of Impact on Student Learning, and Reflection/Self-Evaluation (InTASC standards 6, 9 & 10). The data found that the majority of candidates demonstrated competency of interpreting student learning and providing insight on the effectiveness of their instruction and assessment.

CAEP 3.4 The provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates' advancement from admissions through completion. Kean University's COE Unit Assessment Protocol addresses structure of the Unit Assessment System (p 7), The College of Education Assessment System for Initial and Advanced Programs (p 8), the Quality Control System for the current program structure and for the program structure beginning fall 2018 (pp 9-10), the College of Education Key Common Unit & Program Assessments for Initial Programs (pp 11-12), and the Transition Points for Initial Programs (pp 13-16) that identify when and what data is collected. The progression of assessments is meant to ensure that we produce global learners who are aware of the skills necessary for success for learners in the 21st century.

Introductory Stage (Entry to the COE): Common Assessments for Candidates Pursuing Initial Teacher Licensure Attachment

Students entering the COE have earned a GPA of 3.0, or higher, taken 60 credits, and have passed the Praxis Core for Academic Skills for Educators administered by ETS (Standard 3.1, Table 3.1 & 3.2). Candidates are required to complete an introductory course with a field component embedded, which occurs prior to matriculating as an Education major. This course was designed to provide guidance regarding the expectations of the required knowledge, skills and dispositions as presented in our Conceptual Cornerstones. Students must maintain a GPA of 3.0 (checked each semester by assigned advisors, as well as cumulative grade point average scans conducted by the COE Dean's Office).

Pre-Professional Stage (Transition Point 1): As candidate’s progress beyond the Introductory Stage, they are expected to continue to take course work in General Education (60+ credits), course work in the major area of study (non-professional sequence), pedagogical methods course(s), and successfully complete the first clinical experience course/experience. During the clinical course/experience, candidates are required to complete a Teacher Work Sample Level II Portfolio. The Lawshe’s (1975) CVR for this assessment is addressed in Standard 5.2 and the reliability/inter-rater reliability is addressed in Standard 1. Outcome data specific to the success of candidates across three semesters (cohorts) and between campuses (comparative data) can be found in Standard 1.1. Candidates are also required to be observed in the field and demonstrate competency on their clinical field observation form (Pre-Professional).

Transition 1: TWS II and Pre Professional Field Observation Forms
Given the importance of ensuring that candidates demonstrate consistent and substantial...
growth over time, data has been collected on the impact of the clinical experiences on promoting greater performance by the candidates as well as the ultimate outcome on the students within the partnering schools. Using a five point Likert scale (Ranging from "1" to "5"), the candidates were rated by both the university supervisors as well as the cooperating teachers during spring 2015, fall 2015 and spring 2016. As seen in the respective figures, the participants showed consistently high performance. Areas included pertain to the candidates' preparation, proficiency of implementation, and their professional dispositions. In addition, the impact on the P-12 students' learning and development was assessed. These data demonstrate that the candidates are viewed as competent and are able to transfer what they are learning in the courses to what they are able to practice in the field.

Overall means of the observational data collected across programs, areas of growth, location and raters show a highly consistent level of performance. These data help to demonstrate the robust impact of the preparation program. Aside from consistently high ratings across semesters, as presented with the more detailed information contained in the previous figures, the ratings across Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors were highly consistent and correlated at the 0.01 level using the Pearson (2-tailed) SPSS program. Future efforts will be placed upon furthering the participant’s development in both areas.

Demonstration of Content Knowledge (Transition Point 2):
In addition to the data collection listed in the Pre-Professional Stage, candidates are strongly encouraged to register/take the ETS Praxis II Content Knowledge Assessment appropriate for their discipline and required for licensure through the NJDOE (www.ets.org/praxis/nj).

The COE requires that candidates must successfully take and pass all required Praxis II Content licensure exams prior to beginning their Professional Stage experience. Candidates who are not successful in demonstrating passing scores are not permitted to begin the Professional Stage. The COE Administrative Council is in the process of adopting language to establish an appeal process for candidates who meet the NJDOE's Slide Scale (http://www.nj.gov/education/educators/license/gpa.htm) pass rate for licensure. This scale requires a combination of a minimum cumulative grade point average of 3.5 or higher and scores within 5% of the posted passing cut score.

Each year, the College of Education is responsible for submitting data in compliance with the Title II HEOA requirements. Provided through ETS, this comprehensive data set demonstrates the content knowledge of our candidates through the successful Tier 1 pass rates of our candidates who completed our teacher certification programs. The Summary Institution-Level Pass Rate Data: Traditional Teacher Preparation Program Within IHE report issued for 2014-15 provides a three-year comparative summary of Kean University's Institutional Pass Rate and the New Jersey Statewide Pass Rate. Institutionally, Kean University received a 99% Pass Rate for 2014-15 versus the New Jersey Statewide Pass Rate of 95%. Comparatively, Kean had established 100% Pass Rates for the 2013-14 & 2012-13 academic years; whereas, the New Jersey Statewide Pass Rates for the 2013-14 year was 98% and 99% in 2012-13.

Further, Kean University's Title II Single Assessment Institution-Level Pass Rate Data: Traditional Preparation Program Within IHE report provides specific examples and data of the success of all candidates produced through the College of Education by licensure area/content over a three-year period and comparatively with the New Jersey Statewide Pass Rates. The evidence provided in both the Summary Institution-Level Pass Rate Data, as well as, the Single Assessment Institution-Level Pass Rate Data substantiates the demonstration of content knowledge specific to the licensure preparation of all Kean completers. Analysis specific to content areas with focused points of improvement (content areas where Kean candidates satisfied the NJDOE cut-off score for passing but cohort mean was less than statewide average pass rate) has been addressed in Standard 1.

Professional Stage (Transition Point 3):
Candidates who are admitted into the Professional Stage (clinical internship) are completing their program of study, have provided passing scores on all required Praxis II Content Knowledge exams (Standard 1.1b & Standard 4), have a minimum 3.0 cumulative grade point average, have a minimum of 95+ credits institutionally, and demonstrated competency in the first Pre-Professional Clinical Experience (Standard 1.1, and Standard 2) required of the Pre-Professional Stage. Candidates in this final stage are now listed as Clinical Interns and complete a full-time experience in a partnering school district. Candidates are expected to demonstrate minimum rating of "competent" on the Professional Competency Assessment which satisfies the requirements for the Learner and Learning, Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibilities (Standard 1.1). Additionally, Clinical Interns are required to complete the Teacher Work Sample III Portfolio (Standard 1.1 & 1.2). The Lawshe's (1975) CVR for the Professional Competency Assessment, as well as the Teacher Work Sample III Portfolio assessment is addressed in Standard 5.2 and the reliability/inter-rater reliability is addressed in Standard 1. All data provided in Standard 1 is disaggregated by indicator, assessor, total mean, "N", and comparative data between Kean Union and Ocean locations. The data outcomes and establishment of reliability and inter-rater reliability is presented in the analysis of these indicators in Standard 1.

Transition 3: TWS II and Professional Field Observation Forms
As candidates progress from their pre-professional experience to the professional field experience, it is vital to ensure that they continue to demonstrate steady and meaningful growth over time. Data has been collected on the impact of the clinical experiences on promoting greater performance by the candidates as well as the ultimate outcome on the students within the partnering schools. Using a five point Likert scale (Ranging from "1" to "5"), the candidates were rated by both the university supervisors as well as the cooperating teachers during spring 2015, fall 2015 and spring 2016. Presented in the respective figures, the participants showed consistently high performance in a similar manner as their pre-professional field experiences. Areas included pertained to the candidates' preparation, proficiency of implementation, and their professional dispositions. In addition, the impact on the P-12 students' learning and development was assessed. These data demonstrate that the candidates continued to be viewed as competent and transitioned into their professional field placements in a seamless manner.

Overall means of the observational data collected across programs, areas of growth, location and raters show a highly consistent level of performance. These data help to demonstrate the robust impact of the preparation program and the continuity of gains across semesters. As presented with the more detailed information contained in the previous figures, the ratings across Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors were highly consistent and correlated at the 0.01 level using the Pearson (2-tailed) SPSS program. In addition, these gains are highly consistent with the data from the pre-professional placements. Future efforts will be placed upon furthering the participant's development in both content and pedagogical competency.

CAEP 3.5: (Selection at Completion) Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development. The College of Education ensures the quality of our candidates by the systematic assessment which notes growth over time and impact on student learning. This is accomplished through the usage of two sets of data. First, Praxis II Content exam results are submitted by every candidate to the Teacher Performance Center. This required licensure exam for the NJDOE demonstrates that a teacher candidate has successfully provided evidence of content knowledge on a norm-referenced assessment which is proprietary and does not require Kean to determine content validity, reliability or inter-rater reliability. This evidence was presented in Standard 1: Category 2 Content Knowledge. Further collaborative evidence of content knowledge is the completion of a content major
required for teacher preparation in New Jersey. The formal review of successful program completion is handled through the university Registrar's office and is a requirement prior to the issuance of a degree. All initial licensure candidates in New Jersey are required to be in possession of an issued baccalaureate degree, evidence of completion of an appropriate major (content knowledge) and a minimum 3.0 cumulative grade point average to be considered eligible for certification recommendation.

As notated in Standard 1.1 and Standard 3.4, Kean COE candidates are assessed utilizing the TWS II and III assessments, in addition to specific indicators within their clinical field experience observations. The indicators within these assessments (Plans & Implements Instruction, Varies Instructional Strategies, Motivates & Actively Engages Learners, Manages Learner Behavior and Assesses Students' Progress) provide evidence across cohorts, instructional locations and evaluators which provide evidence that our candidates provide effective instruction with positive impacts on P-12 Learning. As detailed in Standard 4, the data provided by the NJDOE specific to the success of our completers during their evaluation of professional practice in the field once hired is further evidence that what data is detailed in Standard 1 & 2 is consistent with the success of our completers once performing in the areas for which they were prepared. Competence is also noted when the students takes the Praxis I examination before entering the program (content knowledge) and the Praxis II examination (pedagogy) before the Professional field experience.

CAEP 3.6: Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate understands the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies.

Candidates receive instruction concerning ethics, professional practice and relevant laws and policies at admission to the program, during the varied field experiences and at the completion of the program. Detailed examples are provided in attachment 3.6 Assurances.

Implications, Summary and Plan for Standard 3:
The timing of this CAEP reporting period has proved to be quite a challenge specific to Standard 3. The purpose of a self-study is to utilize data specific to current practices, protocols and procedures to identify key areas for improvement, strength and growth. However, on November 4, 2015, the New Jersey State Board of Education adopted N.J.A.C. 6A:9A, "Changes to Traditional Route/CEAS Educator Preparation Programming Requirements." Each New Jersey teacher preparation program must submit all initial licensure programs for approval through the NJDOE for April 1, 2017. Provided successful approval is secured, all new programs will be launched at Kean University beginning September 1, 2018. Please reference Plan for Standard 3- Beginning September 2018.
Standard 4: Program Impact

i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard.)

1. NJDOE issued Initial licensure Survey 2016 overview
   - 4.3 Employer satisfaction
   - 4.4 Completer satisfaction
   - A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
   - A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

2. NJDOE issued Standard Survey 2016
   - 4.3 Employer satisfaction
   - 4.4 Completer satisfaction
   - A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
   - A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

3. EPPR Kean Report 2015 issued by NJDOE- Reportcard
   - 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
   - 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
   - 4.3 Employer satisfaction
   - 4.4 Completer satisfaction
   - A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
   - A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

4. EPPR Kean Report 2016 issued by NJDOE- Reportcard
   - 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
   - 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
   - 4.3 Employer satisfaction
   - 4.4 Completer satisfaction
   - A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
   - A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

ii. Analysis of evidence (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that makes the case that the standard is met

SCOPE OF STANDARD 4
Standards 1 through 3 focus on addressing the preparation of the EPP candidates relative to developing knowledge, skills, and abilities by graduation, Standard 4 extends the scope of evaluation while employed in classrooms and schools. As delineated by CAEP, the EPP must provide evidence regarding the impact of its completers on P-12 students learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools. In addition, Kean must provide information on employer satisfaction of its completers as well as the completers’ teaching knowledge and skills. Standard 4 has four primary components that must be addressed in measuring the broader impact of the EPP program on promoting socially significant changes in children, classrooms and schools. The following specific components are directly from CAEP (http://caepnet.org/standards/standard-4):

Component 4.1 Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development - Using multiple measures the provider documents that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. This includes all available growth measures (including value-added measures, student-growth percentiles, and student learning and development objectives) required by the state for its teachers and available to educator preparation providers and other state-supported P-12 impact measures.

Component 4.2 Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness - The provider demonstrates, through structured and validated observation instruments and/or student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.

Component 4.3 Satisfaction of Employers - Using measures that result in valid and reliable data including employment milestones such as promotion and retention, the provider
demonstrates that employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.

Component 4.4 Satisfaction of Completers - Using measures that result in valid and reliable data, the provider demonstrates that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE ADDRESSING STANDARD 4

To address Standard 4, information and data have been obtained through the State of New Jersey Department of Education. The NJ DOE has published Educator Preparation Provider Performance Reports to "Provide transparent data on teacher preparation providers and outcomes" (http://www.nj.gov/education/educators/rpr/preparation/providers/). These reports contain data on newly certified teachers' certification, hiring, placement, classroom assignment, demographics, education, and testing results. Beginning in 2012/2013 the NJ DOE has worked on developing these reports with the first release in 2014. The current 2016 EPP report builds upon previous efforts and provides additional data analyzed in collaboration with the NJ Office of the Secretary of Higher Education. To prepare the report, the NJ Department of Education integrated the data from multiple sources: NJSmart, TCIS, NJSure and other state data collections. The base of the report is a 2 year cohort of teachers who were certified in 12-13 and 13-14 with a CEAS and employed in the 2015-2016 SY in a New Jersey public school as of October 15, 2015. The 2016 EPP Report includes the following specific data elements:

- Certification and Licensure: Number of completers receiving NJ certification/licensure, plus subject areas of endorsement
- Hiring and Persistence: Number of NJ-certified completers employed in NJ public schools and their persistence in the profession
- School Placement and Classroom Assignment: Districts/subject areas of hired NJ-certified completers
- Post-Secondary Education: Undergraduate GPA, major, and transfer history

FINDINGS FROM EVIDENCE

Presented below is the data relevant to the four components of Standard 4 from the 2016 Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report on Kean University. In addition, comparisons with State-wide Data are presented. Prior to addressing each of the four components, information on the Kean Cohort is presented from the report. The data shows that 65% of the CEAS certified completers were hired in 2016. This number was an increase from 56% in 2015. In terms of Race and Gender, the majority of the completers are "white" and "female".

Component 4.1 Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development

As already noted above, Achieve NJ evaluation data were obtained on the Kean's employed completers evaluated in a New Jersey Public School during the 14-15 SY. Included in their report were 596 Individuals from the Kean cohort who were employed. Presented below is a summative evaluation rating with "NE" indicating 'not evaluated'. As indicated in their report, the 'Teacher SGP Score' chart and table represents employed completer's available SGP scores for teachers that were teaching in tested grades and subjects. SGP is an indication of the degree to which a student improves his or her state test performance from one year to the next compared to students across the state with a similar score history.

A. Student Growth Percentile Score

SGP is an indicator of the degree to which a student improves his or her state test performance from one year to the next compared to students across the state with a
similar score history.

B. Student Growth Objective Score

The 'Teacher SGO Score' chart and table shows this EPP's employed completer's available student growth objective scores. SGOs are measures of student learning included in the evaluations of all principals, assistant/vice principals, and teachers in New Jersey. SGOs provide the following Information using a four point scale.

Teacher’s Attainment of Student Growth Objective

Exceptional 4
Full 3
Partial 2
Insufficient 1

Teacher has demonstrated an exceptional impact on learning by exceeding the objective. Teacher has demonstrated a considerable impact on learning by meeting the objective. Teacher has demonstrated some impact on learning but did not meet the objective. Teacher has demonstrated an insufficient impact on learning by falling far short of the objective.

Use of SGO Scores

For Students: SGOs facilitate reflective and collaborative teaching practices, alignment among standards, instruction, and assessment, and improvements in student learning.

For Teachers: SGOs provide a process by which teachers can improve their performance while clearly demonstrating an impact on student progress.

For Principals/APs/VPs: Administrators share in the SGO results of their teachers and can use the SGO process to help ensure students within their schools participate in the most effective educational practices.

Component 4.2 Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

As part of the EPP Report the teacher evaluation consists of two primary components: (1) Teacher Practice (measured primarily by classroom observations); and (2) Student Achievement including the data from the Student Growth Objectives and for a select group of teachers the Student Growth Percentiles as described above. The Teacher Practice Score is obtained by using a state-approved teacher practice instrument (e.g., Danielson, Marzano, et al.) for gathering evidence primarily through classroom observations. As described in the Teacher Evaluation and Support document the Non-tenured teachers will have at least three required 20 minute observations each year involving multiple observers. Tenured teachers have at least two required observations each year. Prior to serving as an observer, the individual must be trained on the instrument which involves at least two “co-observations” throughout the year (http://www.nj.gov/education/AchieveNJ/intro/1PagerTeachers.pdf).

The overall evaluation score combines data from multiple sources of teacher practice and student growth. Teachers in New Jersey earn one of four ratings: Highly Effective, Effective, Partially Effective, or Ineffective and all teachers are provided with an individual professional development plan based on the results. Teachers who are rated Ineffective or Partially Effective work with their school leaders to create a Corrective Action Plan with targeted professional development for the subsequent year. To maintain tenure, all teachers (regardless of hire date) have to continue to earn a rating of Effective or Highly Effective.
The Teacher Practice Score chart and table presented in the state issued EPPR includes the data from AchieveNJ on Kean's employed completer's available scores from local observations in the EPP Kean Report. The graph for Evaluation shows that the vast majority of teachers who are evaluated are rated as "Effective".

Component 4.3 Satisfaction of Employers
In addition to the observations of the teachers, through the EPP process, data are collected that includes employment milestones and the degree to which employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students. Whether or not the completer remains employed one year later, information is still obtained on whether they remained in the same school, district, or within the state of New Jersey. As seen in the Persistence chart(2), with the most recent data, 64.3% of the completers from Kean remained within the same schools, 70.8% remained within the districts, and 91.8% remained within the state of New Jersey.

In partnership with the NJDOE, there is now a required satisfaction survey issued to every completer when they submit their credentials for licensure. The survey was vetted with all 24 teacher preparation programs in NJ and the data results will be shared as they become available. This new process which has just moved beyond pilot has not yielded enough data yet to report; however, the survey instruments are attached (the NJDOE is working directly with CAEP regarding the instrument(s) as they are the proprietor of the instrument) for inclusion with this report. The survey is issued twice. The first survey, (Initial Licensure Survey) is sent via email to all candidates who are recommended through IHEs. Once completed, the NJDOE will proceed with licensure issuance. That data is being collected (as this has been the pilot year) and will be included in subsequent EPPR report cards. A second survey was created and is currently being piloted by the NJDOE (Standard Survey) that will be sent via email to applicants who have completed their provisional teaching time (two years) and have now applied for their standard certificate. Data was not available regarding this instrument at this time. These surveys will be the data reported moving forward from Kean as previously issued surveys were not valid instruments. However, data outcomes regarding those surveys are available on our CAEP webpage http://www.kean.edu/~ncate/CAEP.htm.

In terms of employment and certification endorsement area, the Certification Areas of Endorsement chart in the EPPR show the percent of teachers employed across all of Kean's areas of endorsement. The percent varies from 33% to a high of 100%.

Component 4.4 Satisfaction of Completers
To address Component 4.4, Cumulative GPA (3) of the EPPR are presented regarding the degree to which the program completers' preparation is relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and whether the preparation was effective. First, information is presented on the students median GPA.

Secondly, information is presented in the EPPR on the largest programs at Kean and the employability of the completers.
Thirdly, information is presented on the percent of completers who are employed with one, two, or three/more endorsements. As indicated in the Number of Endorsements Obtained and Employment (1,2) of the EPPR, the possibility of employment increases by obtaining more than one endorsement.

Lastly, information is presented on the median salaries of the teachers who completed the program from Kean. The median salary for teachers in the North region is comparable to the median salary across all EPPs ($51,494). However the salary levels within the Central and South regions are less (i.e., $52,349 and $51,792 respectively).
Additional Information and Analyses
A comparison is presented between Kean and statewide results obtained with all EPP programs.
Hire Rate
Kean NJ Statewide
Employed certified completer in 15-16 SY 62% 65%

Persistence
Persistence Kean NJ Statewide
Persisted In State in 15-16 91.8% 91.5%
Persisted In District in 15-16 70.8% 65.1%
Persisted In School in 15-16 64.3 59.0%

Relationship Between Number of Endorsements and Employment
Kean NJ Statewide
Percent employed as teachers Percent employed as teachers
One Endorsement 58% 61%
two Endorsements 65% 71%
Three or More Endorsements 78% 82%

Evaluation: Effectiveness
The 'Evaluation' chart and table represents a comparison between Kean and NJ Statewide employed completer's available summative evaluation ratings.

Kean Percent employed as teachers NJ Statewide Percent employed as teachers
Highly Effective 5.2% 9.76%
Effective 61.8% 61.22%
Partially Effective 1.2% 1.24%
Ineffective 0.2% 0.13%
NE 31.7% 27.65%

Teacher SGP Score (Evaluated in 14-15 SY)
Kean NJ Statewide
1.00 - 1.84 0% 0.64%
1.85 - 2.64 1% 0.87%
2.65 - 3.49 8% 8.35%
3.50 - 4.00 1.81% 2.55%
NE 90% 87.59%

Teacher Practice Score
Kean NJ Statewide
1.00 - 1.84 0% 0.09%
1.85 - 2.64 2% 1.35%
2.65 - 3.49 63% 62.53%
3.50 - 4.00 4% 7.65%
NE 32% 26.39%

Teacher SGO Score
Kean NJ Statewide
1.00 - 1.84 1% 0.47%
1.85 - 2.64 2% 2.01%
IMPLICATIONS

Based on the results of the New Jersey Department of Education Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report 2016 for Kean University, we are successful across all indicators. Our ratings are aligned with the overall state scores. However, there are implications for future development and changes within the programs at Kean University. These changes will help ensure that Kean continues as a leader in teacher preparation as we strive to meet certain areas of challenge within New Jersey. The ultimate goal is to have highly prepared, exceptionally trained professionals obtaining employment and assisting districts in elevating the positive impact of their programs for students of great diversity across all regions within New Jersey.

Implication 1: Impact of Number and Areas of Endorsement Area on Employment

Data from the Kean EPP report clearly indicates that students who only obtain one area of endorsement are substantially less likely to obtain employment. As the number of endorsements increased from one to three or more, the likelihood of obtaining employment increased. Similar data were reported by in the statewide report. However, as indicated in the figure, Kean is consistently below the state average. It would be beneficial for Kean University to further examine the offering of specific endorsements in relation to the current needs in the state. In addition, it will be important to review each program's content and delivery to ensure that Kean remains competitive in the respective area of endorsement. Lastly and perhaps most importantly, Kean should assist the students in obtaining endorsements in at least two, if not, three areas.

In terms of endorsement areas and employment, there is a clear indication both with Kean completers as well as statewide, that students who graduate with specific areas of endorsement have a lower likelihood of obtaining employment in that content area. In reviewing these data in light of the Teacher Shortage Area data from the EPP reports, it appears that greater emphasis should be placed on meeting these shortage areas to help ensure that Kean students obtain employment.

Implication 2: Improving the Evaluations of Kean Employed Completers

As noted above, the majority of the Kean employed completers are rated as "Effective" (61.8%) with only 5.2% rated as "Highly Effective". In addition, 0.2% are rated as ineffective. While these data are comparable to those within the statewide report as shown in this figure, Kean should continue to develop procedures for increasing the percentage of individuals rated as "highly effective". It is recommended that a focus group of Kean faculty, graduates and school based administrators should be formed and given the charge of developing a set of recommendations to include specific goals, objectives and processes to raise the ratings. Aside from altering content (e.g., lectures, textbooks, format and topics of lectures and discussion), the recommendations may also include the degree to which the programs are preparing graduates in broader areas (e.g., serving as a team member on planning or school based workgroups). Ultimately, the COE could determine how existing program components could be altered, deleted or substituted with other components that may help promote higher evaluation results.

Bridging School/Teacher Based "Outcome" Data with Kean Programs "Process" Data

As part of a "360 evaluation", greater emphasis should be placed on having a seamless and objective evaluation of Kean's teacher preparation programs, participants, and the eventual success of the graduates as they transition from "Kean students" to "Kean completers". Process and outcome measures should not only be aligned but they must also allow faculty and students to monitor progress in acquiring skills and knowledge across
content, methods and practices of teaching, and evaluation methods. A particular area that may be important is whether or not Kean graduates are prepared to assist schools in identifying and targeting areas of need as they evolve over time.

SUMMARY
Kean's College of Education has a long standing record as one of the largest producers of teachers for the State of New Jersey with 37 different state-approved programs in education. We have been accredited by the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) since 1954. The COE seeks to prepare students to think critically, creatively and globally; to adapt to changing social, economic, and technological environments; and to serve as active and contributing members of their communities. In the field of Education, we work to prepare teachers who can develop instruction based on depth of content, learning variables, formative and summative assessments, appreciation for racial, ethnic, cultural and linguistic diversity, facility with the latest technologies for teaching and a commitment to sustained achievement for all. Faculty from across the various colleges on campus work collaboratively to develop our teacher candidates because we believe it takes collaboration across the university to educate a teacher. While overall Kean's Completers are rated "Effective", a greater focus on developing and aligning objective process and outcome data will likely increase success for graduates, employers and the public school students that they serve.
Standard 5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement and Capacity

i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard.)

1. Kean Lawshe Protocol
   5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

2. HEOA Title II Summary Pass Rate
   5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
   5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
   5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

3. HEOA Title II Single Assessment Data
   5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
   5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
   5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

4. ETS Praxis Core Data
   5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

5. COE Plan for Standard 3
   5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

6. Table 3.1 COE Point of Entry
   5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

7. Standard 5 Plan for Improving Data Collection-Maintenance-Accessibility
   5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
   5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
   5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

8. Standard 5 Plan for Improving the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Support Services
   5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
   5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

9. Kean University Unit Assessment System Protocol 2017
   5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
   5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
   5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
   5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
   5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

* ii. Analysis of evidence (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that makes the case that the standard is met

Component 5.1 Quality Assurance System
The provider’s quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP standards.

The College of Education at Kean University believes in the purposeful, systemic and ongoing evaluation of programs, candidates, curricula and instruction. The Unit Assessment
System (UAS) is based on the shared values reflected in the Conceptual Cornerstones Framework (Unit Assessment Protocol, pp 2-5) and links the performance of its candidates to national, state and professional standards and P-12 student learning through the overarching topics of Global Competencies, 21st Century Skills, Equity and Diversity and The Whole Learner. The current UAS is designed to determine eligibility for admission into professional education and to continuously monitor the professional growth of candidates toward proficiency at the initial level. It ensures that all candidates exit the program with the skills, knowledge and dispositions necessary to be prepared to meet the needs of New Jersey’s diverse learners. The existing UAS is a subset of the Kean COE Quality Control System (QCS) (Unit Assessment Protocol, pp 9-10). The QCS at Kean was developed to ensure that all candidates, regardless of program or campus, will be assured the same high-quality, world-class education that Kean University has been successfully providing in the field of Teacher Education since its' inception. In addition to receiving consistent and quality programming, the QCS also supports the quality of the assessments utilized across the process of recruitment, retention, completion and induction into the profession. Due to the impending changes that will be impacting the Kean COE which are mandated by the NJDOE, two versions of the QCS are being provided. (Current-spring 2018 & fall 2018).

The University Assessment System (Unit Assessment Protocol, p 8) is based on the belief that assessment is both developmental and continuous. Candidates must have the opportunity to connect their own practice to the learning of P-12 students. These learning opportunities must be at the core of our teacher education program and assessment is integral in the process. As candidates progress through the teacher education program, they engage in multiple assessments (Praxis Core, Teacher Work Sample II & III Portfolios, Praxis II and Field Experiences) that allow both faculty and candidates to reflect on their teaching and learning and to use this information for continuous improvement of both candidate performance and program implementation. Data from the initial programs are regularly and systemically compiled (collected each semester and uploaded to a webpage for easy access), analyzed and reported for the purpose of improving candidate performance, program quality and unit operations (http://www.kean.edu/~ncate/CAEP.htm). This continuous assessment data is utilized by program faculty to monitor the success and areas for improvement which were utilized within program area reports submitted through appropriate professional associations toward receiving national recognition. The COE also participates in the institutional Middle States assessment effort, as well as providing yearly program and student learning outcome assessment reports. Kean University is committed to the on-going professional development of the faculty and provides one week each semester on professional development topics where assessment is a prominent theme.

Component 5.2 Quality Assessment Measures
The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

The Unit Assessment System has a common framework (Conceptual Cornerstones) that is shared by all programs at the initial level. The following are common elements:
1. Candidates’ knowledge, skills and dispositions are assessed continuously based on unit standards and outcomes as well as state and national standards.
2. Multiple assessments are used to evaluate candidate performance in a variety of ways.
   a. Praxis Core (proprietary assessment issued by ETS and required for program admission by the NJDOE)- Standard 1 & 3
   b. Teacher Work Sample Portfolio Rubrics Level II (Lawshe's (1975) rating scale Content Validity 2016)* Standard 1 & 3
   c. Teacher Work Sample Portfolio Rubrics Level III (Lawshe's (1975) rating scale Content Validity 2016)* Standard 1 & 3
   d. Professional Internship Performance Competency Assessment Worksheet-Midterm (Lawshe's (1975) rating scale Content Validity 2016)** - Standard 1, 2 & 3
**Beginning in the fall of 2017, all teacher candidates in New Jersey will be required to complete the edTPA by Pearson during their final clinical internship. During the year 2017-18, the NJDOE will require that candidates successfully complete an edTPA portfolio for review; however, there will be no consequential cut score and candidates will be issued their licensure through the NJDOE provided each candidate successfully completes the submission. As of fall 2018, all candidates will be required to complete the edTPA by Pearson (for their initial licensure area only (Early Childhood/Elementary/Secondary Areas); additionally, the New Jersey Board of Education set the cut score to be one standard measure of evidence below the national recommendation (http://www.nj.gov/education/educators/rpr/preparation/assessment). Beginning in 2019 and beyond, the NJDOE will utilize the collected data from the prior two years to set the cut-score moving forward. As such, the edTPA assessment will replace the Teacher Work Sample Level II and Level III requirements within the UAS. Since this is a proprietary assessment which is scored through Pearson under the guidance of SCALE, we will not need to establish validity, reliability or inter-rater reliability (http://www.edtpa.com). However, all program courses across the COE will need to be updated to reflect the knowledge and skills required to meet the edTPA targets.

**Beginning in the fall of 2018, all teacher education programs must revise their required field experiences (as well as other program admission and completion requirements) by submitting for Program Approval through the NJDOE (March, 2017). Per the NJDOE, the duration of at least two consecutive semesters must meet a minimum of 175 hours leading up to one semester of full-time clinical practice, at least 100 of which must occur in the semester immediately preceding full-time clinical practice. Kean has proposed that across all initial licensure programs, the university will require candidates to complete 4 semesters of clinical experiences: 50+ hours in the introductory course (2nd Semester Sophomore year/1st Semester Junior year), a minimum of 75 hours during 2nd semester Junior year, a minimum of 100 hours during 1st semester Senior year and a Full-Time (5 days per week) clinical internship during their 2nd semester Senior Year.

As a result of this significant change to our current clinical requirements, in addition to the embedded requirement by the NJDOE specific to edTPA during a candidate’s senior clinical internship, the existing Professional Internship Performance Competency Assessment Worksheets will need to be amended. Currently, the Standard 2 Clinical Experience Subcommittee is actively engaged in redesigning a tool which will be used for clinical experiences 2, 3 & 4 to ensure that we are able to monitor growth-over-time of our candidates, successfully demonstrate Content Validity of the instrument, prepare training modules for all university supervisors, faculty, and cooperating teachers and collect pilot data to demonstrate inter-rater reliability on the scoring. Our implementation timeline suggests that we will be prepared to move forward with our valid instrument for data collection beginning in the fall of 2018.

The Teacher Work Sample Assessments II and III, as well as the Professional Internship Performance Competency Assessment (Midterm & Final) were all tested for content validity utilizing the Lawshe’s (1975) rating scale for Content Validity in the late fall, 2016. Ten practicing administrators ranging in rank from supervisor to principal and who are subject matter experts in the state of New Jersey, were provided a survey and asked to rate items
utilizing Lawshe’s (1975) scale. Four items were assessed utilizing a three option rating system: "essential," "useful, but not essential," and "not necessary." These items are as follows:
1. The tool is an appropriate measurement of teaching competency.
2. The tool is clear and conducive to assessing an effective teacher.
3. Each of the components collectively measures the teacher’s ability.
4. It is my opinion that this tool is: (essential, useful but not essential, or not necessary). Based on the number of participants (10), a CVR value of .62 is required to prove content validity.

Outcomes: Based on the Lawshe's CVR equation, the Teacher Work Sample Assessment Worksheet for Level II and III both meet content validity specific to the tool being essential and thus, we conclude that despite the tool marginally missing CVR for competency and effectiveness, the experts agree that the tool is in fact valid for data collection purposes as the components of the instrument were deemed essential. Additional data specific to the reliability and inter-reliability of the ratings are addressed in Standard 1. It should be noted that the TWS will no longer be utilized for data collection in the Assessment system beginning fall 2017 due to the mandatory shift to edTPA per the new Jersey Department of Education regulations. Since edTPA is a proprietary instrument of SCALE and Pearson, Kean University will no longer be required to provide evidence of content validity, reliability or inter-rater reliability specific to these assessments.

The Lawshe's CVR equation regarding the Professional Internship Performance Competency Assessment Midterm and Final both meet content validity specific to the tool as essential. Despite narrowly missing the required CVR of .62 (Item 1 & Item 2 scored .6), the tool was seen as useful but not necessarily essential. Although the instrument satisfies content validity for the components and tool as essential, it is the belief of the COE Administrative Council and the CAEP Steering Committee that the clinical field instruments needs to be realigned to match the evaluation tools utilized in our partnering K12 school districts (See Component 5.3-Achieve NJ). It is also very important to ascertain CV, Reliability and Inter-rater reliability of our Cooperating Teachers and Clinical Supervisors of the new assessment tools and rubrics which are currently under development to satisfy the new program requirements set forth by the NJDOE specific to clinical experiences and program approval required by all New Jersey teacher preparation programs in March, 2017. It should be noted that reliability and inter-rater reliability were addressed specific to this instrument and the findings in Standard 1 and 2.

Component 5.3 Continuous Improvement
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.
At the time of the last NCATE visit, the unit had a well-developed system of assessing and monitoring candidate performance. All standards were met with no areas for improvement. The system assessed each individual candidate at critical stages aligned to the conceptual framework of the SPECTRUM. Data from individual assessments were used for monitoring and improving individual candidate performance, and the unit was beginning to systemically aggregate, summarize and use data for program improvement. Additionally, the College was beginning the implementation and assessment of an Educational Portfolio to collect data about P-12 student learning.

However, in June of 2014, the faculty and clinical instructors believed that it was necessary to re-evaluate the SPECTRUM model and adopt a framework that was more reflective of the diverse New Jersey public schools that our candidates were serving. Additionally, the New Jersey Department of Education moved to require a formalized assessment system of in-service teachers known as Achieve NJ (http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/). This formalized review for teacher retention/performance/tenure enacted by the NJDOE served as the groundwork for re-conceptualizing the competencies our candidates need to become successful practitioners under this model. Hence, the COE adopted the Conceptual Cornerstones Framework (Unit Assessment Protocol, pp 2-5) which focuses on the development and competency of four areas: Global Competencies, 21st Century Skills, Equity and Diversity and The Whole Learner. Candidates are able to demonstrate mastery of those competencies through Five Domains: Academic Content Knowledge & Planning for Learning (Teacher Work Sample Portfolio/Praxis Core/Praxis II, content-specific rubrics), Environments for Learning (Teacher Work Sample), Instructional Practices for Learning (Pre-Professional and Professional Field Evaluations), Professional Dispositions (Pre-Professional and Professional Field Evaluations) and Values for Learning and Networks for Learning (Teacher Work Sample and Pre-Professional and Professional Field Evaluations).

With the involvement of the professional community, the COE regularly evaluates the capacity and effectiveness of the assessment system. The Dean of the College of Education (COE) holds monthly Administrative Council Meetings with department chairs and other COE faculty at which assessments and their results are discussed. Advisory meetings with faculty, university supervisors, principals and cooperating teachers and at Superintendent Luncheons, the COE shares assessment data and solicits suggestions and input from school partners.

The UAS provides regular and comprehensive data on program quality, unit operations and candidate performance at the each stage of its programs, extending into the first years of candidates completers’ practice. As seen in the Unit Assessment Protocol, Initial Common Unit & Program Assessments (Unit Assessment Protocol, pps11-16) data is collected from many sources at critical points (transition points), is reported to all stakeholders and is used to make assessment, program and unit decisions.

Assessment data from candidates, graduates, faculty and other members of the professional community are based on multiple assessments from both internal and external sources that are systematically collected as candidate’s progress through the system. As demonstrated in the Unit Assessment Protocol, (Transition Points, pp 13-17) a clear outline of the multiple assessments is required at each critical stage, regardless of whether the assessments are internal or external, who collects the data, how and when the data are collected and processed and how that data is used for candidate/program/unit improvement (http://www.kean.edu/~ncate/CAEP.htm Assessment Reports by Program).

Data are disaggregated by programs when candidates are in alternate, off-campus and distance learning programs. In 2007, Kean University began to offer southern New Jersey residents the opportunity to earn a Kean University degree and/or teacher certification on the Ocean County College (OCC) campus in Toms River, New Jersey. Kean Ocean provides candidates from the southern region of New Jersey to be formally trained through the high-quality teacher preparation program originated at the Kean Union campus while completing their baccalaureate degree (www.ocean.edu/content/public/kean-ocean-students.html).

Kean faculty are housed in both locations and all of the support services offered at Kean
Union are made available to those participating through the Kean Ocean campus. There is parity of service for candidates regardless of campus as they complete their professional sequence of courses.

The COE regularly and systematically compiles, aggregates, summarizes, analyzes and publicly reports data as shown in the Assessment System timeline (Unit Assessment Protocol, pp 20-21) for the purpose of improving candidate performance, program quality and unit operations. In addition to this timeline, faculty and university partners can access the regularly collected data on our CAEP web page (http://www.kean.edu/~ncate/CAEP.htm). This format allows for an open and transparent process of data sharing across departments and campuses.

Component 5.4 Completer Impact
Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.

As reported in Standard 4, the New Jersey Department of Education began producing the Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report (EPPAR) for public release in 2015. The university profile provides evidence specific to hire rates, persistence of hired candidates in the school, district and state and looks at the identified cohort by variables such as race and gender. In addition to providing institutional performance data of our graduates, the EPPAR also compares the success of Kean graduates against others in the field. The 2016 EPPAR report stated that 78% of the candidates who received three or more licenses from Kean upon graduation were employed. Additionally, 65% of candidates with two endorsements and 58% of candidates with one endorsement were employed over the two year hiring window being examined (2014-15 & 2015-16). According to the EPPAR, 62% of Kean completers were employed compared to the 58% of candidates produced from one of the other 23 teacher preparation programs across New Jersey. (http://www.state.nj.us/education/educators/rpr/preparation/providers/2016/Kean/EPP.pdf)

As previously mentioned, the state mandates Achieve NJ (http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ), which requires a summative rating in the following four areas: Summative Evaluation, Teacher SGP score, Teacher Practice score and the Teacher SGO score. Kean completers who were teaching during the 2014-15 school year scored consistently well across all areas.

Summative Evaluation:
The Summative Evaluation scores retrieved from NJSMART showed that 7.2% were Highly Effective, 85.5% were Effective, 1.8% were Partially Effective and .2% were Ineffective. A population of 5.5% were not evaluated based on their subject area assignment.

Evaluation- Teacher SGP:
The largest percentage of candidates that were Kean completers were in the "non-evaluated" category of 87%. Those who scored in the range of 2.65-4.0 equaled 10% with a small group of 3% performing between 1.85-2.64.

Evaluation- Teacher Practice Score:
The greatest performance area was found in the 2.65-3.49 range for Kean candidates (87%). Only 5% of the candidates scored in the 3.5-4.0 range and 2% scored between 1.85-2.64. No candidates scored below a 1.85 and 6% of the candidates in this pool were non-evaluated.

Evaluation: Teacher SGO Score:
Kean completers demonstrated strength in this particular area of evaluation. The top tier of 3.5-4.0 reached 65% with another 22% scoring between 2.65-3.49 for a total of 87% of the 2014-15 data pool.

The data provided specific to P-12 student success and the effectiveness of our candidates in the classroom upon program completion is currently limited to this institutional data that does not permit us to mine deeper specific to licensure area or district/region of the schools.
where they are hired per the negotiation between the NJDOE and the New Jersey Education Association. Despite the "helicopter" view of data, Kean graduates are demonstrating success in the growth of their P-12 students and are viewed as successful professionals based on the retention/persistence data provided of 91%. We believe our candidates have scored well on these evaluative tools during their professional induction due to the extensive practice through the Teacher Work Sample assessments spanning across their final two clinical experiences prior to graduation.

Decision Making Based on Data Analysis:
The EPPAR report was shared with the entire COE during our faculty/staff retreat in December, 2016. Based on the outcomes, program faculty determined that candidates receiving one license upon graduation were not hired at the same percentage as those with two or more licenses. Kean University is required to submit all of our initial licensure programs to the NJDOE for program approval in March, 2017. Based on the data provided through the EPPAR, both the Early Childhood and Elementary faculty determined that their candidates needed to graduate with more than one license and the data supported the creation of dual licensure programs addressing the critical shortage areas of special education and bilingual education. As such, the Early Childhood faculty are currently developing a curriculum that would require all candidates to become dually certified in P-3 (early childhood) & Teacher of Students with Disabilities (special education). Additionally, the Elementary faculty are creating two dual licensure program: K-6 (elementary education) & Teacher of Students with Disabilities (special education) and K-6 (elementary education) & Bilingual Education. If candidates co-major in English, Mathematics, History, Science or World Languages, they will be encouraged to take one additional course which would also entitle them to a 5-8 endorsement (middle school content area) and hence graduate with a minimum of three licenses (which had the highest yield regarding hiring rates).

Component 5.5 Stakeholder/partner involvement
The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence. The unit has fully developed evaluations and continuously searches for stronger relationships between candidate performance and program outcomes in those evaluations, revising both the underlying data systems and analytic techniques as necessary. The COE has fully developed evaluations using input from faculty, university supervisors, cooperating teachers via program and advisory council meetings and using completer/report card feedback from candidates. By reformatting the reporting of data to show the means for each competency of individual evaluations, and disaggregating the data by not just program, but also by the status of candidates, allows for programs to better analyze data for program improvement.

The COE will also be instituting a COE Advisory Board which will address matters beyond clinical partnerships. As the college continues to develop professional relationships with public/private schools across New Jersey, it has become apparent that ensuring high-quality responsive programming is a priority for both the university and the college as well. The COE Advisory Board will have a membership of university-wide administrators, faculty (from Union and Ocean campuses), alumni, university supervisors, cooperating teachers and current students. The goal is to provide the COE administration and faculty with feedback regarding existing programming, the development of new programming in response to the needs of the community and a place to generate ideas for external funding that would allow the COE to expand their connections and relationships.

Kean has always made decisions specific to the direction of the college and our programming with our stakeholders. Effective fall 2017, all candidates completing a teacher preparation program at Kean University will be required to successfully complete an edTPA portfolio, have it scored through Pearson and submit scores to be issued licensure through the NJDOE. Although many institutions like Kean utilized hybrid forms of the Teacher Work
Sample initially submitted by the Renaissance Group (http://www.wku.edu/rtwsc/publications_research.php), the NJDOE chose the edTPA after a selection process and made the usage of the tool mandatory for all twenty-four teacher preparation programs across New Jersey. As such, since clinical internships take place in our partnering P-12 schools/districts, it was imperative to include our partners in the discussion of planning and piloting toward full execution in the fall 2017. On January 27, 2017, Kean University hosted close to 200 participants in an edTPA training offered through Pearson. This multi-layered training was open to university faculty, clinical instructors, university supervisors, cooperating teachers and school partners. This training was the first step of many regarding the redevelopment of clinical instruments, rubrics and evaluation re-alignments necessary to make our teacher preparation program a seamless transfer to the expectations of professional induction and lifelong learning. As our faculty continue to reconceive their programs during the state approval process, utilization of our school partners and professional associations are key in maintaining Kean's long-standing reputation for producing outstanding teachers, including three consecutive New Jersey Teachers of the Year (2012, 2013 and 2014).
III. Cross-cutting themes

a. Statement of integration of diversity
   i. Analysis of evidence that demonstrates diversity integration

The professional education unit at Kean prepares candidates who will serve increasingly diverse classrooms across New Jersey and beyond. Recognized as a Hispanic Serving Institution, Kean proudly acknowledges the importance of recruiting diverse candidates and our goal as a teacher preparation program continues to be focused on the development of those diverse candidates to serve the communities they represent and live in.

Kean's commitment to diversity is evident in our Conceptual Cornerstones which acknowledges diversity as an essential component. We believe in preparing informed, dynamic professionals who will be sensitive to the unique learning styles of the P12 students they serve. The programs offered at Kean support the pursuit of diverse experiences for all candidates in all programs. Every initial program utilizes the Teacher Work Sample II, Teacher Work Sample III, Pre Professional Assessment and Professional Assessment to collect data on the progress of our candidates.

Knowledge: Teacher candidates within the unit rely upon contextual factors to design instruction that accommodates for various learning styles (Teacher Work Sample II & Teacher Work Sample III). As evidenced in the findings for TWS II & III, candidates scored well specific to Contextual Factors and the majority of disciplines had higher ratings issued by course instructors versus university supervisors. Candidates scored consistent or higher demonstrating progress from TWS II which is issued in their first clinical experience compared to TWS III which is scored during their clinical internship prior to program completion. The data for Standard 1 (Data Tables for Standard 1- 1.1, 1.2 & 1.5) demonstrate that Course Instructors scored Contextual Factors higher during the TWS III assignment with a total mean of 4.48 as compared to 4.21 for TWS II. Since candidates are only introduced to contextual factors during the TWS II assignment, the data suggests growth over time which is important. Further, University supervisors had a higher mean (4.82) than the course instructors. The data also suggests that candidates at Kean-Ocean scored higher than candidates at Kean-Union at the course level; however, the Kean-Ocean candidates scored slightly lower than the Kean-Union cohort when scores were analyzed by University Supervisors (KU-Ocean= 4.77, KU-Union= 4.82). Despite the minor inconsistencies across locations, all Kean candidates demonstrate competency and growth specific to this indicator.

Skills: Teacher candidates within the unit rely upon multimodal instructional strategies to promote higher order thinking and problem solving skills of all learners. The data for Standard 1 (Data Tables for Standard 1- 1.1, 1.2 & 1.5) indicate that candidates are assessed through the Preprofessional and Professional clinical assessments are measures that specifically address this indicator. It is imperative for new teacher candidates to be able to actively engage their students and make the learning experience both relevant and accessible. When reviewing the data for the indicator Motivates & Actively Engages Learners, Kean candidates consistently scored well by both assessors across both assessments. The data demonstrates that candidates were able to demonstrate growth over time from their initial evaluation during the Pre Professional experience with a mean score of 4.55 (Cooperating Teacher) and 4.51 (University Supervisor) to 4.77 (Cooperating Teacher) and 4.76 (University Supervisor). Specific to this indicator, Cooperating teachers were almost exactly the same in scoring across instructional locations (KU-Union= 4.77 & KU-Ocean= 4.78).

Dispositions: Teacher candidates are respectful of the unique, diverse talents of all
learners and promote the development of self-confidence and competence. Additionally, teacher candidates are aware of community and cultural norms and demonstrate sensitivity to these in a consistent and nurturing manner. As evidenced in TWS III Reflection and Self Evaluation and in the Pre Professional and Professional Assessment indicator Respects the diverse talents of learner, their cultural beliefs and values, Kean candidates are successful. The data for Standard 1 (Data Tables for Standard 1- 1.1, 1.2 & 1.5) show the comparison of data from the Pre Professional Assessment and the Professional Assessment and disaggregated by Cooperating Teacher, University Supervisor and location (KU-Union/KU-Ocean). The data suggest that the total mean assessed by the Cooperating Teacher during the Pre Professional Assessment was 4.81 and demonstrated upward growth to 4.90 on the Professional Assessment. Further, University Supervisors had an average mean of 4.85 on the Pre Professional Assessment which increased to a 4.93 on the Professional Assessment. Throughout the professional preparation program, candidates are challenged to apply what they know in a meaningful and purposeful way. Teacher Work Sample provided the academic exercise in preparation for the final clinical experience and ultimate submission of the TWS III during the clinical internship and capstone course. The increase in ability suggested by this indicator provides further evidence of the success of our candidate's in addressing the integration of diversity.

It is important to note that the Reflection and Self-Evaluation indicator from TWS III which is isolated for review in the data for Standard 1 (Data Tables for Standard 1- 1.1, 1.2 & 1.5) does provide further evidence that all candidates completing the teacher preparation program at Kean are reflective and mindful of the P12 students they serve. Of all the indicators, this particular one had the greatest difference between the Course Instructor total mean (4.55) and the University Supervisor (4.74). During review of the data, it was suggested by faculty and those who were instructing the capstone course that they could only "score" this indicator based on what was written and submitted without the benefit of "seeing" the candidate in action while working with candidates and putting their reflection into practice. Although anecdotal, it would justify the large stretch specific to this indicator in an area which the college feels is one of the most important practices for new teachers to master.

As previously stated, all New Jersey teacher preparation programs will be launching a newly approved professional sequence for preparation beginning September 1, 2018. This new professional sequence will require additional clinical hours, experiences and the addition of edTPA. The use of the TWS II & III; as well as the existing Pre Professional and Professional Clinical Assessments will no longer be the measures utilized to support this area. Newly developed assessments for the clinical experiences leading up to the clinical internship will be aligned to edTPA and the outcome data of edTPA will be utilized to support the success of our candidates specific to this cross-cutting theme. Further, the clinical assessments will continue to address all the InTASC standards as evidenced in our Conceptual Cornerstones and program/standards alignment matrix.

b. Statement of integration of technology

i. Analysis of evidence that demonstrates technology integration

Technology integration is a hallmark across all initial teacher preparation programs at Kean. The College of Education is considered an exemplar across the university specific to the use of technology. The unit provides professional development through COEpdi (College of Education Professional Development Initiative) that focuses on a range of topics that include technology, 21st Century skill building, integration into educational opportunities for candidates and infusion across our curriculum. During the fall semester, COEpdi invited partners form the NJDOE to present to faculty about the technology initiatives in the P12 schools and how we can continue to develop new programming responsive to the needs of our P12 students.
Further, the university has supported the purchase and integration of Chalk & Wire as a new portfolio and data maintenance system. As we prepare to launch Chalk & Wire in the fall 2017 semester, candidates will be responsible for uploading, maintaining and presenting evidence of program matriculation, competency and completion during their program of study at Kean. Additionally, all candidates across New Jersey will be responsible for the completion of Pearson's edTPA; which is an online portfolio with video support for completers to demonstrate competency prior to licensure issuance. All initial licensure programs are currently revising their programs to add in more opportunities for candidates to use video as a reflective measure, stronger technology infusion through instruction and more comprehensive rubrics specific to supporting these 21st Century skills and initiatives.

Although technology is infused across the curriculum of each program and is reported by program specific to the professional associations, one particular indicator in the Professional Competency was focused on specific to this area. The indicator "Utilizes Technology & Media" is a required observable skill for all candidates in their final clinical internship. The data suggests that candidates were evenly observed regarding the total mean (Cooperating Teachers 4.77 and University Supervisors 4.75). Further candidates who were completers from the Kean-Ocean location scored higher by both Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors over their Kean-Union counterparts. There are other measurable outcomes specific to technology which is supported in our Conceptual Cornerstones, Assessment System and within the data sets provided for Teacher Work Sample as well.

It is important to acknowledge that the "N' being reported is inconsistent between both groups. There were candidates that required more observations and thus, the number of indicators increased which skewed the "N". Moving forward, as we collect our data utilizing Chalk & Wire, we will have the capability to remove duplicates and to ensure that there is only one counted indicator per candidate.

As previously stated, all New Jersey teacher preparation programs will be launching a newly approved professional sequence for preparation beginning September 1, 2018. This new professional sequence will require additional clinical hours, experiences and the addition of edTPA. The use of the TWS II & III; as well as the existing Pre Professional and Professional Clinical Assessments will no longer be the measures utilized to support this area. Newly developed assessments for the clinical experiences leading up to the clinical internship will be aligned to edTPA and the outcome data of edTPA will be utilized to support the success of our candidates specific to this cross-cutting theme. Further, the clinical assessments will continue to address all the InTASC standards as evidenced in our Conceptual Cornerstones and program/standards alignment matrix.
IV. Areas for Improvement (AFIs) from previous accreditation decisions, if any

a. Statement of progress in support of removing the AFI(s)

Kean University does not have any AFI(s) on record.

b. Overview of evidence in support of removing the AFI(s)

No Evidence found.

c. Holistic summary statement (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that provides a narrative explication for how the evidence collection, taken as a whole, demonstrates that area(s) for improvement are corrected.
V. Selected Improvement Plan

a. Provide a description of the selected area for improvement and a rationale for selection.

After careful consideration and reflection on the process of preparing for our self-study, the College of Education determined that the area for selected improvement moving forward would be Standard 3. As indicated previously in the narrative for Standard 3, the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) passed regulations in November of 2015, significantly impacting teacher preparation programs. Targeted areas for program redesign and mandatory approval through the NJDOE are amended admission criteria, added curriculum requirements, an increase in clinical experiences and hours and the successful completion of the Pearson edTPA prior to program completion and issuance of licensure. Every teacher preparation program in New Jersey must submit their initial licensure programs for review and re-approval by October, 2017 and be fully prepared to launch in full compliance beginning September 1, 2018.

b. Identify goals and objectives aligned with the selected area for improvement

The following goals and objectives are identified specific to our selected area for improvement:

1. Admission/recruitment: Currently, all candidates entering Kean University’s College of Education must provide evidence of successfully passing the ETS Praxis CORE exam(s) which is in compliance with the regulations for all New Jersey teacher preparation programs. Although the NJDOE now allows candidates who demonstrate a certain score on the SAT/ACT/GRE as a waiver, Kean has not participated in that process. In the spirit of providing our candidates with every opportunity to successfully matriculate into the college as a native or transfer candidate seamlessly, the COE will amend our admission policy to allow candidates to use appropriate standardized test scores for admission. Further, the COE will develop articulated language with feeder community colleges to ensure that all candidates are aware of the test for admission and to co-instruct the gateway course at the community colleges to ensure candidates enter the professional sequence of courses appropriately.

2. Redevelopment of all assessment instruments: Due to curriculum changes, clinical experience amendments and addition of edTPA as a performance assessment, all existing instruments that measure growth and progress of our candidates (Teacher Work Sample & Professional Clinical assessments) need to be completely re-developed. Once developed, all instruments will need to establish content validity and specific training protocols need to be implemented to ensure reliability and inter-rater reliability across our instructional locations.

3. Development and implementation of Chalk & Wire (data collection and evaluation system): Currently, data is collected from faculty and clinical instructors by program coordinators. That data is then submitted to the Director of Accreditation and Assessment for recording. The outcomes are then made available on our internal "CAEP Assessment" webpage. Since data is collected differently by program and reported differently as well, moving to Chalk & Wire will allow the college to look at each assessment and data collection point from a micro to macro level. Piloting of C&W will begin fall 2017 with a full implementation to follow the launch of newly approved programs in September, 2018.

c. Describe the specific strategies and interventions to be implemented in the Selected Improvement Plan along with a timeline for implementation

1. Admission/recruitment

Objective: Establish new articulation with community colleges regarding gateway course Baseline: No existing co-contructed process/course/protocol exists
Year 1 (2017-18): Schedule meetings, formulate new articulation agreements
Year 2-7 (2018-24): Offer gateway courses at both Kean and targeted Community Colleges. Analyze outcome data and do comparative analysis of native/transfer candidate
success looking at course grades and required field assessment per 50 hour requirement.

2. Redevelopment of all assessment instruments
Objective: Create new critical assessments that monitor candidate progress and growth-over-time specific to clinical experiences and the progressional development and preparation for completing the required state performance assessment.
Year 1 (2017-18): Utilizing the Faculty Coordinator's group and the Sub-Committee for Standard 2, begin inclusive meeting with school and community partners and current and former students in the development of new assessments that will be aligned to InTASC/Professional Associations/NJPST.
Year 2 (2018-19): Pilot newly designed assessments for baseline data.
Year 3-7 (2019-2024): Analyze outcome data and do comparative analysis of cohorts/instructional locations/raters to ensure data quality.

3. Development and Implementation of Chalk & Wire
Objective: To develop program based data collection system that will allow for the analysis of a program from the micro to macro level and to track the development of individual candidates throughout the professional sequence of preparation.
Year 1 (2017-18): Working with Chalk & Wire, establish a small leadership group to begin the development and initial design of pilot programs for data collection.
Year 2 (2018-19): Launch data collection profiles for all initial licensure programs and begin to fully implement data collection in alignment with the newly approved programs.
Year 3-7 (2019-2024): Analyze outcome data and do comparative analysis of cohorts/instructional locations/raters to ensure data quality.

* d. Present a complete description of the assessment plan that details how each goal or objective is to be assessed

Data Collection and Analysis:

1. Admission/recruitment: Data will be collected on candidates taking courses both at community college(s) and at Kean to determine if parity is found between both. Data will be collected through Chalk and Wire to ensure consistency. Monitoring will be overseen by the Director for Accreditation and Assessment and shared with the COE Administrative Council, Program Coordinator's and with Community College colleagues. Annually, the data sets will be compared and recommendations regarding instruction, assessment reliability and outcomes will be reviewed.

2. Redevelopment of all assessment instruments: A committee comprised of university faculty, clinical instructors, P12 partners, and current/former students will review existing instruments and make recommendations to ensure that the assessments adequately reflect the Knowledge/skills/dispositions required for success as public school teachers. Each instrument will be aligned to InTASC, NJPST and all professional associations. Once the instrument has been established, each instrument will go through content validity testing and protocols established for instrument usage created and piloted. The pilot data will further support additional development or baseline data for future analysis.

3. Development and Implementation of Chalk & Wire: A small leadership committee will be trained through Chalk and Wire regarding the development of individual program data collection needs. Each “table of contents” will be created to collect data systemically (each semester) and to have all data outcomes provided to program faculty semesterly. Two initial licensure programs will be piloted to establish baseline data collection and analysis in year 1 while the rest of the programs are being loaded in. Since this system will be charged with utilizing the newly created assessments addressed in #2, the timeline will be fluid as only valid instruments will be utilized to ensure quality data collection.
e. Describe the resources available to implement the plan. This includes staffing and faculty cost (time, salary, or reassignment time), budgeting impacts such as travel or training costs, expertise, and other resources

The COE, under the leadership of the Dean, will establish appropriate working groups to ensure the implementation of the goals and objectives for our selected improvement.

The Director for Accreditation and Assessment will be charged with the oversight of assessment development and lead on the implementation of Chalk & Wire. These responsibilities are within the description of this position and will continue to have the support of the Dean and executive administration in the implementation of these directives.

Kean University has signed a formal agreement to purchase Chalk & Wire and has requested initial implementation meetings to begin in April/May 2017. The university has committed all necessary funds for full implementation and is currently considering utilizing it for other areas outside of the College of Education once the piloting phase has been successfully completed.

Utilizing the COE Administrative Council, Program Coordinator’s and university-wide admission (undergraduate/graduate) personnel, a committee focused on the development of newly articulated COE courses and admission procedures will be established. Under the direction of the COE Dean, with the support of the executive administration, the working committee will establish all appropriate inter-institutional arrangements regarding course offering/scheduling and clearly articulated admission criteria to be in compliance with the NJDOE regulations on teacher preparation program admission.

If preferred, please upload entire SI plan as an attachment here.

Selected Improvement Plan Evidence
No Evidence found
### State Standard(s) Evidence

**Evidence/data/tables** (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard and answer any questions provided by the state.)

1. 📝 Kean University Conceptual Cornerstones & Standards Crosswalk
2. 📝 Standard 1 Alignment to InTASC Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Code</th>
<th>Standard Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x.5.NJ01</td>
<td>NJ Standard 1. Learner Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.5.NJ02</td>
<td>NJ Standard 2. Learning Differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.5.NJ03</td>
<td>NJ Standard 3. Learning Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.5.NJ04</td>
<td>NJ Standard 4. Content Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.5.NJ05</td>
<td>NJ Standard 5. Application of Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.5.NJ06</td>
<td>NJ Standard 6. Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.5.NJ07</td>
<td>NJ Standard 7. Planning for Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.5.NJ08</td>
<td>NJ Standard 8. Instructional Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.5.NJ09</td>
<td>NJ Standard 9. Professional Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.5.NJ10</td>
<td>NJ Standard 10. Leadership and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.5.NJ11</td>
<td>NJ Standard 11. Ethical Practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is the end of the Self-study Report. You may log out at any time and come back to continue; your report will be saved.

When you are ready to submit the report click "Next" below. This will take you to the submit button on the next page. Once you click on "Submit" you will not be able to make changes to the report and evidence.