



Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

Site Visit Report

CAEP Site Visit Team:

Dr. Nicholas M. Michelli
Dr. Jennifer G. Beasley
Dr. Michael W. Wischnowski
Dr. Regina Rahimi
Dr. Janet A. Buckenmeyer
Dr. Lucy L. Payne

State Team:

N/A

State Consultant:

Kimberly Pippin

NEA or AFT Representative:

N/A

Selected Improvement Pathway

**NOVA SOUTHEASTERN
UNIVERSITY**

Fischler School of Education

1750 NE 167th Street

North Miami Beach, FL 33162-3017

December 2, 2018 12:00 a.m.

CONFIDENTIAL

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation
1140 19th Street, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036
Website: caepnet.org
Phone: 202.223-0077

Site Visit Report

Section I Introduction

Overview of the EPP and program offerings: (focus on differences between what was stated in the Formative Feedback Report and what was verified on the site visit.)

Located in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, NSU is a private, not-for-profit research institution accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. Classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as a research university with "high research activity," NSU is 1 of only 50 universities nationwide to also be awarded Carnegie's Community Engagement Classification. NSU is also the largest private, not-for-profit institution in the United States that meets the U.S. Department of Education's criteria as an Hispanic-Serving Institution. For more than 50 years, NSU has been fostering groundbreaking research and a commitment to the community. The university awards associate's, bachelor's, master's, specialist, doctoral, and first-professional degrees in a wide range of fields, including the humanities, biological and environmental science, business, counseling, computing and engineering sciences, conflict resolution, education, family therapy, medicine, dentistry, various health professions, law, marine sciences, performing and visual arts, psychology, and other social sciences. NSU has campuses in Fort Lauderdale, Fort Myers, Jacksonville, Miami, Miramar, Orlando, Palm Beach, and Tampa, Florida, as well as San Juan, Puerto Rico, while maintaining a global presence online. The institution also has an excellent reputation for its programs for families offered through the Mailman Segal Center for Human Development and the NSU University School. These include innovative parenting, preschool, primary, and secondary education programs, as well as an internationally recognized, model program for children with autism spectrum disorders. The University School is a k-12 private school available for field experiences for future teachers.

The Abraham S. Fischler College of Education (FCE) offers degree programs at the bachelors, master's, and doctoral levels that encompass over 25 majors and concentrations. The FCE faculty members are known for their student-centered teaching, scholarly work, and research-oriented activities, and they embrace NSU's core values of excellence in teaching, appreciation for diversity, and service to the community. The FCE serves approximately 3,000 students and has over 60,000 alumni.

Summary of state partnership that guided the visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or a CAEP-only visit)

While this was a CAEP only visit, the State of Florida is deeply involved in accreditation. For example, data on graduates' performance in the classroom, VAM data, is provided by the state and used by the institution. In addition the state has a curriculum for the preparation of clinical faculty which must be followed, although it may be adapted. It is used in the three counties served by the institution, Broward County, Palm Beach County, and Maimi Dade County.

No member of the Florida Department of Education was present at the visit.

Special circumstances of the site visit review, if any. (Example: No unusual circumstances affected the visit.)

The most significant special circumstances present for this site review was the extraordinary amount of change that has occurred to the program and continues. The changes were supported and encouraged by the President and Provost and carried out under the leadership of Dean Kimberly Durham, appointed as Interim Dean 2017 and Dean in 2018. The programs we reviewed were the elementary education and exceptional student education, the only certificate granting programs with graduates at the time of the visit. Endorsements in reading and teaching English as a second language are required of the elementary education, while in the exceptional student education program the teaching English as a second language endorsement is required and the reading endorsement is optional. At the time of the visit, there were few students in this program. The program will continue and is expected to grow. Courses are offered in traditional face-to-face fashion and in hybrid distance learning/in-person modes. Existing secondary education programs were all suspended as part of a plan for excellence and renewal and are in teach-out mode.

At the same time a new program, as of yet without graduates was in place as the "Fishler Academy." This program, in its first year of operation, is highly selective and collaborative with school districts who recommend candidates. Programs for elementary and secondary education are offered, replacing the discontinued secondary programs. All candidates admitted receiving a scholarship of \$18,000 per year for four years and are guaranteed teaching positions in schools. In the first year, 58 students were admitted. It is expected that 100 students will be admitted in each of the following four years. The Institute is headed by a Director with significant public school experience and community connections. In addition new systems for data collection were in place and under development, in cooperation with Watermark, Inc. representing a merger of existing data companies. The system is comprehensive, is easily accessible, and is managed by the College's Director of Assessment.

In the face of extraordinary change, we found the faculty members to be committed, enthusiastic and looking forward to positive impacts of these ongoing changes. Furthermore, we found confidence that the relatively new Dean of the college, although a long time administrator at the institution, would bring stability and a move to enhance excellence within the college.

Section II.1: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Initial)

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

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

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

Task(s)

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

- 1. (1) All attachments in evidence area need to be reviewed for accuracy
 - (2) Comparisons drawn to "EPP range" or "non-CAEP program" range - clarify, where appropriate
 - (3) Summary and next steps section: it is indicated all throughout the narrative for Standard 1 that low numbers make it difficult to draw conclusions, yet the "analysis did highlight several areas for growth". Only two areas were briefly mentioned. May wish to expand and clarify.
- All attachments should be reviewed for accuracy

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

- (1) What, exactly, is each EPP instrument used in Standard 1? Please describe more fully.
- (2) What are the specific decision points (gates) throughout the program?
- (3) How were EPP instruments created?
- (4) How are the results of data disseminated to faculty?
- (5) How are the results of data analyzed by faculty? How often?

Action:

- 1. B1. Completed in the addendum (EPP's Response to CAEP Feedback Statement Pg. 2 Paragraph 3a) and are included as Evidence 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, and 1f in the addendum.
- 2. B2. Clarified in the addendum (EPP's Response to CAEP Feedback Statement Pg. 2 Paragraph 2) and further clarified during site visit.
- 3. B3. Expanded upon and clarified in the addendum (EPP's Response to CAEP Feedback Statement Pg. 3 Paragraph 2.) Further, revisions to SSR Attachments 1d, 1e, 1f, 1g, 1h, and 1i have been made and are presented as Evidence 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d.
- 4. C1. All instruments were fully described and each was provided in the addendum (EPP's Response to CAEP Feedback Statement Pg. 2 Paragraph 3a and include detailed descriptions of each assessment). Revised attachments are included as Evidence 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, and 1f in the addendum.
- 5. C2. All decision (transition) points were detailed in the addendum (EPP's Response to CAEP Feedback Statement Pg. 3 Paragraph 2) and clarified during the site visit.
- 6. C3. Details about creation of EPP-instruments were provided in the addendum (EPP's Response to CAEP Feedback Statement Pg. 2 Paragraph 3c), clarified during the site visit, and included in Assessment Committee and TPAC minutes.
- 7. C4. Details were provided in the addendum (EPP's Response to CAEP Feedback Statement Pg. 3 Paragraph 3), clarified during the site visit, and included in Assessment Committee and TPAC minutes.
- 8. C5. Addressed in the addendum (EPP's Response to CAEP Feedback Statement Pg. 3 Paragraph 3), clarified during the site visit and included in Assessment Committee and TPAC minutes.

2. Analysis regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 1 :

a. Narrative analysis of findings

At the time of the self-study, only two program (BS in Elementary Education and BS in Exceptional Student Education) are currently in place and under review. Data provided in the self-study and the addendum for meeting CAEP Standard 1 are provided and disaggregated by licensure area (Elementary Education, and Exceptional Student Education baccalaureate programs) and three cycles of data were provided. Additional information was obtained during the onsite EPP site visit. The EPP addendum to the offsite report as well as the interviews during the site visit described and provided multiple examples of changes to the Elementary Education program and its common assessments. The Exceptional Student Education program is undergoing revisions currently with a planned implementation beginning Fall 2019.

In the addendum, the EPP reported that its EPP-created assessments that were used

to provide evidence for meeting Standard 1 were evaluated against the CAEP assessment rubric and each was determined to be at the CAEP Sufficient Level. During the onsite EPP visit, details on the this evaluation process were described. Validity of each instrument was provided with details on the face validity analysis and content validity analysis (using Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio). Data reliability was described in terms of inter-rater reliability. Instrument reliability was not discussed in the initial self-study nor in the addendum. During the onsite EPP visit, it was revealed that, because the assessments being used were new or significantly revised, instrument validity could not be completed; however, their plan was to complete this analysis once three cycles of assessment had been completed. From that point, reliability analysis would be completed and remain ongoing.

Component 1.1

All components of the standard were addressed in the self-study, elaborated upon in the addendum, and described fully during the onsite visit. It is evident that a cycle of continuous improvement is now in place. Strong efforts toward continuous improvement are occurring as evidenced by the restructuring of the Elementary Education baccalaureate program and the scheduled implementation of the new Exceptional Student Education baccalaureate program.

A variety of assessments were used to measure student content knowledge, and attainment of knowledge, skills and dispositions as described in the InTASC standards. Students are assessed at various points throughout their program in a variety of ways and details are outlined in the Undergraduate Program Transition Points (Evidence 1g). Results are triangulated, and students' scores are compared against non-CAEP students (non-candidates' performance in the same courses, when available) or against the EPP mean. Assessments, including the Florida Teacher Certification Exam (FTCE) and CAEP SPA reviews, provide evidence of candidate mastery. Additional assessments include the Ethics Assessment (Evidence 1a), the Educator Dispositions Assessment (Evidence 1f), the Assessment Case Study (Evidence 1b), the Classroom Management Plan (Evidence 1c), the Unit Plan (Evidence 1d), and the Teacher Work Sample (Evidence 1e).

A Quality Assurance Plan (artifact 1k) is now in place that involves NSU FCE faculty, staff, and external stakeholders. A schedule of data collection, data review, input and feedback, and continuous improvement has already been implemented. This continuous improvement cycle includes all faculty as well as school partners.

Component 1.2

Candidate performance on the Assessment Case Study (Evidence 1b), the Classroom Management Plan (Evidence 1c), the Unit Plan (Evidence 1d), and the Teacher Work Sample (Evidence 1e) all serve as evidence that students effectively use research and evidence for planning, implementing and evaluating P-12 students' progress. In addition, the Assessment of Ethics ensures candidates' familiarity with ethical use and application of research (Evidence 1a).

Component 1.3

The baccalaureate Elementary Education Program is SPA recognized through 8-1-2026. The baccalaureate Exceptional Student Education is SPA recognized through 3-1-2026. Further, the EPP noted that candidates' passing rates did not compare favorably to state averages on the Florida Teacher Certification Exam. As a result of the data, changes in supporting students are underway. Through onsite EPP interviews with the Assessment Committee and other stakeholders, a variety of supports were implemented the during Fall 2018 semester. Candidates' passing rates have improved. Preliminary anecdotal data show that Fall 2018 candidates are passing the FTCE at rates above the state average (Evidence Assessment Committee Minutes included on NSU website).

Component 1.4

Elements in the Assessment Case Study (Evidence 1b), the Classroom Management Assessment (Evidence 1c), the Unit Plan (Evidence 1d), and the Teacher Work Sample, as well as Observation 2a provide evidence that candidates know, understand, and apply common core standards through instruction. The Educator Disposition Assessment (Evidence 1f) provides evidence of the continuous monitoring of candidate dispositions throughout the program. Further, a detailed diversity plan (Evidence Diversity Statement) has been developed and implemented Fall 2018 (with the launch of the restructured Elementary Education Program - Evidence 1h). The restructuring followed the process of continuous improvement as detailed in their quality assurance plan and involved all key stakeholders. This plan ensures that teacher candidates are placed in a variety of diverse settings throughout their program experience.

Component 1.5

Rubric elements in the Assessment Case Study (Evidence 1b), Classroom Management Assessment (Evidence 1c) and the Unit Plan (Evidence 1d) provide evidence the candidates' proficiencies in the use and application of technology in the classroom as a source to promote P-12 student learning. While candidates have been demonstrating sufficient technology integration skills, the EPP program faculty has been involved in a complete restructuring of both programs. As noted earlier, the restructured Elementary Education program has been launched Fall 2018. The Exceptional Student Education Program is expected to be launched Fall 2019. In both instances, a detailed Technology plan has been developed, in conjunction with key stakeholders, to ensure that technology is infused throughout the curriculum (Evidence Technology Statement).

b. Analysis of Program-Level data

Each category of InTASC (Learner and Learning, Instructional Practice, Professional Responsibility, and Content and Pedagogical Knowledge) are addressed by multiple assessments. Three cycles of data for each was reported and these were disaggregated by program. A system of data collection and decision points was provided and is implemented (Evidence 1g - Undergraduate Program Transition Points) with appropriate faculty and staff involvement.

External data sources include the Florida Teacher Certification Exam (FCTE) for the respective subject area exams, and CAEP SPA reviews. Both programs are nationally recognized through 2026. Internal sources include elements from rubrics from six common assessments. These include: The Assessment Case Study, Ethics Assessment, Classroom Management Assessment, Unit Plan, Teacher Work Sample, and the Assessment of Dispositions.

Each InTASC category was detailed showing sufficiency of attainment along with areas of improvement noted. As the EPP is completely restructuring its assessments and teacher education programs, the data used from this self-study has been the basis for the restructuring. As noted above, the revised BS in Elementary Education program has been launched. Revisions to the Exceptional Student Education program based on this data are occurring now with a planned launch of the revised program in Fall 2019.

Special note:

For this EPP, it is admirable that, given extraordinary circumstances described earlier, the EPP made the decision to completely restructure their teacher education programs (Evidence 1h). The EPP has been intentional in scheduling earlier field experiences, assuring diversity of placement, and integrating technology throughout the curriculum (see Quality Assurance Plan, Diversity Statement, Technology Statement). Preliminary data (as described in Assessment Committee minutes, TPAC minutes, and onsite EPP interviews) already show improvements in terms of candidate recruitment and FTCE passing rates. In addition, the EPP has created a new Fischler Academy, designed to attract students into the teaching profession.

c. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

Revised evidence as provided in the Self-Study Addendum (see below) and further elaborated on during interviews, including changes to the current programs.

Evidence 1a - Revised CAEP Common Assessment- Ethics

Evidence 1b - Revised CAEP Common Assessment- Assessment Case Study

Evidence 1c - Revised CAEP Common Assessment- Classroom Management Plan

Evidence 1d - Revised CAEP Common Assessment- Unit Plan

Evidence 1e - Revised CAEP Common Assessment- Teacher Work Sample

Evidence 1f - Revised CAEP Common Assessment- Assessment of Dispositions

Evidence 1g - Undergraduate Program Transition Points

Evidence 1h - Changes to Program of Study for the BS in Elementary Education

Evidence 1i - Evidence 1i- Results of District Teacher Evaluations

Evidence 1j - Evidence 1j- Assessment Committee Member Chart

Evidence 1k - Evidence 1i- Results of District Teacher Evaluations

Evidence 1l - Evidence 1l- Assessment Committee Activities Timeline

Evidence 1m - Evidence 1m- Content Evaluation Form for CAEP Common Assessments

Evidence 1m - Evidence 1m- Content Evaluation Form for CAEP Common Assessments

Evidence 1n - Evidence 1n- Assessment Committee Agenda 1-10-18

Evidence 1o - Evidence 1o- Assessment Committee Minutes 1-10-18

Evidence 1p - Evidence 1p- Assessment Committee Minutes 8-29-18

Evidence 1q - Evidence 1q- Minutes for TPAC Round table Questions 5-22-18

Evidence 1r - Evidence 1r- Minutes for TPAC Panel Discussion Questions 5-22-18

Evidence 1s - Evidence 1s- Assessment Committee Minutes 6-27-18
Evidence 1t - Evidence 1t- Content Validity Studies for Internship Surveys
Evidence - Diversity Statement
Evidence - Technology Plan
Evidence - NSU Fischler College of Education website

d. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each Area for Improvement

Area for Improvement	Rationale

Stipulation:

Stipulation	Rationale

Section II.1A: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Advanced)

Standard A.1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

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

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

Task(s)

Action:

2. Analysis regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 1 :

a. Narrative analysis of findings

b. Analysis of Program-Level data

c. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

d. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each Area for Improvement

Area for Improvement	Rationale

Stipulation:

Stipulation	Rationale

Section II.2: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Initial)

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

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

students' learning and development.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

Task(s)

Partners Involvement in mutually beneficial P12 experiences and placements	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
1.	(1) Evidence of partnership agreements with various districts claimed as partners (2.1a)
	(2) Interns Assessment of Cooperating Teachers (2.2b)
	(3) Evidence of process of districts' involvement in the selection and monitoring of clinical educators' qualifications (2.2a)
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed	
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews	
	(1) What is the current accurate number of partnerships you have?

Action:

1.	A.1: Evidence of partnership agreements with various districts claimed as partners (2.1a) Partnership agreements were viewed and determined to be current. This item was further corroborated during meetings with partners. A.2: Interns Assessment of Cooperating Teachers (2.2b) Viewed the assessment instrument, viewed TPAC minutes providing evidence of this instrument being shared/discussed with partners. Partners confirmed their input on this instrument during the site visit. A.3: Evidence of process of districts' involvement in the selection and monitoring of clinical educators' qualifications (2.2a) Evidence of districts' involvement in the selection and monitoring of clinical educators' qualifications was confirmed on site by TPAC minutes as well as interviews with partner districts' placement coordinators. C.1: Current number of placements was verified during the site visit.
----	---

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 2 :

a. Summary of findings

The EPP has provided evidence which was corroborated during the site visit that demonstrates their commitment to engaging their partners in the quality preparation of their teacher candidates for work with P-12 students. The EPP stated they have developed partnerships "to provide candidates with diverse, high quality clinical experiences" (SSR, p. 24). According to the EPP, the Assessment Committee holds the responsibility for evaluating "...effectiveness of partnerships and the quality of candidate clinical experiences..." The EPP provided evidence of Assessment Committee minutes demonstrating this. Partner agreements were provided during the site visit demonstrating the EPP's claim that they currently had agreements with 18 districts. Further, upon meeting with the EPP's partners, it is clear that the EPP engages their partners in discussions of assessment, instrumentation, and clinical experience preparation and placements.

In support of component 2.1, the EPP established a Teacher Preparation Advisory Council (TPAC) that "hosts community forums and engages stakeholders in continuous improvement of candidate preparation" (SSR. p. 24). The EPP has provided agendas and minutes from this group's meetings demonstrating a shared discussion of clinical practice and field experience/internship assessments. During the site visit, the EPP's partners confirmed their roles on this Council and articulated the value of these meetings. Further, in support of the nature of their mutually beneficial

partnership, the EPP provided evidence of their involvement in partners' pre-service consortiums and districts' field placement meetings (2.1f, 2.1g, 2.1K, 2.1L). The partners representing partner school districts confirmed the attendance and involvement of the EPP in their meetings. It is clear from the evidence presented and information garnered during the site visit, that the EPP is committed to and makes efforts to ensure their partners are involved in the construction and assessment of mutually beneficial p-12 school experiences.

Relating to component 2.2, the EPP claims that the Office of Field Placement "ensures that all clinical educators are experienced teachers who have at least three years of successful teaching experience, excellent classroom management skills, and clinical education training" (SSR., p.25). The Florida Department of Education requires that all teachers who wish to serve as clinical educators must participate in an online "clinical educator training", therefore all teachers with whom this EPP places candidates have formally completed this training. The EPP also states that the selection of clinical educators is a "collaborative process" and that the "district internship coordinator" helps to determine the placement. It was confirmed through interviews with the partners that the clinical educators utilized by this site must maintain "effective" or "highly effective" designations on their district teacher evaluations for three years. The partner districts monitor this closely. The collaborative nature of these placements was confirmed with interviews with their partners, with the districts confirming that the EPP does make 'recommendations' for placements and does request particular diverse placements. The EPP provides training on their protocols and instrumentation for the clinical educators through the university supervisors in the EPP. The university supervisors confirmed this practice. Further, the EPP provides resources and communication protocols for the clinical educators in the Internship Handbook (2.2e). The clinical educators are provided course credit from the EPP for working with teacher candidates, demonstrating the EPP's recognition of the work of the clinical educator. Evidence 2.1b provides a letter sent to clinical supervisors outlining this credit.

In the Fall of 2017, the Assessment Committee developed and piloted a University Supervisor Performance Evaluation Rubric (2.2d). According to the EPP, this instrument is managed by the Field Placement Coordinator. The Field Placement Coordinator completes this rubric based on results of the University Supervisor Survey completed by teacher candidates, and addresses the university supervisors' performance related to, "...three competencies; Professional Responsibilities, Interactions with the Cooperating Teacher, and Interactions with Interns" (SSR., p.25). The EPP provided minutes of the latest TPAC meeting where this instrument was shared and discussed with partner district representatives. The partners confirmed this participation and discussion outcomes during an interview.

According to the EPP, diverse placements for candidates are monitored through demographic data candidates complete and upload into an Excel spreadsheet (until their data collection system, LiveText, can manage such data). The EPP shared a chart demonstrating the tracking of such placements which is produced and monitored by the Field Placement Office (2.2g). Further, through the site visit, the partners (clinical placement coordinators for the partner districts) confirmed the EPP's commitment to and requests for diverse placements.

Regarding component 2.3, the EPP candidates' depth and breadth of field experiences is evident through the assessments in specific courses linked to field experience. Evidence (2.3.a) provides a matrix of course work linked field experience assignments and expectations. The EPP does scaffold field experiences and clinical practice throughout candidates' matriculation. Those experiences are monitored and assessed through a variety of forms. The EPP provided an updated "Field Experience Placement" form during the site visit. This form is filled out by the candidate during the early field experience opportunities. While the candidates are not observed by a university supervisor during most of these early field experiences, the cooperating teacher does have an opportunity to rate these candidates. These forms are monitored by program faculty. Each candidate within programs at the EPP are engaged in at least one clinical experience that is observed and assessed by a university supervisor prior to final internship. All university supervisors assess candidates' performance in these field experiences through the use of the "Observation Feedback Form". This document was provided during the site visit. While the document appears to provide some alignment with the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices, the EPP provided no evidence of validity or reliability for this instrument. This form is completed by university supervisors and shared with the Field Placement Coordinator. The EPP claims the narrative nature of the instrument provides the candidate with feedback on their "effective behaviors" and "areas for improvement" and provides candidates opportunity to reflect on their performance in the field in the areas of: Instructional Design and Lesson Planning; The Learning Environment; Instructional Delivery Analysis and Reflection; Assessment; Continuous Professional Improvement and Professional Responsibility and Ethical Conduct. Candidates are also to set goals on this document prior to final internship. This instrument is shared with the university supervisor for the candidate's final internship experience.

The EPP assesses the use of technology during internship using Observation 1 (2.3.b). The observation instruments are completed by the university supervisor and data are submitted in Via (the EPP's new data management system), and then provided to both program faculty and the Field Placement Coordinator for analysis and review. The EPP faculty and administration assess candidates' impact on P-12 student learning growth during the internship through the Teacher Work Sample assessment candidates complete during internship.

It has been verified through the EPP self-study report, addendum, interviews, and evidence that the EPP and their partners are: committed to the co construction of mutually beneficial P12 school experiences, share responsibility for continuous improvement and candidate preparation in the field, work to select, prepare, evaluate and retain high quality clinical educators, and ensure that clinical experiences of their candidates reflect breadth, depth and diverse opportunities.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

2.1f- Invitation to TPAC meeting

- 2.1g- Assessment Committee Minutes
- 2.1k- Pre Service Consortium Minutes
- 2.1L- Field Placement Committee Minutes

- 2.2e- Cooperating Teacher Assessment of University Supervisor Instrument
- 2.1b-Record of Teacher Affiliation Agreements
- 2.2g-Diverse Clinical Practice Setting Tracking
- 2.3a- Clinical Experience Assessments/Technology
- 2.3 b- Internship Observation Technology

Teacher Preparation Advisory Council Minutes from November 2018- not tagged

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale

Section II.2A: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Advanced)

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

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

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

Task(s)

Action:

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 2 :

a. Summary of findings

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale

Section II.3: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Initial)

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 4.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

Task(s)

	Recruitment Plan Updates (3.1)
	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
	(1) Update on recruitment plan with goals for the next five years
	(2) Clarification on recruitment plan as it lists more licensure areas than are discussed
1.	B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
	(1) Update on Fischler Academy recruiting efforts (data)
	C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
	(1) Meeting with Fischler Academy director and Director of admissions while on site
	Admissions Data (3.2)
	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
	(1) When are admissions data collect? Do students meet the standardized test requirements at entrance or later prior to completion
2.	B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
	(1) Admission criteria for transfer students that meets CAEP requirements (GPA and standardized test scores)
	C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
	(1) 2017-2018 admissions data to consider test scores
	Transition Points (3.4)
	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
	(1) Review assessment committee and department meeting minutes for evidence of actions based on assessment results

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

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

3.

- (1) How is the candidate informed and what actions are taken if a candidate did not meet a requirement at a transition point?
- (2) What actionable measures occur for candidates who do not meet the work sample score?
- (3) What actionable measures occur for candidates who do not pass their content specialty test?
- (4) Interview assessment committee, faculty and dean on use of assessment results for program improvement

Action:

- 1. The addendum and addendum exhibits (3d and 3e revised recruitment plans) verified the EPP has five-year goals in the traditional program and the new Fischler Academy Program. The EPP shared updated enrollment data for the new Fischler Academy Program. During the interviews with the associate dean, the Director of the Fischler Academy, and undergraduate admissions staff, the recruitment plan development and implementation was confirmed.
- 2. Review of addendum, addendum exhibits, and interviews revealed program admission data is collected upon matriculation in the program, which isn't necessarily the same time as admission to the university. In addition, NSU policy does not require transfer students with more than 24 credits to provide standardized test scores as part of their admission to the education program. However, the data is retrievable through university level student records (Banner). After the EPP had discussion with the admissions office, the program will require this information on the matriculation application for all students beginning in Fall 2018. The EPP submitted revised data tables to include transfer student data and 2017-2018 admission data in exhibit 3c. In this revised data table included the comparison data for the CAEP requirements related to 3.2.
- 3. In the EPP's addendum, addendum evidence (1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, and 1f), and interviews with various groups, additional information was provided on the transition points. The EPP shared who was involved in the transition point work, the communication plan, the remediation process, and program changes based on the data collected from the transition points.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 3:

a. Summary of findings

The EPP demonstrated through the Self Study Report (SSR) with accompanying evidence, the addendum with accompanying evidence, and in onsite interviews they have plans and goals to recruit and support high quality candidates (3.1). The EEP's recruitment plan was modified after the SSR based on the Formative Feedback Report (FFR) and onsite interviews revealed it has been modified since the addendum was shared with the team. These modifications are based on what the EPP has learned from each recruitment cycle. The most recent five-year recruitment plan includes baseline points and goals for each of their programs. The EPP shared disaggregated data by relevant demographics on admitted candidates. The candidates admitted to the program represent a wide range of diversity. The EPP opened the Fischler Academy in Fall 2018 which is recruiting high need area teachers in fields including STEM and special education. The work of the Director of the Fischler Academy includes recruitment to these programs. The EPP has set clear admission requirements (3.2) which includes grades, testing requirements, security clearance, an essay (added winter 2018) and dispositions (added fall 2018). The addendum and supporting evidence indicated that candidate GPAs meet requirements while test scores in some areas exceeds the CAEP requirement and falls below the requirement in others.

Evidence and onsite interviews affirmed the EPP has adopted and assesses candidate dispositions at multiple points in the program (3.3). Beginning fall 2018 the EPP moved from a unit created instrument to the Educator Dispositional Assessment (EDA). With the recent change of instruments, three cycles of data from the old instrument were provided and rationale for the selection of the new instrument was shared. Candidate dispositions are assessed early in the freshman year (EDA),

matriculation (essay and EDA), and during the internship (teaching observation 2a).

The evidence and SSR verified the EPP has developed and implemented a system for monitoring candidate progression that includes four transition points with specific criteria for advancing through each point (3.4). Onsite interviews substantiated remediation processes are in place for candidates that do not meet the criteria. Administrators and staff shared how low scoring candidates are supported by faculty and staff throughout the program. Evidence and interviews that supported the transition points were shared and understood by candidates. Candidate content and pedagogical content knowledge is documented through a variety of assessments including common assessments and state required testing. Common assessments included expectations for the profession (laws, policies, ethics) (3.6) Interviews with faculty and candidates verified information submitted through the SSR and addendum and clarified questions.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

A detailed recruitment plan is provided outlining strategies for five years (3.1). Disaggregated data on applicants provided including relevant demographics including race/ethnicity, SES, and/or sex (3.1).

GPA data provided for each program area (3.1).

The EPP documents evidence of established non-academic criteria used during admissions and monitors candidate progress on established nonacademic criteria at multiple points taking appropriate actions based on results (3.3).

The provider presents explicit criteria for monitoring/assessing with a focus on candidate development throughout preparation (3.4).

Data from the common assessments and state mandated testing provide evidence demonstrating content knowledge (3.5).

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

Data charts for admission of candidates shows not all cohort averages on ACT/SAT tests meet the CAEP requirement. See addendum evidence 3c.

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale
The addendum and supporting evidence indicated some standardized test scores used for admission fall below the CAEP requirement. (component 3.2)	Not all candidates have been reporting GPA and test scores at time of admission to the program although the data is in university systems. Once the EPP retrieved the data for the past three data cycles, they found the group average did not meet the criteria. Although revisions have been made to the process to collect the data prior to admission in the future, the EPP will need to monitor the group average to be sure admission decisions for each cohort will meet the requirements in component 3.2.

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale

Section II.3A: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Advanced)

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 4.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

Task(s)

Action:

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 3:

a. Summary of findings

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale

Section II.4: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Initial)

Standard 4: Program Impact

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

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

Task(s)

Validity and Reliability of Instruments	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
1.	(1) a. Describe more completely all instruments used for Standard 4, noting validity and reliability where applicable, describing the development of any EPP-made instruments, and collection and analysis procedures with faculty.
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed	
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews	

Lack of Employer Satisfaction Data	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
2.	(1) b. Consider getting more employer satisfaction data.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

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

Faculty Data Analysis and Decision Making

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

3. (1) c. Be more specific in your analysis of the data and what the faculty's response is going to be to its suggestions.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

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

Action:

1. 1. The EPP provided richer descriptions of each instrument in the addendum and some context as to why the instruments did or did not have validity and reliability information. 2. An attempt to administer a new employer survey in Fall 2018 resulted in a very low response rate according to the addendum and was corroborated by interviews during the site visit. They will attempt another survey with employers in the future. 3. The EPP provided in the addendum and demonstrated during the visit the establishment of a robust assessment system that should help to influence an effective assessment culture.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 4 :

a. Summary of findings

For component 4.1, the EPP used multiple measures, including value-added and other required measures by the state of Florida and the EPP's contiguous school districts as well as their own measures.

The EPP is dependent on the state of Florida and local school districts for the Value Added Measure (VAM) and Annual Program Performance Review (APPR) respectively and uses their instruments and results to assess completer success. The EPP provided manuals and reports that described the instruments in more detail; however, validity and reliability information was not included in these documents. The exception was the Marzano Evaluation Model, used by Broward County Public Schools, that did provide some validity information, which the EPP provided. The EPP appears to be using the best information available from these sources and has tried to make programmatic decisions based on these state and district results. They compare their data with state averages and have put in place strategies to improve their completers' performance on these measures.

For component 4.2, We found consistent use off observation instruments and continued effort to assure validity and reliability. The instruments adequately give evidence of the success of students.

For component 4.3, the pilot survey for employers was developed in the Fall 2018 semester, but received an extremely low response rate. During the site visit, the EPP articulated plans to retool the survey and try different strategies for administration and completion.

For component 4.4, completers did express on the alumni survey that they perceived their preparation was sufficient for the job responsibilities. During the site visit, alumni echoed these perceptions. The EPP demonstrated having a system for gathering the data, multiple comparison points, and trends over time. Went that it

appears that efforts for reliability were started in 2016-2017 on the pertinent education items in the University Alumni Survey; however, the university changed to a new format for the survey in this year, so this effort was aborted and will be renewed with new administrations of the revised alumni survey. Yet, completers reported general satisfaction with their experience on both versions of the survey and could speak during the site visit to how the EPP prepared them satisfactorily with the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to be successful in their classrooms.

In the addendum and during the site visit, the EPP demonstrated the establishment of a robust system for gathering data using the Watermark/Live Text technology and described extensively how they are using this data to inform some of their recent innovations (e.g., Fischler Academy). The addendum describes multiple examples of how curriculum and programs have changed through the use of data generally.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

State and District data from VAM, APPR, and the University's alumni survey for completers with at least three iterations of data. (Components 4.1 and 4.2)
Alumni survey (Component 4.4)

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

Very low response rate on the employer satisfaction survey and a lack of evidence of employer milestones met by completers. (Component 4.3)

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale
The EPP does not provide sufficient evidence of employer satisfaction.	In the Fall 2018 semester, the EPP attempted to administer a new employer survey, but it resulted in a very low response rate. They plan to revise the survey and try again with new strategies to gain more employer engagement.

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale

Section II.4A: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (AdvancedI)

Standard 4: Program Impact

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

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

Task(s)

Action:

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 4 :

a. Summary of findings

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale

Section II.5: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Initial)

Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

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

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

Task(s)

Quality Assurance System Data	
1.	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
	(1) Tutorial of Data available to Faculty and Stakeholders.
	B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
	C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
	(1) How do stakeholders get a chance to see data in the QAS and in what way do they provide feedback?
	(2) How has the QAS changed over time?

Quality Assurance System	
2.	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
	(1) Corroboration of SSR information through interview with Assessment Team Members
	(2) Corroboration of SSR information through interview with faculty
	(3) Corroboration of SSR information through interview with community partners
	(4) Corroboration of SSR information through interview with other relevant constituents
	B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
	(1) What do the partnership meetings look like? How is information/feedback from these meetings utilized?

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

- (1) What innovations have been tried in response to data? How are these tested and documented?

Action:

1. The EPP addendum and interviews provided corroborating evidence that their quality assurance system provides data. The EPP has an assessment team that regularly looks at data and gets input from faculty, students, and community partners before making changes. In the addendum, the questions about partnership involvement and innovative practices were answered. The faculty have made several changes even since receiving feedback from the site team in the spring. The EPP provided ample information in response to questions.

2. The EPP addendum and interviews provided corroborating evidence. The faculty and partners described how they meet together and provide feedback. The EPP has an assessment team that regularly looks at data and gets input from faculty, students, and community partners before making changes. In the addendum, the questions about partnership involvement and innovative practices were answered. The faculty have made several changes even since receiving feedback from the site team in the spring. Innovations were presented during the site visit and in the addendum.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 5:

a. Summary of findings

The EPP has supportive evidence that they maintain an assurance system comprised of valid data. Evidence is present that they rely on multiple measures to make decisions as a faculty. There is some data to indicate stakeholder involvement in the more recent decisions (i.e. changing courses to increase technology integration, the addition of the new Fischler Academy).

5.1

The EPP is a research-centered university and is classified for a high level of research. At the time of the self study, only two programs (BS in Elementary Education, and BS in Exceptional Student Education) for review are currently in place.

The EPP shows at several points (transition points, faculty meetings, TPAC meetings) that it regularly reviews data to make decision. The data are stored through LiveText (now Via) and is disseminated to faculty to make decisions during faculty meetings.

The EPP utilizes the data at several points and it is accessed by a variety of users (students, clinical faculty, school districts). In the latest revision of the elementary education program, faculty used data from alumni and partners to make changes to coursework in order to integrate faculty more thoroughly in to the program. The data sources are clearly defined and through the SSR, the EPP has an established way that they share the data with their faculty through a Fall and Winter Teacher Preparation meetings (Evidence 5c). The common assessments in the QAS were aligned with state standards as well as InTASC standards (Evidence 1d; 1e; 1f; 1g; 1h; 1i) and further common assessments, were provided through the addendum (Evidence 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 1f).

5.2

The EPP utilizes both proprietary and EPP-created assessments to monitor candidate progress and achievements through transition points and revisions to this system were included in the addendum (1g). In addition, the EPP identified common assessments: Ethics, Case Study, Classroom Management, Unit Plan Assessment, and Teacher Work Sample. Data from these assessments are aggregated and summarized at the program level. At the time of the site visit, the EPP said that they would be going through a review of all assessments during the summer of 2019.

After review, the EPP-created assessments are all meeting CAEP sufficiency standards, with the exception of the reliability of the instrument itself. The EPP is working this year on reliability of assessments beyond inter-rater reliability (test/retest), but currently there is no formal plan for this established. EPP assessment committee members reported during an interview that they would establish this reliability after 3 cycles of data.

The EPP has established validity on each common assessment. To establish validity, the EPP reported that "two types of validity analysis were conducted." They utilized both face validity and content validity (Evidence 5e). All validity data meet accepted research standards. Due to limited artifacts, inter-rater reliability was obtained on a smaller sample size. As noted above, the assessment committee described their plan for assessment reliability during the site visit, but it has not yet been established.

Many of the surveys have been developed only recently. The employer satisfaction survey is yet under development. The survey "Revised Intern Assessment of the Cooperating Teacher" (Evidence 5n, Addendum) contains items with two time periods side-by-side. This was ambiguous and could impact data collection.

5.3

Program changes are linked to evidence/data and the provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards. The EPP tracks results over time and tests innovations. The EPP made clear their selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and used results to improve program elements and processes. The EPP's assessment team meets regularly to overview data and to assess changes to the system. During the last six months, the EPP has changed several assessments, planned course changes to integrate technology, and piloted new assessments.

As part of the work of the assessment team and in collaboration with faculty, all assessments are aligned with CAEP, InTASC, and Florida standards. The EPP included evidence that demonstrated their work on their quality assurance system. The following evidence supports this work: 2.1c TPAC agenda; 2.1d Presentation; 5d Agenda; 5d.1 Minutes, 5b Assessment Committee. The EPP included that the Teacher Preparation Advisory Committee (TPAC) was comprised of "FCE faculty, staff, school district leaders, and representatives from neighboring colleges of education." In the addendum and during the site visit, the EPP described in detail the partner meetings and the decisions they make during those meetings. The collaboration with stakeholders is ongoing and supported by the recent changes to the format of the TPAC. During the meetings the partners and faculty review data and look at surveys and course changes as well as collaborate on changes.

An example of implementing data-driven decisions and testing innovations would be the work they are doing to support students as they prepare for the General Knowledge tests that are needed to matriculate into teacher education. After reviewing the last three cycles of data and noting that students were struggling to pass the General Knowledge test, the faculty explored options to support students. They adopted "Learning Liasions"---an online platform to support general content

knowledge. They also held their biannual "Teacher Conference" (Evidence 3K, Addendum) and spent time helping students who needed to pass the general content tests. They are now looking forward to the newest cycle of data to see if their efforts paid off.

5.4

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.

State data along "are posted on the FCE Assessment Committee website for public review." This information was found on their accreditation page: <https://education.nova.edu/aboutus/accreditation.html>. The EPP stated that "additional measures of candidate progress and completer achievement will be implemented beginning Fall 2018." During the site visit, the EPP shared the new information for measuring completer achievement (alumni survey) with the team and the plans for collecting data on employer satisfaction. Currently the EPP is not collecting data related to employer satisfaction outside of what is reported through district data. Florida is a state with VAM data and the faculty have looked at trends in data for the last seven years (Evidence 4a). The EPP has also examined results of district teacher evaluations (Evidence 4b), and alumni satisfaction (Evidence 4d; 4e). The evidence on the state level has compared EPP to all graduates from other programs on campus (NSU Completers, to VAM Score Average). In the future, the EPP said that they will want to compare their completers with others in the state, but that is not possible at this time. The EPP has noted decisions made in relation to the data including: restructuring program curriculum (to more closely align with goals in technology integration) and monitor candidate process.

Additional data such as employer satisfaction has yet to be collected. The EPP is currently working on developing this survey.

5.5

The EPP provided evidence of diverse stakeholder involvement through multiple sources. The EPP has effectively engaged its partners in program evaluation and improvement through bi-annual meetings of the TPAC group as well as other meetings. This is evidenced through the Palm Beach Preservice Consortium (Evidence 2.1f) and Assessment Committee (Evidence 5b) as well as TPAC meetings (Evidence 2.1c-Self Study and Evidence 4c-Addendum). This was corroborated during the site visit. There are examples of stakeholders involved in reviewing data from surveys as well as contributing to decisions for improvement.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

The EPP quality assurance system is comprised of measures that monitor candidate progress, completer evidence, and operational effectiveness. The EPP has a way to analyze, monitor and support data. The original QAS was piloted in fall 2017, which has now been changed again. Evidence was cited of the QAS (Attachment 5A), due to multiple changes (including revising common assessments and adding revised surveys, the QAS was changed and added to the addendum (Evidence 1K) following the formative feedback report.

Evidence was relevant and representative. After interviews with faculty, students, stakeholders and assessment committee, the evidence was determined to be verifiable. Faculty and stakeholders attested to the action taken on the data and there was an identified way to systematically share data across all audiences. All data was accurately analyzed by the EPP.

The EPP tagged learning outcomes, state standards, and InTASC standards to instruments being used to collect information on candidates and completers. All evidence was made available to the site team and the EPP was quickly able to talk about how they use this information to make changes.

An example of monitoring the system was the presentation of how they use LiveText, now Via to track student information in one coherent system. The assessment team demonstrated how they are able to show reports quickly through the system and share data. They also spoke about the disappointing return rates in their surveys to alumni and employers and their ideas for further data collection.

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

The EPP is currently working on establishing reliability beyond interrater reliability for all EPP created assessments. In addition, the EPP is working to establish an employer satisfaction survey beyond the VAM data for reading and math. Both of these initiatives will need a specific plan in place and currently there is no formalized plan.

While a few areas of evidence are inconsistent with meeting the standard, the overall preponderance of evidence indicates that the EPP is working continuously to meet the standard.

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement

Area for Improvement	Rationale
Establishing assessment reliability for all EPP created assessments (Ethics, Case Study, Classroom Management, Unit Plan Assessment, and Teacher Work Sample) has been determined an area for improvement, specifically reaching the accepted research standards for test/retest reliability. Minimal level of sufficiency needs to be reported for all EPP created surveys as well. The EPP has a plan to do this after 3 cycles of data, but currently this is an area for improvement. This impacts the data in Standard 1 most directly, but can impact other standards as well. (component 5.2)	All EPP created common assessments (Ethics, Case Study, Classroom Management, Unit Plan Assessment, and Teacher Work Sample) showed evidence of minimal level of sufficiency for the content of the assessments (content validity). The scoring is defined well. The inter-rater reliability has been established. All common assessments lacked evidence of establishing the reliability of the instrument itself. Without reliability established (test/retest) it is hard to utilize the data in the common assessments to make generalizations about student growth. This impact specifically the data in Standard 1.

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale

Section II.5A: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Advanced)

Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

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

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

Task(s)

Action:

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 5:

a. Summary of findings

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each
Area for Improvement

Area for Improvement	Rationale

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale

Section III: Cross-cutting Themes of Diversity and Technology

1. DIVERSITY

a. Summary regarding adequacy and accuracy of evidence related to diversity

The institution has a great deal of diversity among students. It has been designated as a Hispanic Serving Institution by the US Department of Education and successfully competed for four Title V grants designed to increase the retention and graduation rates of Hispanic students.

It is accurate that students are placed in a series of diverse settings. Changes in Live Text complicated this a bit and the institution is working to overcome the change. Partner districts reported requests from the university for diverse placements among the field experience and internship placements. The primary districts used, Broward County, Palm Beach, and Miami Dade, are all large enough to include diverse settings and populations.

Diversity as a theme is present in a number of ongoing activities of the institution and extends its work to collaboration with public schools. For example, by hosting the Inaugural Diversity Conference with the Broward County Public Schools. The goal is to create a culturally progressive and socially reflective school and community supporting diversity at all levels.

The institution understands its commitment to preparing students for working in diverse settings. One good example is included in their diversity statement. In order to improve the reflective practice of preservice teachers before they enter their internships and the teaching profession, a team of education faculty from the Abraham S. Fischler College of Education opted to create an in-house simulation to enhance teacher candidate awareness of real world situations involving diversity they may encounter as future teachers. A major goal of this simulation was to encourage group and self-reflection through problem-based learning as the participants evaluated and intervened in a series of six scenarios involving realistic critical incidents demanding their immediate attention as teachers, parents, and administrative staff. The simulation had the theme of diversity running through the

fabric of various authentic scenarios, some inspired by the headlines of recent years. This diversity simulation became a required course for the Bachelor of Science education majors: Elementary Education and Exceptional Student Education titled EDUC 4200: Simulation Experience Diversity and Ethics, specifically addressing diversity within the PK-12 environment.

Students who were alumni and current students with whom we met reported their comfort in working in diverse settings and attributed this to their preparation.

b. Evidence that adequately and accurately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of diversity

This is a Hispanic Serving Institution with a great deal of diversity.

Students are placed in diverse settings.

Diversity as a theme permeates the work of the EPP including hosting a conference with the Broward Count Schools

A simulation on teaching for diversity was developed and is used.

Alumni report comfort in working with diversity in interviews.

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of diversity

None.

Note: Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each are cited under the relevant standard(s)

2. TECHNOLOGY

a. Summary regarding adequacy and accuracy of evidence related to technology

The institution moved to infuse technology across the programs in courses and provided course syllabi demonstrating this effort. The BS in Elementary Education program was the first program to be revised. As part of this revision, all required courses were revised so that assignments, field experiences, and the internship aligned to the mission statement including the commitment to technology.

The institution includes specific examples of the technology assignments that were embedded in some of the required courses in the program as part of the statement on the cross-cutting theme of technology. Interviews with students and faculty verified the importance of the application of technology across courses in the program. Students expressed a sense of preparedness to work with technology in their teaching.

At the college level, FCE strives to ensure all its program offerings integrate the most current technology. As part of FCE's curriculum review process, programs are reviewed on a rotating basis through collaboration of the Curriculum and Assessment Committees to assure the presence of technology and its applications. These two committees were responsible for revising the mission statement with its focus on technology and a commitment to a global society.

Faculty interviewed discussed their use of technology in teaching as a means to introduce students to new techniques and approaches. They were clearly well versed

on the issues and described how their use of technology was intended to teach the use of technology along, that is, to step back from the lesson to look at how the technology worked and how its use could be improved.

b. Evidence that adequately and accurately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of technology.

Course syllabi show integration of technology

Inclusion of technology in all required courses

Examples of technology assignments provided

Satisfaction expressed by students in interviews with their preparedness for technology

Assuring adequacy of technology is a clear goal of the assessment committee and the curriculum committee

Interviews with faculty showed a commitment to using technology in their teaching and then analyzing the impact with students

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of technology.

None.

Note: Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each are cited under the relevant standard(s)

Section IV: Area(s) for Improvement cited from previous accreditation review, if any

Area(s) for Improvement cited from previous accreditation review, if any

Area for Improvement:	Rationale:

Sources of Evidence

List of interviews and participants

List of exhibits reviewed /List additional sources consulted (website, etc.)

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

Interviewees
Exhibits

See **Attachment** panel below.