



Self-Study for CAEP Review

**Governors State University
Educator Preparation Provider**

July 25, 2018

Visit: April 28 – April 30, 2019



Governors State
UNIVERSITY

1 University Parkway
University Park, IL 60484

Governors State University

Table of Contents

| | Page No. |
|--|-----------------|
| Context and Unique Characteristics | 2 |
| Description of Organizational Structure | 3 |
| Vision, Mission, and Goals | 4 |
| EPP's Shared Values and Beliefs for Educator Preparation | 5 |
| Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge | |
| Standard 1 – Initial | 6 |
| Standard 1 – Advanced | 15 |
| Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice | |
| Standard 2 – Initial | 20 |
| Standard 2 – Advanced | 29 |
| Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity | |
| Standard 3 – Initial | 36 |
| Standard 3 – Advanced | 46 |
| Standard 4: Program Impact | |
| Standard 4 – Initial | 51 |
| Standard 4 – Advanced | 61 |
| Standard 5: Program Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity | |
| Standard 5 – Initial and Advanced | 69 |
| Diversity Cross Cutting Theme | |
| Diversity | 85 |
| Technology Cross Cutting Theme | |
| Technology | 88 |
| Contributions | 91 |

Context and Unique Characteristics

Governors State University (GSU) is located 35 miles south of the Chicago loop on a 750-acre campus. GSU was founded in 1969 as an upper-division institution providing the last two years of bachelor degree work and master's degrees. In 2014, it became a comprehensive public university and is proud to offer the most affordable undergraduate tuition rate in the state of Illinois. Serving more than 5,500 students, GSU offers 64 degree and 24 certificate programs, and our students obtain the skills and credentials needed to succeed in business, industry, healthcare, the arts, and education. The University's broad range of graduate programs prepares students for their next level of academic and professional achievement. Student life at GSU is comprehensive, both on- and off-campus. It includes on-campus housing, athletics and recreation, civic engagement, international student services, more than 70 student clubs and organizations, the Nathan Manilow Sculpture Park sculpture park, the Center for Performing Arts, and more.

GSU has evolved into a regional, primarily commuter institution serving southern and southwestern Cook County, Kankakee County, and Will County. The area population of approximately 1.5 million is approximately 23% minority. This region serves about 12% of the Illinois P-12 school population and employs about 12% of all public school teachers and other school personnel in Illinois. Economically, the region is very diverse; it includes one of the poorest of suburbs in the United States, with median household income of \$17,000, and one of the wealthiest suburbs with median household incomes in the \$90,000 range. Historically, the economy has depended upon agriculture, steel and other heavy industries, and petrochemicals. Since the early 1980s, the area's economy has shifted to a heavier reliance upon the transportation, service, and communications sectors. The economic and social diversity of the area it serves, as well as major shifts in the economic base of the area, have significantly shaped GSU, the university's mission, and the missions of its constituent parts, including the College of Education (COE).

The Education Preparation Provider (EPP) is committed to developing practitioners with the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to positively affect P-12 student learning. The work of the unit is guided by the concept of reasoned eclecticism. Reasoned eclecticism has three components: research-based best practices, conceptual development, and growth of the professional self. Candidates must have a strong research base in their respective fields, accompanied by both the cognitive ability and professional maturity that enable them to develop appropriate professional decision-making skills. The ultimate goal is effective education of students in diverse settings in accord with the important belief that all children can learn.

Governors State University

Description of Organization Structure

University

A seven-member Board of Trustees appointed by the governor of Illinois governs this university. One student serves as a member of the Board of Trustees. The president of the university is responsible to the Board of Trustees for the operation and general welfare of the university. The provost/academic vice president has general responsibility in the areas of academic personnel and programs. Their respective deans directly administer GSU's four academic colleges. Faculty, civil service staff, and students participate in university affairs through membership on the Faculty Senate, Civil Service Senate, Student Senate, and academic and administrative committees. These groups consider and recommend policies and procedures to the president.

College

The College of Education (COE) is one of four academic colleges in the University. It has the two divisions, the Division of Education and the Division of Psychology and Counseling; the Family Development Center (FDC) is also part of the COE. The chief operating officer and chief executive officer of the COE is its dean. Each of the two divisions has a chair who is chief operating officer and chief educational officer for that division. Additionally, the director of educator preparation, assessment coordinator, and director of the FDC report to the COE dean.

EPP

The EPP is defined as all courses and programs that prepare P-12 school personnel; these are primarily within the COE organizational unit and under its administration. However, the EPP is a university-wide unit. The EPP includes all programs in the DOE and those that train school personnel in the Division of Psychology and Counseling. The College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) houses the Secondary Education programs. The College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) houses the Communication Disorders (CDIS) and School Social Work (SSW) programs. In addition, the EPP collaborates with local school districts and agencies for the delivery of all of its programs.

The EPP committee includes members of the university from each of the colleges and programs listed above. Additionally, the DOE chair, the COE dean, the coordinators of the programs associated with the school personnel preparation, the director of educator preparation, the assessment coordinator, and other faculty from involved programs serve on this committee, which meets monthly.

[Table of Contents](#)

Vision, Mission and Goals

Mission

The College of Education prepares its students to be reflective lifelong learners; advocates for diversity and social justice; and engaged, effective, transformative educators and mental health professionals. The COE mission is in alignment with the University mission to offer an exceptional and accessible education that prepares students with the knowledge, skills, and confidence to succeed in a global society.

Vision and Goals

The College of Education will be a recognized regional leader in the preparation and ongoing development of educators and of mental health professionals. The College will be especially acclaimed for its leadership in the following areas:

- Performance-based assessment practices,
- Field-based and clinical practice,
- Evidence-based process improvement,
- Achievements in teaching, scholarship, research and service.

Vision 2020

In alignment with GSU's Vision 2020, the College of Education and the EPP hold the following goals:

- **Academic Excellence:** Provide distinctive academic programs that effectively prepare students to become leaders and productive citizens in the global community.
- **Student Success:** Provide a seamless and supportive pathway from admission to graduation focused on personal and academic success to help ensure that students are career ready and positioned to be leaders and citizens in the community.
- **High Quality Faculty and Staff:** Provide students access to a highly qualified, motivated, and diverse faculty and staff.
- **Continuous Process Improvement:** Develop and sustain a climate of continuous improvement, which is defined by evidence-based decision-making focused on enriching the student experience.

EPP's Shared Values and Beliefs

The EPP seeks to offer the highest quality academic programs, balancing innovation and best practice, to meet the needs of all candidates. The faculty, staff, and administration are committed to seeking and maintaining national accreditation of the unit and all of its programs, to enhancing existing programs as well as creating new programs, including doctoral studies. We strive to integrate the widespread use of technology in curricula, content, and modes of instruction. Together, we model and support candidates' understanding and appreciation of the significance of human diversity in ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, and learning styles.

Conceptual Framework

The professional education unit is dedicated to the development of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions of GSU candidates through reflective analysis and guided inquiry to optimize P-12 student learning. Reasoned eclecticism, the harmonizing element in all the unit's activities, emerges from the unit's emphasis on the development of competent practitioners who operate at high cognitive levels and who attend primarily to application and testing of knowledge (rather than to theoretical orthodoxy).

Increasing attention on performance assessment asks teacher educators to expand their focus on the theoretical to include specific P-12 school environments where theory and practice meet. The EPP believes that a reasoned eclectic approach produces desirable results and outcomes for P-12 students more frequently than any single, more purely theoretical approach.

A vital characteristic of the successful reasoned eclectic practitioner is a high level of cognitive development and operation. The EPP is committed to moving candidates from lower pre-conventional levels of cognitive complexity to higher post-conventional cognitive levels in order to optimize their application of reasoned eclecticism. Graduates functioning at higher stages have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to change the learning environment and instruction in accord with the diverse needs of P-12 students.

Vision 2020

In alignment with GSU's Vision 2020, the College of Education and the EPP hold the following core values:

- **Invest in Student Success** through a commitment to mentoring and a deliberate university focus on student achievement of academic, professional, and personal goals.
- **Provide Opportunity and Access** to a first-class public education to residents of our surrounding communities and all those traditionally underserved by higher education.
- **Demonstrate Inclusiveness and Diversity** to encourage acceptance of wide-ranging perspectives among students, staff, faculty, and members of the broader community.
- **Promote Quality of Life**, which encompasses civic, personal, professional, and cultural growth.

Standard 1 – Initial

Through assignments and assessments aligned to InTASC standards (CAEP 1.1), the Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) monitors candidates appropriate progression levels within categories of Learner and Learning, Content Knowledge, Instructional Practice, and Professional Responsibility to prepare candidates with the knowledge, skills and confidence to succeed in a global society in accordance to the GSU mission. Programs within the EPP design opportunities for candidates to engage in research and evidence (CAEP 1.2) to inform their application of content and pedagogical knowledge (CAEP 1.3). Newly-developed rubrics increase the EPP's ability to monitor candidates' implementation of College- and Career-Ready (CAEP 1.4) and International Society for Technology in Education (CAEP 1.5) standards to engage P-12 students and improve learning. Please refer to Hyperlinks, Abbreviations, Definitions, and References (1.1) for website, university and college titles, course codes, and academic terms information.

1.1 GSU's EPP initial preparation programs in Early Childhood (EDEC), Elementary (EMED), Secondary Biology (BTE), Chemistry (CTE), English (ETE), and Mathematics (MTE), and Multi-Categorical Special Education (MCSE) seek to ensure candidates develop a deep understanding of both content knowledge and pedagogical skills that effectively support teaching and student learning. By focusing candidates' preparation on InTASC and discipline-specific standards and practices, particularly those on technology and diversity, the EPP strives to optimally prepare our candidates for working with P-12 students. The EPP Unit Assessment Standards Alignment document (1.2) shows the alignment of the 10 InTASC standards to our EPP assessments. Data from the EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative Assessment Rubric (1.3.a), EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Summative Assessment Rubric (1.3.a), and a variety of other Programmatic Assessment Rubrics (1.4) provide evidence related to the InTASC standards and are used to help identify the EPP's areas of strengths related to Standard 1.

Data cycles differ across programs on some assessments due to the frequency of course offerings or the recent implementation of data points. EDEC and EMED programs offer all methods and student teaching courses in fall and spring semesters. Therefore, a full data cycle for these programs is one semester. Secondary and MCSE programs offer methods courses only once per year and need a full academic year to represent one data cycle. In F17, assessing the student teaching Week 15 EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Summative data was implemented.

The adapted EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative/Summative Rubrics are validated and based on the Danielson Framework for Teaching. The EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative/Summative Assessment rubrics use a 4-point scale with the following numerical point values: Unsatisfactory - 1; Basic - 2; Proficient - 3; Distinguished - 4. Data are collected and analyzed formatively at Weeks 5 and 10 to measure growth, and summatively at Week 15 to evaluate candidates' overall student teaching performance. The Danielson Framework and associated rubrics are aligned to the 10 InTASC standards and grounded in a constructivist view

Governors State University

of learning and teaching. The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), the licensing body for EPP candidates, promotes the Danielson Framework for teacher evaluation, which focuses on aspects of teacher responsibilities that have been empirically documented to affect P-12 student learning. These rubrics are used by University student teacher supervisors to assess candidates' instructional planning and teaching during student teaching placements and prior to Benchmark III of the Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) (1.5) for initial candidates. Until F17, candidates were formatively assessed at Weeks 5 and 10 during the 15-week student teaching experience.

As seen in the EPPU Danielson Assessment Data Report (1.6), these assessments yielded evidence of candidate growth from their beginning to final weeks of student teaching experiences. Mean scores are consistently higher at each assessment point: for F17 there was a 0.76 point or 28.4% increase from Week 5 to Week 10; for S18, there was a 0.76 point or 28.5% increase from Week 5 to Week 10. The coordinators of the various programs discussed with the EPP a formal summative assessment at the end of student teaching for candidates to demonstrate their ability beyond edTPA®. The EPP voted to implement a third, summative assessment point at Week 15 of student teaching beginning in F17. These two cycles of data reveal that the candidates grew by an average of 6.83% (F17) and 12.83% (S18) from Week 5 formative assessment to Week 15 summative assessment.

Analyses of the candidates' performance as it relates to the InTASC standards collected from the EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative/Summative Assessment rubrics are monitored by the EPP and show progress from Week 5 to Week 10 (and to Week 15 for AY17/18). Data consistently show a strength and growth in performance related to all 10 InTASC standards. This suggests that practice, feedback from supervisors, and ongoing professional development via seminars positively affected candidate performance, evident in the EPPU Danielson Assessment Data Reports (1.6) which breaks out each program by term and evaluation cycle. The percentages of candidates with Proficient or above overall evaluations and mean scores are from four cycles of data collection (F16, S17, F17, S18). Score comparisons for F16 and S17 document candidates' improvement from Week 5 to Week 10 of student teaching; score comparisons for F17 and S18 document candidates' improvement from Week 5 to Week 15. Overall, the growth range for all programs was between 7.1% (MTE) to 43.7% (MCSE). The average growth was 28.4% for all candidates by Week 10 or 15 (as appropriate). By Week 10 (or 15 when appropriate), the scores of all candidates were at or beyond the CAEP acceptable level. CTE shows no data as there were no student teachers during these cycles. The 10 InTASC standards disaggregated into the four categories addressed by program and by data cycle can be found in the CAEP InTASC Data Report (1.7).

Assessing candidates' dispositions is another essential element of the GSU EPP assessment system. In May 2016, GSU received an "Early Instrument Review Report" (1.8) from CAEP that indicated GSU needed to revise its Student Progress instrument as well as develop at least one additional EPP instrument. As a result, the COE/EPP held two all-day work sessions September

Governors State University

30 and October 28, 2016 under the guidance of CAEP consultant Dr. Gary Railsback. Meeting Minutes (1.9) provide information about the rubric analysis process. Separate EPP assessment instruments needed to be developed for initial-program and advanced program candidate dispositions. The Dispositions Assessment for Initial Program Educator Preparation Programs rubric and the EPPU Advanced Programs Educational Professional Disposition Rubric were piloted in F16 and implemented EPP-wide S17.

The EPP Dispositions Assessment for Initial Program Educator Preparation Programs rubric focuses on seven professional dispositions—collaboration, respect for student diversity, professional judgment and behavior, ethical behavior, impact on learning, accepting and implementing feedback, and commitment to learning—and is aligned with eight of the ten InTASC standards’ “critical dispositions” indicative of habits of professional action and moral commitments that play a key role in how teachers act in practice. Each dispositional element is scored at one of four levels with these points: Unacceptable - 0, Developing - 1, Target - 2, and Exemplary - 3. It should be noted that starting in F18, this rubric’s scale will be changed from 3- to 4-point scoring for consistency across rubrics used within the EPP. The EPPU Dispositions Assessment for Initial Program Educator Preparation Programs Rubric (1.3.c) is administered at the conclusion of all Professional Education courses (methods courses, teaching laboratories, and student teaching).

As indicated in the EPPU Disposition Data Reports (1.10), all candidates enrolled in Professional Education courses performed at the level of Acceptable or above, demonstrating candidates’ professional dispositions necessary to work with P-12 students. Data have been collected and analyzed by program for four cycles of data collection; summary data are reported below. The first cycle is the F16 pilot of the Dispositions Assessment for Initial Program Educator Preparation Programs rubric. Data gathered in the EPPU Dispositions Data Report (1.10) show the percentage of line items on the rubric by program, course, and data cycle at or above the level of Acceptable as defined by CAEP. The programs achieved a range of 80% to 100% at the acceptable level over the data cycles.

All initial programs use multiple program-specific rubrics for specific assessments such as unit plans, parent letters, reflective essays, etc., as well as the EPPU Dispositions Assessment for Initial Program Educator Preparation Program and the EPPU Danielson Student Teaching 10-Week Formative and 15-Week Summative Assessment rubrics, as reflected in the CAEP InTASC Data Reports (1.7). These program assessments are aligned to the 10 InTASC standards and provide evidence of candidates’ performance in four InTASC categories. Individual program level rubrics are not consistent with regard to performance level descriptors, nor with regard to point values assigned to the various levels. The EPP is working towards more consistency in rating scales across rubrics/assessments (see EPP Rubric Consistency Plan 1.11). Therefore, to simplify reporting, the sufficient or acceptable level on all rubrics will be referred to as

Governors State University

“Acceptable.” The data presented in CAEP InTASC Data Reports (1.7) show the percentage of candidates who met or exceeded the Acceptable criteria for InTASC Standards listed.

Overall, the program-specific rubric data for InTASC standards summatively show that out of 75 data cycles, candidates met or exceeded the Acceptable criteria in 70 data cycles (93.3%).

Overall, the EPP-specific rubric data for InTASC standards summatively show that out of 76 data cycles, candidates met or exceeded the Acceptable criteria in 60 data cycles (78.9%). While the data show that the CAEP Sufficient level is not consistently being met by all programs in every cycle, the trend data indicate that by S18 all programs met the CAEP Acceptable level. The exceptions are ETE and BTE. ETE fell slightly below in S18 in InTASC categories 1-3, 4-5, and 9-10; however, it exceeded in previous terms.

While programs across the EPP review their data to monitor candidate progress and inform program decisions, the EPP’s analysis of program SPA reports and meeting minutes have revealed the need to institute more extensive data review and recording requirements across all programs. Additionally, the manners in which these data have been collected and reported have differed from CAEP self-study requirements. For example, programs review data on candidate professional dispositions, disaggregated by course, expecting candidates to have performed at the Developing level in early course sequences. Candidates in later course sequences, including student teaching, are expected to perform at a Target or Exemplary level. Analyses of the aggregated data by InTASC standards for CAEP Standard 1.1 led to identification of a problem with point calculations. In the CAEP 1.1 report, all of the scores at the Developing level are considered not meeting an Acceptable Level. Because EDEC and EMED assess candidates’ professional dispositions during early Professional Education courses in which the expectation is Developing, the percentage of candidates who are at CAEP Acceptable level is low when including all course sequences. In all data cycles except for S17 for EDEC, this aspect of the Dispositions assessments in early course sequences has had a negative impact on the percentage rates for meeting CAEP Standard 1.1. Therefore, in the CAEP InTASC Data Reports (1.7) each row in the Excel spreadsheets corresponding to a row in the Dispositions Assessment for Initial Program Educator Preparation Programs rubric has the rubric title highlighted in red; this will point to the source of low percentages. A phase-in plan will address this problem. In F18, we will create copies of the Dispositions rubric to be used in early, middle, and later course sequences. This will function in the same manner as our 5, 10, and 15 Week Danielson Student Teaching rubrics that enable us to see candidate growth but do not negatively impact the percentages at which we report meeting CAEP Standard 1.1.

1.2 The GSU EPP ensures that completers use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession, measure their P-12 students’ progress, and enhance their own professional practice. Data derived from the various program-specific Lesson Plan Rubrics (1.4) and other programmatic assessments demonstrate how candidates are evaluated on their ability to plan instruction, teach lessons, and assess P-12 students’ learning. There are common elements across all program lesson plan rubrics and program-unique elements

appropriate to specific content areas and P-12 students' developmental levels.

Evidence of initial program candidates' use of research and evidence can also be found in edTPA® results. EPP student teachers must cite their use of research and evidence in development of plans for and implementation of instruction for edTPA® and noted in the edTPA CAEP Alignment Data Report (1.12). All of these assessments show candidate performance at or above Acceptable levels on rubric indicators.

GSU EPP's program candidates' knowledge and use of research-based best practices to guide their planning for instruction and measuring P-12 students' progress are evidenced by lesson and unit plans data analyzed by CAEP Standards. These assessments occur at various points in each program; program-specific assignments are listed in the CAEP Standards 1.2, 1.4, and 1.5 Data Report (1.13). Individual program level rubrics are not consistent with regard to performance level descriptors, nor with regard to point values assigned to the various levels as indicated in the EPP Rubric Consistency Plan 1.11). Therefore, to simplify reporting, the sufficient or acceptable level on all rubrics will be referred to as "Acceptable." The percentages reported are percentages of candidates who met or exceeded Acceptable level. EDEC and EMED phased in 1.2 in Lesson Plan rubrics beginning F17. The CAEP Standards 1.2, 1.4, and 1.5 Data Report (1.13) summatively shows that out of 13 data cycles, candidates met or exceeded the Acceptable criteria in 11 data cycles (84.6%).

In order to pass Benchmark IV Licensure as described in the BAS (1.5) for initial candidates, all initial program candidates must successfully complete the edTPA®. The edTPA® is a proprietary benchmarked assessment with established reliability and content validity. It is a performance-based, subject-specific support and assessment system used by educator preparation providers nationwide; it became a state of Illinois requirement for licensure July 1, 2015. The edTPA® complements the EPP's multiple-measures assessment system as a summative capstone that provides an opportunity for candidates to integrate what they have learned about effective teaching practice throughout their program and to demonstrate that they can plan, teach, and assess based on knowledge of their students. The edTPA® Crosswalk (1.14) shows how the constructs included in edTPA® rubrics align with CAEP Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge.

The edTPA® assessment typically includes 15 rubrics, each of which is scored on a 5-point scale. The EPP initial programs' data overall show that all candidates met or exceeded the edTPA® cut scores established by ISBE by program completion. Data in the edTPA CAEP Alignment Data Report (1.12) show the mean scores for each rubric. Overall, for all programs the mean scores for AY15/16 - 2.93; AY16/17 - 3.02; AY17/18 - 2.99; AY15-AY18 - 2.98. This works out to be an average score of between 43.95 and 45.3, well beyond the state requirement for passage. However, some candidates were not successful in their first attempt. The edTPA® individual rubric scores are presented at program meetings to look for trends. Although these minutes

have not been captured by all programs, it is evident in the History of Change Document (1.15) that a new course is being developed to address the needs of candidates who are not successful on the edTPA® assessment during their first attempt.

1.3 The EPP ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS), and other accrediting bodies. As noted in initial program SPA Reports and SPA Feedback Documents (1.16), all initial programs have received national recognition.

Initial-Level Programs:

- B.A. in EDEC (nationally recognized in 2017)
- B.A. in EMED Education (nationally recognized in 2017)
- Post-Bac certificate in EDEC (nationally recognized in 2018)
- M.A. in MCSE, Option II (nationally recognized in 2016)
- M.S. in MTE (nationally recognized in 2017)
- Post-B.A. certificate in MTE (nationally recognized in 2016)
- Post-B.A. certificate in ETE (nationally recognized in 2018)
- Post-B.A. certificate in BTE (nationally recognized in 2017)
- Post-B.A. certificate in CTE (nationally recognized in 2017)

1.4 The EPP ensures that candidates demonstrate the skills and commitment necessary for their P-12 students to meet rigorous College- and Career-Ready (CCR) standards. Our initial preparation programs seek to ensure candidates develop a deep understanding of content knowledge and the method on how to teach that content. Throughout their Professional Education courses and field experiences, candidates are asked to identify ways to engage all of their P-12 students in activities that promote critical thinking and collaboration. Candidates in all programs are expected to align lesson plans to the content-specific state-approved standards (e.g. Common Core State Standards—CCSS, Next Generation Science Standards—NGSS).

For CAEP Standard 1.4, the EPP depends most heavily on two data sources in making judgments about CCR: Lesson Plan assessments as represented in the CAEP Standards 1.2, 1.4, and 1.5 Data Report (1.13) and edTPA® results represented in the edTPA CAEP Alignment Data Report (1.12).

EPP candidates identify and apply CCSS in lesson plans to ensure P-12 students meet CCR anchor standards. The various program lesson plan rubrics that capture CCSS outcomes are not consistent with regard to performance level descriptors, nor with regard to point values assigned to the various levels (see EPP Rubric Consistency Plan 1.11). Therefore, to simplify reporting, the sufficient or acceptable level on all rubrics will be referred to as “Acceptable.” Candidates’ performance related to CAEP Standard 1.4 CCR are included in CAEP Standards 1.2,

1.4, and 1.5 Data Report (1.13) by program and data cycle. The data summatively show that out of 19 data cycles, candidates met or exceeded the Acceptable criteria in 17 data cycles (89.5%). The data for ETE in AY17/18 and MTE in AY15/16 reflect non-acceptable scores and were considered anomalies. The percentage of candidates who failed to meet the Acceptable level of performance in the aforementioned areas occurred only in a single academic year for both ETE and MTE. In those cases, the anomalous scores for individual candidates were addressed through intervention of program faculty with each candidate. The data from other academic years show candidates well above the Acceptable level in most cases.

edTPA® results found in the edTPA CAEP Alignment Data Report (1.12) provide evidence of candidates' skills and commitments regarding P-12 student CCR standards. The edTPA® data for CAEP 1.2, utilizes the same rubrics as for 1.4. because all 15 rubrics are utilized in both.

1.5 The EPP seeks to ensure that initial program candidates both understand technology standards and can apply these standards in their Professional Education course assignments and field experiences through integrated technology requirements. Candidates design and implement instructional activities using appropriate technology tools and applications that will engage P-12 students and improve learning. Finding a lack of systematic data points for measuring technology standards being met, the EPP decided to implement a technology-focused row in the lesson plan rubrics to assess candidates' use of technology in lesson plans in F17 as seen in the Program Rubrics for Initial Programs (1.4) Candidates are assessed on how effectively they integrate available and appropriate technology and media communication. However, the various program lesson plan rubrics are not consistent with regard to performance level descriptors, nor with regard to point values assigned to the various levels as indicated in the EPP Rubric Consistency Plan (1.11). Educational Technology Course Assessment Data Report (1.17), CAEP Standard 1 Assessment Report (1.13), and CAEP 1.5 Technology ISTE Student Standards Pilot (1.18) results are listed below and indicate the percentage of assessments at or above the acceptable level.

Educational Technology Course: F16 - 96.1%; S17 - 95%; F17 - 97.1%; S18 - 95.9%

Program Use of Technology CAEP Standard 1 Assessment Report (1.13) (excludes MCSE) - The data summatively show that out of 17 data cycles, candidates met or exceeded the Acceptable criteria in 15 data cycles (88.2%).

The addition of this rubric criterion did not extend far enough to include candidates' understanding of appropriate technology implementation for P-12 students. Therefore, in S18 the EPP began a pilot to include an assessment of candidates' inclusion of 2017 ISTE Standards for Students in their program-required lesson plans. Each program would formally assess candidates' identification and planned instruction of appropriate technology standards. EDEC, ETE, and BTE participated in the S18 ISTE Student Standards pilot of this criterion addition to

the lesson plan rubric.

S18: EDEC– 16.7%, ETE – 66.7%, BTE – 100%

Phase-in for Technology

Rationale for Technology Phase-in

Examination of CAEP Technology cross-cutting theme, Standard 1.5, and ISTE Standards for Educators highlighted shortfalls in assessing candidates' knowledge of technology, their skills with using digital media, and their ability to implement technology in the classroom. An educational technology course, required for all programs until 2015, was designed to teach candidates basic technology skills such as word processing, data manipulation, and web applications. During review, it was found that the educational technology course was aligned to the 2008 International Society for Technology in Education standards and did not extend instruction to the implementation of technology in the classroom. Further, methods courses in the EPP did not expand upon basic technology skills to explore digital literacy or technology platforms used in the local school districts. For the AY15/16, AY16/17, and AY17/18 data collection cycles, an educational technology course was not required for secondary education programs, a decision based on the goal of embedding technology in the methods courses.

Technology Phase-in

The technology phase-in plan is two-fold. First, an educational technology course revision will include alignment to the 2017 ISTE Standards for Educators and instruction for how to use databases, digital media, and other technological functions to engage, monitor, and assess P-12 students. Second, methods courses will address the importance of data literacy, particularly ways in which knowing classroom management systems and databases can address Danielson Domains such as getting to know students (1b), designing assessments (1f), managing student behavior (2d), communicating with students (3a), and using assessment in instruction (3d).

The Educational Technology Revision Process (1.19) informs the technology phase-in. Professionals in the field were surveyed about the technology skills student teachers and new teachers need in the classroom. K-12 teachers, administrators, and curriculum coaches across multiple states responded in professional forums on social media that candidates should understand the features of document creation software that make commenting and giving feedback happen in a digital age. They emphasized the importance of teaching candidates how to model digital citizenship and find trusted resources, as well as how to organize resources and documents appropriately.

Feedback from our partner districts and stakeholders, evidenced in the Educational Technology Revision Process (1.19) indicated that candidates need knowledge of classroom management systems (e.g. Google Apps for Education™, Schoology®) and how to create an online presence (Twitter Inc., Snapchat Inc., Facebook®), particularly as a means for communicating with

parents. As candidates advance to the methods courses in their programs, they will need embedded technology instruction to further the skills learned in the introductory educational technology course. During methods courses and the participatory field experiences, candidates will become more familiar with the classroom management systems used by the local school districts for tracking and using student data to inform instruction. Some programs (e.g. ENGL 4575 Reading Theory & Practice, EMED 4453 Middle Grades ELA Methods) have begun piloting the integration of Google Apps for Education™ as a teaching platform as well as the integrated use of online bulletin boards that provide audio and video tools (e.g. Padlet®).

Beginning F18, professional development will be provided at DOE meetings for faculty to learn how to integrate these technologies into their methods and field-based courses. Modules and assessments will be created and included in syllabi for S19 (beyond the pilot in ENGL 4575 and EMED 4453).

Dispositions Assessment

In F18 the EPP will duplicate the Dispositions rubric for each course sequence level: Dispositions E (early course sequences such as foundation courses prior to formal program acceptance), Dispositions M (middle course sequences such as methods courses), and Dispositions F (final course sequences such as student teaching). This phase-in plan is described in Phase-In Plan for Initial Dispositions Progressions (1.20).

Standard 1 – Advanced

The Educational Administration – Principal Leadership (EDAD) program is the single advanced program represented in this Self-Study. The EPP ensures that EDAD develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles and by completion, are able to use professional practices to advance the learning of all P-12 students toward attainment of College- and Career-Readiness (CCR) standards. Data from the required Illinois licensure test (ILTS 195 and 196) and ‘Growth Through Learning’ modules; the EPP Disposition Rubric for Advance Candidates (1.3); and a variety of other programmatic assessments as reflected in the Principal Leadership Content Exams Data Reports (A.1.1) provide assessment evidence related to candidates knowledge and skills and professional disposition as a principal.

A.1.1 The Principal as Instructional Leader ILTS 195 and 196 content tests are designed to assess the candidates’ knowledge of content principal administration. The tests are based on current and relevant expectations for principals in Illinois. Candidates must take and pass both ILTS tests (195,196) with a minimum passing score of 240. Each test is divided into subareas.

ILTS Test 195

Planning, Change and Accountability

- Understand how to lead change and engage in collaborative, data-driven planning and decision making to improve student learning outcomes
- Understand the use of assessment and accountability systems to monitor students’ progress and promote educational excellence

Instructional Improvement

- Understand how to establish and sustain a school culture and learning environment conducive to student learning and staff professional growth
- Understand professional development that improves learning for every student

All EDAD completers were successful on the ILST 195 content exam with an overall mean of 265.1. The Advanced Standard 1 data report shows a breakdown of the subarea scores for all completers over the three data cycles.

ILTS Test 196

Visionary Leadership, Collaboration, and Context of Education

- Understand the collaborative development and implementation of a shared vision to promote continuous and sustainable improvement in students’ achievement and growth
- Understand how to communicate and collaborate with students, faculty and other staff, families and community members; respond to diverse community interests and needs;

and mobilize community resources to strengthen school programs and support school goals

- Understand the political, social, economic, legal and cultural context of education and how to respond to an influence these contexts

School Management and Legal/Ethical Guidelines

- Understand organizational and operational management that supports school improvement and desired educational outcomes
- Understand fiscal and human resource management that supports school improvement and desired educational outcomes
- Understand legal and ethical guidelines related to schools and education

All EDAD candidates were successful on the ILST 196 content exam with an overall mean of 253.5. The Advanced Standard 1 Data Report (A.1.2) shows a breakdown of the subarea scores for all completers over the three data cycles.

EPP EDAD candidates must successfully complete the 'Growth Through Learning' (GTL) Training Modules for Teacher Evaluation as required in EDAD-7803 Principal as Evaluator course. In 2010, Illinois Governor, Pat Quinn signed the Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA), which requires all schools in Illinois to change how teachers' and principals' performance is measured. PERA requires school districts to design and implement performance evaluations that assesses teachers' and principals' professional skills as well as incorporate measures of student growth. Since September 1, 2012, both teachers and administrators in all districts have been rated on these performance categories: excellent, proficient, needs improvement and unsatisfactory.

As teacher evaluators, principals must go through the pre-qualification training and pass the developed assessments. The Illinois 'GTL' Performance Evaluation project provides separate evaluation training modules for teacher evaluators. Each training program is rigorous, validated for accuracy and reliability, and focused on the minimum requirements set forth by the Evaluation Certified Employee. Individual modules address the use of student growth data and indicators to evaluate teachers, as well as methods and strategies for evaluating the professional practice of teachers. The training is separated into five discrete modules for teacher evaluation. Module 1: Understand Teacher Practice – Module 2: Observation Skills and evidence collections; Module 3: Conferencing skills; Module 4: Reflect, measure, evaluate with teachers to improve performance; and Module 5: Student Growth. 100% of EDAD completers were successful on the series of GTL modules which is reported as a Pass or Fail status. The Advanced Standard 1 data report shows a breakdown of the scores for all completers over the three data cycles.

In May 2016, GSU received an "Early Instrument Review Report" from CAEP. It was determined that GSU needed to revise its Student Progress instrument per CAEP recommendations as well as develop at least one additional EPP instrument as discussed in Standard 1 initial. As a result,

Governors State University

the College of Education/EPP held two all-day CAEP work sessions under the guidance of CAEP consultant Dr. Gary Railsback. These sessions occurred on September 30 and October 28, 2016; Meeting Minutes (1.9) provide information about the rubric development process. It was decided that separate EPP disposition assessment instruments needed to be developed for initial-program candidate dispositions and advanced-program candidate dispositions. The participants who contributed to the EPPU Advanced Programs Educational Professional Disposition Rubric (1.3) were Drs. Barbara Winicki, Marlon Cummings, Megan McCaffrey, Betsy Essex, and Katie Wix. These participants represented various programs and colleges included in the EPP. The Dispositions Assessment for the EPP Advanced Programs Educational Professional Disposition Rubric were piloted in F16 and implemented EPP-wide during S17.

The EPP Dispositions Assessment for Advanced Educator Preparation Programs rubric focuses on six professional dispositions – appreciation of diversity, commitment to collaboration, commitment to professional growth, ethical behavior, habits of mind for reasoned eclecticism, and professional behavior. Each dispositional element is scored with these points at one of four levels – Far Below Standards - 1, Below Standards - 2, Meets Standards - 3, and Exceeds Standards - 4. The EPPU Dispositions Assessment for Advanced Program Educator Preparation Programs Rubric is administered throughout the program.

The expectation is that candidates be rated at least "Meets Standards" on a majority of the elements. As indicated in the Disposition Data Reports (1.10), 99.2% of all candidates were at this Acceptable level or above for the overall dispositions element. The analysis of this data demonstrates that the GSU EPP's advanced candidates have the necessary professional dispositions to work with P-12 students. The Disposition Data Reports (1.10) shows a breakdown of scores for all completers over the three data cycles.

In addition to the ILTS content exams, GTL modules, and EPPU Dispositions Assessment for Advanced Program Educator Preparation Programs Rubric (1.3.d), the EPP EDAD program also utilize multiple program-specific assessments, including a case study assessment, an internship assessment, a school improvement plan assessment, and others that are aligned to CAEP Standard A.1.1. The rubrics label levels of achievement vary and some use a 3-point scale, while others use a 4-point scale. Therefore, to simplify reporting, the Sufficient or Acceptable level on all rubrics will be referred to as "Acceptable;" the percentages reported are percentages of candidates who met the Acceptable criterion or above for the named assessment. As noted in Standard 1 initial, the EPP is working towards more consistency in rating scales across rubrics/assessments. Data for only two academic years are reflected in the Standard 1 Advanced data report. These data are disaggregated from the various rubrics by CAEP subparts of A.1.1. To organize these data into logical components, they are disaggregated by self-defined subparts. These subparts (1) applications of data literacy; (2) collaborative activities; and (3) laws, policies, and codes of ethics. The data reflects that candidates met the CAEP Acceptable or above level 100% of the time for these subparts. The Advanced Standard 1 data report

shows a breakdown of the scores for all completers over the two data cycles collected. The EPP Phase-In Plan includes plans for additional evidence over time.

Professional Responsibilities:

A.1.2 Providers ensure that advanced program completers have opportunities to learn and apply specialized content and discipline knowledge contained in approved state and/or national discipline-specific standards. These specialized standards include, but are not limited to, Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards, individual state standards, standards of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and standards of other accrediting bodies [e.g., Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)].

The EPP ensure that completers apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and State. As noted in EDAD SPA Reports and SPA Feedback Documents (1.16), all advanced programs have received national recognition.

The College of Education is one of four colleges within Governors State University and houses the Division of Education and the Division of Psychology and Counseling. The EPP is responsible for educator preparation programs across the university, including those within the COE. GSU's secondary teacher preparation programs are housed in the College of Arts; the MHS in Communication Disorders (school speech pathologist) program is housed in the College of Health and Human Services. Several of GSU's EPP programs were eliminated by the Board of Trustees during the 2016-2017 academic year and are currently on teach-out. The M.A. in Educational Administration, Principal Preparation sequence is the only remaining advanced program represented in this CAEP study. The M.A. in Multi-Categorical Special Education, Option I, the MA in Reading, the Chief School Business Official sequence in Educational Administration are currently being taught-out. Additionally, the School Social Work sequence for the MSW Program in the CHHS is also being taught-out. The Ed.D. in Interdisciplinary Leadership Superintendent concentration was re-designed and approved by Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) on June 6, 2018 and will accept its first cohort in August 2018. The remaining advanced programs, including eliminated programs with remaining candidates, new programs, programs in redesign, and programs with other accrediting agencies, as well as their SPA accreditation statuses are as follows:

Advanced-Level Programs:

- M.A. in Educational Administration, Principal Preparation sequence (nationally recognized in 2017)
- M.A. in Multi-Categorical Special Education, Option I (nationally recognized in 2016)

Governors State University

- M.H.S. in Communications Disorders (accredited by CAA)
- M.A. in Counseling, School Counseling sequence (accredited by CACREP)
- Post-M.A. certificate in School Counseling (accredited by CACREP)
- Ed.S. in School Psychology (new program)
- Ed.D. in Interdisciplinary Leadership, Superintendent Concentration (approved by ISBE June 6, 2018)

Standard 2 – Initial

In alignment to Governor State University's (GSU) mission to prepare students with the knowledge, skills, and confidence to succeed in a global society, the EPP district partnership agreements such as Memoranda of Understanding (CAEP 2.1) allow for broad-ranging experiences in diverse settings. The GSU EPP provides for candidate preparation with high quality co-prepared and co-selected clinical educators (CAEP 2.2). Clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, coherence, and duration (CAEP 2.3) prepare candidates to positively impact students in the classroom. Refer to Hyperlinks, Abbreviations, Definitions, and References (1.1) for website, university and college titles, course codes, and academic terms information.

2.1 GSU's EPP has developed effective affiliations and partnerships with local districts and the ISBE so that candidates develop the skills and professional dispositions necessary for having a positive impact on P-12 learners. The EPP faculty members have the responsibility of designing, delivering, and evaluating all field and clinical experiences in collaboration with the EPP's school partners. Through three levels of partnership agreements, the EPP offers its candidates opportunities to work with diverse student populations in both rural and urban settings in districts serving P-12 students with a wide range of racial/ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds, as noted in Diverse School Districts (2.1). Agreements include the following: *Primary Level* - affiliation; *Secondary Level* - field experience placements; *Tertiary Level* - Memoranda of Understanding.

Primary Level: Affiliation Agreements- EPP Partnerships

GSU's EPP has signed agreements with over 60 Partner School Districts (2.2), including Chicago Public Schools and districts in Cook, Will, and Kankakee Counties. As stated in the Affiliation Agreement (2.3), GSU and the School/LEA have determined that they have a mutual interest in providing educational training experiences for GSU candidates. GSU has determined that candidate placements in these Schools/LEAs are consistent with the goals and objectives of the curricula and will enhance the programs of study in Early Childhood (EDEC), Elementary (EMED), Multi-Categorical Special Education (MCSE), and Secondary Biology (BTE), Chemistry (CTE), English (ETE), and Mathematics (MTE).

Affiliation Agreements are updated every five years and provide GSU and School/LEA with standards and procedures. The Affiliation Agreements ask both parties to participate in planning and evaluation sessions with candidates and, where appropriate, with GSU faculty members and district school staff.

Secondary Level: Field Experience Placement Agreements

Course-based field experiences opportunities are available in over 60 partner school districts serving multiple programs, offering candidates diversity in student populations and socio-economic characteristics as noted in Diverse School Districts (2.1). These districts provide settings that reflect the broad rural, suburban, and urban character, as well as the racial, ethnic,

Governors State University

gender, and socioeconomic diversity of GSU's service region; summary data indicate the overall demographics as being 49% White, 23.6% Black, 20.6% Hispanic, 2.8% Asian; 13.9% with IEPs and 45.9% Title 1. Candidates experience a range of curricula, administrative structures, and instructional formats and modalities. For example, local school districts such as Bloom Township District 206 have updated their technology capabilities with newly-acquired equipment to accommodate online classroom learning systems (e.g. Google Apps for Education™) for their nearly one-to-one computer-student ratio.

EDEC partners with the on-campus Family Development Center (FDC), which was designed to serve the educational needs of young children and their families. GSU students in EDEC, both undergraduate and graduate, are active participants in the FDC. Candidates rotate through school settings with different racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic student populations, including *Park Forest District 163, Orland District 135, Arbor Park District 145, Crete-Monee Community Unit District 201-U (CM)*. EMED Lab I courses are based at *Park Forest District 163*, and EMED Lab II courses are based in three schools in *Indian Springs District 109*. Partner school districts for Secondary Education content methods courses include *Bloom Township District 206, Rich Township District 227, Homewood Flossmoor Community District 233, Lincoln-Way Community District 210*, and *Crete-Monee Community Unit District 201-U*, which includes the Village of University Park, where the GSU EPP is located.

All initial preparation program candidates are required to take Survey of Students with Exceptionalities (or equivalent course from another institution), which includes fifteen hours of field experience in elementary or middle schools. Particularly beneficial to Secondary education candidates who are involved in immersive clinical methods course experiences in one high school setting, candidates in this course must observe in regular grade 1-8 classrooms. Additionally, EMED and Secondary education majors must take Educational Psychology II: Learning, Assessment, and Classroom Management, which includes fifteen field experience hours in their particular grade range. These 30 field experience hours at various grade levels further engage secondary candidates with grade- and school-level experiences beyond those part of their high school content methods courses.

The COE Programs Exit Survey F17 and S18 (2.4), administered to graduating candidates each semester, gathers data about candidates' field experience with different populations of students. F17 survey responses indicated that candidates' perceived experiences included interactions with groups of P-12 students at the following levels: students with disabilities - 70%; English Language Learners - 75%; Title I (low-income) students - 67%; gifted students - 62%. Exit Survey Data Reports (2.5) show that S18 candidates' perceived interactions with specified groups of P-12 students were at the following levels: students with disabilities - 69%; English Language Learners - 93%; Title I (low-income) students - 93%; gifted students - 93%.

Tertiary Level: Memoranda of Understanding

Through Memoranda of Understanding (MOU), partners acknowledge the mutual benefits of their relationships with the University. These reciprocal relationships provide opportunities for

Governors State University

the simultaneous support and improvement of P-12 students, practicing teachers, other educators, and candidates. As stated in the GSU MOUs, partners commit to a collaboration that ensures high-quality clinical/field experiences for the EPP candidates. The partnership goals include improving student learning, providing professional learning opportunities for partner school teachers and GSU candidates and faculty, strengthening pre-service teacher education, increasing support for partner school teachers and leaders, and seeking funding for education research and professional resources. Current initial program MOUs (2.6) examples include GSU-Monee Elementary School MOU for EMED school-based courses in reading and language arts (starting F18) and GSU-Crete-Monee High School (CMHS) MOU for ETE school-based English methods. Immersive field experiences have been an important component of the EMED program for decades, and the newly-established joint effort between the EPP and CMHS to create a similar experience for ETE candidates will serve as a model for other secondary programs. Our candidates can benefit from the technology mission of the Crete-Monee School District 201-U that states the goal “to provide an unparalleled technology experience that strives to endure and continually advance the curricular, instructional, and administrative functions of our district.”

In the CMHS clinical setting, candidates observe and conduct lessons in high-school mentor teachers’ classrooms and then return to the methods classroom to discuss the experience. This close proximity provides candidates with immediate connections of theory to practice. School administrators are invited to the class meetings to share information about teacher evaluations, formative and summative assessment data analyses, reflective teaching practices, relationships with students, and collaboration, as seen in CMHS Email Communications as reported in the Meeting Minutes (1.9).

The organization and implementation of this GSU-CMHS effort to create a more immersive experience for candidates highlighted the need for more descriptive feedback from all stakeholders in the development of course assignments, experiences, and expectations.

Phase-In: Collaboration with School Partners

Collaboration with stakeholders will expand efforts to prepare teachers for local districts. As part of the EPP’s continuing efforts to work with other institutions and organizations, GSU’s EPP and CM applied for ISBE’s pilot “[Continuous Improvement Communities of Practice](#)” (see link in 1.1). The EPP and CM were selected as one of four University-P-12 partnerships to participate as evidenced in the CICIP Acceptance Letter (2.7). The CICIP is organized and funded by [Branch Alliance for Educator Diversity \(BranchED\)](#)--see link in 1.1). The goal, as described in the CICIP Overview (2.8), is to create unified efforts led by EPPs and district teams to ensure that all P-12 students have “learner-ready teachers,” particularly teachers in high-need areas. EPP and CM will work to achieve the following: (1) advance the effectiveness of collaboration among the EPP and CM in order to better recruit, train, and retain teachers in high-need subjects and in high-need schools throughout Illinois; (2) utilize district outcome data (student learning and

teacher evaluation) to improve programming at the EPPs; (3) explore the effectiveness of CICPs as a model for continuous improvement of educator preparation and as potential solutions to common collaborative barriers; and (4) build the state's collective knowledge, resources, research findings, experiences, and insights about communities of practice as a model of collaboration to share with those beyond each CICP. To evaluate the effectiveness of this program, EPPs and schools are required to collect, analyze, and report on relevant and meaningful data.

The initial CICP, June 19-20, 2018, provided an opportunity for the partners to identify focus areas for the project. The result was the development of a CICP GSU-CM Action Plan (2.9) to align clinical immersion methods courses with Domains 2 (Classroom Environment) and 3 (Instruction) of the EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative/Summative Assessment rubrics (1.3). Use of video recording and other technology will be part of the project's efforts to improve data collection, analyses, and instruction reflection to enhance P-12 students' learning.

In another phase-in initiative to expand collaborative efforts, EPP accepted an invitation to be a part of the McCormick Foundation Grant Proposal (2.10) titled "Building Partnerships to Diversify the Teacher Education Pipeline and Facilitate Civic and Political Learning to Enhance the Placement of Teachers in High Needs Areas." The partnership model described in the McCormick Foundation Grant Proposal (2.10) involves a community member, K-12 teacher, and EPP faculty or staff. The goal is to generate better practices and resources for integrating political and civic learning in teacher preparation.

GSU's EPP seeks to enrich its initial preparation programs by developing relationships among partner institutions and obtaining feedback from stakeholders. Engagement in CICP and the McCormick Foundation will strengthen GSU's efforts in building stronger, mutually-beneficial relationships with local districts.

2.2 For initial preparation programs described below, "mentor teacher" refers to P-12 teachers with whom short-term teaching episodes occur during professional course field experiences. "Cooperating teachers" are P-12 teachers with whom the student teachers are assigned. "University supervisors" refers to trained personnel hired by GSU to facilitate the student teaching experience.

The GSU EPP co-selects, prepares, evaluates, supports, and seek to retain high-quality clinical educators in both the University and district schools. The preparation for clinical educators begins with our selection criteria. Cooperating teachers and university supervisors must have earned at minimum a master's degree and be exemplary teachers as determined by faculty in the program's GSU division and proficient PERA evaluation required by ISBE. GSU and its student leadership organization support pre-service candidates and inservice teachers with professional development opportunities in which teachers may obtain Continuing Professional Development Units (CPDUs). For example, GSU's Student Education Association actively

Governors State University

engages the local community as panel presenters and collaborators in candidate preparation for the field of education (see SEA link in 1.1).

The Completer Exit Survey results found in the Data Reports (2.5) indicate that field-based educators have positive impacts on our candidates and on the P-12 students in classrooms where candidates are placed for field experiences and student teaching. We seek to support and retain these high-quality clinical educators through frequent communication, including sharing feedback from all stakeholders. Additionally, cooperating teachers receive positive recognition through a Cooperating Teacher Certificate and Cooperating Teacher Recognition Letter (2.11) sent by the Coordinator of Field Experiences shows our gratitude and verifies the 30 CPDUs. In addition, cooperating teachers receive a tuition waiver for a course of their choice.

To facilitate cooperating teachers' understandings of ISBE licensing requirements, the Director of Educator Preparation shares information about edTPA® webinar trainings and other requirements with cooperating teachers; an example is seen in *edTPA® Training (2.12)*. Additionally, as ISBE disseminates information about changing state licensure requirements, the Director of Educator Preparation provides information about these changes at EPP meetings and via email to all program coordinators and other stakeholders.

As indicated in Student Teaching Handbooks (2.13), the cooperating teachers' responsibilities include orienting and helping the student teacher with school's policies and procedures; assisting student teacher's review of school records, test materials, teacher resources, and special services and development of teaching assignments and responsibilities; demonstrating effective teaching/learning practices and assist the student teacher in analyzing and understanding why these are effective; taking observation notes to be shared with the student teacher in a post-observation conference; and conferring with the university supervisor and/or principal regarding progress.

The *university supervisor* serves as a liaison between the EPP and the school/LEA, in addition to coordinating all supervisory activities, orienting the student teacher and cooperating teacher to the student teaching experience, supervising and evaluating the student teacher's development, performance, and progress. In this liaison role, the university supervisor is the immediate contact for the cooperating teacher should issues with candidate performance arise. Issues requiring conferences, remediation, or disciplinary action are reported to the candidate's program coordinator for discussion with the progress committee.

Finally, the *candidate's expectations* include observing classes and classrooms at various levels within the school; becoming acquainted with the school's policies and the roles of all personnel associated with the school's functions; preparing appropriate and adequately-constructed lesson plans that include instructional objectives reflecting the Illinois State Goals, Standards and Benchmarks; teaching strategies and evaluation measures to meet the needs of large

Governors State University

groups, small groups, and individuals; attending appropriate in-service sessions, PTA meetings, parent conferences, extracurricular activities, etc..

The evaluation form contained in Student Teacher Handbooks (2.13) asks cooperating teachers to provide candid feedback on student teachers' and university supervisors' preparation and competence in meeting their role expectations. Though cooperating teachers have the opportunity to provide feedback, the EPP does not have a systematic plan for collection of these evaluations across programs. Identifying this gap in data collection, the EPP has decided to provide online evaluation forms and surveys similar to the Mentor Teacher Survey Results (2.14) piloted in the S18 EDUC 4465 English Methods. These survey results will inform EPP and Stakeholders decisions in how to provide better field experiences for both in-service and pre-service teachers.

The ISBE Performance Evaluation Advisory Council promotes the [Danielson Framework for teacher evaluation](#) (see link in 1.1). As noted under CAEP Standard 1, the Danielson Group (2017) states, "The [Framework for Teaching](#) is a research-based set of components of instruction, aligned to the InTASC standards, and grounded in a constructivist view of learning and teaching. The complex activity of teaching is divided into 22 components (and 76 smaller elements) clustered into four domains of teaching responsibility: Domain 1: Planning and Preparation; Domain 2: Classroom Environment; Domain 3: Instruction; Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities." The EPP and district schools establish mutually-agreed expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit, which are described and measured by three initial preparation observation instruments based on the Danielson Framework: EPPU Danielson Domain 1 Methods/Labs Formative Assessment Rubric (1.3); EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative Assessment [used at weeks 5 and 10] (1.3.a,b); and EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Summative Assessment Rubric [used at conclusion of student teaching] (1.3.b).

In F16, the EPP sent the proposed rubrics to educators in the field, including K-12 teachers, school counselors, administrators, and instructional coaches. Overall, our panel of experts validated our instruments for clinical practice as seen in the Validations of EPPU Dispositions and Danielson Rubrics (2.15). Professionals rated 21 items as essential, useful, or not necessary. The ratings by 73 experts associated with our partner schools resulted in 17 having a content validity index between .34 and .89. (According to Lawshe, when there are 40 or more panelists, the content validity ratio must be between .29 and 1.00). The four items that were not validated are: 1b: Demonstrating knowledge of resources (.068493); 2e: Organizing physical space (-0.17808); 4c: Communicating with families (0.150685); 4d: Participating in a Professional Community (-0.15068). When these four items are included in the instrument, the overall content validity index is 0.5199. When these items are omitted, the overall content validity index is 0.6487.

The validated rubrics were implemented in F16. Calibration of two of the Danielson-based instruments (EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative Assessment [Weeks 5 and 10] and

Governors State University

EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Summative Assessment rubric [Week 15]) during a S18 EPP meeting ensured its accurate and reliable implementation. During this EPP Meeting dated May 9, 2018 (1.9) program coordinators and professors watched a teaching episode, used the rubric to score the teaching, discussed disparities, and rescored the episode based on common understandings.

Similarly, the Dispositions Assessment for Initial Program Educator Preparation Rubric underwent a content validation process in F16. The content Validations of EPPU Dispositions and Danielson Rubrics (2.15) for rubric elements ranged from .82 to .96. Because more than 40 experts rated the instrument, a content validity ratio of at least .29 is required. Thus, every element/row of the rubric has been validated and the instrument itself was validated.

Lab/field experiences require candidates work with students, assist classroom teachers, and conduct short teaching episodes. Candidates are required to communicate in a professional manner with their classroom mentor and cooperating teachers regarding lesson content. Any teaching segment must result in a developmentally-appropriate outcome expectation of the students. During teaching episodes, candidates are evaluated by both the university supervisor and the classroom mentor teacher regarding the candidate's lesson planning via Lesson Plan Rubrics (1.4) and lesson implementation regarding Domain 1 of the Danielson Framework (EPPU Danielson Domain 1 Methods/Labs Formative Assessment rubric (1.3.b). University supervisors also evaluate candidates' using the EPPU Dispositions Assessment for Initial Program Educator Preparation Programs rubric (1.3.c). The rubrics and observation feedback forms provide ongoing guidance to candidates. The data from them also provide systematic review opportunities for methods course instructors and program coordinators.

The capstone 15-week student teaching experience takes place in a partner school appropriate for licensure area and grade level. University supervisors complete evaluations of and conferences about candidates' performances using the EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative Assessment (1.3.a) at weeks 5 and 10; both university supervisors and cooperating teachers complete summative evaluations at the end of student teaching (EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Summative Assessment rubric 1.3.a).

Phase-In: Co-Selecting, Preparing, Evaluating, Supporting High Quality Educators

Previously, NCATE (now CAEP) standards influenced updates to assessments and curriculum, while reflective teaching practices dictated other changes. However, the development and validation processes for the Dispositions rubric and the Danielson-based instruments resulted in the EPP identifying the need to intentionally involve all stakeholders in design, feedback, and decision-making. EPP programs must more routinely use feedback from professionals who mentor candidates in partner schools to update recording forms related to observation of lab (i.e., pre-student teaching field experiences) students' performances using EPPU Danielson Domain 1 Methods/Labs Formative Assessment Rubric (1..a3), EPPU Dispositions Assessment for Initial Program Educator Preparation Programs Rubric (1.3.c), and Lesson Plan Rubrics (1.4). Surveys and meetings with mentors, cooperating teachers, administrators, and other

stakeholders will provide meaningful, mutually-beneficial data to inform decisions about student learning and professional development supports. A pilot of the Mentor Teacher Survey (2.14) (see Turner & Greene, 2017, for description of validation) was used to evaluate the effectiveness of a new partnership with CMHS in S18. Four CMHS mentor teachers completed the survey questionnaire. Based on their responses, the EPP plans to institute structures to engage future mentor teachers about their roles in candidate preparation and more clearly outline the extent candidates can and should participate in classroom activities and instruction. This mentor teacher survey instrument can be expanded to all programs as a means for data collection and analysis. Additionally, conversations such as those described in new collaborative partnerships (CAEP 2.1) can result in clearer agreement regarding the characteristics of quality clinical educators.

2.3 Field experience observations begin in pre-professional courses with a total of 40 clock hours. Candidates have opportunities to observe in classrooms, including technology-enhanced settings, in accordance with goals and objectives specific to each course. For example, in Foundations of Education, candidates learn about topics such as school desegregation, cultural pluralism, and bilingual/multicultural education; this course's 10 hours of field observations allow candidates to obtain first-hand, concrete knowledge in these areas. Survey of Students with Exceptionalities introduces the study of various exceptionalities, including learning disabilities and appropriate classroom instruction and the learning environments; this class requires 15 field observation hours to help candidates deepen these understandings; expectations for candidates' reports on these field observations are listed in field placement request. In Educational Psychology II: Learning, Assessment, and Classroom Management, candidates explore current research in educational psychology and examine major theories of learning, assessment, and classroom management and engage in 15 hours of specifically-focused field experience.

The second level of field experiences takes place in candidates' *Professional Education courses*, during which the remaining 60 hours of field experiences occur. These field experiences are designated as lab or clinical experience assignments. A unique collaboration is required for the EMED and EDEC programs as the methods courses are taught in elementary schools and early childhood centers where candidates observe and teach small groups and whole classes of students. Potential lab sites are selected to ensure diverse experiences for the candidates. Program faculty members meet with school site principals and teachers to discuss program goals prior to establishing the lab sites. Teachers from these sites volunteer to work with candidates for their field experiences. For example, EDEC and EMED integrate more than the 100 hours of field time required prior to student teaching. Field experiences are designed in a paired methods/lab co-requisite format so theory is effectively connected to 'real time' practice every semester throughout the candidates' program. The continued accumulation of field hours prior to student teaching occurs over four different labs (literacy, math, science, social studies) in a manner that rotates candidates across age-level categories of birth through age three, prekindergarten through kindergarten, and 1st through 3rd grade for early childhood

Governors State University

candidates, and across grades 1-6 for the elementary candidates. The field labs take place in five different settings, ranging from GSU's on-campus FDC to schools offering a wide range of experiences, populations, geographic and economic diversity, different curricula and instructional formats, as well as administrative styles.

For initial programs in specific areas such as ETE or SPED, the Field Experience Placement Coordinator and/or program coordinator, in collaboration with affiliated schools, seeks placements that are closely aligned to the candidates' program content and grade level. These more advanced pre-student teaching participatory field experiences require candidate involvement in classroom activities. The candidates write lesson plans, implement lessons, and/or perform teaching episodes during which they are evaluated by university supervisors with a shortened version of the same Danielson Rubric used to evaluate student teachers (i.e., EPPU Danielson Domain 1 Methods/Labs Formative Assessment Rubric). Candidates observe teachers using classroom management systems (e.g. Google Apps for Education™, Schoology®, Class Dojo, Inc.) and learn ways in which to support or enhance learning using these tools in their own teaching episodes. Ongoing communication among candidates, classroom mentor teachers, and university professors/supervisors ensure that the field experiences are sufficiently developing candidates' understandings of the classroom climate, culture, and learning.

In S18, the EPP took a next step in design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, coherence and duration for ETE candidates by partnering with CMHS starting in S18 for an immersive classroom model. Meeting the needs of all stakeholders required collaboration and logistical planning as detailed in the CMHS Email Communications via meeting minutes (1.9). The proximity to school administration, mentor teachers, and 9-12 students has provided opportunities for all stakeholders to build relationships and engage in mutually-beneficial learning experiences such as a student shark tank and end-of-semester partnership feedback session, both described in the CMHS Email Communications document.

As evidenced in the candidates' Program Study Plans (2.16) and GSU Catalog Course Descriptions (see link in 1.1), candidates must complete a minimum of 100 clock hours pre-student teaching field experiences in different settings as part of the ISBE requirement. Field/clinical experiences culminate with *student teaching*. Throughout early professional courses, candidates are encouraged to connect with classroom teachers and, when possible, administrators in order to have foundational knowledge of potential student teaching placements. As indicated on the Field Experience Request (2.14), cooperating teachers for student teaching should have at least four, preferably five years of teaching experience, must be considered excellent teachers themselves with proficient evaluation level per ISBE, and must be licensed/certified teachers. As an incentive for welcoming GSU candidates, cooperating teachers receive three credit-hour GSU tuition waivers, in addition to certificates that can be used for school district continuing professional development credit.

[Table of Contents](#)

Standard 2 – Advanced

Collaboration

There is deep and continuing collaboration between the GSU EPP's Educational Administration-Principal Preparation (EDAD) advanced preparation program and Schools/LEAs in which its candidates are placed for field/clinical experiences, including three internship courses. This collaboration occurs throughout each semester via email and visits by the university supervisor. Ongoing communication through informal updates and inquiries ensures a voice for mentor administrators in candidate preparation. For example, the university supervisor and the K-12 mentor administrator collaborate to set standards-aligned goals and expectations for the candidate. In addition, EDAD cohort workshops provide support for candidates on topics such as management, legal issues, and career services. Feedback on candidate performance from mentor administrators and university supervisors, used to identify appropriate topics for these workshops.

Mentor administrators and university supervisors provide informal feedback on candidates' progress to candidates during conferences and after observations. Formal feedback on their progress is provided to candidates via program key assessments: Illinois Principal Preparation Internship Assessment Rubric (A.2.1) and the EPPU Advanced Programs Educational Professional Disposition Rubric (1.3); LiveText® is the repository for rubrics and data from these assessments. Detailed information about the responsibilities of all stakeholders associated with the EDAD program is contained in the Student Handbook for the Principal Leadership Program (2.13), which is provided to the mentor administrators, as well as to candidates. By collecting and attending to feedback from university supervisors, K-12 field placement mentor administrators, and university faculty, the EPP can provide appropriate support candidates' progress during seminars, conferences, and observations.

Partnership Agreements

GSU's EPP has developed effective affiliations and partnerships with local school districts, local schools, and ISBE so that candidates develop the skills and professional dispositions necessary for having a positive impact on P-12 learners. The faculty members of the programs comprising the EPP have the primary responsibility of designing, delivering, and evaluating all field and clinical experiences in collaboration with the EPP's school partners. Through three levels of partnership agreements, GSU's EPP offers its candidates opportunities to work with diverse student populations in both rural and urban settings in school districts serving P-12 students with a wide range of racial/ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds. The Primary Level of agreements includes affiliation agreements, the Secondary Level includes the field experience placement agreements, and the Tertiary Level is Memoranda of Understanding.

Primary Level: Affiliation Agreements- EPP Partnerships

Governors State University

GSU's EPP currently has signed agreements with over 60 school districts, as indicated in the Partner Schools List (2.2), including Chicago Public Schools and school districts in Cook County, Will County, and Kankakee County. As stated in the sample Affiliation Agreement (2.3) parties (the University and the School/LEA) involved have determined that they have a mutual interest in providing educational training experiences for University candidates in their respective School/LEA. Moreover, the University has determined that candidate placements in these Schools/LEAs are consistent with the goals and objectives of the curriculum and will enhance the program of study of the GSU's EPP for Educational Administration (EDAD).

Affiliation Agreements are updated every five years. They provide the parties with standards and procedures, such as meeting dates and expectations. In addition, the Affiliation Agreement asks both parties to participate in planning or evaluation sessions with candidates and, where appropriate, with GSU faculty members and school staff.

Secondary Level: Internship Placements Agreements

Field experiences in over 60 partner school districts offer our candidates appropriate experiences with a wide range of student populations in a variety of geographic locations. The school districts offer diversity of socio-economic characteristics, curricula, instructional formats, as well as of administrative structures. The candidates in the EDAD program do internships in their respective schools. The following paragraphs provide demographics of a few partner school districts for the EDAD program and illustrate the diverse school populations our candidates' experience. These districts provide settings that reflect the broad rural, suburban, and urban character of GSU's service region as well as the racial, ethnic, gender, and socio-economic diversity of the region Diverse School Districts (2.1). The following districts and associated schools served as internship sites during the SU18 term for the EDAD program.

- Ashe Elementary School, Cameron Elementary School, and Ruggles Elementary School in City of Chicago School District 299: 2017 student population of 382,929, with 10.0% White, 37.6% Black, and 46.4% Hispanic; 83.1% low-income, 11.0% IEPs, and 17.7% English learners.
- Rich East Campus High School in Rich Township High School District 227: 2017 3,057-member student body was 2.9% White, 89.6% Black, 5.7% Hispanic; 80.2% low-income; 19.2% IEPs, and 2.6% English learners. District 227's 220-member faculty was also more diverse than the statewide means, with 62.1% White, 32.0% Black, and 3.2% Hispanic.
- Lincoln Way High School in Lincoln Way Community High School District 210: 2017 student population was 7,048, with 82.8% White, 3.4% Black, and 9.5% Hispanic; 9.5% low-income; 9.4% IEPs; 0.4% English learners. The 393-member district faculty was 98.2% White (which exceeds the state mean of 83.3% White), 0.88% Black, and 0.3% Hispanic.
- Indiana Elementary School in Matteson Elementary School District 162 had a student population in 2017 of 2,699, with 2.7% White, 91.0% Black, and 4.3% Hispanic; 78.4% low-income, 15.3% IEPs, and 0.9% English learners.

Governors State University

- Mark Twain Primary School, Kankakee Junior High School, and Kankakee High School in Kankakee School District 111: 2017 student population was 5,199; its demographic makeup was 20.4% White, 48.6% Black, and 29.0% Hispanic; 56.9% low-income, 11.9% IEPs, and 13.9% English learners.
- Michelle Obama School of Technology in Park Forest School District 163: 2017 student population was 1,892; its demographic makeup was 2.5% White, 84.6% Black, and 7.9% Hispanic; 87.9% low-income, 12.3% IEPs, and 0.6% English learners.

Tertiary Level: Memoranda of Understanding (MOU)

Through Memoranda of Understanding Memoranda of Understandings, partners acknowledge the mutual benefits of their relationships with the University. These reciprocal relationships provide opportunities for the simultaneous support and improvement of K-12 students, of practicing teachers and other educators, and of teacher/educator candidates.

As stated in the GSU MOU, partners intend to create a dynamic and sustained relationship that will promote benefits to both the EPP and the school district. To achieve this goal, these partners promise to engage in collaboration opportunities involving district students, teachers, administrators, and the EPP's candidates and faculty.

The MOU explains that clinical/field experiences influence the quality of educator preparation degrees and have an impact on candidate degree completion, licensure, and retention in the field. With this understanding, the EPP and the school district commit to a collaboration that ensures high-quality clinical/field experiences for the EPP EDAD candidates. The partnership not only allows for the sharing of space and resources, it offers opportunities for professional development and grant writing.

GSU's EPP has resources and space agreements for the EDAD program with a variety of diverse schools in urban, rural, suburban and high-needs areas. One, for instance, is Lansing School District 158, which has a particularly close partnership with GSU's EPP. As of F18, EPP EDAD candidates will meet in the district's schools for field experiences and class meetings. The racial and ethnic makeup of this school district facilitates the EPP's mission of preparing EDAD candidates for becoming educational leaders in diverse school settings. During 2017, its 2,596 students were 15.8% White, 50.7% Black, and 28.3% Hispanic; 74.1% low-income, 19% IEPs, and 4.2% English learners. GSU EPP's EDAD cohort courses are taught in the school district to strengthen relationships among candidates who typically teach at that district or one of the surrounding districts.

Assessment of Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

The EPP collects data through in-person observations, paper assignments, and assessments evaluated through rubrics in LiveText®. These assessments are completed by mentor principals as well as the university supervisor. For example, each mentor administrator completes an assessment of her/his interns at the end of an internship. Most of the assessment data focus on

candidates' content knowledge and skills. However, the GSU EPP also collects data on EDAD candidates' professional dispositions through the EPPU Advanced Programs Educational Professionals Disposition Rubric v. SP 2017 (1.3.d) evaluated by course instructors. Important to the success of EDAD candidates are positive dispositions in the following areas: ethical behavior, professional behavior, commitment to collaboration, appreciation of diversity, habits of mind for reasoned eclecticism, and commitment to professional growth. Each dispositional element is scored with the listed points at one of four levels: Far Below Standards (to be labeled Unsatisfactory in AY18/19) - 1; Below Standards (to be labeled Developing in AY18/19) - 2, Meets Standards (to be labeled Target in AY18/19) - 3, and Exceeds Standards (to be labeled Exemplary in AY18/19) - 4. In S17, data for EDAD candidates in all disposition areas met or exceeded the Meets Standards level by 100% across nine courses that included application of the EPPU Advanced Programs Educational Professionals Disposition Rubric v. SP 2017 (1.3.d). During F17, similar results were reported across five courses, with 100% of dispositions measures at the met or exceeded Meets Standards level. In S18, two courses reported 95.6% dispositions measures at the met or exceeded Meets Standards level, as reflected in the EPP Disposition Data Report (1.10).

Analysis of the data indicate consistency in Educational Administration-Principal Preparation candidate dispositions. The EPP will continue to monitor the program to ensure that candidates display positive dispositions.

A.2.2 The GSU EPP's EDAD program's clinical experiences, including its three-term internship sequence, provide extensive and wide-ranging activities and experiences for its candidates. These activities and experiences include those related to the ISBE Standards assessed by the ILTS 195 and 196 examinations, such as: Growth Through Learning modules, professional development plans, internship portfolio, and School Improvement Plan assessments.

At the beginning of the semester (or summer term), university supervisors meet (or, when necessary, communicate through email) with their assigned interns and mentor principals to discuss and approve proposed activities. Communication continues throughout semester as needed.

Documentation of Stakeholder Involvement

EDAD candidates are required to be licensed, active P-12 teachers for a minimum of two years prior to enrollment in the program. Candidates typically are invested in the success of the Illinois schools where they want to conduct their three semester-long internships. That is, they are themselves teachers in those schools. Each candidate is assigned to his/her school principal, who must then complete an online training prior to being allowed to mentor. Both the school district superintendent and the school principal must sign an official Principal Mentor Agreement and Superintendent Agreement for Principal Internship (A.2.2). In addition to specifying the qualifications required for mentor administrators, these agreement documents

Governors State University

provide lists of internship responsibilities for each stakeholder. The school district/mentor principal must:

- Meet with a GSU representative to discuss, plan, and evaluate the intern and his/her experiences;
- Foster a supportive, learning environment among district staff for any accepted intern;
- Verify that the mentoring principal meets State certification and performance requirements;
- Supervise and mentor the intern;
- Provide experiences, where possible, regarding cultural and economic diversity, ELL, IEP, gifted, PK-12;
- Provide experiences, where possible, in IEP meetings, Section 504 meetings;
- Provide observational experiences, where possible, in the hiring, supervision, and evaluation of teachers;
- Provide experiences, where possible, in working with parents, the community, and school board/LSC;
- Provide experiences, where possible, in assessment, local and state-mandated.

GSU's EPP/the University Supervisor will:

- Meet with the mentoring principal to plan and monitor the intern's experiences;
- Provide any GSU support that may be needed by the mentoring principal and/or intern;
- Prepare, through appropriate coursework, candidates for the internship experience;
- Host three seminars per year for interns to share experiential information;
- Meet, at the intern site, with the mentoring principal at least twice per semester;
- Ensure the intern experiences exposure to diverse populations, within the district's availability;
- Assist the mentoring principal in evaluating the intern and his/her experiences.

Orientation for mentor principals takes place onsite on an individual basis. During the candidate's field experiences, the mentor principal collaborates with the university supervisor through discussions about the candidate's performance. The agreement documents described above provide essential information about roles and responsibilities to interns, mentor principals, and university supervisors; these agreements are based on a shared responsibility model. Additionally, School Leadership Internship Requirements (A.2.3) details 16 specific required activities candidates must complete during EDAD internships. Among the 16 are:

- Review school-level data, including, but not limited to, State assessment results or the use of interventions, and identification of improvement based on those results;
- Participate in a school improvement planning (SIP) process, including a presentation to the school community explaining the SIP and its relationship to the school's goals;

- Participate in a model evaluation of a teacher, to include at least notes, observations, student achievement data, and examples of interventions and support, as applicable, based on the evaluation results, with the understanding that no candidate will participate in the official evaluation process for any particular teacher;
- Analyze the school's budget, to include a discussion of how resources are used and evaluated for adequacy and effectiveness; recommendations for improvement; and the impact of budget choices, particularly on low-income students, students with disabilities, and English language learners;
- Use student data to work collaboratively with teachers to modify curriculum and instructional strategies to meet the needs of each student, including ELLs and students with disabilities, and to incorporate the data into the School improvement Plan;
- Recognize the individual needs of students and work with special education and bilingual education teachers to develop school support systems so that teachers can differentiate strategies, materials, pace, levels of complexity, and language to introduce concepts and principles so that they are meaningful to students at varying levels of development and to students with diverse learning needs.

Assessment of Clinical Experience Effectiveness

EDAD candidate-interns are required to develop their leadership skills and their ability to provide leadership in P-12 settings in collaboration with field sites. Coupled with assessment by on-site mentor principals, online portfolios in LiveText® require candidates to document the development of their leadership skills. The portfolio assignment requires each candidate-intern to upload artifacts, including multimedia work within required courses (e.g. EDAD 7802 Technology Driven Leadership) completed during the semester. In addition, the portfolio requires candidates' written reflections about their internship experiences, which include creating wikis to communicate with stakeholders and providing professional development based on the needs within their internship site.

To evaluate the perceived effectiveness the EDAD cohort program, an Educational Administration (Principal Preparation) Graduate/Completer Survey (title and instrument to be revised for future use, GSU EPPU Principal Leadership Exit Survey) (2.4) was distributed to candidates enrolled in EDAD 8208 through SurveyMonkey® in S18; there was a 72.7% response rate for this survey. In conjunction with Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEIs), the responses to this survey have informed the program coordinator's decisions regarding adjustments that need to be made to institutional, classroom, and field experience structures.

Phase-in Assessment of Program Effectiveness and Partner Collaboration

Reviewing data for the CAEP Standard 2 Advanced highlighted the need to measure program effectiveness through additional data points. For example, EDAD program courses emphasize using technology-enhanced leadership to promote enhanced student learning, organizational effectiveness, and ethical and legal citizenship in an evolving, technologically-supported world; yet, available data do not adequately relay these qualities, nor the extent to which our partners collaborate in designing these experiences. A phase-in will include data collection of specific

technology assignments' graded rubrics to determine the quality and effectiveness of our program's focus on digital literacy and citizenship.

Further, collaboration with stakeholders was key in the development of the newly-approved superintendent program as documented in Meeting Minutes (1.9). The EPP will use the superintendent program's process of collaboration as a model for improving stakeholder involvement in the EDAD program. Surveys will be developed through a process of discussing and evaluating course objectives (program coordinators and course instructors), obtaining feedback (district and school administrators, university supervisors), and piloting stakeholder surveys to partner schools for field testing.

Standard 3 – Initial

In accordance with its commitment to offering an exceptional and accessible education providing the knowledge, skills, and confidence to succeed in a global society, the GSU EPP is deliberate in its selection and monitoring the progress of qualified candidates with diverse backgrounds (CAEP 3.1). The EPP recruits and admits candidates academically capable of meeting the standards of its high-quality courses and fieldwork (CAEP 3.2). The EPP monitors all candidates from beginning to end of their programs to ensure they have and develop the dispositions (CAEP 3.3) and the content, pedagogical, and technology knowledge and skills (CAEP 3.4) necessary to meet the needs of all P-12 students. After preparing candidates with in-depth content knowledge (CAEP 3.5) and requiring high expectations for professionalism in the field (CAEP 3.6), the EPP recommends candidates for licensure. Please refer to the Hyperlinks, Abbreviations, Definitions, and References (1.1) for website, university and college titles, course codes, and academic terms information.

3.1 The COE is one of GSU’s four academic colleges and houses the Division of Education and the Division of Psychology and Counseling. The EPP is responsible for educator preparation programs across the university, including those in the COE. GSU’s secondary teacher preparation programs are housed in the College of Arts and Sciences. Our programs’ enrollments are representative of the Chicago Southland Region where our university is located: 29.5% are students of Color; 72.8% have some type of financial aid, while 33.3% have \$0 for Expected Family Contributions EPP Diversity Data (3.0). While maintaining diversity in enrollment is important, equally important to our plan is to increase enrollment across all sectors to assure that P-12 students within our region are taught by teachers representative of their community.

The goal of the 5-Year Recruitment Plan (3.1) is to increase enrollment in the programs still active and to create an MAT to address the two major factors affecting the future of U.S. P-12 education, specifically in the greater Chicago area: teacher shortages in general and P-12 preparedness in particular geographic and content areas. A shortage of qualified teachers is being experienced across the country, including in Illinois. As recently as November 17, 2017, news reports attributed the shortages in Illinois to the fear of “the state not funding K-12 education,” which prompts prospective educators “to look for work in other states or other fields” (Nevel, 2017, “Too Much Red Tape?” para. 7). It should be noted, however, that the Sutchter, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas (2016) study found that Illinois is one of the three states that teachers are least likely to report plans to leave.

In 2015, the Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents of Schools conducted a survey that was reported in “Illinois Educator Shortage Crisis” (1.1) that found districts had the most difficulty in recruiting special education, mathematics, and science teachers. This survey found that urban districts had the most trouble finding speech and language pathologists and English as a second language (ESL) teachers, while qualified science teachers were most difficult to find in suburban districts. Additionally, there are “structural issues that impact students’ interests in

teaching as a career” (p. 1). The survey respondents indicated that there are factors that lead teachers to leave Illinois. A study by Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas (2016) found that national “annual teacher shortages could increase to as much as 112,000 teachers by 2018” (p. 1) and that “by 2020, an estimated 300,000 new teachers will be needed per year” (p. 1). Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas (2016) note that “nearly 8% of the workforce” leave annually (p. 2) and the rates “are much higher for beginners and for teachers in high poverty schools and districts” (p. 4). One solution to this attrition problem is high-quality educator-preparation programs that support beginning teachers, especially those who begin their careers in high-poverty schools and districts. However, “Many of the teachers in hard-to-staff fields receive less pedagogical preparation because they are encouraged to enter before they have completed training, as districts seek to meet their pressing hiring needs” (Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016, p. 47).

The EPP intends to resist the weakening of preparation programs causing teacher shortages and attrition problems in Illinois; to the contrary, strong preparation programs must be built and maintained. Strong programs will provide beginning educators with the tools needed to deal with areas of “dissatisfaction” that are the major reasons for pre-retirement attrition: physical conditions (class sizes, facilities, and classroom resources), unhappiness with administrative practices (lack of support, classroom autonomy, or input to decisions), and policy issues (effects of testing and accountability) (Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016, p. 49).

Over the last 18 years, the DOE and COE have been informed on state and district needs through the Alternative Certification Program (2000-2011), the Illinois Grow Your Own Initiative (2005-2013), and a Teaching Quality Partnership Grant (TQP) from the Department of Education (2011-2015). Using these as guideposts, the EPP has created a 5-Year Recruitment Plan (3.1), which is a collaborative initiative among colleges, divisions/departments, programs, and other university offices, such as marketing, in partnership with stakeholders in public schools, community colleges, and the community at large. The plan supports program completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and prepares them for work in high-need areas.

The candidate recruitment goals of the EPP are to:

- Maintain strong diversity of initial-level program and advanced-level program candidates;
- Increase the number of initial-level program candidates by 10 – 20% each year, with the focus being on high-need areas i.e. STEM and special education;
- Recruit advanced-level program candidates who meet high admission and retention criteria
- Increase the number of minority candidates by 10% each year;
- Increase retention of educators in the field of education beyond 5 years through collaborative teacher support programs.

3.2 As evidenced in the Benchmark Data Report (3.2), our candidates meet CAEP's and ISBE's minimum criteria for academic achievement at admission. Despite the fact that the stated admission GPA criterion for most GSU EPP programs is 2.75, almost all candidates who have been admitted exceed that criterion. The following are the program-specific incoming mean GPAs for accepted candidates for three data collection cycles:

EDEC: S17 - 3.10; F17 - 3.30; S18 - 3.25

EMED: S17 - 3.31; F17 - 3.52; S18 - 3.32

ETE: S17 - 3.08; F17 - 2.5 (no new candidates accepted in S18)

MTE: S17 - 3.14 (no new candidates accepted in F17 or S18).

BTE: S17 - 3.18; F17 - 3.93; S18 - NA

MCSE Option II: S17 - 3.41 (eliminated; no new candidates accepted as of F17).

In addition to the admission criteria, what drives the GPAs as reported above is our policy on Licensure of Teachers and Other School Professionals (see hyperlink in artifact 1.1). Candidates who are working toward the Initial Early Childhood, Elementary Licenses, and Secondary Licenses must maintain a G.P.A. of 3.0 or higher in their Professional Education requirements, exclusive of student teaching. They must complete all professional courses with a grade of "B" or better. To be recommended for licensure, a student must achieve a grade of "B" or better in student teaching.

All admitted initial-program candidates must successfully complete ISBE's basic skills criterion. Candidates may use any of three tests to meet this criterion: Test of Academic Proficiency (TAP 400), ACT composite score of 22 with a minimum score of 6 in writing (for tests taken 9/10/16 or later), or SAT composite score of 1110 with a minimum score of 26 in writing and language (for tests taken 3/5/15 or later). These scores reflect ISBE's criterion for being in the top 50% of test takers. Candidates may use optional superscoring for ACT or SAT; ISBE describes superscoring as adding "the highest subject scores from each test and divide by the total number of tests for a composite score." More than 80% of GSU initial-program candidates have chosen to submit ACT scores. Candidates who do not meet this criterion can be conditionally admitted as stated in the Application for Teacher Candidacy Form (3.3). It should be noted that conditionally-admitted candidates must meet this requirement prior to Benchmark III. The following are mean ACT scores across three admission points (S17, F18, S18, except MCSE, which is S16, F16, S17) for admitted candidates: EDEC – 23.63; EMED - 25.91; All Secondary Ed. programs - 21.63; MCSE Option II - 20.00.

3.3 The EPP has established criteria and monitors the initial licensure program candidates' behaviors and dispositions beyond academic achievement they must demonstrate both at admission and during their programs. The EPP requires evaluations of non-academic characteristics of initial licensure candidates at specified points: completion of the Application for Teacher Candidacy Form (3.3), evaluation by cooperating teachers after each field experience, continuous evaluation with the EPPU Dispositions Rubric for Initial Program Educator Preparation Programs Rubric (1.3.c), at program-level Student Progress Committee

Governors State University

meetings to monitor candidates' academic and non-academic progress, and the EPP candidates' Application for Student Teaching (3.4).

Completed Application for Teacher Candidacy Forms (3.3) are evaluated by program coordinators. The program coordinator's decision may be Approved, Interview Required, or Not Accepted. Each potential candidate is notified by letter of the program coordinator's decision by the program's academic advisor. In the case of "Interview Required," the potential candidate is deficient in one of the following areas: test score, coursework, GPA, disposition.

After completing an interview with the program coordinator, potential candidates may be granted a one-semester status of Approved with Conditions. Any deficiencies must be eliminated in order for the status to be changed to Approved. If deficiencies remain, the status reverts to Not Accepted. Students who are denied Teacher Candidacy are informed in writing by the program coordinator and Director of Educator Preparation.

After admission to an EPP initial licensure program, candidates are required per ISBE regulations to complete a minimum of 100 clock hours of field experiences. These hours are distributed across each level within programs. At each point, mentor teachers, cooperating teachers, and/or university instructors are asked to evaluate students' potential. These evaluations include such dispositional evidence as promptness. Prior to any field experience, each candidate must pass a criminal background check. The EPP currently requires candidates to use CastleBranch Inc. to conduct a state criminal background check, nationwide record indicator, sex offender indicator, and residency history. Each candidate also must complete Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) online training prior to any field experience placement.

Professional dispositions also are assessed at specified points in each program via the EPP's Dispositions Rubric for Initial Program Educator Preparation Programs Rubric (1.3.c). The elements of this rubric include: Collaboration, Respect for Student Diversity, Professional Judgment and Behavior, Ethical Behavior, Impact on Learning, and Commitment to Learning.

Each EPP initial licensure program has established a Student Progress Committee or other progress monitoring mechanisms to monitor candidates' progress throughout their program of study. If a faculty member has academic or dispositional concerns about a candidate, a referral form is submitted. The candidate then meets with the committee to discuss the concerns and a student success plan may be created. The candidate is responsible for following the success plan and the faculty monitors candidate progress. The Student Progress Committees for the programs in the unit may recommend candidates to the [GSU Academic Resources Center](#) (ARC-- see link in 1.1) if faculty members observe that a candidate is struggling in the academic areas of mathematics or writing or is experiencing difficulties that may require counseling services.

3.4 The EPP has developed criteria for candidates' progression from program admission through program completion at four distinct benchmarks. Academic advisors monitor all admission materials including the scores from standardized entrance examinations, grade point averages, and undergraduate transcripts. The faculty members of each EPP program continuously monitor their candidates' content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and dispositions during classroom and field experiences using multiple forms of institutional, state, and national measures. These measures include validated rubrics, state tests of basic skills (e.g., TAP), and state and national content examinations. If candidates are not successful in meeting the program and benchmark requirements, they are referred to the appropriate Student Progress Committee for review and feedback on addressing the areas of concern.

The EPP has identified four assessment Benchmarks (1.5) that apply to initial candidates. In each of the phases, specific data are collected and analyzed with regard to the criteria established by each program. The Benchmark Data Report (3.2) are used to assess (and, where indicated, implement support for) individual candidates. The aggregated data also are analyzed and used for improving the programs themselves. The four Benchmarks include:

Benchmark I: Acceptance – identifies requirements/criteria for initial admission to the Unit;

Benchmark II: Continuance – describes monitoring process and criteria for continuation in the program;

Benchmark III: Student Teaching/Internship – delineates requirements for student teaching (initial) or internship (advanced) acceptance;

Benchmark IV: Licensure - identifies the qualification for institutional recommendation of candidate for licensure.

Benchmark I: Acceptance

Admission to the EPP takes place at the beginning of the junior year for initial candidates in the EMED program and the EDEC program. For admission to Post-Baccalaureate Certificates for Secondary Education in Biology, Chemistry, English, and Mathematics, and the M.S. in Mathematics Teacher Education sequence, applicants must present evidence of an undergraduate degree in an appropriate major content area. For admission to the M.A. in Multi-Categorical Special Education Option II (candidates seeking initial licensure), evidence of completing a B.A. or B.S. must be presented.

During F17, the EPP (faculty/staff/administration) approved the Application for Teacher Candidacy (3.3) to document a candidate's official acceptance into an initial educator preparation program. Academic advisors consult with pre-candidates regarding the application process and requirements for admission to each specific program. The application form completion requires a review of required test scores, required prerequisite course completion, minimum GPA, criminal background check clearance, and FERPA training. Official acceptance

allows a candidate continued enrollment in program coursework and movement to Benchmark II Continuance.

Potential initial candidates must meet the criteria identified on the Application for Teacher Candidacy Form (3.3):

- Overall UG GPA of 2.75 for all initial programs except EDEC (2.50) and M.S. Math (3.0);
- Passing score on TAP or equivalent (ACT/SAT);
- Within 6 hours of completing General Education (GE) courses;
- Completion of all course prerequisites, identified in the course curriculum for each perspective program;
- Criminal background check clearance;
- Submission of Application for Teacher Candidacy form;
- Acceptance by program coordinator.

The program coordinator's decision will be one of the following: Approved, Interview Required, or Not Accepted. Each potential candidate is notified by letter of the program coordinator's decision by the program's academic advisor. In the case of "Interview Required," the potential candidate is deficient in one of the following areas: one test score; coursework; GPA; dispositions.

After completing an interview with the program coordinator, potential candidates may be granted a one-semester status of Approved with Conditions. Any deficiencies must be eliminated in order for the status to be changed to Approved. If deficiencies remain, the status reverts to Not Accepted.

Benchmark II: Continuance

EPP program faculty and academic advisors monitor candidates' progress from admission through program completion. Multiple forms of evidence ensure candidates' ability to successfully address CCR standards for P-12 students. Initial licensure program candidates' content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and integration of technology, as well as professional dispositions are assessed throughout their programs.

Candidates in initial licensure programs must continue to meet the GPA requirements. In general, the criteria include maintaining a 2.75 GPA for GE coursework and a 3.0 GPA for Professional Education coursework. For candidates in the EDEC program, all GE coursework must be completed with a C or better; Professional Education courses EDEC 3099, 3310, and 3320 must be completed with a B or better and other Professional Education coursework completed to maintain a GPA of 3.0 or better. For candidates in the EMED program, all GE coursework must be completed with a C or better; Professional Education coursework must be completed with a B or better. Post-Baccalaureate Certificates in Biology (BTE), Chemistry (CTE), English (ETE), and Mathematics (MTE) require a 3.0 GPA and a grade of C or better in all coursework, as well as a B or better in specified professional and content courses. The M.S. in MTE requires a cumulative GPA of 3.0, 2.75 GPA in GE coursework, 3.0 GPA and a C or better in

Governors State University

all mathematics and statistics coursework, and a B or better in specified Professional Education courses. The M.A. in MCSE Option II program, candidates must maintain a GPA of 3.0 or higher, earn a B or better in SPED 8619 and 8200, and a C or better in all other coursework.

The following are program-specific mean *overall* GPAs (including GE) for candidates at Benchmark II Continuance:

EDEC S17 - 3.77; F17 - 3.81
EMED: S17 - 3.76; F17 - 3.65
ETE: S17 - 3.81; F17 - 3.59
MTE: S & F 17 - 3.76; S18 - 3.26
BTE: S17 - 3.56; F17 - 3.48
MCSE Option II: S16 - 3.7; F17 - 3.4; S17 - 3.6

The following are program-specific mean *Professional Education* GPAs for candidates at Benchmark II Continuance:

EDEC: S17 - 3.41; F17 - 3.44; S18 - 3.38
EMED: S17 - 3.69; F17 - 3.65
ETE: S17 - 3.62; F17 - 3.36
MTE: S17 - 3.57; F17 - 3.45
BTE: S17 - 3.78; F17 - 3.82
MCSE Option II: S16 - 3.79; F16 - 3.42; S17 - 3.47

Initial licensure program candidates' pedagogical content knowledge and pedagogical skills are assessed throughout their programs according to the EPPU Danielson Domain 1 Methods/Labs Formative Assessment Rubric (1.3.b). This rubric's elements are Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy, Demonstrating Knowledge of Students, Setting Instructional Outcomes, Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources, Designing Coherent Instruction, and Designing Student Assessments. The EPPU Danielson Domain 1 Methods/Labs Formative Assessment Rubric (1.3.b) is aligned with InTASC Standards. The rubric uses a 4-point scale with the following point values: Unsatisfactory - 1; Basic - 2; Proficient - 3; Distinguished - 4. Candidates are expected to be at minimum of Basic at this time of their program. As shown below, mean scores in the Danielson Assessment Data Report (1.6) (for Domain 1) consistently show candidates' early-performance strength related to the InTASC standards and that candidates perform far above the criterion 2.0 score.

EDEC: S17 (n=24) - 3.01; F17 (n=21) - 2.67; S18 (n=39) - 2.58
EMED: S17 (n=38) - 2.70; F17 (n=46) - 3.11; S18 (n=26) - 2.90
ETE: S17 (n=7) - 3.21; F17 (n=7) - 3.64; S18 (n=6) - 3.22
MTE: S17 (n=8) - 2.07; F17 (n=14) - 2.83; S18 (n=12) - 2.67
BTE: S17 (n=3) - 3.00; F17 (n=5) - 3.19; S18 (n=1) - 3.67
MCSE: S17 (n=10) - 3.0

Benchmark III: Student Teaching Acceptance

Governors State University

GSU EPP's initial licensure programs require candidates complete 12 credit-hour, semester-long student teaching experiences (EDUC 4999, EMED 4999, EDEC 4999, SPED 6999, or EDUC 8970 [for M.S. in MTE]). (The EDAD advanced licensure program requires internships.)

For initial licensure programs, each candidate completes a detailed Application for Student Teaching Form (3.4), which requires candidates respond to the question, "Why do you want to become a teacher?" as well as confirm that they have completed all necessary prerequisites for their respective program's student teaching course:

- Submission of application to academic advisor in accordance with Student Teaching Schedule (3.5) distributed to candidates (December 1 for spring student teaching; March 1 for fall student teaching)
- Evidence of passing score on appropriate ILTS content exam (or registration evidence; passing score due Nov. 1 for spring student teaching; April 1 for fall student teaching)
- Minimum GPA of 2.75 in GE courses
- Minimum GPA of 3.0 in Professional Education courses
- Minimum GPA of 3.0 in content courses (for secondary)
- Successful completion of 100 clock hours of field experience
- Criminal background check clearance
- Successful completion of FERPA training/assessment
- Professional Letter of Introduction and Resume

The teacher candidate completes an Application for Student Teaching (3.4) and submits it to the appropriate academic advisor, in accordance with the Student Teaching Schedule (3.5). In addition, candidates in Initial Licensure Programs must have ongoing work in electronic professional portfolios. Teacher candidates who are not approved for student teaching receive a letter indicating the reasons for the denial. The teacher candidate may initiate the Appeals Process as defined in the Student Teaching Handbooks (2.13). All candidates who are accepted for student teaching meet the requirements outlined above. Candidates' performance for all programs (except MCSE) on ILTS content exam is reported in the Benchmark Data Report (3.2) and provides evidence of candidates' content knowledge. The ILTS examinations for each program are as follows: EMED 110; EDEC 107; BTE 105, CTE 106, ETE 111, and MTE 115; MCSE 155 and 163. The ILTS passing score for each content test is 240. The scores for three data collection cycles range from 240 - 291, with an overall mean of 261.16. The following are program-specific mean scores on ILTS tests:

EDEC: S17 (n=7) – 254.33; F17 (n=8) – 258.25; S18 (n=4) – 257.5

EMED: S17 (n=12) – 265.91; F17 (n=15) – 259.2; S18 (n=6) – 260.17

ETE: S17 (n=8) – 271.63; F17 (n=6) – 259.83; S18 (n=2) – 275.5

MTE: S17 (n=6) – 254.83; F17 (n=3) – 246.00; S18 (n=3) – 260.00

BTE: S17 (n=1) – 265.00; F17 (n=2) – 263.50; S18 (n=2) – 255.50

MCSE candidates must pass two content exams (ILTS 155 & 163), as noted in the Benchmark Data Report (3.2). Due to program elimination, candidates were not admitted after S17. The mean scores for three data collection cycles (S16, F17, S17) range from 240 to 300.

MCSE LBS1 Test 155: S16 (n= 0); F16 (n=8) – 274.38; S17 (n=4) – 278.25

MCSE Test 163: S16 (n= 0); F16 (n=6) – 267.17; S17 (n=4) – 254.25

Benchmark IV: Recommendation for Licensure

The Director of Educator Preparation is the ISBE Certification Officer for GSU and has the authority to recommend a candidate for initial or advanced educator licensure by the State of Illinois. To apply for a State of Illinois License, all candidates must successfully meet the qualifications identified in Benchmark IV for their respective programs. Details regarding criteria are provided below under 3.5 & 3.6.

3.5 & 3.6 Prior to recommendation for licensure by the GSU Director of Educator Preparation (ISBE Certification Officer), all candidates' content knowledge, pedagogical/professional skills, and professional dispositions are evaluated according to specified assessment criteria. All candidates must pass their student teaching coursework at a level of B or better. All candidates also must complete the GSU EPPU CAEP Programs Exit Survey.

Throughout their respective programs, all candidates in initial licensure programs are assessed for professional dispositions via a validated institutional rubric (Dispositions Assessment for Initial Educator Preparation Programs). This rubric includes criteria regarding expectations of the profession (code of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies).

Before recommendation for licensure of any candidate (and, in fact, prior to commencement of student teaching for initial licensure candidates), her/his content knowledge is assessed via the ILTS content test for the program. The ILTS examinations for each program are as follows: EMED 110; EDEC 107; BTE 105, CTE 106, ETE 111, and MTE 115; MCSE 155 and 163. Data for potential impact on P-12 students are collected and analyzed via edTPA® portfolio.

In addition, each program assesses its candidates' pedagogical/professional skills according to program-specific criteria (e.g., portfolio, national examination), and each program has criteria for student teaching completion (e.g., edTPA®). These are described below.

GSU EPP's initial licensure programs all assess student teachers multiple times using Danielson-based rubrics. During the course of student teaching, the EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative Assessment Rubrics are used at Weeks 5 and 10, and the EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Summative Assessment Rubric is used at Week 15 (1.3.a,b). In addition to the elements of Domain 1 (described above under Continuance), these rubrics include elements of Domain 2 (Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport, Establishing a Culture for Learning, Managing Classroom Procedures, Managing Student Behavior, and Organizing Physical Space), Domain 3 (Communication with Students, Questioning and Discussion Techniques, Engaging

Students in Learning, Using Assessment in Instruction), and Domain 4 (Reflecting on Teaching, Maintaining Accurate Records, Communication with Families, Participating in a Professional Community, Growing and Developing, and Showing Professionalism). As demonstrated in the Danielson Assessment Data Report (1.6) and discussed in Standard 1, all candidates meet the criterion expectations.

In addition to positive evaluations based on these rubrics, GSU student teachers must successfully complete edTPA® portfolios prior to recommendation for licensure. The edTPA®, a performance-based, subject-specific assessment and support system to emphasize, measure and support the skills and knowledge that teachers must have a positive impact P-12 students' learning and development. The edTPA® data reflect candidates' proficiencies in the following key areas: Planning for Content and Understanding; Knowledge of Students; Supporting Academic Language Development; Planning and Assessment.

The EPP's initial program completers' performance on the edTPA® as described in Benchmark Data Report (3.2) demonstrates their pedagogical skills and impact on P-12 student learning. The passing score for edTPA® established by ISBE was 35 for AY16/17 and increased to 37 in AY17/18. Data collected at the program level, as reported in the Benchmark Data Report (3.2), reflect overall candidates' performance levels having met and/or exceeded an Acceptable level. All candidates obtained passing scores ranging from 39 to 56. The overall mean for all program completers was 46.48 in S17, 45.04 in F17 and 45.8 in S18.

Analysis of the data indicates candidates will be well prepared to meet and exceed the AY19/20 ISBE edTPA® cut score of 41. Candidates can and will continue to demonstrate the skills and knowledge that all teachers need from Day 1 in the classroom evidenced by passing scores on the edTPA® tasks: Planning, Instruction, and Assessment.

[Table of Contents](#)

Standard 3 – Advanced

GSU's EPP is deliberate in its selection and monitoring the progress of qualified candidates with diverse backgrounds. The GSU EPP recruits and admits candidates academically capable of meeting the standards of its high-quality courses and fieldwork. The EPP monitors all candidates from beginning to end of their programs to ensure they acquire and possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to meet the needs of all P-12 students. Please refer to the Hyperlinks, Abbreviations, Definitions, and References (1.1) for website, university and college titles, course codes, and academic terms information.

A.3.1 The COE is one of GSU's four academic colleges and houses the Division of Education and the Division of Psychology and Counseling. The EPP is responsible for educator preparation programs across the university, including those in the COE. GSU's secondary teacher preparation programs are housed in the College of Arts and Sciences. The EDAD program's enrollment are representative of the Chicago Southland Region where our university is located: 48.3% have some type of financial aid, while 9.49% have \$0 for Expected Family Contributions EPP Diversity Data (3.0). While maintaining diversity in enrollment is important, equally important to our plan is to increase enrollment across all sectors to assure that P-12 students within our region have administrators representative of their community.

Many of GSU's EPP programs were eliminated by the Board of Trustees during AY16/17 and are currently on teach-out. The remaining initial preparation programs are listed under CAEP Standard 3.1. The remaining advanced preparation programs and their respective accreditation statuses are:

Included in CAEP Self-Study Report:

- M.A. in Educational Administration, Principal Preparation sequence (EDAD)
- Not included in CAEP Self-Study Report due to accreditation by other agencies:
- M.H.S. in Communications Disorders (accredited by CAA)
- M.A. in Counseling, School Counseling sequence (accredited by CACREP)
- Post-M.A. certificate in School Counseling (accredited by CACREP)
- Not included in CAEP Self-Study Report due to other factors:
- M.A. in Early Childhood Education (eliminated program on teach out)
- M.A. in Educational Administration-Chief School Business Official (eliminated program, zero candidates)
- M.A. in Multi-Categorical Special Education (Option I) (eliminated program on teach out)
- M.A. in Reading (eliminated program on teach out)
- Ed.S. in School Psychology (new program approved, first completers in 2018)
- Ed.D. in Interdisciplinary Leadership, Superintendent concentration (new program approved by ISBE June 6, 2018)

A.3.2 As evidenced in the Benchmark Data Report (3.2), our EPP candidates meet CAEP's minimum and the Illinois State Board of Education's (ISBE) minimum criteria for academic

achievement at admission. The stated admission GPA criterion for most GSU EPP programs is 2.75, and almost all candidates who have been admitted exceed that standard. The Educational Administration-Principal Preparation (EDAD) program requires an undergraduate GPA of 2.75, but applicants may submit GRE analytical writing score of 4.0 or higher as an alternative. For EDAD, the mean admission-point GPAs are 3.41 for AY15/16, 3.22 for AY16/17, and 3.36 for AY17/18.

A.3.3 The EPP has developed criteria for candidates' progression from program admission through program completion at four distinct benchmarks. Academic advisors monitor all admission materials including the scores from standardized entrance examinations, grade point averages, and undergraduate transcripts. The faculty members of each EPP program continuously monitor their candidates' content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and dispositions during classroom and field experiences using multiple forms of institutional, state, and national measures. These measures include a validated institutional rubric, as well as state and national content examinations. If candidates are not successful in meeting the program and benchmark requirements, they are referred to the appropriate Student Progress Committee for review and feedback on addressing the areas of concern.

The EPP has identified four assessment phases (Benchmarks) that apply to both initial and advanced candidates. In each of the phases, specific data are collected and analyzed with regard to the criteria established by each program. The data from the Benchmark Data Report (3.2) are used to assess (and, where indicated, implement support for) individual candidates. The aggregated data also are analyzed and used for improving the programs themselves. The four Benchmarks include:

- Benchmark I: Acceptance – identifies requirements/criteria for initial admission to the EPP;
- Benchmark II: Continuance – describes monitoring process and criteria for continuation in the program;
- Benchmark III: Internship – delineates requirements for internship acceptance;
- Benchmark IV: Licensure - identifies the qualification for institutional recommendation of candidate for licensure.

Benchmark I: Acceptance

Advanced program candidates' admission to GSU's EPP takes place upon acceptance to the program. For the EDAD program, the admission criteria include:

- undergraduate GPA of 2.75 or higher OR scores from the Graduate Record Examination (GRE), including a score of "4" or higher on Analytic Writing;
- letter of recommendation and support from school district administrator;
- valid IL Professional Educator License;
- evidence of passing the Illinois Test of Academic Proficiency (TAP) or equivalent;
- two years of full-time teaching experience.

A committee consisting of EDAD program faculty members is charged with the authority for acceptance decisions based on the criteria above.

For the Educational Administration-Principal Preparation program, the mean admission-point GPAs are 3.41 for AY15/16, 3.22 for AY16/17, and 3.36 for AY17/18. The mean GPAs for these three data cycles of data are substantially higher than the criterion 2.75. The Benchmark Data Report (3.2) for the EDAD program also show that 100% of candidates for these three data cycles met other stated requirements (letters of recommendation, portfolio, and two years of full-time teaching experience).

Benchmark II: Continuance

EPP program faculty and academic advisors monitor candidates' progress from admission through program completion. Multiple forms of evidence ensure candidates' ability to successfully address CCR standards for P-12 students. Advanced licensure program candidates' content knowledge, data analysis and data/research-driven decision making, professional collaboration, and application of technology are assessed throughout their programs.

In order to continue in their programs, candidates in GSU EPP's single advanced licensure program included in the Self-Study Report, Educational Administration-Principal Preparation (EDAD), must demonstrate academic success, acquisition of professional knowledge and skills, and demonstrate appropriate professional dispositions. Faculty members assess candidates' professional dispositions according to the EPPU Advanced Programs Educational Professional Disposition Rubric (1.3.d).

Candidates in this program must maintain a GPA of 3.0 and complete EDAD 7801 and 7802 with a B or better. During EDAD 7801, candidates must complete a professional portfolio that includes evidence of their knowledge of curriculum, their current impact on student learning, and their leadership of teachers. In addition, the portfolio requires an oral interview with program faculty and a written response to a scenario. Finally, candidate in the EDAD program must submit a formal application for M.A. Degree Candidacy, which requires recommendation by program faculty.

All candidates consistently meet the program 3.0 GPA requirement to continue the EDAD program. This is as reflected in the Benchmark Data Report (3.2). For EDAD, the mean Continuance coursework GPAs are 3.98 for AY15/16, 3.97 for AY16/17, and 3.97 for AY17/18.

The EPPU Advanced Programs Educational Professional Disposition Rubric (1.3.d) focuses on five professional dispositions: ethical behavior, professional behavior, commitment to collaboration, appreciation of diversity, habits of mind for reasoned eclecticism, and commitment to professional growth. Each dispositional element is scored with points at one of four levels: Far Below Standards (to be labeled Unsatisfactory in AY18/19) - 1; Below Standards (to be labeled Developing in AY18/19) - 2, Meets Standards (to be labeled Target in AY18/19) - 3, and Exceeds Standards (to be labeled Exemplary in AY18/19) - 4. The EPPU Dispositions

Assessment for Advanced Program Educator Preparation Programs rubric is administered throughout the program.

The expectation is that EDAD candidates will be rated at least Meets Standards on a majority of the elements. As indicated in the Disposition Data Reports (1.10), a grand mean of 99.2% of the evaluation criteria was at Meets Standards or above. The mean scores of the evaluation criteria for dispositions have been collected and analyzed over three data cycles: S17, 99.2%, F17, 99.7%, and S18, 95.6%. These scores demonstrate that EDAD candidates have the necessary professional dispositions to work with P-12 students.

Benchmark III: Internship Acceptance

GSU EPP's advanced licensure programs require internships. Candidates in the EDAD program must complete three 2-credit hour courses (EDAD 8206, 8207, 8208), each of which is one term.

Candidates in the EDAD program must apply for Internship I, II, and III by the appropriate deadline (April 15 for fall internship; October 15 for spring internship; March 15 for summer internship). Approval of the Internship Application Form (A.3.1) requires completion of 18 credit hours in EDAD coursework. The specific course prerequisites for the three internships courses are: EDAD 7803 for EDAD 8201 Principal Internship I; EDAD 8201 for EDAD 8202 Principal Internship II; EDAD 8202 for EDAD 8203 Principal Internship III. In addition, the candidate's overall GPA must be 3.0, including a B or better in EDUC 7801, 7802, 7803, and 7902. Finally, prior to internship, EDAD candidates must have successfully completed the ISBE Growth through Learning Training Modules (GTL) for Teacher Evaluation during EDAD 7803.

Despite the requirement for all candidates to successfully complete the GTL prior to internship, many EDAD candidates who decided to receive a master's degree but not ISBE licensure did not complete the required training modules. 100% of the candidates who did attempt the GTL modules were successful. The following reflects the percentages of eligible candidates who completed the GTL as part of the Principal Leadership Benchmark III requirement: AY15/16 – 100%; AY16/17 – 100%; AY17/18 - 100%.

Benchmark IV: Recommendation for Licensure

The Director of Educator Preparation is the ISBE Certification Officer for GSU and has the authority to recommend a candidate for initial or advanced educator licensure by the State of Illinois. To apply for a State of Illinois License, all EDAD candidates must successfully meet the qualifications identified in the EDAD Benchmark IV. Details regarding criteria are provided below.

A.3.4 Prior to recommendation for licensure by the GSU Director of Educator Preparation (ISBE Certification Officer), all EDAD program candidates' content knowledge, pedagogical/professional skills, and professional dispositions are evaluated according to specified assessment criteria. All candidates must pass their internship coursework at a level of

Governors State University

B or better. All candidates also must complete the Educational Administration (Principal Preparation) Graduate/Completer Survey (title and instrument revised for future use: GSU EPPU Principal Leadership Exit Survey).

Throughout their respective programs, all candidates in the EDAD program are assessed for professional dispositions via a validated institutional rubric (Advanced Programs Educational Professional Disposition Rubric). This rubric includes criteria regarding expectations of the profession (code of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies).

Before recommendation for licensure of any EDAD candidate, her/his content knowledge is assessed via ILTS content tests 195 and 196. The test, as a whole, is designed to assess the candidates' content knowledge regarding P-12 principal administration and is based on current and relevant expectations for principals in Illinois. The pass/fail cut score on each section of each test is 240. Despite the requirement for all candidates to successfully complete the ILTS 195 and 196 prior to internship, many candidates who decided to receive a master's degree but not licensure did not take the required exams. All completers who took the ILTS 195 and 196 in AY15/16, AY16/17, and AY17/18 were successful.

As reported in CAEP Standard A.1, the mean score on the ILTS 195 exam for three data collection cycles (AY15/16, AY16/17, AY17/18) was 265.2. The ILTS 195 mean scores on the ILTS overall, on subareas (sub scores 1 and 2), and on constructed-response items (sub score 3) for the three data collection cycles are as follows:

AY15/16 (n=10): overall - 265.1; sub score 1 - 267.1; sub score 2 - 266.9; sub score 3 - 262.5
AY16/17(n=16): overall - 268.3; sub score 1 - 270.8; sub score 2 - 267.7; sub score 3 - 267.4
AY17/18 (n=24): overall - 263.2; sub score 1 - 261.7; sub score 2 - 264; sub score 3 - 263.5
All Years (n= 51): overall - 265.2; sub score 1 - 265.6; sub score 2 - 265.5; sub score 3 - 264.8

The mean score on the ILTS 196 exam for three data collection cycles (AY15/16, AY16/17, AY17/18) was 253.5. The ILTS 196 mean scores on the ILTS overall, on subareas (sub scores 1 and 2), and on constructed-response items (sub score 3) for the three data collection cycles are as follows:

AY15/16 (n=10): overall - 256.6; sub score 1 - 256.9; sub score 2 - 258; sub score 3 - 254.1
AY16/17 (n=16): overall - 256; sub score 1 - 254.4; sub score 2 - 260.4; sub score 3 - 254.5
AY17/18 (n=24): overall - 251.3; sub score 1 - 247.5; sub score 2 - 252.6; sub score 3 - 254.0
All Years (n= 51): overall - 253.5; sub score 1 - 251.2; sub score 2 - 255.4; sub score 3 - 254.0

Finally, the EDAD program includes the course EDAD 7802 Technology-Driven Leadership during which candidates' ability to incorporate technology in the school administration is the focus. 100% of candidates achieved Target level for all elements of the technology portfolio, as described in the Principal Preparation Technology Portfolio Data (A.3.2).

[Table of Contents](#)

Standard 4 – Initial

GSU's EPP implemented several quantitative measures and plans to phase-in additional qualitative measures of initial program impact on P-12 students (CAEP 4.1), all of which align with state and national standards and the values described in the University's and the COE's mission statements. The EPP prepares transformative educators who effectively contribute to an expected level of student learning and development by applying the knowledge, skills, and dispositions their preparation experiences at GSU were designed to achieve (CAEP 4.2). Continuous assessment by multiple measures yields data indicating both employer (CAEP 4.3) and completer (CAEP 4.4) satisfaction with GSU's preparation for working with the P-12 student population. Ongoing sharing and analysis of data from these multiple measures by program faculty and other stakeholders result in an evidence-based process of continuous improvement to continue development of high-quality programs. Please refer to the Hyperlinks, Abbreviations, and Definitions artifact (1.1) for website, university and college titles, course codes, and academic terms information.

The GSU EPP assessment plan for CAEP Standard 4 includes quantitative and qualitative measures to provide data for statistical analysis as well as analysis for themes and trends. The quantitative data used to support the EPP's response to Standard 4 is taken from ISBE and the Illinois Partnership for Educator Preparation (PEP) 2018 Report (4.1). This new statewide program, designed to improve educator preparation programs and better serve P-12 students through strengthened data collection, sharing, and reporting, started with a series of pilot assessment collections/analyses in August 2016. GSU participated in the second pilot assessment collection/analysis in 2017 and received a report from PEP in July 2018. This report provides data on the EPP's and programs' effectiveness and the student impact of completers employed in Illinois in 2015, 2016, and 2017.

To supplement the basic and global statistical information provided by PEP, the EPP pursued descriptive data with surveys of candidates, alumni, and employers. The following Survey Assessments (2.4) were developed and implemented beginning AY16/17 to provide quantitative data:

- 1) COE Exit Survey F16, S18
- 2) DOE Graduate/Completer Survey Year 1 and Year 3
- 3) Administrator Survey Part I and Part II

Each of these surveys was shaped by standards of adequacy questions for survey instruments adapted from the McMillan and Schumacher (2001) model.

Because 3 years of consistent data have not been collected unit-wide and the above surveys do not sufficiently document impact on P-12 students, a Phase-In Plan for Case Study of Initial

Program Completers (4.2) has been developed. The DOE Graduate/Completer Survey (2.4), administered Year 1 and Year 3 after program completion, and the revised version of the EPPU Administrator Survey will be used as repeated measures in the case study for each initial program. All collected data are/will be tabulated, compiled, and archived in LiveText®.

Additional evidence of GSU EPP's initial program candidates' and completers' impact on P-12 students and completer satisfaction is derived from ISBE-sponsored surveys. Illinois Partnership for Educator Preparation (PEP) 2018 Report (4.1) provides these results. This statewide program to improve educator preparation programs and better serve P-12 students through strengthened data collection, sharing, and reporting was initiated with a series of pilot assessment collections/analyses beginning in August 2016. GSU participated in the second pilot assessment collection/analysis in 2017 and received the PEP report in July 2018. The report includes data on the effectiveness and student impact of GSU-trained teachers employed in Illinois in 2015, 2016, and 2017. The collection of these data was mandated by the Illinois Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA) 2010 (4.3). Also, since September 1, 2017, all Illinois educator-preparation program completers are required to answer the ISBE Completer Survey (4.4), which was developed by Deans of Colleges of Education across Illinois for Impact and is in a first-year, state-wide pilot implementation. This survey was adopted because of the quality of its items and its validity and reliability. Year-one GSU data are reported below in 4.4.

4.1 Results from the PEP 2018 Report (4.1) for GSU-trained teachers' impact on student learning were strongly positive, with the following percentage of GSU-trained teachers rated at Proficient or Excellent in demonstrated teaching skills and impact on students: 2015 (n=75) - 97.20%; 2016 (n=45) - 97.80%; 2017 (n=17) - 100%.

To augment these highly positive results with descriptive data, the EPP developed and distributed the Administrator Survey Part I (2.4) in S17. However, because of a very low response rate (5%), the EPP developed and distributed a much briefer form of the survey (Administrator Survey Part II, 2.4) in S18. This version resulted in a significantly higher response rate (42%) but for a significantly smaller and more general data set. Description of these instruments and initial results are found in the Survey Data report (2.5) and as follows.

EPP initial program completers (n=19) in S16 were asked to respond to the DOE Graduate/Completer Survey Year 1 (2.4) in F17. Of the 13 respondents (68.4% response rate), 5 initial program completers voluntarily identified their names, contact information, and school employer and administrator contact information. Administrators at these schools received an email request for participation with a link to the EPPU Administrator Survey Part I through SurveyMonkey®. One of those five administrators responded (20% response rate). Results about a single completer are inadequate for analyzing program effectiveness, but the results were positive: The teacher worked in a diverse classroom including ELL, special education, and gifted students of whom 40% or more received free/reduced price lunches. Based on NWEA benchmark assessments, expected growth goals were met by 75-80% of this teacher's students.

Governors State University

Three recommendations resulted from analysis of these data: 1) revise EPPU Administrator Survey Part I to reduce time required, 2) revise EPPU Administrator Survey Part I to streamline collection procedure, and 3) revise DOE Graduate/Completer Surveys to delete items related to identification of the respondent and the respondent's employer.

In response to the first recommendation, the EPP developed a two-item version, Administrator Survey Part II (2.4), and distributed it in S18 through a similar SurveyMonkey®-generated email procedure.

In response to the second recommendation, ISBE licensure database were used to identify 31 completers of GSU initial programs for AY16/17 employed in Illinois public schools during AY17/18. Surveys were sent to the schools' administrators. Of the 31 administrators, 13 (42% response rate) responded to Administrator Survey Part II (2.4), which represented: 9 EMED, 1 EDEC, 1 ETE, 1 BTE, and 1 MCSE completers.

Results for both items on the Administrator Survey Part II (2.4) were strongly positive. Results for item #1 are described below, and results for item #2 appear in 4.2.

To item #1 [*Based on the most recent benchmark assessment (i.e., NWEA), did at least 75% of this GSU-trained teacher's students meet expected growth this year?*], 10 administrators (77%), responded "Yes." Three administrators (23%) indicated N/A, commenting that their GSU-trained teachers were employed in instructional capacities other than classroom teacher and were not responsible for or evaluated by student progress on the NWEA-MAP. One administrator responded "No," commenting that his/her GSU-trained teacher works with moderately handicapped students, only some of whom were required to take the NWEA-MAP, but that those who were did not meet grade level expectations. Thus, results indicated that 100% of this sample of completers working with general education students met the 75% student growth criterion.

These survey results are shared and discussed with the EPP committee using Survey Result Summaries (4.5) and Survey Results (2.5) directly from SurveyMonkey®. Recommendations to improve the survey process and individual programs are discussed, and improvements are implemented if necessary. These surveys have been used for only one academic year, and overall the survey results have been positive; therefore, to date no significant changes to the program have occurred.

Response to the third recommendation resulted in a revision of the survey of completers of initial programs. All items related to identification of the respondent and of the respondent's employer are deleted. Additionally, the central "Neutral" response option is eliminated across all items. A revised version of the DOE Graduate/Completer Survey will be administered to completers of EPP initial programs at one and three year intervals post completion beginning in S19.

4.1 Phase-in Beginning in F18, the EPP will phase in case study assessment, described in Phase-in Plan for Case Study of Initial Program Completers (4.2), of programs' and completers' effects on P-12 student growth and development. The EPP will follow one volunteer completer for each initial program from AY17/18 who is employed as a classroom teacher in a local school district. These case studies will permit, through data-sharing agreements to be developed beginning in F18 between GSU and case studies' participant teachers' school districts, the collection of student growth percentiles on NWEA–MAP assessments, as well as PERA evaluations, for each participant teacher through his/her first three years in the classroom. This process will be repeated annually for the initial programs. Case study (i.e., program-level) analyses will be conducted annually as will a cross-case (i.e., EPP-level) analysis. Themes and trends across programs and across years will be identified and contribute to faculty and stakeholder decisions regarding program development.

4.2 Because the EPP could not rely on the timely receipt of the 2018 PEP report to include its results in this CAEP application, the EPP developed the Administrator Survey Part I, described in 4.1, to provide data demonstrating that S16 completers of initial programs effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that their preparation experiences were designed to achieve. Of the 5 administrators, who each received three requests to participate in the survey over a two-week period in S16, only 1 responded. This respondent indicated that the first-year GSU-trained teacher at his/her school demonstrated competency in content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and professional dispositions, including respect for diversity. This administrator expected his/her first-year GSU-trained teacher to be retained (next career milestone). Although reported here, no analysis or interpretation for program development was attempted based on this one response.

Subsequently, the EPP developed and distributed in S18 the two-item EPPU Administrator Survey Part II (2.4), which is described in 4.1. This survey was sent to administrators of the 31 employed AY16/17 initial program completers. Of the 31 administrators, 13 responded (42% response rate). The data collected from responses to Item #2 and pertaining to CAEP 4.2 were strongly positive; results are described below.

To item #2 [*Based on the most recent teacher evaluation, did this GSU-trained teacher perform at a proficient level?*], 10 administrators (77%) responded "Yes." 3 administrators (23%) indicated N/A, explaining in comments that their GSU-trained teachers were employed as paraprofessionals and were not evaluated on a teacher performance scale. Thus, results indicated that 100% of this sample of GSU initial program completers working as classroom teachers met the performance criterion at the Proficient level on PERA evaluations.

Recommendations and subsequent EPP use of the Administrator Survey Part II (2.4) pertaining to both CAEP 4.1 and 4.2 are described under 4.1 above.

As described in 4.1, the 2018 Illinois PEP Report (4.2) demonstrated impressive results for GSU-trained teachers. This report documents the pedagogical skills and student impact of GSU-

trained teachers employed in Illinois during 2015, 2016, and 2017. Their PERA evaluations show that 97-100% of were rated Proficient or Excellent for demonstrated teaching skills and impact on students.

4.2 Phase-in Recognizing limitations of both the PEP report and survey data for creating a full picture of the EPP initial program completers' effectiveness in the classroom, the EPP will phase in case studies of AY17/18 completers to augment survey data, beginning in F18. In addition to detailed information regarding P-12 student growth, case studies will draw on data from the Administrator Survey Part I (2.4), the original, longer version of the survey that references each of the IPTS and PERA standards. This will allow the EPP to identify specific information about each GSU-trained teacher's performance as evaluated against identified criterion behaviors. These data will be supplemented with qualitative data from annual completer/teacher interviews and administrator focus groups described in the Phase-in Plan for Case Study of Initial Program Completers (4.2). All data pertaining to each of the case-study teachers will be reviewed and analyzed by program faculty each year for a three-year period. As case studies are developed in successive years, results of the repeated measures will be analyzed for individual participants' trends, as well as trends for participants across programs. These cross-case analyses will provide additional evidence for the ongoing development of all EPP initial programs.

4.3 Results from the 2018 PEP report (4.1), described in 4.1, for GSU-trained teachers' demonstrated teaching skills were strongly positive. The following years demonstrate the percentage of GSU-trained teachers who were rated Proficient or Excellent: 2015 (n=75) - 97.20%; 2016 (n=45) - 97.80%; 2017 (n=13) - 100%. Results for candidates who are rated Proficient or Excellent on demonstrated teaching skills/ impact on K-12 students over three years show that candidates are performing above an acceptable level. Further, the 2018 PEP report provided program-level data 2015, 2016, and 2017 that are highly positive:

2015: ETE (n=10) - 100%; MCSE (n=16) - 93.5%; MTE (n=5) - 100%; EDEC (n=11) - 90.9%; EMED (n=30) - 100%; BTE (n=3) - 100%

2016: ETE (n=4) - 100%; MCSE (n=14) - 92.8%; MTE (n=5) - 100%; EDEC (n=10) - 100%; EMED (n=12) - 100%; BTE (n=0)

2017: ETE (n=2) - 100%; MCSE (n=5) - 100%; MTE (n=1) - 100%; EDEC (n=2) - 100%; EMED (n=7) - 100%; BTE (n=0).

The EPP administered the EPP Administrator Survey Part I (2.4), described in 4.1 above, to determine if employers of completers of the EPP's initial programs were satisfied with completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students. The low response rate to that initial effort to obtain these data, as well as subsequent development and use of the Administrator Survey Part II, has been previously discussed. Results from item #2 of Administrator Survey Part II (2.4) indicated that 100% of the sample's initial program

completers working as general education classroom teachers met the performance criterion at the Proficient level in PERA evaluations.

Although the logical inference from both PEP and Administrator Survey Part II data is that employers of GSU-trained first-year classroom teachers are satisfied, confirmation of the employment milestones of retention and tenure was not obtained from either measure. The single responding administrator to EPP Administrator Survey Part I said that retention of his/her school's GSU-trained teacher was anticipated.

One factor in the EPP's inability to trace the retention of GSU initial program completers was reliance on completers' self-identification for data collection purposes with Administrator Survey Part I. That issue was resolved by consulting ISBE records to learn where completers were employed. However, the survey revision, Administrator Survey Part II, which reduced the number of items to 2, did not specifically ask whether teachers would be retained. The EPP resolved this second issue by adding two items (*Will this GSU-trained teacher be retained?* and *If appropriate, please indicate whether this GSU-trained teacher will earn tenure.*) to Administrator Survey, resulting in Administrator Survey Part II (2.4).

4.3 Phase-in To further the goal of continuous program development, the EPP will implement a Phase-In Plan Case Study for Initial Program Completers (4.2) to include completer/teacher interviews and administrator focus group discussions each spring. Analysis and interpretation of interviews and focus group qualitative data within and across programs will enhance EPP and program faculty understanding of factors related to retention or non-retention of GSU-trained teachers over their first three years in the classroom.

4.4 The ISBE Completer Survey Raw Data (4.6) was just released on July 12, 2018. There are plans for more complete analysis of the data. Due to the significance of these data, the EPP thought it was necessary to report preliminary, aggregated findings in a format that would allow us to include them in this Self-Study. The results below and in the EPP ISBE Completer Survey Aggregated Data Report (4.7) reflect completers' perceptions of their respective programs, reported as overall program means for items asking about satisfaction with their experiences and the preparation they received. The survey items have a 5-point Likert scale format, and level 3 can be equated to CAEP's Acceptable. The following are percentages of responses that were at Acceptable or above levels: EDEC - 100%; EMED - 96.8%; MCSE - 95%; Secondary Programs (not disaggregated by the ISBE) - 100%. Mean scores were: EDEC 4.41, EMED 4.49, MSCE - 4.08, SEC ED - 4.71. The EPP plans to share these data at the next EPP meeting and add this survey to the Assessment Collection System-Initial (ACS-I) (4.8), which will allow the EPP to make recommendations and improvements based on the results.

The existing COE exit survey was revised in F17, and was first administered F17. Another revision occurred during winter 17/18, and COE Exit Survey S18 was first administered in S18. The purpose of Exit Surveys is to collect data from completers regarding their perceptions of their preparation, specifically about preparation for assuming the responsibilities they will

confront in the classroom. The DOE Graduate/Completer Surveys also has this purpose but respondents are directed to consider their preparation from the vantage of having 1 and then 3 years of experience in the classroom. Administration of the DOE Graduate/Completer Surveys began in S17 for completers who had graduated during AY15/16 (1 year) and for completers who had graduated during AY13/14 (3 year). Plans to revise the EPPU Graduate/Completer Survey include deleting Neutral responses and disaggregating all data for advanced programs from that for initial programs. The revised survey will be used beginning S19. Data have been collected, analyzed, and shared by program faculty and other stakeholders, contributing to ongoing program improvement.

Graduates'/Completers' Satisfaction at Graduation/Completion S17 and S18

Administered in S17, COE Exit Survey F17 (2.4) provided data in three major areas: demographic information, attitudes/perceptions about completers' general experience at GSU, and completers' attitudes/perceptions regarding their programs. Because data collection for the Exit and Graduate/Completer Surveys did not provide initial vs. advanced program disaggregated data for demographic items or for items related to general attitudes toward GSU experience, these data are presented in COE Exit Survey Results (2.5) and Survey Summaries (4.5).

During winter 17/18, COE Exit Survey F17 was revised to achieve item consistency across initial programs, reduce item redundancy, and delete the central Neutral response option for all items. The COE Exit Survey S18 (2.4) was administered first at the end of the S18 semester to all completers. However, most of the data from these two iterations of the COE Exit Survey can only be reported here but not compared due to the removal of the Neutral response option. (This change in the data collection instrument would likely have been responsible for an unknown but increased percentage of Agree or Disagree responses.) The EPP looks forward to the opportunity to compare responses on successive administrations of Exit Survey F18, scheduled to begin in S19.

Despite the difference in item response options, the procedure for administration of the COE Exit Surveys Part I and Part II was the same each year. Both Exit Surveys used SurveyMonkey® as the platform. The EPP identified all completers and forwarded to them, through SurveyMonkey®, an email participation request with a link to the appropriate survey. All emails were sent to completers' GSU email addresses.

In F17, the 65-item EPPU Exit Survey F17 was sent to all 23 initial program completers for AY16/17; 21 responded (91% response rate). The 21 respondents had been in the following programs: EDEC - 2; EMED - 8; Secondary Ed - 10; MCSE - 1.

In S18, the 59-item EPPU Exit Survey S18 was sent to all 24 initial program completers for AY17/18; 16 responded (67% response rate). The 16 respondents had been in the following programs: EDEC - 4; EMED - 7; Secondary Ed - 3; MCSE - 1.

Results for these initial completers on the Exit Surveys items are included in the EPP's LiveText® archive and are summarized in the Survey Data Report (2.5) and below.

In response to the S17 and S18 administration of the Exit Survey, completers indicated their preparation was relevant to the responsibilities they expect to confront on the job and that their preparation will have been effective. They were highly pleased with their choice of major/focus and were likely or extremely likely to recommend it to others (S17 - 82%; S18 - 94%). They agreed or strongly agreed that their professional dispositions were enhanced by their program participation (S17 - 82%; S18 - 100%). Completers also indicated they were adequately, well, or extremely-well prepared by their programs in the knowledge and skills described in all IPTS (S17 - 85%; S18 - 100%). In response to a number of survey items, they indicated they believed the following major pre-student teaching experiences to have been valuable or extremely valuable: creating standards-based, data-driven lesson plans (S17 - 87%; S18 - 95%); demonstrating a variety of strategies and models of learning (S17 - 86%, S18 - 95%); delivering instruction to P-12 students (S17 - 93%, S18 - 95%); and engaging in multiple field experiences (S17 - 90%, S18 - 100%). They also indicated that discussion of lesson plans and teaching with both cooperating teachers (S17 - 95%, S18 - 96%) and university supervisors (S17 - 83%, S18 - 90%). Hence, GSU's EPP programs are rated highly by completers of the programs.

Graduates'/Completers' Satisfaction at One Year

Like the COE Exit Surveys, the DOE Graduate/Completer Surveys collect three types of information: demographic information and general attitude toward GSU, and completers' attitudes/perceptions regarding their preparation, specifically about their preparation for assuming the responsibilities they have experienced in their classrooms.

In S17, 78 EPP initial (33 or 42%) and advanced (45 or 58%) program completers who graduated during AY15/16 received the COE Exit Survey F17 (2.4) through the email and SurveyMonkey® procedure previously described. 13 responded (16.7% response rate). Of those 13, 6 were initial program completers. This equals an 18.2% response rate for initial program completers. The 6 initial program completers provided their own and their employers' names and contact information. Results for these 6 respondents on each of the COE Exit Survey F17 (2.4) items are included in the EPP's LiveText® archive and are summarized in the Survey Data Report (2.5) and below.

One year after graduation/completion of EPP initial programs, completers continued to indicate their preparation was relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job and that their preparation was effective. However, responses were somewhat less positive than those of completers immediately following graduation/completion. Of respondents, 80% remained positive or strongly positive about their choice of major/focus and would choose it again. Respondents agreed or strongly agreed that all identified professional dispositions were enhanced by their program participation (ranging from 60-70% strongly agree/agree depending on the program). A majority of respondents (ranging from 70-100% depending on the program)

Governors State University

indicated they believe they were very well, well, or adequately prepared by their programs in all of the knowledge and skills described in the IPTS, except regarding preparation for the teaching of beginning and/or content area literacy (50% very well/well/adequately).

Although every respondent did not answer every item, and, therefore, it is difficult to make comparisons across items, the data collected are strongly positive. For example, 1-year completers assessed their pre-student teaching experiences as valuable or very valuable for the following survey items: creating standards-based, data-driven lesson plans (80%); demonstrating a variety of strategies and models of learning (78%); delivering instruction to P-12 students (89%); and engaging in multiple field experiences (100%). They also indicated that discussions of lesson plans and teaching with cooperating teachers were positive learning experiences (86% very valuable/valuable) during student teaching, but discussions of lesson plans and teaching with university supervisors were considered positive learning experiences for fewer respondents (43% very valuable/valuable). These data will allow our programs to make informed decisions moving forward.

Graduates'/Completers' Satisfaction at Three Years

In S17, 63 completers from the AY13/14 class received the COE Graduate/Completer Survey Part I (2.4) via email/SurveyMonkey®. Six responded (9.5% response rate). Of those 6, 2 were initial program completers. Those 2 initial program completers provided their own and their employers' names and contact information.

The 2 initial program respondents results on each of the Graduate/Completer Survey items are included in the EPP's LiveText® archive and summarized in the Survey Data Report (2.5) and below. Although too small a sample for analysis and interpretation to significantly contribute to program development, data are provided here for transparency and completeness of process.

Respondents indicated their preparation was relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job and that their preparation was effective. Respondents were positive or strongly positive about their choice of major/focus and would choose it again (100%). Both respondents (100%) agreed or strongly agreed that all identified professional dispositions were enhanced by their program participation. However, one of these two respondents (50%) indicated she did not believe she had been adequately prepared for the IPTS related to the knowledge/skill of creating differentiated instruction. The EPP will review data to address these concerns by adjusting programs and/or assignments to better prepare candidates for differentiating instruction.

Responses to several items asking them to evaluate their pre-student teaching experiences were valuable or very valuable: creating standards-based, data-driven lesson plans (100%); demonstrating a variety of strategies and models of learning (100%); delivering instruction to P-12 students (100%); and engaging in multiple field experiences (100%). They also indicated that discussions of lesson plans and teaching with cooperating teachers were valuable (100%) during student teaching, but discussions of lesson plans and teaching with university supervisors were

considered positive learning experiences for only one respondent (50%). Program faculty are taking these feedback to future university supervisor professional development sessions to discuss this feedback and determine what changes should be made to this process.

Responses demonstrate generally more positive attitudes/ perceptions than those of the EPP's first-year completers. Based on these data and research findings, the EPP is considering the change of administration of follow up surveys of initial program completers from first and third to second and third years following program completion.

Overall teacher effectiveness and impact on P-12 student learning for the EPP initial program completers have been demonstrated with data derived from ISBE PEP and EPP-developed survey instruments. PEP samples and survey response rates were too small, however, to permit meaningful analysis or interpretation of similarities and differences among licensure programs. Plans to implement case studies, including completer/teacher interviews and administrator focus groups, to augment these data sources are described in referenced artifacts. Completers and their employers indicate on multiple measures high satisfaction with GSU's P-12 teacher preparation programs. Moreover, PEP data (4.1) during the 2015-2018 period indicate that 97-100% of the EPP's initial program completers were evaluated as Proficient or Excellent. The EPP will incorporate data from these assessments into its evidence-based, continuous improvement to guarantee provision of high-quality programs for its teacher candidates and Illinois' P-12 students.

Standard 4 – Advanced

GSU's EPP implemented several quantitative measures and plans to phase-in additional qualitative measures of advanced program effectiveness, all of which align with state and national standards and the values described in the University's and the COE's mission statements. The EPP's EDAD program prepares transformative educational leaders who effectively apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions their preparation experiences at GSU were designed to achieve. Continuous assessment by multiple measures yields data indicating both employer (CAEP A.4.1) and completer (CAEP A.4.2) satisfaction with GSU's preparation of principals for work with teachers and the P-12 student population. Ongoing sharing and analysis of data from these multiple measures by program faculty and other stakeholders result in an evidence-based process of continuous improvement to continue development of high-quality programs. Please refer to the Hyperlinks, Abbreviations, Definitions, and References artifact (1.1) for website, university and college titles, course codes, and academic terms information.

The EPP pursued descriptive data from candidates, alumni, mentor administrators, and employers. Beginning F18, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) and the Illinois Partnership for Educator Preparation (PEP) will collect and publish data regarding administrators' impact on student learning similar to those provided for teachers the first time in SU18. The EPP expects these reports to enhance the data provided by the following Survey Assessments (2.4) that were implemented beginning in AY14/15 to provide quantitative data for this report:

- 1) Administrator Survey Part I and Part II
- 3) DOE Graduate/Completer Survey Year I and Year 3
- 4) COE Completer/Exit Surveys
- 5) Educational Administration (Principal Preparation) Graduate/Completer Survey

Each of the survey assessments was shaped by standards of adequacy questions for survey instruments adapted from the McMillan and Schumacher (2001) model. All collected data are/will be tabulated, compiled, and archived in the EPP LiveText® CAEP Data Archive.

The EPPU Educational Administration Exit Survey, the Graduate/Completer Survey, and the Administrator Survey will be used as repeated measures in the multiple-instrument case study that the EPP will phase in for the EDAD program. These case studies will follow one completer of the EDAD program employed as a principal and one completer employed in another educational leadership position each year for a period of three years. Quantitative data about these advanced program completers' impact on student growth and development will be augmented with qualitative data derived from interviews with these completers and with these completers' administrators, conducted annually for a three-year period. Additional description of this planned case study is included in the appropriate section below and in the Phase-In Plan for Principal Leadership Case Study (4.2).

In addition to the ISBE PEP report for initial program completers, ISBE will implement a similar survey for advanced program completers in upcoming years. When available, these data will be analyzed to evaluate program effectiveness.

A.4.1 Employer Satisfaction

Initial Steps

The EPP developed and distributed the Administrator Survey Part I (2.4) in S17. However, because of a very low response rate (5%), the EPP developed a much briefer form of the Administrator Survey, the GSU EPPU Administrator Survey Part II (2.4). This second version yielded a significantly higher response rate but a smaller and more general data set. Description of these instruments and initial results follows.

The 15-item Administrator Survey Part I (2.4) addresses completers' school setting, preparation, and impact on student learning. Administrators of GSU-trained EDAD program completers are asked to respond to six EDAD-specific items. These items provide an opportunity for the administrator to share information about the GSU-trained EDAD program completer's performance as described in behaviors articulated in the National Policy Board for Educational Administration's Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (2015) and the Illinois Performance Standards for School Leaders (IPSSL) (see link in 1.1) used in Illinois PERA evaluations.

To facilitate the collection of these data from administrators, the 19 completers of the EDAD program in AY15/16 were asked to respond to the DOE Graduate/Completer Survey Year I (2.4) in S17, one year after their program completion. Of the 13 respondents (68% response rate), one advanced program completer (a principal) voluntarily provided his/her name, contact information, school employer, and administrator contact information. This principal's administrator (a district superintendent) received an email request for participation with a link to the Administrator Survey Part I (2.4) through SurveyMonkey®. This superintendent (100% response rate) responded to the request for data. Results about a single completer are inadequate as a basis for analysis of completer performance or program effectiveness but are presented here, nevertheless, for transparency and completeness of process. Results for this advanced program completer were positive: The EDAD program completer worked in a diverse school including ELL, special education, and gifted students. Based on NWEA benchmark assessments, expected growth goals were not met by 75-80% of this principal's school's students; however, the superintendent's evaluations of this principal were excellent across all identified standards of performance.

EPP program coordinators analyzed this initial attempt to collect information about completers' impact on P-12 students' learning and overall effectiveness. Three recommendations resulted. The EPP should: 1) revise Administrator Survey Part I to reduce time required to complete the assessment, 2) revise Administrator Survey Part I to streamline collection procedure, and 3) use ISBE records to identify EDAD program completers' employers.

In response to the first recommendation, the EPP developed a two-item version, Administrator Survey Part II, which asks: *Based on the most recent benchmark assessment (i.e., NWEA), did at least 75% of this GSU-trained EDAD program completer's students meet expected growth this year?* and *Based on the most recent evaluation, did this GSU-trained EDAD program completer perform at a proficient level?*. The EPP will distribute this version of the Administrator Survey through a similar SurveyMonkey®-generated email procedure beginning SU18. No internet link will be necessary. The previous reminder email procedure will be repeated. If the program completer functions as an educational leader in a position other than principal, his/her school's principal will receive the survey; if the program completer functions as a school principal, his/her district superintendent will receive the survey.

In response to the second recommendation, ISBE records will be used to identify completers of the GSU EDAD program for AY17/18 who are employed in Illinois public schools. Response to the third recommendation is discussed in A.4.2 below.

The EPP will continue to survey administrators of first-year completers of the GSU EDAD program in the summer of each academic year when NWEA–MAP scores and PERA evaluations are available to them. ISBE records will continue to be used for identification of employed completers, and SurveyMonkey® will continue to be used as the platform for the administrator survey.

Phase-in

Beginning in F18, to facilitate triangulation of employer satisfaction with the EDAD program and program completers, the EPP will phase in two additional measures. First, longitudinal case study assessment of the EDAD program's and completers' effectiveness, particularly with regard to P-12 student growth and development, will be implemented. The EPP will select and follow one volunteer EDAD program completer who is employed as a principal and one volunteer EDAD program completer who is in another leadership position (e.g., lead teacher, curriculum director, dean of students) in a local school district each academic year for three years, beginning with AY17/18 completers in F18. Case study participants will be selected from among volunteers who indicate an interest in maintaining a professional relationship with the University and feel an obligation to support those who follow them in the EDAD program by providing ongoing feedback about the efficacy and effectiveness of program components. As studies of EDAD completer participants are added each year, these case studies will permit, through data-sharing agreements to be developed beginning in F18 between GSU and case study participants' school districts, the collection of student growth percentiles on NWEA–MAP assessments, as well as PERA evaluations, for each participant principal and educational leader through his/her first three years post program completion. Case studies will also permit longitudinal data collection on employment trajectory and career milestones, including retention and promotion for at least some program completers. These data can provide qualitative evidence to address the results of the SU18 administration of the Educational Administration (Principal Preparation) Graduate/Completer Survey, which indicated 83% of

EDAD completers do not currently function as principals and 82% do not intend to seek a position as a principal. Case study (i.e., program-level) analyses will be conducted annually as will cross-case analyses. Differences in attitudes between those who are or who seek to be principals and those who choose another leadership role will be examined beginning in the second academic year of implementation of the case study procedure (i.e. AY18/19). Themes and trends across years and participants will be identified and contribute to faculty and stakeholder decisions regarding program development.

Additionally, the EPP will phase in implementation of a GSU EPP mentor administrator survey during AY18/19. This survey, to be developed before December 2018, will ask mentors of EDAD candidate-interns, mandated by Illinois to have a minimum of two years' experience in the role of principal, if they believe their interns' preparation was sufficient to meet the expectations of future job responsibilities as demonstrated by their mentored performance of those responsibilities as interns. In EDAD 8206, 8207, and 8208, Principal Internship I, II, and III, candidate-interns observe and participate in a range of school leadership situations in economically and culturally diverse school settings, interacting with members of the school community under the direct guidance of a mentor principal. These internship experiences are designed to provide opportunities for candidate-interns to demonstrate the knowledge and skills described in both the National Policy Board for Educational Administration's Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (2015) and the Illinois Performance Standards for School Leaders (IPSSL) (see hyperlink in 1.1) used in Illinois PERA evaluations. Mentor administrators will be trained in responding to this survey through an online training module created by the EDAD program faculty and added to the required online training each principal must undergo before supervising an EDAD candidate-intern. Analysis and interpretation of these mentors' evaluations of their interns and their interns' programmatic preparation will provide faculty and other stakeholders with additional descriptive and comparative data to inform the EDAD program's continuing development process.

A.4.2 Advanced Program Completer Satisfaction

Initial Steps

GSU's EPPU has always administered an exit survey to all its program completers during their final semester. That survey was revised in S17, and COE Exit Survey F17 (2.4) was first administered F17 to both initial and advanced program completers. The purpose of the Exit Survey is to collect data from completers regarding their perceptions of their preparation, specifically their perceptions about their preparation for assuming the responsibilities they will confront in the role for which their program prepared them. DOE Graduate/Completer Survey (2.4) also has this purpose but respondents are directed to consider their preparation from the vantage of having one and then, subsequently, three years of experience in their positions. Administration of the DOE Graduate/Completer Survey Year I was begun in S18 for one-year completers of EPPU programs who had graduated during AY15/16 and for three-year completers who had graduated during AY13/14. Data from this administration have been

collected, analyzed, and shared by program faculty and other stakeholders, contributing to ongoing program improvement.

Administration of the revised COE Exit Survey S18 (2.4), which deletes the central “Neutral” response option and disaggregates all data for the advanced program from that for initial programs was initially planned for S19. However, due to the lack of response in S17 and S18 to the COE Exit Survey S18 from EDAD program candidates described below, the EPP and program faculty has decided that a survey previously administered during EDAD 8208, Educational Administration (Principal Preparation) Graduate/Completer Survey (2.4) will be revised and used as an exit survey for EDAD going forward. The revised exit survey instrument will be titled GSU EPPU EDAD Exit Survey.

The discussion below presents program preparation satisfaction of immediate completers and then satisfaction of completers with one and three years of experience, based on available survey data.

Graduates'/Completers' Satisfaction at Graduation/Completion

In S17, the COE Exit Survey F17 was sent to 24 program completers (23 initial program; 1 advanced program). That EDAD program completer did not respond to the survey. In S18, the COE Exit Survey S18 was also sent to 24 program completers (19 initial program; 5 EDAD program). None of those 5 completers responded to the survey.

The EPP determined, therefore, to capture SU18 completers' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the EDAD program's preparation with the Educational Administration (Principal Preparation) Graduate/Completer Survey, which has been administered during EDAD 8208 Internship III since the program's inception. As stated above, a revised version of this survey instrument, to be titled GSU EPPU EDAD Exit Survey, will be used going forward.

The Educational Administration (Principal Preparation) Graduate/Completer Survey (2.4) was administered in June 2018 using SurveyMonkey® as the survey platform. An email to Principal Leadership candidates in their final program term was generated by SurveyMonkey® with the request for candidates' participation and a link to the survey. Candidates' GSU and personal email accounts both received this request. Five reminder emails were sent during the one-week period following the initial solicitation.

The Educational Administration (Principal Preparation) Graduate/Completer Survey (2.4), composed of 25 items, was sent to 33 EDAD program completers enrolled in EDAD 8208 during the SU18 term. Of those 33 advanced program completers, 24 responded (73% response rate). Data were collected in three areas: demographic information, general attitudes toward GSU, and attitudes toward the EDAD program. Results for these EDAD completers on each of the survey's items are included in the EPP's LiveText® CAEP Data Archive and are summarized below.

Governors State University

Demographic Information:

The majority of candidates were White (52%) females (58%), and the plurality are between the ages of 36 and 40 years (29%).

General Attitudes toward GSU:

The majority (71%) of candidates reported either neutral (Note: The revision of this instrument will remove the “Neutral” option throughout) or a positive attitude toward GSU and a majority (63%) would attend GSU again. A majority (71%) of candidates would also choose the EDAD program as a focus of their advanced studies again. The major factors candidates indicated were important in their selection of GSU as the site of their advanced program study were geographic proximity (100%), cost of the program (96%), quality of the program (88%), and amount of time to complete the program (86%). The least important (37%) factor in candidates’ selection of GSU was the opportunity to conduct research.

Attitudes toward the EDAD Program:

A majority of candidates indicated either a positive or neutral attitude toward most components of the EDAD program. (Note: Neutral responses are reported here but cannot be used for analysis or interpretation. This problem has been resolved with the revision of this instrument for use with SU19 candidate interns enrolled in EDAD 8208.) A majority (87% averaged across dispositions) of candidates indicated a positive (56%) or neutral (29%) attitude toward the program’s enhancement of all identified professional dispositions. A majority (54%) of candidates were either positive (33%) or neutral (21%) about the general effectiveness of their preparation for the Principal licensure examination (ILTS 195 and 196). A larger majority (75%) of candidates were either positive (58%) or neutral (17%) about preparation for the Growth through Learning (GTL) Training Modules for Teacher Evaluation completed during EDAD 7803 Principal as Evaluator. Additional knowledge and skills that candidates agreed/strongly agreed their program had prepared them to demonstrate or had enhanced in them included the following: professional and ethical leadership (73%); management of information and program evaluation (65%); management of curriculum, instruction, supervision, and the learning environment (61%); management in the school/district of professional development and human resources (56%); administration of student personnel services (56%); management of educational organizations (56%). The program components about which candidates were the most critical were program advising (35% satisfied or very satisfied) and program advisor (39% satisfied or very satisfied).

The EPP believes the Educational Administration (Principal Preparation) Graduate/Completer Survey (2.4), which is administered during EDAD 8208 Internship III, is a flawed instrument. Only pressure to obtain at least some data from more program completers, after the previous assessments (COE Exit Surveys administered in F17 and S18, respectively) had resulted in no data, could have prompted the EPP to rely on this assessment of candidates’ perceptions of the effectiveness of their program preparation for the responsibilities principals must confront daily. The EPP plans to revise this assessment (following the standards of adequacy questions

for survey instruments adapted from the McMillan & Schumacher, 2001 model) before its next administration in June 2019. Revisions will include deleting the “Neutral” option throughout and addressing redundancies and lack of clarity. For consistency of assessment titles across programs, this revised assessment will be titled GSU EPPU Educational Administration Exit Survey.

The ISBE Completer Survey Raw data (4.6) was just released on July 12, 2018. There are plans for more complete analysis of the data. Due to the significance of these data, the EPP thought it was necessary to report preliminary, aggregated findings in a format that would allow us to include them in this Self-Study. The following results and in the ISBE Completer Survey Aggregated Data report (4.7) reflect EDAD completers’ perceptions of their program, reported as an overall program mean for items asking about satisfaction with their experiences and the preparation they received. The survey items have a 5-point Likert scale format, and level 3 can be equated to CAEP’s Acceptable. The percentage of EDAD completers’ responses that were at Acceptable or above level is 83.2%. The mean score of items for this program was 3.46. The EPP plans to share these data at the next EPP meeting and add this survey to the Assessment Collection System-Initial (ACS-I) (4.8), which will allow the EPP to make recommendations and improvements based on the results.

Graduates’/Completers’ Satisfaction at One Year and Three Years

One Year. In F17, 78 EPP initial (33 or 42%) and advanced (45 or 58%) program completers who graduated during the AY16/17 received the DOE Graduate/Completer Survey Year I through the email and SurveyMonkey® procedure previously described. Of those 78 completers, 13 responded (17% response rate). Unfortunately, none of those respondents were EDAD program completers.

Three Years. In F17, 63 graduates/completers of EPP programs in AY14/15 received the DOE Graduate/Completer Survey Year 3 through the email and SurveyMonkey® procedure previously described. Of those 63 completers, only 6 responded (10% response rate). Unfortunately, none of those respondents were EDAD program completers.

Phase-in

The EPP believes the difficulties described above in obtaining feedback from EDAD graduates/completers one year and three years following their program completion may be obviated with the implementation of the three-year case studies described in A.4.1 and in the Phase-In Plan for Principal Leadership Case Study (4.2). These assessments of the program’s and completers’ effectiveness, especially regarding P-12 student growth and development, will also provide opportunity to explore completers’ evolving attitudes toward their preparation. Because the Educational Administration (Principal Preparation) Graduate/Completer Survey (2.4) administered in SU18 indicated that a significant number of completers (83%) do not function as principals at program completion, and that a significant number (82%) have no

intention of seeking a position as a principal, the EPP also will follow in case studies one graduate/completer each year who functions in another leadership role such as lead teacher, curriculum director, or dean of students. Like the participants who function as principals, these case study participants will be selected from among volunteers who indicate an interest in maintaining a professional relationship with the University and feel an obligation to support those who follow them in the EDAD program by providing ongoing feedback about the efficacy and effectiveness of program components. As indicated in A.4.1, case study (i.e., program-level) analyses will be conducted annually as will cross-case analyses beginning in the second academic year, AY19/20, after implementation of the case study procedure. Differences in attitudes between those who are or who seek to be principals and those who choose another leadership role will be examined. Themes and trends across years and participants will be identified and contribute to faculty and stakeholder decisions regarding program development.

In summary, although the EPP pursued descriptive data about the EDAD program from candidates, alumni, and employers, there is a general lack of data from assessments other than those from immediate program completers in SU18. Moreover, the survey instrument used in SU18 was flawed by the inclusion of the central “Neutral” option that prevents meaningful analysis and interpretation of that data. The EPP looks forward to implementation of revised assessments and to implementation of the case study element of its Phase-In Plan for Principal Leadership Case Study (4.2), which will generate rich and complex qualitative data. The EPP also looks forward to the implementation of ISBE PEP reports of administrators’ impact on student learning, scheduled to begin in F18. The EPP expects these revised and additional data sources to significantly enhance its evidence-based, continuous improvement plan, guaranteeing provision of high-quality programs for its advanced program completers and Illinois’ P-12 students.

Standard 5 Initial and Advanced

5.1 and A.5.1 GSU's EPP has a quality assurance system (CAEP 5.1) which is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Examples of the data collected and analyzed by GSU's EPP are generated from program key assessments for each Specialized Professional Association (SPA) accreditation, EPP-developed candidate disposition rubrics, Danielson-based rubrics, and graduate Exit Surveys (CAEP 5.2); these data points are described below and under Standards 3 and 4. The measures work together as part of GSU's quality assurance system. The EPP regularly and systematically collects, analyzes, and shares data to inform our decisions for continuous improvement (CAEP 5.3). The EPP Assessment Collection System for Initial and Advanced Programs (ACS-I and ACS-A) (4.8) display the processes by which proprietary and EPP assessment tools are used to obtain data on candidate perception of preparation, administrator perception of preparation; to monitor acceptance, performance, persistence, enrollment, program compliance, changing program criteria, and program data; and to gauge disposition, readiness, preparation, content knowledge, and impact on student learning (CAEP 5.4). Each assessment is conducted on a regular schedule (annually, beginning of program, end of program, ongoing, etc.). Various stakeholders are responsible for the implementation of the assessment tools. These individuals include administrators from the COE and DOE, faculty, academic advisors, coordinators, and GSU Institutional Research (CAEP 5.5).

Assessment results are collected via a number of sources such as SurveyMonkey®, state reports, Pearson edTPA® reports, and LiveText®. Data are analyzed, shared, and acted upon by members of the EPP on a regular basis. ACS-I and ACS-A provide evidence of the EPP's efforts to satisfy all CAEP standards. In addition, the artifacts listed in ACS-I and ACS-A are aligned with state and professional standards. Faculty, administrators, and staff regularly perform operational and program assessments to ensure this alignment is maintained. Beyond assessment data collection, analysis of data is required under the EPP's ACSs; these analyses provide for continuous improvement of the programs and of the EPP as a whole. The data collected in accordance with the ACSs are monitored, shared, and discussed with faculty, program coordinators, and other stakeholders in an effort to inform and identify program areas that require improvements.

Within ACSs is GSU's EPP Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) (1.5) that identifies specific candidate assessments conducted at each of four points in each program, including both initial and advanced programs: (1) Acceptance, (2) Continuance, (3) Student Teaching/Internship, and (4) Licensure. Data collected at each benchmark are used to make programmatic decisions about candidates' performance, persistence, and retention throughout their program. Faculty, program coordinators, administrators, and staff all participate in monitoring student progress from one benchmark level to the next. Each BAS includes multiple internal and external assessments at each benchmark/transition point; it provides both formative and summative

data designed to measure EPP effectiveness, candidate performance, and impact upon P-12 students. For example, impact on student learning data are collected through surveys of employers, completers (at 1 and 3 years after completion), and state surveys, which have been described in Standard 4. Each program's BAS provides opportunities for stakeholders to formally check candidates' progression in a timely manner. For example, failure to pass a state content area test would prevent/postpone a candidate's placement in student teaching (Benchmark 3). Another example is seen in analysis and use of the EPPU initial or advanced Disposition Rubric (1.3) to initiate a *Student Success Plan* (remediation plan) (5.1); this might result in program delays or candidate removal from a program. An example of a process in action was when an MTE candidate was removed from student teaching after a dispositional issue was identified by the Secondary Education Progress Committee through use of the EPPU Dispositions Assessment for Initial Program Educator Preparation Programs Rubric (1.3.c) (see Meeting Minutes of the Secondary Education Progress Committee (1.9). The candidate successfully satisfied the recommendations on the Student Success Plan and was able to complete student teaching in the next term.

The EPP employs multiple measures to determine operational effectiveness. Key internal checks of candidates' progress through each program provide faculty, administrators, and staff with student-level and, when aggregated, program-level data. For initial programs, these assessments include an analysis of GPA stakeholder surveys, and student teaching evaluations, as well as analysis of data from EPP and program assessments: EPPU Danielson Domain 1 Methods/Labs Formative Assessment rubric (1.3.b), EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative Assessment rubric (1.3.a), EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Summative Assessment rubric (1.3.a), Dispositions Assessment for Initial Program Educator Preparation Programs rubric (1.3.c), Lesson Plan rubrics (1.4). As described under CAEP Standard 3, the EPP continuously collects available external assessment data, including ISBE's ILTS content test results to measure the overall content preparation of our graduates and the edTPA® results that measure their initial impact on P-12 student learning. As described under CAEP Standard 4, the EPP collects, analyzes, and makes decisions using proprietary assessments and other state data, such as those required for its Title II report and programs' ISBE annual reports. These include the COE Exit Survey (2.4), DOE Graduate/Completer Survey (at one and three years after completion of program) (2.4), and Administrator Surveys (2.4) (for program completers after one year of teaching). These survey data are analyzed at the program, licensure area, and unit levels. Candidate-level and program-level benchmark data can be found under CAEP Standard 3 Benchmark Assessment System (1.5) and Benchmark Data report (3.2) and CAEP Standard 4 Administrator Survey, DOE Graduate/Completer Survey, and COE Exit Survey. These data are regularly analyzed and shared with EPP faculty, administrators, staff, and other stakeholders as part of the EPP's continuous improvement process.

A full-time Coordinator of Assessment is responsible for the management of LiveText®, which is the EPP's comprehensive system for collecting and extracting data. Faculty and staff are required to store assessment tools and data associated with program key assessments, surveys,

annual reports, state reports, and federal reports in LiveText®. A naming convention was developed for LiveText® documents that assists programs in using the correct rubrics for their programs and that they are using the most current versions of those rubrics. As such, the data from LiveText® will show rubrics with a “v. date” at the end of their titles. This denotes when the rubric was initially implemented. All faculty and key administrators have access to LiveText®, and every student is required to have a LiveText® account. GSU has a shared drive where EPP data such as ILTS test results are stored.

GSU is committed to continuous operations and program improvement. Both ACSs involve internal and external stakeholders in the assessment process of the unit on an ongoing basis. EPP assessment summaries and program assessment summaries provide the EPP with opportunities to regularly analyze unit operations, program, candidate, and completer outcomes. Over the years, the EPP has used a unit assessment system to collect, analyze, discuss, and make improvements. The EPP has developed a History of Change (1.15) to document all the major programmatic processes and decisions. Detailed in the document are the program changes/revisions/redesigns made to improve the unit. The History of Change document describes the changes made, when they occurred, why each change was made, the aspect(s) of the program that would be affected, and the faculty and staff involved with the change. This document provides evidence that the unit continuously involves stakeholders in data analysis. This document also reflects the academic and budget priorities of the EPP and GSU.

A similar process is used by GSU to evaluate the COE as a whole and its individual programs. Internal assessments such as enrollment data, recruitment and retention figures, budget, faculty qualifications, annual reports, self-evaluations, academic priorities (strategic plans), professional development, Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEIs), and faculty scholarly activities all assist decision making regarding the status, accomplishments, and needs of the college. External assessments from alumni, employers, and accrediting agencies also determine the effectiveness of the college; these include DOE Graduate/Completer Survey (2.4) and Administrator Survey (2.4); Quarterly Community Advisory Board Meeting Minutes (1.9), bi-annual COE meetings, and annual retreats, stakeholder discussions (1.9), ISBE data, and assessment processes. When appropriate, these discussions lead to modifications in programs and/or assessments processes.

5.2 and A.5.2 To ensure quality of outcomes, the performance of all GSU EPP candidates is monitored. Data are gathered through a myriad of rubrics and surveys (see ACS-I, ACS -A). These data provide information relevant and valid to the identified candidate and program outcomes, and each assessment measures its intended knowledge, skill, or disposition. The data are verifiable (reliable) in that their analyses results have been shown to be replicable. The data are representative of candidate and program outcomes as a whole. Through a careful and exhaustive process, the EPP makes certain that the data samples are free of bias and are typical for candidates and programs. The data are cumulative and represent at least three data cycles.

Finally, the data are actionable. As described under CAEP 5.1 and A.5.1, analyzed data are used to inform decisions regarding program changes. Faculty and program coordinators regularly discuss data and necessary program improvements during EPP meetings. Data drive discussions and reflections regarding what we do, how we do it, and why. After feedback from CAEP accreditation, our EPP committee will again make adjustments to our unit assessment systems (i.e., ACSs) to provide more meaningful measures of our EPP's goals.

Administrators and faculty members decided early in their preparation for re-accreditation that in order to construct valid and reliable assessments and rubrics the EPP needed to work with experts in the field. GSU chose to send the EPPU Student Progress Assessment Rubric (5.2) rubric for an early instrument review by CAEP. In May 2016, GSU received an "Early Instrument Review Report" from CAEP (1.8) It was determined that GSU needed to revise the instrument per CAEP recommendations for more measurable criteria descriptors as well as develop at least one additional EPP instrument. As a result, the COE held two all-day CAEP work sessions on September 30 and October 28, 2016 under the guidance of CAEP consultant Dr. Gary Railsback. During the September 30th session, Dr. Railsback provided a presentation (5.3) outlining the steps EPP needed to take in order to develop the new instruments. It was decided that separate EPP disposition assessment instruments needed to be developed for initial-program and advanced-program candidates, resulting in two development teams being formed. The participants who contributed to the EPP initial-program assessment instruments Dispositions Assessment for Initial Program Educator Preparation Programs rubric (1.3.c) and 3 Danielson-based rubrics (1.3.a,b) were Dr. Glenna Howell, Dr. Pam Guimond, Dr. Angela Thompson, Dr. Amy Vujaklija, Dr. Steven Russell, and Ms. Melinda Elliott. The participants who contributed to the EPPU Advanced Programs Educational Professional Disposition Rubric (1.3.d) were Drs. Barbara Winicki, Marlon Cummings, Megan McCaffrey, Betsy Essex, and Katie Wix. These participants represented various programs and colleges included in the EPP.

The second set of EPP initial-program rubrics was based on the Danielson Framework, which is used throughout the state of Illinois to evaluate teachers (Danielson Domain 1 Methods/Labs Formative Assessment Rubric (1.3.b) and EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative/Summative Assessment Rubrics 1.3.a). The Danielson Framework for Teaching and the associated rubrics are research-based measures of instruction. They are aligned to the InTASC standards and grounded in a constructivist view of learning and teaching. The complex activity of teaching is divided into 22 components (and 76 smaller elements) clustered into four domains of teaching responsibility: Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities.

After the dispositions rubrics and the Danielson-based rubrics were created, the EPP undertook three means of determining their validity and reliability. Validation surveys were created for both initial and advanced preparation programs. First, the surveys and associated rubrics were sent to stakeholders in the field, collected, and analyzed for strength of validity with Lawshe's Constant calculations. Second, the EPP has regular discussions about the rubrics to continually

review for improvement. For items included in the rubrics used for EPP assessments, members of the EPP committee (including faculty from each licensure area programs from the College of Education, College of Arts and Sciences, College of Health and Human Services, and administrators from College of Education) identified and described the construct that each item was designed to measure. When it was determined that there was a need to revise an item for clarity, the committee discussed needed revisions until a general consensus was reached. Third, the EPP conducted an inter-rater reliability check on each of the instruments as a means of insuring reliability. This reliability testing is ongoing and requires annual training. This process was also used for the surveys described below.

The EPP revised existing surveys and developed the COE Exit Survey and the DOE Graduate/Completer Survey for initial and advanced programs (2.4), described in detail under Standard 4, for graduating candidates and first- and third-year alumni of our programs. These surveys measure to the quality and effectiveness of programs based on candidates' perceptions. The Exit Survey, which is primarily Likert formatted, about graduating candidates' perceptions of their preparation, specifically their perceptions about their preparation for assuming the responsibilities they will confront in the classroom. The Graduate/Completer Survey, which is distributed to program alumni one year and three years after their graduation, also has this purpose, but respondents are directed to consider their preparation from the vantage of having one and then three years of experience in the classroom. Data from survey responses provide insights that can and have been applied in identifying areas needing improvement. Additionally, the administrators of schools where program completers teach receive the Administrator Survey (2.4) at the end of the completers' first year of teaching. This survey instrument is described under Standard 4. All survey questionnaires were developed by the EPP and validated by external stakeholders of the University, who were local school administrators and teachers.

The EPP regularly participates in inter-rater reliability exercises to calibrate consistency across rubric users and adjust the rubric if necessary. Most recently, an inter-rater reliability exercise was conducted for the EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative/Summative Assessment rubrics, as described in the May 9, 2018, EPP Meeting Minutes (1.9). During the May 9, 2018 meeting, each EPP Committee member independently scored a video-recording of a teaching demonstration work sample. Percentage of absolute agreement on each dimension of the rubric was calculated. Values between 80% - 100% indicate an acceptable level of agreement, assuming ratings are no more than one level apart. However, calculations revealed an unacceptable high rate of discrepancy among reviewers with approximately 60% agreement. After a discussion about individual perspectives/rationales for scoring, participants conducted a second review of the teaching demonstration. The resulting scores produced an improved level of agreement of approximately 70%. It should be noted, however, that many of the EPP members participating in this exercise were not faculty who typically work with or assess student teachers using this rubric. Such exercises conducted with those faculty typically have much greater levels of agreement. These exercises occur at the beginning of each academic

year in university supervisor meetings (see EDEC/EMED Supervisor Orientation Agenda August 2016, August 2017) (1.9).

The EPP recognizes the need for all appropriate faculty to engage in such assessment exercises to ensure systematic and rigorous consistency in candidate evaluation throughout initial programs. Moving forward, the EPP will include additional stakeholders, such as cooperating/mentor teachers, and conduct collaborative inter-rater reliability exercises/discussions each semester with a goal of achieving a minimum of 80% agreement. In collaboration with all appropriate faculty, the EPP will develop scoring guidelines to assist those unfamiliar with the EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative/Summative Assessment Rubric. Such guidelines will assist assessors in making consistent evaluative decisions across candidates and programs. By conducting inter-rater reliability training with all appropriate faculty and other stakeholders such as cooperating/mentor teachers, in all initial programs each term, the EPP will be able to identify and assist any outliers as well as discern patterns across semesters which can determine whether descriptors should be clarified and inform decisions about changing scoring procedures and training. These enhanced procedures will assure reliable evaluation across candidates, programs, and stakeholders.

Our Division Chair, Director of Educator Preparation (CAEP liaison), and Coordinator of Assessment ensure data samples are representative and typical of our programs and not exemplars. We are confident that these data are currently representative of our program, but we are interested in better understanding how representativeness might change over time as we design and implement modifications to our programs.

5.3 and A.5.3

Regular and Systematic Assessment

The EPP has systematic, ongoing processes for collecting and reviewing data. The processes and timeline used by the EPP to collect, summarize, and analyze data have been developed and are summarized in the Assessment Collection Systems (ACS-I and ACS-A) (4.8). Included are data from candidates, graduates, faculty, practitioners, and state and national reports. These data as well as surveys are used to make decisions about candidate progress through the program benchmarks, program quality, and overall quality of unit operations.

The BAS (1.5) consists of benchmark assessment points for each EPP program. Each program has its unique set of assessments, but all programs share the same four benchmark points: (1) program acceptance, (2) continuance, (3) admission into student teaching/internship, and (4) licensure. The assessment instruments and the individuals responsible for ensuring satisfactory completion of each benchmark phase are included in the benchmark document for each program.

Information about assessment data and processes are shared among stakeholders during regular DOE and EPP meetings, bi-annual meetings of COE, annual retreats, and Community

Advisory Council meetings (see Meeting Minutes 1.9). Their input helps attain the mutual goal of improving the quality of EPP program completers who might be employed in their school districts. EPP assessment practices and procedures are reviewed during these meetings and modified when appropriate given the generated data, stakeholder feedback, and updates from ISBE.

Beyond the EPP level, university systems are in place to monitor course completion and grade point averages (e.g., Degree Audit). Student teaching is the capstone for the teacher education programs. Thus, regular and systematic data-driven changes, based on research and evidence from the field and data analyses from the ACS, 2013 CAEP Standards, and GSU's own goals and standards are made to ensure program quality and candidate success.

Data Collected Over Time

Data are routinely collected according to a timeline defined by EPP faculty, supervising teachers and administrators and are stored in a centralized database system in LiveText®, which is operated primarily by the full-time EPP Unit Assessment Coordinator. LiveText® provides a single and seamless process for submitting and grading course-based assessments and has the ability to record and generate reports on that data. All EPP programs utilize LiveText® to collect and store data and monitor student progress. The EPP Assessment Coordinator ensures that all assignments are set up in the courses with the appropriate assessment documents (rubrics) in LiveText® every semester. The Assessment Coordinator runs reports for the EPP and each program within the EPP. These reports are made available to EPP administrators and individual program coordinators for analysis and dissemination to program faculty and other stakeholders.

The History of Change (1.15) records all major programmatic changes made over the past eight years and documents the EPP's continuous use of data for program and EPP improvement. Stakeholders are involved in conversations that lead to subsequent changes, which occur at various levels of the EPP. Some developments described in 5.2 have been made across the entire EPP (e.g., GSU EPPU Graduate/Completer Survey). Other changes have been made across the initial preparation programs (e.g., EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative/Summative Assessment rubrics, edTPA® required for licensure). Additional changes were made across the four Secondary Education programs (e.g., teaching assessment rubrics), and others were program-specific (e.g., the addition of a first course in probability to the MTE teacher education program). In many cases, the changes eliminated redundancies in assessments or added increased emphasis on key issues (e.g., ELL, SEL). In more than 80% of the cases, changes were data-driven based on the results of gap-analyses, changing state licensure requirements, changing SPA requirements, and input from key stakeholders (e.g., cooperating teachers, administrators, employers, university supervisors, program faculty, and program completers).

Selection Criteria

Program selection criteria are designed to identify those individuals who have the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to complete programs of study and are dedicated to the belief that all students can learn. These criteria are described in detail under CAEP Standard 3. Initial licensure programs' selection criteria include a basic skills exam (e.g., TAP, ACT), GPA minimum, criminal background check clearance, FERPA training, and completion of an Application for Teacher Candidacy; the last of these involves a program coordinator review that includes candidate's professional dispositions. For admission to the EDAD program, candidates must have evidence of holding an educator license that required a basic skills exam, GRE and/or minimum GPA, FERPA training, and letters of recommendation. In addition to these requirements, the EDAD program requires that applicants provide documentation of two years successful teaching experience.

Innovations

During monthly EPP meetings, program data are shared and discussed. The discussions focus on how programs can use the data for program improvement and how to measure the success of any attempted innovations. Like EPP meetings, DOE meetings provide forums for sharing data across programs seeking SPA and CAEP accreditation. One EPP innovation that resulted from data sharing was the revision of the original Danielson rubric designed to assess in-service teachers that had previously been used to assess the EPP's student teachers. The revised EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative/Summative Assessment rubrics (1.3.a) more closely reflect what pre-service teachers (student teachers) actually have the opportunity to do during student teaching, which in some respects is much different from what in-service teachers do in their own classrooms.

Another GSU EPP innovation is to extend video assessment opportunities to secondary education programs. Previously, secondary education students had little opportunity to view and assess teaching videos. Because this is an important part of the edTPA[®] required for the candidates' licensure, additional opportunities to learn how to observe and assess teaching segments during methods courses are now being provided. Feedback from candidates indicate that they feel more confident completing video recording and analysis for the edTPA[®].

A third example of a recently-implemented innovation is the development of Student Teacher Licensure Profiles (5.4). This brochure was developed and is maintained by the Director of Educator Preparation. The Licensure Profiles brochure presents photos and brief biographies of the current student teachers. Each semester, the Licensure Profiles brochure is sent to over 200 local public schools partnering with GSU. This innovation has proven to be highly effective resulting in positive employment results for completers during its two semesters of implementation.

Use of Results to Improve Programs and Processes

Assessment data are analyzed at three levels: candidate performance, P-12 student outcomes, and EPP performance. Examples of initial program candidate performance assessments are the

externally validated EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative/Summative rubrics and the edTPA® rubric, along with a variety of program-specific assessments, including lesson plan rubrics, unit plans, and portfolios. EPP performance is assessed by SPA recognition, input from stakeholders during Community Advisory Council meetings, and through Graduate/Completer Surveys and Administrator Surveys. To date, all GSU school personnel preparation programs have been nationally recognized by their respective SPAs. Survey data are described under CAEP Standard 4. Analyses of these assessment data are shared and discussed among EPP members, and, as a result, program changes have been made to improve the quality of teacher preparation and P-12 student learning. These changes are described in the attached History of Change document (1.15). Examples of changes in assessment instruments and processes can be found under CAEP Standard 4.

The examples described above substantiate the claim that GSU's EPP regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks the 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.

5.4 and A.5.4

(NOTE: This standard is included in the Phase-In Plan Case Study for Initial Program Completers (4.2) and Phase-In Plan for Principal Leadership Case Study (4.2). Some of the assessments do not have three years/cycles of data. Details about the Phase-In Plan can be found under CAEP Standards 4 and A.4.)

Although some EPP programs employ additional measures, three assessments of completer outcomes and impact are used across initial programs. These common assessments include two items on the Administrator Survey Part II (2.4) and two reliable and valid instruments: EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative/Summative Assessment rubrics and edTPA®. Together, they are used across the EPP's initial programs to determine our pre-service teachers' and recent initial program completers' teaching effectiveness and their impact on P-12 student learning. Additional data regarding GSU EPP's initial program completers can be found in the 2018 PEP report, which provides extensive information about GSU-trained teachers, including their "demonstrated teaching skills/impact on K-12 students." This report is described below and under CAEP Standard 4.

The content validity and reliability of the EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative/Summative Assessment rubrics were established in the F16. Faculty, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers are trained to use the rubric to ensure inter-rater reliability. The edTPA® became a state of Illinois requirement for licensure July 1, 2015. The edTPA® is an externally-benchmarked assessment with established reliability and content validity. It should be noted that prior to the edTPA® pre-service teachers were required to pass a paper and pencil Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) administered by the State of Illinois' Licensure Testing System (ILTS).

CAEP's Eight Outcome and Impact Measures

The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), the accrediting body for Governors State University's (GSU) Education Preparation Provider (EPP), requires EPPs to disseminate information on the Eight Annual Reporting Measures annually to the public, prospective teacher candidates, policy makers, and the media to provide information on both program outcome and program impact. The CAEP measures and links to supporting evidence for each of these eight measures are posted on the [COE website](#). The measures are as follows:

Impact on Student Learning

Information on GSU EPP candidates' impact on P-12 student learning provides an opportunity for providers, the state, and the candidates themselves, to examine their effect on student growth. Details about the GSU EPP's phase-in plan for assessing impact on P-12 student growth can be found under CAEP Standard 4. Here, current sources of data are identified.

The Administrator Survey Part II (2.4), which is sent one year after program completion to the principals of schools where GSU-trained teachers have been hired, provides data on whether program completers' P-12 students met expected learning outcomes (*"Based on the most recent benchmark assessment (i.e., NWEA), did at least 75% of this GSU-trained teacher's students meet expected growth this year?"*). More detailed information about this survey can be found under CAEP Standard 4. One measure of EDAD candidates' impact on P-12 student learning and development is the Principal Preparation School Improvement Plan Rubric (5.5) assignment, which includes the development of a strategic plan and requires identification of areas of need and planning for potential solutions. Other EDAD assessments that provide information about program effectiveness and candidates' impact on P-12 student growth are described under CAEP Standard A.4.

Additional evidence regarding the EPP's candidates' impact on P-12 student growth can be seen in the 2018 Partnership for Educator Preparation Report (PEP) (4.1). The collection of these data was mandated by the Illinois Performance Evaluation Reform Act, which requires inclusion of data from two assessment types to measure student growth for each teacher as well as one or more measurement models that use multiple data points to determine student growth. This statewide program, designed to improve educator preparation programs and better serve P-12 students, was initiated with a series of pilot assessment collections/analyses beginning in August 2016. GSU participated in the second pilot assessment collection/analysis in 2017 and received a report from PEP in June 2018. The report includes data on the effectiveness and student impact of GSU-trained teachers employed in Illinois in 2015, 2016, and 2017. Teacher ratings are categorized as Needs Improvement, Proficient, and Excellent. Teachers must meet the Proficient level of performance. Results from the PEP 2018 report for GSU-trained teachers' demonstrated teaching skills/impact on K-12 students were strongly positive. The following data are the percentages of GSU-trained teachers for each reported year who were rated Proficient or Excellent: 2015 (n=75) - 97.20%; 2016 (n=45) - 97.80%; 2017 (n=17) - 100%.

Governors State University

The most fundamental benefit of these data is the information they provide about the efficacy of our teacher preparation programs. Using the PEP program performance data, including impact on student learning, the EPP can focus on evidence of both our completers' strengths and challenges, ensuring future completers are highly prepared to succeed with their P-12 students. These data will prove instrumental as we move forward with continuous program improvement.

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

GSU's EPP demonstrates through structure and validated observation instruments that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation programs are designed to produce. For initial candidates, teacher effectiveness is currently measured through the edTPA® and through the EPPU Danielson Domain 1 Methods/Labs Formative Assessment rubric and EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative/Summative Assessment rubrics, which measures candidates' ability to plan and implement instruction. These are described under CAEP Standard 1. Teaching effectiveness also is measured through the Dispositions Assessment for Initial Program Educator Preparation Programs rubric or the EPPU Advanced Programs Educational Professionals Disposition rubric, described under CAEP Standards 1 and A.1.

As defined by Pearson, edTPA® is a performance-based, subject-specific assessment that measures teacher candidates' skills and knowledge with a rigorous process requiring a demonstration of the classroom skills necessary to ensure students are learning. Each fall and spring semester, GSU EPP candidates' edTPA® results are analyzed, shared across programs, and acted upon in decision-making related to initial programs, resource allocation, and future direction. For AY16/17, the mean score on the edTPA® 15-rubric assessment for all initial licensure programs at GSU was 45.27. The mean score for edTPA® 15-rubric assessment at the national level was 45.49 across similar edTPA® testing areas, and the mean score for Illinois was 46.12. GSU's scores are similar to both the national and the state means. In Illinois, the passing score for edTPA® 15-rubric assessments in AY16/17 was 37. Therefore, GSU's candidates' mean score was well above the passing score. In Illinois, the passing edTPA® 15-rubric assessment score will be raised to 41 in September 1, 2019. GSU candidates' current mean is already well above this adjusted passing criterion. The data suggest that GSU is adequately preparing initial licensure candidates to pass the edTPA®.

The university provides supportive resources for candidates who are completing their edTPA® assignments. For example, the EPP provides iPads to candidates to use for recording their teaching videos. It also provides a course release for a faculty member who is trained as a Pearson grader to support and to mentor teacher candidates. Additionally, this faculty member works one-on-one with candidates who do not pass all sections of the edTPA®. Further, an elective edTPA®-prep course will be offered beginning in F18.

Additional evidence regarding the teaching effectiveness of GSU initial program completers from the 2018 PEP Report (4.1). Finally, the Administrator Survey Part II (2.4), which is sent one year after program completion to the principals of schools where GSU-trained teachers have been hired, provides data on program completers' teaching effectiveness (*Based on the most recent teacher evaluation, did this GSU-trained teacher perform at a proficient level?*). It should be noted that the next time this survey is administered (S19), it will include an item asking whether the GSU-trained teacher will be retained by the school district. More detailed information about this survey can be found under CAEP Standard 4.

Satisfaction of Employers Milestones

GSU's EPP demonstrates satisfaction of employers using measures that result in valid and reliable data and that include employment milestones. The EPP measures this via the Administrator Survey (2.4), which is described in under CAEP Standard 4. The AY17/18 Administrator Survey Part I (2.4) included 15 items. Due to a very low response rate when this survey was distributed, the EPP shortened the survey to two items Administrator Survey Part II (2.4). In order to capture information about completer/teacher effectiveness, the survey instrument will be revised and distributed for the first time in S19.

The Administrator Survey provides information on the impact program completers have on P-12 student learning. Administrator Survey Part II (2.4) data indicate that 100% of the program graduates/completers who work with general education students and whose administrator responded to the survey met the criterion of "75% of their students met the expected growth this year." In this administration of the Administrator Survey Part II (2.4), surveys were sent to 31 administrators, and 13 (42% response rate) responded; 9 administrators (69%) responded "Yes" to this item. Three administrators (23%) indicated N/A, commenting that their GSU-trained teachers were employed in instructional capacities other than classroom teacher. One administrator responded "No," commenting that his/her GSU-trained teacher works with moderately handicapped students, only some of whom were required to take the NWEA – MAP. Additionally, 10 administrators indicated that teachers who were EPP program graduates met the criterion of "performing at a proficient level"; the remaining 3 respondents indicated N/A.

Satisfaction of Completers

GSU's EPP can demonstrate satisfaction of its program completers through measures that produce valid and reliable data. These data indicate the EPP's program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job. The satisfaction of EPP program completers is measured through the following surveys: the COE Exit Survey F17 and S18, DOE Graduate/Completer Survey Year I and Year 3 for initial program completers one and three years after program completion. The data from S16 and S17 Exit Surveys indicate 90% of candidates would again select GSU for their teacher preparation program, and a similarly high percentage would choose the same major and recommend it to others. More detailed

information from the Exit Surveys findings can be found under CAEP Standard 4. Although response rates for Graduate/Completer Surveys, both at year one and year three, are lower than the response rates for Exit Surveys, the data they provide have contributed to the on-going program improvement within GSU's EPP. They indicate that the majority of respondents (70-100%) believe they were very well, well, or adequately prepared by their programs. The data from these surveys are shared with stakeholders, analyzed, and discussed with a goal of improving in those areas found to be deficient.

Since September 1, 2017, all Illinois educator-preparation program completers are required to answer the ISBE Completer Survey (4.4), which was developed by Deans for Impact and is in a first-year, statewide pilot implementation in Illinois. This survey was adopted because of the quality of its items and its validity and reliability. The ISBE Completer Survey Raw Data (4.6) was just released on July 12, 2018. The preliminary results for all EPP programs, including the EDAD program, are very positive (see CAEP Standard 4.4 and CAEP Standard A.4.2).

Graduation Rates

The EPP's graduation rates are based on four-year and six-year models for the following licensure programs. The EPP programs' six-year Graduation Rates (5.6)* from AY16/17 range from 42% to 87.5%; the comparable national average is 47% for undergraduate programs and 59% for graduate programs. EDEC Education (initial) had the lowest 6-year graduation rate at 42%, MCSE Option I (Advanced) and Option II (Initial) rate was 46%, EMED (Initial) was 58.3%, CTE (Initial) was 60%, BTE (Initial) was 75%, MTE (Initial) was 80%, EDAD (Advanced) was 82%, and ETE (Initial) was 87.5%. Collectively, all Initial programs graduation rate of 64%, which is above the national mean six-year graduation rate of 47% for undergraduate programs; the Educational Administration advanced program's graduation rate of 82% is above the national mean graduation rate of 59% for graduate programs. (*Note - "Majors" as defined by the University include declared majors regardless of candidate acceptance into programs as defined by the BAS 1.5. Completion rates of admitted candidates are much higher; however, without a cohort system and a way to account for the number of years a candidate has been in college prior to formal admittance to a DOE program the rates are negatively skewed.)

Ability of Completer to Meet Licensing and State Requirements

The ability of GSU EPP candidates to meet licensing and state requirements is measured by the results of ILTS content tests. Title II Results (5.7) reflect 97-100% pass rate for the AY14/15, AY15/16, and AY16/17. Summary data from the Title II report the number of total candidates/program completers and pass rates for the state test: AY14/15 (n=50) 49 (98%); AY15/16 (n=28) 28 (100%); AY16/17 (n=49) 49 (100%).

Governors State University

Ability of Completers to be Hired in Educational Position

The Administrator Survey Part II (2.4) data show that almost 100% of completers have the ability to be hired. As noted above, 98%-100% of completers successfully complete the program and pass the state required exams. Additionally, the Administrator Survey Part II Data (2.5) show that 60% of 2015/16 completers are currently employed in Illinois public schools. Note that completers who find employment outside of Illinois or Illinois public schools are not represented in this report. As a bordering state, many candidates live and choose to work in Indiana.

Student Loan Default Rate and Other Consumer Information

Loan default rates are reported for borrowers who are at least four years in arrears. The Loan Default Rate Report (5.8) shows the GSU loan default rate was 7.4% in FY11, 4.0% in FY12, and 3.2% in FY13 (the most recent year for which data is available), reflecting a positive trend compared to previous years and considerably lower than the 11.3% national loan default rate.

A considerable amount of consumer information is made available on GSU public website (www.govst.edu). "Rules, Regulations, and Reports: [Compliance Administration at GSU](#)" (see link 1.1) can be accessed through the web page, which displays student graduation and retention rates. Other helpful consumer information is found in "[Gainful Employment](#)" (see link in 1.1)

Additionally, GSU annually distributes on a one-on-one basis to all enrolled students a notice describing the availability of required consumer information that has been provided to the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE). Each disclosure in the notice includes contact information for the applicable campus official should the student have questions, wish to obtain the full disclosures, or obtain a paper copy of the Notice. The GSU Consumer Information link to the following information includes instructions on access, much of which is already found on or through various GSU websites and on the US DOE's [College Navigator website](#) (see link in 1.1). Along with extensive other data/information, the College Navigator database provides consumer information regarding academic program (degree and other educational or training programs, institutional facilities, faculty and other instructional personnel, and any plans for improving the academic program), retention rate, completion/graduation and transfer-out rates (including disaggregated completion/graduation rates), placement in employment, including types of employment and any placement rates the institution calculates, and types of graduate and professional education in which the institution's graduates enroll.

5.5 and A.5.5 GSU's EPP has systematic, ongoing processes for collecting and reviewing data. Clear processes and timelines used by the EPP to collect, summarize, and analyze data have been developed and are summarized in the ACS documents (ACS-I, ACS-A) (4.8). These processes require obtaining data from diverse stakeholders, including from candidates, graduates, faculty, practitioners, employers, and school and community partners. The data collected and analyzed provide information regarding program development and quality and

Governors State University

candidate performance and impact. Candidates, as well as other stakeholders, have multiple opportunities for providing feedback, reflecting on practices, and making improvements. These data are used to make decisions about candidate progress and retention, individual program quality, and overall quality of the EPP's operations.

At regular meetings at the program, DOE, and EPP levels, results of surveys and other data are discussed and plans of action are made as needed. Based on feedback from a wide variety of stakeholders described under CAEP Standard 2, programmatic changes have been made. A concise list of changes made over the past eight years is included in the History of Change (1.15) document; these changes range from those affecting individual programs to those affecting the entire EPP.

One example of how stakeholders are involved in program evaluation and improvement are the EPP's Advisory Councils, which includes both internal and external stakeholders: GSU administrators, faculty, GSU staff, local P-12 administrators, community members, and other external business partners. Meetings are held at least quarterly and more frequently when necessary. For example, when the EMED program was redesigned to meet changes in state standards, input from stakeholders was included to help shape the redesigned EMED program, which was approved by ISBE in 2016. When the Type 75 Educational Administration program was redesigned to meet changing state requirements, Advisory Council Meetings (1.9) were regularly held as the EDAD program was being developed. The EDAD program was approved by ISBE and began admitting students in F14.

Another way external stakeholders are essential in the EPP's quality assurance system is their participation in assessing candidates and programs. For example, clinical partners complete program evaluation forms at the conclusion of student teaching/principal internship. Cooperating teachers also provide candidate feedback on the EPPU Danielson Student Teaching Formative Assessment rubrics, which are used at Weeks 5 and 10 of student teaching and are discussed under CAEP Standard 2. This clinical experience observation by classroom teachers is evidence that the EPP and partner schools have established mutually agreed upon expectations for candidate preparation. In early F16, before implementing the Danielson-based rubrics in its initial programs, the EPP sent the proposed rubric to P-12 teachers, school counselors, administrators, and instructional coaches and requested feedback. Through this process, the proposed rubric was validated and, as a result, implemented at the end of F16. The rubric assessments for written lesson plans, implemented lessons, EPPU Danielson Domain 1 Methods/Labs Formative Assessment rubric, which also was validated by school-based stakeholders, and the Dispositions Assessment for Initial Program Educator Preparation Programs rubric are completed in LiveText® each semester for all initial program methods courses and labs.

Another example of stakeholders' role in the continuous improvement of the EPP's programs is seen in the opportunities candidates have to provide input. Candidates provide feedback to programs when they complete course SEIs at the end of each semester for every course. SEIs

allow candidates to assess faculty and have a voice about course delivery and program quality. In addition to SEIs, surveys administered by GSU and by ISBE provide a venue for program completers' input. These surveys (e.g., Exit Survey and Graduate/Completer Surveys) are administered at program completion and at one and three years post-graduation. An example of a specific program change resulting from candidate feedback was the development of teaching episode experiences during methods courses for secondary education candidates. These teaching episode experiences satisfy candidates' requests for additional experiences working with secondary students in preparation for student teaching.

As described under CAEP Standard 2, GSU's EPP and Crete-Monee Community Unit School District 201-U partnership was recently selected by ISBE as one of four partnerships to participate in a pilot "Continuous Improvement Communities of Practice" (2.8) which is organized by ISBE and facilitated by [Branch Alliance for Educator Diversity \(BranchED\)](#) (see link in 1.1) is to create unified efforts led by regional educator preparation programs (EPPs) and district teams to ensure that all P-12 students have "learner-ready teachers," particularly teachers certified in high-need areas. To evaluate the effectiveness of this pilot program, EPPs and schools are required to collect, analyze, and report on relevant and meaningful data, including data obtained from school-based educators.

[Table of Contents](#)

Diversity

Based on evidence cited under Standards 1, 2, and 3, the EPP concludes that our candidates are well-prepared for teaching and leading in America's P-12 classrooms and schools and to have a positive impact on student learning (CAEP 4). GSU Vision 2020 Strategic Plan (D.1) identifies diversity as integral to GSU's and its EPP's mission and vision. Candidates learn among diverse faculty, supervising and cooperating teachers, P-12 students, and administrators (CAEP 2) and develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions crucial to supporting diverse P-12 student populations through a range of coursework, field experiences (CAEP 1). Field placement sites vary geographically, socioeconomically, and programmatically, providing opportunities for candidates to acquire in-depth understanding about supporting all P-12 students' learning (CAEP 2).

The EPP has affirmed its commitment to recruiting and retaining highly-qualified diverse candidates (EPP Diversity Data 3.0) by making good-faith efforts outlined in the EPP's 5-Year Recruitment Plan (3.1), including the goal to increase enrollment of candidates by 5% each year in high-needs areas (CAEP 3). As a primarily upper-division institution, many of our candidates come to GSU from 5 feeder community colleges, including Chicago City Colleges. GSU's Dual-Degree Partnership Agreements with 17 community colleges create affordable undergraduate degrees for applicants, 41.16% (AY15/16 n=1,951 of 4,725; AY16/17 n= 1,880 of 4,611; and AY17/18 n=1,824 of 4,403) of whom are from low socioeconomic backgrounds based on the Estimated Family Contribution (D.2).

The CAEP/Diversity Alignment Data Report (D.3) provides data about candidate dispositions, including those related to diversity, at multiple points in their programs (CAEP 5). EPP assessments (CAEP 1), including Dispositions rubrics for initial and advanced programs and Danielson-based rubrics (1.3.c,d), produce data on candidates' respect for student diversity and ability to engage P-12 students.

The data reported represent the percentage of candidates who met Acceptable level for programs. Overall, all program data together show that 80% of candidates met or exceeded the Acceptable criterion in 24 of 27 data cycles (88.9%). As indicated by data disaggregated by program (see CAEP/Diversity Alignment Data Report D.3), candidates have demonstrated respect for student diversity.

The EPP will analyze EDEC S18 data to determine the cause of the lower than 80% results for the S18 data cycle. EMED F16 data reflect a weakness in the area of diversity; however, there has been a positive trend. This coincided with ISBE-required program redesign, which focuses more on understanding diversity. EDAD S17 fell below 80%, which was anomalous given the other levels of 98.5 – 100%. Further analysis of data will determine any potential shortcomings in instruction, assignment design, or field experiences and improvements that might be made

ensure all candidates are reaching an acceptable level of understanding and behavior in regards to diversity.

Beyond the campus, the diversity of GSU's surrounding Chicago Southland's demographics (D.4) grounds the candidates' understanding of diverse perspectives. Over 60 partner school districts and 900 schools listed in Affiliation Agreements and Partner Schools (2.3) offer candidates field-based experiences in a range of geographic locations and socioeconomic characteristics, curricula, instructional formats, and administrative structures. Collectively, these schools serve very diverse student populations: 55% low income, 9% ELL, 14% with disabilities, and 58% students of color. Additionally, three sites are specific to special education and have 100% students with disabilities. Memoranda of Understanding (2.6) between the EPP and schools show the mutually-beneficial agreement to positively affect all P-12 students' learning and development. EPP field experiences go beyond the traditional model and include co-teaching, professional development, research, grant writing and data sharing.

The EPP has measured completers' experiences regarding diversity over recent data cycles. Four completer surveys (2.4) have been administered starting in F17: Exit Survey (each semester); Completer Survey Year 1 (annual); Completer Survey Year 3 (annual); EPPU Educational Administration (Principal Preparation) Exit Survey (annual). The results of these 5-point Likert scale surveys show the percentages of candidates who always, often, or sometimes encountered specified categories of P-12 students during their field placements.

Students with disabilities

Exit Survey: F17 - 70%; S18 - 90%

Principal Preparation Exit Survey: AY17/18 - 83.3%

Completer Survey Year 3: AY17/18 - 90%

Completer Survey Year 1: AY17/18 - 90%

English Language Learners

Exit Survey F17 - 75%; S18 - 70%

Principal Preparation Exit Survey: AY17/18 - 87.5%

Completer Survey Year 1: AY17/18 - 70%

Completer Survey Year 3: AY17/18 - 70%

Low Income

Exit Survey F17 - 67%; S18 - 90%

Principal Preparation Exit Survey: AY17/18 - 100%

Completer Survey Year 1: AY17/18 - 90%

Completer Survey Year 3: AY17/18 - 90%

Gifted

Exit Survey F17 - 62%; S18 - 90%

Principal Preparation Exit Survey: AY17/18 - 79.2%

Completer Survey Year 1: AY17/18 - 90%

Completer Survey Year 3: AY17/18 - 90%

Survey results from AY17/18 indicate that a majority of GSU-prepared candidates have opportunities for experiences with diverse groups of students. EPP will closely analyze reports to determine how perceptions influence data trends as well as how to increase candidates' experiences with various groups of students to ensure all candidates are highly prepared to serve in diverse school settings.

Technology

The mission in the “GSU Technology Strategic Plan 2015” (T.1) outlines the importance of “providing high-quality computing, networking, and telecommunication services ... to facilitate the management, teaching, and learning process.” In 2011, GSU installed ten centralized computer classrooms in the library, four new computer labs, and three collaborative technology rooms across campus. EPP faculty have used LiveText® for the submission of artifacts, data collection and analysis, and for candidate e-portfolios since 2004. COE seeks to prepare candidates for actual classrooms. For example, COE has 3 SMART Boards™ and 21 iPads for candidate use in methods courses and student teaching.

CAEP Standards 1.2, 1.4, and 1.5 Data Report (1.11) and Completer Exit Surveys (2.4) inform programs of candidate technology use. Initial program candidates have met the ISTE Standards for Educators in an Introduction to Educational Technology course and throughout program courses (CAEP 1). In F17, all programs added a technology assessment row to Lesson Plan Rubrics (1.4). In late F17, it was decided that three Initial programs would pilot the ISTE-S standards to lesson plans in S18. All initial programs will require candidates to add ISTE-S standards beginning in F18.

Data from Educational Technology Course (% at “Acceptable” or above): F16 – 96.1%; S17 – 95%; F17– 97.1%; S18 – 95.9%

Data for Use of Technology from Lesson Plans

Individual program level rubrics are not consistent with regard to performance level descriptors, nor with regard to point values assigned to the various levels. The EPP is working towards more consistency in rating scales across rubrics/assessments (EPP Rubric Consistency Plan 1.11). The sufficient or acceptable level on all rubrics are referred to as “Acceptable.” The percentages reported below are of candidates who met the Acceptable or above criterion (CAEP Standards 1.2, 1.4, and 1.5 Data Report (1.13)). The data overall show that 80% of candidates met or exceeded the Acceptable criterion in 15 of 17 data cycles (88.2%).

EDEC: F16 - 100%; S17 - 100%; F17 - 92.7%; S18 - 74%.

EMED: F16 - 97.3%; S17 - 95%; F17 - 91.6%; S18 - 100%.

ETE: AY15/16 - 100%; AY16/17 - 95.6%; AY17/18 - 88.5%.

MTE: AY15/16 - 100%; AY16/17 - 100%; AY17/18 - 95.2%.

BTE: AY15/16 - 72.4%; AY16/17 - 97.6%; AY17/18 - 95.0%

Candidate’s use of technology to track, share, and evaluate student learning exceeded Acceptable levels, except for EDEC in S18 and BTE in AY15/16.

S18 Pilot Data: Alignment of ISTE Standards for Students (ISTE-S) within Lesson Plans(% at Acceptable or above): EDEC: 16.7%; ETE: 66.7%; BTE: 100%

Governors State University

The candidates and instructors in the pilot were introduced to the ISTE-S for the first time in S18. The data highlights a needed area of improvement. The EPP will conduct professional development for faculty on the ISTE-S in F18 so they will be able to model these technology standards with our candidates.

For the advanced program, technology requirements are focused in a Technology Driven Leadership course. The course was designed to meet the ISBE and ELCC standards for technology. In F17, a pilot summative assessment was added to the course to assess the use of ISTE Standards for Education Leaders (ISTE-EL) (see Hyperlinks, Abbreviations, Definitions and References 1.1) to meet CAEP standard A1.1. The Assessment of ISTE Standards for Administrators data report (T.2) pilot results showed 100% met or exceeded expectations in AY17/18. Further administrations of this assessment will determine if there are any gaps in meeting these standards.

The EPP's partnerships with local elementary, middle, and secondary schools allow candidates to observe and teach in high-needs, low-SES schools (CAEP 2) and become familiar with the technology classroom management systems they utilize. Our partnership with Crete-Monee High School (District 201-U) positions us with the opportunity to learn the school's digital tools and develop educational technology course curricula alongside mentor teachers and administrators based on the school's technology needs. This partnership was recently selected by ISBE as one of four EPP-districts to participate in the pilot "Continuous Improvement Communities of Practice" (2.7). The goal according to the CICP overview (2.8) is to create unified efforts led EPP-district teams to ensure that all P-12 students have "learner-ready teachers," particularly teachers certified in high-need and STEM areas (CAEP 1). To evaluate the effectiveness of this pilot program, EPPs and schools are required to collect, analyze, and report on relevant and meaningful data including the use of technology.

Initial licensure program EPPU Exit Survey data reports (2.5) of F17 indicated that 86.6% of respondents were "very well" or "well" prepared "to identify individual needs and how to locate and access technology, services, and resources to address those needs."

Phase-in

CAEP 2.2, 2.3, and 3.4: Careful consideration of CAEP 1.5, CAEP cross-cutting technology theme, and ISTE Standards for Educators and for Students, as well as analyses of the EPP's available data have highlighted a need for the Educational Technology Course Revision Plan (1.19) and additional technology focus in existing courses. This will include alignment to new technology standards, instruction in use of databases, digital media, and other technological functions to engage, monitor, and assess P-12 students. In F18, the following performance indicators will be incorporated into the educational technology course: knowing why and how to help P-12 students to access and assess quality digital content; designing and facilitating digital learning, mentoring and collaboration including the use of social networks. In order to better prepare candidates to serve our local school districts, we will survey and collaborate with partner

districts to obtain their perceptions of EPP technology preparation and to help design new curricula and rubrics.

[Table of Contents](#)

[Table of Contents](#)

Contributions

CAEP Administrative Team

Dr. Shannon Dermer, Unit Head
Dr. Timothy Harrington, Unit Head 2
Dr. Joi Patterson, CAEP Coordinator
Ms. Melinda Elliott, Data Coordinator
Dr. Amy Vujaklija, Faculty Representative

CAEP Reviewer/Editors

Mr. Steve Damarjian
Dr. Glenna Howell
Dr. Colleen Sexton
Dr. Amy Vujaklija
Dr. Barbara Winicki

Writing Team

Dr. Lisa Chang
Dr. Matthew Cooney
Dr. Marlon Cummings
Mrs. Andrea DalPolo
Ms. Melinda Elliott
Dr. Sandi Estep
Dr. Dianna Galante
Dr. Sandy Gandy
Mr. Mike Gordon
Dr. Pamela Guimond
Dr. Timothy Harrington
Dr. Katy Hisrich
Dr. Glenna Howell
Mrs. Carla Johnson
Dr. Jeannine Klomes
Dr. Danel Koonce
Dr. Quincy Martin
Dr. Megan McCaffrey
Dr. Joi Patterson
Dr. Steven Russel
Dr. Xiaobo She

Dr. Angela Thompson

Dr. Amy Vujaklija

Dr. Barbara Winicki

Administrative Support

Mrs. Vicki Gregory

Mrs. Eileen Lally

Institutional Research

Ms. Jordan Miroballi

Ms. Jaime Elkhoury

[Table of Contents](#)