

**CAEP ACCREDITATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SUBMISSION OF ANALYSIS MAY - JUNE 2016**

**Standard 5**

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

**\*Maximum character count: 15,000**

**Summary of Results in Meeting Standard:**

The WSU College of Education employs multiple measures that offers program quality assurance. The STARS system is the University's web application that provides access to data for advising, program evaluation, curriculum tracking and retention. This system extends candidates, faculty, advisors and programs direct and up-to-date information including grades, financial aid, and plans of work. STARS tracks student from the time of acceptance into the University, the College of Education, through graduation and state licensure. STARS also provides advisors and programs the ability to run reports such as cohort data and graduation by majors. Additional data in the form of surveys are collected from clinical supervisors, graduating candidates, and cooperating teachers by the State of Michigan (State-Specific evidence/MI - 2016 EPI WSU Compiled Survey Efficacy Scores) which are designed to report about candidate's preparedness from the program.

The college is committed to continuous improvement. The task of revising and analyzing assessments and results from the surveys and data is fulfilled by the Accreditation Advisory Committee (Other Measures/COE - Accreditation Advisory Committee Bios and COE - Accreditation Comm. Min. - 8/2015, 9/2015, & 12/2015). In collaboration with the support and service of the College Dean, faculty, school partners, and the Michigan Department of Education, the committee is charged with systematic program monitoring, evaluation and improvement of curriculum and instruction. The 18-member council includes the Director of Office of Clinical Experiences, the Executive Director of Metro Bureau—a group who supports local schools and districts—and faculty representative of the departments in COE (Other Measures/OCE – Advisory Board). Each month, the advisory committee meets to review standards and updates by the accrediting body and the State, and will study, plan, enact, evaluate and implement improvements as needed throughout the program. Special task forces present these plans to the appropriate groups such as the Program coordinators, the Teacher Education Department and/or the College of Education Assembly comprised of all College faculty. A List of Annual changes and recommendations are presented to the committee each year to make considerations for the upcoming semester (Other Measures/COE - Complete List of Changes - Accreditation Adv Comm 1/2015 – 5/2016). The latest revision has been the Capstone Conversation and will be piloted in Fall 2016. It now reflects a deeper sense of purpose which is to engage in collegial dialogue about candidates' teaching practice using artifacts from their e-portfolio. The Capstone will also provide feedback on the program and candidates' strengths and areas of need.

Further operational system and curriculum review occur at the University level. Programs at Wayne State University developed, implemented and evaluated learning outcomes for program monitoring and/or improvement as we work towards renewal of our accreditation through the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association (Other Measures/COE - Compliance Assist Instructions and Sample screenshot of ELE program). In our college, all programs identified a mission statement and multiple learning outcomes;

created a curriculum map; provided results of the teacher candidates' assessments of the outcomes provided in coursework; provided an action plan and timeline of improvements; and presented a report to stakeholders.

The College of Education systematically monitors candidates as they progress through the certification program. The College's Academic Services reviews applications and provides status letters to all applicants. Candidates are accepted in COE's Level 1 upon application and after University admission. Three criminal background check questions must be answered. At the time of acceptance, candidates enter into Level 1. A plan of work is enacted by Academic Services which outlines the course requirements and necessary tests for certification; and candidates are assigned an academic advisor who will monitor the candidate's grades and performance through program completion (Other Measures/COE – Level 2 Plan of Work Sample). Level 2 is a selective process of identifying those candidates who in addition to overall academic achievement, demonstrate proficiency in basic skills and who may begin the professional certification sequence in his/her licensure area. To be accepted at Level 2, candidates will have applied, passed the MDE Professional Readiness Exam (PRE) or its equivalence, and met the minimum criteria including 40 hours of group work with children (7). The E-Portfolio and Capstone Conversation is the culminating experience for teacher candidates in which they present and engage in a discussion centered on what it means to be an innovative and reflective practitioner who is committed to diversity (Other Measures/OCE/Capstone Conversation- reviewer schedule 2015-16). Through their E-Portfolio, teacher candidates demonstrate how they have evolved as a teacher in the K-12 classroom through the use of digital media and technology. Teacher candidates are evaluated by the Teacher Education faculty, Field Instructors, and external reviewers.

The College, led by the Accreditation Advisory Committee, also reviews and revises the assessments we collect as data of candidate preparedness. Beginning 2015, all assessments were researched, revised and aligned to the InTASC standards by experts in the field, including faculty from the department of curriculum and instruction (EPP-Wide Assessments Folder and Data Results/2015-2016 MASTER FILE - Teacher Candidates Assessments). Candidates are scored by line item on each assessment which are uploaded to the Blackboard system by the clinical supervisor. The student teaching clinical observations and digital video assessment instruments are now guided by the Danielson framework and all assignments reflect the principles of the same framework to further provide consistency throughout the program, reliable evaluations from our clinical educators and familiarity for our candidates. In May 2016, a study revealed that the Danielson Framework is valid when used as an overall indicator of teacher effectiveness and correlates moderately with student learning (Other Measures/Danielson Framework Validity Article May 2016). The addition of the digital video assignment has been a work in progress and documented in our annual reports over the last two years.

To ensure validity and consistency when analyzing our data, reports are run twice to capture and missing data so that final results are accurate and reflect all of the candidates' work. Final reporting is done each year and any discrepancies or outliers are examined to make program recommendations and improvements. Fall 2015 was the pilot semester of all new rubrics and revised assignments. We noticed that clinical observation assessment scores were consistently low and inquired of supervisors about using the instrument during a one-on-one coaching workshop with them from our newly hired Clinical Supervisor Coach. After multiple

professional development workshops in Fall 2015 (Other Measures/Field Instructor Prof. Devt. 9/24, 10/19, & 11/19), clinical supervisors established better norming on scoring components of the rubric and scores in Winter 2016 better reflect the level of proficiency of the candidates.

Documentation of program changes are prepared and presented each year to the Accreditation Advisory Committee. A report is given each month to the College regarding enrollment, recruitment and retention (Other Measures/COE – Retention Recruitment Assembly Report 11/2015). Additionally, specific changes to programs are reviewed with Program Coordinators at their monthly meeting. Beginning May 2016, faculty was presented with Michigan Department of Education’s EPI report that scores completer impact and reveals a score of satisfactory (Other Measures/COE - Asst Dean TED Email re EPI Reports May 2016). Faculty was asked to reflect upon practice and specifically how we can work to improve support for job search for our completers as they scored lower than the other components surveyed. As part of the Selected Improvement Plan, new measures including a completer case study, completer (Years 1-5 out) survey and administrator observation of completers, and administrator survey will be piloted for implementation during 2016-17 school year that collects data on completer impact on P-12 student learning.

In addition to the Accreditation Advisory Committee which is made up of faculty, teacher education administrators and local school district representatives, the Office of Clinical Experiences has established multiple partnerships in the Metropolitan Detroit area who not only help develop clinical practice for our candidates, they participate with us in professional development to improve the clinical components of our program. Districts such as Dearborn Schools has asked us to participate in their strategic plan development as they look to create a mission, vision, goals and actions to promote academic learning for P-12 students. Just as these districts open communication to our College, we share our program reporting to stakeholders and the larger community via our website. Finally, we are building a group of key stakeholders to serve on our Teacher Education Advisory board for Fall 2016 who will provide professional guidance, recommendations and support on all aspects of the program.

### **Guiding Questions for Analysis of Evidence**

- Describe how the quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness.
- Describe how the quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.
- How does the provider regularly and systematically assess performance against its goals and relevant standards, track results over time, test innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and use results to improve program elements and processes based on the Selected Improvement Plan?
- How are measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction?

- How does the provider assure that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence?