

STANDARD 5: PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

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

The School of Education (EPP) has a functional Assessment System with ongoing processes that outlines objectives and timetables to gather and use evidence for the continuous improvement of student learning outcomes and efficient and effective overall operations. The Plan is aligned with the College's Institutional Assessment and Quality Assurance system that embodies our mission of social justice and access, as well as the Strategic Plan's vision to cultivate academic engagement through a culture of assessment, mentorships, learning communities, service, and innovative research experiences.

The EPP's Assessment System addresses the following assessment needs of the School, College, and larger University system (CUNY): 1) a comprehensive, sustainable, and systematic process to assess preparation effectiveness, student learning at the course and program levels, and general education learning outcomes; 2) the assessment of student learning at each key transition point in a student's educational experience, as framed by the EPP's Assessment Plan; 3) the systematic collection and assessment of student learning for ongoing program assessment, and accreditation (CAEP/NCATE), CEC, ACEI, NAEYC); 4) the assessment of EPP's progress toward the goals established in the Institutional Strategic Plan, and CUNY's Performance Management Process and Master Plan; 5) the use of assessment results to improve programs and services and to determine resource allocations and future planning needs; and, 6) the evaluation and improvement of the entire assessment process— always with the aim of improving student learning and EPP effectiveness.

5.1 Quality Assurance System

The EPP uses multiple data sources for assessing its operations and its preparation programs, among them: The College Snapshots and the Pipeline Analysis Reports from the College's Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA), Departmental Annual Reports, Faculty Evaluations, Course Evaluations, Graduate Surveys, Alumni Surveys, In-service Teachers Annual Evaluations, and Employer Surveys. These reports provide information about the EPP's admissions, retention, and graduation rates, candidate preparation, resources, governance, planning, budget, personnel, facilities, and advisement and mentoring programs.

Institutional Assessments

Snapshot

The Medgar Evers College Snapshots is an annual publication of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment and is available on the College website. It presents an overview of the College for the year. The Snapshot provides information that is responsive to the basic quantitative needs, and to address the important questions: “Who are the Medgar Evers College students at different stages of their career preparation?” and “How do the Medgar Evers College students persist, perform and progress?” At the institutional level, the Snapshot provides general information on enrollment, admissions, basic skills and proficiency testing, students’ progress and graduation, courses and curricula, faculty and staff, and selected college operations which are retrieved from original data sources, including fall and spring semesters Show/Performance Files and System Data for student enrollment, performance, graduation and course enrollment data; CUNY-First Reports and IPEDS Report for faculty and staff data; Student Financial Aid System Report for financial aid data; CUNY Central Testing Office and SIMS for testing data; and, the IPEDS Financial Report prepared by the CUNY Central Office of Institutional Research and Assessment for finance data.

The EPP’s main use of data from Snapshots is to verify its program enrollment, grade distributions, instructor profiles, graduation numbers and overall performance. Analysis of this data informs the EPP about the adequacy, distribution and use of its resources in meeting the needs of the School. Enrollment data show increases in the number of candidates entering all the BA programs between 2015 and 2017. However, compared to the two dual-certificate degree programs (ECSE and CSE), the enrollment in the CE (Generalist) is significantly lower. The CSE and ECSE dual-certificate degree programs continue to increase in numbers in 2018.

Candidate performances as reported, using cumulative GPA, show that the majority of program candidates had GPAs of 3.0 and above across all programs. GPAs between the 3.0 and 4.0 range by program and reflect an increasing trend among CE candidates: [N=28: 75% in 2015, N= 26: 77% in 2016, and N= 19: 79% in 2017]. Among CSE candidates, a fluctuating trend is demonstrated [N =55: 89% in 2015; N= 51: 88% in 2016, and N= 51: 96% in 2017, with significant increase in 2017]. ECSE candidates also demonstrated increasing performances over the three year span [N = 62: 84% in 2015; N=70: 93% in 2016, and N = 56: 93% in 2017]. Grade distribution data show that between 2015 and 2017, over 70% [78%; 73%; 77%] of teacher candidates earned A’s and B’s in credit-bearing courses across the college. Snapshot data also show an increase in adjunct faculty instruction between 2015 and 2017, indicating less courses being provided by full-time faculty. The challenge here was that full-time faculty received reassigned time for research, grants management, and other promotion-bearing activities. The EPP is aware of the impact of non-vested instructional faculty on program performance and made every effort to

ensure that adjunct/part-time faculty are equally qualified and experienced as full-time faculty. The EPP includes its adjunct faculty in its planning and assessment activities, and conducts frequent peer mentoring and peer evaluations, as well as candidate evaluations of its faculty contributions. **With the establishment of the School of Education in 2017, the College invested in hiring more fulltime faculty. The School received two reassigned fulltime professors, and there are searches for three additional fulltime professors for the School.**

From 2013, the EPP's graduation numbers increased. With the exception of one year (2017), which saw a decline in program completers, the EPP graduated 16 candidates in 2015 and 23 in 2016. This year, 2018 saw the largest graduating class in the history of the College with its inaugural class of 35 graduates from the new School of Education (*See Table 5.1a*), which show the School of Education with significantly higher growth rates than the majority of other schools and programs at the College. This increase is attributed to the increased grant support for more qualifying candidates to transition from the AA to the BA degree programs, the introduction of a tutoring program in academic writing and mathematics in the pre-professional program, and increased opportunities for professional development during preparation.

Pipeline Analysis Report – Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA)

Assessment of the EPP's Admissions, Retention and Graduation Policies and Trends

A guiding component of the EPP's operations is the clear alignment of teacher expectations in New York State, as well as nationwide. As such, the EPP has developed admissions, retention and graduation policies that outline specific criteria for candidates pursuing the professional programs. This process for recruitment and retention is shared with prospective candidates early in the teacher education program (AA), and ensures that the EPP produces highly qualified and competent teachers with the knowledge, skills and dispositions to meet the value-added demands of educating all P-6 students, including diverse students with exceptionalities. [\[EPP's Need to Know Policies in Appendix 5.1A\]](#).

The EPP receives and uses periodic data from the Institution's assessment offices to review its operations. The OIRA is responsible for carrying out overall institutional research and assessment, and providing information for institutional improvement, planning and decision-making at the College. OIRA communicates with the CUNY Institutional Research and Assessment Office to understand the computational aspects of the University's requirements for evaluative measures, as well as to provide the College's feedback. The EPP's Assessment Process also provides data to support these College-wide reports. A member of the EPP sits on *the Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee (IEAC)*, and engages in the refinement of the College's assessment practices, and conveys improvement goals and plans to and from the EPP.

Another indicator of EPP operations was the retention rates of candidates in the professional programs. Data from the OIRA Pipeline Report indicated that the Fall to Spring retention rates were among the highest in teacher education programs than any other degree programs at the institution (92%; 96%; 97%) across the three programs during the 2015-2017 review period. This data reflect the EPP's transition criteria and candidate performance as they move from one phase to the next. Initial admissions to the BA Programs occur in the Fall semester (see Appendix 5.1B).

EPP Assessment System: Assessment Plan and Assessment Timelines

The EPP's **Assessment Handbook** (Appendix 5.1C) makes public the assessment system to all stakeholders and is accessible on the College's *Sharepoint* portal. The EPP's quality assurance system is characterized by its comprehensive Assessment Plan. The Plan is characterized by five key assessment domains: **External, Portfolio, Early Field and Clinical, Program, and Dispositions**. Each assessment domain is distinguished by key assessment measures which are used to assess candidate and graduate progress and performance. These key assessments which are administered to all candidates were developed based on the EPP's Performance Standards and use the competencies delineated in the Standards as performance criteria. The EPP performance Standards are also aligned with the Interstate New Teacher and Assessment Consortium (INTASC) Standards and the Specialty Professional Association (SPA) Standards. Decisions about candidate progress and performance are made at four transition points: Entrance to the BA Programs, Entry to Clinical Practice I & II, Exit from Clinical Practice, and Graduate. *Table 5.1b* shows the five domains and the four points of assessment, as well as the instruments used for each assessment to ensure that *data are relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable, and provide empirical evidence that data are valid and consistent*. The MEC EPP's assessment system - plan and instruments were developed, enhanced, piloted and reviewed by a collaborative body of EPP faculty, representative institutional faculty and staff from the Liberal Arts and Sciences, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA), partner schools and community personnel, and EPP candidates and alumni.

1. Measures of Candidate Progress

The EPP uses multiple measures that are characterized by internal and external key assessments to monitor candidate progress through its programs. The process begin from the pre-professional degree program in Teacher Education (AA), and which program completion serves as a gateway for transition to the professional programs (BA). At the pre-professional level, key assessments include content knowledge and skills in the general education curriculum and content knowledge and skills in the

education core curriculum. The *EAS* also serves as a beginning external measure of professional preparation.

1.1. EPP Key Assessments in the General Education Curriculum (Liberal Arts and Sciences)

Candidate performances in the general curriculum are monitored in specific courses in the content areas of English (ENG 112; ENG 150; ENG 212), Mathematics (MTH 136; MTH 231) and Science (PHS 101; BIO 101). Candidate performances at entry in English, mathematics and science are areas for improvement. Description of the use of this data in the EPP's assessment is appended to the data in [Table 1.1m](#), while actions toward improvement are detailed in Standard 1.

1.2. EPP Key Assessments in the Education Core Curriculum

The Education Core Curriculum comprises 13 credits distributed over six courses; four of these courses carry early field experiences as co-requisites. These INTASC aligned co-requisite field experiences are referenced in **CAEP Standard 1: [Table 1.1ki](#)**, and show that candidates are meeting the criteria at the highest levels.

1.3. External Assessment of Candidate Progress – Educating All Students (EAS) Test

Based on the Assessment Plan, the prescribed taking of the EAS (and other NYSTCEs) is included on candidates' program sequences, and is used as a diagnostic measure to determine what candidates know and can do. Evidence of this measure that shows 80%> pass rate among test takers is referenced with three years of data in **CAEP: Standard 1: [Table 1.1l](#) - [Table 1.1liii](#)**.

1.4. Progress in the BA Professional Programs

The above constitute the first major assessments at the beginning of the professional program (BA). As candidates progress in the programs, the EPP's Assessment Plan continues to systematically and continuously track candidate performances throughout their preparation. One measure used for subject area content knowledge is data on candidate performance in their State required concentration of 27-30 credits in either English, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, or for early childhood special education program candidates, an option is Psychology. The responsibility of monitoring candidate progress in the professional program shifts from the EPP's Academic Advisor to designated Specialty Faculty Program Advisors in the EPP. Specialty Program Advisors monitor candidate performances in all required courses in their respective programs each semester, and provides reports of progress in assessment meetings and faculty meetings. Recommendations for continuation, repeating a course, degree program changes, or

other conditional decisions are made by full EPP faculty body through a voting process. Reference is made to **CAEP Standard 1: [Table 1.1m](#)** for performances in the Concentrations.

1.5. Course Level Assessments

Candidate progress in the Education professional curriculum is closely monitored at the Course level and at the Program Level. Course level assessments follow the process for data collection, analyses, submission, and reporting using the EPP's uniform template. Department Chairs are responsible for ensuring that reports from all instructional faculty are submitted in a timely manner, each semester. Reports are shared each semester through the course level assessment process during departmental and School meetings described earlier in this narrative. Progress in the Education curriculum is measured by the key assessments, including Early Field Experiences as indicated on the Assessment Plan. For evidence of assessments results in candidate progress in the professional preparation, see [Table 5.1ci-ciii](#), which shows that 80% - 90% of candidates are meeting course criteria.

1.6. Program Level Assessments

For program level assessments, the Specialty Program Advisors track, record, and analyze performance in all areas of candidate preparation, and report on progress at departmental and School meetings. Candidates are notified of progress and concerns through formal and informal methods. They are required to meet individually with their Program Advisors at least twice per semester: at the middle, and at the end of each semester. Notes on discussions and decisions, or formal conditional letters, if necessary, are recorded in each candidate's file. Decisions on candidate continuation or other conditional arrangements are brought to full EPP faculty to be voted upon. While the process for data collection, analysis, and reporting of candidate performance at the various benchmarks in the assessment system is the shared responsibility of the EPP's Academic Advisor, all course instructors, department Chairs, specialty program faculty advisors and mentors, the EPP established an Assessment Committee with the responsibility of general oversight of the entire Assessment System. The program specific capstone experiences are internally, the professional portfolio. One program example of this extensive assessment is included in this Self Study, with measures and outcomes for the other two programs available for on-site review ([see Appendix 5.1D: CSE Portfolio Guidelines](#) and [Table 5.1h: CSE Portfolio Data](#)) and externally, the ed-TPA ([Tables 1.4ai-1.4aiii](#)). Data show that between 85% -100% met the criteria at competent to exemplary levels on the professional portfolio, and 83% (2015), 92% (2016) and 94% (2017) passed the edTPA, with 39%, 17% and 18% each year achieving mastery level.

1.7. EPP Assessment Committee

This Committee consists of three designated faculty members who assumed the responsibility for further analysis, sharing, and storage of the EPP's data. They prepare summary and disaggregated reports and schedule assessment review meetings, facilitate faculty in assessment revisions, and use of new data collection platform. The committee works closely with all parties, including Chairs and Dean, to ensure that the assessment process runs smoothly, and that the EPP meets its own, as well as the institutional timelines for report submission to the larger community, including OAA, OIRA, CUNY, and TEPAC (see *Table 5.1d*). They also guide discussions on revisions, and develop, monitor, and report on assessment action plans, to complete the full cycle of assessment and quality assurance.

2. Measures of Completer Achievements

The EPP relies on several internal and external assessments to measure completer achievements. Its Assessment System utilizes performance outcomes on the external **State licensure examinations**, as well as the ***Graduate/Alumni Surveys, Employer Surveys, and NYC Annual Teacher Evaluations***, as key assessments. These assessments are tracked based on the Assessment Timelines established for data collection, analysis and reporting. EPP program completers are required to take and pass between three to four assessments to meet the criteria for initial state licensure. Completers in the CE – Grades 1-6 program require three examinations, while completers in the ECSE – Birth to Grade 2, and CSE – Grades 1-6 require four examinations to be licensed.

2.1. State Licensure Examinations

The EPP has strategically sequenced a prescribed timeline (see **CAEP Standard 1: *Table 1.1a; Table 1.1b; and Table 1.1c***) for candidates to take these examinations with the ambitious goal of graduating licensed teachers from its programs. The prescribed timelines for taking the licensure tests allows the EPP to assess its candidates' progress towards completion and certification. The State mandates that licensure examinations cannot be used to halt degree progression, therefore candidate test taking is not mandatory and leads to low test taking rates. However, the EPP uses the results of these tests for diagnostic purposes of both candidate and completer competencies, as well as to measure program effectiveness.

The state tests are used as externally validated measures in the EPP's Assessment Plan, and each test is a target measure at key transition points on the Plan. For example, the EAS was used at Transition Point 1 – Entry to BA Program; CST – MultiSubject was used at the beginning of Transition Point 2 for all candidates, while CST-Students with Disabilities was a measure only for CSE and ECSE at the end of Transition Point 2. The edTPA is used in Transition Point 3 – Clinical Practice Exit for all completers (see Assessment Plan graphic model: *Table 5.1b*). Data on candidate/completer performances by

program on the State licensure examinations are in Tables can be referenced in **CAEP Standard 1** (see [Tables 1.11-1.11ii](#); [Table 1.4ai-1.4aiii](#); and [Tables 5.1e – 5.1eiii](#) in this standard.

2.2. Graduate/Alumni Surveys

At the time of exiting the programs, the EPP administers a survey of 17 elements requiring program completers' responses on their abilities. This instrument has two iterations: first, it is administered after candidates complete their one year of clinical practice, and again after at least nine months of professional teaching, and is referenced in **CAEP Standard 4: [Table 4.4a](#)**. Another survey that captures their self-rating of 14 competencies in relation to their program preparation is administered after one year and up to two years of professional teaching. Reference is made to the survey instrument in **CAEP Standard 4: [Table 4.1c](#)**.-Part 1 provides demographical data. These instruments guide the EPP in identifying preparation quality - program satisfaction and effectiveness.

2.3. Employer Surveys

Similarly, the EPP administers adapted versions of the two survey instruments used for alumni to their employers. The 17-elements measure and the 14-dimension instruments are used by employers to rate completers' performances in each area, as well as their satisfaction with program completers as beginning teachers (see **CAEP Standard 4: [Table 4.3a: Part 2 B](#)**). By administering the same instruments to alumni and employers, EPP can decipher whether its program completers are efficiently prepared for their careers, and if employers are satisfied with the breadth and depth of the EPP's program preparation as demonstrated by its completers' performances in the workplace.

2.4. NYC Annual Teacher Evaluations

A citywide validated measure of completers' achievements is the New York City Annual Teacher Evaluation, based on the Danielson Framework for effective teaching. This assessment was added to the EPP's assessment plan in 2015 when it was fully implemented in NYC. The descriptions and uses of these assessments are detailed in **CAEP Standard 4**. These reports are important for the EPP in assessing the effectiveness of its program preparation and teachers in impacting student learning outcomes. The EPP collects data on the two instruments used for the NYC Annual Teacher Evaluation: Measure of Teacher Performance (MOTP) and the measure of Student Learning (MOSL) by requesting and encouraging completers to self-submit. The data gathered to date by the EPP are solely by alumni self-submission. Due to the confidential nature and the ethical responsibility of sharing this information, the EPP, its school partners, and alumni are working on a more reliable method for collecting this data on an annual basis. The EPP is committed to securing completers' personnel data and maintaining ethical

principles, such as candidate identifying characteristics, in using and reporting shared data. Evidence of the use of these data in the EPP's assessment of completer achievement is referenced in **CAEP Standard 4: *Table 4.2bi.*** and *Table 4.2bii.*

Other program specific measures used by the EPP in its assessment of completer achievement include graduate school completion, employment promotion, and tenure, evidence of which are collected through demographical data pages on surveys, and are recorded and stored in the EPP's electronic databases.

3. EPP Operational Effectiveness

3.1. EPP Budget

Data from the College's Budget Office indicate that the EPP receives financial resources to support its general operations, including adjunct faculty compensation, faculty travel to professional conferences, and equipment and supplies. During this current year (2017), the EPP has been afforded an opportunity to submit a more detailed budget that outlines its expenditures and proposed expenses for additional faculty and resources for its new School and accompanying Centers. Included in the budget proposal were requests for continued travel support for faculty attendance and presentations at professional conferences. During the 2015-2017 budget periods, each faculty was supported by the Office of Academic Affairs to the amount of \$1,500 toward conferences or professional development activities. In addition, faculty and candidates received up to \$10,000 through grant funded projects for conference attendance and presentations, including CAEPon conferences. **This additional support responded to the last NCATE Board of Examiners report's only Area for Improvement (AFI) during the last accreditation visit (2013).**

3.2. EPP Resources and Facilities

The School of Education (formerly Education Department) has been successful in attracting external funding from local, state and federal sources to support its operations. The profile of the MEC teacher candidate is one that requires additional support to persist through rigorous teacher preparation programs. Most candidates are heads of households, single parents, first generation college students, independent students, or from low socioeconomic status who need to have a source of reliable income to sustain them during their studies. This trend prompted faculty in the School to continue to seek out external funding support for candidates rather than compromise the intensity and quality of the programs. In 2015, the EPP received a five-year \$1.25M award from the US Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. Prior to that the EPP received over \$2M in OSEP grants. In 2016, the EPP received a \$1.65M NYSED My Brother's Keeper Teacher Opportunity Corps II program grant. The EPP was able to include general education candidates into this support stream, with the intention of increasing the enrollment of

Grades 1-6 general education teachers (CE) for the mathematics and science concentrations (*see Table 5.1f*).

The EPP's faculty members are housed in a suite of offices where each full-time faculty member has a private office so that mentoring and advisement activities can be efficiently carried out. Faculty have full access to and use smart classrooms, computer laboratories, library, and other campus facilities that were recently upgraded in 2016. A challenge for the College as a whole is physical space. During the last four years, the institution has experienced a growth in enrollment from 5,000 to approximately 7,000. The College has outgrown its current facilities, and is currently negotiating with the University (CUNY) for facilities for the new School of Education. In the interim, the College is exploring other options, such as sub-leasing to accommodate its expansion.

3.3. Governance and Personnel

With the establishment of the new School that now houses two academic departments, and manages the Center for Cognitive Development and the College's Ella Baker/Charles Romain Child Development Center, the EPP experienced a drain in full-time experienced faculty (*see Fig. 5.1a*). Between 2015 and 2017, two senior faculty members have retired, one tenured faculty was promoted to the executive administrative role as Founding Dean of the School of Education, leaving the EPP with a skeleton of seasoned staff and increased dependence on adjunct faculty. With the submission for and approval of the new School in 2017, the EPP made a strong case for additional full-time hires to support its operations. Two faculty from the department of English (1 tenured Full Professor, and one Lecturer) requested and was transferred to the School of Education, and are now part of the cadre of fulltime faculty. Three additional searches are in progress. With more full-time faculty, the EPP is in a better position to increase the number of course offerings/sections to include day, evening, and weekend sections for more courses, and to continue to provide the instructional and mentoring supervision and support for candidates.

3.4. Faculty Evaluations

Data from 2015 - 2017 of peer evaluations of faculty indicate that the majority of EPP faculty achieve a mean score of 4.0 (on a scale from 1-5). These data, which include assessing faculty on the clarity and appropriateness of course objectives, their presentation of subject matter, their ability to communicate clearly and motivate students, their use of instructional media, materials, and relevant assignments, their evaluation techniques, and their overall effectiveness, inform the EPP that faculty are performing their teaching responsibilities at a high level, and that their courses continue to offer candidates appropriate and engaging opportunities to learn. Due to the sensitive nature of these personnel data, onsite review of this

evidence is recommended for the BOE. Data from 2015-2017 of student evaluations of faculty indicate that EPP faculty were evaluated by candidates on the same set of measures that peers evaluate faculty (the clarity and appropriateness of course objectives, their presentation of subject matter, their ability to communicate clearly and motivate students, their use of instructional media, materials, and relevant assignments) and scored on a scale of 1-100. The majority (90%) of EPP faculty scored 90 and above. These data confirm peer evaluation data, and assure the EPP that its cadre of faculty is providing candidates with exemplary teaching and learning experiences. [Onsite verification is available in Personnel Files].

3.5. Employer Surveys on Program Quality and Effectiveness

Employer Surveys (N=18) rate graduates' performances in the workplace as evidence of the program quality and EPP effectiveness in producing life-long learners and professionals in the field. Ratings on sixteen dimensions inform the EPP about graduates' strengths and areas for improvement in their professional careers. Employers also rated MEC graduate performances with other beginning teachers at their schools. Employer Survey Data Tables 2015-2017 are included in this Self Study in CAEP

Standard 4: *Table 4.2d*. The data indicate that the majority of our graduates demonstrate strengths in all areas of the assessment, earning ratings between 1 and 2 (1 = very effective; 2 = effective) from their employers: 75% in 2017; 88% in 2016; and 100% in 2015. The EPP has since established an Annual Alumni Gathering for the sole purpose of designing professional development opportunities and ongoing mentoring for its graduates. As a result of feedback from both employers and graduates, the EPP applied for and received State approval to operate as a professional development site from 2017. One area of interest to employers is the EPP's strength in practicing and promoting culturally responsive pedagogy. The EPP held two of these professional development sessions for partner school personnel and candidates from 2015-2017, one of which was facilitated by the renowned Geneva Gay.

Table 5.1: provides a *Summary Table of the EPP's Self Study Assessment of its Operations and Program Quality* and the responses to these findings. These assessments are the major sources for data collection and analyses each year that demonstrate the seamless integration of assessments in program quality and overall EPP operations that inform the School and its stakeholders.

5.2 Quality Assurance Measures

The School of Education's comprehensive Assessment System was first developed in 2004 and serves to (1) support the goals of the EPP's conceptual framework; (2) assess applicant qualifications, candidates' and graduates' performance in relation to the requisite knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated by

EPP and Professional Association and INTASC standards, and (3) improve the function of the EPP and its programs. Since then, there have been several updates to the original system, based on annual reviews by the EPP's collaborative entities: TEPAC, Liberal Arts & Sciences, school and community partners, EPP faculty, staff, candidates and alumni. The collaborative engagement of multiple agencies in developing, reviewing, piloting, and evaluating assessment goals and instruments, as well as a systematic data collection, analysis and reporting system with established timelines, the purchase of a sophisticated technological platform for continuous assessment, and an oversight Assessment Committee that guides and ensures that the overall quality assurance system is relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable, and is a deeply rooted practice of the EPP, provide evidence that the EPP's quality assurance system is sound, and that its findings are valid and consistent with the data. A summary of the reviews and changes that were specific to the Assessment Plan are provided in [Table 5.2b](#).

Assessment Instruments

The goals and related objectives of the conceptual framework grow out of eight EPP Standards (Knowledge, Personal & Global Consciousness, Analytic Ability, Creativity, Collaboration, Effective Communication, Professionalism, and Commitment & Care) and articulate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that all candidates must have upon completion of their programs of study. The EPP aligned its Standards with the standards of the respective Specialty Professional Associations (NAEYC, CEC, ACEI) which represent the EPP's current programs (ECSE, CSE and CE, respectively) ensuring that candidates meet all of these standards. This alignment further ensures that candidates meet nationally recognized standards (represented by INTASC Standards), which guide them as they enter their first year of teaching.

Candidates develop the competencies described in this body of standards (EPP, SPA, and INTASC) as they engage in coursework, early field and clinical practice experiences. **Rubrics** (as evidenced in [general Appendix F: Rubrics](#)) for Learning Experiences and/or Key Assessments in each of the EPP's courses are aligned across these standards. Multiple assessments, from internal and external sources, completed by candidates, faculty, and school partners, serve to provide the EPP with information regarding candidates' performance in relation to the goals of the conceptual framework. The EPP assesses graduates' performance in relation to the goals of the conceptual framework, using measures such as the **Employer Surveys** and the **Graduate /Alumni Surveys** that draw on the competencies delineated in the Standards as well.

All assessment instruments were developed using current research, EPP and professional standards in collaboration with partners. Once developed, the Assessment Committee leads calibration sessions using samples of candidate work to ensure understanding and comparability of measures. Calibration is done at two levels: 1) EPP faculty, and 2) TEPAC (all partners). Following calibration, instruments are piloted for one year, soliciting feedback from users. During reviews of data collected from pilot use of instruments, and feedback received, revisions, if any are made, with subsequent full implementation of instruments. Not set in stone, the EPP and its partners continue to review these instruments on a regular basis during its scheduled periodic reviews based on its Assessment Timelines (*see Table 5.1d*). These reviews examine verifiability among samples of data, and ensure that grading and responses are representatively aligned to goals of the instruments. Moreover, the EPP uses interrater reliability on assessments that are graded by more than one persons to check for internal consistency. The periodic reviews also take into consideration revisions or changes in EPP, SPA, national, local or Accreditation Standards. This EPP maintains that its Assessment processes in its School of Education are the shared responsibility of all partners.

Moreover, based on the feedback during the last accreditation visit, the EPP's assessment system was validated as there were no AFIs and the Standard was fully met. NCATE noted that: *“Currently faculty members are collecting, recording and reporting data. This data is then entered into Excel spreadsheets, organized, summarized, and shared with faculty using the SharePoint system. Efforts are underway to improve the unit's assessment procedures in order to regularly and systematically compile, aggregate, summarize and analyze data collected from all stakeholders. The unit has added a faculty position to take on the responsibility for developing and implementing these procedures”* (NCATE BOE Report, 2013, p10). Since then, the EPP established an Assessment Committee of three faculty members, instead of one faculty member, and has explored several technological platforms for its ongoing assessment, finally deciding on and purchasing the Chalk and Wire platform. This system is still being developed and will be in full implementation by Fall 2018. These measures indicate that the EPP has gone beyond expectations in ensuring that its quality assurance system is current, and *relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures, thereby producing empirical evidence that data are valid and consistent.*

5.3. Continuous Improvement

The EPP uses its eight performance standards closely aligned to the specialty professional organization standards (NAEYC, CEC, ACEI), as well as the Interstate standards for teacher preparation (INTASC to measure candidate performance in meeting the goals of its teacher preparation programs. Curriculum Mapping allows for relevant course level assessments of Standards. Data from these course level

assessments are collected and reviewed each semester. Individual faculty data and reflections identify strengths and challenges on each learning experience in each course, each semester, and data are used systematically to guide areas for revision and refocus. [[Appendix 5.3A: Sample of Template used for course-level data collection](#)]. The EPP's Assessment Committee reviews these data and recommendations and presents them for full faculty discussion and revisions, if and when needed. Performance data follow a cycle each year to coincide with other institutional assessment reporting timelines as established by the Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee ([Table 5.1d](#))

1. Transcript Reviews – Developmental Education

The EPP also uses transcript data at entry to program to determine candidate performance on critical academic subjects – English, Mathematics and Science to assess candidate's ability to meet program requirements and completion. [Table 5.3a](#) shows the number of candidates from each of the completer cohorts that required one or both developmental education courses prior to entry into the program, and the number who progressed successfully through the EPP's exit points. The goal of this strategic and intentional progress monitoring at program entry for the EPP is to systematically track its candidates' progress in order to provide appropriate supports such as tutoring and mentoring in challenging areas. The data on exit GPA reveal that candidates who took developmental education courses succeeded at the same levels as, or better than candidates who did not need developmental education courses. In two of the three years, candidates taking developmental education courses in the beginning finished stronger (higher GPAs) than candidates who did not need remediation, and that they were similarly successful in gaining licensure. It was based on this trend annually that the decision to exercise some flexibility on an individual basis to accept selected candidates with a less than 3.0 GPA at entry, particularly when candidates who know and understand the EPP's qualifying criteria, make passionate requests, and demonstrate the commitment to learning and growing. In these cases, candidates are accepted conditionally, through a written contract, and provided with supports to improve their performances ([see Action Plan](#)).

2. Analysis of Key Assessments: 2015 -2017

Moreover, the EPP conducts annual evaluations of performances on the Key Assessments in its Assessment Plan to determine the effectiveness of its teacher preparation programs in meeting the desired goals. The data also aid in budgetary considerations and ongoing strategic planning activities, including program revisions and enhancements. Reference is made to [Tables 5.1ci – 5.1ciii](#), which show that the majority of candidates met most internal and external performance measures at the highest levels: competent to exemplary. The areas of concern are in the licensure test taking rates ([See Action Plan](#)).

3. EPP's Improvements to Program

Using the annual data on the Assessment Plan, the institutional snapshots of admissions, retention, and graduation rates, and the course-related assessments, the EPP made several changes to improve program elements and processes. Details of changes made are included in [Table 5.3b](#). **In addition, the recent non-recognized decision received from the SPA BOE Report for the ECSE program indicated the need for a more in-depth review of assessments to reflect more performance-based measures rather than product-based measures. While the NAEYC Standards were Met (1 Met with Conditions) and the CEC Standards were mostly Met with Conditions (1 Met), the decision of Not Nationally Recognized was given based on the EPP's failure to meet submission deadlines, having exhausted its time to submit a Revised Report. The EPP and its partners continue to make extensive revisions to the ECSE program, its learning experiences, and assessment instruments, and will be guided by feedback from our accreditation officers to meet the NAEYC and CEC standards.**

5.4. Measures of Completer Impact

As discussed in **CAEP Standard 4: Program Impact**, the EPP uses multiple instruments administered at several points. NYC Teacher Annual Evaluations, graduate/alumni survey instruments and employer surveys as well as the NYC annual evaluation of practicing completers are used to identify completer impact in P-6 settings. Specific elements of these instruments inform the EPP about its completer impact and are administered, analyzed and shared annually. This information is shared with school partners and the college community during the TEPAC meetings, and is used to improve programs and partnerships between the EPP and P-6 stakeholders.

1. NYC Teacher Annual Evaluations

The New York City Annual Teacher Evaluation is a relatively new addition to the EPP's Assessment Plan. Measure of teacher practice (MOTP) and measure of student learning (MOSL) serves the purpose to highlight teachers practice in the classroom, as well as indicating improvements in teachers' pedagogy. Though difficult to retrieve due to the confidentiality issues, the EPP was able to access overall ratings on candidate performances of these assessments. Reference is made to **CAEP Standard 4: Table 4.2bi** and [Table 4.2bii](#). These overall ratings were used by the EPP as a comparison with ratings on surveys from employers. Decisions emanating from these review by the EPP and its partners indicated a need for a more strategic plan for accessing the data for more expansive use. This plan requires signed permissions from completers for schools to share their performance data. **These discussions are ongoing to arrive at a consensus and an established plan by the end of 2018.** A recent survey of NY City program

completers' performances in the classroom show that 4% of teachers were ineffective, 9% were developing, 79% were effective and 9% were highly effective (The Education Trust, NY, 2018). Compared to the sample of EPPs completer data, 43% were rated as being highly effective, 52% were rated as effective and only 1 teacher (5%) was rated as developing. It is important to note that none of our teachers were rated as ineffective. Employer ratings of our 2015-2017 employed MEC graduate/alumni show that our beginning teachers possess the requisite knowledge, demonstrate high quality skills, and display positive attributes in the working environment.

2. Graduate/Alumni Surveys

The EPP administers three separate surveys at separate points after completers' exit the program. Reference is made to **CAEP Standard 4: Table 4.4a** is administered between nine months to one year of teaching experience. **Table 4.4b**, administered after one year of professional teaching, show alumni responses about the quality of their preparation, while **Table 4.4c** is administered two to three years into the teaching career and professional development (graduate study), and provides responses related to their satisfaction with their preparation in meeting the demands of their teaching experiences as well as their graduate studies. **Data from alumni surveys for 2015-2017 indicate that the EPP's completers are effective or highly effective as classroom teachers, and that they possess the knowledge, skills and dispositions to meet the needs of learners, with their greatest strength in working with students with disabilities.** During annual reviews, these data are compared to data from previous cohorts to determine the EPP's progress in meeting its goals in teacher preparation, and also compared to ratings on the NYC Annual Teacher Evaluations.

3. School Report Cards

The EPP also looked at the School Report Cards for the grade levels and the years that program completers worked in those settings. The majority of schools showed increase in student performance on both ELA and Mathematics, particularly among the special education group (see **CAEP Standard 4: Tables 4.1bi** and **4.1bii**). While direct correlations cannot be made based on this comparison, it is fair to assume that our practicing teachers had an impact on the outcomes. **The EPP is working with partner schools and alumni to devise an agreed upon plan to gather classroom data on direct completer impact on student learning. At the moment, this information requires the consent of alumni and schools in sharing these data.**

4. Employer Surveys

Reports on completers' performances in the workplace were also provided by Employers through the EPP's Employer Surveys, as well as self-disclosed submission of teachers' Annual Evaluations. Employers (N=18) responded to the same questions as in the Alumni Survey on the competencies of program completers (See **CAEP Standard 4: Table 4.2d**). In some instances, there were more than one MEC graduates employed in the same school/setting. The data below show that over 80% of MEC graduates are very effective or effective across 15 of the 17 ability measures. The challenging areas for them are their ability to cater fully to English language learners and gifted students, similar to the concerns identified by the graduates.

The recognition in 2015 that the EPP should disseminate information more widely through cutting-edge research and publications led to the establishment in 2017 of a Center for Cognitive Development. A primary goal of the Center is for the EPP to lead the narrative on P-6 student learning and development in Central Brooklyn. The Center's goals are deeply rooted to the four stakeholder strands of the conceptual framework of the School of Education: principals, parents, teachers and students, and operates as an umbrella for collaborative research among EPP and partners, customization and coordination of services and resources, and sharing of the knowledge and experiences of culturally responsive education. A primary purpose of the Center is to systematically and intentionally conduct research and use data to design interventions and match resources to achieve learner goals and outcomes. **Publication of results from the Center for Cognitive Development, as the dissemination arm of the EPP, is one of the new and innovative initiatives geared at continuous evaluation of our teacher preparation programs, and improving the impact of program completers on student learning.**

5.5: Stakeholder/Partner Involvement in EPP

An enduring force in the EPP's program success is its collaborative systems approach in all aspects of its operations. Our partner schools, college, and community partners through our Teacher Education Preparation Advisory Council (TEPAC) are actively engaged in the program evaluation and improvement process. TEPAC currently has an active membership of 30 persons (*see TEPAC Membership: Table 5.5a*), representative of education faculty, faculty from the Liberal Arts and Sciences, school partners, community leaders, alumni and candidates. The Council meets twice each semester to discuss a number of agenda items, including program evaluation. **Appendix 5.5A: TEPAC Meeting Agendas and Minutes** are provided as evidence of this ongoing partnership. It is out of these discussions that the EPP seeks out opportunities to make a greater impact in the education of children in our community schools. The need for financial support and resources for candidates led to several federal- and state-funded grants. These projects engage partners as Advisory Board members who collaborate in all aspects of project

management. Lists of board members on these projects in *Table 5.5b* as evidence of this ongoing stakeholder collaboration are reserved for on-site review.

Summary

The evidence provided for Standard 5 shows that the EPP has a well-organized quality assurance system that utilizes multiple measures, involves multiple stakeholders, and systematically uses multiple means to prepare, monitor, and continuously evaluate its programs. As the School of Education and its accompanying Center for Cognitive Development become more entrenched in their work, there will be ongoing stakeholder input. An **Action Plan** (Appendix 5.5B) charts the EPP's continuous improvement agenda.