

# 2019 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	10841	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	3850
<b>Institution:</b>	University of Rhode Island		
<b>Unit:</b>	School of Education		

## Section 1. AIMS Profile

After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate.

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure <sup>1</sup>	148
2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.) <sup>2</sup>	39

**Total number of program completers** 187

<sup>1</sup> For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

<sup>2</sup> For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

**Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2017-2018 academic year?**

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.
- 3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited  
 The EPP now offers a TESOL/Dual Language (BDL) extension for all our initial licensure programs.
- 3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited
- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements
- Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:
- 3.6 Change in regional accreditation status
- 3.7 Change in state program approval  
 The School Psychology program did not submit materials for state program approval in 2017. The department has suspend

admissions as of Fall 2017, and discussions are taking place regarding the future continuation of the program.

### Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4   A.5.4)	
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3   A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4   A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

4.1 Provide a link or links that demonstrate data relevant to each of the Annual Reporting Measures are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's website.

1

**Link:** <https://web.uri.edu/education/about/>

**Description of data accessible via link:** On our about page the SOE lists completion rates, accreditation reports, employment data within Rhode Island, and performance data of recent graduates

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

*What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?  
 Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?  
 Are benchmarks available for comparison?  
 Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?*

- The following are recent examples of how faculty have made program improvements and how data is collected regarding these efforts:
1. Through the GEMSNet program, elementary program faculty meet with principals three times a year, superintendents 3 times a year, and teacher leaders 4 times a year to collect feedback on the GEMSNet and elementary programs. Every three years, the GEMSNet program sets goals with each district as part of the MOU process. Additionally, the GEMSNet program has approximately 20 years of data collected at workshops from clinical educators and teacher candidates.
  2. The elementary program recently added the opportunity for students to add additional certifications during their undergraduate program in addition to working towards the elementary certification. Elementary students now can complete their elementary and TESOL certifications in 4 years or their elementary and special education certifications in 4.5 years. This change was based on feedback from districts that they have hiring needs for special education and TESOL teachers and data analyzed from the ED-PREP index provided by RIDE annually. RIDE has approved these changes and supports our shortage area efforts.
  3. Secondary mathematics faculty meets monthly with clinical educators from the field to connect current best practices with the secondary mathematics curriculum and address the work of current student teachers.
  4. Faculty from the music education program consistently meets with professionals in the Rhode Island Music Association (RIMEA) participating and assisting with workshops that address best practices in the field such as integrating the new National Arts

Standards into music curriculums and lesson planning as well as exploring the Common Music Assessment that has recently been implemented in Massachusetts and Connecticut.

5. Faculty from the School Library Media program consistently meet with professionals from their professional organization to ask for best practices in the field and how to incorporate this into the program. The faculty also discuss program needs and initiatives twice yearly at the Graduate School of Library and Information Studies Advisory Board meetings.

6. Completer recommendations from our completers satisfaction survey and feedback from Rhode Island special education leaders, the special education program, through the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), regularly invites special education teachers, parents of children with disabilities, disability organization leaders, special education directors, and related services professionals to speak to students about supporting individuals with disabilities in their classrooms.

7. Given the severe shortage of TESOL and dual-language teachers in this state, a grant was awarded from Title II and a subsequent intervention was conducted for program success. Participants were given pre and post-tests in Common Core aligned elementary math content and in content from the Praxis Test for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. They were also observed teaching a math lesson in the spring of 2018 to evaluate their effectiveness at implementing TESOL instructional strategies. A follow up observation was then conducted the following fall semester. The results of analyses of testing and observation data show a statistically significant improvement in tests scores on both the math and TESOL assessments. Increases in observation scores were also statistically significant for all but two of the SIOP categories.

8. URI's Talent Development (TD) program serves Rhode Island high school graduates who come from disadvantaged backgrounds. A majority of TD students are students of color. School of Education faculty members meet monthly with the director of TD and TD advisors to inform SOE program evaluation and improvement.

9. Programs continue to report section 5 in the professional association reports, which addresses program improvements based on data analysis.

Gathering feedback and information from stakeholders and community partners is a priority for continuous improvement and program evaluation. Feedback is gathered at the program level through faculty and university supervisors and at the unit level through the directors of the School of Education and the Office of Teacher Education, faculty, and staff. Feedback is gathered through surveys (completers and employers), networking at professional association and state level meetings, and meetings with clinical educators and various other stakeholders.

Representatives from the School of Education have elicited feedback from stakeholders from across the state in multiple ways throughout the year:

1) Through the URI Council for Teacher Education, various K-12 representatives collaborated with teacher preparation faculty in fall of 2018 to revise the student impact assessment sequence within each program. Stakeholder feedback was used to align the expectations of impact assessment assignments with current practice.

2) Based on partnership work started in 2016 between the directors of the School of Education and the Office of Teacher Education, along with teacher preparation faculty members, the collaboration with the South Kingstown Public School District, the Exeter-West Greenwich Public School District, and the Chariho Regional School District continues to grow. In addition to representatives from these districts providing feedback on student impact assessments (example above, #1), these districts have also collaborated with elementary faculty to align student assessment with student teaching and beginning teacher expectations in relation to district assessment systems. The result of this mutually beneficial collaboration is the modification of how student teachers are prepared to assess student learning, as well as district expectations regarding beginning teacher support needed for assessment.

3) The director of the Office of Teacher Education is a member of the Rhode Island Placements and Partnership Consortium and serves on the Rhode Island State Leadership Team for CEEDAR. Both groups work towards deeper partnership work between higher education and K-12 districts.

4) The Director of the School of Education has been working with the Pathway to Teaching state-wide workgroup, as well as a team of faculty and K-12 district partners from Central Falls RI to design and grow pipelines into teacher preparation.

5) In addition to face-to-face meetings, stakeholders and community partners have access to our Rhode Island Educator Preparation Index data on our website and can leave feedback on our embedded survey, located on the same page. Various stakeholders and community partners are surveyed for feedback regarding programs and communication.

6) At the program level, feedback is regularly gathered in multiple ways through faculty and university supervisors. University supervisors meet with clinical educators monthly to review progress with student teachers. Through these meetings, information is gathered regarding the impact of the program on candidates and classrooms. The information gathered at these meetings is used to improve curriculum and feedback to candidates.

7) Representatives from the URI School of Education meet with superintendents, assistant superintendents, curriculum leaders, and district human resource professionals through the RIDE yearly network meetings.

## Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

### **NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:**

- 1 Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with faculty from diverse populations. (ITP (ADV ) )**
- 2 Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with peers from diverse racial and ethnic groups. (ITP (ADV ) )**

The School of Education has recently hired:

- a Black, female full-time student advisor to work with accepted undergraduates in the College of Education and Professional Studies.
- a Hispanic, full-time tenure track assistant professor (split between Spanish/Department of Modern Languages and Educator Preparation in the School of Education) to lead the K-12 World Languages teacher certification program.
- a Middle Eastern, full-time tenure-track assistant professor for the TESOL/DLI teacher certification program.

The School hired a black male, full time lecturer (1 year appointment) for teaching EDC 102 Foundations of Education and EDC 103G Education and Social Justice for the 2018-2019 academic year.

Candidates:

The School of Education believes that more work is needed in the area of outreach to the larger university population in terms of recruiting diverse candidates. The School of Education has a strong, long-standing relationship with Talent Development (TD). TD advisors also reach out for advice on students who are considering applying to the SOE. At the University's annual Freshman Orientation, intensive advisement is provided to diverse students who have expressed interest in an education program, and a one-on-one meeting with an appropriate education advisor is guaranteed. This provides an opportunity to make initial contact with diverse candidates.

SOE advisors also attend an annual "Majors Fair" for university students who remain 'undecided' in choice of major, and are specifically seeking a clear academic/career direction. This setting provides an opportunity to provide targeted encouragement to diverse students, offer important program information, and encourage a follow-up one-on-one advisement meeting. EDC 280, offered every semester, has been significant to our recruitment efforts because students who need additional targeted preparation are assured support; TD & education advisors recommend this class to diverse candidates. The School of Education faculty member serves as the liaison to the Living/Learning community which provides both a common living space and programming and, during the first semester at the University, 3 out of 5 common classes.

The School of Education has reached out to undeclared students from diverse racial and ethnic groups that qualify for direct acceptance (Teacher Education Scholar/TES) through email. The School of Education has begun to investigate additional methods to reach out and support students from racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds, such as working with the RI Department of Education through workshops, and partnering with the URI Office of Strategic Initiatives.

The SOE also has secured alumni support through the URI Foundation to help defray testing costs that enable students with demonstrated need.

Efforts are also systematic with the focus of our grant writing to help with minority recruitment. An example is the NOYCE scholarship, which was applied for in three consecutive years, to attract underrepresented groups and those interested in working in urban schools. Scholarships through this program award \$10,000 for several undergraduates per semester and \$40,000 to a graduate student. In addition, The Eddy Scholarship, funded through the URI foundation, awards funds to graduates of urban high schools.

### **NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 6 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:**

- 1 The unit does not have sufficient administrative support staff to ensure the effective and efficient operation of the unit for the preparation of educators. (IT (AD P) V)**

The Office of Teacher Education has recently hired a full-time staff coordinator for field placements to work in the Office of Teacher Education. The main role of this person is to secure field placements for teacher candidates across all teacher preparation programs.

## Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

*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.*

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

*The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.*

**6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.**

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloguing continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs  
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

Using data and feedback provided by the Rhode Island Department of Education's (RIDE) Program Approval Process (PREP-RI, 2017) and our last NCATE visit (2015), the following unit-wide modifications and innovations have been implemented to increase capacity and quality of programs:

1) Based on feedback that one area for improvement for the School of Education (SOE) is in resources (PREP-RI and NCATE), the SOE has taken great strides in leveraging technology to increase the capacity of the unit to allow for streamlined data collection, outcomes analysis, and reporting of key candidate data.

a. The Unit launched its fully online application through FileMaker, where candidate data now flows directly into the database. The unit has also moved to an exclusively online admissions portfolio process and the interview requests for applicants are done through Google calendar. The Unit produces all admissions letters through FileMaker, in addition to placement request forms. All faculty, including external program leaders such as music education and physical education, have been given access to FileMaker to encourage data sharing, accurate teacher candidate tracking, and cohesive communication between stakeholders. The Unit continues to work on adding other automated features, such as connecting the FileMaker Database directly to Educational Testing Service's (ETS) database to allow for all testing data to flow directly into FileMaker when a candidate takes a licensure exam. Current automated features include: the ability to track the field progressions of a candidate from point of entry to program exit by running a simple report function; the clearance reporting feature, which allows the Office of Teacher Education (OTE) to assure each candidate has met the benchmarks required to move from each critical transition point to the next. OTE can also track the number of attempts a candidate has taken a licensure exam prior to student teaching.

b. The School of Education at URI is entering its 8th continuous year of using TaskStream (now Watermark) as its outcomes assessment platform. Field supervisors and cooperating teachers also interact with the system. The School of Education has complete data sets for all assessments required for accreditation and state program approval. Faculty and candidates found the program very easy to navigate and customer support is very knowledgeable. Exit surveys administered through TaskStream have response rates above 95%. The Outcomes Assessment Specialist for the School of Education has run reports showing how candidates are performing on both national and state standards by aligning the standards to the assessments. It has allowed data analysis at a very high level to better shape program improvement.

2) Faculty and district partners collaborated to review our program impact assessments during the 2018-2019 academic year to assure we are in sync with the new CAEP standard regarding impact, as well as respond to PREP-RI feedback on student impact assessments. We have a three-scaffolded assignment sequence for every program assessing student impact during key points in the program. We are now focusing on professional dispositions. During the 2019-2020 academic year we will research, review, and

adopt a reliable and valid dispositional rubric to measure dispositions throughout the program, culminating with a summative evaluation during the student teaching experience.

3) The URI Council for Teacher Education (CTE) collaborates across all teacher preparation programs, including programs situated in the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Health Sciences. Communication and collaboration between teacher preparation programs were noted as areas for improvement in our NCATE and PREP-RI feedback. To respond to this, CTE has been revitalized this year with specific goals and activities. By strategizing and prioritizing our CTE work, we have increased the breadth and depth of our collaboration and innovation, including district partners to support our program improvement efforts.

4) Individual programs continue to analyze data for their respective national content area professional reports e.g., Elementary Education's Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI); Early Childhood Education's National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), Secondary Science's National Science Teachers Association (NSTA), and Physical Education's National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE).

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the data or changes apply.

3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students  
A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or s activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

Yes  No

6.3 Optional Comments

## Section 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a successful transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful reporting regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPP's evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progress in addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level.

If there are no identified gaps, click the box next to "No identified gaps" and proceed to question 7.2.

No identified gaps

If there are identified gaps, please summarize the gaps and any steps planned or taken toward the gap(s) to be prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text applies.

Faculty and district partners collaborated to review our program impact assessments during the 2018-2019 academic year to assure we are in sync with the new CAEP standard regarding impact, as well as respond to PREP-RI feedback on student impact assessments. We have a three-scaffolded assignment sequence for every program assessing student impact during key points in the program. We are now focusing on professional dispositions.

During the 2019-2020 academic year we will research, review, and adopt a reliable and valid dispositional rubric to measure dispositions throughout the program, culminating with a summative evaluation during the student teaching experience.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the text applies.

3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students  
A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

Yes  No

7.3 If no, please describe any changes that mean that the EPP does not continue to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

## Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

**Preparer's authorization.** By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2019 EPP Annual Report.

**I am authorized to complete this report.**

### Report Preparer's Information

Name: Joshua Smith  
Position: Outcomes Assessment and Accreditation  
Phone: 401 874 7404  
E-mail: josh@uri.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

### Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completion data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

### Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes,

including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site visit report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

 **Acknowledge**