

**Jacksonville State University
School of Education
Quality Assurance System**

Standard Five

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 to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

Quality and Strategic Evaluation

5.1: The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP standards.

5.2: The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
QAS Map	By Cycle	Bavonese
Schedule and Process Map	By Cycle	Bavonese
EPP Strategic Map	EPP overall; Program Specific	CAEP Committee
Instrument Development	Agendas, Narrative, Results of Cycles of Development	Bavonese
Instrument Implementation	Agendas, Narrative of Implementation, including professional development	Bavonese
Instrument Phase-In Plans for Advanced Programs	Stakeholder Groups, Agendas, Surveys for Content Validity, examples of iterations of development	Bavonese/Richards/Department Heads/Program Chairs

Continuous Improvement

5.3 Required Component: 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.

The EPP will hold regular and consistent data meetings that integrate data literacy strategies with program data at the initial and advanced levels. The EPP will collect and present evidence of the data meetings, processes for analysis, strategies for data literacy, actionable items, and plans to improve program elements and processes over time. The Associate Dean’s office along with the CAEP Committee is responsible for 5.3 and its evidence and documentation.

5.4 Requirement Component: 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.

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
CAEP Annual Measures	Annually	Bavonese/Bohannon
Academic & Non-Academic Performance Analysis	Annually	Bavonese/Richards/Barker/Koger/Light
Completer Case Study CLP + COBS, P12 Data	Annually	Richards/Committee
Completer Case Study edTPA Professional Growth Plan	Annually	Richards/Committee
Student Perception Surveys	Annually	Richards/Committee
State Survey Completers	Annually	Dean’s Office
State Survey Employers	Annually	Dean’s Office
Data Meeting Minutes	By Meeting	Bavonese/Bohannon
CAEP Meeting Minutes	By Meeting	Bavonese/Bohannon
Record of Changes	Evidence specific to changes made (syllabi, assignments, pre-post, etc)	Bavonese/D Heads/Dir
Innovations	Plans and results specific to criteria and supported by research	Bavonese/D Heads/Dir
Superintendents’ Consort	By Semester	Dean’s Office
Advisory Council Meeting Notes by Program, INI & Adv	By Meeting (at least annually)	Bavonese/Richards/D Heads/Program Chairs

SoE Newsletter	By Semester with updates on program impact and completer data, including milestones for completer employment and employer satisfaction, and updates on CAEP's required annual measures, innovations and changes, new initiatives drawn from data	Bavonese/Paynter
Completer Totals	Annually	Light/Koger

5.5 The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and other defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
Advisory Council Meeting Notes by Program, INI & Adv	By Meeting (at least annually)	Bavonese/Richards/D Heads/Program Chairs
Superintendents' Consort	By Semester	Dean's Office
Data Meeting Map	By Cycle (Semester)	CAEP Committee
Data Meeting Minutes	By Meeting	Bavonese/Bohannon
CAEP Meeting Minutes	By Meeting	Bavonese/Bohannon
Record of Changes	Evidence specific to changes made (syllabi, assignments, pre-post, etc)	Bavonese/D Heads/Dir
Website	Data Evidence and Narrative Reports	Bavonese/Bohannon
SoE Newsletter	By Semester with updates on program impact and completer data, including milestones for completer employment and employer satisfaction, and updates on CAEP's required annual measures, innovations and changes, new initiatives drawn from data	Bavonese/Paynter
SoE Newsletter	By Semester, Fall and Spring each academic year	Bavonese/Paynter
Board of Advocates	Annually as called by the Dean	Turner/Bavonese

Standard One: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

INITIAL

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

ADVANCED

The provider ensures that candidates for professional specialties develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their field of preparation and, by completion, are able to use professional specialty practices flexibly to advance the learning of all P-12 students toward attainment of college-and-career-readiness standards.

Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

1.1 Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC Standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
edTPA R 1-15, 16-18 EED	Total EPP; Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Barker/Richards
Praxis II Content	Disaggregated by Specialty Area; National or State Avg	Light/Koger/Richards
Ethics Assessment	(ED 302/501); (Internship); Total EPP; Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Barker/Richards
Dispositions Survey	At Selected Program Points, EPP; Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Barker/Richards
CLP + COBS	At Selected Program Points, EPP; Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Barker/Richards

Provider Responsibilities

1.2 Providers ensure that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students’ progress and their professional practice.

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
edTPA R 1-15, 16-18 EED	Total EPP; Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Barker
CLP + COBS	At Selected Program Points, EPP; Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Barker/Richards

1.3 Providers ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
edTPA R 1-15, 16-18 EED	Total EPP; Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Barker/Richards
Praxis II Content	Disaggregated by Specialty Area; National or State Avg	Light/Coger/Richards
CIEP Results (Approved Checklists)	Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Light/Coger
CIEP Submissions	Organized by Program	Bavonese
Program Outcome Assessments	Program specific assessments, included in semester EPP-wide data meetings and program advisory councils	Bavonese/Barker/D Heads/Program Chairs

1.4 Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career- ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards).

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
edTPA R 1-15, 16-18 EED	Total EPP; Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Barker
CLP + COBS	At Selected Program Points, EPP; Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Barker/Richards

1.5 Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning, and enrich professional practice.

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
CLP + COBS	At Selected Program Points, EPP; Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Barker/Richards
Technology Survey	(Internship); EPP; Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Barker/Richards
Technology Definition	EPP-created definition/aligned with ISTE/CAEP	Richards
Technology Chart	Chart of Technology Integration, EPP; Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Richards
Digital Learning COS	Plan for implementation EPP wide	Richards

Tech Café	Plan for Tech Café	Russell/Richards
Tech Café Data	Session Feedback	Russell/Richards

Advanced Standard A.1

A.1.1 Candidates for advanced preparation demonstrate their proficiencies to understand and apply knowledge and skills appropriate to their professional field of specialization so that learning and development opportunities for all P-12 are enhanced, through:

- Applications of data literacy;
- Use of research and understanding of qualitative, quantitative, and/or mixed methods research methodologies;
- Employment of data analysis and evidence to develop supportive school environments;
- Leading and/or participating in collaborative activities with others such as peers, colleagues, teachers, administrators, community organizations, and parents;
- Supporting appropriate applications of technology for their field of specialization; and
- Application of professional dispositions, laws and policies, codes of ethics and professional standards appropriate to their field of specialization.

A.1.2 Evidence of candidate content knowledge appropriate for the professional specialty will be documented by state licensure test scores or other proficiency measures.

Phase-In Applies for A.1. and A.1.2 Data Collection		
Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
A.1 Matrices	Annually to monitor curriculum	Bavonese/Richards
A.1 Table of Assessments	Annually to monitor assessments	Bavonese/Richards
EPP Created Assessments A.1 Data	Annually or dependent upon course rotation, disaggregated by advanced program	Barker/Bavonese/Richards
Content Validity Surveys	As needed for EPP-Created Assessments	Bavonese/Richards
Minutes; Agendas; Etc.	As needed: Superintendent's Consortium; Advanced Program Advisory Panels	Bavonese/Secretaries
LiveText Resources	Advanced Program Support Pages	Barker/Bavonese/Richards
Praxis (Green Programs)	Praxis Subject Assessment, disaggregated by advanced program (Green)	Light/Koger/Richards
Instrument Phase-In Plans for Advanced Programs	Stakeholder Groups, Agendas, Surveys for Content Validity, examples of iterations of development	Bavonese/Richards/Department Heads/Program Chairs

Praxis II	Proprietary Assessment (Library Media, Instructional Leadership, Reading Specialist)	Bavonese/Richards/Department Heads/Program Chairs/Faculty
-----------	--	---

Standard Two: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

INITIAL

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

ADVANCED

The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions appropriate for their field of specialization.

2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation, including technology-based collaborations, and share responsibility for continuous improvement of educator preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
MOU's	Copies of MOU's; emails; other documents	Hayes
CEU's Awarded/Used	By Semester	Hayes
Content Validity Surveys	As needed for EPP-Created Assessments	Bavonese/Richards
Minutes; Agendas; Etc	As needed: Superintendent's Consortium; Advisory Panels	Bavonese/Secretaries
Shared Responsibility List	Common Clinical Agenda & Rubric	Hayes/Barker
Data Meetings	Internal & External Stakeholders; Agendas/Minutes	Bavonese/Secretaries
Evidence of Change	Agendas/Minutes/Syllabi/Artifacts/Rubric Data	Bavonese/Barker/Richards
LiveText Resource Page	CT confirmation of information	Barker
Reverse Career Fair	Program and Participation Data from annual Reverse Career Fair	Light/Russell/Bavonese
Professional Experiences	Annually	Barker/Bavonese/Richards
Technology Fair	Annually/Stats from participation/schools/volunteers/candidates	Russell/Richards

2.2 Clinical Educators Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both EPP and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates’ development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
Technology Based Collaboration	Co-Teaching Training Documentation/on Common Clinical Agenda	Hayes/Barker
Technology Based Collaboration	LiveText FEM Dashboard/on Common Clinical Agenda	Hayes/Barker
Technology Based Collaboration	CT Training via Video/on Common Clinical Agenda	Hayes/Barker
LiveText Resource Page	Visitor Pass/on Common Clinical Agenda	Hayes/Barker
CT, US Performance	Survey Data	Bavonese/Barker
If/Then Flow Chart	Pair with CT, US Performance Data + Program Needs	Russell/Hayes
Recruit/Retain/PD CT, US	Clinical Experiences Committee Minutes/Agenda/PD Plans, etc.	Russell/Hayes

2.3 Clinical Experiences The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students’ learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple, performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates’ development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
Minutes; Agendas; Etc	As needed: Superintendent’s Consortium; Advisory Panels	Bavonese/Secretaries
Evidence of Change	Agendas/Minutes/Syllabi/Artifacts/Rubric Data	Bavonese/Barker/Richards
Clinical Scope & Sequence	EPP Wide; Program Specific Charts	Light/Koger

Diverse Settings	EPP Wide; Disaggregated by Program, Clinical Trace	Hayes
Diverse Populations	EPP Wide; Disaggregated by Program	Hayes

Advanced Standard A.2

A.2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of advanced program candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for advanced program candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for advanced candidate program outcomes.

Phase-In Applies for A.2.1 Data Collection		
Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
MOU's	Copies of MOU's; emails; other documents	Hayes
CEU's Awarded/Used	By Semester	Hayes
Content Validity Surveys	As needed for EPP-Created Assessments	Bavonese/Richards
EPP Created Assessments A.1	Annually or dependent upon course rotation	Barker/Bavonese/Richards
Instrument Phase-In Plans for Advanced Programs	Stakeholder Groups, Agendas, Surveys for Content Validity, examples of iterations of development	Bavonese/Richards/Department Heads/Program Chairs
Minutes; Agendas; Etc	As needed: Superintendent's Consortium; Advanced Program Advisory Panels	Bavonese/Secretaries
Shared Responsibility List	Green Programs Handbooks for Clinical Experiences	Advanced Program Faculty
Data Meetings	Internal & External Stakeholders; Agendas/Minutes	Bavonese/Secretaries
Evidence of Change	Agendas/Minutes/Syllabi/Artifacts/Rubric Data	Bavonese/Barker/Richards
LiveText Resources	Advanced Program Support Pages	Barker/Bavonese/Richards

A.2.2 The provider works with partners to design varied and developmental clinical settings that allow opportunities for candidates to practice applications of content knowledge and skills that the courses and other experiences of the advanced program emphasize. The opportunities lead to appropriate culminating experiences in which candidates demonstrate their proficiencies, through problem-based tasks or research (e.g. qualitative, quantitative, mixed methods, action) that are characteristic of their professional specialization as detailed in component A.1.1).

Phase-In Applies for A.2.2 Data Collection		
Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
MOU's	Copies of MOU's; emails; other documents	Russell/Hayes
CEU's Awarded/Used	By Semester	Russell/Hayes
EPP Created Assessments A.1	Annually or dependent upon course rotation	Barker/Bavonese/Richards
Instrument Phase-In Plans for Advanced Programs	Stakeholder Groups, Agendas, Surveys for Content Validity, examples of iterations of development	Bavonese/Richards/Department Heads/Program Chairs
Minutes; Agendas; Etc	As needed: Superintendent's Consortium; Advanced Program Advisory Panels	Bavonese/Secretaries
Shared Responsibility List	Green Programs Handbooks for Clinical Experiences	Advanced Program Faculty
Data Meetings	Internal & External Stakeholders; Agendas/Minutes	Bavonese/Secretaries
Evidence of Change	Agendas/Minutes/Syllabi/Artifacts/Rubric Data	Bavonese/Barker/Richards
LiveText Resources	Advanced Program Support Pages	Barker/Bavonese/Richards

Standard Three: Candidate Quality, Selectivity, and Progress

INITIAL

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

ADVANCED

The provider demonstrates that the quality of advanced program candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility so that completers are prepared to perform effectively and can be recommended for certification where applicable.

Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidate Who Meet Employment Needs

3.1 The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support completing of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America’s P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
Cohort Demographics	Annually to inform recruitment, retention and support plans as progress monitoring measure	Bavonese/Coger
Recruitment Plan	Annually with performance measures each semester	Trucks/Hammack
Retention Plan	Annually with performance measures each semester	Trucks/Hammack
Marketing Plan	Annually with performance measures each semester	Trucks/Hammack
Recruitment Events	Digital Evidence, Agenda, Planning Notes, Results	Dean’s Office
Social Media Recruitment	Reach/EPP; Disaggregated by Program	Bohannon
Virtual Recruitment Activities	Digital evidence, by semester	Trucks/Hammack
TEP Articulation CC	Annually	Dean’s Office

Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement

3.2 *Required Component:* The provider meets CAEP minimum criteria or the state’s minimum criteria for academic achievement, whichever are higher, and gathers disaggregated data on the enrollment candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year.

*See additional details in CAEP Manual p. 39

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
Average GPA	GPA of defined Cohort; Teaching Field + Rationale	Light/Koger
ACT + Writing	Institutional, State, and National Results of Cohort	Light/Koger
ED 302/501/MU244	By Semester/GPA/Recommendations	Bavonese/Richards

Additional Selectivity Factors

3.3 Educator preparation providers establish and monitor attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. The provider selects criteria, describes the measures used and evidence of the reliability and validity of those measures, and reports data that show how the academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.

Selectivity During Preparation

3.4 The provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates’ advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach to college-and-career-ready standards. Providers present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates’ developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all of these domains.

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
CLP + COBS	At Selected Program Points, EPP; Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Barker/Richards
TCDA	At Selected Program Points, EPP; Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Barker/Richards
TCPoA	As needed for candidate support	D Heads
GPA	By Semester/GPA & D/F Policy	Assoc Dean’s Office
Academic and Non-Academic Performance Analysis	Annually, EPP; Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Bavonese/Richards

Selection at Completion

3.5 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard of content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development.

3.6 Before the provider recommends any candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate understands the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards for practice, and relevant laws and policies. CAEP monitors the development of measures that assess candidates' success and revises standards in light of new results.

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
edTPA	Overall and by program, by task, by rubric	Bavonese/Barker
CLP + COBS	At Selected Program Points, EPP; Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Barker/Richards
TCDA	At Selected Program Points, EPP; Disaggregated by Specialty Area	Barker/Richards
TCPoA	As needed for candidate support	D Heads
Praxis II Content	Disaggregated by program	Light/Coger/Richards
Checkout for Internship	Narrative of Process/Number of Checkouts	TES Team

Advanced Standard 3

A.3.1 The provider sets goals and monitors progress for admission and support of high-quality advanced program candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America's teacher pool, and over time, should reflect the diversity of P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for school and district staff prepared in advanced fields.

Phase-In Applies for A.3.1 Data Collection		
Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
Graduate Cohort Demographics	Annually to inform recruitment, retention and support plans as progress monitoring measure	Bavonese/Coger/D Heads, Program Chairs
Recruitment Plan	Annually with performance measures each semester	Trucks/Hammack
Retention Plan	Annually with performance measures each semester	Trucks/Hammack
Marketing Plans	Annually with performance measures each semester	Trucks/Hammack

Advanced Program Cohorts in Shortage Areas	Annually with performance measures each semester	Trucks/Hammack
--	--	----------------

A.3.2 The provider sets admission requirements for academic achievement, including CAEP minimum criteria, the state’s minimum criteria, or graduate school minimum criteria, whichever is highest, and gathers data to monitor candidates from admission to completing.

Phase-In Applies for A.3.2 Data Collection		
Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
Gateway Data	Annually	Light/Koger/Richards
Cohort Average GPA at Admission	Annually as collected by Graduate Studies via application materials and provided to the SoE, GPA captured will be undergraduate final GPA posted on the matriculated transcript OR the most recent final GPA from a graduate degree posted on the matriculated transcript	Bavonese/Richards/JSU Graduate School

A.3.3 The provider creates criteria for program progression and uses disaggregated data to monitor candidates’ advancement from admissions to completion.

Phase-In Applies for A.3.3 Data Collection		
Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
Gateway Data	Annually, disaggregated by advanced program	Light/Koger/Richards
Average GPA	Annually, disaggregated by advanced program	Light/Koger/Richards
Praxis (Green Programs)	Annually, disaggregated by advanced program	Light/Koger/Richards
Graduate Checkout Plan	By semester, disaggregated by advanced program	Bavonese/JSU Graduate Studies/Teacher Education Services/Program Chairs

A. 3.4 Before the provider recommends any advanced program candidate for completion, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the field of specialization, data literacy, and research-driven decision making, effective use

of collaborative skills, applications of technology, and applications of dispositions, laws, codes of ethics, and professional standards appropriate for the field.

Phase-In Applies for A.3.4 Data Collection		
Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
Multiple Measures A.1	Annually, disaggregated by advanced program	Barker/Richards
Praxis (Green Programs)	Annually, disaggregated by advanced program	Light/Koger/Richards
GPA	Annually, disaggregated by advanced program	Light/Koger/Richards
Instrument Phase-In Plans for Advanced Programs	Stakeholder Groups, Agendas, Surveys for Content Validity, examples of iterations of development	Bavonese/Richards/Department Heads/Program Chairs

Standard Four: Program Impact

INITIAL

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

ADVANCED

The provider documents the satisfaction of its completers from advanced preparation programs and their employers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development

4.1 *Required Component:* The provider documents, using multiple measures that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. Multiple measures shall include all available growth measures (including value-added measures, student growth percentiles, and student learning and development objectives) required by the state for its teachers and available to educator preparation providers, other state-supported P-12 impact measures, and any other measures employed by the employer.

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
P-12 Student Learning Outcomes	Annually as Case Study Artifacts	Richards/Committee

P-12 Student Perception Surveys	Annually as Case Study Artifacts	Richards/Program Impact Committee
State Completer Surveys	Annually	Richards/Program Impact Committee
State Employer Surveys	Annually	Richards/Program Impact Committee
Phase-In Plan	Evidence of case study development with indicators of P-12 student learning and development	Richards/Program Impact Committee

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

4.2 *Required Component:* The provider demonstrates, through structured and validated observation instruments and/or student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
Completer Case Study 1 st -3 rd year Completors	Annually (Includes CLP + COBS, P-12 Student Learning Outcomes, P-12 Student Perception Surveys, Interviews), EPP-Wide; Disaggregated by Program	Richards/Program Impact Committee
edTPA© Professional Growth Plan	Annually as Case Study Artifacts	Richards/Program Impact Committee
State Completer Surveys	Annually	Richards/Program Impact Committee
State Employer Surveys	Annually	Richards/Program Impact Committee

Satisfaction of Employers

4.3 *Required Component:* The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data and including employment milestones such as promotion and retention, that employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
Employer Interviews	Annually as Case Study Artifacts	Richards/Program Impact Committee

State Completer Surveys	Annually	Richards/Program Impact Committee
State Employer Surveys	Annually	Richards/Program Impact Committee

Satisfaction of Completers

4.4 *Required Component:* The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.

Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
Completer Interviews	Annually as Case Study Artifacts	Richards/Program Impact Committee
edTPA© Professional Growth Plan	Annually as Case Study Artifacts	Richards/Program Impact Committee
Completer Focus Groups	Annually as Case Study Artifacts	Richards/Program Impact Committee
State Completer Surveys	Annually	Richards/Program Impact Committee
State Employer Surveys	Annually	Richards/Program Impact Committee

Advanced Standard A.4

A.4.1 The provider demonstrates that employers are satisfied with completers' preparation and that completers reach employment milestones such as promotion and retention.

Phase-In Applies for A.4.1 Data Collection		
Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
Employer Satisfaction Meetings	Annually for the EPP, disaggregated by advanced program on a continuous cycle	Bavonese/Richards/Advanced P Faculty
Employer Satisfaction Survey for Advanced Program	Annually for the EPP, disaggregated by advanced program on a continuous cycle	Bavonese/Richards/Advanced P Faculty

Employer Advanced Focus Groups	Annually for the EPP, disaggregated by advanced program on a continuous cycle aligned with goals selected via JSU SoE Advanced Programs Protocol	Bavonese/Richards/ Advanced P Faculty
--------------------------------	--	--

A.4.2 The provider demonstrates that advanced program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.

Phase-In Applies for A.4.2 Data Collection		
Assessment/Evidence	How Reported	Person(s) Responsible
Completer Advanced Focus Groups	Annually for the EPP, disaggregated by advanced program on a continuous cycle aligned with goals selected via JSU SoE Advanced Programs Protocol	Bavonese/Richards/ Advanced P Faculty
Completer Satisfaction Survey for Advanced Program	Annually for the EPP, disaggregated by advanced program on a continuous cycle	Bavonese/Richards/ Advanced P Faculty