

Site Visit Report

CAEP Site Visit Team:

Dr. Malina K. Monaco
Dr. Michael Cosimano
Dr. Traci Tuttle
Mrs. Jodi L. Becker

State Team:

N/A

State Consultant:

Ángel Loredó

NEA or AFT Representative:

N/A

Selected Improvement Pathway

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE AT FARMINGTON

College of Education, Health &
Rehabilitation

186 High Street

Farmington, ME 04938

November 5, 2017 12:00 a.m.

CONFIDENTIAL

CAEP Site Visit Report Selected Improvement Pathway

Section I Introduction

Overview of the EPP and program offerings: (focus on differences between what was stated in the Formative Feedback Report and what was verified onsite.)

Much of the information contained in the Self-Study Report (SSR) and SSR Addendum was confirmed at the site visit. The EPP clearly has strong relationships with the community, particularly at the individual staff and faculty level. The "town to gown" relationship is quite important to both entities. The EPP is located in a rural area. Many joint activities and collaborations on large projects connect the community and EPP. The community values the EPP, its candidates, and completers. The EPP, in turn, supports the P-12 community and provides resources and support for educational improvement. The site team was impressed with the level of commitment both ways. The SSR was originally loaded improperly and the site team was not able to provide feedback on Standards 3-5. The Addendum addressed the technical issue and provided answers to most of the AFIs and all the Stipulation in the FFR. The EPP has worked very hard to create a suite of assessments aligning to CAEP standards and simultaneously transition new assessments while phasing out existing measures. For the most part, the transition has been smooth, however, some areas for improvement emerged as this process unfolded.

Summary of state partnership that guided the visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or a CAEP-only visit)

This was a joint review with the State of Maine. There were four official members of the state team and one observer, who did not have any formal role, present during the site visit. The state team was responsible for writing to state standards 5 and 6 and were present in interviews and in the campus workroom.

Special circumstances of the onsite review, if any. (Example: No unusual circumstances affected the visit.)

No unusual circumstances affected the site visit.

Section II CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence

Standard 1: 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, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

1. Tasks completed by the team:

Task(s)

	Confirm outcome data
	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
1.	(1) Results of state program review submitted during the summer of 2017.
	B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed
	C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

	Congruence of assessments
	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
	B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed
2.	C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
	(1) How do the previous assessments align to the current assessments?
	(2) What role do the additional assessments (not mentioned above) play in the overall assessment plan for continuous and/or selected improvement?

	Technology assessment of candidates
	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
3.	(1) Assessment plan with required components aligned to technology standards that are required of candidates from all licensure areas.
	B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed
	C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
	(1) How are candidates' abilities to incorporate technology assessed?
	(2) How does the EPP ensure that all candidates in all programs are proficient

in the use of technology?

Action:

1. All tasks successfully completed through SSR addendum, onsite interviews, onsite evidences. All evidences reviewed by team are compiled, by standard, in Sources of Evidence section of report under: List of all evidences File.
2. Analysis regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 1 :
 - a. Narrative analysis of findings

The data provided for Standard 1 include three cycles of data, have been disaggregated by specialty licensure area, is sequential and updated data were included onsite or in the addendum (1.6, 1.9, 1.11, 1.12, 1.26-1.30). The new EPP-wide lesson plan rubric is the only tool without three cycles of data; pilot data were provided in the addendum for one cycle (1.17; 1.18). The EPP has provided evidence that candidates demonstrate understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression levels. The learning goals developed by the EPP provide evidence that the driving mission and vision of the EPP are aligned to InTASC and Maine state standards for teacher preparation (1.24.5). The disposition and professional expectations rubric was redesigned in fall 2015 and is collected at the points of pre-candidacy, pre-student teaching, and during student teaching. The CCTS standards rationale and rubric was redesigned in fall 2016 and is assessed during pre-student teaching and during student teaching. The EPP-wide Lesson Plan Assessment was piloted in fall 2016 and is collected during pre-student teaching and student teaching. (5.5.1) The EPP also uses three additional assessments collected only during student teaching to help validate previously collected data. The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) has been in place in the program since 2009, the EPP recently added the Panorama Student Survey in fall 2014, and the Classroom Management Observation checklist was developed in fall 2015 (5.5.1).

The EPP has ensured that candidates can apply content and pedagogical knowledge appropriate to their content and level. They have provided evidence that all candidates are instructed in content-specific methods courses in alignment with state expectations. The Lesson Plan Assessment (1.17) allows consistent evaluation of candidates across all six programs. The EPP has provided evidence that they were able to gather and analyze data in each of these areas by each section and were also able to disaggregate data at both the pre-student teaching and student teaching levels and by licensure area (1.17). Initial data indicate that the majority of candidates have met or exceeded the standard of proficiency set by the EPP on all required components and across licensure areas. The Panorama Student Survey was adapted by the EPP and used by all student teachers across licensure areas (1.12). The survey includes three scales of the nine original scales: Pedagogical Effectiveness, Expectations and Rigor, and Supportive Relationships. The EPP Field Supervisors also adjusted the questions

developmentally and adjusted to a 3 point scale for use in K-2 classrooms. The EPP has aligned all sections of the rubric to collect information on the Learner and Learning from the P-12 students perspective.

The EPP has provided evidence that candidates' program requirements include adequate preparation in content in accordance with state expectations (1.19; 1.31). The Early Childhood Education (1.24.6), Early Childhood Special Education (1.24.8), and Elementary Education (1.24.9) Programs all meet the liberal arts content coursework and content-methods required by the state review process. The secondary education programs all include the required content and content-methods course work required by the state (1.24.8). Additional evidence of content mastery has been provided through pass rates on the state designated Praxis II Content assessments (1.10). All licensure areas were above an 80% pass rate; most were above 90% and many were at 100%. This met or exceeded the state and national averages. The EPP has also provided evidence of their analysis of candidate data, which includes a recent decline in candidate performance. The EPP has responded to the decline by providing additional test taking supports to candidates to cover recent revisions to the assessments (1.19.1).

The EPP has provided evidence that candidates can provide learning opportunities so that all students have access to college and career ready standards. The Teacher Work Sample has been implemented by the EPP during the clinical student teaching experience since 2009 with periodic revision. The EPP has presented three cycles of data that are disaggregated by licensure area. The majority of candidates in all licensure areas met or exceeded the minimal guideline set by the EPP. The Classroom Management Observation Checklist assesses candidates' ability to create an effective learning environment for all students. Indicators for "Teacher Behavior" are the following: Instructional Management Strategies; Preventative Management Strategies; Behavior Intervention Strategies; and, Classroom Climate (1.13). The majority of candidates in the 2015-16 pilot were at or above the EPP acceptable standard. Several mentors indicated varying levels of candidate proficiency with expectations, both mentors and candidates indicated that they needed additional preparation or independent research to have the content knowledge, and in some cases, pedagogical knowledge to meet the needs of all classroom students. Specifically, several alumni stated they were not prepared to use the technology available in their classrooms, were discouraged from requesting placements at the middle grade levels, or had difficulty knowing how to support English Language Learners in the classroom. The lack of knowledge of supporting ELL students is consistent with the information provided in the Alumni survey (4.2) and information presented by current candidates. Current candidates indicated in their interview that they were only required to complete a field experience in a setting with ELL students if they were seeking an ELL certification. They also confirmed the information obtained from current student teachers that placement in a nearby district with a large ELL population is an option for

student teaching, but most students do not request to be placed there unless they were originally from that area. Interviews with current EPP faculty and field supervisors provided evidence that current measures are in place to remediate this deficiency.

The EPP has implemented assessments that allow candidates the ability to practice and demonstrate ability in assessment, planning and content. Candidates practice these skills and they are assessed using the Lesson Plan assessment (1.17). It includes the optional sections on integration of other content and integration of technology. The the EPP has provided evidence that they were able to gather, analyze, and disaggregate data at both the pre-student teaching and student teaching levels and by licensure area at exceed the level of proficiency (1.17). Again, it should be noted that the technology integration requirement is optional and less than 50% of practicum candidates completed this section. The portfolio assessments both pre-student teaching and during student teaching require students to provide documentation that they have met ISTE standards for teachers in both of these portfolios.

Candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and development as professionals. The Disposition Rubric evaluates and provides feedback to students regarding their proficiency with nine different categories of professional dispositions (1.9). This assessment includes nine professional standards aligned with the Conceptual Framework and the InTASC standards. The Lesson Plan assessment and the TWS also include sections on self-reflection. Candidates must provide evidence for each of these standards in their documentation and rationales for the portfolios. The EPP also requires that candidates use technology to collect, display, and reflect on student performance and their teaching (1.11). The state has recently adopted proficiency-based learning and not all candidates are comfortable with this approach. Interviews with field mentors indicated many student teachers were taking the lead as experts in this area, but several of the graduates felt they were ill prepared. The previous director of teacher education accreditation indicated the data indicated the candidates did not feel confident, but alumni and employers evaluated the skills at a proficient or advanced level.

The EPP has provided evidence that candidates can model and apply technology standards. As part of the portfolio evaluation, all candidates are required to provide multiple artifacts and rationales that align to the ISTE standards for teachers (1.8). The EPP has provided course alignment of student required coursework for each program to the modified ISTE standards used by the EPP (1.22). The TWS requires that candidates use technology to display p-12 student data, make educational decisions, and reflect on their own teaching abilities. The three cycles of data presented by the EPP indicate that the majority of candidates in each licensure area met or exceeded the minimal guideline set by the EPP (1.11). Interviews with mentor teachers

indicated that current students are proficient in this area and often demonstrate new methods of monitoring student progress. Current student teachers indicated their current use of technology was dependent on their placement. This was confirmed in the narrative submitted for Standard 1 in the addendum. Interviews with current candidates indicated that this group was more knowledgeable about different types of technology available, but still not all candidates had experience in using technology in the field. They were, however, better able to discuss examples of how they are able to use technology to collect assessment information to inform instruction. They also confirmed that they use the online assessment management system to regularly submit artifacts of their proficiency in the 10 InTASC standards and reflect on their professional growth.

b. Analysis of Program-Level data

The state reviewed and approved all of the EPPs academic programs in compliance with Maine Chapter 115.

c. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1.6: CCTS Rubric
1.8: CCTS Rationale and Artifact Assessment
1.9: Teacher Candidate Dispositions and Professional Expectations
1.10: Praxis Exam Data
1.11: Contextual Factors Analysis/Teacher Work Sample
1.12: Panorama K-12 Student Survey
1.13: Classroom Management Observation Checklist
1.17: Unit-Wide Lesson Plan Pilot
1.18: Unit-Wide Lesson Plan Pilot - Feedback & Revisions
1.19: 2012-16 Praxis Data Addendum
1.19.1: Findings and Interpretations
1.22: Technology Integration and CAEP Standard
1.24.5: 2017 State Program Review-Education Programs General Information
1.24.6 2017 State Program Review-Education Programs Early Elementary Education
1.24.7 2017 State Program Review-Education Programs Early Childhood Special Education
1.24.8 2017 State Program Review-Education Programs Elementary Education
1.24.9 2017 State Program Review-Education Programs Secondary Middle Education
1.26: AY 2016-17 CCTS Rationales and Artifacts
1.27: AY 2016-17 Teacher Candidate Dispositions and Professional Expectations
1.28: AY 2016-17 Panorama Data
1.29: AY 2015-17 Classroom Management Report
1.30: AY 2016-17 Student Teacher Portfolio, CCTS Rationale and Artifact Rubric
1.31: Maine Dept of Education Program Approval Letter
5.5.1: TEU Assessment System Timeline

Interviews with candidates, student teachers, alumni, mentor teachers, field supervisors, and EPP faculty

d. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

4.2: Alumni Survey

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement

Area for Improvement	Rationale
None	

Stipulation:

Stipulation	Rationale
None.	

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

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.

1. Findings for each offsite report task to be verified onsite:

Task(s)

Evidence of collaboration in formal field experiences	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
(1)	What is the evidence for collaboration partnership input in selection of mentor teachers and making placements - especially in diverse schools as well as revising handbooks and programming?
(2)	What is the evidence of co-construction and designing of programming and field experiences including expectations, tools, assessments, accountability, etc.
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed	
1.	
(1)	Page 30: "...UMF has established a strong, collaborative network of community partners, including P-12 schools, private care providers, non-profit organizations, government agencies and committees, and professional organizations, who collectively contribute to nearly every component of UMF's preparation programs, especially clinical experiences."
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews	
(1)	Interview the Field Services office to verify placement information, collaboration with partners, etc. Need to see documentation of diverse placements for all students.
(2)	Interview administrators and mentor teachers from partner schools about co-construction of programming and field experiences.

Clinical Educator Evaluation and Feedback Plan tool and pilot data	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
2.	(1) Feedback tool and pilot data from mentors who agreed to participate
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed	
(1)	In evidence connected to SSR - EPP Plan: Clinical Educator Evaluation & Feedback Plan: "By the time of the fall CAAEP visit, we expect to have the

tool available, along with pilot data from those mentors who agreed to work with us."

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) What feedback was gathered on the tool and the plan. What has the unit done based on analysis of this feedback?

Digital observation

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Maine's iObservation data system and how it is being used in the program.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

3. (1) Page 34: "Beginning spring 2017, the Field Office commenced use of digital Field Experience Binders in Tk20...in which all stakeholders complete digital observation, assessment and self-assessment forms."

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) What is the outcome of the first use of digital Field Experience Binders and the iObservation evaluation tool? Was there enough professional development given to stakeholders to make them comfortable to this new process? What changes are being made based on the feedback received?

Action:

1. All tasks successfully completed through SSR addendum, onsite interviews, onsite evidences. All evidences reviewed by team are compiled, by standard, in Sources of Evidence section of report under: List of all evidences File.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 2 :

a. Summary of findings

Candidates in the University of Maine at Farmington Teacher Education Unit are provided with quality and varied field experiences throughout their program that give experiences in various aspects of the educational system. Students in every program spend at least 600 hours and up to 1000 hours in field experiences. Candidates begin formal experiences connected to course work in their sophomore year. Site visit interviews with alumni and stakeholders showed additional optional field experience opportunities through partnerships for after school programs, work studies, tutoring, etc. This verifies evidence in 2.5.1, Faculty Partnerships for Informal Field Experiences. The Field Services Office directs the placements in collaboration with partner schools, facilities and organizations. All of these partnerships include a Memorandum of Understanding (2.1.6 Universal Memorandum of Understanding) that details the responsibilities of all stakeholders to ensure effective and successful experiences. These MOUs do not provide evidence of the partner schools' input in the co-construction of these field experiences.

Site visit interviews suggest that there is an informal process for feedback and discussion of improvements in programming and assessment. Previous assessments seem to be EPP constructed followed by co-partner feedback for adjustments and modifications. However, newer assessments show co-construction with partners throughout the entire process with continual feedback and modification.

The partner schools for placements include those with diverse populations according to the Maine Department of Education profile. As noted in the addendum, "the seven schools within 10 miles of campus have an average of just 4.7% non-Caucasian students (half the percentage of the average Maine school), and none have a measurable population of English Language Learners (ELLs), however, 85.7% of these schools are Title I eligible and they have a higher percentage of students on Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) than the average Maine school." A majority of the students have their practicum and advanced practicum in this area with student teaching placements being made further away from the EPP based on where the student will be living during the student teaching semester. Evidence shows (2.7.1) in spring 2016-spring 2017, 100% were in high needs schools based on greater than 40% FRL, 94% in a Title 1 school; 22% in a school with ELL; 22% in schools with greater than 8.5% non-caucasian which is the state average. The Field Services office tracks placements for all students and can compare the placement schools to the state diversity data (2.7.2 field placement by student). It is a priority of the TEU to place candidates in diverse placements, but all students are not able to participate in a diverse field experience. Through onsite interviews, it was noted that within courses there are some additional informal activities that qualify as diverse activities, but these activities are not tracked by the Field Services Department.

The Field Experiences Handbook details all aspects of the experiences that candidates participate in to fulfill program requirements including assignments, responsibilities, assessments and tools, policies and procedures. There is also information in the handbook of the Protocol for student at Risk of Failing Field Experiences and a process for action plans.

For formal field experiences in partner schools, there is a set process. Practicum placements are made within a 20 mile radius of the University. The Director of Field Services works collaboratively with the principal of the school and the supervisor to make placements. Once a candidate applies to student teaching, the Director of Field Services reviews the applications and places them in cohorts based on where they will be living during the student teaching semester. She puts together information about each candidate and provides this information to the supervisor of that cohort. The supervisor interviews the student and contacts principals in the area about the students that need to be placed. The principal then nominates and recruits mentor teachers. The UMF Supervisor then meets with the administrator and mentor to ensure that there is a placement match and before a match is complete,

the mentor and candidate must meet. There is evidence that mentors must participate in a 1:1 training with the UMF Supervisor to ensure they understand the expectations, procedures, and assessments (2.2.3). Through interviews, this mentor induction process was required for new mentors, but it could be adjusted for returning mentors based on changes in tools and expectations. The EPP is struggling to ensure that the mentors participate in an inter-rater reliability protocol, so they are not including the mentor observation data for data analysis.

All UMF supervisors are full-time faculty and members of the education programs. Because of this, they have regular meetings to collaborate on program planning, professional development, assessment tools, etc. Supervisors also host weekly seminars with candidates. The EPP also has an Education Advisory Council (EAC) which includes alumni, P-12 stakeholders, and members of EPP's College Leadership Team (CLT). They meet regularly to develop and revise policies and tools, expectations, curriculum and PD. Data was provided in the Self-Study Report of minutes of these meetings that included data-based decisions that stem from this collaboration.

The Field Services Office provides professional development opportunities for the candidates as well as opening up opportunities for teachers in partner schools based on needs. Evidence was provided of multiple professional development opportunities including Civil Rights training, working with English Language Learners, Proficiency Based Education, working with trauma exposed children, etc. Through feedback with school partners, the EPP is also building customized professional development programs. The EPP created a Mathematics coaching Program to meet the needs in area schools where mathematics scores were remaining stagnant.

The EPP has made adjustments in programming based on feedback from partners. The Office of Graduate Studies is developing certificates to meet district needs. These certifications include Gifted and Talented (GT), Proficiency Based Education (PBE) and English Language Learners (ELL). The ELE program also elected to require an advanced practicum course for all elementary majors based on feedback from stakeholders. Based on a concern brought to the Educational Advisory Council, the Teacher Education Unit recognized the need to formalize the process for providing feedback to the mentors. The EPP worked collaboratively to develop the tool and process. The tool was provided as evidence at the site visit. Fall 2017 is the first time that the tool is being implemented.

The EPP has built significant partnerships in the community and area that provide the candidates with multiple opportunities to build knowledge and skills in practical situations. Examples of these activities include creating technology ELL instruction for students, creating STEM lessons for schools, becoming literacy mentors, etc. The EPP is continually building new partnerships to provide opportunities for candidates.

Progress monitoring of knowledge, skills and dispositions of candidates occurs multiple times during field experiences. Candidates must complete the following assessments: Lesson Plan, Teacher Candidate Dispositions and Professional Expectations (Progress monitoring of standards). Student teachers complete the Teacher Work Sample and Professional Standards Portfolio (Progress monitoring of content and pedagogical content knowledge). The Conceptual Factors Analysis is part of the Teacher Work Sample. A new tool that is being implemented fall of 2017 is the Essential Areas of Teaching, which is used twice during student teaching. The supervising teacher, student teacher and mentor teacher complete the assessment. It is broken down into categories of Instruction, Management, Assessment and Technology.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

- 2.1: Field Experience Guidelines and Expectations
- 2.2: Field Placement Experiences (excluding 2.2.8)
- 2.3: Clinical Educator Selection and Feedback Process
- 2.4: Field Experience Binders
- 2.5: Faculty Partnerships
- 2.6: Evidence of Co-Construction of Experiences
- 2.7: Candidate Experiences with Diverse Students
- 2.8: International Partnership Expansion
- 2.9: Mentor Teacher Evaluation & Feedback Pilot
- OnSite Interviews with candidates, partners and EPP staff

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

2.2.8: Placement Mentors by School

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale
None.	

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale
None.	

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

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.

1. Findings for each offsite report task to be verified onsite:

Task(s)

Analysis of Data	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
1. (1)	Provide and analysis of data discussion in the narrative section for Standard 3, Components 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 & 3.6.
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed	
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews	

Admission requirements/Recruitment and Retention Plan	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
(1)	Analysis of Data discussed in narrative for Standard 3 Components 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 & 3.6.
(2)	What specific admission requirements are in place (i.e. minimum grade point average, ACT, SAT, or GRE average performance required for admission)?
2. B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed	
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews	
(1)	What is the plan in place if any that addresses the specific set of admission requirements required by the EPP (3.2.1)? Please explain this process in detail. Please explain this in the narrative section of the SSR.

- (2) Explain how the process monitoring plan was designed and the process used to support the evidence cited in (3.3). Please explain this in the narrative section of the SSR.
- (3) Is there data from Spring 2017 to support efforts to raise retention for the "murky middle" candidates whose GPA at UMF range from 2.0 to 2.5?
- (4) How is the EPPs recruiting efforts addressing the recruitment of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations?
Interview admissions and recruitment EPP staff
- (5) What data (cycles of data) exists to support the implementation of Target X. Is there data available from FrontRush to support recruitment?
- (6) Interview EPP members that addressed standard 3 to discuss Enrollment Data, Admission Plan, & Recruitment and Retention Plan (3.1, 3.2, 3.3).
- (7) Interview admissions department to discuss admission policies and the "Alumni-in-Admission program," and review data collected supporting its implementation and review the Alumni-in-Admission program plan.
- (8) Interview the departments of admissions and advancement to discuss shared relationships and admission policies or plans in place.

Action:

1. All tasks successfully completed through SSR addendum, onsite interviews, onsite evidences. All evidences reviewed by team are compiled, by standard, in Sources of Evidence section of report under: List of all evidences File.
2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 3:
 - a. Summary of findings

The analysis of Standard 3 noted in the EPPs addendum report presented strengths in the areas of candidate quality, recruitment, and selectivity. The EPP demonstrated 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 EPP has acknowledged the importance of recruitment and the diverse needs of their region, and has provided evidence that supports a plan for recruitment focusing on attracting and retaining diverse candidates who meet the needs of this goal. UMF is seeking to attract and retain candidates whose "experiences and teaching interests" reflect those of the EPPs regions. The EPP explained that enrollment has increased in both education and non-education programs; the enrollment in UMFs teacher education programs has still not rebounded to pre-recession rates during the 2008-2015 AY as indicated in 3.1.1 Fig 1. Because of this result, UMFs revamping of its three year recruitment plan (3.2.2) has goals of increasing overall applications, out-of-state apps, selectivity, and scholarship funds to increase enrollment. Evidence has been provided showing success with increasing student enrollment in the teacher education program (3.2.1). Information about the revised strategic recruitment and retention plan identified five broad recruitment goals, including: increasing program offerings for career shortages, increase selectivity and strengthen candidate quality, increase college visibility, increase student recruitment of diverse students for high needs fields and increasing student retention (3.2.2a-e).

The EPP has provided evidence in support of the revised plan. For Goal 1, (3.2.2a), UMF contributed 100% of the 28 teachers certified in ECS and 42% of the 65 teachers certified in SED in Maine over the last three years. UMF offers programs in secondary math, physical science, and life science and contributed 29% of the 48 teachers certified in secondary math and 10% of the 68 teachers certified in secondary science in Maine over the last three years (1.10.2). The teacher education unit is exploring two additional pathway and certification options including a dual certificate program for Elementary and Special Education, as well as an initial certification option for world languages. To meet Goal 2 (3.2.2b) the EPPs addendum for Standard 3 indicated the need to revise its selectivity process and criteria. Evidence was provided in the addendum narrative to support the implementation of this plan. Goal 3 (3.2.2c) UMF proposes increasing visibility through several different endeavors: increase and improve TEU use of web-based, social media and marketing outreach; update marketing materials; and partner with Gear Up and local organizations to host more K-12 student activities on campus. During the site visit interview with the director of admissions, information was provided that supported their plan to increase student achievement for those students in the "Murky Middle" with GPAs within the 2.0-2.5 range. An action plan is provided that identifies strategies and types of support that will be provided for the identified students. Strong evidence for Goal 4, (3.2.2d) indicated that between 2013-16, approximately 92% of TEU first-year students were Caucasian (3.1.1 Table 20), 78% were female (3.1.1 Figures 10-11), 51% were first-gen college students (Table 31) and 48% came from low SES backgrounds (based on Pell Eligibility) (3.1.1 Table 29). It was evident that TEU students at UMF are less racially diverse than Maine's K-12 population and extreme gender gaps exist as presented in evidence item 2.2.16. Evidence indicated that between 2012-16, TEU first year enrollment included a total of 592 new students, with an average of 197 per year. Of the 592, approximately 24% (141 students) were enrolled in shortage-area fields (37 in ECS, 40 in SED, 8 in SMED-LS, 44 in SMED-Math, 12 in SMED-PS) (3.1.1 Table). Goal 5 (3.2.2e) compared retention rates of education candidates with non-education candidates and reported that UMF education students exhibit higher 4- and 6- year completion rates for first-year students (45% and 65%, respectively) than their non-education peers (by 15% or more for FYR between 2008-11) (3.1.1 Table 46), and Male students in TEU programs have considerably higher completion rates (67%) than their non-education peers (51%)(3.1.1 Table 47). Education candidates still have a major challenge with passing the Praxis Core and Praxis II content exams (3.1.1 Table 44). The data indicated that between 2013-2016, 67% of the enrolled students in education programs who took the Praxis core test; 73% passed (53% passing on the first attempt). The EPP strives to increase 6-year completion rate by 1% each year.

During the site visit, interviews with the Interim Director of Admissions and Vice President for Enrollment, the status of the recruitment and retention policy was discussed (3.2.2). There was a shift in the EPP's marketing plan

which included TV and radio commercials and advertising on social media. The EPP increased high school visits in the state of Maine to over 600. The EPP noted in the SSR and verified in interviews, that they are beginning to collect data to support since they converted to the Target/CRM program. The EPP is striving to increase recruitment of diverse students by 1% and recruitment into shortage area programs by 1% each year through more purposeful use of faculty in recruiting and activities and using the CRM program.

During the site visit, current candidates, student teachers, faculty and alumni were interviewed about their experience with dispositions during their academic program. All respondents indicated that during their freshman year they were assigned an advisor that explained the dispositions and the contents of them (1.27). The advisors met with candidates each academic year to discuss their progress. If there was an area of concern, a student would develop an action plan with their advisor who would identify areas for improvement. Evidence for student dispositional data was uploaded into TK-20, UMFs data assessment system (1.9.7, 1.9.8, 1.27) and students' scores for the practicum and student teachers indicated meeting the goal at 80% or higher.

The EPP provided evidence to support its efforts to meet the minimum CAEP competence for component 3.2. The EPP began collaboration with the admission office during the summer of 2015 to establish a more rigorous admission policy. Evidence provided showed the admission for incoming freshman candidates to an education major now requires a minimum 2.75 GPA and a cohort average of 3.0. Between 2013-16, the entering cohort of students in education programs had a mean reported high school GPA of 3.27 with a range of 0.0 to 5.42. With the change in minimum GPA, the college anticipates an increase in both the minimum value of the reported high school GPA range accompanied by an increase in the mean GPA.

In support of Component 3.2, the EPP provided evidence (5.2.8 a. b) of candidate selectivity and formal entry into the education program at UMF. Candidates can apply for candidacy during the third tier of selectivity to formally enter an education program and enroll in upper-level professional courses. To achieve Candidacy, students must demonstrate academic achievement and must meet the grade requirement of no less than B- in all professional education courses, a grade of C or better in UMF's introductory English course, a cumulative GPA of 2.75 or better, and passing Praxis Core scores.

Candidates must also demonstrate proficiency in professional behaviors as evidenced in the teacher disposition and professional expectations assessment (1.9).

UMF does not require students to submit SAT scores for admission, scores are only available for approximately 93% of the cohort. All Maine students are required to take the SAT in their junior year. During the candidacy phase, UMF monitors candidates who submit SAT scores. During the site visit, interviews with current and alumni students revealed that students have the

option of either submitting their SAT scores or must take several content area placement tests. While examining the evidence, the 2013-16 mean (reported) cohort scores are 531 for math, 534 for verbal and 527 for writing, which surpass the national 50th percentile scores of 500, 520, and 490 respectively. When scores are disaggregated by program, the 2013-16 mean score for each program surpassed the 50th percentile scores in math and writing; however, the mean score for Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education and Special Education programs was just below the 50th percentile on the SAT Verbal exam (3.1.1 Tables 41-43). The Teacher Education Unit (TEU) evaluates and monitors candidate growth and progress toward proficiency with Maine's Common Core Teacher Standards after candidacy until graduation (3.3). The EPP stated that beginning in the fall of 2016 the EPP began implementing a new set of EPP-wide assessments that include a lesson plan (1.7) and a standards-based portfolio with rationales (1.8). The EPP expects that by the time students enter student teaching, they should have at least one rationale statement for CCTS standards 1-10 and two for CCTS standard 11. The standards-based portfolio provides an additional EPP-wide tool for monitoring student progress, while also ensuring that students become familiar with the standards and practice reflecting on their professional practice. The EPP provided evidence of their program monitor plan (3.3.2) and explained that beginning in the fall of 2016 each program began monitoring candidate progression using checklists (1.32). Because this is a new assessment that was recently added (after self study) to the program, no evidence was provided

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

Evidence 3.1.1 Enrollment Data
 Evidence 3.2.2 Recruitment and Retention Plan
 Interview with Alumni
 Interview with Current Students
 Interview with Mentor Teachers
 Interview with Director of Field Services
 Interview with Teacher Education Accreditation
 Interview with Coordinator of Educational Assessment & Special Projects
 Interview with Partners and Stakeholders
 UMF 3.4 AY17-18 CEHR Admissions Funnel Data
 UMP 3.6 TEU Admissions Required Plan
 UMF 3.7 UMF Degree Audit Form
 3.3.2 program monitor plan

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

Evidence 3.2.1 Admission Plan

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale
----------------------	-----------

None.	
-------	--

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale
None.	

Standard 4: Program Impact

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.

1. Findings for each offsite report task to be verified onsite:

Task(s)

Standard 4 Task 1: Verify employer and completer perceptions of preparation.	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
(1)	(4.3) The Employer survey appears to measure employer perceptions of completer preparation. The documentation includes response rates and three cycles of data as well as a description of the system for gathering data, representativeness of the sample and comparison data points. Interview employers regarding their satisfaction with completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.
(2)	(4.4) The Alumni Survey appears to measure completers perceptions of their preparation. Interview completers regarding their perceptions of the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation. Interview alumni regarding their satisfaction with their preparation to work in P-12 schools.
1.	B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
(1)	The narrative submitted for Standard 4 does not address any of the evidences provided. There are no discussions in the narrative about survey data.
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews	
(1)	What are the program's criteria for success for survey data?
(2)	The Employer survey provides 3 cycles of data however, in Fig 1, 2012 data is not included but is included in other figures (Fig 5). Why not for all?
(3)	Interview personnel who administer surveys and analyze the results.
(4)	Reliability and validity data and process are not fully discussed. Is there data/reports on how the process was conducted? Inter-rater reliability coefficients and data on validation measures?

Action:

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | All tasks successfully completed through SSR addendum, onsite interviews, onsite evidences. All evidences reviewed by team are compiled, by standard, in Sources of Evidence section of report under: List of all evidences File. |
|----|---|

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 4 :

a. Summary of findings

In order to probe the accuracy of the EPP's statements regarding the evidence related to Standard 4, the site team examined the results of the various surveys used by the EPP, interviewed completers and employers, the CAEP coordinator, Coordinator of educational assessment, Student Teacher Supervisors, and the Director of Field Services, and examined the Educator Effectiveness Case Study materials provided. Component 4.1 requires that "multiple measures shall include all available growth measures required by the state". The state of Maine provides no value added or performance data. The EPP conducted a case study to evaluate educator effectiveness. The case study includes three key measures of educator effectiveness: student growth data from completers' K-12 students, K-12 student surveys, and observation of completers' professional practice and utilizes a research-based methodology. According to the CAEP Accreditation Manual phase-in procedures (pp.87-114), self-study reports in 2017 will include both plans and initial data collection. The EPP has provided a pilot case study, including one year of full data, in accordance with the stated criteria. In the onsite evidences, the EPP provided year two (2016-2017) data and analysis. The 2015-2016 pilot case study was conducted within a local school district with 10 recent (1-4 years) completers. The pilot appears to have used a purposive sampling framework based on location and clustering of completers within the district. The sample of participants is representative of the pool of completers by content and grade level. Based on interviews and evidence provided onsite, the EPP is proposing to incorporate completers from the Health Education and Secondary Science programs in upcoming case studies. The 2016-2017 data was conducted within 10 different schools with 12 recent (10 first year and 2 second year) completers. Component 4.2 states provider demonstrates, through structured observation instruments or student surveys, that completers effectively apply professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The EPP case-study provided Classroom Management Observation Checklist data, student growth data, Panorama K-12 student survey data. Alumni and Employer survey data were also provided to triangulate case study results. Strengths and weaknesses within other survey data and interviews were triangulated with case study findings. The implementation of proficiency-based education is one area, in most data sources, completers need additional support or training.

The Self-Study Report provided an employer survey designed to measure employers' satisfaction with completers (4.3). The employer survey measured employer perceptions of candidate preparation in many areas. The EPP provided three cycles of data that was disaggregated by program, administration year, and standard. Survey data were presented with interpretation for EPP continuous improvement initiatives and strength/weakness analysis. Response rates for employer survey were 31%, 28%, and 18% for 2012, 2014, and 2016 respectively. One cycle (2016) had

a response rate below the 20% minimum. EPP documented the State of Maine stopped providing contact information for employers of completers and the EPP "sent surveys to all public K-12 schools as well as other agencies and organizations that hosted practicum students." The EPP indicated the state would be providing employer data in the future. For 2016, Maine completers are rated as competent educators (94%) collaborative professionals (94%) and caring teachers (96%). Data results provided are generally positive. The EPP noted some areas of weakness 1) Collaborating effectively with families & communities, 2) Effectively planning for and modifying instruction to support English Language Learners, and 3) Planning, instructing and assessing students in a Proficiency-Based Education (PBE) system. Interviews with principals, school personnel, and stakeholders during the onsite substantiate the survey findings.

The Self-Study Report provided an alumni survey designed to assess the degree to which completers perceive their preparation regarding job responsibilities and if preparation was effective (4.2). The EPP provided three cycles of data that was disaggregated by program, administration year, and standard. Response rates for the alumni survey were 26%, 24%, and 26% for 2012, 2014, and 2016 respectively. EPP-wide alumni responses indicate 90% overall satisfaction with the effectiveness of preparation. The EPP identified areas of weakness in 1) Using best practices for classroom management (61%) 2) Effectively planning for and modifying instruction to support English Language Learners (44%) 3) Planning, instructing and assessing students in a Proficiency-Based Education (PBE) system (43%) 4) Facilitating student use of technology(63%) and 5) Effectively using instructional technology(60%). Interviews with alumni during the onsite substantiate the survey findings.

The EPP has enacted initiatives to address weaknesses identified in survey data. The EPP, through the Field Services office and faculty, has implemented a process to support candidates in these areas. For example, faculty collaborated to integrate ELL strategies into the curricula, developed a tool to provide specific, actionable feedback to student teachers regarding classroom management, and redesigned methods courses to model a proficiency-based environment.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

4.1 Educator Effectiveness Case Study Pilot
4.2 Alumni Survey
4.3 Employer Survey
4.4 Measuring Impact Through Other Measures
4.5 Educator Effectiveness Case Study Year 2
Interview with Alumni
Interview with Current Students
Interview with Mentor Teachers
Panorama K-12 Student Survey
Interview with Director of Field Services

Interview with Director of Teacher Education Accreditation
Interview with Coordinator of Educational Assessment & Special Projects
Interview with Partners and Stakeholders

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

--

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale
None.	

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale
None.	

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.

1. Findings for each offsite report task to be verified onsite:

Task(s)

	Analysis of Data						
	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration						
	B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed						
	C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews						
1.	<table border="1"><tr><td>(1)</td><td>How are the multiple data-bases connected for a complete and systemic analysis of EPP data? How is the data analyzed for effective continuous improvement that connects all aspects of the programming?</td></tr><tr><td>(2)</td><td>How is the CANDIDATE impact on P-12 Student Learning assessed and documented? How does the EPP utilize this data to make course and field experiences adjustments and decisions?</td></tr><tr><td>(3)</td><td>Who uses the Data Audit Template to triangulate and compare data from multiple sources to identify trends in program strengths, weaknesses and needs assessment?</td></tr></table>	(1)	How are the multiple data-bases connected for a complete and systemic analysis of EPP data? How is the data analyzed for effective continuous improvement that connects all aspects of the programming?	(2)	How is the CANDIDATE impact on P-12 Student Learning assessed and documented? How does the EPP utilize this data to make course and field experiences adjustments and decisions?	(3)	Who uses the Data Audit Template to triangulate and compare data from multiple sources to identify trends in program strengths, weaknesses and needs assessment?
(1)	How are the multiple data-bases connected for a complete and systemic analysis of EPP data? How is the data analyzed for effective continuous improvement that connects all aspects of the programming?						
(2)	How is the CANDIDATE impact on P-12 Student Learning assessed and documented? How does the EPP utilize this data to make course and field experiences adjustments and decisions?						
(3)	Who uses the Data Audit Template to triangulate and compare data from multiple sources to identify trends in program strengths, weaknesses and needs assessment?						

	Inter-rater Reliability				
	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration				
	B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed				
	C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews				
2.	<table border="1"><tr><td>(1)</td><td>Interview Mentor teachers: What is the training you received to be a mentor teacher? Does this training include training on assessment? Is there an inter-rater reliability training on assessing candidates?</td></tr><tr><td>(2)</td><td>Interview supervisors: What is the training that is given to mentors each year? Are all mentors required to take this training yearly - even if</td></tr></table>	(1)	Interview Mentor teachers: What is the training you received to be a mentor teacher? Does this training include training on assessment? Is there an inter-rater reliability training on assessing candidates?	(2)	Interview supervisors: What is the training that is given to mentors each year? Are all mentors required to take this training yearly - even if
(1)	Interview Mentor teachers: What is the training you received to be a mentor teacher? Does this training include training on assessment? Is there an inter-rater reliability training on assessing candidates?				
(2)	Interview supervisors: What is the training that is given to mentors each year? Are all mentors required to take this training yearly - even if				

experienced? Is there training on giving the assessments? Is there any discussion/training on inter-rater reliability of assessments?

Data Review Protocol and P-12 Student Learning analysis

- A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
- B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
- C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

3.

(1) What is the history of the Data Review Protocol for the EPP? Is this process newly created? What documentation is there of historical data review?

(2) Evidence presented from annual report showed programs needed to address P-12 student learning. How are programs addressing this need? How is the EPP addressing this need? What are partners doing to address this need? Is there collaboration between all stakeholders taking place to address this need? When will changes be implemented?

Action:

1. All tasks successfully completed through SSR addendum, onsite interviews, onsite evidences. All evidences reviewed by team are compiled, by standard, in Sources of Evidence section of report under: List of all evidences File.
2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 5:
 - a. Summary of findings

Examination of materials contained in addendum showed that the EPP is making progress in the use of data and continues using data in its decision making. The inclusion of data summaries and analysis in the addendum was a positive step. At the site visit, the team noted that faculty and administrators expressed a value in the use of data to support decision making.

The EPP has created a quality assurance system that includes two parts that comprise data from multiple measures. The Instructional Capacity Framework measures organizational effectiveness and includes programs and curriculum, faculty and staff qualifications, governance, resources and data accessibility and delivery. The Assessment System measures teacher preparation effectiveness using multiple measures that include standards and expectations and EPP-wide assessment components. The Assessment System monitors candidate progress, candidate completion, completer effectiveness, impact, and satisfaction and program quality, relevance and effectiveness at both the unit and program area.

A process is in place for regularly collecting and analyzing the data as well as sharing the data within the EPP and with stakeholders. Site visitors were able to access the data systems onsite to review candidate data and tracking protocols for Practicum and Student Teaching placements. Interviews with the Director of Field Services, the Administrative Specialist for Field Services and

the Coordinator of Educational Assessment & Special Projects substantiated the EPP data collection and tracking process. There have been several transitions in the EPP and changes in assessments in the last few years; however, it was evident that the EPP is on a trajectory to be more efficient and systematic in this process.

Component 5.2 requires the EPP to establish content validity and inter-rater reliability for EPP-created assessments. The Self-Study Report provided evidence of the utilization of the Lawshe Method for content validity for the Teacher Candidate Dispositions and Professional Expectations Assessment, the Teacher Work Sample, the Lesson Plan Rubric, and the Classroom Management Observation Checklist. The pilot data for the Lesson Plan Rubric did include data on the implementation of technology with P-12 students but was an optional component. As a result, less than half of the pre-student teaching candidates, but almost all (94 of 97) student teaching candidates were assessed on this skill (1.17) thus providing inconsistent data. Within each EPP-created assessment, the validity and reliability data is provided. Documentation that evidence is relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable is provided within the assessment framework evidences.

Survey data is required to align to standards. Alumni and employer surveys are aligned to InTASC and CAEP standards. Although the employer survey is aligned to standards, the construction of the survey does not allow participants to choose a negative option. The likert scale on the tool includes 'very satisfied,' 'satisfied,' and 'somewhat satisfied' as the only options. Onsite interviews with the Director of Teacher Education Accreditation and the Former Director of Teacher Education Accreditation verified that the employer survey was being revised for 2018 to include a 'not satisfied' option for participants to choose. Some survey data was reported with a criteria for success of 80% while others had a criteria for success of 70%. Alumni survey data from 2016 seemed to yield lower percents of preparation effectiveness in several areas compared to 2012 and 2014. Data was averaged over the three cycles and reported. The interview with former Director of Teacher Education Accreditation yielded no explanation for the drop nor the rationale for reporting three year averages.

The EPP shares data and analysis program-wide and EPP-wide to make decisions and set goals. Evidence was provided on Data-Driven Decision Logs showing analysis, outcomes, and action plans are used to drive program improvement. Examples of EPP-wide decisions include the creation of increasing embedded instruction for diverse learners within coursework and the creation of the ELL certificate as well as increasing the technology in the unit with iPad carts and providing instruction within courses (5.4.1a). Program-wide decisions include the SMED/SHE program creating Praxis II digital support as well as in-person support sessions to help students pass this assessment (5.4.1e). Interviews with faculty, Coordinator of Educational

Assessments and Special Projects, Director of Field Services and Division chairs corroborated the process.

The State of Maine is providing no data to EPPs to support meeting this standard (4.4 Measuring Impact Through Other Measures). The EPP is collecting student impact data from a case study approach along with Panorama K-12 surveys, and employer surveys to examine impact of P-12 student learning. The EPP provided two years of data from the Educator Effectiveness Case Study along with data from the other measures of impact.

The EPP includes alumni, employers, school-based professionals, and school and community partners in program evaluation and continuous improvement activities. The Educational Advisory Committee meets three times a year and provides feedback on best practices, building and enhancing partnerships and new assessment tools, etc. Interviews with alumni, current student teachers, and mentor teachers revealed that although feedback was sought by the EPP, much of the feedback and suggestions were provided in more informal avenues. Candidates felt comfortable verbalizing suggestions and modifications directly to the Director of Field Services where changes and tweaks could be implemented. Mentor teachers were reluctant to meet at more formal meetings rather providing direct feedback and comment to the Director of Field Services.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

Evidence 5.1: TEU Quality Assurance (QA) System (excluding 5.1.a/b/c)
Evidence 5.2: TEU Undergraduate Assessment System
Evidence 5.3: Stakeholder Involvement
Evidence 5.4: Data-Driven Decision Making
Evidence 5.5.1: TEU Assessment System Timeline: Continuity of Common Assessments
On-Site Interviews with stakeholders, candidates and school personnel

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement

Area for Improvement	Rationale
The interpretation of survey data was not consistent with the data provided.	Survey data was provided with three year averages (alumni), skewed scales (employer), and unclear criteria for success.
Feedback mechanisms operate outside the formal quality assurance system.	Informal feedback processes are sometimes utilized by candidates and school partners in lieu of the formal quality assurance system.
Cumulative data was not provided for all Assessment Instruments.	Some assessment instruments were provided with only 2-cycles of data and interpretation.

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale

None.	
-------	--

Section 3: Cross-cutting Themes of Diversity and Technology

1. DIVERSITY

a. Summary regarding adequacy and accuracy of evidence related to diversity

The EPP has documented actionable steps and revision of goals to promote the cross-cutting theme of diversity as a focus for improvement. The EPP began by revising its Diversity Expectations and outlined nine professional dispositions in 2015 in order to reaffirm its commitment to diversity. The new disposition requirements are more inclusive of different types of diversity (learning styles, learners' needs, religion, socioeconomic status, gender, culture, family status, etc.) and the tool is regularly collected and discussed with students at different points throughout their program (Addendum - Cross Cutting Themes narrative). The EPP has also provided evidence that instructors across programs have integrated assignments, activities, and/or assessments to address the UMF and CAEP Diversity standards throughout the program (UMF 1.2.5). Candidates across programs are also provided with course requirements for promoting knowledge and skills for promoting inclusion of students with disabilities (SSR). In addition, the EPP hosts an event on campus to provide candidates the opportunity to join the professional discussion on relevant themes of diversity. The EPP has indicated this is an annual event, but has become more relaxed in required attendance, smaller in scale and adjusted for a wider variety of topical focus including: poverty, trauma, and anti-bullying (Addendum - Cross Cutting Themes narrative). Interviews with faculty and administrators provided evidence that these experiences are built into course across programs. Faculty use their own teaching in diverse settings to build case examples for use by candidates in course work and field supervisors meet with student teachers from a variety of levels and areas. The discussion and video analysis in seminar allow student teachers to compare experiences from a variety of placement settings.

The EPP assessments have also been revised to assess candidate ability to meet the needs of students from diverse backgrounds. The Contextual Factor Analysis and Teacher Work Sample, both collected during student teaching, support candidate proficiency in supporting diverse students. Also, findings from the disposition pilot indicate that it shows candidate progression across the program (UMF 1.9.7).

The EPP has established that they are located in an area with little racial-ethnic diversity, but available experiences in socio-economically diverse areas. As such, the EPP has provided professional development for field supervisors in supporting poverty and trauma affected students (SSR) and attempts to place candidates in diverse placements. The SSR, however, indicates that "more than 80%" are in Title I schools or HeadStart facilities, 21% were placed in schools with ELL students, and 24% were in schools with a higher percentage of racially/ethnically diverse students than the state. The Field supervisors have also worked to create simulated experiences and

discussions that "involve meeting diverse learner needs," and make efforts to place students in a variety of settings. Although candidates do not represent the K-12 student population, the EPP has identified "increased recruitment of diverse students into shortage fields" as one of its recruitment and retention goals (UMF 3.2.2). The program already demonstrates some diversity in their pool of socio-economically disadvantaged students, and first-generation students (UMF 3.1.1; table 33) and is also targeting gender equity as a program focus.

b. Evidence that adequately and accurately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of diversity

SSR Cross-cutting themes narrative
Addendum - Cross-cutting theme narrative
1.2.5 - Technology Integration Coursework
1.9.7 - Disposition Indicators data
3.1.1 - TEU First-Year Enrollment
3.2.2 - Recruitment and Retention Plan
Interviews with field supervisors and EPP faculty

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of diversity

Note: Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each are cited under the relevant standard(s)

2. TECHNOLOGY

a. Summary regarding adequacy and accuracy of evidence related to technology

There was narrative evidence provided by the EPP that promotes the cross-cutting theme of technology. The integration of technology in candidate preparation and curriculum was supported in the addendum and tagged as evidence Standard 1, Task 3. and supports their claim for meeting technology in the standards. As noted by the EPP in the addendum the State of Maine uses the Common Core Teacher Standards (CCTS) as the professional standard for the University. In addition, UMF has provided information in the site interview with the Technology Faculty Team that they include the ISTE Standard 11, which includes ISTE technology standards for teachers (1.4.4). The lesson plan includes a component which assesses technology integration with lesson planning. The pilot data for the lesson plan rubric did include data on the implementation of technology with P-12 students, but was an optional component. As a result, less than half of the pre-student teaching candidates were assessed on this skill (1.17). The EPP has been collecting samples of evidence regarding candidate proficiency and use of technology to help inform future discussions regarding technology assessment. During the site visit interview with the faculty technology team at the meeting, they indicated that the TEU fall meeting scheduled to discuss how to move forward in assessing technology has been tabled pending the release of the changes to the ISTE Standards.

During the two practicum courses, candidates complete an EPP-wide lesson

plan. (1.17.1, 1.17.1 figure 1, table 1) during their student teaching semester. This document includes a technology component that all candidates must meet. Faculty reported in the site visit interview that they have a new technology course created for candidates to take during their sophomore year in program. As part of this course EDU 222 Learning with Technology, students are introduced to selecting appropriate applications for iPad to use with instruction, the use of smartboards, document cameras, MacBook links to Smartboards, collecting data on students in P-12 classrooms. They are beginning to document evidence of candidate success in TK20.

During the site visit interview with the EPPs coordinator of educational assessment and review of the TK20 data collection program, there was preliminary evidence provided that documented preliminary data that is being collected in the spring 2017. The EPP faculty verified in the technology site visit interview that the students in both the elementary and secondary programs all must complete the ISTE Standard 11.4 component. This is a required component to complete. Candidates can then select to address any one of the remaining five ISTE standards. Candidates upload their artifacts/evidence in TK20 which collects the data and saves it in the appropriate standard in their electronic portfolio.

b. Evidence that adequately and accurately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of technology.

UMF 1.2.4 Cross Cutting Themes Technology Integration in Coursework
UMF 1.22 Assistive and Instructional Technology
UMF 1.16 Student Teacher and Internship Professional Portfolio's
UMF 5.1.1c TEU Data Processing System
On-Site Interviews with stakeholders, candidates and school personnel

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of technology.

Note: Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each are cited under the relevant standard(s)

Section 4: Area(s) for Improvement cited from previous accreditation review, if any

Area(s) for Improvement cited from previous accreditation review, if any

Area for Improvement:	Rationale:
Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with students from diverse groups.	This AFI is removed. This legacy AFI is currently being addressed in CAEP standard 2 (2.3). The EPP has provided documentation and data that satisfied this AFI.
Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with faculty members from diverse groups	This AFI is removed. EPP provided recruitment plans and interviewed Dean about faculty recruitment efforts. This NCATE AFI relates to a standard no longer in the CAEP review. The State of Maine review is reviewing this AFI as part of the State process.

Section 5: Response to the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP)

(Use the Rubric for Evaluating the Capacity and Potential in the SIP)

1. Summary of findings and overall evaluation of Selected Improvement Plan

The EPP's capacity to implement and complete the SIP is progressing. There is a detailed timetable provided for year by year activities that includes yearly indicators, specific actions, evaluation and monitoring activities.

a. The EPP's capacity for initiating, implementing and complete the SIP.

The SIP is primarily a plan to implement a recruitment and retention plan. There is identification capacity but no substantive investment of faculty. The EPP's capacity to initiate the plan is progressing.

b. The potential of the SIP to have a positive impact on the EPP and its candidates.

The potential of goals to have a positive impact on the EPP and its candidates is progressing. Goals for improvement involve multiple programs (all initial licensure programs) and are related to the rationale for the focal area. Potential to have a positive impact on the EPP or its candidates appears to be good.

c. The proposed use of data and evidence.

Identified baseline and yearly objectives that will lead to a successful SIP is progressing.

d. The potential of the EPP to demonstrate a higher level of excellence beyond what is required in the standards

Potential to demonstrate a higher level of excellence beyond what is required in the standards is Progressing.

Evaluation of the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP)

This rubric is intended to be used as a tool by the site visit team to provide feedback to an EPP on the Selected Improvement plan and its progress, including (a) its capacity for initiating, implementing, and completing a Selected Improvement Plan (SIP); (b) the potential of the SIP to have a positive impact on the EPP and its candidates; (c) the proposed use of data and evidence; (d) the potential of the EPP to demonstrate a higher level of excellence beyond what is required in the standards. An overall evaluation of the SIP is also provided.

Click [here](#) to open the rubric in a new window.

Sources of Evidence

List of interviews and participants

See Upload

List of exhibits reviewed /List additional sources consulted (website, etc.)

See Upload

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

List of attendees
Evidence provided On-Site
List of ALL evidences provided by UMF

See Attachment panel below.