

CAEP Accountability Measures (Advanced Programs)

Measure 2: Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholder Involvement

For CAEP Measure 2, our EPP conducted the Employer Satisfaction for Advanced Programs through a focus group. Below is a synopsis of the focus group;

The focus group was conducted for advanced program (November 12, 2020). The focus group was comprised of 9 school administrators who have hired GCU graduates of the following programs: Administration and Leadership (Supervisors and Principal), Teaching Students with Disabilities (TOSD), ESL, School Psychology, School Counseling, Reading Specialist. The participants were led through a discussion using the GCU Professional Dispositions Rating document. The participants were asked to have a list of current employees that graduated from one of the Advanced Professional Programs at GCU. The employees were not named, but the program was referenced. The opening premise was that the graduates would be meeting expectations in all areas, and incidents giving evidence of exceeding expectations or below expectations were to be articulated. At the end of the review of the nine areas of professional dispositions, participants were asked to name areas where they feel the graduates could have had additional training.

Georgian Court University School of Education Advisory Board consists of 12 school leaders and teachers from around Ocean, Monmouth and Middlesex counties in the state of New Jersey. The Advisory Board's role is to provide input from stakeholders to ensure that our programs promote our candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions that reflect the University's mission and core values. Furthermore, the Advisory Board's responsibility is to ensure that programs and candidates meet state and professional standards. The Advisory Board meeting was held on November 1, 2021. For the full meeting minutes, please see Appendix A.

Measure 3: Candidate competency at completion

Candidate competency at completion is measured by proprietary measures (Praxis II) and EPP-created measures (internship evaluation and professional dispositions).

Praxis II

All candidates in Administration and Leadership program passed Praxis II School Leaders Licensure Assessment.

PRAXIS Test Code	PRAXIS Test Name	N	GCU Average Score	State Average	Passing Score
6990	School Leaders Licensure Assessment	39	167.21	169.64	151

Professional Dispositions

All other advanced programs including Administration and Leadership use the faculty developed Disposition Survey for completer competency. All candidates in the advanced programs (Administration & Leadership, Teacher of Students with Disabilities, English as a Second Language, Reading Specialist) meet the expectation of proficiency in all categories of professional dispositions (Communication, Interpersonal Interactions, Professional Conduct, Ethical Practice, Leadership and Service, and Problem Solving).

Professional Dispositions (Advanced Programs, Fall 2020)

Rubric Criteria		Program	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Below Proficient 1	Proficient 2	Advanced Proficient 3
Communication [Verbal and Nonverbal]	PD. 1a	ALP	68	2.60	0.49	0%	40%	60%
		TOSD	19	2.79	0.42	0%	21%	79%
		ESL	8	2.88	0.35	0%	12%	88%
		Reading Sp.	5	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%
	PD. 1b	ALP	69	2.55	0.50	0%	45%	55%
		TOSD	19	2.79	0.42	0%	21%	79%
		ESL	8	2.50	0.53	0%	50%	50%
		Reading Sp.	5	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%
Interpersonal Interactions [Respect, Compassion, Collaboration]	PD. 2a	ALP	69	2.67	0.47	0%	33%	67%
		TOSD	19	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%
		ESL	8	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%
		Reading Sp.	5	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%
	PD. 2b	ALP	69	2.65	0.48	0%	35%	65%
		TOSD	19	2.89	0.32	0%	11%	89%
		ESL	8	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%
		Reading Sp.	5	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%
	PD. 2c	ALP	69	2.57	0.50	0%	43%	57%
		TOSD	19	2.84	0.37	0%	16%	84%
		ESL	8	2.88	0.35	0%	12%	88%
		Reading Sp.	5	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%
Professional Conduct [Integrity, Responsibility]	PD. 3a	ALP	69	2.65	0.48	0%	35%	65%
		TOSD	19	2.84	0.37	0%	16%	84%
		ESL	8	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%
		Reading Sp.	5	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%
	PD. 3b	ALP	69	2.62	0.52	1%	35%	64%
		TOSD	19	2.95	0.23	0%	5%	95%
		ESL	8	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%

		Reading Sp.	5	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%
Ethical Practice [Justice]	PD. 4	ALP	69	2.52	0.50	0%	48%	52%
		TOSD	19	2.89	0.32	0%	11%	89%
		ESL	8	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%
		Reading Sp.	5	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%
Leadership and Service	PD. 5a	ALP	69	2.57	0.50	0%	43%	57%
		TOSD	19	2.89	0.32	0%	11%	89%
		ESL	8	2.88	0.35	0%	12%	88%
		Reading Sp.	5	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%
	PD. 5b	ALP	69	2.48	0.50	0%	52%	48%
		TOSD	19	2.79	0.42	0%	21%	79%
		ESL	8	2.50	0.53	0%	50%	50%
		Reading Sp.	5	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%
Problem Solving [Analytical and Divergent]	PD. 6a	ALP	69	2.54	0.50	0%	46%	54%
		TOSD	19	2.79	0.42	0%	21%	79%
		ESL	8	2.88	0.35	0%	12%	88%
		Reading Sp.	5	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%
	PD. 6b	ALP	69	2.45	0.50	0%	55%	45%
		TOSD	19	2.79	0.42	0%	21%	79%
		ESL	8	2.75	0.46	0%	25%	75%
		Reading Sp.	5	3.00	0.00	0%	0%	100%

Professional Dispositions (Advanced Programs, Spring 2021/Summer2021)

Rubric Criteria		Program	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Below Proficient 1	Proficient 2	Advanced Proficient 3
Communication [Verbal and Nonverbal]	PD. 1a	ALP	35	2.63	0.49	0%	37%	63%
		TOSD	22	2.00	0.00	0%	100%	0%
		ESL	11	2.82	0.40	0%	18%	82%
		Reading Sp.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	PD. 1b	ALP	35	2.63	0.49	0%	37%	63%
		TOSD	22	2.00	0.00	0%	100%	0%
		ESL	11	2.36	0.50	0%	64%	36%
		Reading Sp.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpersonal Interactions [Respect,	PD. 2a	ALP	35	2.71	0.46	0%	29%	71%
		TOSD	22	2.91	0.29	0%	9%	91%
		ESL	11	2.91	0.30	0%	9%	91%
		Reading Sp.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Compassion, Collaboration]	PD. 2b	ALP	34	2.59	0.50	0%	41%	59%
		TOSD	22	2.05	0.21	0%	95%	5%
		ESL	11	2.91	0.30	0%	9%	91%
		Reading Sp.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	PD. 2c	ALP	35	2.49	0.51	0%	51%	49%
		TOSD	22	2.05	0.21	0%	95%	5%
		ESL	11	2.82	0.40	0%	18%	82%
		Reading Sp.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Professional Conduct [Integrity, Responsibility]	PD. 3a	ALP	35	2.77	0.43	0%	23%	77%
		TOSD	22	2.91	0.29	0%	9%	91%
		ESL	11	2.82	0.40	0%	18%	82%
		Reading Sp.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	PD. 3b	ALP	35	2.71	0.46	0%	29%	71%
		TOSD	22	2.86	0.35	0%	14%	86%
		ESL	11	2.82	0.40	0%	18%	82%
		Reading Sp.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ethical Practice [Justice]	PD. 4	ALP	35	2.54	0.51	0%	46%	54%
		TOSD	22	2.00	0.00	0%	100%	0%
		ESL	11	2.73	0.47	0%	27%	73%
		Reading Sp.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Leadership and Service	PD. 5a	ALP	35	2.60	0.50	0%	40%	60%
		TOSD	22	2.00	0.00	0%	100%	0%
		ESL	11	2.73	0.47	0%	27%	73%
		Reading Sp.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	PD. 5b	ALP	35	2.60	0.50	0%	40%	60%
		TOSD	22	2.00	0.00	0%	100%	0%
		ESL	11	2.73	0.47	0%	27%	73%
		Reading Sp.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Problem Solving [Analytical and Divergent]	PD. 6a	ALP	35	2.54	0.51	0%	46%	54%
		TOSD	22	2.82	0.39	0%	18%	82%
		ESL	11	2.82	0.40	0%	18%	82%
		Reading Sp.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	PD. 6b	ALP	35	2.60	0.50	0%	40%	60%
		TOSD	22	2.82	0.39	0%	18%	82%
		ESL	11	2.73	0.47	0%	27%	73%
		Reading Sp.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Candidate competency at completion

Our EPP uses proprietary and self-created instruments to measure candidacy competency for advanced programs; School Leaders Licensor Assessment Praxis 6990 with a qualifying score of 151 is used as a

proprietary assessment for candidates that opt to take it for principal certification. *(Note; not all candidates take the test at completion. This is normal practice as candidates are already employed and might not apply for administration positions right away).* The scores here are only for those candidates that took the test between Fall 2020 and Summer 2021. Administration and Leadership program also uses the internship survey as an assessment of competency. The survey addresses all the 10 standards for Professional Standards for Educational Leaders.

Internship Evaluation – Advanced Program

Based on the internship evaluation in Administration and Leadership program, all candidates meet the expectation of proficiency in all 5 categories.

Internship Evaluation (Fall 2020, n=26)

Competency Area		Below Proficient	Proficient	Advanced Proficient
Scope	Frequency (%)	0(0%)	9(35%)	17(65%)
	Mean(SD)		2.65(0.49)	
Content	Frequency (%)	0(0%)	9(35%)	16(62%)
	Mean(SD)		2.58(0.58)	
Reflection on Standards	Frequency (%)	0(0%)	10(38%)	16(62%)
	Mean(SD)		2.62(0.50)	
Writing	Frequency (%)	0(0%)	14(54%)	11(42%)
	Mean(SD)		2.38(0.57)	
Conclusion	Frequency (%)	0(0%)	17(65%)	9(35%)
	Mean(SD)		2.35(0.49)	

Internship Evaluation (Summer 2021, n=30)

Competency Area		Below Proficient	Proficient	Advanced Proficient
Scope	Frequency (%)	0(0%)	17(57%)	13(43%)
	Mean(SD)		2.46(0.51)	
Content	Frequency (%)	0(0%)	19(63%)	11(37%)
	Mean(SD)		2.38(0.50)	
Reflection on Standards	Frequency (%)	0(0%)	18(60%)	12(40%)
	Mean(SD)		2.42(0.50)	
Writing	Frequency (%)	0(0%)	22(73%)	8(27%)
	Mean(SD)		2.27(0.45)	
Conclusion	Frequency (%)	0(0%)	19(63%)	11(37%)
	Mean(SD)		2.38(0.50)	

School of Education Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

Fall 2021 - November 1, 2021

13 Attendees

The meeting began with a prayer from the Dean

1. Accreditation - (CAEP) updates

The Dean thanked everyone for their contribution to the SOE accreditation and gave an update. There was no area of improvement and no stipulations.

Department Reorganization (2 chairs)

The dean reported about the reorganization of the department from 3 chairs to two namely; Teacher Education/Initial and Advanced Programs (Graduate).

There were originally 3 areas in the School of Education and now there are only 2 Chairs that consist of Undergraduate and Graduate programs.

2. Continuous Improvement - Keystones/internship activities/lesson plan models etc.

The Dean is looking to continually improve the programs. We welcome any improvements the Advisory Board may have regarding our programs.

3. Social Media Platform – School of Education is on Social Media

We are creating a platform for School of Education on social media. We want to highlight our achievements as a School and those of our alumni.

Data Retreat and Stakeholders

Dean announced about the upcoming data retreat. Data from each program to be shared with each sub advisory board committee member (based on programs and expertise). Faculty and advisory board to analyze the data and come up with highlights and areas that need improvement.

Updates:

Board members were asked to briefly share their thoughts on;

a) What is going on in the schools?

b) What do we need to be looking for?

Director of Special Education in the Jackson school district provided insight regarding her belief that there will be long-term effects of COVID. Regarding big picture needs she feels that considering the pandemic we need to address the needs of all students regarding the effect of the pandemic.

In the Lakewood school district, an administrator provided insight regarding how in their district the School Counselors come into the class and teach the teachers about social emotional learning. The sciences of reading and they are working on better ways to help their students improve in language arts. Due to the past virtual learning due to the pandemic, they have learned that the students are behind approximately 4 to 6 months. What seems to be an issue with new staff and upcoming student teachers is that they are not truly prepared as English language learners. The new teachers coming into the field are having a problem with data analysis. they do not know how to take their data and drive their instruction from it.

The Chair for Advanced Programs asked about what is being done about social emotional learning. The teachers have training once a week on SEL. This should not be a separate part of the day it should be imbedded throughout the day. A conversation began regarding Social Emotional Learning and training.

Contributed from the Counselors point of view she would like them to focus on equity and bias as we can teach lesson in the elementary and middle school but she does not believe they are taking into account to consider the student that is in front of them.

The Chair for Advanced Programs spoke about the fact that he is an administrator and he is in the schools would it be possible for anyone to go to their administrator to see if any of the GCU faculty spend time in the school district with you to see what exactly is taking place in the schools. The Dean continued the conversation regarding the potential of faculty visiting the schools to learn more.

An administrator of Brick Township School District agreed that ELL and SEL is a very important and hot topic. At the secondary level it is not very mainstreamed into the day although. Each district has a different approach. She feels that teachers coming out of the program need to be educated more on revising curriculum as this is a huge task and new teachers are not prepared whether in their undergraduate or graduate program.

An administrator of Colt Neck shared that in the Freehold District one of the initiatives was to train the staff on restorative practices. This is a means to a different type of discipline to try to change behavior of the students. In the building that she works in they started to implement circles with some of the students. That they are finding they are manifesting certain behaviors. As opposed to finding students with anxiety they are finding students that are full of anger. The upper classmen want to get out of the building and ask for early release and the under classmen are in the fight mode where there are many fights and altercations. Therefore, they are trying to use certain skills to manage the aggression. They are also doing training on equity as well. She would like to see a bi-lingual school counselor.

The dean thanked the members and announced that the next meeting will be in tSpring 2022. The list below was shared with the advisory board

List of School of Education Programs:

- **Teacher Education Programs**
 - Early Childhood Education P-3
 - Elementary Education
 - Subject Specific Education (History, Art, Biology, Mathematics, Physics, Business, etc)
 - English as a Second Language (ESL)

- **Advanced Programs**
 - Administration and Leadership (ALP)
 - TOSD
 - English as a Second Language (ESL)
 - Reading Specialist
 - School Counseling
 - School Psychology (Psychology Department)

Statement on Role and Responsibilities of the Advisory Board -

Georgian Court University School of Education Advisory Board consists of 12 school leaders and teachers from around Ocean, Monmouth and Middlesex counties in the state of New Jersey. The Advisory Board's role is to provide input from stakeholders to ensure that our programs promote our candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions that reflect the University's mission and core values. Furthermore, the Advisory Board's responsibility is to ensure that programs and candidates meet state and professional standards.

Membership of the Advisory Board consists of the following:

- School Partners (e.g., Principal, Special Education Teacher, Counselor, etc.)

Each program within the School of Education has an Advisory Council which meets once each semester. Information from these meetings is considered when making modifications to existing programs. The purpose of the Advisory Council is to discuss the following:

1. Disseminate and discuss program data summaries with all constituents.
2. Discuss core assessments and make revisions as needed.
3. Assessments must be examined for accuracy, consistency, and fairness.
4. Discuss student outcomes and candidate success in the field.