Section 1. AIMS Profile
After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider’s (EPP’s) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Contact person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 EPP characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Program listings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2. Program Completers
2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2014-2015?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure
9

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)
0

Total number of program completers 9

2.2 Indicate whether the EPP is currently offering a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure.
Yes, a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification is currently being offered.

Section 3. Substantive Changes
Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2014-2015 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the published mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
No Change / Not Applicable

3.2 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited
No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited
No Change / Not Applicable

3.4 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements
No Change / Not Applicable

Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:

3.5 Change in regional accreditation status
No Change / Not Applicable

3.6 Change in state program approval
No Change / Not Applicable

Section 4. Display of candidate performance data.
Section 6. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

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

Weakness 2.3 Influential quality control system

The quality control system is not effective in identifying inconsistencies in student records.

In 2013 taskstream LAT was adopted as the electronic platform used to collect, house, and evaluate student work, provide evidence of learning, and to maintain EPP records. Electronic data collection procedures were subsequently implemented in fall 2013. Students enrolled in ED 484/488 (fall 2013) and ED 484/488 (spring 2014) were the first to input materials onto the taskstream platform and have their work evaluated/stored. In the summer of 2014, Dr. Miller worked with the taskstream Implementation Specialists to enhance the IECE/IEE portal to accept, evaluate and store identified anchor assignments for all education courses listed in the IECE/IEE Programs. The 2018 IECE/IEE graduation cohort will be the first cohort to have taskstream files with all designated anchor assignments and data included. During the summer of 2015, Dr. Barno Reynolds worked with the taskstream Implementation Specialists to enhance the IAE portal to accept, evaluate and store identified anchor assignments for all education courses listed in the IAE Programs. The 2019 IAE graduation cohort will be the first cohort to have taskstream files with all designated anchor assignments and data included. In spring 2015, Cazenovia College as a whole adopted the taskstream. The inclusive education programs have linked the LAT and AMS sides of the taskstream platform to one another and now have the capability to map out curricular goals, track student SLOs and map CAEP claims to the overall college strategic plan. During the 2015-2016 academic year the host teacher survey, alumni survey, student teaching video observation and student teaching midterm/final evaluations were launched on the taskstream portal and data is now stored in the taskstream system rather than in local paper/electronic files.

Section 7. Accreditation Pathway

Inquiry Brief. Update Appendix E to confirm the categories of evidence the faculty members rely on and have available to support their claims that candidates know their subjects, know pedagogy, and can teach in an effective and caring manner. The update should also note any new categories of evidence the faculty plans to collect.

A. Items under each category of Appendix E are examples. Programs may have more or different evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Evidence</th>
<th>Available and in the Brief</th>
<th>Not available and not in the Brief</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Grades           | Relied on                 | Not Relied on                     | For future use
|                  |                           |                                   | Not for future use for your selection |

Candidate grades and grade point averages

Scores on standardized tests

Candidate scores on standardized license or board examinations

Candidate scores on undergraduate and/or graduate admission tests of subject matter knowledge and aptitude

Standardized scores and gains of the completers’ own students

Ratings

Ratings of portfolios of academic and clinical accomplishments

Third-party rating of program’s students

Provide a link that demonstrates candidate performance data are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the school, college, or department of education homepage.

Testing and employment data for program completers:
http://www.cazenovia.edu/about/institutional-research/accreditation
Ratings of in-service, clinical, and PDS teaching

Ratings, by cooperating teacher and college/ university supervisors, of practice teachers' work samples

Rates

Rates of completion of courses and program

Completers' career retention rates

Completers' job placement rates

Rates of completers' professional advanced study

Rates of completers' leadership roles

Rates of graduates' professional service activities

Case studies and alumni competence

Evaluations of completers by their own pupils

Completer self-assessment of their accomplishments

Third-party professional recognition of completers (e.g., NBPTS)

Employers' evaluations of the program's completers

Completers' authoring of textbooks, curriculum materials, etc.

Case studies of completers' own students' learning and accomplishment

1: Assessment results related to TEAC Quality Principle I that the program faculty uses elsewhere must be included in the Brief. Evidence that is reported to the institution or state licensing authorities, or alluded to in publications, Web sites, catalogs, and the like must be included in the Brief. Therefore, Title II results, grades (if they are used for graduation, transfer, and admission), admission test results (if they are used), and hiring rates (if they are reported elsewhere) would all be included in the Brief.

B. Provide an update of the program's data spreadsheet(s) or data tables related to the program's claims.

Updated Appendix E 2016

IECE/IEE Program Crosswalk

See attached updated Appendix E

See attached updated Appendix E

See attached updated Appendix E

See attached updated Appendix E

See attached updated Appendix E

See attached updated Appendix E

See attached updated Appendix E

See attached updated Appendix E

See attached updated Appendix E

See attached updated Appendix E

See attached updated Appendix E

See attached updated Appendix E

See attached updated Appendix E

See attached updated Appendix E

See attached updated Appendix E

See attached updated Appendix E

See attached updated Appendix E

See attached updated Appendix E
Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2016 EPP Annual Report.

☐ I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Erica V. Miller
Position: CAEP Coordinator
Phone: 315-655-7390
E-mail: evmiller@cazenovia.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, going forward accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.
# Appendix E: Full Disclosure of All Relevant and Available Evidence

## Inventory: Status of evidence from measures and indicators for TEAC Quality Principle 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Evidence</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Not Available</th>
<th>For future use</th>
<th>Not for future use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In the Brief</strong></td>
<td>Reasons for including the results in the Brief and location in Brief.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reasons for not including the results in the Brief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not in the Brief</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For future use</strong></td>
<td>Reasons for including in future Briefs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reasons for not including in future Briefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not for future use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRADES

1. Student grades and grade point averages
   - Overall GPA relied on to support claim #1. Education Program GPA and individual program specific course grades relied on to support claims #2 and #3.
   - pp. 40-52

### SCORES ON STANDARDIZED TESTS

2. Student scores on standardized license examinations
   - LAST, ATSW, Multi-Subject Content Area Test, Teaching Students with Disabilities Content Area Test relied on to support claims #1 and #2.
   - pp. 40-52
   - 2014 graduates and beyond will take the new NYS teacher certification tests. EAS, ASLT, new Content Area Test pass rates will be used to support claims #1 and #2. These assessments were not used at the time that our brief was written.

3. Student scores on undergraduate admission tests of subject matter knowledge and aptitude
   - SAT/ACT scores are available for some of our college entrants. However, they are not a requirement for entrance to our institution. During the 2012-2013 academic year, the IECE/IEE programs went to a two level acceptance model where students...
were conditionally accepted to the IECE/IEE programs but could not proceed to student teaching before meeting specific criteria. In response to CAEP Standard 3, during the 2014-2015 the IECE/IEE programs required that students formally apply to the professional semesters (i.e. student teaching semesters). Students must have a minimum GPA and successful completion of prerequisite tests/courses to be formally admitted into the professional semesters for their designated program. Students apply during the fall of their junior year to begin ED 388-Student Teaching I during the spring of their junior year and ED 484/488- Student Teaching II during the fall of their senior year. The students graduate (complete the program) the spring of their senior year. The number of students who are accepted into the professional semesters is now the number used to calculate our # of candidates.

| 4. Standardized scores and gains of the program graduates’ own pupils | The state of NY was awarded Race to the Top money to create a system to track and connect student achievement to teacher quality. The state ran out of money before this system was developed. There is no systematic process for collecting this data. |
### RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Ratings of portfolios of academic and clinical accomplishments</th>
<th>Ratings on portfolios artifacts and entry slips are included as part of grades in ED 388 and ED 484/484, in Section 4, rationale in Section 2 to support claims # 2 and #3. Portfolios are evaluated by the college supervisors.</th>
<th>pp. 40-52; pp. 20-31</th>
<th>2014 graduates and beyond create an additional edTPA portfolio that is evaluated by third party evaluators. edTPA pass rates will be used to support claim #3. This assessment was not available at the time that our brief was written.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Third-party rating of program’s students</td>
<td>Student teacher host teachers’ complete mid-term and end of term evaluations of student teachers.</td>
<td>pp. 40-52</td>
<td>A new survey portal used for rating practicum student performance was implemented at the beginning of the 2013-2014 academic year. 2014 graduates and beyond create an additional edTPA portfolio that is evaluated by third party evaluators. edTPA pass rates will be used to support claim #3. The taskstream portal is now used to collect host teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ratings of in-service, clinical, and PDS teaching</td>
<td>There is not yet a systematic process for collecting this data. Some completers do not go directly into teaching. Some go onto graduate school and/or decide to pursue other avenues of employment that do not have them regularly participating in PDS teaching, clinical or in-service training. We currently do not have a procedure for obtaining this information from employers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching assessment rubric is completed by host teachers and college supervisors’ data relied on to support claims #2 and #3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Rates of completion of courses and program</td>
<td>Graduation rates by program option included in Section 1.</td>
<td>p. 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Graduates’ career retention rates</td>
<td>A richer system for data collection is underway. The alumni survey currently is the only vehicle for completers to anecdotally report career retention rates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Graduates’ job placement rates</td>
<td>EPP created a system for collecting graduates job placement rates using the alumni survey and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by joining forces with the Office of Career Services. Together they will collect graduates job placement data at various intervals (6 months-5 years).

12. Rates of graduates’ professional advanced study

EPP included specific questions related to completers’ attainment of professional advanced study on the 2016 alumni survey.

13. Rates of graduates’ leadership roles

EPP included questions related to completers’ leadership roles on the 2016 alumni survey.

14. Rates of graduates’ professional service activities

EPP included questions related to completers’ professional service activities on the 2016 alumni survey.

CASE STUDIES AND ALUMNI COMPETENCE

15. Evaluations of graduates by their own pupils

There is not yet a systematic process for collecting this data. Some completers do not go directly into teaching. Some go onto graduate school and/or decide to pursue other avenues of employment that do not have them in direct contact with students who will evaluate them. Potential issues if confidentiality and difficulty collecting data in a systematic manner make this data point an unrealistic option for EPP at this time.

16. Alumni self-assessment of their accomplishments

Data from alumni survey is included in Section 4 rationale and in Section 2 to support claims #2 and #3. pp. 40-52; pp. 20-31

17. Third-party professional recognition of

System for data collection is underway. The 2016 alumni
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>graduates (e.g., NBPTS)</th>
<th>survey was used to collect data regarding completers' rates of professional recognition. It has also been proposed that the EPP establish relationships with third-party professional recognition organizations to gather names of EPP grads who achieve such recognitions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Employers' evaluations of program graduates</td>
<td>Potential issues of confidentiality and difficulty collecting data in a systematic manner make this data point an unrealistic option for EPP at this time. However, the EPP is working with the Office of Institutional Advancement and the Office of Institutional Assessment to explore options for obtaining such data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Graduates' authoring of textbooks, curriculum materials</td>
<td>EPP included specific questions related to completers' rates of authoring textbooks/curriculum on the 2016 alumni survey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Case studies of graduates' own pupils' learning and accomplishments</td>
<td>This is being explored as a point of future inquiry. EPP is in the process of developing a procedure for obtaining case studies illustrating completers' own students' learning and accomplishment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social & Behavioral Sciences Graduates
2012-2015
Six Months After Date of Graduation

Criminal Justice & Homeland Security Studies
2012-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CJHSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Employed (&amp; Grad School)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Employed in field (&amp; Grad School)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social & Behavioral Sciences Graduates
2012-2015
Six Months After Date of Graduation

Inclusive Early Childhood & Inclusive Elementary Education 2012-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Employed (&amp; Grad School)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Employed in field (&amp; Grad School)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social & Behavioral Sciences Graduates
2012-2015
Six Months After Date of Graduation

Human Services
2012-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Services</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Employed (&amp; Grad School)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Employed in field (&amp; Grad School)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social & Behavioral Sciences Graduates
2012-2015
Six Months After Date of Graduation

International Studies
2012-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% Employed (&amp; Grad School)</th>
<th>% Employed in field (&amp; Grad School)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social & Behavioral Sciences Graduates
2012-2015
Six Months After Date of Graduation

Psychology 2012-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employed (&amp; Grad School)</th>
<th>Employed in field (&amp; Grad School)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graph:

- **Psychology 2012-2015**
- **Y-axis**: Responses
- **X-axis**: Years 2012-2015
- **Categories**: Grads, Responses, Employed in field, Employed outside of field, Grad School

- **Legend**:
  - Blue: Grads
  - Orange: Responses
  - Gray: Employed in field
  - Yellow: Employed outside of field
  - Green: Grad School

- **Data Points**:
  - 2012: 9 responses, 8 in field, 3 outside of field, 2 in grad school
  - 2013: 18 responses, 13 in field, 1 outside of field, 2 in grad school
  - 2014: 12 responses, 10 in field, 5 outside of field, 2 in grad school
  - 2015: 9 responses, 9 in field, 2 outside of field, 1 in grad school
Social & Behavioral Sciences Graduates

2012-2015

Six Months After Date of Graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Science</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Employed (&amp; Grad School)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Employed in field (&amp; Grad School)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>