CAEP Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Case Analysis for the *Inquiry Brief* Pathway
College of St. Scholastica
Teacher Preparation Program

Audit Opinion: The College of St. Scholastica *Inquiry Brief* received a clean audit opinion indicating that 100% of the targets were verified. The *Brief* was found to be accurate and trustworthy.

Summary of claims and evidence: The College of St. Scholastica claims that its program completers:

1. demonstrate competence in the subject matter they will teach *(CAEP 1.1)*;
2. use research-based pedagogy to promote student achievement *(CAEP 1.1)*;
3. are caring professionals *(CAEP 1.2 and 1.3)*;
4. have the ability to learn new information and have the skills to support life-long learning *(CAEP 1.6)*;
5. understand diverse and multicultural perspectives *(CAEP 1.3)*;
6. use technology to increase student learning and efficiencies *(CAEP 1.4.)*; and
7. know how to collect and use data to assess the academic achievement of their students *(CAEP 1.2 and 1.4)*.

Evidence supporting the claims

The program relies on the following several lines of evidence in support of its claims: overall Grade Point Averages (GPA) at the college and program levels; state licensure exams (Praxis and Minnesota Teacher Licensure Examinations, MTLE); portfolios; course assessments aligned to Minnesota Licensure Standards and/or program outcomes; assessment of professional behaviors; student teacher evaluations; surveys of candidates, alumni, and employers; and undergraduate focus groups. The Teacher Licensure assessment measures, aligned to CAEP Standards, are:

Measure	CAEP Standard
Grade point average – CSS and EDU	CAEP 1.1
State licensure exams – Praxis/MTLE	CAEP 1.1
Portfolio	CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6
Course assessments aligned to Minnesota Licensure Standards	CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6
Professional Behaviors Form	CAEP 1.2, 1.3, 1.6
Student Teacher Final Evaluations	CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 1.6

Surveys: Exit, Alumni, Employer	CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 1.6
Focus Group Feedback	CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4

The Master of Education assessment measures, aligned to CAEP Standards, are:

Measure	Claim
Grade point average	CAEP 1.1
Course assessments aligned to Minnesota Licensure Standards	CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6
Exit Survey	CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6

In addition, the School of Education participates in year two of the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA), now referred to as edTPA, field test. The edTPA consists of a videotaped segment of the student teacher in a K-12 classroom over a 3-5 day period of time. Student teachers review their teaching and prepare written reflections regarding four tasks: planning instruction and assessment; instructing and engaging students in learning; assessing student learning; and analyzing teaching.

Internal audit: SOE faculty and staff conducted an internal audit of the program's quality control system (QCS) during a full day retreat on May 22, 2012 at the Duluth campus under the leadership of Chery Takkunen, Graduate Chair. Prior to conducting the internal audit, faculty provided feedback and approved the QCS elements and audit probes aligned with the ten elements of *CAEP Standard 3, Resources and Practices Support Candidate Learning*. The internal audit found the QCS to be working as designed, in general, and identified the need for increased terminal degree faculty, technology support for adjuncts, file checklists for candidate documentation, and a systematic review process for adjunct teaching.

Plans for program improvement: The program identified the following areas for continuous improvement:
- Strengthen preparation for ELL and children with special needs;
- Establish formal structures to identify why candidates complete and why they do not;
- Strengthen mechanisms to locate and gather data on completers' impact on K-12 learning and retention rates in the profession for completers; and
- Improve systems for data integrity and analysis.

Statement regarding capacity and commitment: The faculty concluded that The College of St. Scholastica is committed to the Teacher Preparation Program and that there is sufficient capacity to offer a quality program.

Audit Map: Audit tasks are organized by CAEP Standards and are noted as Verified, Verified with Error, Not Verified, or Disclaimer.

CAEP Standard	Verified	Verified with Error	Not Verified	Disclaimer
1.1 Candidates know subject matter (including pedagogical content knowledge) and pedagogy	A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, A6, A7, A8, A27, A28			
1.2 Candidates teach students in schools effectively and demonstrate impact on P-12 student learning	A9, A10, A12, A27, A29	A11		
1.3 Candidates nurture the academic and social development of all students	A9, A13, A14, A15, A16, A17, A18, A27, A30, A31			
1.4 Candidates use technology to enhance teaching, classroom management, communications with families, and assessment of student learning	A19, A20, A21, A22, A23, A25, A27, A31			
1.5 Candidates work collaboratively with the community and other school personnel to support student learning	A24, A27, B5			
1.6 Candidates engage in ongoing learning that improves practice	A26, A27, A31			
2.1 EPP decisions are based on evidence from multiple measures	B1, B2			
2.2 EPP has a system for regular self-assessment	B1, B2, B3			
2.3 The reliability and validity of each assessment measure are known and adequate	B4, B5, B6, B7	B8		
2.4 EPP uses data for program improvement	B9			
3.1 Curricula and other program components meet state and/or national standards	C1, C9A #1			
3.2 Field experiences and clinical practice support candidate development as effective educators	C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9A #2			
3.3 Candidates work with diverse P-12 students and teachers,	C9A #3			

faculty and other candidates				
3.4 Faculty members are qualified	C9A **#4, #5**			
3.5 Support services for candidates/ completers are sufficient and equitable	C9B **#6, #7,** D.1			
3.6 Facilities are appropriate and adequate	C9B **#8, #9, 10,** D.1			
3.7 Administrative structures and financial resources support candidate learning and show parity at the institution	C9B **#11, #12, #13,** D.1			
3.8 Admissions and mentoring policies encourage recruitment and retention of high quality candidates	C9B **#14**			
3.9 Provision exists for candidates/ completers to voice concerns	C9B **#15**			
3.10 Policies and practices are transparent and consistent	C9B **#15**			

Presentation of the College of St. Scholastica Case for accreditation aligned to the CAEP Interim Standards

STANDARD 1: Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for effective work in schools. *This standard addresses what candidates know and are able to do. Evidence must be provided regarding candidates' knowledge of subject matter (including pedagogical content knowledge), of the field of pedagogy, and their capacity for independent learning as professionals. In addition, evidence must be provided regarding candidates' effective performance in schools, including evidence of P-12 pupil learning and the candidates' capacity to nurture all students as learners and to work effectively as members of the school community.*

Standard 1: Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for effective work in schools.
Component 1.1: Know subject matter (including pedagogical content knowledge) and pedagogy
Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with subject matter and pedagogical knowledge   Content knowledge   • Evidence for Claim 1 (content knowledge) appears in Tables 4.7 and 4.8 (page 35) showing candidates' mean GPAs between 3.52-3.77 and Table 4.9 (page 36) showing comparable GPAs between non-teaching majors and secondary education majors.   • Audit Tasks A6 and A7 verify that both undergraduate and graduate candidates meet the program's GPA requirement of 2.8 (undergraduate) and 3.0 (graduate).   • Tables 4.10 (undergraduates) and 4.11 (graduates) show evidence of candidates' means scores on the Praxis II licensure tests exceeding the state minimum passing score (page 37).   • Audit Task A8 verified that 24 randomly selected candidates passed both the Praxis II content knowledge test and the PLT pedagogical knowledge test.   • Tables 4.12, 4.13, 4.14, and 4.15 report candidates' scores in subject matter competence from the final student teacher evaluation; 52.8% of undergraduates and 58.8% of graduates "exceed expectations" (pages 38-39).   • Tables 4.16 and 4.17 report survey items measuring subject matter knowledge (page 40).   • Tables 4.18 and 4.19 report evidence from the capstone portfolio of candidate success in meeting the content knowledge claim (pages 40-41).   • Audit Tasks A1 and A2 verified the collaboration of faculty from the arts and sciences and education in assessing candidate content knowledge.   • IB Commission surveys of faculty, candidates, graduates, and cooperating teachers corroborate the program's evidence that candidates acquire content knowledge (Audit Tasks A27 and A28).   Pedagogical knowledge   • Evidence for candidates' success in meeting Claim 2 (pedagogical knowledge) appears in Tables 4.24 and 4.25 which report Praxis II Principles of Learning scores for both undergraduate and graduate candidates (page 43).   • Audit Task A8 verified that 24 randomly selected candidates passed both the Praxis II content knowledge test and the PLT pedagogical knowledge test.   • Tables 4.26, 4.27, 4.28, and 4.29 report candidate achievement on 7 items in the student teacher final examination which supports the program's claim that candidates meet Claim 2 (pages 43-45).   • Tables 4.30, 4.31, and 4.35 report candidate achievement on 10 items related to Claim 2 as reported by the candidates themselves, alumni, and employers (pages 45-47; page 49).

• Tables 4.32 and 4.33 report evidence of candidate achievement in meeting Claim 2 through exhibits in the capstone portfolio (pages 47-48). • Table 4.36 reports course assessment results for M.Ed. candidates meeting Claim 2 (page 50). • IB Commission surveys of faculty, candidates, graduates, and cooperating teachers corroborate the program's evidence of candidates' pedagogical knowledge (Audit Tasks A27 and A29).

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with subject matter and pedagogical knowledge
None

Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with subject matter and pedagogical knowledge
None

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with Standard 1.1)
☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with Standard 1.1)

Standard 1: Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for effective work in schools.
Component 1.2: Teach students in schools effectively and demonstrate impact on P-12 student learning.

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with teaching ability
• The *IB* describes the program's use of the Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) on page 10 and its use of edTPA to prepare candidates to use student data to improve their teaching on page 77. • Audit Tasks A9, A10, A11, and A12 verify that candidates participate in early and ongoing clinical experiences. • Tables 4.37 and 4.38 report evidence of candidate achievement in meeting Claim 3 (caring educators) through responses to 3 items of the Professional Behaviors Form (pages 50-51). • Tables 4.39 and 4.40 report evidence on 13 items in the student teacher final examination which supports the program's claim that candidates meet Claim 3 (pages 51-52). • Tables 4.41 and 4.42 report candidate achievement on 10 items related to Claim 3 as reported by the candidates themselves, alumni, and employers (pages 52-54). • Tables 4.43 and 4.44 report evidence of candidate achievement in meeting Claim 3 through exhibits in the capstone portfolio (pages 54-55). • Table 4.45 reports course assessment results for M.Ed. candidates meeting Claim 3 (pages 56-57). • Tables 4.69 and 4.70 report evidence on 2 items in the student teacher final examination which supports the program's claim that candidates meet Claim 7 (analyze P-12 academic achievement) (page 70). • Tables 4.71 and 4.72 report candidate achievement on 6 items related to Claim 7 as reported by the candidates themselves, alumni, and employers (pages 70-72). • Tables 4.73, 4.74, and 4.75 report evidence of candidate achievement in meeting Claim 7 through exhibits in the capstone portfolio (pages 72-73). • Table 4.76 reports course assessment results for M.Ed. candidates meeting Claim 7 (pages 73-74). • IB Commission surveys of faculty, candidates, graduates, and cooperating teachers corroborate the program's evidence of candidates' teaching skill (Audit Tasks A27 and A29)

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with teaching ability
None

Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with teaching ability
None

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with Standard 1.2)

☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with Standard 1.2)

Standard 1: Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for effective work in schools.

Component 1.3: Nurture the academic and social development of all students.

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with nurturing academic and social development of all students
- The *IB* describes the program's expectations in terms of candidate dispositions and response to diversity on pages 7-8, the influence of Benedictine values on page 11, and the Native Teacher Program Collaboration with the Fond du Lac Tribal Community College on page 11.
- Audit Tasks A14 and A15 verify that candidates are placed in school settings that enable them to work with a wide range of students.
- Audit Tasks A16 and A17 verify program elements that strengthen candidates' knowledge and skills in working with diverse students and developing multicultural perspectives.
- Tables 4.39 and 4.40 report evidence on 13 items in the student teacher final examination which supports the program's claim that candidates meet Claim 3 (pages 51-52).
- Tables 4.55 and 4.56 report evidence on 3 items in the student teacher final examination which supports the program's claim that candidates meet Claim 5 (diversity and multicultural) (pages 61-62).
- Tables 4.57 and 4.58 report candidate achievement on 4 items related to Claim 5 as reported by the candidates themselves, alumni, and employers (pages 62-64).
- Tables 4.60 and 4.61 report evidence of candidate achievement in meeting Claim 5 through exhibits in the capstone portfolio (pages 64-66).
- Table 4.62 reports course assessment results for M.Ed. candidates meeting Claim 5 (page 66).
- IB Commission surveys of faculty, candidates, graduates, and cooperating teachers corroborate the program's evidence of candidates' ability to teach all students (Audit Tasks A27, A30, and A31).

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with nurturing academic and social development of all students
None

Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with nurturing academic and social development of all students
None

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with Standard 1.3)
☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with Standard 1.3)

Standard 1: Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for effective work in schools.

Component 1.4: Use technology to enhance teaching, classroom management, communications with families, and assessment of student learning.

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with ability to use technology effectively
- The *IB* describes the program's expectations in terms of candidate use of technology on page 8.
- Audit Tasks A18, A19, A20, A21, and A22 verify program strategies to ensure candidate success in using technology.
- Audit Task A23 verifies the program's adoption of various technology tools to enhance the preparation of candidates.
- Table 4.46 reports course assessment results for M.Ed. candidates meeting Claim 3 (page 56) includes results from an assignment to "create a technology initiative."
- Table 4.68 reports course assessment results for M.Ed. candidates meeting Claim 6 (pages

69-70) includes results from assignments to "examine the Internet for web sites to enhance student learning, analyze digital apps for learning, and research a digital media project."
- Tables 4.63, 4.64, and 4.65 report candidate achievement on 4 items related to <u>Claim 6</u> as reported by the candidates themselves, alumni, and employers (pages 67-68).
- Table 4.66 reports evidence of candidate achievement in meeting <u>Claim 6</u> through exhibits in the capstone portfolio (pages 67-68).
- IB Commission surveys of faculty, candidates, graduates, and cooperating teachers corroborate the program's evidence of candidates' effectiveness using technology (Audit Tasks A27 and A31).

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with ability to use technology effectively
None

Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with ability to use technology effectively
None

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with Standard 1.4)
☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with Standard 1.4)

<u>Standard 1:</u> Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for effective work in schools.

Component 1.5: Work collaboratively with the community and other school personnel to support student learning.

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with working effectively as members of the school community
- The *IB* describes the program's commitment to developing collaborative partnerships with K-12 schools on page 8.
- Audit Tasks A24 and B5 verify the program's collaboration with community members and school personnel through the School of Education's Advisory Committee.
- Audit Tasks C4 and C5 verify the strength of clinical portion of the program based on its collaborative relationship with local schools.
- Tables 4.37 and 4.38 report evidence of candidate achievement in meeting <u>Claim 3</u> (caring educators) through responses to 3 items of the Professional Behaviors Form (pages 50-51).
- Tables 4.41 and 4.42 report candidate achievement on "actively involving parents/guardians and families in the education of their children" (<u>Claim 3</u>) as reported by the candidates themselves, alumni, and employers (pages 52-54).
- Tables 4.43 and 4.44 report evidence of candidate achievement in meeting <u>Claim 3</u> through exhibits in the capstone portfolio (pages 54-55).
- Table 4.45 reports course assessment results for M.Ed. candidates meeting <u>Claim 3</u> (pages 56-57).
- IB Commission surveys of faculty, candidates, graduates, and cooperating teachers corroborate the program's evidence of candidates' ability to work collaboratively in the school community (Audit Tasks A27).

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with working effectively as members of the school community
None

Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with working effectively as members of the school community
None

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with Standard 1.5)
☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with Standard 1.5)

<u>Standard 1:</u> Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions

for effective work in schools.
Component 1.6: Engage in ongoing learning that improves practice.
Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with engaging in ongoing learning
• The *IB* describes the program's commitment to teaching candidates the value of critical reflection on page 7 and its activities designed to involve candidates in research on page 12.
• Table 4.47 reports evidence of candidate achievement in meeting <u>Claim 4</u> (life-long learning) through responses to 1 item of the Professional Behaviors Form (pages 57).
• Tables 4.48 and 4.49 report evidence on 2 items in the student teacher final examination which supports the program's claim that candidates meet <u>Claim 4</u> (page 58).
• Tables 4.50, 4.51, and 4.53 report candidate achievement on 3 items related to <u>Claim 4</u> as reported by the candidates themselves, alumni, and employers (pages 58-59;page 61).
• Table 4.52 reports evidence of candidate achievement in meeting <u>Claim 4</u> through exhibits in the capstone portfolio (page 60).
• Table 4.54 reports course assessment results for M.Ed. candidates meeting <u>Claim 4</u> (pages 56-57).
• IB Commission surveys of faculty, candidates, graduates, and cooperating teachers corroborate the program's evidence of candidates' capacity for ongoing learning (Audit Tasks A27 and A31).
Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with engaging in ongoing learning None
Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with engaging in ongoing learning None

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with Standard 1.6)
☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with Standard 1.6)

STANDARD 2: Data drive decisions about candidates and programs.

This standard addresses CAEP's expectations regarding data quality and data use in program improvement. The educator preparation provider (EPP) must provide evidence that it has a functioning quality control system that is effective in supporting program improvement, and that tis quality control system draws on valid and reliable evidence from multiple sources.

<u>Standard 2:</u> Data drive decisions about candidates and programs.
Component 2.1: Decisions are based on evidence from multiple measures of candidates' learning, completers' performance in the schools, and school and community conditions and needs
Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with decisions based on evidence
• The *IB* describes the program's continuous improvement approach, and the ways in which it has improved various assessments on pages 9-10.
• The *IB* provides details about how faculty used program results to improve both the digital portfolio and the professional behaviors evaluation form on pages 78-79.
• Audit Task B1 verified by minutes of faculty meetings that improvements in the program's quality control system were the result of examination of evidence of candidate learning.
• Audit Task B2 reviewed minutes of monthly faculty meetings to review results of program assessments and monitor progress on improvements.
Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with routine self-assessment None
Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with routine self-

assessment
None

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with Standard 2.1)

☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with Standard 2.1)

Standard 2: Data drive decisions about candidates and programs.
Component 2.2: **The EPP has a system for regular self-assessment based on a coherent logic that connects the program's aims, content, experiences, and assessments**
Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the program basing its decisions on evidence
• The *IB* outlines 11 areas for continuous improvement based on what faculty learned during the internal academic audit of its quality control system (described in Appendix A) on pages 79-80.
• Audit Task B3 verified the program's annual faculty retreat to review data and propose changes to the quality control system.
• Audit Task B1 verified by minutes of faculty meetings that improvements in the program's quality control system were the result of examination of evidence of candidate learning.
• Audit Task B2 reviewed minutes of monthly faculty meetings to review results of program assessments and monitor progress on improvements.
Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the program basing its decisions on evidence
None
Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with the program basing its decisions on evidence
None

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with Standard 2.2)

☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with Standard 2.2)

Standard 2: Data drive decisions about candidates and programs.
Component 2.3: **The reliability and validity of each assessment measure are known and adequate, and the unit reviews and revises assessments and data sources regularly and systematically.**
Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with multiple measures of evidence
• The *IB* describes the program's use of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) to compare means among survey responses from candidates, alumni, and employers in terms of Claim 3 (page 52) and Claim 5 (page 63). Appendix G7 reports the results of the analysis for all 17 items on the survey (page 181).
• Frequency score ratings for selected survey items are reported for Claim 5 (pages 63-64) and Claim 6 (page 67).
• Appendices G1 and G2 report correlations between Praxis I scores and GPA for undergraduate completers (page 175) and GTL completers (page 176).
• Appendices G3 and G4 report correlations between Praxis II scores and GPA for undergraduate completers (page 177) and GTL completers (page 178).
• Appendices G5 and G7 report t-test analysis of the significance of program completer means scores with state passing scores for undergraduate completers (page 179) and GTL completers (page 180).
• Appendices G8-G13 report results on the Minnesota basic skills, content, and principles of learning tests in terms of undergraduate and GTL completers. The number of failed attempts, Minnesota passing score, state mean, and St. Scholastica mean are reported.
• Audit Tasks B4, B5, B6, B7, and B8 verified the development and use of assessments as

reported in the *IB*.
Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with multiple measures of evidence None
Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with multiple measures of evidence None

⬤ **Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with the requirements)**
☐ **Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with the requirements)**

Standard 2: Data drive decisions about candidates and programs.
Component 2.4: **The EPP uses data for program improvement and disaggregates the evidence for discrete program options or certification areas**
Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the reliability and validity of the assessment measures • The *IB* describes the program's continuous improvement approach, and the ways in which it has improved various assessments on pages 9-10. • Results from the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching led faculty to target improvements in what candidates are taught about how to teach English language learners and children with special needs (page 75). • Results from survey responses led faculty to strengthen teaching strategies designed to prepare candidates in teaching English language learners and children with special needs (pages 76-77). • Faculty and candidates receive focused training and experience in using various technologies to improve student learning. The program is also adapting its program to reflect the new Minnesota Board of Teaching technology standards (page 77). • Audit Task B3 verified the program's annual faculty retreat to review data and propose changes to the quality control system. • Audit Task B1 verified by minutes of faculty meetings that improvements in the program's quality control system were the result of examination of evidence of candidate learning. • Audit Task B2 reviewed minutes of monthly faculty meetings to review results of program assessments and monitor progress on improvements.
Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the reliability and validity of the assessment measures None
Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with the reliability and validity of the assessment measures None

⬤ Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with Standard 2.4)
☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with Standard 2.4)

STANDARD 3: Resources and practices support candidate learning. *This standard addresses the EPP's capacity for offering a high quality program. Evidence must be provided in two areas: (1) learning conditions that provide the capacity for program quality, and (2) supportive services and policies that constitute ongoing commitment to the program.*

Standard 3: Resources and practices support candidate learning.
Component 3.1: Curricula and other program components meet state and/or national

standards
Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the standard • Audit Task C1 verified that course syllabi are aligned to Minnesota Licensure standards. • Table C9a provides evidence of course requirements
Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the standard None
Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with the standard None

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with the requirements)
☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with the requirements)

Standard 3: Resources and practices support candidate learning.
Component 3.2: Field experiences and clinical practice offered in collaboration with P-12 schools support candidate development as effective teachers
Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the standard • Audit Task C2 corroborates the validity of cooperating teacher ratings • Audit Tasks C3, C4, and C5 verify the clinical portion of the program offered in collaboration with P-12 schools • Table C9a provides evidence of clinical experiences
Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the standard None
Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with the standard None

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with the requirements)
☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with the requirements)

Standard 3: Resources and practices support candidate learning.
Component 3.3: The EPP provides opportunities for candidates to work with diverse P-12 students and teachers, faculty, and other candidates
Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the standard • Table C9a provides evidence of candidate exposure to diverse populations of students, faculty, and other candidates
Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the standard None
Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with the standard None

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with the requirements)
☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with the requirements)

Standard 3: Resources and practices support candidate learning.
Components 3.4: Full-time and part-time faculty members are qualified, individually and in aggregate, for academic and/or clinical teaching.
Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the standard • Table C9a provides evidence of faculty qualifications
Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the standard None
Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with the standard None

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with the requirements)

☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with the requirements)

| **Standard 3:** Resources and practices support candidate learning. |
| **Component 3.5: Support services for candidates/completers are sufficient and equitable** |
| |
| **Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the standard**
• Table C9b provides evidence of support services for candidates/completers
• Table D.1 provides results from the IB Commission surveys of faculty, candidates, graduates, and cooperating teachers in terms of support services |
| **Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the standard**
None |
| **Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with the standard**
None |

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with the requirements)
☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with the requirements)

| **Standard 3:** Resources and practices support student learning. |
| **Component 3.6: Facilities are appropriate and adequate to support candidates learning** |
| |
| **Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the standard**
• Table C9b provides evidence of appropriate facilities
• Table D.1 provides results from the IB Commission surveys of faculty and candidates in terms of appropriate facilities |
| **Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the standard**
None |
| **Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with the standard**
None |

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with the requirements)
☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with the requirements)

| **Standard 3:** Resources and practices support student learning. |
| **Standard 3.7: Administrative structures and financial resources support candidate learning and show parity at the institution** |
| |
| **Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the standard**
• Table C9b provides evidence of administrative and financial support
• Table D.1 provides results from the IB Commission surveys of faculty in terms of administrative and financial support |
| **Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the standard**
None |
| **Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with the standard**
None |

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with the requirements)
☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with the requirements)

| **Standard 3:** Resources and practices support student learning. |
| **Component 3.8: Admissions and mentoring policies encourage the recruitment and retention of high quality candidates** |
| |
| **Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the standard**
• Table C9b provides evidence of appropriate admissions and mentoring |
| **Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the standard** |

None
Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with the standard
None

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with the requirements)
☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with the requirements)

Standard 3: Resources and practices support student learning.
Component 3.9: Provision exists for candidates/completers to voice concerns
Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the standard
• Table C9b provides evidence that candidates have the opportunity to voice concerns
Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the standard
None
Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with the standard
None

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with the requirements)
☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with the requirements)

Standard 3: Standards and practices support student learning.
Component 3.10: Policies and practices (academic calendar, grading policy, program requirements, outcome data, etc.) are transparent and consistent.
Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the standard
• Table C9b provides evidence that the noted policies and practices are transparent and consistent.
• Table C9b provides evidence that the College of St. Scholastica delivers its online program options in a manner consistent with regulations and in parity with the onsite program options
Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the standard
None
Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with the standard
None

● Above (preponderance of the evidence is consistent with the requirements)
☐ Below (preponderance of the evidence is inconsistent with the requirements)

Program options include: The College of St. Scholastica Teacher Preparation Program prepares candidates at the undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, and graduate levels leading to recommendation for certification in elementary teacher certification K-6, middle/secondary certification 5-8, and K-12 subject area certifications. Subject specific options include instrumental music, vocal music, educational media (discontinued), Spanish, mathematics, social studies, communication arts & literature, life science w/general science and chemistry w/general science. The state of Minnesota, at its discretion, offers teacher certification to program completers in these areas.

IB COMMISSION Suggested Recommendations

Suggested Areas for Improvement and Stipulations

Areas for Improvement (AFI) - NONE
Stipulations - NONE

Suggested Accreditation Recommendation (shaded)

CAEP Standard 1 Candidate learning	*CAEP Standard 2* Data drive decisions	*CAEP Standard 3* Capacity & Commitment	Accreditation status designations
Above standard	Above standard	Above standard	Accreditation (7 years)
Above standard	Below standard	Above standard	Accreditation (2 years)
Below standard	Above standard	Above standard	Accreditation (2 years)
Above standard	Above standard	Below standard	Accreditation (2 years)
Below standard	Below standard	Above standard	Deny
Below standard	Above standard	Below standard	Deny