

# 2020 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	10138	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	1965
<b>Institution:</b>	McNeese State University		
<b>Unit:</b>	Burton College of Education		

## Section 1. EPP 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...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1.2 [For EPPs seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation]. Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial-Licensure Level and/or Advanced-Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).

<https://catalog.mcneese.edu/content.php?catoid=47&navoid=3955>

## 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 2018-2019 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure<sup>1</sup>

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.)<sup>2</sup>

**Total number of program completers** 153

<sup>1</sup> For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

<sup>2</sup> For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

**Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2018-2019 academic year?**

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP

---

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.

---

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited

---

3.4 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

---

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

---

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

## Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4   A.5.4)	
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3   A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4   A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

4.1 Provide a link or links that demonstrate data relevant to each of the Annual Reporting Measures are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's website.

1

**Link:** [https://www.mcneese.edu/stpes/assessment\\_annual\\_reports](https://www.mcneese.edu/stpes/assessment_annual_reports)

**Description of data accessible via link:** Impact on P-12 Learning Measures and Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness have been reported through the Louisiana Teacher Preparation Fact Book and Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Dashboard. Previous years data is posted on the site. The following statement is from the Board of Regents concerning the unavailability of the current year's reports:

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

*What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?*

*Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?*

*Are benchmarks available for comparison?*

*Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?*

McNeese State University (MSU)'s EPP impact and outcome measures' data is collected from several sources including the Louisiana Department of Education (LDoE), Louisiana Board of Regents (LBoR), Completer Follow-up Surveys (CFS), Employer Satisfaction Surveys (ESS), and the United States Department of Education Federal Student website. This written report outlines the data included within the 'CAEP Standard 4 updated presentation' PowerPoint found within the link in the Standard 4 Annual Report section in AIMS. No new data has been added to CAEP standard 4.1, 4.2, or persistence data representing the 2019 academic year. The following is the official statement for all Louisiana Preparation Providers from the Louisiana Board of Regents, Louisiana Board of Regents statement: "Due to discrepancies found in data used to calculate Growth in Student Learning Scores and Compass Teacher Evaluation Scores for new teachers completing individual teacher preparation programs, it was not possible to release 2019 Teacher Preparation Data Dashboards or create a 2019 Teacher Preparation Fact Book. Please go to the USDE Title 2 website at <https://Title2.ed.gov> to locate information about teacher preparation programs pertaining to: listing of programs, number of enrolled candidates, race and gender of enrolled candidates, number of completers, GPA of completers, Praxis passage rates, and other relevant information."

The EPP continues to strive for excellence. Although no new data was presented for 4.1, 4.2 and persistence data for the 2019 academic year, previous years' data was further analyzed, and next steps were implemented based on those conclusions.

After reviewing the previously reported CAEP 4.1 and 4.2 data, several new collaborations and additions were made with our redesigned initial certification programs. For completers, using data to drive instruction is a skill that needs to be practiced as shown by data when VAM scores are disaggregated from our VAM/SLT scores. Completers must be able to use summative data, beginning of the year testing data, and progress monitoring to determine student level of mastery of the standards. The Teaching Cycle portfolio which includes analysis of summative data and inventories of particular groups of students in order to create a lesson plan tied to the assigned field placement within each methodology course has been added to all programs. Candidates then analyze student artifact data from the lesson to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses and what post-lesson scaffolding should look like as a next step for students mastering the content.

It was noted that MSU had a high percentage of completers scoring at the Ineffective range according our VAM data in Math grades 4-8. Due to this, MSU participated in the Deans for Impact Collaborative during the 2018-2019 academic year with a strategic focus on Math preparation. We have realigned four math courses (two in content and two in methodology) to include a coherent sequence of content, instructional activities, Tier 1 curriculum and instructional practice in the field.

The LDoE has mandated all EPP's to include the Louisiana Teacher Preparation Competencies so that completers can develop them with quality experiences embedded throughout their certification programs. MSU has chosen to do this through several ways. First, within our redesigned programs, we have included work within the state approved Tier 1 curriculum. Second, we will be realigning the last portion of our field experience evaluation instrument to include a final section (Domain 5) that is specific to the content area focus and grade band of the lesson. For instance, within the Mathematics Teacher Competencies are both Content Knowledge Competencies and Content Pedagogy Competencies. These competencies were strategically placed within our new four-course math sequence and will be measured by a university instructor and host teacher in the field on multiple occasions. Third, MSU has implemented a performance-based portfolio that is included within the first semester of residency (Senior-Year Residency Performance Portfolio). This portfolio builds upon the data analysis practiced with the Teaching Cycle in the methodology coursework mentioned earlier. Fourth, MSU is redesigning our assessment course that is a co-requisite to the performance portfolio to include strategies for academic feedback for P-12 students.

Previously reported mean data for all three types of programs (undergraduate, MAT, and PBC) indicate that our completers are scoring at the Effective: Proficient and Highly Effective concerning observations of their teaching effectiveness. Even so, MSU is examining better ways to train, norm, and conduct inter-rater reliability sessions with faculty, university supervisors, and mentor teachers. Moving forward we will determine the best method of moving from our current Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) form which is based on the same components as the Louisiana Danielson Model to the actual Compass model used by the state department (Compass). This will allow for better communication of look-fors and yearly training as the LDoE already has a Compass library and electronic training modules. We will spend two days in the month of July norming the instrument as well as conducting professional development with our faculty, university supervisors, and mentor teachers as we shift instruments.

With a shortage of qualified mentors in the field, MSU is now a state approved Mentor Teacher Training Site. This opportunity will also allow us to support new mentors with understanding the elements of the Compass, look-fors with descriptors, and practice providing feedback in the field within the POP (pre-observation, observation, and post-observation) cycle.

Also new to the residency model is the procedure of a formalized POP cycle. MSU will continue to work with university faculty and supervisors on implementing the POP cycle to include feedback conversations and adjusting feedback to identified areas of challenge for individual candidates. In addition to using the POP cycle during residency, we will scaffold components of the POP throughout methodology coursework as well.

To further support an increase in future enrollment, MSU is working with high school EdRising teachers to create dual enrollment courses. McNeese also hosted its first EdRising Regional Conference and plans to use this opportunity to recruit students specific to education. Minors in Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and Special Education will be implemented in the 2020-2021 Academic Year to allow students to earn 19 of the 33 credits for a PBC initial-certification program while completing their chosen undergraduate degree. A contract has been made with Hubspot to help recruit through electronic measures for our alternative certification programs.

To better prepare our completers for Day 1 teaching, we have redesigned all initial-certification programs with full implementation occurring during the 2019-2020 academic year. We are now members of the US PREP Coalition Team with offers additional support for residents during their two-semester residency. Also, with the inclusion of state-approved Tier 1 curriculum, completers will be knowledgeable about Louisiana Student Standards, Content and Pedagogy specific to those standards and the Tier 1 curriculum.

Combined results for both CFS and ESS administered for spring and fall 2018 indicated that employers rated completer abilities higher than our graduates by .12 for baccalaureate program completers and .18 for alternative certification program completers.

In order to better support our students' progression through programs, all PBC and MAT coursework has moved online.

We have added pre-selected videos as part of the field experience requirements that are aligned to course assignments and standards to support candidates having less time away from their full-time teaching assignments.

We have also added Praxis workshops, created by faculty who are experts in the content. This extra support is for those

candidates that cannot progress in the program without passage of Praxis I or II.

MSU EPP completers have a consistently high rate of receiving their state teaching licenses. For the three cycles of data collected, completers of all EPP initial-certification programs had a state licensure rate of 97% or higher over the last three years. The data shows that over the course of three cycles, with all three programs accounted for, only nine (9) completers out of a total of 371 did not submit their paperwork to become a licensed teacher in the state of Louisiana.

Although licensure rates for all three programs are very high, employment rates for the licensed completers are much lower. Employment rates included with the LBoR Data Dashboard and Factbook take into account only the completers who gain employment within the state of Louisiana and in a public P-12 setting.

Advanced programs now include newly redesigned Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction programs are in place for 2020-2021 academic year.

We will also continue to offer the Mentor Teacher Training pathways for 2020-2021. Pathway 1 is professional development. Pathway 2 is embedded coursework within our Master of Education Curriculum and Instruction Programs.

MSU cohort default rates for the enrollment years of 2014-2016 are as follows: 11%, 9.9%, and 13.6% respectively. The reported cohort default rates are for all students enrolled in MSU, not just those specific to the EPP. The national cohort default rate for the 2016 fiscal year was 10.1%. The conclusions from this data are that the default rates of MSU students have had a steady decline over during 2013-2015. MSU had a default rate of almost less than 1% of the national average for the 2015 reporting period; however, for the 2016 reporting period, MSU is 2.5% higher than the national default rate.

## Section 5. 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.

### **CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)**

1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

**The curriculum is not structured to provide comprehensive knowledge and skills for candidates to respond to the cultural and ethnic diversity of the students they serve. (Component 1.1)**

Continuing our transformation since our April 2018 CAEP site visit final report and in addition to alterations from last year's report, during the 2018-2019 academic year we have: 1. Completed a professional development training with US PREP on differentiation. Their model for differentiation is included within the curriculum development/lesson planning course embedded in all initial certification programs. 2. The Teaching Cycle which includes analysis of student formal and informal data to drive instruction is embedded in all methods coursework. 3. A community mapping activity has been added to all programs that requires students to conduct a geographical search in order to determine the environment and opportunities available to the students in their assigned field placement school.

### **CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)**

2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice

**An insufficient plan was provided to ensure that school-based clinical educators and EPP-based clinical educators are evaluated to improve programs and candidate performance (Component 2.2).**

Continuing our transformation since our April 2018 CAEP site visit final report and in addition to alterations from last year's report, during the 2018-2019 academic year we have: 1. Partnered with US PREP to conduct training for supervisors and university faculty to norm instruments and provide inter-rater reliability training. 2. Also during summer 2019, we held a two-day shared governance meeting that included collaboration between college personnel, classroom teachers, curriculum supervisors, administrators, personnel directors, and superintendents. This forum allowed a designated time to examine program data, receive feedback on major assessments from various stakeholders, and have an open discussion pertaining to coursework, instructional activities, and field experiences embedded within programs to ensure alignment with the rigor of content and standards expectations within public school settings. 3. A day at the end of each semester is designated for graduates to complete survey data on university supervisors and mentor teachers so decisions can be based on data. 4. McNeese was granted a license from the state department to become a Mentor Teacher Training site. This initiative will support mentor teachers (school-based clinical educators) to receive training on how to better support our candidates.

### **CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)**

2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice

**An sufficient plan was not provided to demonstrate that candidates' placements in a diverse field and clinical settings are tracked in a systematic manner (Component 2.3).**

Continuing our transformation since our April 2018 CAEP site visit final report and in addition to alterations from last year's report, during the 2018-2019 academic year we have: 1. Incorporated Via (electronic portfolio system) into newly redesigned programs which allows for easier tracking of field experiences by professors throughout a program and not only at the end of the program during student teaching/residency. 2. Program coursework has been blocked so that field experiences for each semester are predetermined to ensure variety of experiences and settings according to state identified Urgent Intervention Required (UIR)/ Comprehensive Intervention Required (CIR) school. 3. The Louisiana Department of Education is requiring

student teachers/residency candidates to be placed with teachers who have completed a state-approved Mentor Training micro-credential. McNeese State University has been granted permission to administer a pilot program for Mentor Teacher Training during the 2019-2020 academic year. Cultural responsiveness will be woven throughout our Mentor Training coursework. This will support our future mentor teachers' ability to practice cultural responsiveness, which in turn will support our candidates' and residents' ability to observe it in practice.

**CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)**

3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity

**The EPP does not have a plan to develop a systematic process for addressing deficiencies related to measures of dispositions (Component 3.3).**

Continuing our transformation since our April 2018 CAEP site visit final report and in addition to alterations from last year's report, during the 2018-2019 academic year we have: 1. All newly redesigned programs will be implemented within the 2019-20 academic year. The first semester now includes EDUC 110 in which faculty and staff will create seminars that build a cohort community for our candidates and a relationship with our students. This will also be where we begin discussions and development about expectations, professionalism, and dispositions. Two seminar meetings will be conducted during the semester. These seminars are in addition to previous requirements. 2. Each mid-semester faculty will meet to discuss students of concern in order to better identify and support students in need (grades, health, dispositions).

**CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)**

3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity

**The Recruitment Plan is not sufficient and lacks strategies and targets to increase the diversity of candidates (Component 3.1).**

Continuing our transformation since our April 2018 CAEP site visit final report and in addition to alterations from last year's report, during the 2018-2019 academic year we have: 1. Created a partnership with local school districts to implement and support EdRising within all high schools within their districts. A professional development was conducted in June of 2019 to support those teachers who were chosen to lead the pilot classes for the 2019-20 academic year. 2. MSU submitted documentation to the state for approval to include a minor in education (elementary and secondary) in order to recruit college students in other fields of study already on our university campus. Current college students may not know about the teaching field and this would offer them the opportunity to complete 19 hours of teaching coursework while completing their undergraduate degree. They would have three semesters of coursework left after graduation in order to become a teacher. 3. To recruit more special education teachers, a new minor has been added for special education (grades 1-5 and 6-12) that supports our candidates completing additional certification in high needs areas while working on their initial teaching license.

**CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)**

4 Program Impact

**There was an insufficient plan to collect feedback from employers and completers on a systematic basis (Components 4.3 & 4.4).**

Continuing our transformation since our April 2018 CAEP site visit final report and in addition to alterations from last year's report, during the 2018-2019 academic year we have: 1. Written and had approved a grant that monetarily supports a contract with Skyfactor. How we had previously collected survey data was cumbersome. The Skyfactor site will make contacting students, collecting data, and analysis of data much less time consuming. Skyfactor surveys will be piloted in the spring 2020 semester and fully implemented during the 2020-2021 academic year and will be used for all programs.

**CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)**

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

**The EPP provided limited evidence of ways in which to document, through multiple sources, how key stakeholders are involved in the decision-making, program evaluation, and the selection and implementation for improvement (Component 5.5)**

Continuing our transformation since our April 2018 CAEP site visit final report and in addition to alterations from last year's report, during the 2018-2019 academic year we have: 1. Attended Southwest Superintendents Association meetings to speak about our programs, initiatives, etc. and get feedback from superintendents 2. Held District Collaborations where discussions about initiatives with our district stakeholders occurred. 3. Held professional collaboration days with faculty, university supervisors, and district stakeholders in June 2019 covering specific content areas, technology integration, recruiting through EdRising, data share out, master program redesigns, academic feedback and differentiation

## Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

*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.*

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

*The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.*



**6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.**

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloguing continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs  
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

The McNeese State University (MSU) Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) implements a cohesive quality assurance system using multiple assessment measures to monitor candidate and completer progress. The following standards are used to inform, amend and evaluate EPP effectiveness: AIMS Program Review System, Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC), Louisiana Student Standards (LSS), and Louisiana Teacher Preparation Competencies.

EPP assessments and evaluations are ongoing and iterative. Collaborative practice with program faculty and P-12 partners contribute to creating, maintaining, and revising EPP assessments. Data from the Louisiana Board of Regents (LBoR) reflects effective EPP systems and assessments for initial certification relative to data on candidate progress, professional dispositions, and candidate success in P-12 environments, including impact on P-12 learning and development and indicators of teaching effectiveness. The EPP annually reviews data collected and reported by the Office of Student Teaching and Professional Education Services (STPES), the Office of the Registrar (REG), and the Office of Institutional Research (IRE) in order to promote continuous program improvement and operational effectiveness.

CAEP reviewers (2018 site visit) noted, 'Even though the EPP has a system for routinely collecting and analyzing assessment data the CAEP process has illuminated areas of concern.' The Assessment Plan process for program effectiveness is theoretically efficient; however, the EPPs data indicates gaps exist in three key areas: faculty awareness and appropriate use of assessments, effective review of data relative to program goals; clarity of standards and alignment.

In order for faculty and university supervisors to have better awareness and appropriate use of assessments, US PREP will conduct norming and inter-rater reliability sessions with faculty and university supervisors for both our Field Experience Evaluation instrument and Pre-observation, Observation, and Post-observation (POP) instrument.

In addition to program faculty reviewing assessment data from the previous academic year, district stakeholders will become part of the conversation as we begin an annual shared governance discussion around data. During this collaboration, stakeholders and faculty will review and update performance objectives, identified core values and strategic goals, assess benchmarks and achievement levels, and provide data from assessments. From this, action plans will be developed based on data analysis and results. Assessment plans will be aligned to Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) standards, which effectively report EPP program alignment to national program standards. This process of review and revision promotes EPP effectiveness in preparing highly qualified teachers. Our first shared governance collaboration occurred during June 2019 with another annual meeting scheduled for summer 2019.

Disaggregated Value-Added Model (VAM) scores by grade level and content area for undergraduate completers indicate math as an area of challenge. The Math Cluster for Elementary involves 5 professors who participated in the Deans for Impact Collaborative during the 2018-2019 academic year with a focus on math content and methodology. They reviewed data and made decisions to implement a four-course sequence consisting of two courses focusing on content and two courses focusing on methodology, both incorporating Tier 1 curriculum. The changes made through this process should result in improved VAM scores in mathematics.

Data indicates within our initial-certification programs that there is a lack of ethnic diversity among our candidates. The Burton College of Education is partnering with local school districts to build EdRising courses for high school credit and dual enrollment. McNeese will also conduct an EdRising regional conference during the 19-20 academic year. By partnering with local districts, high school students who aspire to be educators can begin cultivating their professional skills before entering college. Implementing the

EdRising program will help identify diverse populations of P-12 students for future recruitment efforts.

As our 2019 Employer Satisfaction Survey and Completer Follow-up Surveys show, around 20% of all survey participants list Curriculum Design and Implementation as a recommended area of need. Moving forward, all redesigned programs (BS Elem began in 2018-19; all other programs begin in 2019-20) have a required fundamental of planning and instruction course that covers topics such as: academic standards, curriculum, assessments, differentiation, objectives, evaluating curriculum, relevance and rationale, student misconceptions, academic vocabulary, and questioning.


During the 2018-19 academic year, McNeese State University wrote for a Louisiana Department of Education grant opportunity to create and offer the Mentor Teacher Training Pilot program for the 2019-20 academic year. We were awarded the grant and have been working with the local school districts to encourage teacher participation in mentor training. We feel this not only supports building effective mentors for our future residents but also a strong partnership with our districts.


In summary, the EPP is confident it provides a comprehensive, quality assurance system that supports program development and continuous improvement. Relevant and reliable data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs and improve candidate impact on P-12 learning and development. The EPP's robust relationship with the five-parish area provides the EPP with opportunity and inspiration for teaching innovations and for making continuous improvements in teacher preparation.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the data or changes apply.

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
- 3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 4.4 Completer satisfaction
- 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities
- x.1 Diversity
- x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

 **CAEP\_Standard\_4\_2020\_Final\_PPT.pdf**

 **CAEP\_Standard\_4\_2020\_Final\_written\_report.pdf**

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or s activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

Yes  No

## 6.3 Optional Comments

---

### 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 2020 EPP Annual Report.*

**I am authorized to complete this report.**

#### Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing 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.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

#### Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completer data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

#### Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site visit report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

**Acknowledge**