2022 EPP Annual Report - Reviewer Feedback (Staff Review Report)

Section 1 AIMS Profile & Section 2 Program Completers

Overview: These sections ask for a yearly update to the EPP's electronic profile information and number of completers to ensure relevant communication and actions from CAEP.

Why are these sections important? The assurance of accurate profile information (including confirming up to five points of contact, identifying EPP characteristics, and detailing programs offered) are crucial to CAEP being able to get in touch with you, as well as being aware of EPP characteristics for research and site team assignment purposes, and accurate scrutiny of disaggregated data from relevant programs by Program Reviewers and/or site visitors and Accreditation Councilors. Additionally, completer counts are important to accurate billing for accreditation activities.

Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?

- ✔ **CAEP asks for current listings of contact persons** due to potential turnover at the EPP that may prevent the most relevant individuals from receiving essential information. As the contact information confirmed in the EPP Annual Report is used for official accreditation-related communications, the EPP should take the opportunity to list up to two "EPP Heads" and up to three "CAEP Coordinators" to facilitate a consistent flow of information to appropriate individuals. Individual identified "EPP Head" should have authority over the EPP. This contact may receive time-sensitive communications related to the accreditation of the EPP. The individual(s) identified as the CAEP Coordinator should have a role in managing accreditation activities and may be carbon copied on communications to the EPP head.
- ✔ **CAEP asks for current EPP Characteristics** to generate official accreditation documents, provide context for site visitors and Accreditation Councilors, allow for disaggregation of information by relevant demographics for research purposes, and ensuring adequate representation in formal and informal feedback efforts.
  - ○ **Basic Information**. This section includes information that CAEP uses to generate official accreditation documents, including mailing address and EPP name.
  - ○ **EPP Characteristics and Affiliations**. This section provides contextual information for better understanding the EPP and its work including types of licensure/degree programs at the initial-teacher licensure and/or advanced-level, EPP type consistent with Carnegie Classification, Professional Development School levels, Religious affiliation, admissions test(s), language of instruction, teaching majors, institutional/regional accreditation, institutional memberships, and off campus/branch campus(es)/distance learning/alternative certification programs.
- ✔ **CAEP asks for current EPP Program Listings** to ensure current information for all programs offered by the EPP that fall within CAEP's scope, as well as those covered by current NCATE or TEAC accreditation. Please review, update, and/or add each Program Name, Level, Certificate Level for Degree(s), and Program Category Fields.
- ✔ **CAEP asks for current EPP Program Completers** to generate accurate billing information, as the CAEP Annual Fee structure is based on the number of completers - for both initial-licensure and advanced-level programs - and scaled to support smaller EPPs.

1.1 Update Contact Information in AIMS

1.1.1 Has the EPP listed contact information for the individual(s) designated as "EPP Head?"
- ⊙ Yes ○ No

1.1.2 Has the EPP listed the contact information for the individual(s) designated as "CAEP Coordinator?"
- ⊙ Yes ○ No

1.1.3 Has the EPP provided contact information for two distinct people for these roles?
- ⊙ Yes ○ No

1.2 Update EPP Information in AIMS

1.2.1 Does the EPP's basic information (including mailing address and EPP name) appear up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS.
- ⊙ Yes ○ No

1.2.2: Do the EPP characteristics and affiliations (including Carnegie classification, EPP type, religious affiliation, language of instruction, institutional accreditation, and branch campuses/sites) appear to be up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS?
- ⊙ Yes ○ No

1.2.3: Do the EPP's program listings (including program name, program review level, certificate level, program category, and program review option) appear up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS for all EPP programs that fall within CAEP's scope of accreditation?

  ○ Yes ◉ No

Please indicate whether the NASM-accredited Music programs, and NASAD-accredited Art programs are included as part of CAEP review. This information may be added in the comment box on the program's profile in AIMS under Program Options. Once the above issues are addressed, please send a confirmation to CAEP staff via email (eppannualreport@caepnet.org) within 30 days of the receiving the feedback.

Section 2. EPP's Program Completers [Academic Year 2020-2021]

2.1 Comparing the EPP's reported completer numbers from this year to last year, has the EPP changed fee brackets with CAEP? [No EPP action is required, unless the EPP finds the reported numbers to be in error.]

  ○ Yes ◉ No

Section 3 Substantive Changes

Overview: If a substantive change occurred during the Academic Year of the present EPP Annual Report through the date of the submission of this report, the EPP should provide an explanation. The explanation should provide CAEP with information about the nature of the change, a rationale for the change, an implementation timeline, and other any other essential information. Substantive changes to be reported include changes in the published mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP; in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP; addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited; 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; a contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements; that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirement; in regional accreditation status; or in state program approval.

Why is this section important? Advising CAEP of substantive changes is one of the actions that must be taken to maintain accreditation or eligibility. Changes are reviewed to determine effects, if any, to accreditation status.

Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?

✓ CAEP, in accordance with Federal regulation (34 CFR Part 602 Subpart B (§602.22)), requires an EPP to inform CAEP of any changes to the educational mission, program, or programs of the EPP which may adversely affect the capacity of the EPP to continue to meet CAEP's standards. These changes must be communicated as part of the Annual Report or in a separate communication to the CAEP President, addressed to president@caepnet.org or the current mailing address for the organization. CAEP has the responsibility to determine what effect, if any, substantive changes would have on an EPP's accreditation

Section 3 Substantive Changes

3.1 Did the EPP report any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP?

  ○ Yes ◉ No

3.2 Did the EPP report any change related to the EPP entering a contract with other providers for direct instructional services (including any teach out agreements)?

  ○ Yes ◉ No

3.3 Did the EPP report any change related to the state approval of any of its programs? If the EPP reported a substantive change in its state program approval status (since the last reporting cycle) does the item require additional follow up with CAEP?

  ○ Yes ◉ No

3.4 Did the EPP report any change in the institution's regional accreditation status?

  ○ Yes ◉ No

3.5 Did the EPP indicate any other change(s) since the last annual reporting cycle?

  ○ Yes ◉ No

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

Overview: CAEP re-worked its approach to the Annual Reporting Measures. Instead of requesting data via a series of questions and CAEP-created standardized tables, CAEP has aligned its approach to CAEP Standards 4 and 5. In Section 4 of the 2018 EPP Annual Report, the provider is asked to publicly display data, pertaining to each of the Annual Reporting Measures (four of these measures are impact measures matching the four components of the CAEP Standard 4 for Initial-Licensure Programs and two of these match the two components of CAEP Standard 4 for Advanced-Level Programs), on the its website. This approach respects an EPP's context by allowing context-specific data collection and hosting in a manner of the EPP's choice, as long as the presented data are appropriate measures and are accurate.

Why is this section important? Having accreditation standards and policies that require EPPs "to routinely provide reliable information to the public on their performance, including student achievement," is central to maintaining CAEP's CHEA recognition, CAEP's role as an accreditor, and EPP's demonstration of accountability to stakeholders and provision of transparent information to potential candidates.

Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?

√ The requirement to widely disseminate and display the Annual Reporting Measures is located in Components 5.4 and A.5.4 of the CAEP Standards and a part of CAEP Policy (Policies 6.01, on Annual Reporting, and 8.01, on Consumer Information). EPPs accredited under the NCATE standards or TEAC quality principles were required to publicly display candidate performance data in previous EPP Annual Report years. The updated Section 4 includes and builds from that approach by including the Annual Reporting Measures. In alignment with Component 5.4, providers are also asked to summarize the data and trends represented in the provider's Annual Reporting Measures, which allows EPPs to prepare for writing a self-study report and to use the EPP Annual Report as a repository and source for working toward Component 5.4. Site visitors and Accreditation Councilors review EPP Annual Report submissions in evaluating your EPP's evidence toward Component 5.4. Annual Report Reviewers flag exemplars of best practices of displaying these data to enhance the tips and exemplars to be included in next year's EPP Annual Report Technical Guide.

EPP Weblink with CAEP (NCATE/TEAC) Accreditation Status and Reviewed Programs

Link: https://www.mcneese.edu/education/burton-college-of-education/accreditation/

4.1 Did the EPP provide a weblink that displays its current accreditation status and an accurate list of programs included during the most recent CAEP (NCATE or TEAC) accreditation review?
⊙ Yes   ◯ No

4.2 Weblinks displaying evidence of CAEP Accountability Measures

Initial: https://www.mcneese.edu/education/burton-college-of-education/accreditation/

Advanced: https://www.mcneese.edu/education/burton-college-of-education/accreditation/

4.2.1 Did the EPP provide a direct weblink to its website where the EPP's display of data for the CAEP Accountability Measures is available to the public?
⊙ Yes   ◯ No

4.2.2: Are the CAEP Accountability Measures clearly identified and tagged? (Includes header identifying the CAEP Accountability Measures and sub-headings/tags to each of the four measures as defined by CAEP)
⊙ Yes   ◯ No

4.2.3: Do the data, tagged to each of the four CAEP Accountability Measures, appear to be collected using appropriate data collection instruments/procedures for the relevant CAEP Component?
⊙ Yes   ◯ No

4.2.4: Are the data for the CAEP Accountability Measures reflect data collected in the 2020-2021 Academic Year? (*If data are currently unavailable, does the EPP provide a placeholder statement that details why data are unavailable, and an expected timeline for when updated data will be shared?)
⊙ Yes   ◯ No

4.2.5: Has the EPP shared and explained the relevance of each of its data measures in a way that can be easily understood by the public?
⊙ Yes   ◯ No

4.2.6: Has data been disaggregated and shared at the program level? Did the EPP separate its Initial Level Program data and Advanced Level Program data for the CAEP Accountability Measures? [*Relevant to EPPs that receive/will receive CAEP accreditation at both the initial and advanced level.]

◉ Yes   ○ No

Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Overview: This section asks EPPs to report on progress correcting any Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations cited during the most recent accreditation site visit.

Why is this section important? Any citations earned by EPPs at the most recent accreditation visit represent parts of accreditation standards or principles that were not demonstrated sufficiently according to expectations represented by such a designation. Therefore, rectifying these deficiencies is essential to the quality of the EPP and the integrity of accreditation. This section allows for the EPP's annual reflection on progress -looking toward addressing gaps sufficiently within the required time - and CAEP's monitoring of the EPP during the accreditation cycle between in-depth self-study submissions.

Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?

✓ Accreditation is a check on work EPPs do daily - not just every seven years. Therefore, CAEP's role as an accreditor, in general and as part of being recognized by CHEA, includes monitoring EPPs between site visits, particularly when accreditation standards were not fully met. Under CAEP, Areas for Improvement describe a weakness in evidence for a CAEP Standard and/or component that should be remediated by the end of the accreditation term, while Stipulations describe one or more systemic concerns or serious deficiencies in evidence for a CAEP Standard and/or component that must be remedied to continue accreditation. Accordingly, this section allows EPPs and CAEP to check-in on progress to prompt EPPs to hopefully have fully corrected any deficiencies by the time of the next review, if not sooner as these represent aspects of EPP's program(s) that hinder ensuring development of effective candidates to meet the needs of P-12 students. Further, EPP Annual Report Reviewers review progress and offer prompts, as appropriate to steer EPPs in productive direction.

1

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)** related to *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)
This section demonstrates the EPP's ability to provide comprehensive knowledge and skills for candidates to respond to the cultural and ethnic diversity of the students they serve.
In the 2019-2020 academic year, two courses were redesigned to include Teaching Tolerance standards and align with Educators Rising micro credentialing. Anti-Bias Instruction is addressed in EDUC 204: Orientation to Multiculturalism in Education in undergraduate and post-baccalaureate certificate programs and in EDUC 647: Educational Foundations in the Master of Arts in Teaching initial certification programs. Within these courses, candidates begin to evaluate real-world connections in lessons and to understand differentiated instruction, reflecting on the importance of learning about students as individuals and customizing instruction and interaction based on those individual needs. Candidates use the results of an Implicit Bias Survey as a basis for reflection and growth. Candidates also perform field experience observations focused on the Five Critical Components of Anti-Bias Instruction: Engagement in material, Real-world connections, Cooperative/Collaborative learning, Differentiation, and Value-based assessment.
Classroom Culture is addressed in EDUC 203: Theories and Principles of Learning and Teaching in undergraduate and post-baccalaureate initial certificate programs and EDUC 635: Principles of Learning and Teaching for Master of Arts in Teaching candidates. Within field observations assigned to the courses, candidates identify the Five Critical Components of Classroom Culture in action: Honoring student experience, Thoughtful classroom setup and structure, Shared inquiry and dialogue, Social and emotional safety, and Values-based classroom management. Each of the above mentioned courses provide the foundation for anti-bias instruction and classroom culture that is built upon through program coursework.
All initial teacher education preparation programs require a lesson planning course in which candidates are instructed on and practice creating and developing interdisciplinary lessons including differentiation, scaffolding, culturally responsive teaching, state approved Tier 1 curriculum, and current state and national standards. Within methods coursework, faculty guide candidates in selecting materials and high leverage teaching practices and pedagogies appropriate to the P-12 current classroom. Candidates are encouraged to explore curriculums, content, standards, and methods for the greatest effect on student learning.
The Teaching Cycle assessment continues to be implemented in all methods coursework, requiring candidates to define the student population in the P-12 classroom and note individual differences pertaining to academics and preferences. Candidates then analyze student work samples along side observation notes to determine correlations and/or influences on student learning. Candidates build a differentiated lesson with four major areas aligned: standards, assessment, outcomes, and teaching strategies.
Candidates identify areas for reinforcement and refinement based on the administered assessments and make decisions on how to differentiate the lesson to ensure all P-12 students are able to meet the objectives/standards of the lesson as it pertains to the assessment. Candidates must document their reasoning for choosing the strategy and how it will benefit students in mastering the content. EPP faculty report and analyze Teaching Cycle data each semester. Revisions in instruction, activities, and/or processes are made based on the analyses. The EPP is also formalizing the progression and reinforcement of activities within the programs to ensure a more effective analysis of candidate growth in knowledge and skills.
The Residency 1 Performance Portfolio is included in all initial-certification programs. EDUC 469: Field Study Project for all undergraduate programs and post-baccalaureate programs and EDUC 681: MAT Residency Performance Portfolio for all Master of Arts in Teaching programs. This portfolio focuses on four major stages of effective teaching. In Stage 1: Relevance and Rationale, candidates to collect and analyze artifacts about Learner Characteristics and Learning

Environment including the community, school, and classroom in which they are serving during their residency semesters. In Stage 2: Planning for Instruction and Assessment, candidates use their analysis of artifacts in Stage 1 to develop Standards Alignment and Data-Driven Instructional Decisions. In Stage 3: Evidence of Instruction and Assessment, candidates Analyze Student Assessment Data, provide written and verbal Academic Feedback, and incorporate High-Leverage Practices within their instruction. In Stage 4: Analysis of Equitable Practices, candidates Determine Actions for Improvement and Build on Learners' Strengths. All resident placements are determined by the Office of Clinical Practices and School Partnership, adhering to state guidelines for placements in high needs schools and with certified mentor teachers. Through the placements in identified high needs schools candidates understand the portfolio work to be an essential process in learning about and understanding the diversity of P-12 students prior to planning followed by examining academic feedback and student data to determine actions for improvement.

The EPP continuously collaborates with district area partners to create and establish diverse clinical learning experiences supported by classroom instruction and certified mentor teachers to develop the skills and knowledge of teacher candidates. The EPP also supports candidates in meeting the needs of diverse populations through special education and English language learner courses embedded within program coursework. Systematic monitoring of assessment results and data collection drives change and improvement in candidate responses to cultural and ethnic diversity of the P-12 students they serve.

Has the EPP summarized its activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the area cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report? [As a reminder: The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.]

◉ Yes   ○ No

2

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)** related to *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).

All initial certification programs are currently teaching out the one-semester student teaching programs as new programs with the yearlong residency are being implemented. To support the yearlong residency, the EPP is also transitioning from university supervisors to site supervisors. The EPP continues to train mentor teachers as a state approved site through coursework applicable to the MEd. in Curriculum and Instruction programs. EPP faculty who hold the mentor teacher ancillary certificate instruct these courses and support candidates in completing the assessments. In the 2021-2022 AY, the EPP will also offer the mentor teacher training as a professional development in hopes of increasing interest in P-12 teachers willing to serve as certified mentors. Requirements for the EPP's mentor training program include a valid teaching license, a minimum of three years of teaching experience, and a score of Effective: Proficient or Highly Effective in three of the last five years. The Director of Clinical Practices and School Partnership continues to work with local public and charter school personnel directors to identify highly effective mentor teachers skilled in coaching for candidates.

As the EPP transitions to site coordinators over traditional university supervisors, the roles of the site coordinator and mentor are evolving. US PREP provides professional development opportunities for the site coordinator and support through joint observations and scoring calibrations, coaching, modeling, and constructive feedback for continuous improvement. The current site coordinator will train additional faculty in the 2021-2022 AY to take on the role of site coordinator for additional grade levels and programs.

Mentor teachers are supported through opportunities for feedback, clarity, and continued professional development from both the US PREP team and the site coordinator through monthly mentor meetings. Mentor meetings address relevant professional development based on feedback and observational data to support the resident. 2020-2021 AY topics included Co-Teaching and Coaching, High Quality Feedback, and Coaching Conversations.

Within the first month of the fall 2020 semester, two hurricanes significantly impacted the EPP and the surrounding P-12 schools. This resulted in an increase in communication amongst the EPP and P-12 partners to provide experiences for candidates and residents; however, formal shared governance meetings with district personnel were limited in the fall 2020 semester.

A shared governance meeting with mentors, principals, and district personnel was held in March 2021. The meeting was a two-way conversation between MSU and school partner representatives to inform future decisions about the yearlong residency experience. The site coordinator shared candidate data from the Field Experience Evaluation during the first POP Cycle by domain (Domain 1: Planning and Preparation; Domain 2: Classroom Environment; and Domain 3: Instruction) and then by identified areas of refinement and reinforcement for the residents. Initial feedback from the March meeting indicated the site coordinator/mentor teacher model was working well and that the current residents are strong and open to feedback. Overall, partners felt that candidates had a grasp of the content and planning, but needed further support in classroom management and higher order thinking questions. A second meeting will be held in June 2021 where comparison domain data from POP Cycles #1 and #2 will be shared and district personnel will be asked for feedback and input to further support mentor teachers and residents.

Spring 2021 student teachers and residents completed a survey administered by US PREP. Data provided insight into candidate perceptions of student teaching/residency experience and quality of feedback from instructors, the site coordinator, university supervisor, and mentor. The following data was collected, on a 4-point scale, from graduates in 2019-2020 (n=46) and 2020-2021 (n=51). All three surveys resulted in increased mean scores from 19-20 to 20-21 and

all exceeded the benchmark of 3:
• Instructors feedback: frequent enough to support development, specific, readily implemented, and used to improve instruction. (2020: μ=3.39; 2021: μ=3.60)
• Mentor teacher feedback: aligned to student teaching observation tool, informed by data from student teaching classroom, frequent, specific, readily implemented, and used to improve instruction. (2020: μ=3.74; 2021: μ= 3.74)
• University supervisor/Site Coordinator feedback: aligned to student teaching observation tool, informed by data from student teaching classroom, frequent, specific, readily implemented and used to improve instruction. (2020: μ=3.08; 2021: μ=3.66)

Completers also rated consistency of feedback among instructors, mentors, and university supervisors on a scale of 1-4 with average mean scores of 3.23 and above. A slight drop in scores from 2020 to 2021 was noted but is not alarming. Candidates in the 20-21 AY had a unique experience with COVID restrictions and the hurricane destruction mentioned above. Entering the 21-22 AY, consistency in feedback to candidates will be reviewed:
• Consistency of feedback from mentor teacher with university supervisor (2020: μ=3.35; 2021: μ=3.26)
• Consistency of feedback from mentor teacher and university supervisor with course instructors (2020: μ=3.30; 2021: μ=3.23)

Candidates rated the influence of mentors, supervisors/coordinators, and instructors in their development as teachers. Results reinforced the importance of knowledge, skills, and consistency among instructors, mentors, and site coordinators/university supervisors since all have a significant influence on candidates as they and evolve in their professional practice:
• Mentor Teachers (2020: μ=3.44; 2021: μ=3.53)
• University Supervisor/Site Coordinator: (2020: μ= 3.16; 2021 μ=3.13)
• Coursework and Course Instructors: (2020: μ=3.02; 2021: μ= 2.91)
    Has the EPP summarized its activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the area cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report? [As a reminder: The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.]
    🔘 Yes   ⚪ No

3

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)** related to *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).
The EPP collaborates with local district personnel, principals, mentors, and teachers to offer well-planned and sequential field experience opportunities for candidates to: Obtain practical experiences that bridge the gap between theory and practice; Study and practice in a variety of school settings with students of different ages, abilities, and cultural backgrounds; Reflect on field experiences and receive evaluations from teacher educators, school faculty, and peers; and Demonstrate competence in professional roles.

The EPP, led by the Office of Clinical Practices and School Partnership, partners with area districts to provide candidates with field experience opportunities to observe, plan, and practice in a variety of settings appropriate to their future roles as educators. Field experience expectations are planned, sequenced and consistent in the process of developing the skills and knowledge of teacher candidates. Course instructors select field experiences with the cooperation from the Field Experience Coordinator, Director of Clinical Practices and School Partnership, and school district personnel. The experiences are agreed upon within program progressions to candidates experience sites with the following characteristics: diverse cultures, various socio-economic backgrounds, exceptional populations (disabilities, gifted and talented, etc.), inclusion settings, rural and urban schools, alternative schools, and immersed technology.

General guidelines for field experiences are as follows:
• Level I Courses: Observation is the primary focus, with completion of related assignments and activities such as service learning, tutoring, student/teacher interviews, interacting with small groups, attending professional meetings and observing and identifying various learning styles.
• Level II Courses: Demonstrate instructional development with satisfactory completion of activities and assignments such as observation, actively participating in the instructional process, whole group instruction, small group instruction, conducting student assessment, integration of technology in instruction, case studies, developing implementation of standards for instruction and management and planning in a variety of settings with diverse populations.
• Level III Courses: Clinical practice is the time of full immersion into the teaching community through experiences such as observing mentor teachers and other professionals, direct teaching including planning and implementation, attendance at parent/teacher conferences and IEPs as appropriate, daily classroom responsibilities, and the use of information technology to support learning.

To ensure candidates are participating in diverse placements, a time log indicating hours spent at field experience sites must be signed by a certified classroom teacher or administrator at the site and submitted to the course instructor at the completion of hours. Education candidates are also required to complete and submit the Field Experience Data Form electronically to the assessment office by the end of each semester. The hours are tracked to ensure field experience placements are consistent with planned diverse locations, including both high needs and non-high needs schools, as designated by the Louisiana Department of Education (and updated every three years) prior to residency. The Director of

Clinical Practices and School Partnership, with guidance and input from district personnel, then purposefully places candidates for the yearlong residency with a credentialed mentor teacher in a high needs school.

> Has the EPP summarized its activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the area cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report? [As a reminder: The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.]
>
> ◉ Yes   ○ No

4

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)** related to *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).

The EPP is continuously working to devise a consistent, efficient, and effective process for monitoring candidate dispositions and guidelines for addressing concerns and unfavorable behaviors. Exposure to dispositions of effective educators was added into entry-level education coursework. The Professional Disposition Questionnaire Assessment prompts candidates to consciously note the qualities of a good teacher and evaluate how those qualities describe themselves using a Likert scale. The instructor reviews the qualities with the candidates and together they note ways to develop those deemed important.

The Student Pre-Collegiate Narrative (SPCN), along with the graded rubric, is submitted by the candidate as a component of the admission packet into an initial certification teacher education program.

The SPCN is written by candidates enrolled in EDUC 202: Foundations in Early Childhood and Early Interventionist (PBC-ECHD candidates), EDUC 204: Orientation to Multiculturalism and Diversity in Education (PBC, BS, and BA candidates), EDUC 647: Educational Foundations (MAT candidates), and MUED 226: Introduction to Music Education in a Diverse Society (BM and PBC MUED candidates).

The SPCN is a response to a set of provided prompts describing a candidate's own pre-collegiate educational experience. The first four prompts encourage candidates to describe their educational environments and experiences. The fifth prompt asks candidates to critically evaluate how their own experiences and familiar environments may impact their perceptions and expectations of students in their own future classrooms. The last prompt has the candidate explain why understanding their own frame of reference is important when setting expectations for learners in their classroom and in building relationships with students and families.

The instructor of the course (depending on program: EDUC 202: Foundations in Early Childhood and Early Interventionist; EDUC 203: Theories and Principles of Learning and Teaching; EDUC 204: Orientation to Multiculturalism and Diversity in Education; EDUC 647: Educational Foundations; MUED 226: Introduction to Music Education in a Diverse Society) scores the narrative. Each of the instructors has gone through the norming process so that SPCNs are scored similarly across courses. The last two items are directly related to InTASC standards and have been designated as the two components that candidates must score at benchmark or above (≥ 3) before being able to submit the SPCN in their admission packet.

If a candidate does not score at or above benchmark on either of the two InTASC prompts Essential Knowledge: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice or Critical Dispositions: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice, then the candidate is referred to the Department Chair for Students for Education Professions to receive additional instruction and remediation. The candidate must participate in a SPCN remediation seminar that is typically held on the day after the last day of class each semester. Once the candidates attend the seminar, they are then required to rewrite the section(s) in which they did not initially meet benchmark. The candidate then submits the rewrite for grading. Once the candidate achieves a passing score, then the SPCN can be included in the packet for submission.

Within each methods course, candidates are asked to complete a self-reflection using the Professional Dispositions Questionnaire (PDQ) covering the following topics: professional commitment and responsibility, intra/interpersonal skills, and attitudes toward learners. Candidates are required to complete the self-assessment in several courses and are encouraged to reflect on their growth and areas still in need of refinement. The PDQ data is submitted electronically to the assessment office for analysis at the end of each semester.

Mentor teachers and/or university instructors also complete a PDQ for each of the candidates they work most closely to support. At any point in time, however, a faculty member or mentor can complete a PDQ as documentation for a candidate that is presenting non-professional behaviors. Any issues identified by the mentors or faculty are brought to the attention of the Director of Clinical Practices and School Partnership, who then provides mediation, counseling, and direction to the candidate as appropriate to the situation.

At mid-term each semester, faculty meet to identify candidates exhibiting dispositions and/or difficulties effecting progression through coursework or the program as a whole. Patterns of behavior are noted across coursework and a member of the faculty reaches out to the student to offer support, guidance, remediation, and/or resources to help steer them back on track. Concerns brought to the table include grades and expectations for dispositions such as attitude, attendance, and professionalism.

Arising from the mid-semester meetings, faculty have expressed a desire to explore other options for evaluating, reporting, and tracking candidate dispositions. In the 2021-2022 academic year, the EPP will collaborate with the US PREP Regional Transformational Specialist and Clinical Coach to explore other options for more effective and efficient tools and processes.

> Has the EPP summarized its activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the area cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report? [As a reminder: The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.]
>
> ◉ Yes   ○ No

5

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)** related to *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).

The EPP continues to make intentional efforts to recruit candidates into teacher education programs and has focused particular attention on those candidates from diverse backgrounds and within high needs areas. In addition to the traditional attendance at parish career fairs and expos, the following are part of the developing recruitment and retention plan.

Unlock Education is an annual spring event hosted by the EPP in which high school students expressing interest in the field of education are invited to MSU for teacher education sessions and activities geared to promote excitement for the profession. Attendees also have an opportunity to visit with advisors, ask questions about programs, and make connections with faculty. Due to COVID restrictions, the spring 2021 Unlock Education event was moved to an online format. There were approximately 25 high school students who participated in Zoom breakout rooms for interactive activities, EdRising competitions, and meetings with faculty and advisors. Enrollment data of high school students who attended the 2019 Unlock Education event as high school students indicates that 58% enrolled at McNeese State University in a teacher education program. The EPP will continue to track Unlock attendees who become MSU candidates and/or MSU education majors. Moving forward, the EPP plans to expand the number and diversity of schools invited to participate in the event.

The EPP proposed to local district personnel a partnership with them to implement the Educators Rising curriculum in their schools. In the 2019-2020 academic year, the EPP began with three partner schools. By the 2021-2022 academic year, we expect to have eight partner schools within three districts. The EdRising Coordinator and the Dean from the Burton College of Education visit the schools and meet with P-12 students to discuss their learning, education professions, and MSU education degree offerings.

The EPP has submitted the paperwork to establish the Educators Rising Collegiate organization on campus as a continued support for retention of candidates to keep them on the path to graduation and licensing. As an incentive for high school student to participate in the Educators Rising program and to enroll at McNeese State University for their baccalaureate degree, high school students earning micro-credentials are awarded up to six hours of credit within their teacher education programs. Candidates receiving credit for the coursework will be tracked through the process for official admission into the program.

The EPP has researched and initiated the application process to partner with Call Me Mister, a nationally recognized scholarship and support program created by Clemson University focused on encouraging young men of color from underserved, socio-economically disadvantaged, and educationally at-risk communities to enter the education profession as elementary teachers. Decisions on the partnering application are expected in fall 2021.

The EPP developed elementary and secondary education area minors that went into effect with the 2020-2021 academic year catalog. Candidates are able to complete a baccalaureate degree within a content area while exploring the world of teacher education. Once completed, the candidate has the opportunity to enroll after graduation into a post-baccalaureate program to complete the residency/internship process and complete additional coursework to acquire certification (3-semester process). This is beneficial to candidates and school systems who hire them as non-certified teachers, since they do have at least 19 hours of education coursework completed from their minor to guide their teaching practices. By offering the minors in secondary education, the EPP is positioning themselves to expose content area experts to the field of education to consider as a current career or a potential second career in the future.

Candidates within student teaching and residency student teaching will continue to be placed in high needs schools. The EPP considers this an opportunity to recruit future candidates as university supervisors and site coordinators visit campuses and can positively influence the image of MSU, the Burton College of Education, and the teaching profession within these P-12 students.

The EPP will continue to work to develop the above initiatives, track progress, and explore additional opportunities.

> Has the EPP summarized its activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the area cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report? [As a reminder: The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.]
>
> ◉ Yes   ○ No

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)** related to *4 Program Impact*

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

In the spring 2020 semester, the EPP employed an outside entity to assist with administering the Teacher Education Exit Assessment, the Teacher Education Employer Assessment and the Teacher Education Alumni Assessment. In the spring 2021 semester, the Teacher Education Assessment was administered to candidates who completed the program in the 2020-2021 academic year. Completers ranked their answers on a score from 1 (Not at All) to 7 (Extremely). The four factors that scored the highest means were: Satisfaction: Classmates (μ=6.09), Satisfaction: Student Teaching Experience (μ=5.80), Learning: Diversity (μ=5.76), and Learning: Professional Development (μ=5.70).

The Teacher Education Employer Assessment was administered to the employers of all fall 2019 and spring 2020 completers. The General Learning Outcomes questions ask employers about their satisfaction with recent graduates from MSU education programs based on a scale from 1 (Not at all) to 7 (Extremely) in several areas: General Learning Outcomes, Employee Traits, Learning Outcomes, and Overall Evaluation. The mean scores ranged from 6.20 for Ability to Apply Knowledge of Assessment Strategies to 6.8 for Commitment to their Current Job. Responses also indicated that employers surveyed are extremely satisfied with graduates from these programs (μ=6.80) and would highly recommend (μ=6.90) that the school/organization hire graduates from this program in the future. 9 out of 10 respondents also rated the preparation of recent graduates as being Among the Best Prepared.

The Teacher Education Alumni Assessment was administered to candidates who had completed the program in the previous academic year (2019-2020). Mean scores on the factors ranged from 5.08 (Learning: Enhanced Diversity) to 6.96 (Learning: Importance of Classroom Environment). 33% of alumni indicated that they had a position waiting for them upon graduation/completion, and 66.7% found a position within 1-3 months of graduating.

> Has the EPP summarized its activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the area cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report? [As a reminder: The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.]
>
> ⦿ Yes   ◯ No

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

The EPPs continuous improvement process is evolving into a systematic collection of stakeholder input and shared governance including decision-making, program evaluation, and plans for improvement. Evidence of these partnerships is documented through agendas, notes, presentations, revised documents, focus group notes, and other methods as appropriate.

The Office of Clinical Practice and School Partnerships works closely with Human Resource Directors, principals, curriculum coordinators, and other district personnel to identify the most effective and qualified mentor teachers with whom to place candidates. This is a collaborative effort to identify mentor trained P-12 faculty, particularly at high needs schools. There are continuous efforts to promote P-12 faculty to become mentor trained as the old programs are phased out. Shared Governance meetings with P-12 district personnel often address this topic and progress is continuing toward identifying teachers to become mentors, as both the districts and BCOE realize the benefits of this grow-your-own partnership.

The EPP continues to build relationships with personnel at every level from teachers to superintendents of the local public district and charter schools. Through shared governance meetings, authentic two-way relationships and dialogue exchange are evolving and leading to program and process improvements. Faculty and program coordinators collaborate on continuous improvement efforts through review of relevant data, action planning, and monitoring of progress toward improvement goals. This process is documented within annual assessment plans and data is also used for share-outs with district personnel at shared governance meetings. The share-out is an opening for a dialogue about continuous improvement.

Shared governance meetings are scheduled regularly with targeted groups of district personnel. Meeting topics include special education, technology in education, Curriculum and Instruction program concentration areas, and other relevant topics. Workforce needs, state requirements, demographic changes, and interests brought to the EPP by district stakeholders have resulted in C&I concentrations in Special Education, English Language Learners, Transformational Teaching and Learning, Content Literacy, and Gifted Education.

Monthly mentor meetings with the site coordinator are designed to discuss candidate progression including areas of reinforcement and refinement. The site coordinator brings those concerns back to the EPP faculty to address the application of those skills within program coursework. With additional site coordinator and mentors in the 2021-2022 academic year, these regularly scheduled meetings should result in documented feedback with actionable goals and

tracking of progress.

Exit surveys, completer follow-up surveys, and employer survey data are also analyzed for strengths and areas for program improvement. EPP faculty also continue to network with P-12 partners by attending conferences, professional development, and state meeting along side them.

The EPP will continue to document partnership experiences that lead to program changes followed by program improvement.

Has the EPP summarized its activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the area cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report? [As a reminder: The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.]

◉ Yes   ◯ No

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

Overview: In this section of the EPP Annual Report, EPPs no longer respond by accreditation pathway. Instead of responding to pathway requirements, all providers have an opportunity to share continuous improvement efforts and processes relating to the CAEP Standards.

Why is this section important? The prompts in Section 6 are aligned with Standard 5 and Component 5.3, allowing providers to use the EPP Annual Report to catalog data and narrative over time in a way that prepares the provider to respond to Component 5.3 in the self-study report. Component 5.3 provides a chance for EPPs to put data related to the rest of CAEP's Standards to work to systematically change programs to improve outcomes for candidates and ultimately the P-12 students they will serve. Not only is the application of appropriate data to make and monitor informed changes a requirement of CAEP's Standards, but it is also a regular behavior and value of high-performing organizations; noticeably, the Baldridge Criteria and improvement science research inspired Standard 5.

Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?

✔ Quality assurance systems and data-informed continuous improvement are essential, foundational requirements for CAEP accreditation. This section instantiates an ongoing culture of evidence, while allowing CAEP to see some of the work done between accreditation cycles. Further EPP Annual Report Reviewers identify models of data-informed improvement so that CAEP may further collaborate with the field to spread continuous improvement initiatives.

6.1.1 Has the EPP shared its continuous improvement initiatives , AND (if applicable) provided CAEP with an update regarding the EPP's progress on its advanced level phase-in plans and/or initial level transition plans?
◉ Yes ○ No

6.1.2 If the EPP indicated that it would be willing to publicly share it efforts towards continuous improvement, is there a particular effort that could be highlighted by CAEP? [This information is for internal CAEP use and does not require additional action from the EPP.]
○ Yes ◉ No

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Overview: : The report preparer checks the box to affirm that they are authorized to complete the report by the and enters their name, position, phone number, and email address. The report preparer checks the box to acknowledge their understanding of the CAEP Policies pertaining to the EPP Annual Report.

Why is this section important? The final section of the report requests information on the report preparer and asks the preparer to affirm that he or she is authorized to complete the EPP Annual Report and demonstrate that he or she understands and agrees to CAEP's policy on data ownership, annual reporting, and misleading or incorrect statements.

Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?

✔ As submission of the EPP Annual Report is a condition of maintaining current accreditation or eligibility status, collecting the authorization of the preparer is needed to officially represent the EPP, as well as protect the EPP and CAEP. This section must be completed before the EPP Annual Report is officially submitted. CAEP visits this information if any questions of authenticity arise or to aid in contacting the EPP, if needed.

8.1.1 Semester of EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Visit: Fall 2024

EPP Questions:
No

8.1.2 CAEP Response to EPP Questions
○ Yes ◉ No

8.2 The EPP report preparer indicated that they were authorized by the EPP to complete the 2022 EPP Annual Report and that the details provided in this report and linked webpages were up to date and accurate at the time of submission.
◉ Yes ○ No