

# 2021 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	10125	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	1360
<b>Institution:</b>	Grambling State University		
<b>Unit:</b>	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).

## 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 2019-2020 ?

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** 9

<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 2019-2020 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.gram.edu/academics/majors/education/instruction/caep/docs/M1%20-%20Assessment%20Resident%20Impact%20on%20Student%20Learning.pdf>

**Description of data accessible via link:** Assessment Resident Impact on Student Learning

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2

**Link:** <https://www.gram.edu/academics/majors/education/instruction/caep/docs/M2%20-%20Student%20Teaching%20Evaluation-GSU%20Danielson%20Rubric.pdf>

**Description of data accessible via link:** Student Teaching Evaluation/GSU Danielson Rubric

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3

**Link:** <https://www.gram.edu/academics/majors/education/instruction/caep/docs/M3%20-%20Employer%20Questionnaire.pdf>

**Description of data accessible via link:** Employer Questionnaire

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4

Link: <https://www.gram.edu/academics/majors/education/instruction/caep/docs/M4%20-%20Follow-up%20Survey%20of%20CI%20Graduates.pdf>

Description of data accessible via link: Follow-Up Survey of C&I Graduates

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5

Link: <https://www.gram.edu/academics/majors/education/instruction/caep/docs/M5%20-%20Initial%20Program%20Completers.pdf>

Description of data accessible via link: Initial Program Completers

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6

Link: <https://www.gram.edu/academics/majors/education/instruction/caep/docs/M5%20-%20Advanced%20Level%20Program%20Completers.pdf>

Description of data accessible via link: Advanced Level Program Completers

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7

Link: <https://www.gram.edu/academics/majors/education/instruction/caep/docs/M6%20-%202019-2020%20Title%20II%20Report.pdf>

Description of data accessible via link: 2020 Title II Report

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8

**Link:** <https://www.gram.edu/academics/majors/education/instruction/caep/docs/M7%20-%20Initial%20Employment%20Upon%20Program%20Completion%20Table.pdf>

**Description of data accessible via link:** Initial Employment Upon Program Completers

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9

**Link:** <https://www.gram.edu/academics/majors/education/instruction/caep/docs/M7%20-%20Advanced%20level%20Employment%20Upon%20Program%20Completion%20Table.pdf>

**Description of data accessible via link:** Advanced Level Employment Upon Program Completers

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10

**Link:** <https://www.gram.edu/academics/majors/education/instruction/caep/docs/M8%20-%20Student%20Loan%20Default%20Rates.pdf>

**Description of data accessible via link:** Student Loan Default Rates

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?

1. Impact on P-12 learning and development - (Component 4.1)  
 Schools/Districts faced enormous challenges regarding how to operate efficiently and safely for the 2020-21 school year. The coronavirus pandemic affected everything we do as educators, including our new teacher evaluations. One of the many questions facing districts and states during the coronavirus school shutdowns: How can schools grade their teachers during a disrupted school year? Many district began the year using online or blended education delivery models of instruction for the first time. These new experiences caused schools and districts to rethink new teacher evaluations given the new education settings. In conversation with 7 districts that have made any kind of concrete decision regarding new teacher evaluations, we have found the general type of response was to suspend the evaluation process for this academic year. As this year progresses, districts will continue this flexibility where possible to ensure new teachers professional growth takes place and leads to improved instructional performance and student learning. - Student teachers are required to plan and teach a complete unit and calculate their impact on

student learning in their assigned classroom. The process includes developing a pretest/posttest, conducting pretest and preparing a results sheet, making indicated adjustments to unit plan. Candidates then teach the unit, conduct posttest, add results to results sheet, and calculate and analyze results for students who took both the pre- and posttest, and prepare and present results in a seminar session. Skills in planning and delivering instruction effectively as demonstrated by achievement of students in their class are a measure of student teachers' effectiveness in facilitating learning. Student teachers must achieve a score of 2 or above on a four point scale. This assessment targets skills in planning and delivering lessons that advance the learning of PK12 students. This assessment is scored on a four point scale based on 4-Highly Effective, 3-Effective Proficient, 2- Effective Emerging, and 1-Ineffective. The assessment rubric measures assessment design, data analysis, and interpretation and reflection.

## 2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness - (Component 4.2)

Schools/Districts faced enormous challenges regarding how to operate efficiently and safely for the 2020-21 school year. The coronavirus pandemic affected everything we do as educators, including our new teacher evaluations. One of the many questions facing districts and states during the coronavirus school shutdowns: How can schools grade their teachers during a disrupted school year? Many district began the year using online or blended education delivery models of instruction for the first time. These new experiences caused schools and districts to rethink new teacher evaluations given the new education settings. In conversation with 7 districts that have made any kind of concrete decision regarding new teacher evaluations, we have found the general type of response was to suspend the evaluation process for this academic year. As this year progresses, districts will continue this flexibility where possible to ensure new teachers professional growth takes place and leads to improved instructional performance and student learning. The Teacher Preparation Program (TPP) in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Grambling State University is designed to focus on preparing teachers to effectively facilitate learning in PK-12 settings. The successful teacher candidate must demonstrate proficiencies as content scholars, facilitators of learning, and nurturers of affective behaviors. During student teaching clinical practice, teacher candidates are assessed on pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions using an instrument based on the Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching and the Danielson Rubric. During 2019-2020 the Student Teaching Evaluation was divided into four main sections: Domain I-Planning; Domain II- Management; Domain III- Instruction; IV- Professional Responsibilities.

The observation and evaluation rubric is aligned with the InTASC, CEC, SHAPE and ACEI standards, the State of Louisiana Teacher Preparation Competencies, and best practices research findings. The Special Education addendum is aligned with the CEC Standards. The Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric was revised in 2018. It was adapted from the Compass-Complete Framework for Teaching Instrument, (2013). Candidates are observed and evaluated a minimum of two times by cooperating teachers and university supervisors.

## 3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones - (Component 4.3 | A.4.1)

Louisiana principals complete the Employer Questionnaire. The questionnaire collects perception data on the quality of Grambling State University completers as measured by their supervisors. The Employee Questionnaire is distributed annually to Louisiana school district principals to measure their satisfaction of the preparation of the College of Education's teacher education graduates for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students. In the fall 2019, the EPP identified three graduates in three school districts and received three Employer Questionnaires for a return rate of 100%. In spring 2020, the EPP identified six graduates (one graduate attending graduate school) in five school districts and received four Employer Questionnaires for a return rate of 80%. The graduate licensure areas included Elementary, Kinesiology and Music. Current job placement and contact information are collected via the Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE) webpage on completers working in Louisiana public schools.

## 4. Satisfaction of completers - (Component 4.4 | A.4.2)

The purpose of this assessment is to gauge exiting candidates' perceptions of how well they were prepared to take their place as a professional educator in the public schools in Louisiana. This survey is delivered via email. Follow-up Surveys are sent to completers six months after graduation. Respondents are asked to evaluate their preparation on a four-point scale from Very Dissatisfied (1) to Very Satisfied (4). Nine undergraduate students responded to the survey request.

## 5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)

The completers' graduation rate is defined as the initial and advanced program completer's ability to successfully complete their degree requirements for a Bachelor degree or Master degree. The EPP monitors the persistence and completion of teacher candidates that have been admitted into a Teacher Education licensure program(s). To ensure that teacher candidates are persisting through and completing their licensure programs, the EPP tracks the number of teacher candidates that are active within the program and completed the program, and if they were employed after the completion of the program. Candidates completing an approved teacher certification program are eligible to apply for the Louisiana Level I professional teaching certificate. The EPP defines program completers as candidates who earn their degree by successfully completing all requirements of their licensure program. Based on that definition, data demonstrates a 100% completers' graduation rate for the past three academic years.

## 6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)

We are continuously engaged in efforts to improve our programs in order to improve teaching and learning for all children. Our goal is to produce excellent educators who engage in ongoing inquiry and intellectual work and are committed to the highest standards of professionalism, democratic citizenship, quality and high achievement in a context that affirms human diversity. EPP candidates are required to take and pass applicable Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) tests and Praxis subject area test(s) to be recommended to the state of Louisiana for licensure. Our EPP uses and analyzes two Praxis data sets to obtain a full picture of how well our candidates can apply content and pedagogical knowledge and meet licensure requirements. The EPP requires that all initial and advanced teacher candidates complete and pass all state requirements prior to graduation. Data from Title II reports show that our completers have a 100% pass rate demonstrating that all of our completers meet state certification requirements.

**Measure 7: Ability of Completers to be Hired in Education Positions for Which They Have Been Prepared**  
The EPP surveys graduating seniors and recent graduates to track employment trends. Additionally, the Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE) provides completers' employment trends for recent completers hired in public schools in Louisiana. The completers' employment information provided to the EPP by the Louisiana Department of Education includes only completers employed by public schools in the state of Louisiana. It does not include employment information for completers hired by private, parochial, or out-of-state schools. Louisiana requirements for obtaining educator licenses for teachers include the passage of tests of subject area content and professional knowledge. All program completers have at least one test to pass to demonstrate their mastery of content and professional knowledge and some licensure areas require the passage of three to four licensure exam. The percentage of program graduates who hold a Louisiana teaching position one year after graduation ranges from 100 percent. 80% of Grambling State University College of Education Department of Teacher Education Completers that responded indicated that they were employed full-time teaching.

**Measure 8: Student Loan Default Rates and Other Consumer Information**  
The Draft Default Rate for FY 2018 has reduced to 19% from the 2017 rate of 22.2%

## 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.

### **NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 1 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:**

#### **1. Multiple years of data are not available for analysis. (ITP) (ADV)**

In the 2018 redesign of the undergraduate educator preparation program, syllabi in the graduate programs were also redesigned to demonstrate alignment with CAEP, InTASC, state standards, EPP outcomes, and SPA standards. The next steps will be to ensure that all assessments and rubrics also reflect InTASC standards. The EPP has received initial feedback from International Literacy Association and has begun to review alignments and rubrics to ensure that they meet the newest standards. The same will be done for syllabi and assessment to address the revised Council for Exceptional Children standards for initial certification.

There are several courses that require the development, and use of technology. In the new course ED 360 Social Studies and Science Methods and Strategies, candidates are required to create developmentally appropriate Social Studies WebQuests that meets state and NCSS standards. Candidates are able to demonstrate lesson plans that incorporate technology and can present through multiple technological media

## 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?

In an effort to expand recruitment efforts and increase the graduation rate, the department of Curriculum and Instruction offers GRAMTEACH, an accelerated option in the undergraduate teacher education program in Elementary Education, Grades 1-5 and Elementary Education and Special Education Mild/Moderate, Grades 1-5. The goals, objectives and long-range plans of the university include creating a diversified pool of highly prepared K - 12 educators to teach. Goal 2 of the Grambling State University Strategic plans, states that Grambling State University seeks to diversify its student enrollment by enhancing efforts to recruit non-traditional students as well as more international students and students from different cultures and geographic regions in the United States. Goal two further states that Grambling will also work to enhance efforts to increase retention and graduation rates of undergraduate and graduate students. This option is targeted to candidates who are employed by a partner school district as a paraprofessional and will help increase the pool of diversified non-traditional candidates.

The Grambling State University Alice Brown Smith PRAXIS Laboratory is available to all education majors. The lab administers Edmentum retired PRAXIS exams for the students to practice before attempting the actual PRAXIS exams. These tests are simulated and the results are evaluated to determine where the student may need additional help. Workshops are also offered according to the individual student reports generated through Edmentum.

The EPP reviews data from principal surveys, candidate surveys, graduation rates, licensure tests, and state reports. Data support that candidates are being well prepared with the skills, knowledge and dispositions to be effective teachers. (see response in section 4).

In order to improve student achievement on the Praxis certification exams, faculty and staff track and monitor passage rates amongst education students. The director of the CARE center disseminates reports on testing activity and passage rates. The data from these reports is used in multiple ways. They provide the benchmark data for Title II activities aimed at increasing retention and graduation rates. They are also used to assess the effectiveness of interventions provided by faculty and staff. These interventions include revising the course learning objectives of the ED 111, 112, 162, and 200 courses to include taking all parts of the Praxis Core Exam. Praxis practice was also added to the list of activities for these courses.

Students complete two self-reporting disposition surveys and clinical faculty complete three disposition surveys for candidates at intervals throughout their matriculation. These dispositions are completed and housed in TaskStream, the EPPs assessment management system of learning achievement. This allows students, faculty, and staff easy access to survey results and trend data that can be used for reflection, support, and intervention, when necessary.

Students choosing to complete the degree program with the license are expected to complete all related requirements including the portfolio, specialized Praxis exams and the clinical internship which extends across the final two semesters.

Quality Assurance- The University's attention to assessment intensified in Fall 2019 when it began its preparation for SACSCOC reaccreditation. Programs were asked to identify key assessments for specific program and operational goals. Fortunately, prior to this focus, the EPP had been producing annual reports for the Louisiana State Department of Education (LDOE) and submitting annual reports to Title II and CAEP. Additionally, comprehensive, five-year program reviews are also required by the Louisiana State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE). Assessment systems were designed for NCATE and to meet these expectations in 2016. The current Quality Assurance System and program assessment plans reflect the continuing development of this long-standing commitment to assessment and continuous improvement.

Several criteria were identified to guide the development and implementation of the QAS. System components must: 1) Utilize a systems approach and be cohesive with multiple decision points; 2) Integrate with other existing evaluation/assessment requirements and technologies; 3) Align with the Conceptual Framework and be comprehensive; 4) Exhibit Flexibility; 5) Demonstrate alignment with state-specific and SPA knowledge and skill standards; 6) Based on data from multiple sources that are based on carefully selected evaluation criteria; 7) Developed from simple to complex; 8) Committed to be valid, reliable and free of bias; 9) Inclusive through stakeholder (content faculty, professional education faculty, P-12 faculty and administrators, candidates, and graduates/alumni [PK16 Advisory Council]) involvement in system development and management; 10) Continuously supported and managed; and 11) Formally reviewed and revised as needed on a regular basis. Lastly, all components of the QAS model in the EPP are part of three major processes: data collection from a comprehensive and integrated set of assessments, analysis of data for forming judgments, and use of analysis in making decisions. Based on these three processes, assessment is operationally defined as a process in which data/information are collected, summarized, and analyzed as a basis for forming judgments. Judgments then form the basis for making decisions regarding continuous improvement of our programs.

The CARE Center sends weekly updates with Praxis scores received to the faculty members, advisors, staff, and Department Head. This information helps each member to understand how well we are preparing students for Praxis exams, it helps the advisor identify what they should do with the student moving forward and it also helps the advisor to work with Praxis Lab coordinator, tutors and add students to upcoming workshops. Each semester we also review ETS passage rate reports to identify trends in students who took Praxis exams the semester prior. Incoming Freshman students are placed in Praxis Accountability courses based on their ACT/SAT scores. These courses help students to prepare for their upcoming Praxis I exams. Students are also required to take ED 201 Advisee Report at least three times during their degree program. The advisee report course helps to give students a good idea of where they are in the program and what things they need to do to stay on track. During the meeting, the advisor and student discuss progression, ACT/SAT scores, Praxis scores, Test dates, Accountability courses, GPA, Praxis Lab or Khan Academy enrollment, observation hours, degree requirements and other information that is important to their degree completion.

The EPP focuses on continuous teaching effectiveness in its program. The strength of the education program is in its competence to provide copious opportunities for candidates to practice and get prepared for teaching. The elementary and secondary education majors will teach various disciplines of Math, English, Social Studies, and Sciences. The lesson plan is one of those instances where candidates are introduced to lesson planning using the Madeleine Hunter's Model. It is vital for teacher candidates to master the ability to design an effective lesson plan that are aligned with state standards for implementation. The candidates are exposed to these practices from level 1 through level 4. Candidates are required to write a lesson plan following the step by step provided for them by the instructors. Candidates are exposed and supported on using state standards for lesson planning, using measurable objectives, materials, activities, formative assessment, and the procedure of delivery a lesson.

The lesson plans for each level are assessed throughout the program using the Danielson rubric. The lesson plans are assessed to see if candidates understand writing measurable objectives, goals, material, and delivery of lessons and aligning the assessment to the objectives. The grades are used to see areas of strength and weakness of the candidates and by next level emphasis is placed where candidates showed difficulties. The goal is by level 4, candidates are comfortable writing a good lesson plan before they go into internship. This enables the candidates to focus more on teaching rather than perfecting lesson plans. The lesson plan assessment is required as part of the requirements for final evaluation in the program.

The Learning Management System(LMS) enables the instructor to plan, facilitate, evaluate, and implement personalized learning. Personalized learning methods are increasingly being used in the field of education. LMSs provide support for the instructor to use the curriculum to achieve learning goals, plan class activities for course delivery, as well as to monitor, analyze and report student participation.

The Call Me MiSTER (Mentors Instructing Students Toward Effective Role Models) National Initiative was commenced to increase the pool of available teachers from a broader more diverse background particularly among the lowest performing elementary schools. College student participants with high academic potential, a demonstrated commitment to teach and a servant-leadership orientation are largely selected from among under-served, socio-economically disadvantaged and educationally at-risk communities. As graduates, students are expected to have an impact by returning to critical need schools and communities to pursue their professional careers. It is expected that a MiSTER who completes his program of study and becomes certified to teach will assume a teaching position in a public school and teach one year for each year they received financial support from the Call Me MiSTER program.

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 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
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 4.4 Completer satisfaction
- 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
  - A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
  - A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
  - A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
  - A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
  - A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
  - A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
  - A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
  - A.5.5 Continuous Improvement



Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

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 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a succe transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful r regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the fo information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPP's™ evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progre on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's™ assessment of its evidence. It may hel the Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial lev programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level

If there are no identified gaps, click the box next to "No identified gaps" and proceed to question 7.2.

No identified gaps

If there are identified gaps, please summarize the gaps and any steps planned or taken toward the gap(s) to be prepared by your CAEP site review in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text

---

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the text applies.

Not applicable

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC C Principles, as applicable.

Yes  No

7.3 If no, please describe any changes that mean that the EPP does not continue to meet legacy NCATE Stand TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

---

## 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 2021 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 reviews.
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 review 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**