

# 2020 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	11864	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	4485
<b>Institution:</b>	Stephen F. Austin State University		
<b>Unit:</b>	James I. Perkins 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 EPP seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation<sup>1</sup> applies to CAEP eligible EPPs] Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial Licensure 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 2018-2019 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure<sup>1</sup> 360

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> 294

**Total number of program completers** 654

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

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

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

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

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP. \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements \_\_\_\_\_

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

## Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

**Link:** <http://coe.sfasu.edu/facstaff/caep>

**Description of data accessible via link:** This link is to a public facing webpage with links to all eight annual reporting measures.

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

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

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

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

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

*Are benchmarks available for comparison?*

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

All reported data were shared with internal and external stakeholder groups.

Reflection on Annual Reporting Measures

1. Impact on P-12 Learning: Data used for this measure are provided to Stephen F. Austin State University Perkins College of Education by the Texas Education Agency. More specifically these data are from the Center for Research, Evaluation, and Advancement of Teacher Education (CREATE) at the University of Houston. CREATE provides SFASU Performance Analysis for Colleges of Education (PACE) data annually.

To facilitate consistent long-term assessment of institutional impact, and afford comparative analysis, CREATE has established a Proximal Zone of Professional Impact (PZPI) for CREATE institutions which includes SFASU. SFASU's Proximal Zone of Professional Impact is comprised of the university and all school districts and campuses within a 150-mile radius. While this Proximal Zone of Professional Impact does not convey the complete impact scenario of the university's teacher preparation programs, it does provide a common and consistent setting in which the university may measure program effects over time. From CREATE's perspective, the PZPI offers a useful frame of reference for SFA EPP to utilize in assessing teaching and learning trends over time in the geographic area within a 150-mile radius of SFA.

Data utilized to examine impact of P-12 learning include a performance summary of student academic performance in the PZPI on State Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) at the elementary, middle and high school levels.

Analysis of these data reveals the following for each level

#### Elementary

□ Students scored slightly below the state of Texas average score for Reading, Writing, Mathematics and Science from 2017 to 2018. However, scores increased by at least 4 points from 2017 to 2018 for Reading, Writing, Mathematics and Science.

#### Middle School

□ Student scores increased from 2017 to 2018 for Reading, Writing, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies from 1 to 4 points. A four-point increase in Mathematics resulted in being at the state average for 2018. Scores for Reading, Writing, Science and Social Studies were from 1 to less than one point below the state average.

#### High School

□ Students scored slightly below the state average for English I, II, Algebra I, Biology and US History for 2018. Despite being below the state average by no more than 1 point across all tested areas, scores from 2017 to 2018 were up from 1 to as many as 4 points.

Eighty-five percent of the EPPs completers are employed in this PZPI, therefore demographic details about these school districts and children they serve were presented and discussed with the Professional Educators' Council. The percentage of At-Risk students in the EPPs PZPI is well above the TX mean for At-Risk students. As a result, STAAR scores at or slightly below TX mean scores suggests SFA completers have a positive impact on K-12 learners.

#### 2. Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness (4.2)

In 2019 the EPP expanded collection of data on the teaching effectiveness of its completers to include data gathered from three different assessments including: The Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System (T-TESS), The Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS) and the TEA conducted Principal Survey. The two newest sources of data T-TESS and PDAS are proprietary assessments used by campus administrators to evaluate teachers. The third data source is the TEA Administered Principal Survey Instrument and included the scores for 245 SFA completers.

#### Conclusion:

All three data sources on a total of 274 participants suggest the EPPs completers are at least proficient in their teaching effectiveness as rated by principals.

#### 3. Satisfaction of Employers: Component 4.3/A4.1

##### 4.3

#### Principal Survey Instrument (based on observations)

In 2019 Principals rated 245 of the EPPs candidates across 12 different certification programs and indicated 100% of the EPP's completers were at least sufficiently prepared.

##### A4.1

#### • Survey Development

In 2019, the following programs created a standards-based employer satisfaction survey: Educational Diagnostician, Reading Specialist, School Psychology MS, and School Psychology PhD which are included in the link to the CAEP Annual Reporting Measures. The Principal and Superintendent developed a plan to collect employer satisfaction data using the CAEP plan template. The Office of Assessment and Accountability worked with each advanced program and the TEA to identify where program completers were employed. Data from TEA was used to identify employers so employer satisfaction could be determined.

#### 4. Satisfaction of Completers: Component 4.4/A4.2

##### 4.4

#### • Texas Education Agency Administered First-Year Teacher Survey

##### Summary Report 2018-19

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) Administers the First Year Teacher Satisfaction Survey. This is a 55-item survey administered by TEA to SFA prepared first year teachers. TEA fully certified 361 SFA prepared teachers in 2017-18 and 75 chose to participate in the survey. The summary results indicate SFA prepared teachers felt most prepared in the areas of instruction, and technology integration. All participants indicated they were sufficiently prepared on 82% of the 55-survey items.

##### SFA Prepared Teachers 2018-19 Alumni Survey Report

In addition to the TEA administered Teacher Satisfaction Survey, the EPP sent out a program completer/alumni survey in 2018-19. Completers that chose to participate included 43 teachers from 13 different SFA certification programs.

100% of program mean scores indicated SFA completers reported they were at least sufficiently prepared for each of the follow: The Learner and Learning, Content, Instructional Practice, Professional Responsibility.

##### A4.2

#### • Educational Diagnostician Alumni Satisfaction Survey 2018-19

The Educational Diagnostician program had 20 alumni participate in a standards-based program satisfaction survey. Participants completed the program approximately 1 year ago at the time the survey was completed. Approximately 39 candidates complete the program each year.

Mean scores revealed participants indicated they were at least Adequately Prepared (3.0) for all standards except the following two which had mean scores of 2.88 and 2.99 respectively.

Standard VI. The educational diagnostician selects, administers, and interprets appropriate formal and informal assessments and evaluations.

Standard X. The educational diagnostician knows and understands appropriate curricula and instructional strategies for individuals with disabilities. 2.88

#### • A4.2 Reading Specialist Alumni Satisfaction Survey 2018-19

The Reading Specialist program had 12 alumni participate in a standards-based program satisfaction survey. Approximately 18 candidates complete the program annually.

Mean scores for 2018-19 revealed participants indicated they were at least Adequately Prepared (3.0) for all standards. Mean scores ranged from 3.91 -3.73.

School Psychology and Counseling developed their own assessments for completer satisfaction but data were not analyzed at the time of the annual report.

The Principal and Superintendent Programs developed plans to collect completer satisfaction data using the CAEP plan for data

collection template.

5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)

Full-Time, First-Time Undergraduates who were admitted to the Ed prep program Fall 2013 and Graduated within 6 years (6-yr Graduation Rate): 97.3%

Full-Time, First-Time Undergraduate Transfer Students who were admitted to the Ed prep program Fall 2015 (4-yr Graduation Rate): 82.9%

First-Time Graduate Students who were admitted to the Ed prep program and Graduated within 4 Years (4-yr Graduation Rate): 53.7% This number is low as many advanced candidates do not seek to earn a degree, instead they seek licensure only.

6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels) Using information available from the TEA Educator Certification Online System Report, the SFA initial level certification rate range for 2017, 2018, and 2019 was from 97% to 99%. Simultaneously the advanced level rate ranged from 93% to 98% from 2017 – 2019. Interestingly both initial and advanced program ability to meet licensing requirements were lower in 2018 than in 2017 or 2019.

7. Ability of Completers to be Hired in Education Positions for which they have been Prepared (initial).

Data from the Annual Report, from the Center for Research, Evaluation & Advancement of Teacher Education: University of Houston <https://uh.edu/education/research/institutes-centers/create/> and the 2017-2018 Texas Education Agency (TEA) Accountability System for Educator Preparation

indicate 83% of initial level completers were hired within a year. This is equivalent to the state of TX average, which is 83%.

Ability of Completers to be Hired in Education Positions for which they have been Prepared (advanced).

Using the latest data available from the Texas Education Agency, it was determined there were 218 SFA program finishers who were certified in advanced programs areas in 2017-18. Approximately 15% of SFA prepared educators in advanced programs found jobs in their advanced field of certification in the first year after completion. The largest advanced educator preparation program offered at SFA is Principal Certification. Most of those who complete this program continue in their roles as classroom teachers for more than one year before a principal position is open and/or deciding to take such a position, thus providing context and rationale for the low percentage.

8. Student Loan Default Rate

The latest data indicate SFASU's student loan default rate for 2016 was slightly lower (8.2) than in 2015 (9).

## 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 The unit does not regularly and systematically assess professional dispositions of all advanced program candidates. (ADV)**

In order to continue progress toward regularly and systematically assessing professional dispositions of all advanced program candidates, the following action steps were successfully accomplished for AY 2018-19:

a. Data collection for advanced programs began Fall 18 and continued into Spring 2019. All programs except school psychology began implementation of the EPP disposition assessment using it in at least three points in time within each program. This included measurement of candidate dispositions upon entry to the program, at the midpoint, and during the final semester of the program. Details for the assessment include: The Stephen F Austin (SFA) Educator Preparation Program (EPP) Dispositions Assessment provides faculty, candidates, and programs with feedback on candidate professional dispositions and is used to help the EPP make evidence-informed decisions related to continuous program improvement. More specifically, the SFA EPP Dispositions Assessment informs candidates and programs on the extent to which candidate's professional dispositions reflect the following core values defined in The Professional Dispositions Statement for SFA Educator Preparation: (a) academic excellence, (b) potential for becoming a life-long learner(c) collaboration and shared decision-making, (d) openness to new ideas, diversity, innovation, and change (e) integrity, responsibility, diligence, and ethical behavior and (f) service that enriches the community. As part of an annual Perkins College of Education (PCOE) Data Day, each EPP receives a report from the PCOE Office of Assessment and Accountability that includes mean scores on each disposition assessment item disaggregated by program. These results are made available to support-evidence based program improvement.

Data collected to date for advanced programs revealed means scores overall and across programs were at what the EPP considers an acceptable level of performance on the core values defined in The Professional Dispositions Statement for SFA Educator Preparation: (a) academic excellence, (b) potential for becoming a life-long learner(c) collaboration and shared decision-making, (d) openness to new ideas, diversity, innovation, and change (e) integrity, responsibility, diligence, and ethical behavior and (f) service that enriches the community.

b. It was determined school psychology uses their own more content specific dispositions assessment that support NASP accreditation efforts and data collection with assessment also continued.

It would be helpful to be able to upload data files to AFIs each year in the annual report. Current report format does not allow uploads here.

**NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:**

**1 The unit does not systematically share assessment data with faculty across initial programs to support continuous improvement.** (IT P)

**2 The unit does not systematically collect data for some assessments to improve the unit and its programs.** (ADV)

In 2018/19 the following four mechanisms continued to be utilized to systematically share assessment data with faculty across initial programs as a means to make data based decision making increasingly part of the culture within the EPP: (a) The Professional Educator's Council (PEC), (b) The Educator Preparation Program Advisory Council (EPP Advisory Council) (c) EPP Wide Data Day, (d) LiveText Field Experience Module and Qualtrics.

Collectively these mechanisms enhance the unit's capacity to make more informed evidence-based decisions that support continued improvement.

a) The Professional Educator's Council (PEC) consists of representatives from every initial and advanced certification program across the college, and from the colleges whose majors seek educator certification as well as students. This includes the program coordinator for each of these programs, as well as each department chair or director. PEC met four times creating multiple opportunities for shared decision-making and dissemination of assessment data. The types of assessment and data shared and discussed at PEC meetings included but were not limited to: Results from unit level assessments such as candidate dispositions, work sample, Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System (T-TESS), Candidate Evaluation of the Program, as well as candidate pass rates on required state content exams, annual Texas Education Agency Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) Report results, and SPA Report results. Results from a TEA administered Principal Appraisal were also presented and made available. The Principal Survey is completed on new teachers by their campus Principal. This summary report included means for each assessment item for the overall EPP and disaggregated by certification area. The PEC Representatives then communicate the information to their departments, schools, and programs during regularly scheduled meetings. The following link to CAEP unit assessment data is now made available to programs and stakeholders annually.

b) The Educator Preparation Program Advisory Committee (EPP Advisory Committee) is comprised of faculty members, associate deans, clinical faculty, university supervisors, and P-12 partner school district leaders. This committee met twice creating multiple opportunities for shared decision-making and dissemination of assessment data.

The following were key agenda items discussed in the 2018-19 school year:

- The EPP communicates information related to the bi-annual teacher job fair. This communication is not only information for our EPP partners but allows for partners to provide feedback and input on strengths, and areas for improvement in the planning and hosting of the event in partnership with the SFA office of Career and Professional Development.

- Reports:

- PCOE certification data--Katie Martin, PCOE Certification Officer
- Clinical teaching data--Carrie Durrett, PCOE Clinical Practice Coordinator
- Cert testing pass rates --Julie Stadler, PCOE Testing Coordinator
- Texas Education Agency updates (TEA) updates – Carrie Baker, Educator Preparation Program Manager
- Committee Discussion:

In 2018-19 a goal was to more actively engage the group with input for the EPP. The following were questions asked and discussed in a roundtable format with EPP faculty and staff members facilitating the discussion table. Table discussions were summarized and shared with PEC to guide programs in making decision with stakeholder input.

**EPP Advisory Board Round Table Discussion Questions November 2018 Mtg**

1. Describe strengths you see related to our admission requirements, benchmarks, and/or assessments for initial licensure teacher candidates.
2. Describe ways you think we could improve/change our admission requirements, benchmarks, and/or assessments for initial licensure teacher candidates.
3. T-TESS usage in clinical teaching--What should a clinical teacher score to pass?
4. What do SFA prepared candidates do well?
5. What do SFA prepared candidates need to be able to do better as they become new teachers on your campuses?
6. Are there things you would like to see us do to better prepare our teacher candidates?
7. Describe ways your districts benefit from partnering with us (SFA Ed Prep Programs)

EPP- Wide Data Day. This event occurs each September, and provides time and space for faculty across all initial and advanced programs to share and analyze both unit and program data, as a means to make strategic data-informed program decisions. The event allowed programs to meet individually for several hours in the morning, to analyze program and unit data for use in their annual program reports that are due each November 1. The keynote for 2019 was Dr. Francisco Rios, Dean, Woodring College of Education at Western Washington University Bellingham, he presented a Fostering Inclusive Education.

c) LiveText and LiveText Field Experience Module (FEM) Qualtrics use. A fourth mechanism utilized for sharing of data is the use of our data management system. EPP faculty (which includes field supervisors), mentor/cooperating teachers, program coordinators, and unit heads have access to LiveText, our adopted data-management system, as well as the benefit of a college-wide data management coordinator. The Office of Assessment and Accountability and the data management coordinator assist all stakeholders with utilizing the system to access and examine program and unit data. Advanced programs have had the most trouble using the FEM product due to the need for external stakeholders to login LiveText, thus limiting the EPPs ability to centralize data collection for advanced practicums. Progress was made in this area for 2019 when The Office of Assessment and Accountability began use of Qualtrics to capture such data with advanced programs.

**NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:**

**1 The unit does not ensure that all candidates have field experience and clinical practice with P-12 students from different socio-economic groups, and diverse ethnic/racial groups, and English language learners and students with disabilities.**

(I ( T A P D ) V)

In order to ensure that all candidates have field experience and clinical practice with P-12 students from different socio-economic groups, and diverse ethnic/racial groups, and English language learners and students with disabilities the following action steps were successfully completed:

a) As indicated in 2017 the EPP system for tracking and documenting diversity of placements as candidates move through the program was further refined in 2018. A decision was made to track diversity classification in five categories: Special Education/Disability, Economically Disadvantaged, Limited English Proficient [LEP], Gender, and Ethnicity/Race.

b) Diversity Ratings Based on National Averages

A placement earns 1 point if: Special ED > 13.20%, A placement earns 1 point if Economically Disadvantaged > 51.30%, A placement earns 1 point if ESL population > 9.50%, A placement earns 1 point if > 30% < 70% Male or Females

Diversity Rating Categories for Placement Sites

1-2pts = Not diverse, 3-4 pts = Moderately Diverse, 5-6 pts Highly Diverse

Below is a breakdown of all K-12 field placements for the 2018-19 school year by semester.

**Initial Level Programs**

• Clinical Teaching Placement Sites 2018-19

Fall 18

Total CT Placement Sites in each Diversity Rating Category

316 total placements were made in K-12 schools

23% Not Diverse

37% Diverse

40 % Very Diverse

Spring 19

Total CT Placement Sites in each Diversity Rating Category

360 total placements were made in K-12 schools

22% Not Diverse

38% Diverse

41 % Very Diverse

All placements are disaggregated by certification area in an excel file. AFIs need a place in the Annual Report System to upload files to better reflect progress being made.

The EPP made the following Field I II and III placements in K-12 schools.

Fall 2018

478 total Field I II and III, 66% Very Diverse, 10% were Diverse and 24% were Not Diverse.

Spring 2019

469 total Field I II and III, 66% Very Diverse, 13% were Diverse and 21% were Not Diverse.

• ELE Field I Placement Sites 2018-19

Fall 18

ELE Field I K-12 Placement Sites in each Diversity Rating Category

93 total placements were made in K-12 schools

9% Not Diverse

16% Diverse

75 % Very Diverse

Spring 19

ELE Field I K-12 Placement Sites in each Diversity Rating Category

99 total placements were made in K-12 schools

6% Not Diverse

13% Diverse

81 % Very Diverse

• ELE Field II Placement Sites 2018-19

Fall 18

ELE Field II K-12 Placement Sites in each Diversity Rating Category

99 total placements were made in K-12 schools

75% Not Diverse

7% Diverse  
18 % Very Diverse

Spring 19  
ELE Field I K-12 Placement Sites in each Diversity Rating Category  
81 total placements were made in K-12 schools  
74% Not Diverse  
14% Diverse  
12 % Very Diverse

• MLG Field I Placement Sites 2018-19  
Fall 18  
MLG Field I K-12 Placement Sites in each Diversity Rating Category  
23 total placements were made in K-12 schools  
9% Not Diverse  
26% Diverse  
65% Very Diverse

Spring 19  
MLG Field I K-12 Placement Sites in each Diversity Rating Category  
16 total placements were made in K-12 schools  
6% Not Diverse  
6% Diverse  
88 % Very Diverse

• MLG Field II Placement Sites 2018-19  
Fall 18  
MLG Field II K-12 Placement Sites in each Diversity Rating Category  
17 total placements were made in K-12 schools  
0% Not Diverse  
6% Diverse  
94 % Very Diverse

Spring 19  
MLG Field II K-12 Placement Sites in each Diversity Rating Category  
19 total placements were made in K-12 schools  
5% Not Diverse  
32% Diverse  
63 % Very Diverse

• SED Field I Placement Sites 2018-19  
Fall 18  
SED Field I K-12 Placement Sites in each Diversity Rating Category  
68 total placements were made in K-12 schools  
6% Not Diverse  
7% Diverse  
87 % Very Diverse

Spring 19  
SED Field I K-12 Placement Sites in each Diversity Rating Category  
74 total placements were made in K-12 schools  
5% Not Diverse  
7% Diverse  
88 % Very Diverse

• SED Field II Placement Sites 2018-19  
Fall 18  
SED Field II K-12 Placement Sites in each Diversity Rating Category  
83 total placements were made in K-12 schools  
14% Not Diverse  
05% Diverse  
81% Very Diverse

Spring 19  
SED Field II K-12 Placement Sites in each Diversity Rating Category  
129 total placements were made in K-12 schools  
5% Not Diverse  
32% Diverse  
63 % Very Diverse

- SED Field III Placement Sites (EC-6 & MLG do not have a Field III in the curriculum)

Fall 18

SED Field II K-12 Placement Sites in each Diversity Rating Category

99 total placements were made in K-12 schools

20% Not Diverse

9% Diverse

71 % Very Diverse

Spring 19

SED Field II K-12 Placement Sites in each Diversity Rating Category

129 total placements were made in K-12 schools

12% Not Diverse

17% Diverse

71 % Very Diverse

Advanced Level Programs

Fall 2018

Educational Diagnostician: (N= 62), 29% Very Diverse, 44% Diverse, 27% Not Diverse

Principal Preparation: (N= 39), 36% Very Diverse, 41% Diverse, 23% Not Diverse

Reading Specialist: (N= 22), 55% Very Diverse, 41% Diverse, 5% Not Diverse

School Counselor (N=5) 60% Very Diverse 0 % Diverse, 40% Not Diverse

School Psychology (MS & PhD): (N= 2), 0% Very Diverse, 0% Diverse, 100% Not Diverse

Superintendent –No candidates to place for that semester

Spring 2019

Educational Diagnostician: (N= 62), 29% Very Diverse, 42% Diverse, 29% Not Diverse

Principal Preparation: (N= 73), 38% Very Diverse, 51% Diverse, 11% Not Diverse

Reading Specialist: (N= 22), 59% Very Diverse, 36% Diverse, 5% Not Diverse

School Counselor (N=0) No students to place

School Psychology (MS & PhD): (N= 2), 0% Very Diverse, 0% Diverse, 100% Not Diverse

Superintendent (N=7) 57% Very Diverse, 29% Diverse, 14% Not Diverse

c) It was concluded that both initial and advanced candidates have field experiences with P-12 students from different socioeconomic groups, and diverse ethnic/racial groups, and English language learners and students in Special Education Programs.

## 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?

1. The EPP programs within the Perkins College of Education underwent a reorganization in 2018-19. The reorganization was designed to better support candidates and faculty through the creation of two different departments with a more streamlined and central focus overall. The reorganization brought together most all initial certification programs within the college into one department. The included combining EC-6, Middle Level Grades, special education and Secondary Education faculty in one department named Education Studies. Previously these programs were split across three different departments. Additionally, advanced programs with non-teacher roles such as principal, superintendent, school counselor, and school psychology were reorganized into one department newly named Human Services and Educational Leadership.
2. A major effort made by the EPP in 2019 was resubmission of 13 different SPA reports. Unfortunately, the EC-12 Physical Education and EC-6 face to face and online programs were not able to get feedback their professional associations are no longer reviewing SPAs w CAEP. Program response to reviews included enhancing rubrics and in some cases collection of one round of data.
3. The EPP created a CAEP writing team that began meeting at least 1-2 per month. Teams include EPP faculty, unit heads and staff members. A team was created for each of the five standards with individuals as a lead for each cross-cutting theme. The team uses Microsoft Office 365 OneDrive and Sharepoint for sharing of data and information. In addition to reviewing EPP created assessments such as the Dispositions and Worksample to ensure each meets a CAEP Sufficient level for EPP created assessments, the team's review lead to revision to of the disposition assessment rubric and rating scale. The Professional Educators' Council reviewed the adjustments and as Fall 2019 began data were collected using the updated professional dispositions assessment.
4. Another major effort made by the EPP was apply to and becoming accepted as part of the Texas Education Agency edTPA Pilot being conducted in Texas. Texas is looking to adopt edTPA in place of one of its paper pencil standardized test like certification exams. As part of the pilot the EPP hosted three different edTPA regional workshops to help programs begin to understand edTPA in ways that would lead to curriculum redesign. Work toward adoption of edTPA took significant amounts of time particularly for the EC-6 and Middle-Level grades programs. The goal is for these programs to fully implement edTPA with all candidates starting Fall 2019. Although the EPP currently uses an EPP designed form of authentic assessment, adoption of edTPA will further enhance the depth and breadth of knowledge for initial candidates as they will be more prepared for new teacher roles. The longer-term goal is for the EC-12 and secondary programs to adopt edTPA in either spring or Fall 2021.
5. The EPP also began offering two different dual credit courses high school students can take that are part of the EPP. One of these is an EDU 101 focused on the history and background of education as well as a human development course HMS 203.
6. The EPP participated in an electronic Texas Education Agency Desk Review/Audit. All materials for the Desk Review were submitted Fall 2018 and included: Updated program curriculum matrices showing alignment of all coursework with all appropriate standards, program benchmarks and assessments as well as the overall EPP Handbook, Clinical Teacher Handbook, Field Supervisor Handbook, Cooperating/Mentor Teacher Handbook, and Advanced Program Handbook. The EPP earned a status of fully accredited from the Texas Education Agency for 2018-19.
7. Last, uploaded to this section are the cross-walks created to show what evidence the EPP is using to meet each CAEP standard. These are working documents and indicated data collected annually.

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures  
A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities  
A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation  
x.5 State Standards (if applicable)

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

 CAEP\_Standards\_Crosswalks\_with\_SFA\_EPP\_Evidence.docx  
 CAEP\_Standard\_Crosswalks\_Advanced\_0612192.xlsx

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 success 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 help the Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level 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 visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text ap

### Initial Level

The CAEP writing teams developed cross-walks to indicate evidence that would be used for each CAEP standard and elements. See uploaded file CAEP CROSSWALK in section 6 of the annual report. The uploaded cross-walk is for initial programs. Cross-walks for advanced programs have also been upload in a separate document with each program having a tab a the bottom of the page.

### 4.2 Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

### 4.4 Satisfaction of Completers

The EPP spent considerable time securing data sharing agreements with local education agencies to expand and develop its capacity to collect data on alumni/completers. As indicated in the annual measures information the EPP was able to gather data on a grand total of 274 completers using data from combination of EPP created assessment including a case study as well as two different proprietary teacher observation instruments scored by school administrators where completers are employed.

### 5.3 Quality and Strategic Evaluation

More formal documentation of ways programs are using this information to support continuous improvement efforts (data-informed decision making) is an area where the EPP will continue to make progress.

### Advanced Level

As the Spring 2021 CAEP site visit approaches, advanced level programs will continue to use of multiple assessments to monitor progress. In 2018-19 the CAEP advanced programs began meeting with the Associate Dean for Assessment and Accountability every two weeks so as to collaboratively review the advanced CAEP standards and determine the best sources of data. Progress in

2018-19 included creation of completer and employer satisfaction surveys and/or plans for data collection. Most programs and this point are utilizing multiple assessments to support evidence based decision making across all CAEP standards.

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

- 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers

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

NA

## Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

**Preparer's authorization.** By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2020 EPP Annual Report.

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

### Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

### Policy 6.01 Annual Report

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

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

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

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

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

### **Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements**

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

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

**Acknowledge**