2020 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10148		AACTE SID:	3550
Institution:	Northwestern State University of Louisiana			
Unit:	Gallaspy College of Education and Human Development			

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	⦿	○
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	⦿	○
1.1.3 Program listings	⦿	○

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

https://education.nsula.edu/

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[1]

115

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.)[2]

103

Total number of program completers 218

---

[1] For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

[2] For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

Section 3. Substantive Changes

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

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

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

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

3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: https://education.nsula.edu/accountablility/

Description of data accessible via link: Annual program reports, candidate and completer performance data, survey results, educator workforce reports, and other consumer information

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	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Advanced-Level Programs			☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑

2

Link: https://www.nsula.edu/institutionaleffectiveness/

Description of data accessible via link: Annual program reports (assessment cycle reports) by college

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	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Advanced-Level Programs			☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑

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?

The following is a synthesis of findings, actions, and plans derived from a meta-analysis of annual program reports for all educator

preparation programs. Complete reports labeled Assessment Cycle Reports at our institution, are linked on our accountability Web page as well as on our institution's Institutional Effectiveness Web Page identified in Section 4.1. Advanced programs are preparing for a virtual site visit by 2022.

Initial Programs
• Continue to offer Praxis workshops and partner with Natchitoches Parish Library to offer access to Learning Express, a source for Praxis test preparation to support candidate learning.
• Add videos and resources addressing questioning techniques, designing student assessments and managing classroom routines and procedures to support candidate learning.
• Add additional resources and course content on differentiation, higher order thinking skills to support candidate learning.
• Continue to place greater emphasis on professionalism in all courses adding resources and support materials focusing on self confidence and self-initiative to positively impact candidate dispositions.
• Continue to increase focus deep reflection, writing skills, research writing and on APA format.
• Continue to engage students in service learning in elementary and early childhood programs.
Advanced Programs
• Continue to enhance preparation for and resources on research writing and on APA format.
• Add additional course resources to support writing and formative feedback.
• Continue to use probing questions during candidate presentations of research findings.
• Continue to redesign curricula and assessments in response to CAEP Advanced Standard 1 focusing on standards for educational leadership
• Continue to revise curricula and assessments in response to CAEP Advanced Standard 1for educational technology leadership and special education programs.
• Continue the process of examining evidence quality for all key assessments in advanced programs
The EPP uses completer performance reports (Board of Regents' Data Dashboard and Fact Books) to derive external benchmarks for comparative purposes. The EPP also reviews data from the LA Department of Education. More meaningful, though, are the program-level and cycle benchmarks by assessment. The Assessment Cycle Reports, completed annually, reflect comparisons of the previous academic year's data cycles to the current year's data cycles for each assessment reported in each program report. While cycles do not represent the same candidates, the benchmarks allow faculty to identify potential changes needed in assessments, test those changes, and reflect upon the results of the changes, albeit with different candidates. This process facilitates meaningful evidence reflection, decision-making, testing and review.
Annual performance of candidates and completers are shared publicly on the accountability Web page, cited in Section 4.1 of this report, and at biannual Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) meetings. For candidate performance reports, data are reported in aggregate form given that some "n" values are quite low. This is done to avoid the opportunity to associate or identify a particular individual with particular scores. Other performance reports are presented on the accountability Web page in the exact forms they are reported the institution's Office of Institutional Research, the Louisiana Board of Regents, or the Louisiana Department of Education, or the U.S. Department of Education.

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

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)**   2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice

There is limited evidence to demonstrate that the EPP has a systematic plan to document that all clinical educators have completed professional development. (Component 2.2).

The EPP is in the initial phase of developing and implementing a systematic plan to provide continuous professional development for all clinical educators. During AY 2018-2019, a general meeting with university supervisors was held at the beginning of the fall and spring semester, as always.

The Director of Clinical Practice and Partnerships reviewed the roles and responsibilities of university supervisors; provided State and program updates; and discussed the Class Measures process and rubric. University supervisors were trained on the electronic portfolio system used to record and store candidate artifacts for documenting assessment data by Dr. Sanson. Dr. Sanson will continue to provide a TaskStream refresher for documenting assessment data each semester.

University supervisors and mentor teachers were formally trained on the use of the School of Education evaluation instrument. Approximately, 25 supervisors participated either in person or virtually. Between 10-15 university supervisors attended the evaluator training, and a session was held for the 11 CLIP mentors.
The groups participated in a norming activity to set a clear standard for effective teaching and learning and to better ensure consistency in evaluation ratings for teacher candidates.

Participants watched a video lesson as a group and independently scored the teacher using the evaluation instrument. They were then asked to orally compare their ratings and reflect on the evidence they highlighted as support.

Pre-and post-observation protocol were also discussed.

The EPP will continue to provide evaluator training sessions each semester to ensure university supervisors and mentors share a

common set of expectations for teacher practice.

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)**   5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP provided limited evidence of formal diverse stakeholder involvement related to program evaluation and changes for improvement. (Component 5.5)

During AY 2018-2019 a plan was developed and the EPP reconfigured the Teacher Education Advisory Council to involve a more diverse group of stakeholders in program evaluation and continuous improvement. Discussions throughout 2018-2019 focused on ways to involve stakeholders in program evaluation. A faculty member, chairperson, was appointed to reorganize the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC). The Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) is a diverse group comprised of a broad range of local community stakeholders including
• Civic Leader
• Classroom Teacher
• Community Member
• Current Student, Candidate, or Resident in the School of Education (undergraduate, PREP, or graduate programs)
• Curriculum Specialist
• District Administrator (superintendent, assistant superintendent, director of academics, etc.)
• Educator Preparation Program Faculty Member
• Human Resource Specialist
• Parent of local/regional school student(s)
• School Building Administrator (principal, assistant principal, dean of students, etc.)
• Workforce Development Specialist
Applications and nominations were solicited through social media outlets (Twitter and Facebook) and via email for representation for each of the stakeholder roles and council membership includes a diverse representation of roles (see TEAC Call for Applications and Nominations).
Following the application/nomination period, prospective members accepted appointment to the council via email confirmation (see TEAC Letter of Appointment).
The council meetings are scheduled for Spring and Summer 2020 to inform continuous improvement efforts beginning fall 2020. While initially planned for early Spring 2020, the meetings were rescheduled in response to the national and statewide social distancing orders associated with the coronavirus pandemic Spring 2020. As a result, meetings were rescheduled for virtual delivery and for dates/times that best fit the availability of council members. The results of the meetings will be used in a formal presentation to faculty/staff in the SOE at the annual "Data Day" Summer 2020.

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?

Over the last few years, the EPP has experienced significant changes in key personnel. In AY 17-18 and AY18-19 the EPP was undergoing changes in leadership. As of Fall 2019, the department appointed a new assessment coordinator and a new CAEP coordinator. As these individuals become more acquainted in new roles, the EPP will continue to systematically review its continuous improvement efforts. The EPP has made changes in the process used to solicit and engage stakeholders who serve on the TEAC and also as of Fall 2019 began using a process to review data to assess performance toward meeting annual goals at the end of each semester. A report of the mid-year review will be included in annual report data beginning with the 2021 EPP annual report. The EPP will continue assess it progress and results formally through the institutions' annual assessment cycle review.

The EPP instituted a process for continuously reviewing data to the annual report. The mid-year report can be considered Phase 1 for writing the Annual Report. The Mid-Year report is an effort to reduce the workload at the end of the assessment cycle (AC) by completing portions of the report that can be completed now at the conclusion of the Fall semester. This process aims to support the strategic focus on implementation of the decision/action/recommendation from 2018-2019 AC. The Mid-Year Report also sets the foundation for the Findings, Decision/Action/Recommendations, and Plan of Action for the next AC that will be completed for the Annual Report due each Spring. We will formally use this process to report data in our Annual Report beginning in 2021.

Final Mid-Year reports were due in February. The results of the report were to be discussed in March through our assurances survey where faculty report changes that may need to be made. While initially planned for late March 2020, the assurances survey was delayed allowing faculty to focus on transitioning face-2-face courses to virtual delivery formats as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The EPP also focused on organizing the TEAC. The Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) is a diverse group comprised of a broad range of local community stakeholders including
• Civic Leader
• Classroom Teacher
• Community Member
• Current Student, Candidate, or Resident in the School of Education (undergraduate, PREP, or graduate programs)
• Curriculum Specialist
• District Administrator (superintendent, assistant superintendent, director of academics, etc.)
• Educator Preparation Program Faculty Member
• Human Resource Specialist
• Parent of local/regional school student(s)
• School Building Administrator (principal, assistant principal, dean of students, etc.)
• Workforce Development Specialist

Applications and nominations were solicited through social media outlets (Twitter and Facebook) and via email for representation for each of the stakeholder roles and council membership includes a diverse representation of roles (see Call for Applications and Nominations attached). The EPP received 100+ applications/nominations for the council.

Following the application/nomination period, prospective members accepted appointment to the council via email confirmation (see Letter of Appointment attached).

The council meetings are scheduled for Spring and Summer 2020 to inform continuous improvement efforts beginning fall 2020. While initially planned for early Spring 2020, the meetings were rescheduled in response to the national and statewide social distancing orders associated with the coronavirus pandemic Spring 2020. As a result, meetings were rescheduled for virtual delivery and for dates/times that best fit the availability of council members. Meeting minutes will be recorded for each meeting and shared with the council at each subsequent meeting, respectively. Members will be surveyed after each meeting to provide individual responses to the information shared and discussed at each meeting, with the opportunity to provide suggestions and recommendations for continuous improvement in teacher education.

Results of the TEAC council members surveys will be presented to School of Education faculty and staff at the annual "Data Day" Summer 2020. Recommendations of the TEAC will be used by School of Education faculty and staff in program planning for academic year 2020-2021.

In addition, the recommendations of the TEAC will be used along with assessment cycle reports to develop the interim report for advanced programs which will be submitted in 2021.

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

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

📎 **TEAC_Call_for_Applications_and_Nominations_2019.pdf**
📎 **TEAC_Letter_of_Appointment.pdf**
📎 **TEAC_Meeting_Agendas_Spring_2020.docx**
📎 **Initial_Licensure_Programs._Annual_Assessment_Reports.pdf**
📎 **Advanced_Programs._Annual_Assessment_Reports.pdf**
📎 **Annual_Assessment_Timelines._AC_Process.docx**

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

COVID-19 has significantly impacted Louisiana. Louisiana was placed under a mandatory social distancing order.

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:	Keicia Hawkins
Position:	CAEP Coordinator
Phone:	3183575554
E-mail:	hawkinsk@nsula.edu

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**