2019 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10558	**AACTE SID:**	980
Institution:	East Central University		
Unit:	Teacher Preparation Program		

Section 1. AIMS 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	◉	○

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 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure[1]	64
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]	94
Total number of program completers	158

[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 2017-2018 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

The Educational Leadership Program is now offered on-line. The School Superintendent Certification program is now offere on-line.

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://sites.google.com/tigerapps.ecok.edu/ecuedprogramdata/caep-evidence

Description of data accessible via link: East Central University Program Information and Assessment Data

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://drive.google.com/file/d/1WN5d6R_k7ifiHHqwpbbLBPsiAFmq6Pqw/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 4.1.1 IRB Approval Letter

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			☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1CS3sGlyU9jfWqJtgrxW_BbaCiv-WyyWc/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 4.1.2 Growth Data Chart

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

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1plzAYfyM3IqnwZhuF4VFwPL6gWXKLNAs/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 4.2 TLE Data and Summary Table

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			☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1plzAYfyM3IqnwZhuF4VFwPL6gWXKLNAs/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 4.3.1 Satisfaction of Employers- Initial

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			☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

6

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1HUQqfjA0g2ajBZCWtzXd_70MNTTf8QrQ/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: A4.3.1 Satisfaction of Employers- Advanced

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			☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

7

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1maeGJANEKZZwe0gadqs7ZoNBxnqXGYm_/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 4.3.2 & 7.1 Retention & Milestones- Initial

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			☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

8

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1Y0Yp0_NV5kN4qGKHPaCoLPwbQfNeUmpp/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: A4.3.2 & A7.1 Retention & Milestones- Advanced

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			☑	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐

9

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1SnIoDJYfC4UUCfl1OC6kX8NsrP5MmkL1/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 4.4.1 Completer Satisfaction- Initial

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			☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

10

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1qXOt3Sh1PJbQ6CXFajkrFoz9Y2KE1AoL/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: A4.4.1 Completer Satisfaction- Advanced

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			☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐

11

Link: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1FSpj29j8Ji19F_TSnrtTYKIJhUwhYjqe/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 5.1.1 Graduation 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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs			☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐

12

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1jCRMA6pOLDSh2-26ONbFNr6itsVRKByj/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 6.1 Title II Reports (2019-2016 can be found on Program Information and Assessment Data Website)

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Advanced-Level Programs			☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐

13

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/16SwWpm2JydNKM2EH1_kMpWr_gR9WV1q3/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 8.1 Student Loan Default Rate Summary Table

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			☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑

14

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1qSLzFjE0_bR4CJVqX4_e5A6oaD03R2ZV/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 5.1.2 Retention Rate

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?

4.1 While steps have been taken at the state level to implement a comprehensive assessment system which would be used to gather data needed to determine the effectiveness of candidates, it has not yet been completed. As a result, the Professional Education Committee decided that meeting this standard must come from research data derived from a sample of P-12 teachers. The research design and subsequent IRB was approved by the university. The Principle Investigator (PI) planned to do the following: a) gather student growth data on a sample of first year completers from the program, b) gather administrator and parent satisfaction surveys on these first-year completers and c) look for a correlation between our newly implemented PPAT and the Teacher Leader Evaluation (TLE) utilized to measure teacher effectiveness. The PI contacted all first-year completers in the service area who completed the program, who taught in a tested grade (3rd, 5th, or 8th), and who had TLE data reported to the State Department of Education. There were five completers who met the criteria and who volunteered for the study. The committee determined that the lack of participation resulted from the completers being concerned about state testing in the spring; therefore, the committee decided to invite completers to participate in the fall. The PI, who had taught the identified five completers, contacted them again. All of the completers responded but two were in different positions at different schools. All of the participants completed the consent form even though they did not have all necessary pieces of data. The PI emailed all completers and their administrators the satisfaction survey (N=10). Only one first year (now in his/her second year) completer responded. This participant had a different teaching assignment and did not have any growth data. Participants were contacted again which only yielded one additional survey and no student growth data. Consequently, the EPP's attempts to gather data necessary to complete the case study were not successful. The Professional Education Committee discussion centered around the following issues: a) TLE is not available on a first year teacher until the fall after his/her first year which means that the case study must be completed in two different academic years creating an obvious logistical issue, b) participants must be identified and contacted early and consent forms signed so there is a pool of participants in the event that some drop out, c) email is not a reliable communication tool for this type of study, and d) this case study design was not practical for gathering data needed to determine P-12 student growth.

The alternative plan was to contact a school partner who employed many of the EPP's graduates to obtain STAR or Dibbles

growth scores. Of the seven completers on the list, only one taught in the elementary school which used a test that yielded student growth percentile (SGP) data. The completer utilized the STAR Reading test which captures an SGP. The SGP is calculated for students who have taken at least two tests within different testing windows of fall, winter, or spring. The calculation uses the first test in the fall, the test closest to January 15 in winter, and the last test in spring. The student growth data used for the EPP's purposes represents data in fall and in winter. The final testing data will not be available until after the Spring 2019 test. The median SGP for 20 students was 61. There was a 41 point increase in the average score from pretest to posttest. Only two students decreased from pretest to posttest and one of those students appeared not to have answered any questions which invalidates that score. One student increased 239 points. From this report there is clearly positive growth for the first-grade students in reading. This is not generalizable data, but it does give the EPP a starting point for knowing what growth data is and is not available.

The state of Oklahoma has not yet developed a statewide assessment system that, "can support calculating growth for students in at least grades 4-8" as discussed above. That leaves EPPs with limited options. The EPP's initial case study design proved problematic. The pool of completers who taught in tested grades was much smaller than anticipated. The design itself spread over two years which could result in completers changing grades, schools, or having different administrators. The EPP assumed that participants of this study would continue to provide data in subsequent years for potential trend data. Many EPPs across the state are discussing options for meeting Standard 4.1. Discussions with area administrators and curriculum directors indicated that a resolution for growth data for elementary and middle school would be possible with a statewide assessment system that would yield an Oklahoma Performance Index (OPI) in math and English. The OPIs are currently being field tested. While this movement toward growth scores is encouraging, it does not solve the problem of growth data for secondary completers. Consequently, the EPP is working on a case study model that would identify completers each year at one level and gather growth data on predetermined assessments. The evidence for Standard 4.1 would be gathered over multiple years in order to present representative data. Nevertheless, some evidence that indicates the potential of completers to impact student growth is the PPAT. Data from the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers shows that candidates can impact P-12 student growth during their final semester of their education program. The TLE discussed in 4.2 along with Administrator Surveys discussed in 4.3, indicate that the completers from the EPP are effective teachers who positively impact P-12 students.
Data indicate that for domain 1, Classroom Management, cohort scores increased from 3.42 to 3.52. In domain 2, Instructional Effectiveness, cohort scores increased from 3.35 to 3.50. Scores also increased in domain 4, Interpersonal Skills from a 3.47 to 3.63 and in Leadership from 3.53 to 3.55. However, there was a decrease in domain 3, Professional Growth and Continuous Improvement. The scores decreased from 3.59 to 3.53.
For the first year of data 100% of the candidates scored 3 or above and met state standards. The second year of data on this cohort indicated that scores actually decreased minimally in domains 1, 2 and 3 with the ranges widening in domains 1 and 2. There were a few more scores with a 4 or better but there were also a few low scores. Domains 4 and 5 were met at 100% with only a slight increase in the ranges. For the third year of data on the cohort some scores increased but only slightly. 95% of the cohort reached the state standard for domains 1, 2 and 3. 100% of the cohort reached the state standard for domains 4 and 5.

There were increases in each domain for this second cohort (2015-16). Domain 1, Classroom Management, increased from 3.36 to 3.42 for a .06% increase. Domain 2, Instructional Effectiveness, increased from an average 3.32 to 3.46 for a .14% increase. Domain 3, Professional Growth and Continuous Improvement, went from an average of 3.45 to 3.47 for a .02% increase. Domain 4, Interpersonal Skills, increased from a 3.29-3.54 for a .25% increase which was the largest increase. Domain 5, Leadership, increased from 3.32 to 3.41 for a .09% increase. It is interesting to note that even though there was an increase in domain 3, Professional Growth and Continuous Improvement, it was the smallest increase. Year 1 data for the second cohort indicated that for domains 1, 2, 3 and 4, 96% of the first-year teachers met the state standard. Only 1 candidate scored below the “3” standard in all four domains. 100% of the first-year teachers from this cohort met the state standard of “3” in domain 5. The range was the widest in domain 4 where one teacher received a score of “2” on Collegiality and Professionalism and one teacher received a score of “5”. The range for domain 1 was 2.33 to 4.00. The range for domain 2 was 2.5-4.3. The range for domain 3 was 2.5-4.5. The range for domain 5 was 3-4. The ranges are in-line for what one would expect for first-year teachers. The majority of the scores are in the “Effective” range (3-4) with very few earning a Superior (5) on the high end and no teachers with an Ineffective (1) score.

In domains 1 and 2, 96% of 2016-17 cohort scored at a “3” or better. In the same cohort, 100% scored a “3” or better in domains 3, 4 and 5. The ranges were much tighter with no teacher receiving a score of “5” or a score of “1”.

In examining the TLE scores by teaching level, the secondary (English, history, math, and science with a N=33) scored higher in every domain. These programs are housed in the content area departments. The differences were not significant though. The EPP’s secondary completers scored highest in domains 3 and 4 (Professional Growth and Continuous Improvement, and Interpersonal Skills). The elementary, early childhood, and special education (N=35) are housed in the education department. The high scores were also in domains 3 and 4 even though the scores were .08 and .15 lower on average. This provides evidence that all programs are receiving the necessary knowledge, skills and dispositions throughout the professional education sequence and the specific methods courses. There is very little difference in the domain averages and ranges among three years of data for completers. Employers believe that completers from the EPP are effective teachers and contribute to student growth in the classroom.

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 2 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. The unit lacks procedures to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessment measures used to evaluate candidate performance in field placements. (ADV)

The previous Institutional Report identified assessment measures in our field placements as being problematic. From that feedback from NCATE, the Advanced Programs underwent dramatic changes. All EPP created assessments have been revised. Since the EPP's site visit is in November 2019, the newly revised assessments and processes will be piloted this spring. The new instruments include EPP created practicum supervisor instruments, and completer, employer, and supervisor satisfaction surveys. The CAEP Graduate Program subcommittee will be working with alumni in the field and EPP faculty to validate all instruments this spring and then pilot the process and instruments at the end of the semester. The Graduate Program subcommittee will follow study procedures like the one conducted on the EPP's Graduate Program Dispositional Instrument. The hypothesis for the study stated those students who received higher ratings on factors that include; character and personality, intellectual capacity and laboratory/technical abilities, as indicated by their evaluators on the recommendation forms, would have greater academic success as measured by GPA than those students who received lower ratings on these factors. We also hoped to establish inter-rater reliability between the rankings of the two evaluators required by each candidate.This experiment was a 2 x 3 mixed design Pearson r analysis. The dependent variables were evaluator ratings (0 thru 5) on graduate student's applications for descriptive characteristics relevant to the independent variables; 1) Disposition, 2) Knowledge, 3) Skills, and 4) Composite Score. A Pearson's Correlation and a simple linear regression were conducted using the student's GPA on their last 60 credit hours of coursework before being admitted to the graduate program as the dependent variable.

A one-tailed Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated for the relationship between Evaluator 1's Disposition, Knowledge, and Skill Score Set compared with Evaluator 2's Disposition, Knowledge and Skill Set scorings. A significant correlation was found, $r(391) = .325$, $p < .001$, between the two variables as both evaluators rated students similarly. In general, the raters were consistent with their ratings for each student, thereby establishing inter-rater reliability. A second one-tailed Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated for the relationship between the composite scores for Evaluator 1 and Evaluator 2. A significant correlation was found, $r(391) = .340$, $p < .001$. In general, the evaluators would rate a student similar again demonstrating inter-rater reliability. A third one-tailed Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated for the relationship between the Composite Reviewers score average and the last 60 hours Grade Point Average (GPA) significant correlation was found, $r(391) = .200$, $p < .001$, demonstrating concurrent validity between raters and students' GPA. To further investigate the relationship between the variables, a simple linear regression was calculated predicting the GPA for the students using the composite disposition scores (COMP) of the evaluators. A significant regression equation was found, $F(1, 390) = 16.32$, $p < .001$, $R2 = .04$. A student with a composite disposition score of 4.5 is equal to GPA = 2.286 +.244(4.5). In general, that student's 60 hour GPA was approximately 3.38 when initially applying to graduate school. Our study sought to investigate the correlation between Dispositions, Knowledge and Skills that have been compiled from the applicant's recommenders in order to determine whether

these scores are a reliable and valid source of information that might indicate a student's potential for success in graduate school. After analyzing the data, it was found that our hypothesis was correct. A strong correlation between average GPA scores and the means of composite scores representing evaluator ratings of disposition, knowledge and skills that substantiates high inter-rater reliability agreement. A separate correlation examined the GPA earned from the last 60 hours of a student's education (3.43) and the composite means (4.69) revealing that applicants for graduate school were generally bright students who performed well academically. These results adequately support the assertion that these indicators are accurate predictors of future academic performance by students admitted to these programs.

In order to engage stakeholders in the process, subcommittee's were formed and program candidates, recent graduates, in-service teachers, and administrators were given the EPP created instruments to evaluate for content validity. All EPP created graduate program instruments are in the process of being evaluated by multiple stakeholders. After the stakeholder data has been collected and revisions made, the instruments must be approved by the EPP graduate program committee and the EPP Teacher Education Committee.

The new instruments will be available in all program handbooks for the Fall, 2019 semester. All University Supervisors and Public School Supervisors will discuss changes made to the practicum instruments. The data from the pilot study will be shared at the annual Graduate Faculty Retreat. All data will be made public via the Education Program Data Website.

The Graduate Program Coordinator will start looking for trends in data once the instruments have been validated. Since the EPP graduate programs were in a phase-in transition point, time was spent creating the instruments and aligning them to CAEP standards while previous instruments were used to collect data on the AFI. The EPP can address fairness, accuracy and consistency much better than with the new instruments.

The instruments will work with annual data supplied by the Office of Educator Quality and Accountability, Certification Test Scores, Practicum Evaluations and Supervisor Evaluations to ensure fairness, accuracy and consistency of assessment measures.

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

1. There is limited evidence that candidates participate in field experiences or clinical practice that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups. (ADV)

(2) East Central University is in the heart of south central Oklahoma. The traditional service area where most ECU advanced candidates' practicums and field experiences occur have students with above state averages in ethnic minorities and low socioeconomic level (as determined by free and reduced lunches). Program directors require advanced candidates to upload

practicum or field experience data into their electronic Chalk and Wire Portfolio. Credentials of the practicum supervisor as well as location of the practicum and locations are tracked to determine that Advanced level candidates are receiving diverse field experiences which ensure that candidates have the knowledge necessary to teach and impact diverse students in diverse settings. Program directors provide a list of approved practicum or internship sites to the Assessment Coordinator for review. Additionally, the program director reviews the credentials of the practicum or internship supervisor to ensure that the licensing area for which the advanced candidate is being prepared is an area the supervisor has had experience in and is credentialed for. The EPP is moving from Chalk and Wire to Blackboard Outcomes in Spring 2019. This will be a new e-portfolio platform where practicum placements and supervisor credentials will be uploaded.

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

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

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

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

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

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

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

The EPP reviews its processes annually to guarantee it is gathering the data needed from all stakeholders to make informed program decisions.
In Fall 2017 the EPP raised admission standards to ensure that high quality candidates were entering the EPP's programs. To be fully admitted to the teacher education program, candidates must have a 2.75 GPA, must have completed 36 hours of general education courses, must pass the Oklahoma General Education Test (a pre-approved CAEP assessment), must have a "C" or better in ENG 1113 and 1213 as well as COMM 1113. The increase in the GPA was one change implemented to meet CAEP requirements. The addition of a new technology course early in the program is also a change in Block 1. The technology changes resulted from first year teacher and employer satisfaction surveys. The technology assessment Wayfind was implemented to gather data on candidate technology skills. The initial question concerning the effectiveness of the program change in increasing technology skills will be answered when data is available on the candidates who completed our program before the changes and those who completed after the change. This will provide much needed information on the EPP's strategy to improve technology skills prior to candidates completing the program.
For Block II, all candidates must continue working on their program e-portfolio, as well as complete 25 field experience hours in the public school. Candidates must pass the courses, satisfactorily complete field experience hours, and complete Block II portfolio requirements. Changes that have been made or are currently in transition involve changing from a Chalk and Wire e-portfolio platform to Blackboard Outcomes. This change should improve the e-portfolio process since candidates are more familiar with Blackboard's interface. The preliminary transition in Fall 2018 indicated greater student satisfaction and faculty satisfaction with the

e-portfolio change. Realignment of the assessment instruments to InTASC standards that are addressed in Block II courses has assisted mentor teachers and candidates in more clearly understanding field experience expectations. The implementation of the PPAT has resulted in a redesign of all activities in the professional block courses. Tasks 1, 2, 3, 4 of the PPAT have been introduced earlier in the program. This spiraling of the curriculum ensures that candidates understand the language of the tasks and the expectation of the tasks prior to completing the assessment in the final block. Data indicate that these changes have impacted candidate PPAT scores. The mean raw scores for Task 2 as earned from national assessors is, 61% in Fall 2017, 65% in Spring 2018, and 70% in the Fall of 2018. The EPP believes this increase in scores demonstrates both the ability of faculty to guide candidates in the completion of this Task, as well as the increased effort of the candidates during the Fall 2018 semester when PPAT was first accepted for certification purposes. This same trend in the mean raw score for this Task is the same as seen in Task 2 with scores of 58% for Fall 2017, 66% for Spring 2018, and 69.5% for Fall 2018. Additionally, like Tasks 2 and 3, the scores for Task 4 demonstrate increased focus from candidates with a mean average of 71% during the Fall 2018 as compared to 65% for Spring 2018 and 59% for Fall 2017.

Block III consists of two courses and one field experience for a total of 5 credit hours. It is typically completed during the first semester of a candidate's senior year. The changes made to this professional block include moving the Educational Technology class from Block II to Block III, implementing a case study that integrates diversity and technology to ensure candidates can apply technology in culturally relevant teaching projects, and revision of Block III field experience assessment instruments to align with InTASC standards addressed in Block III.

Two seminars were reorganized and added to the student teaching block or Block IV. The preliminary work in piloting the PPAT along with data from First Year Teaching Surveys indicated that the EPP needed additional classroom management strategies and additional focus on PPAT Tasks 3 and 4. In the CAEP 2018 Annual Report, the EPP reported this finding, "ECU is similar to most institutions in that Classroom Management is identified by all evaluation instruments as an area needing improvement. Candidates verbalize this area as a concern on open ended comments on the first year teacher surveys as well as during their student teaching. In order to address classroom management concerns, a holistic view of the education program was discussed by the Education Department faculty which resulted in more thorough classroom management content integrated throughout the professional education program and evaluations of that knowledge implemented in the first professional block and continuing on each block and into student teaching. Addressing this need, as well as ensuring focus on student learning, led to the implementation of the PPAT performance assessment, first as a pilot in fall of 2016 with full implementation fall of 2017. As the EPP piloted the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers, it became necessary to redesign the courses offered at each professional block (four) in order to scaffold the process for our teacher candidates throughout the program. East Central University's EPP was the first in the state to fully implement the PPAT as a required component of student teaching. While the state did not have a cut score, we did submit candidate PPATs for national scoring. Even though the scores did reveal some areas of concern, an independent evaluation of the projects from two individual teacher education faculty validated the evaluation process. The high scores on the PPAT national scores correlated to high scores on faculty evaluations of the project. Low scores from national scoring correlated to low scores by education faculty evaluation. Data from both evaluations indicate that Task 3 and Task 4 are areas that need further work: Designing Instruction for Student Learning and Implementation, and Analyzing Instruction to Promote Learning. We will be analyzing data to determine if the program changes result in an increase in PPAT scores." Even though Classroom Management continues to be a concern for first year teachers as reported in individual comments, the changes have resulted in increases in PPAT scores.

While steps have been taken at the state level to implement a comprehensive assessment system which would be used to gather data needed to determine the effectiveness of candidates, it has not yet been completed. As a result, the Professional Education Committee decided that meeting this standard must come from research data derived from a sample of P-12 teachers. The research design and subsequent IRB was approved by the university. The study was a mixed method design intended to show the effectiveness of first year teachers in positively impacting student learning. The study was also designed to gather satisfaction information to determine if the EPP prepared candidates were ready to teach immediately after graduation. The Principle Investigator (PI) planned to do the following: a) gather student growth data on a sample of first year completers from the program, b) gather administrator and parent satisfaction surveys on these first-year completers and c) look for a correlation between our newly implemented PPAT and the Teacher Leader Evaluation (TLE) utilized to measure teacher effectiveness. The PI contacted all first-year completers in the service area who completed the program, who taught in a tested grade (3rd, 5th, or 8th), and who had TLE data reported to the State Department of Education. There were five completers who met the criteria and who volunteered for the study. The committee determined that the lack of participation resulted from the completers being concerned about state testing in the spring; therefore, the committee decided to invite completers to participate in the fall. The PI, who had taught the identified five completers, contacted them again. All of the completers responded but two were in different positions at different schools. All of the participants completed the consent form even though they did not have all necessary pieces of data. The PI emailed all completers and their administrators the satisfaction survey (N=10). Only one first year (now in his/her second year) completer responded. This participant had a different teaching assignment and did not have any growth data. Participants were contacted again which only yielded one additional survey and no student growth data. Consequently, the EPP's attempts to gather data necessary to complete the case study were not successful. The Professional Education Committee discussion centered around the following issues: a) TLE is not available on a first year teacher until the fall after his/her first year which means that the case study must be completed in two different academic years creating an obvious logistical issue, b) participants must be identified and contacted early and consent forms signed so there is a pool of participants in the event that some drop out, c) email is not a reliable communication tool for this type of study, and d) this case study design was not practical for gathering data needed to determine P-12 student growth.

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

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
1.5 Model and apply technology standards
3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
x.2 Technology

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 progress m addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use 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

The EPP has identified two gaps. The first area has been discussed earlier under Section 4 "Reporting Measures". The EPP's self-study was completed February 6, 2019. The process that we anticipated using to gather student impact data did not work. In lieu of conducting a study, the professional education committee contacted area schools and only one school had a recent graduate in a grade that was tested. We were only able to secure one teacher's classroom "growth data". Even though the growth data was significant, we did not have Teacher Leader Effectiveness data on this first year teacher to corroborate "teacher effectiveness". This attempt at a study demonstrated the challenges we face in gathering the data and the continual changes in the state's teacher evaluation system has led to gaps in evaluation data. The problem is exacerbated by a teacher shortage and mobility within and without of the state. We currently have six area schools who have signed Memorandums of Understanding in order to gather growth data from our graduates' classrooms if they are hired in these schools. We will use this model to secure growth data from other graduates outside of our service area. We will have growth data on 4 early childhood graduates by the end of May. There is currently no mechanism in the state to gather secondary student impact data. The state does not require it. The last tested grade

before high school is 8th grade. The next test is in 11th grade. If there is growth, it would be difficult to attribute it to one teacher. One school district has implemented a Gear Up grant. They are in their second year of planning. They will be identifying tests to use to gather student growth data as they move their school district to a continuous improvement model. However, tests have not yet been identified and therefore, growth data will not be available on secondary students for at least another year. While this is encouraging as we attempt to meet standard 4.1, the sample is far from representative so the problem has not yet been solved.
The second gap was evident in our Advanced Program completer satisfaction data. Data on completer satisfaction in jobs related to new certification areas is not available from the state of Oklahoma. The EPP is responsible for gathering this data. It is, however, a difficult challenge for two reasons made clear while working on the self study. First, many completers do not stay in Oklahoma making them difficult to track. Second, many candidates pursue new certification areas but do not immediately use their new certification in their job. In fact, data gathered on Advanced Program candidates who graduated in 2017-18, indicated that of the 69 who completed, only 15 (21%) obtained jobs in their new certification area for the upcoming year. There is a teacher shortage in Oklahoma which has resulted in nearly 2000 emergency certificates being issued. School districts are competing for qualified teachers and other school personnel so maintaining certified teachers in the district is top priority. Data on the number of years candidates have worked at their current district: 45% have been at their current district 0-3 years; 26% have been at their current district 4-6 years; 14% have been at their district 7-10 years, and 15% have been at their district for over 10 years. Additionally, tracking of Advanced Candidates is made more difficult by "On-Line Programs". This spring the institution signed a contract to partner with Learning House, an on-line program management company. The Advanced On-Line programs will be marketed more widely which will make tracking much more problematic.
The Advanced Programs are currently obtaining validity information on all of the EPP created instruments. The Advanced Programs fell in a transition year so limited data was needed which gave the EPP the opportunity to create and validate EPP created instruments.

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

4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Q 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 2019 EPP Annual Report.*

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

Report Preparer's Information

Name:	Brenda Sherbourne
Position:	Dean, College of Education and Psychology
Phone:	580 559-5350
E-mail:	bsherbrn@ecok.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**