

2019 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10199	AACTE SID:	1910
Institution:	University of New Orleans		
Unit:	College of Education and Human Development		

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	<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"/>

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	63
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	26

Total number of program completers 89

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
- 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://new.uno.edu/academics/colaehd/ehd/accountability>

Description of data accessible via link: EPP Annual Reports, State reports, candidate performance data, and completer and employer satisfaction 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	<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?

In reviewing Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years, faculty and staff at the EPP have observed trends in the data and collaboratively and thoughtfully made meaningful changes to the EPP and the various programs. The data reviewed to measure program impact is provided by the Louisiana Board of Regents and consists of the Louisiana Teacher Preparation Fact Book and the Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Dashboard. The Faculty also review Title II reports and EPP assessments to identify trends and make programmatic improvements. The EPP holds monthly program improvement meetings to review data (external and EPP data), observe trends, and suggest relevant changes to programs. A subcommittee also meets regularly to tie data to CAEP standards.

Undergraduate Trends

Over a three-year period, the average enrollment for the undergraduate program is 143 students. The overall number has declined slightly year to year, but this is consistent with the enrollment pattern of the university over the same period. The percentage of males and females has remained consistent from year to year with roughly 80% female enrollment and 20% male enrollment. In 2015, students of color comprised 22% of the student population. In 2017, that percentage rose to 28%.

In reviewing the five-year persistence rates of undergraduate completers who begin teaching in public schools, we see a sharp decline from year one to year two. The decline in year one is 34%. From year two to year five, the number of teachers who stay in public schools only slightly declines to 41%. Compared to other public providers in the state, the teachers prepared at the university leave public schools after one year at slightly higher rates. The providers with similar attrition rates include, LSU and Louisiana Tech. In discussions about the decline, stakeholders discussed the Greater New Orleans area and the disproportionate numbers of private and parochial schools as compared to other areas in the state. Although there is a decline, our students are not leaving the profession; they are often finding jobs outside the scope of the state collected data.

Compass scores are assessed to measure teacher impact on K-12 students and demonstrated teaching skill. The three-year average of UNO undergraduate completers with less than two years of teaching for Compass student outcomes is 3.1 out of 4 with 80% of teachers scoring either effective proficient or highly effective. These numbers are on par with similar institutions in the state. The three-year average of UNO completers with less than two years of teaching for Compass professional practice is 2.9 out of 4 with 86% of teachers scoring either effective proficient or highly effective.

Graduate Trends

Over a three-year period, the average enrollment for the MAT program is 174 students. The overall number has declined slightly year to year, but this is consistent with the enrollment pattern of the university over the same time period. The percentage of males and females has remained consistent from year to year with roughly 74% female enrollment and 26% male enrollment. In 2015, students of color comprised 18% of the student population. In 2017, that percentage rose to 28%.

Graduate persistence rates of MAT completers who begin teaching in public schools show a decline from year one to year two that is consistent with other public universities in the state with an attrition rate of 33%. In year five, the attrition rate moves to 51%. This is similar to the average for public universities in the state.

Compass scores for teachers who completed the MAT program were reviewed and the three-year average of UNO MAT completers with less than two years of teaching for Compass student outcomes is 3.1 out of 4 with 84% of teachers scoring either effective proficient or highly effective. These numbers are on par with similar institutions in the state. The three-year average of UNO MAT completers with less than two years of teaching for Compass professional practice is 3.1 out of 4 with 89% of teachers scoring either effective proficient or highly effective.

Program Improvement

The university and the are sensitive to enrollment and put measures in place to recruit and retain a diverse and prepared student body. The University has launched a major recruitment campaign highlighting national distinction on the university, affordable tuition, and the culture and diversity of the city of New Orleans. Although additional longitudinal data is required to confirm the lower enrollment trends, faculty and staff within the EPP play and active role in the overall university recruitment plan and also recruit students into teacher education programs, with a special focus on the high need areas of math, science, and special education. Studies also indicate that teachers who have attended schools in the area tend to be retained longer as teachers. Therefore recruiting students from secondary schools in Greater New Orleans could potentially prepare teachers who would remain in the profession and in New Orleans where there is a teacher shortage.

The EPP prepares students for teaching in diverse settings with a special focus on teaching in public schools. To improve rates of attrition, the various preparation programs require the majority of field experiences take place in public schools in the area. Field experience begins in the first semester of coursework and is continued throughout the programs, with the level of experience increasing and the student's progress. This program feature is in place to prepare students to teach in public and private schools with diverse student populations and reduce attrition of new teachers.

Although the EPP's Compass scores are similar to peer institutions, stakeholder analysis revealed that the number of teachers scoring highly effective is slightly lower when compared to peer institutions. In response, measures have been put in place to adequately prepare teacher candidates for classroom teaching. For example, a three-tier disposition review system has been created and improved upon that tracks teacher candidates throughout their time in the program. When dispositional issues arise for a student at any time, appropriate measures are taken to help the student understand the issue and take action to resolve the concern. Most recently, the dispositions 1 process for undergraduates has transitioned from a self-assessment to a faculty assessment of student dispositions. This shift was made in hopes of identifying possible dispositional issues early in the student's academic career. The dispositions rubric has also been streamlined based on input from the EPP faculty.

Satisfaction of Completers and Employers

The EPP has recently developed surveys for completer and employer satisfaction. The first surveys were sent out in the Fall 2018 and a second round will be sent in the Fall 2019. Faculty will analyze the responses and compare the results to the trends identified in the internal and external assessments observed over the past three years.

Dr. Susannah Craig, the Associate Commissioner for Teacher and Leadership Initiatives at the Louisiana Board of Regents, has informed all EPPs that at the present time, a process does not exist to calculate Graduation Rates of candidates in graduate programs or candidates in non-degree advanced programs that result in licensure. Therefore, data are not available at the present time. By August of 2019, the Board of Regents will work with EPPs to identify a set of consistent procedures for EPPs across the state to use to calculate graduation rates for advanced programs. During 2019-2020, EPPs will use the new procedures to calculate Graduation Rates for candidates in advanced programs and report these data in the April 2020 CAEP Annual Report.

Student loan default rates are reported by the U.S. Department of Education at <https://www2.ed.gov/offices/OSFAP/defaultmanagement/cdr.html>. The University of New Orleans' most current default rate reported (2015) was 7.5% with 141 loans in default and 1868 loans in repayment. This is a decrease of 1.2 percent from the 2014 rate of 8.7%.

Accountability

The college website now contains an accountability page accessible to the public that contains relevant data used for continuous improvement of the EPP.

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 Assessments and data across all programs do not consistently indicate that candidates meet national professional standards.** (IT P)

In preparation for the Fall 2021 CAEP visit the Unit is in the process of submitting six SPA reports showing how our programs meet national professional standards. The reports are as follows: Elementary Education-Baccalaureate (SPA-Association for Childhood Education International), Mild/Moderate-Baccalaureate (SPA-Council for Exceptional Children), Secondary Education, Social Studies-Baccalaureate (SPA-National Council for the Social Studies), Secondary Education, English-Baccalaureate (SPA- National Council of Teachers of English), Secondary Education, Mathematics-Baccalaureate (SPA- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics), and Educational Leadership (School Building Leadership Level)-Advanced (SPA-Educational Leadership Constituent Council). Due to low completers, Secondary Science (Biology, Chemistry and Earth Science) (SPA-National Science Teachers Association) will go through the review with feedback process as directed by the state of Louisiana Board of Regents.

Programs at the MAT level will all go through the review with feedback process. The programs are as follows: Special Education: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (1-5), Special Education: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (6-12), Secondary Science (Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, General Science, and Physics), Elementary (1-5), Special Education: Early Interventionist (B-5), English (6-12), Social Studies (6-12), and Mathematics (6-12).

Across all programs, assessments are collected, aggregated, disaggregated, and analyzed. Praxis 2 tests (content knowledge) are analyzed using the composite score as well as the score for each sub section of the test. Grades in content area coursework is also collected and analyzed to determine low performing areas. Grade data is then triangulated with praxis data to determine if weak areas of praxis match areas where students are performing poorly on content coursework. Programs use EPP assessments (ie. teacher work sample, end of semester evaluation, compass, and disposition reviews) to to measure candidates knowledge skills and dispositions.

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

- 1 The unit assessment plan does not include comprehensive and integrated measures to manage and improve the unit's operations** (IT (AD P) V)

The staff of the college office, headed by the dean, along with department chairs are responsible for the systematic collection, review, and analysis of data related to unit operations. Information from the provost and the offices of academic and business affairs are shared with the EPP's leadership team at monthly leadership team meetings. Additional agenda items for these meetings are recommended by chairs, the assistant dean, faculty, and the assessment coordinator. Topics, such as scheduling, enrollment data, grant opportunities, workload policies, program reviews, strategic planning, and budgetary reviews are among agenda items. Initiatives and policy changes are also shared from state level deans' meeting and from the Louisiana Department of Education. Chairs disseminate information from these meetings to faculty at department meetings and are often charged with related tasks. Some of the conversations and work related to these tasks occurs during the bi-weekly program improvement meetings. The Dean of the college meets monthly separately with the chairs of Curriculum, Instruction and Special Education, and Educational Leadership Counseling and Foundations to discuss and analyze data in reference to budgeting, technology, and faculty performance and effectiveness. The Assistant Dean meets monthly with both chairs to discuss concerns and generate action plans.

The Unit assessment system measures teacher-candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions at intervals throughout the program. Each of these assessments align with state standards and Unit standards outlined in the Conceptual Framework. The following assessments are used to assess the progress and growth of teacher candidates: 1) Compass assessments 2) PRAXIS 3) Teacher Work Sample 4) End of Semester Evaluation and 5) Dispositions Reviews. An exit survey is administered at the end of the Student Teaching/Capstone Internship semester to give candidates the opportunity to evaluate their experiences within the program and give useful feedback informing program improvement. Three years after completion, the EPP sends out a completers satisfaction survey to completers in the field and also sends out an employer satisfaction survey to relevant principles who employ certification completers. During summer 2018, faculty will meet to review and revise existing assessments in light of CAEP, InTasc, and state standards. A similar review is scheduled for Summer 2019. The Unit holds monthly program improvement meetings to review data, observe trends, and suggest relevant changes to programs. Based on the meetings the unit is in the process of improvement on the following areas: 1. Quality of selection, 2. Quality of Content Knowledge and Teaching Method, 3. Clinical Placement, Feedback, and Candidate Performance, and 4. Quality of Program Performance Management.

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 3 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

- 1** (A)

- **The unit has no formal system to manage and coordinate field experiences to ensure that candidates in the program for continuing preparation of teachers are placed in a variety of settings.** DV)

Pre-Internship field Experiences Early field experiences are included in each course of the Educational Administration program at UNO. Candidates engage in field experiences in each level of the program. Schools are where the connection of educational leadership theory and professional practice can happen. To support and encourage this connection, two types of field experiences (required and elective) are included in the Program. The required field activities are assigned at specific points in time in alignment with coursework, and the elective field experiences are selected by the candidate based on the current needs of their district.

The field experiences are organized into three levels of involvement: observing, participating, and leading. In our early program courses, there are more field experiences at the observation and participation levels; later in the program, there are more field experiences at the participation and leading levels.

In the Masters of Education in Curriculum and Instruction, students complete field experiences in specific courses dedicated to add on courses (Gifted, ESL, MM, Early Intervention, Reading Specialist). These Field experiences range from observation and direct instruction with P-12 students. All FE are predominantly conducted in public schools in the greater New Orleans area.

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 Unit assessment system measures teacher-candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions at intervals throughout the program. Each of these assessments align with state standards and Unit standards outlined in the Conceptual Framework. The following assessments are used to assess the progress and growth of teacher candidates: 1) Compass assessments 2) PRAXIS 3) Teacher Work Sample 4) End of Semester Evaluation and 5) Dispositions Reviews. An exit survey is administered at the end of the Student Teaching/Capstone Internship semester to give candidates the opportunity to evaluate their experiences within the program and give useful feedback informing program improvement. Three years after completion, the EPP sends out a completer satisfaction survey to completers in the field and also sends out an employer satisfaction survey to relevant principles who employ certification completers. During summer 2018, faculty will meet to review and revise existing assessments in light of CAEP, InTasc, and state standards. A similar review is scheduled for Summer 2019. The Unit holds monthly program improvement meetings to

review data, observe trends, and suggest relevant changes to programs. Based on the meetings the unit is in the process of improvement on the following areas: 1. Quality of selection, 2. Quality of Content Knowledge and Teaching Method, 3. Clinical Placement, Feedback, and Candidate Performance, and 4. Quality of Program Performance Management. Current Action steps are listed below.

Quality of selection

Faculty members in the department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education (CISE) received grants to engage regional high school students in science summer programs and STEM competitions, in partnership with NASA and Shell. The Education Preparation Provider (EPP) will continue to recruit participating students of color during these events and cultivate an interest to teach in the high needs fields of science and math.

The University of New Orleans recruits students from local high schools in the Greater New Orleans Region. The EPP also has MOUs with Bogalusa and St. John Parishes to recruit high school students to the teacher preparation programs. In St. Charles Parish, high school students are able to participate in dual enrollment and may take an introductory course, EDUC 1010, while taking their high school courses.

CISE faculty attend college and career events of partnering school districts, Jefferson and St. Charles Parishes. These events help the EPP recruit candidates from public and charter schools in the greater New Orleans area, increasing the likelihood that our candidates will be more reflective of the schools where students are placed. In addition, UNO recruits students from Delgado Community College. An articulation agreement exists so students are able to have their credits transfer to UNO. CISE faculty members participate in three UNO Open House events for recruiting high school students. These events provide opportunities for the Department to recruit and inform potential UNO students about the teacher education programs.

The EPP is discussing the MAT admissions requirements to include additional measures as part of the application process, such as an interview, letters of recommendation, and a statement of purpose. These additional measures will provide faculty with a broader sense of the abilities of potential candidates. Multiple measures will provide a stronger indicator of the likelihood of candidate success and allow the EPP to see strengths and weaknesses of incoming teacher candidates.

Quality of Content Knowledge and Teaching Method

The EPP disseminated a Praxis preparation flyer via email blast to all teacher candidates. Paper copies are available in the college office. A Praxis preparation bulletin board with exam schedules, online resources, and local Praxis opportunities is located outside of the CISE office so candidates have visible access to the information. The EPP is working in partnership with the Graduate School to offer Praxis workshops.

Through work with the Deans for Impact initiative, the EPP created and disseminated a survey to math candidates at the end of the Fall 2018 semester asking about their experiences with the math Praxis exam and math content courses. The responses from the surveys will help formulate a math module created by the math education coordinator. The goals of the module are to create assignments and assessments that demonstrate candidate specialized content knowledge in math and increase the math Praxis passage rate.

The social studies coordinator reviewed Praxis data to determine the areas where candidates were not performing well in social studies. After review of Praxis data and course descriptions of general social science courses, education majors are now required to enroll in specific social science courses: US History and World History. The content of these courses aligns with the content of the social studies Praxis exam, increasing the likelihood of undergraduate candidates passing the exam.

The EPP added an English Learner (EL) course to provide candidates with coursework related to peer learning and differentiation when teaching English learners. This course prepares candidates with knowledge about how to support the language development of English learners. All undergraduate and MAT candidates are also required to take a multicultural course. If students choose to apply for the ELL Add-On certification, both courses are accepted towards the certification. The remaining two courses to receive the Add-On certification will be offered Summer 2019.

Clinical Placement, Feedback, and Candidate Performance

In Fall 2018, the EPP changed its observation tool to improve the quality of feedback during all teacher candidate observations. The university supervisors are using the Compass evaluation rubric, along with a revised pre-observation form, to conduct formal observations. In preparation for the change, the university supervisors participated in the Compass evaluation webinar training provided by the State. A UNO department training was held with university supervisors to discuss the new observation forms and the components of Compass and to watch exemplar videos together as a way to improve inter-rater reliability.

During pre- and post-observation conference sessions, university supervisors provide constructive feedback, facilitate reflective discussions, and inquire about evidence of student learning with teacher candidates. Some supervisors share their Compass observations (omitting identifiable candidate information) with other university supervisors. The sharing of data allows supervisors to improve and reflect about their own Compass observations and rationale for the scores given to candidates. In Spring 2019, mentor teachers and administrators will be asked to use Compass or their school's official observation instrument when conducting observations.

The EPP now asks mentor teachers to play a more active role with the documentation, progress and growth of teacher candidates. As a result, the university supervisor and the mentor teacher communicate more frequently about the results and feedback

regarding the formal observations. Mentor teachers are identified in collaboration with schools and district leaders, with priority given to those who have received state training when possible.

The undergraduate and MAT teacher candidates complete surveys in three areas at the conclusion of their clinical practice: mentor teacher, university supervisor and overall program. The faculty uses the information to identify areas of strength and areas for improvement with the clinical placement and overall teacher education program. The assessment coordinator aggregated the UG and MAT comments. This data was shared with faculty during the December 2018 and February 2019 monthly department meetings.

Quality of Program Performance Management

The EPP is participating in the Statewide Deans for Impact Collaborative. The Collaborative works to help providers join together to address targeted program quality improvement. After review of programmatic data, the EPP's team selected increasing math Praxis scores and math program completers as an area of inquiry. The team will work during the remainder of the Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 semesters to implement their logic model with goals to increase candidates' specialized content knowledge in math, increase first time and overall Praxis passage rate, and increase the GPA of students' math content courses.

After using this improvement cycle to improve the EPP's secondary math program, this process may be useful to identify and address future programmatic performance areas. For example, a logic model may be created to develop a plan to address the EPP's area for improvement regarding validating internal sources of assessments. In addition, the process may be used to help the Department create a better longitudinal data collection system.

Each course in the teacher preparation undergraduate and MAT pathways provide candidates opportunities to complete fieldwork. The EPP is working to provide more innovative fieldwork experiences for candidates through the partnership with their high-performing Professional Development School (PDS) and other partner schools. During the Fall 2018 semester, the EPP met formally and informally with their PDS school to coordinate supervised, meaningful field experiences. A liaison was identified to coordinate field experience placements.

A local funder, New Schools for New Orleans (NSNO), met with the EPP in Fall 2018. NSNO will provide assistance to facilitate field experiences and clinical partnerships with charter schools in close proximity to campus. Administrators will look at creating block scheduling that considers travel time for students and professors.

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

- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
- 3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
- 3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 4.4 Completer satisfaction
- 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
- A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
- x.1 Diversity

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 r 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

In evaluating the Unit's assessment tools and data, the following gaps have been identified. The sections to follow will identify the gaps and address the progress made in addressing those gaps.

5.2 The accreditation leadership team has taken steps to learn how to produce valid and reliable data. The team leaders have attended numerous conferences addressing quality of data and are in the process of implementing a plan to evaluate current assessments for quality, validity and reliability. The unit accreditation leadership team will first conduct a face validity analysis of the alignment of the InTASC standards with the Unit's key assessments. Once face validity is determined, content validity will be established using Lawshe's ratio. Next, inter-rater reliability will be done to assess the degree to which different raters give consistent scoring to the same assessment. The EPP plans to have a series of workdays over the summer and ongoing program improvement meetings to address this issue. Validity and reliability studies will be done on all EPP assessments.

A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers; A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers: The EPP has developed and administered instruments for employer and completer satisfaction for initial certification completers. Similar instruments will need to be developed for advanced completers.

x.4 Previous AFI / Weakness: Although steps have been taken to improve measures to ensure that candidate in the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction are placed in a variety of settings, more needs to be done to encourage candidates of the importance of documenting their field experiences using the Unit's field experience form. The chair of the department has formulated a statement of importance and will personally email candidates each semester with the statement and the link to the field experience form.

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

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool

3.2 Sets selective admission requirements

5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers

A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

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.

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: Kurt Ovella

Position: Assessment Coordinator

Phone: 504-280-1278

E-mail: kmovella@uno.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