2018 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	◉	○
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 2016-2017 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to <u>initial</u> teacher certification or licensure[1]

`88`

2.1.2 Number of completers in <u>advanced</u> 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]

`25`

Total number of program completers   113

---

[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 2016-2017 academic year?

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

No Change / Not Applicable

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

No Change / Not Applicable

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

No Change / Not Applicable

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

No Change / Not Applicable

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

No Change / Not Applicable

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

> No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

> No Change / Not Applicable

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://www.uno.edu/coehd/resources.aspx

Description of data accessible via link: Teacher Preparation Fact Book, Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Dashboard,Title II

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?

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 Unit 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 for relevant data. The Unit holds monthly program improvement meetings to review 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, undergraduate enrollment within the unit has decreased slightly for students admitted to the program (not counting program completers). This trend is consistent with the enrollment pattern of the university during the same period. Although enrollment has decreased slightly, the number of completers has risen from 60 in year one to 68 in year three. When looking at overall numbers, enrolled students plus completers, the number of students has remained consistent over the three-year period.

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
Like undergraduate enrollment, enrollment in the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) has also seen a slight decline. This decline is also consistent with university enrollment in master's programs. Completer numbers over the three-year period have remained consistent, 83 in year one and 78 in year three.

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 27%. In year five the attrition rate moves to 45%. 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 75% 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 2.9 out of 4 with 84% of teachers scoring either effective proficient or highly effective.

Program Improvement
The university and the Unit 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 Unit 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.

The Unit 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 students progress. This program feature is in place to prepare students to teach in public and private schools with diverse student populations and hopefully reduce attrition of new teachers.
Although the Unit'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.

Satisfaction of Completers
The Louisiana Board of Regents is in the process of developing valid and reliable instruments. Once developed they will collect data for institutions within the state. Once the data is available, the BoR will provide the data to the Unit for analysis.

Advanced Graduation Rates
Dr. Jeanne Burns, the Board of Regents Associate Commissioner for Teacher and Leadership Initiatives, has informed all EPPs that at the present time, a process does not exist in Louisiana to calculate Graduation Rates of candidates in graduate programs or candidates in non-degree advanced programs that result in licensure. Thus, data are not currently available. During the months of May-June (2018), 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 2018-19, EPPs will use the procedures to calculate Graduation Rates for candidates in advanced programs and report them in the April 2019 CAEP Annual Report.

Initial Graduation Rates
The office is currently working with the office of institutional research at the university to add six-year graduation rates for students admitted to initial certification programs to the college website. The information will be added to the website by June 1, 2018.

Accountability
The unit is in the process of building an accountability page where data addressing impact and outcome measures will be housed. By June 1, 2018, the page will include:
-CAEP Annual Reports

-Title II Annual Reports (6)
-Teacher Preparation Data Dashboards (1, 2, 7)
-Teacher Preparation Fact Books (1, 2, 7)
- Educator Workforce Reports (7)
-Graduation Rates (Initial) (5)
-Student Loan Default Rates (8)
-Exit Surveys (4)

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. (ITP)

The EPP went through its NCATE legacy visit in the Fall 2015. At the time of the visit three initial programs were nationally recognized, seven initial programs were recognized with conditions and four initial programs were not recognized. As of Spring 2018, 6 more programs did gain national recognition including Mild/Moderate 1-5 (UG), Mild/Moderate 1-5 (MAT), Mild Moderate 6-12 (MAT), Early Intervention Birth-5 (MAT). However, as per CAEP requirements, five of six undergraduate programs were submitted for initial review in advance of our CAEP visit. The undergraduate secondary science program was not submitted due to low enrollment and will prepare for the review with feedback process during our CAEP self study report in Fall 2021. Furthermore, all MAT programs will prepare for the review with feedback process as well.

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 (ITP) (ADV)

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.

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

1. 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. (ADV)

At the time of the onsite visit, data was not available related to the documentation and tracking of field placements for candidates in the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction. All of the candidates in this program are already certified teachers and most are employed in the Greater New Orleans Area. Candidates are allowed to fulfill field experience requirements within in his/her own classroom and school. Effective fall 2015, the unit requires all M.Ed. in C&I candidates to document field experiences via a LiveText public form. The assessment coordinator tracks field experience information and shares it with the graduate coordinator of the program. During monthly program improvement meetings, the chair of the Curriculum and Instruction and Special Education remind faculty to have teacher candidates fill out the electronic form to track field experiences and to remind teacher candidates that filling out the form is mandatory for all teacher candidates in the M.Ed. program. Teacher candidates also have access to the field experience handbook located on the EPP's website. The handbook makes teacher candidates aware of the importance of field experience data, and how it collected and used to inform EPP improvement.

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) Conceptual Framework assessment 2) PRAXIS 3) Teacher Work Sample 4) End of Semester Evaluation 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. During summer 2018, faculty will meet to review and revise existing assessments in light of CAEP, InTasc, and state standards.

The Unit holds monthly program improvement meetings to review data, observe trends, and suggest relevant changes to programs. Two positive changes the Unit has made in reviewing data are related to candidate success measures for Praxis and upgrades to technology.

Praxis
In the process of SPA reporting the program coordinator for Social Studies observed an alarming trend of candidates not successfully passing the social studies content knowledge test. Upon further analysis of completer Praxis data including sub-scores student areas of strength and weakness were identified and used to update the content curriculum in the undergraduate program. The unit has compile a list of resources to assist students (e.g., preparation course at neighboring university, study skills prep at UNO's Learning Resource Center, online Praxis practice test via Learning Express).

Technology
In reviewing the exit survey administered to candidates completing the program, the faculty analyzed the data for 3 years. A three year trend indicated that candidates across all programs reported low scores for availability of technology on campus as well as how to incorporate technology in teaching. In order to address the candidates need to effectively use technology in teaching, the unit added a technology course to the undergraduate program. The unit also partnered with a local school to allow students enrolled in the class to use the latest technology available in their classrooms. In addition, faculty are encouraged to require students to incorporate technology in class presentations. To address the lack of technology on campus, the Unit leadership was able to use the student data to procure funding for a new Promethean board and several document cameras.

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.

📎 Praxis_1417.pdf

📎 Exit_Survey_72017.pdf

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or service 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 successful transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful reflection regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the following 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 made on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use the Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level.

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

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

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.

1.1 Understanding of the InTASC Standards
The Unit is aware of the InTASC standards and understands their importance in having a successful program. Faculty are in the process of revising the Unit's assessments to align with the InTASC standards. This is a long process that requires input from multiple stakeholders.

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

A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers; A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
Over the past several semesters stakeholders within the Unit have been brainstorming to find ways to develop instruments that will provide valid and reliable data on employer and completer satisfaction. In past attempts, instruments were used but data was flawed because of low participation in survey completion. In meetings held by the Board of Regents (BoR) in the state of Louisiana, it was discovered that the BoR is in the process of developing valid and reliable instruments for completer satisfaction and is planning to collect data for institutions within the state. Once developed and disseminated the BoR will provide the data to the Unit for analysis. The unit continues to work on a survey for employer satisfaction and hopes to distribute the survey in the Fall 2018 semester.

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
> 4.3 Employer satisfaction
> 4.4 Completer satisfaction
> 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
> 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 2018 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