

2020 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10135	AACTE SID:	1915
Institution:	Louisiana Tech University		
Unit:	College of Education		

Section 1. EPP Profile

After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate.

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1.2 [For EPP seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation¹ applies to CAEP eligible EPPs] Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial Licensure and/or Advanced Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2018-2019 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹

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

Total number of program completers 180

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: <https://education.latech.edu/about/assessment-accreditation/>

Description of data accessible via link: 2018-2019 candidate and completer 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?

PREFACE

The last three years have proven to be significant to our self-analysis and subsequent action. In that period, we held a regularly scheduled CAEP site visit, prepared for a follow-up Stipulation visit to be held in May 2020, and discovered through those experiences and leadership turnover that our quality assurance system was not as sound as we believed it to be. Beyond the substance of our analysis, we discovered that procedural requirements of some standards, like posting data of the eight annual reporting measures online, were not carried out as thoroughly as they could be. In all, we used the first two of those three years to conduct an examination of our quality assurance system measures, processes, and utility. The third year, the current 2019-2020 academic year, has been devoted to making substantive changes to measures and processes that will yield greater utility in and from the quality assurance system. While tangible evidence presented currently and discussed herein is limited, we submit that much effort has been devoted to quality, long-term continuous improvement, even though evidence of that is intangible at the moment.

MEASURES 1 AND 2

Data from the Danielson Framework evaluations on the 2018-2019 cohort of completers revealed the lowest mean ratings ($m=2.84$ and $m=2.86$, respectively) on two criteria relating to assessment and the use of data to determine impact on student learning and to inform future instruction (3d. Using assessments in instruction, 3b. Using questioning and discussion techniques).

In preparation for fall 2020, faculty will conduct thorough analyses of the data for these two criteria. This review will attempt to identify whether low ratings impacting the means are isolated to any program(s), and related data quantitative and qualitative data points will be compiled to triangulate findings before programmatic changes are made. Some of these data points will be qualitative feedback provided to candidates and comparable evaluative criteria in pre-clinical residency evaluations.

Additionally, a Student Learning Target (SLT) assessment has been integrated into all residency, student teaching, and internship courses. Beginning in 2020-2021, this assessment will become the primary evidence of P-12 student learning impact. It will yield more valid results of Measure 1 because it includes setting learning targets, collecting student performance data on those targets, analyzing the data, and devising reteaching and other intervention strategies to address the data results. Currently, our evidence for Measure 1 is limited to certain criteria on the Danielson Framework, which provides only a performance-based snapshot of data rather than the true collection, review, and use of student performance data over time.

Teaching effectiveness evidence for Measure 2 was also generated from the Danielson Framework, primarily from the criteria related to managing environments, behavior, and procedures; question and discussion strategies; instruction; engagement; and content knowledge. On these indicators, the 2018-2019 completers routinely scored above 3.00 on a 4.00 scale with two exceptions. Across all programs, the mean scores for 1e. Designing coherent instruction and 3b. Using question and discussion techniques (as reported above) were $m=2.96$ and $m=2.86$, respectively.

We have determined that our efforts to unpack the 1e Danielson Framework criterion with candidates were not as comprehensive as we anticipated. Corrections in methodology courses to apply this unpacking by subject area are underway. Similarly, course changes related to questioning and discussion techniques are being integrated into our assessment and methodology courses to ensure that candidates experience the implementation of those techniques for both assessment and instruction purposes.

MEASURES 3 AND 4

Overall, completers report satisfaction with the programs that prepared them for their current roles, and employers report that completers are as prepared as possible when they assume their professional roles. Results, though, do reveal two trends of concern across results for the completer and employer surveys, and those two areas relate to completers' preparedness for working with English Language Learners (ELLs) and students with special needs.

Currently, the proportion of ELLs compared to all students in our service area is low. Whenever possible, we work to ensure that candidates have experiences with ELLs, but demographics of partner schools do not always permit this to occur across all programs. It is an area for growth that we recognize, however, and we work with our school district liaisons annually to determine the demographic compositions of schools and make diverse field placements accordingly. While ensuring practical experience with ELLs is an area for growth, we do ensure that, at least conceptually, candidates learn strategies for working with diverse populations of students.

The second area for growth relating to working with students with special needs has been addressed through curriculum revisions. Effective with 2020-2021, all initial program curricula will include at least two special education courses. One course, a foundational course, will introduce candidates to classifications, laws, services, responsibilities, reporting, etc. related to all special populations. The second course is a strategies course where candidates will learn current best practices in working with diverse populations of students.

MEASURES 5 AND 8

Graduation rates and consumer information are reported institutionally, and comparisons across programs and colleges are available in the evidence.

MEASURES 6 AND 7

We adhere closely to Louisiana policies for teacher credentialing. No candidate completes a program and is recommended for certification without meeting the requirements appropriate for the certification(s) sought. Reports from the Louisiana Board of Regents and the Louisiana Department of Education include performance and workforce data on our completers.

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

Waived

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

Waived

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

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

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

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

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

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

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

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

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

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

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

Acknowledge