

2021 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 EPPs seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation]. Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial-Licensure Level and/or Advanced-Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).

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

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 2019-2020 ?

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 93

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 2019-2020 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: 2019-2020 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"/>							
Advanced-Level Programs			<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 2019-2020 academic year was devoted to making substantive changes to measures and processes that would yield greater utility in and from the quality assurance system. At the same time, the closures from the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in much of the relevant data not being collected at the end of the 2019-20 academic year. 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 for Impact Measures 1 and 2 are provided by the State of Louisiana Board of Regents. Due to discrepancies found in data used to calculate Growth in Student Learning Scores and Compass Teacher Evaluation Scores for new teachers completing individual teacher preparation programs, the Board of Regents did not release the 2019 Teacher Preparation Data Dashboards or create a 2019 Teacher Preparation Fact Book. These would have included data for the 2018-2019 academic year. Because of school closures as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, teacher performance data was not collected by the state. As a result, the 2020 Teacher Preparation Data Dashboards and 2020 Teacher Preparation Fact Book with data from the 2019-2020 academic year will not be available.

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. The analysis of results in the 2018-19 surveys revealed two trends of concern across results for the completer and employer surveys, completers' preparedness for working with English Language Learners (ELLs) and students with special needs. The survey data for 2019-20 continue to show these areas as concerns.

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

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

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP provided limited evidence of a quality assurance system specific to use of completer data. (Component 5.4)

A new process to address this AFI was implemented during the 2019-2020 academic year related to annual data collection, review, and action. Institutionally, annual reporting is required of all programs for regional accreditation. Efforts within the EPP to meet this requirement were implemented but not with the fidelity necessary to ensure cohesion and meaningfulness. To that end, how the EPP implemented the institutional process was revisited and retooled to ensure that a single effort met the needs of both the institution for regional accreditation and the EPP for CAEP accreditation.

During Fall 2019 the process was reviewed and areas for growth in how the process has been implemented were examined. Data needs by program were identified and 2018-2019 reports based on outcomes and measures identified during the 2017-2018 academic year were completed. In Winter 2020 common programmatic outcome areas for all programs were identified. Those are: discipline-specific content knowledge, discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice, professional behaviors and characteristics, creative thinking, ideas, processes, materials, experiences, and data-driven decisions. The next step was to identify student learning outcomes for each programmatic outcome area as well as measures to yield data for each outcome. Reports for 2019-2020 were prepared based on the new outcomes with data currently available. Given that 2019-2020 was a transition year between the former and new processes, data collection as evidence for some new outcomes was not yet underway. The 2019-2020 reports represent the new process, which provides a framework quite different from the former process. Moving forward, the new process was implemented for the 2020-2021 academic year. Given that reports reflect academic year cycles, one full year must elapse before the new process can be realized. The new process with evidence based on the new outcomes will be collected with fidelity during the 2020-2021 academic year and reported and acted upon fall 2021.

Before data was collected in a somewhat passive manner; now the data collection is a robust process that produces actionable outcomes. The data is now used for broader purposes than before, including program improvement, resource allocation, grant funding, and research. The new processes have been integrated into the overall strategic plan, thereby supporting continued progress in data collection, management and use for continuous improvement.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP lacks formal systems and structures for stakeholders to provide feedback, analyze data, and have input in programmatic decisions. (component 5.5)

A significant overhaul of the Quality Assurance System began in academic year 2019-2020 and continues into 2020-2021. A program-level data collection, review, decision-making, and reporting process provides an annual review that drives continuous improvement and is based on Deming's Plan-Do-Study-Act model for ongoing improvement (<https://deming.org/explore/p-d-s-a>). At the end of each academic year, a Data Day is held to review data (both aggregated and disaggregated), identify patterns across programs, identify strengths and weaknesses, and use the findings for continuous improvement and to identify data trends that will guide the changes made to courses, assessments, and program requirements. During this process, each program provides a relevant analysis of trends, comparison of trends with identified benchmarks, and alignment of the results to future directions and plans. Beginning in 2020-2021, stakeholders were introduced to this process and will work with EPP faculty during the Data Days to make decisions based on the program-level analyses.

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?

During the 2019-2020 academic year substantive changes to measures and processes were made in order to yield greater utility in and from the quality assurance system. Institutionally, annual reporting is required of all programs for regional accreditation. How the EPP implemented the institutional process was revisited and retooled to ensure that a single effort met the needs of both the institution for regional accreditation and the EPP for CAEP accreditation.

The required annual institutional reports were revised in 2019-2020 to yield a standardized template with common student learning outcomes (SLOs) across all educator preparation programs, initial and advanced. The outcome of this EPP-based process is an Institutional Effectiveness Audit that 1) articulates the program's mission; 2) shows alignment of measures to departmental SLO foci; 3) identifies SLOs which represent candidate performance constructs embedded in CAEP Standards 1-3 and A.1-A.3; 4) identifies assessments, assessment methods; and benchmarks per SLO; 5) provides data from assessments; 6) presents decisions on benchmark status; and 7) describes action steps to be taken based on results reported. In the following year's report, progress on the action steps (#7) are reported.

This new data collection, review, decision-making, and reporting process provides an annual review that drives continuous improvement. At the end of each academic year, the EPP reviews data (both aggregated and disaggregated), identifies patterns across programs, identifies strengths and weaknesses, and uses data for continuous improvement and to identify data trends that will guide the changes made to courses, assessments, and program requirements. During this process, each program provides a relevant analysis of trends, comparison of trends with identified benchmarks, and alignment of the results to future directions and

plans. Beginning in 2020-2021, stakeholders were introduced to this process and will work with EPP faculty in making decisions based on the program-level analyses.

Given that 2019-2020 was a transition year between the former and new processes, data collection as evidence for some new outcomes was not yet underway. The reports prepared for the 2019-2020 year represent the new process, which provides a framework quite different from the former process. Given that reports reflect academic year cycles, one full year must elapse before the new process can be realized. The new process with evidence based on the new outcomes will be collected with fidelity during the 2020-2021 academic year and reported and acted upon fall 2021. The new processes have been integrated into the overall strategic plan, thereby supporting continued progress in data collection, management and use for continuous improvement.

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
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
- A.5.5 Continuous Improvement

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 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2021 EPP Annual Report.

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Tina Allen

Position: Assessment Coordinator

Phone: 318-257-3923

E-mail: tallen@latech.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 reviews.
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 review 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