

# 2018 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	10222	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	5125
<b>Institution:</b>	Xavier University of Louisiana		
<b>Unit:</b>	Division of Education and Counseling		

## 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 2016-2017 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

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.)<sup>2</sup>

Total number of program completers 8

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

<sup>2</sup> 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:** <https://regents.la.gov/divisions/planning-research-and-academic-affairs/academic-affairs/teacher-education-initiatives/teacher-preparation-data-dashboards-fact-book/>

**Description of data accessible via link:** You will find the 2014, 2015, and 2016 data dashboards and fact books at this link. The 2017 data dashboards will not be on the website until May 2018. If you are citing the above link for the CAEP Annual Report, just indicate the years when data are available on the website and that new data will be on the web site during May 2018.

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 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?

The Louisiana Department of Education states that Compass is Louisiana's educator support and evaluation system designed to provide all educators with regular, meaningful feedback on their performance (<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/teaching/compass>). Under this system, every teacher in public schools in Louisiana is evaluated annually using a four-tiered rating – Highly Effective, Effective: Proficient, Effective: Emerging, and Ineffective. Half of the evaluation is based on achievement of student learning targets to generate the Compass Student Growth score and half of the evaluation is based on observations by teachers' supervisors using the appropriate Compass rubric to generate a Compass Professional Practice score. The two scores are combined to generate Compass Final Evaluation Scores that range from 1.00 to 4.00.

The scores above are calculated from an n of at least 25. Xavier's EPP did not receive scores because of the size of our student population. In 2015 and 2016, Xavier received aggregated scores from the state for the alternative program only. In reviewing the data between the two years, the mean student outcome score is 2.8 and 2.9 respectively. In 2015, 5% of Xavier's program

completers scored ineffective, 23% scored effective emerging, 48% score effective proficient and 25% were highly effective. The following year, there was a shift: 3% scored ineffective, 20% scored effective emerging, 48% scored effective proficient and 30% scored highly effective. We were surprised that we had program completers who scored ineffective. Our plan is to drill down the data to determine which of our students scored ineffective to identify the whys and to plan with faculty and staff, what needs to be done to have 0% ineffective teachers. These measures will be shared with our Advisory Council, which will meet May 14, 2018. Additionally, a three - day retreat is being planned for the Curriculum and Instruction team to look at our data for analysis and sense making.

## 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) 1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

The EPP did not provide clear assessments aligned with the components of this standard.

This is in progress.

**CAEP:** Areas for Improvement (ITP) 2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The EPP does not have a formal process to ensure partner participation in the design, delivery, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice.

Xavier's EPP has formed partnerships with a number of local charter management organizations (CMO). Each CMO selected a representative who helped design the residency experience for the MAT candidates. The residency experience includes a yearlong "apprenticeship" relationship where the teacher candidate works with a "master" teacher selected by the principal. The master teacher or mentor coaches the resident, teaches the resident about the nuances of schooling, co-teaches with the resident and helps the resident connect theory to practice. For year 2, the model was tweaked and improved based on the feedback received from mentor teachers and residents alike. This model is being used to design the residency program for the undergraduate candidates, which will begin fall 2018.

**CAEP:** Areas for Improvement (ITP) 2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The EPP does not systematically and regularly evaluate school-based faculty.

At the end of each semester, student teachers are asked to evaluate their supervising teacher or school-based faculty. The students are given a twenty item survey to complete that assesses the effectiveness, teachability and coachability of their supervising teacher. Students are also asked to or not to recommend the supervising teacher for other student teachers. This happens at the undergraduate and resident level. MAT students who are not in the residency program do not complete a survey because they are already Teachers of Record.

**CAEP:** Areas for Improvement (ITP) 4 Program Impact

The EPP does not formally analyze data from multiple measures of candidates' impact on student learning.

The EPP uses the university-wide assessment software system called TracDat, a software platform that documents academic program assessments.

The EPP's assessment of its program outcomes is based on the following process:

- Develop a strong assessment plan;
- Report assessment results;
- Document assessment results;
- Describe actions taken;
- Follow-up on actions taken; and
- Revise the assessment plan through faculty input.

The university is exploring with Nuventive, the parent company of Trac Dat, the possibility of adding a module called Improve Analytics, which is designed to capture and analyze drill-down data. The EPP is also working with consultants from US Prep to design online forms that will formally analyze impact data from multiple measures. An agenda item for our retreat is to look at our data and learn how to analyze it to determine impact on student learning.

**CAEP:** Areas for Improvement (ITP) 4 Program Impact

The EPP does not systematically and regularly analyze data on employers' satisfaction with completers' effectiveness.

The employer survey is scheduled to be distributed late May 2018.

**CAEP:** Areas for Improvement (ITP) 4 Program Impact

The EPP does not formally assess candidates' perception of their readiness to fulfill job responsibilities.

We have not begun any work on this item yet. It is on our retreat agenda.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP does not have a formal system designed to use data for program improvement. Stakeholders are not involved in program evaluation and improvement.

Xavier data system that is used university - wide to collect and analyze data is called Trac Dat, The university is exploring with Nuventive, the parent company of Trac Dat, the possibility of adding Improve Analytics, which is designed to capture and analyze drill-down data. In the mean time, the EPP is working with consultants from US Prep to design an online forms that will analyze data for program improvement. The first form we are redesigning in the classroom observation form. Not only will this form be aligned with INTASC standards and the EPP's core values, but it will also include "Grows and Glows" and actionable next steps. In conjunction with this form, pre- and post-observation forms are also being developed. The faculty are collaborating with the consultants on the design of the forms. Faculty have identified potential teachers who will be brought in this summer to vet the redesign of our undergraduate curricula.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

Stakeholders are not involved in program evaluation and improvement.

Faculty was asked to submit at least one name for the unit's Advisory Council. Thirteen people were selected and asked to serve. Ten agreed. The ten comprise of two charter school principals, 1 Catholic School principal, 1 professor emeritus, 1 counselor, 1 math and science district director (Washington DC), an undergraduate and a graduate student and two community members. The first meeting of our Advisory Council was October 5, 2017 in which the Council members were given an overview of the unit and its activities. The next one is May 14, 2018. During this meeting, data will be shared and discussed. Additionally, Teacher education faculty work collaboratively with public, private, parochial, and charter school partners to co-construct mutually beneficial field placements. To initiate this process, Memoranda of Understanding help to establish contractual guidelines and define relationships with school partners. Contractual obligations require that placements for field experiences must be made through the Division of Education and Counseling's Coordinator of Field Experiences, in collaboration with respective principals, charter school directors, and supervising teachers. Contractual agreements between the division and its school partners are renewed every three years. A sample is included in the evidence files. Over twenty-five formal partnership agreements have been signed. This provides a variety of diverse locations for candidates to conduct their field and clinical experiences.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP assessment instruments do not meet the "sufficient level" as defined by the CAEP assessment rubric.

For this academic year, some faculty have begun to design their assessment instruments to meet CAEP's "sufficient level". During our retreat, all faculty will be making their assessments CAEP ready.

CAEP: Stipulation (ITP)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP's quality assurance system does not include formal processes to ensure that all candidates: (1) develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions appropriate for their specialty field; or (2) have field experiences and clinical practice of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration.

The EPP's Assessment Coordinator annually reviews each program's assessment plan with the Division Chair, program coordinators, and faculty to determine whether each program's Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) were met and what the next action steps should be. This is documented in TracDat with the information presented through a Four-Column Report. Aggregated and disaggregated data are systematically and regularly collected and analyzed to identify and monitor program improvements. The Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for each program are assessed and measured annually. Program adjustments or changes are made to positively impact the SLOs. In addition to Trac Dat, the Division uses a four-portal model to help assess dispositions. The initial portal for measuring candidate's disposition is upon admission in to the Teacher Education Program (TEP). Education majors have two to four semesters prior to their TEP interview. During that time they are taking introductory education and core curriculum courses. This period affords candidates the opportunity to interact with faculty members within the Division and to engage in classroom observations in our local schools. Both on campus and in the schools, our candidates have the occasion to witness early on and learn the importance disposition plays for effective classroom teachers. The instrument used to measure disposition for candidates entering our Teacher Education Program (TEP) is the TEP Interview Rubric. Faculty poses questions to candidates focusing on the following six constructs: Spirituality, Diversity, Professionalism, Inquiry, Competence, and Innovation. Candidate's ability to answer questions throughout the interview are scored at 1 - 2 Unmet, 3 - 5 Met, and 6 - 7 Target. In order to successfully enter in to the Teacher Education Program, candidates must achieve a score of Met or Target along all six constructs. As evident from the past six semesters, 100 % of our candidates have scored in the Met or Target category. Should a candidate score Unmet, a prescription is developed for the candidate and he/she may enter TEP provisionally. The second time disposition is assessed is during coursework activities along with classroom and school observations (field experience). In the Methods courses, EDUC 205 Child Psychology, EDUC 2040 Introduction to the Exceptional Child, EDUC 2044 Classroom Management, EDUC 2200 Multicultural Education, and EDUC 3040 Educational Psychology, our candidates have assignments and field experience activities that allow faculty to gauge the candidates' disposition while assessing other nonacademic

attributes. The third and final threshold for measuring disposition of our candidates is when they engage in their student teaching experience. They are assessed throughout the semester by the Director of Student Teaching, their cooperating teacher, and principal. The complete an exit interview which uses the same rubric as the entrance interview to be able to assess the growth of the candidate.

For our graduate candidates in the alternate certification program, the majority of them are already teaching in the classroom. In addition to being beginner teachers, this includes maintaining a 3.0 GPA, approval of all background checks required at this point in the program, and successful passing of the PRAXIS II. Disposition is officially measured during the semesters they engage in their Internship course (2 semesters). The Observation Rubric in the file Observation Form, is used to assess candidates in the following areas: 1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes, 2c: Managing Classroom Procedures, 3b: Using Questions and Discussion Techniques, 3c: Engaging Students in Learning, and 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction. They are scored using the following scale: Ineffective, Effective: Emerging, Effective: Proficient, and Highly Effective.

## 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?

We are in the process of assembling a data system that will ensure quality and provide data for program improvement and student impact. One of the biggest project we undertook in the past two years was the redesign of our elementary, middle school and secondary curricula. Each curricula was designed to provide course work that will assist our undergraduates to become practitioner scholars. Antiquated, theory laden courses were replaced with relevant courses that will give them the skills to conduct research, analyze data and to make sound instructional decisions based on the research and data. Currently, the EPP is collaborating with our secondary content partners to complete the secondary revisions to their programs.



The EPP is the leader of a USDOE Grant - SEED, which is funding a collaborative project to increase the number of diverse teachers in New Orleans. Over a three - year period, the EPP, Loyola University, Teach For America, The New Teacher Project and RELAY, have joined forces to provide New Orleans public schools with 800 teachers by the end of the grant. The EPP and partners meet once a quarter to discuss challenges and solution to improving student achievement, share ideas of how to make teachers culturally competent, and assess the impact of our partnership to meet the goal. The EPP, along with representatives from participating charter schools, co-constructed a residency program designed to provide theory - connected, on-site training. In addition, the mentor teachers, who were selected by their principals, receive approximately 40 hours of training as a coach, a

mentor, and a co-teacher. Year 1, ten participated in the residency and they are now transitioning to become a Teacher of Record. The EPP is preparing for year two with a target of preparing 30 teachers. So far, there are 128 applicants. We anticipate meeting our target. The applicants for this program are interviewed via telephone, then face - to - face. The applicants also conduct a mini lesson, not to see how the applicant teach, but to see how well the applicant can receive feedback. We find that this is essential for a co-teaching relationship. There is also a coach available to monitor the relationships between the mentor and the resident. Her main goal is to keep the relationships harmonious and functional to get the most out of the co-teaching arrangement. Data collection for this project has begun but there is not enough collected yet to analyze and report.

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 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
- 3.3 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
- 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.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
- A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
- A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
- A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
- x.1 Diversity

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  Elem\_Ed\_Prog\_2017.docx
-  MS\_Ed\_Prog\_2017.docx

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 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:

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 completion 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