

2020 EPP Annual Report

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

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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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).

http://catalog.xula.edu/preview_entity.php?catoid=21&ent_oid=610

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 36

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://regents.la.gov/%202018-teacher-preparation-data-dashboards/>

Description of data accessible via link: You will find the 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018 data dashboards and fact books at this link.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?

For over the past three years, data indicates that our program has been strengthened by improvements put in place to meet national and state measures. We learned that it is vitally important to connect theory and content to practice. The number of hours our undergraduate students spend in the field has an impact on student learning, as evident by data displayed by the Board of Regents data dashboards. The dashboard data, as well as anecdotal data from MATs in the field, alumni, supervising teachers and faculty, has revealed the opposite for the MAT candidates. Just teaching pedagogy is no longer enough. There is a need to include specific content, particularly mathematics and science, into the MAT curriculum. Our observation system improved to now include the POP system: pre-conferencing, observation and post-conferencing. Observing students and how they deliver the pedagogy inspired faculty to merge 3 observation forms into one digitized tool that is aligned with CAEP Standards, INTASC standards, the appropriate content standards, and the Louisiana State Teacher Competencies. This tool and the rubric are housed on a video capturing platform that will provide faculty data for real-time actionable feedback. This eliminated manual management of observation data and will greatly increase the faculty's ability to correct candidates' teaching practices with real-time data that will better guide them towards effectiveness. Unfortunately, the training and the pilot work were interrupted by the pandemic, but all will resume, in an on-line format, the beginning of the fall semester. Xavier uses a university-wide assessment system to track outcomes across campus. We realized that the system built for education was not capturing and tracking outcomes aligned to CAEP and state standards and Teacher Effectiveness Indicators. The system is now aligned with all three. We have also

strengthen collaborative partnerships and input from stakeholders to gauge the necessary changes to continuously improve the teacher preparation program at Xavier. We use our Portal system, with built in benchmarks, to compare the academic growth of our candidates, impact our candidates have on K-12 student learning, and the quality of their professional practice. The state of Louisiana provides public display of data on the above links, but not every measure is represented. The state's Department of Education is currently putting the finishing touches on a Performance Profile website that will house pertinent data for each of the state's preparation program. This data includes the score received from the state's accreditation review, program highlights, unique program offerings, and financial aid data. This will capture more of the measures, but not all. Xavier's IT department will work with education faculty to publicly display the data that is needed to cover each measure on the Xavier web platform.

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.

The EPP provides clear assessments aligned with the components of this standard: Content Courses, TEP, Candidacy, Content Redesign, Connecting Content to Practice, and Assessments across the EPP.

To ensure undergraduate program completers possess and can deliver sufficient content knowledge to K -12 learners and to prepare program completers for initial certification, Xavier University of Louisiana's (XULAs) teacher preparation program collaborates with eight departments across the university to evaluate all aspects of the program, including content. These departments offer an average of thirty hours of specific content courses designed for education students. The EPP offers an average of forty hours of specific education content to majors. The EPP ensures that students possess content knowledge by designing state-approved aligned programs that (a) offer a wide range of academic courses with rigor sufficient to, or exceeding, the state's requirements; (b) include field experiences with each education course; (c) have specific admission criterion into the teacher programs; (d) specified content hours at each level; and (e) test the candidate's ability through the state mandated PRAXIS exam.

In 2018, XULA completed a total redesign of all education programs in collaboration with content departments. The changes resulted in additional content and changes in content courses to ensure program completers possess sufficient knowledge to meet teacher competencies as described at the Louisiana Believes website. The redesign also included a mapping of Louisiana Teacher competencies to all education programs. Programs can be accessed at the following link to the University Catalog. http://catalog.xula.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=21&poid=4432&returnto=1033.

At the undergraduate level, the Teacher Education Program (TEP) is used to assess content and pedagogical knowledge. Admission to TEP indicates passage of Praxis I and Praxis II content. A rubric aligned with the components of CAEP standard 1 and the Division's core values is used to measure the candidate's pedagogical content knowledge. If a candidate does not demonstrate sufficient competence, the candidate is denied admission. In Spring 2018, 100% of those who applied were admitted to TEP.

Candidacy is at the graduate level and signifies that the student has been admitted to the degree program, completed 12 hours of coursework, and is ready to move forward to satisfy graduation requirements. The applications are reviewed and evaluated by Xavier University's Graduate Council. An application is denied if a student has a C in any course or less than a 3.0 GPA. Seventeen of the nineteen completers were admitted into candidacy spring 2018.

Anecdotal data collected from alumni, principals, and MATs in the field indicate that content knowledge is a challenge of the MAT program. This was confirmed by the data dashboard and a review of Praxis Content scores. According to the 2018 and 2019 LA Dept. of Education Teacher Education Dashboards, the average percentage of Xavier prepared teachers in grades 4 - 8 with less than two years of teaching science and who were highly effective or effective proficient, was 62%. Praxis II secondary science content scores (n = 9 in Biology and Chemistry) ranged from 152 – 196 and had a median score of 162. This is below the ETS median of 167. While this percentage is consistent with other Teacher Preparation Program graduates in the state, an analysis of the content scores prompted enhanced discussions among faculty about adding content courses to the MAT curriculum involving content-partners, as well as K-12 teachers and school leaders in the redesign process, beginning Fall 2020.

The charge to better connect content knowledge to practice has made effective improvements in our observation and feedback systems, including developing and implementing a full Pre-Observation-Post (POP) cycle containing a digitized quality evaluation form to be housed in an assessment system called TORSH that allows for video submission of candidates' teaching and ease of monitoring results. Multiple instructors observe candidates teaching in the field, which helps the instructors see whether coursework is transferred to effective instruction and provides candidates with real-time focused feedback that directly connects to their coursework teachings. For those who are unable to observe in the field, the TORSH system provides an excellent opportunity to view how candidates apply their learning in the classroom with possibilities to receive additional feedback from their instructors using annotated notes in the submitted video assignments.

Within class assessments across the EPP are given to all candidates who must complete one of the two classes listed below.

- EDCI 5282 – Survey of Assessment – graduate program (Fall 2018)

• EDUC 4030 – Evaluation and Measurement – undergraduate program (Spring 2019)

One of the assessments in both classes is to complete a case study with the purpose to accomplish the following:

- design and implement assessments
- plan, design and implement instruction
- analyze results and use the data to inform instruction.

Each assessment is completed in the clinical practice of the candidates' programs.

- For undergraduate students, this practicum assessment is completed when students are in the clinical field during EDUC 4030 Evaluation and Measurement. The field practicum is a five-week experience in which students are required to work with K-12 learners and their teachers in a school setting.
- For MAT, candidates are required to complete the assessment in their own classrooms while enrolled in EDCI 5282, Survey of Assessment.

In both cases, the purpose of the assessments is explained at the beginning of the semester when the syllabus and course expectations are presented. The assignments are then reintroduced as the course progresses and content is discussed and learned in class.

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.

The EPP has a formal process to ensure partner participation in the design, delivery and evaluation of field and clinical practice: Advisory Board, Collaborative Partnerships, Alumni and Student Supports.

The Division of Education & Counseling (DOEC) Advisory Board. A meeting was convened of our advisory board in December of 2018. The membership of the Advisory Board consists of a charter network administrator, a charter school principal, a Catholic school principal, a STEM administrator from Washington, DC public schools, a professor emeritus of education, a graduate student, an undergraduate student, and four community members. The goal of meeting was for board members to provide feedback on completed projects such as the newly revised undergraduate programs of study and the newly revised observation forms. Feedback was provided indicating that the redesign is a better alignment with what teachers need to know and be able to do in a high needs classroom. There was not enough time to do a full review of both items. Advisory board members recommended that the next meeting be used as dedicated time to critique the redesigned undergraduate programs of study in particular, and make recommendations for further improvements. We did not meet in 2019 because of membership shifts. We are in the process of reorganizing for a Fall 2020 meeting.

Collaborative Partnerships. In 2018, Xavier collaborated with:

- New School for New Orleans
- Loyola University of New Orleans
- teachNOLA of the The New Teacher Project
- RELAY Graduate School and,
- Teach for America

on a US DOE SEED grant, that awarded the collaborative almost \$13 million to increase the number of effective teachers of color in New Orleans. Xavier is the fiscal lead on the project. Each partner is engaged in diverse activities to meet this goal. This award allowed Xavier to expand its residency program. In 2017, the first cohort of 11 candidates were accepted to the residency program. In 2018, 16 participants were accepted to cohort two. In 2019, 21 were accepted. Survey data indicated that there is overall satisfaction with the program. Residents expressed a need for graduate courses to align theory with practice. This concern will be addressed with the redesign of the MAT programs of study. This collaboration is the result of Xavier partnering with local Charter Management Organizations to collaboratively design the teacher residency program and associated activities, such as the residency year, site mentor training, and Match Day.

Alumni Support. This summer, K - 12 teachers will be invited to provide feedback on the revised undergraduate curriculum, the field experience activities, and the observation system. The goal is to use the same teachers to co-redesign the MAT programs of study to include content.

Undergraduate Support. At the undergraduate level, faculty members contacted schools who previously welcomed our students in practicum experiences. We scheduled meetings with principals to share our desire to create partnerships (explaining expectations, desire to co-plan, evaluation of experiences, logistics) and were invited back to discuss with school administrators. At this meeting, we shared information about our programs, what we needed from them and they shared their needs, and collaboration goals. We then planned successive meetings. We took the information back to faculty to discuss how we could include these topics in our classes and incorporate application of activities in field practicums.

Contact with schools continued via email and visits. As each semester began, students were placed with teachers selected by principals. Principals selected mentors who had a proven record of effectiveness, demonstrated they could advance student learning, possessed mentor dispositions, and demonstrated they possessed skills in cultivating a positive learning environment for children to learn (these were discussed at previous meetings).

In designing field experiences for Xavier students in collaboration with school partners, the Curriculum and Instruction team members determined what was expected of the faculty including:

- a. Assignments that are centered on Application of Obtained Knowledge (linking content learned in classroom to application in

field during Observations)

b. Timeline for Observations

c. What is expected of students while in Observations

d. Protocol of establishing contact with Observation Teachers

e. What is expected of Observation Teachers as they work with XULA students

f. Contact with Observation Teacher during and after about concerns with any student(s)

g. Follow up with Administration Team at the completion of Observations to address successes/concerns.

While students were in field practicums, faculty members observed each student, providing feedback and assistance. Mentor teachers were asked to evaluate undergraduate performance. Meetings were held at the end of the semester with Principals to evaluate the effectiveness of the experience and preparations were made for the next semester.

School Partners 2018 - 2019:

Joseph A. Craig Elementary

Lawrence D. Crocker, Elementary

Walter L. Cohen High School

Morris Jeff Community School.

Graduate Support. MAT residents have a full-time mentor assigned to them while they teach during their yearlong residency, providing daily opportunities to receive feedback on teaching. MAT students in the STEM STARS program also have a cyber mentor who is the content expert and designated to provide planning and feedback support. Some residents have an assigned coach from the school who regularly visits to provide feedback, and all have a university supervisor who visits approximately once a month to observe and provide actionable feedback. The exit interviews with MAT candidates reveal that the frequency and the quality of these kinds of supports have helped them to become more confident as teachers by delivering more effective teaching practices.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice

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

The EPP systematically and regularly evaluates school-based faculty: Mentors, Mentorship Training, and Supervising Teachers.

The MAT candidate who is a Teacher of Record or a resident, is assigned a mentor by the principal, based on student achievement data, mentor coaching ability, and successful teaching. Mentor Teachers are the lifeline of our MAT pathways. They help to mold and shape our students and will have a significant impact on who they are as educators.

To work with our students, Mentor Teachers must be willing to have their practice questioned and to explain their thinking behind all curricular and logistical decisions as an educator, as well as be versed in their role and expectations. Mentor Teachers are expected to provide daily mentoring and coaching during classroom instruction, actionable feedback in debriefing sessions, and model co-teaching strategies and culturally relevant pedagogy.

In 2017, a training for Mentor Teachers was designed that was launched in 2018 with a cohort of seven teachers. The training provides coach and mentor resources, discussions on relationship building, and modeling behaviors of support. The mentors also learn how to transition the MAT candidate from small groups to whole class through a gradual release model designed to improve the teaching capacity of the assigned candidate.

Mentor Teachers are required to participate in a three-day training on best practices for mentoring Residents. The three-day training is centered on the concepts of co-teaching strategies, critical observation and actionable feedback. On Day 3 of training, the Mentor Teachers are introduced to their assigned resident and they both participate in structured bonding activities.

Mentors also meet quarterly throughout the year. These meetings are meant to build mentoring and coaching skills, identify and resolve challenges and network with other mentors. These meetings can be in-person or online and through modules or independent assignments.

Session topics included:

- Residency Requirements
- Current education events
- Case studies
- Relevant scenarios
- Effective mentoring practices
- Challenging conversations
- Actionable Feedback
- Observation
- Pedagogical Content Knowledge
- Building relationship
- Culturally relevant pedagogy
- Trauma-informed practices

Since this was the first year of the training, a formal evaluation was not administered; however, Mentor Teachers were given an opportunity to assess the training sessions. Seven mentor teachers (n=7) agreed that the training sessions:

- Provided a better understanding of the Mentor Teacher role.
- Made the Mentor Teachers feel that they would be a more effective mentor.

- Assisted in building on or developing new skills that will help the Mentor Teacher to succeed as a mentor.

Residents in an exit interview were asked: How would you describe your relationship with your resident mentor? Data from the interviews (n = 5) were as follows:

R1: Our relationship was combative. The mentor was not supportive.

R2: We did not see eye to eye. Her expectations were misaligned with the program.

R3: Great relationship. She presented opportunities for advancement in classroom practices. She always provided ongoing feedback.

R4: Absolutely fabulous. She welcomed me with open arms.

R5: We got along splendidly. I learned a lot from her.

Even though 60% of the participants reported a positive relationship with their mentor, this data was used to improve the training curriculum around relationship building. The mentors for R1 and R2 were not used again.

At the undergraduate level, student teachers formally evaluate the Supervising Teacher. The information is used by the Student Teacher Coordinator to determine which school the student teachers will be placed. In the Spring of 2018, there were four student teachers; three of them did student teaching in elementary grades and one taught English at a Math and Science High School. Each were administered a 20 item Likert-scale survey with two questions to capture qualitative data. The students were asked if they would recommend the Supervising Teacher for future student teachers; 100 % answered yes. The second item simply asked them to "tell us more." These are their comments:

Teacher Candidate #1: Excellent mentor, a great example, and welcomed me into her classroom.

Teacher Candidate # 2: Excellent example of what Xavier wants their teachers to look like. Takes pride in her profession, set bar HIGH for both her students and myself.

Teacher Candidate #3: Excellent role model. Learned a lot both inside and outside of the classroom.

Teacher Candidate #4: Modeled how things should be done and gave me insight on what to do and what not to do.

The Student Teacher Coordinator has taught at Xavier for 40 years and has an excellent network of Supervising Teachers based on candidate recommendations and principal evaluations.

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 formally analyzes data from multiple measures of candidates' impact on student learning: COMPASS, Senior Capstone Project, Classes, Observation and Feedback.

The Louisiana teacher evaluation system is called COMPASS. It measures quantitatively, the impact a teacher, with 2 years or less teaching experience, has on student growth, and qualitatively, the teacher's classroom practices. The two components are Teacher Effectiveness Levels for student growth, based on the K-12 students' standardized test scores and Professional Practice, based on the principal's assessment of the teachers' practice. The four scoring categories are Ineffective, Effective Emerging, Effective Proficient, and Highly Effective. Data released by the LA Board of Regents in 2018 provides the scoring percentages of Xavier completers during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years. In the 2014-2015 school year, 79% of MATs (n=49), scored in the top two categories for Student Impact, and 84% of the undergraduates. The 2015-2016 school year showed improvement: 83% of the MATS (n=55) and 100% of the undergraduates (n=12) scored Effective Proficient or Highly Effective. For Professional Practice, in 2014-2015, 79% of the MATs and 83% of the undergraduates and in 2015-2016, 83% of the MATs and 100% the undergraduates were top scorers. The performance gap between undergraduate and MAT candidates was a surprise, especially in student growth. Over 60% of the undergraduates scored highly effective, where a little over 30% of the MATs did. After much discussion, faculty and staff ascertained that the 180 hours of undergraduate field experiences before student teaching are significantly contributing to the candidates' impact on student learning.

Senior Capstone Project. Student Teachers in general have a difficult time grading papers, performing good, clean observations and assigning grades to students. To help candidates understand their impact on student learning, they complete a short research project in Student Teaching Seminar. The assignment is to talk to their supervising teacher about the project and asking permission to conduct the project with the class. The candidate is required to administer pre- and posttest (s) to measure whether or not the student learned from the lesson (s) that was/were prepared. Once the candidates select which content area they will administer each test, they must decide how they will assess student learning and what kind of methodology will be used. The next step is to write an abstract that summarizes the research problem. The body of the paper introduces the problem, presents the hypothesis, develops the background based on a mini-literature review, state the purpose, describe the methodology and summarizes the results. The discussion and concluding remarks follow. The candidates present their research at Xavier's Festival of Scholars, which is an undergraduate research fair. Unfortunately, the data for this measure has been lost while transitioning to an online platform due to COVID-19.

Classes: EDCI 5282 Survey of Assessment was offered Spring 2019

This is a sample class assignment that is used to show students how to apply assessment results to improve student learning. Candidates identify one classroom of students for the Teacher Made Assessment and one student who will be diagnosed and receive remediation. The candidate begins by writing a brief description of the student and why that student was chosen. Candidates obtain any standardized scores that may be available for the student and analyze and summarize the results. Next, they develop and administer a teacher made test in the subject area they chose for the case study. They prepare a report that

includes a blank copy of the test, a key and rubric for scoring the test, a table of specifications explaining content and category of each question, a database containing actual scores of students tested, and an output file of statistical (descriptive) analysis for the class. Once the results are examined candidates prepare a report indicating the student's percentile rank on the test, student's chronological age at the day of testing, the description of testing situation, an error analysis of difficulties on assessment, and recommendations for intervention for the student assessed. They also conduct an interview with the student, if possible. Finally, they develop a plan of intervention for the student assessed based on the recommendations. Eighty-two percent of the class (n=17) met or exceeded the Emerging Proficient Performance level. The mean score was 3.5 and the standard deviation was .77, indicating that the candidates are more than proficient in assessing students and using the results to impact student learning.

Observation and feedback are important tools to make candidates aware of their impact on student learning. Faculty worked with consultants from US Prep to collapse three different observation tools into one comprehensive form that is standardized, aligned to INTASC or content standards, the Compass domains, and has a focus on critical teaching practices. To measure candidate's impact on student learning, under the Instruction domain, three performance indicators were chosen. Candidates are given a score from 1–4, with 4 being the highest. The chart below summarizes candidates' (MAT n=14) performance levels for each indicator.

Performance Indicator n= 13 Mean Median Mode Stand Dev

Students are challenged to think and perform beyond simple recall to more complex levels of reasoning 2.7 3 3 .84

Students are engaged in learning challenging content 3.2 3.5 4 .88

Teacher monitors & uses a variety of assessment strategies to elicit evidence of student understanding 2.5 3 3 .65

There was no deviation from the mean, indicating that the students are successfully employing strategies that effectively impact 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 EPP systematically and regularly analyzes data on employers' satisfaction with completers' effectiveness: Employer Survey.

The EPP emailed an Employer Survey form to ten (10) principals on February 7, 2019 and received only one response. A follow-up email did not move the response rate beyond 10%. The Employer who responded was a principal whose school was housed in a correctional facility. Among the strengths listed for our graduates were their ability to "build rapport with students, and their deep understanding of the content." As an area for improvement, the principal suggested that the EPP provide a course, or a track that prepares teachers to work in juvenile and/or adult correctional facilities. Faculty have begun thinking about offering an MAT track to meet this need.

To improve the Principal response rate, the EPP has developed an online form for assessing the employers' satisfaction with program completers.

The use of an online form will help the EPP to become more efficient in collecting and analyzing results from employers. The EPP's previous form required handwritten responses, which the employers often returned slowly by fax. The online form is expected to help the EPP increase its response rate and provide immediate access to the survey's results. Program completers will be required to update their contact information prior to graduation. This information will be monitored in an active database. The established protocol for sending the online survey to respective employers will be one month after a program completer has been hired. Once the survey forms are returned to the EPP, a select team of faculty members from the Curriculum and Instructions department will examine the surveys to categorize the data, and to identify patterns in responses. This will guide the EPP in interpreting the results to assess the employers' satisfaction with program completers, and will also provide the EPP with insight into its program's strength and weaknesses. At the end of each academic year, the survey results will be displayed in charts and graphical form. This data will be shared with the entire Division of Education and Counseling Faculty for feedback and suggestions on programmatic changes or adjustments. The 2019-2020 will serve as the pilot year for the EPP's online employers' satisfaction survey. The survey to employers was emailed on May 18th, 2020. We will coordinate this effort with each Principal's administrative assistant to increase the response rate.

The online form is available in the link provided below.

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSd9y4rlxWglQBQsLd_1FOtZ7NBVV5QdC7JmBYk7A3AvxsXQ/viewform?usp=sf_link

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

4 Program Impact

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

The EPP formally assesses candidates' perception of their readiness to fulfill job responsibilities: University-wide Exit Interviews, National Center for Teacher Residencies Survey; McCREL International Survey.

An important data point for program improvement is "customer satisfaction". The EPP collects this information in the university-wide exit interview survey. An analysis of the data, from 2016-2019, found:

- In 2015–2016, among MAT graduates, the statement "The field experience/practicum were meaningful" received a high percentage of "Excellent" response (87.5%).

- In 2016-2017, among MAT graduates, three statements (“Faculty implemented curriculum that exemplified equity and diversity;” “Faculty evaluated and used data effectively to assess the needs of all students;” “The program included content that will be relevant in my career choice”) received the highest percentage of “Excellent” responses (87.5%).
- In 2016-2017, among MAT graduates, seventy-percent of the students rated the field/clinical practicum experiences as excellent.
- In 2016–2017, among MAT graduates, the statement “Faculty implemented curriculum that included methods and strategies for applying technology” received a 62.5 percentage of “Excellent” responses.
- In 2017–2018, among MAT graduates, the statement, “The program included content that will be relevant in my career choice” received the highest percentage of “Excellent” responses (100%).
- In 2017–2018, among MAT graduates, three statements, “Faculty implemented curriculum that exemplified equity and diversity;” “Faculty evaluated and used data effectively to assess the needs of all students;” and, “The field/clinical practicum experiences were meaningful” received 75% of “Excellent” responses.
- In 2018–2019, among MAT graduates (n = 15), evaluated these statements that received a high percent of excellent: Faculty implemented curriculum that exemplified equity and diversity – 60%; Faculty implemented curriculum that included methods and strategies for applying technology – 60%; Faculty evaluated and used data effectively to assess the needs of all students – 53%; The field/clinical practicum experiences were meaningful received 60% of “Excellent” responses. Student comments on this instrument included: The program provided tools for me to become a great teacher; the program provided me a network; the courses enabled me to feel confident in my field.

In 2018 and 2019, the National Center for Teacher Residencies surveyed Xavier residents who were asked to respond to My program is preparing me to be an effective teacher. Midyear of 2018 (n=15), the score was 3.7, but by the end of the year, it dropped to 2.6. This was the first year of residency and a number of issues emerged. Students had an issue with the \$15,000 stipend, which they said was too low. They were struggling to make ends meet which was diverting their focus from the residency program. We increased the stipend to \$25,000. Also during the first year, the students had support, but it was not meeting their needs as preservice teachers. The next year, two site mentors were hired to provide more intensive support, not only during residency year, but also during their first year as the Teacher of Record. Additionally, Year 1 residents indicated that some of the Institute topics did not meet their needs. Suggestions were made for more aligned topics and they were presented in Year 2. These improvement efforts are reflected in the 2019 scores. In 2019 (n = 12), this same item received a 3.7 midyear, and a 3.6 by the end of the year.

The evaluator of the SEED grant, McREL International (2019), surveyed 13 NCFTR residents from Cohort 2 during the 2018-2019 academic year. The following items and responses are related to this standard:

- My program has been useful in preparing me to become a teacher – 92% agree
- My program’s approach is relevant to me in my role as a teacher – 92% agree
- My program has prepared me to positively influence student academic results – 85% agree.

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.

The EPP has a formal system designed to use data for program improvement: Improve; Portal System.

The University’s assessment system, Improve, is the central repository for all assessment reporting across campus. Programs in each Division self-select the learning outcomes to be evaluated through various assessments that monitor candidate and program performance. The university’s assessment coordinator worked with the C & I Team to rebuild the DOEC’s assessment plans to better capture data, from multiple sources, for quality assurance and program improvements.

Improve runs on 3-year reporting cycle, which ends for this reporting period Fall 2020. This includes an examination of the results from the previous three years to judge progress. Assessment coordinators are asked to complete the assessment report for the previous academic year in the fall semester. At the end of the spring semester, the EPP’s Assessment Coordinator reviews the status of the outcomes with the Division Chair, program coordinators, faculty, and staff to determine if the learning outcomes were met and what the next action steps should be.

In 2018, the university’s assessment coordinator and the C & I Team agreed, in addition to the Four-Column Report, to also use the Teacher Preparation Program 2020 Key Effectiveness Indicators as a component of our assessment system and for quality assurance. The objectives of this system are to 1). capture all measures necessary for the accreditation renewal process; 2). assess candidate performance with real time data; and, 3). better collect, analyze, and disaggregate data for continuous program improvements.

In addition to the university-wide assessment system, the Division developed a timeline of 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. Candidates cannot move to the next portal, until all requirements are met and documented.

Portal I – Admission to the university. For the undergraduate program, recruitment and selection is controlled by the university. The university uses HS GPA, standardized test scores such as the ACT or SAT, HS academic success via transcripts, and placement exams to determine whether or not a student needs “remedial” courses in math, reading and/or writing before the

student can “declare” education as a major.

The graduate admissions process uses multiple measures to select candidates who show the potential to be effective teachers which includes college GPA, standardized test data (GRE or Miller's Analogy Test), two academic recommendations, a satisfactory rating on the interview scoring rubric, and a satisfactory rating on teaching a lesson, receiving feedback and using feedback to improve the lesson.

Portal II – Admission to the Teacher Education Program (Undergraduate) or Candidacy (Graduate). The Teacher Education Program or TEP prepares candidates to teach in diverse settings; integrates fieldwork and methodology coursework to understand the dynamic relationship between teaching and learning and the intersectionality of race, gender, and economic status. Each applicant is interviewed by multiple faculty members and must achieve a satisfactory rating. The interview protocol and scoring rubric are aligned with the Division's core values. To be eligible for TEP membership, students must pass Praxis I and achieve at least a 3.0 cumulative GPA in all coursework. Each of the 2018-2019 TEP members were exempt from taking Praxis I because they met the criteria to waive the exam.

Candidacy. After successfully matriculating in the program for 12 hours and achieving a “B” or better in coursework, graduate students are eligible to apply for candidacy. The overall average GPA of those who applied for candidacy 2018-2019 was 3.8. Candidacy applications are reviewed by a subcommittee of the University's Graduate Council who approves candidacy status.

Portal III – Pre-Professionals and Novice Teachers. In this portal, undergraduates move from field experience to clinical practicums, which includes undergraduate student teaching (in 2022, residencies will replace student teaching) and graduate internships. Undergraduate students are required to pass Praxis II content and have a cumulative GPA of 3.0 before applying for student teaching. Graduate students must maintain a cumulative GPA of 3.0 and above to begin the internship series.

MATs are second year Teachers of Record, in Portal III. The internships are purposely designed to provide faculty with scheduled time to observe the teaching practices and behaviors of novice teachers and provide to them actionable feedback. An observation system that includes a video capturing service, will be implemented by fall 2020. The goal of using this innovation is to more accurately monitor the quality of the candidate's teaching performance.

Portal IV- Graduation. Before undergraduate and graduate education majors can apply for graduation, they must pass the third part of the Praxis exam series – Principles of Teaching and Learning. Undergraduates are also required to complete a number of surveys. The data from these surveys are used to gauge the quality of the program, the student teaching experience and the Supervising Teacher. Additionally, the university requires all graduates to take an exit survey that determines the candidate's satisfaction with the EPP.

Portal V – COMPASS Teacher Evaluation. Student Impact scores and overall demonstrated teaching scores are also used to measure the quality of the program. Based on the COMPASS Teacher Evaluation Rubric, the State of Louisiana's Board of Regents provides university-level data that reports how well teachers with two years or less of teaching experience meet student learning outcomes and demonstrates effective teaching practices.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

Stakeholders are not involved in program evaluation and improvement.

Stakeholders are involved in program evaluation and improvement: Advisory Board, Education Students, State of Louisiana.

Advisory Board. A meeting was convened of our advisory board in December of 2018. The membership of the Advisory Board consists of a charter network administrator, a charter school principal, a Catholic school principal, a STEM administrator from Washington, DC public schools, a professor emeritus of education, a graduate student, an undergraduate student, and four community members. The goal of the meeting was for board members to provide feedback on completed projects such as the newly revised undergraduate programs of study and the newly revised observation forms. Feedback was provided indicating that the redesign is a better alignment with what teachers need to know and be able to do in a high needs classroom. There was not enough time to do a full review of both items. Advisory board members recommended that the next meeting be used as dedicated time to critique the redesigned undergraduate programs of study in particular, and make recommendations for further improvements.

Education Students. For approximately two years (2017–2019), education faculty:

- worked very closely with university content partners to redesign the curriculum of the undergraduate program to reduce the credit hours from 139 to 120;
- deleted outdated courses;
- added courses that better met the needs of K-12 learners and were aligned with the state's Teacher Competencies;
- deleted the student teaching model (one semester) and added the residency model (one year);
- aligned program syllabi.

The redesign was accepted and approved by the state's Board of Regents and the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. Student teachers of Spring 2018 did not experience the newly revised programs of study, but their answers to this exit interview question are examples of what we used to gauge the changes to the curriculum.

How could the Division of Education's faculty better prepare you for the student teaching experience? Are there areas of the

program that are not relevant? Which ones? Explain.

TC1: Have more method courses for science and math. Content is taught but how to teach the subjects are not. More "Hands on" for special needs/accommodations. Offer a course that offers multiple learning styles for 504/IEP students.

TC2: Make sure student teachers are placed in a class where all subjects are taught. The way the field experiences are handled. Need to learn more subject matter and have "hands on" experiences. Offer more volunteer activities after class and on weekends.

TC3: More preparation for PRAXIS Exams and more serious about taking the test on time. More detailed lesson plans. We never had to do assessment until student teaching. More classroom management.

As a result, the syllabi are more comprehensive and better aligned with applicable standards and the state's Teacher Competencies. Additionally, the work of mapping course content has begun.

State of Louisiana. The State of Louisiana conducts a review of all preparation programs operating in the state. We are assessed on the quality of selection for teacher candidates; quality of content knowledge and teaching methods; quality of clinical placement, feedback, and candidate performance; and, quality of program performance management. We were assessed March 2018 and received a 2 out of 4 and March 2019 and received a 3 out of 4. Here is a summary of the 2019 findings:

The key strengths of the program are:

- Xavier program leaders and faculty acted upon TPI-US 2018 On-Site Review findings and recommendations with a sense of urgency to quickly and systematically launch ongoing improvements, with evidence of progress noted in the findings, including an articulated plan for continual improvement.
- The Division of Education and Counseling (DOEC) faculty, and leadership made effective improvements in observation and feedback systems, including developing and implementing a full Pre-Observation-Post (POP) cycle containing a digitized quality evaluation form to be housed in an assessment system that allows for video submission of candidates teaching and ease of monitoring results.
- The program holds high expectations for selecting candidates with proven success in GPA and with standardized test results pulled from the top third of the college-going population; the program uses performance assessments with multiple measures designed to identify XULA's six core values while also enrolling candidates who make a significant contribution to a diverse teacher workforce.

Key areas of improvement include:

- Replicating the high-quality observation and feedback practices that recently hired supervisors delivered. Ensure all supervisors and mentors engage in high-quality initial and ongoing observation and feedback training that includes the effective use of the Today's One Room School House (TORSH) data system, the recognition of what constitutes good and better teaching and learning, and a commitment to high expectations and how best to meet standards of inter-rater reliability.
- Rigorously monitoring observation and feedback data, coursework content and delivery, assignments, and the impact of training on observation and feedback practices and then using the outcomes of these activities to drive improvement and decision-making. Where weaknesses remain, the program should tackle these with urgency as well as identifying strengths to replicate in other areas.
- Ensuring all faculty agree on shared definitions and understanding of key teaching skills, such as differentiation, formative assessment, and academic feedback and questioning. All faculty should explicitly model and label these key teaching skills so that candidates can consistently see what the skills look like in practice and in doing so better enhance and further all students' learning and academic outcomes.

The next state review is scheduled for March 2021.

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.

The EPP assessment instruments meet the "sufficient level" as defined by the CAEP assessment rubric: Assessments, Course Syllabi, Observation Tools, and TORSH Talent.

To improve assessments and bring rubrics to CAEP "sufficient level" standards, the C & I team first had to redesign course syllabi to be more comprehensive and to include alignment of content and INTASC, standards, TPI-US (state accreditation) domains or judgement areas, CAEP standards, course objectives and student learning outcomes (SLO), and, course assessments with rubrics to measure SLOs. Professors developed diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments, using the CAEP Evaluation Framework as a guide. Professors piloted the syllabi, assessments and rubrics in the spring 2019 semester. Data from each programs' assessments (reading, special education, elementary and middle school, and secondary) were collected, analyzed and disaggregated by program faculty after the end of the spring 2019 semester. It was during this time that the state accreditation visit was being completed by TPI/US PREP.

The EPP collaborated with US Prep consultants to strengthen the program by aligning the observation tool with state and CAEP standards. The work began during the spring 2019 semester with biweekly virtual visits with US Prep consultants and program faculty. The observation tool was digitized and aligned with CAEP and state standards. During the summer of 2019, faculty attended an in-person meeting with other universities in Louisiana and continued to align and refine our program. It was at that meeting that we tested the reliability and validity of the observation tool. We used the CAEP, Louisiana State Department of Education's Standards and the Charlotte Danielson's framework to guide our work. Other universities were doing similar work for their programs.

Xavier's work continued during a three-day retreat held at the university. During the summer retreat, each professor developed a

plan for how SLOs are used to improve candidate and program performance. Additionally, a plan was developed that describes the type of reliability that will be established and the steps taken to ensure validity. As a part of the summer data review work, the next phase of this work included 1).evaluation of the pilot; 2).tweaking the syllabi (if necessary); 3).assessing content reliability and validation of each program's assessments and rubrics; and, 4).collecting and analyzing data.

To improve the data collected from our students during the field experiences, the TORSH Talent platform was adopted. TORSH is a video capturing platform that provides school leaders, teachers, faculty and students access to data needed to set, track and reach professional learning goals. Adopting TORSH allows us to OBSERVE teachers in action, MEASURE the effectiveness of classroom instruction, COACH teachers at scale, REFLECT on instructional practice and COLLABORATE with our students and their mentors in real-time. TORSH allows us to monitor observation and feedback data to ensure that data is entered promptly and then analyzed at aggregated and disaggregated levels to make sure that inter-rater agreement and standards of reliability exist. Once data accuracy and reliability exist, the data is used to support continuous and ongoing improvement efforts. The TORSH system provides a critical and valuable lens for improvement planning and quality monitoring of clinical coursework. Candidates can be viewed teaching students, which can be used to determine whether courses need additional improvements in content, teaching methods, or more assignments that connect to practice. TORSH was scheduled to be piloted during the 2019-2020 school year. The faculty was trained in fall of 2019. The students were to be trained in the use of TORSH when the pandemic occurred. Training will resume in the beginning of the fall semester, in an online format.

Please see the links for the observation tools that were revised:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1dCTpGr08zewNVgv6sGgcWPfbBliMAcPE2Ce9rtfVVNA/edit?usp=drive_web

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/117fUMo7ui_9ili2nrUCeQ6Q-ZKHnKgdH91SdWotZ8Cc/edit

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?

1. Collapsing three observation tools into one digitized form, that has been tested for validity and reliability, has been a great accomplishment for the education faculty. In addition to the observation tool, walkthroughs were also developed. Both tools and rubrics were loaded onto a video capturing platform. Training for faculty was accomplished before the pandemic. Training for students and full implementation of the system will begin fall semester 2020. The forms are only available via Google Drive. They

are too large to upload.

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1dCTpGr08zewnVgv6sGgcWPfbBliIMAcPE2Ce9rtfVVNA/edit?usp=drive_web
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/117fUMo7ui_9ili2nrUCeQ6Q-ZKHnKgDh91SdWOTz8Cc/edit






2. The Louisiana Board of Regents Data for 2014-2016 revealed that Xavier completers, with 2 years or less teaching experience, are having a positive impact on K-12 student learning and principals assess their practice to be of high quality. The attached file indicates the percentages of Xavier completers who scored Ineffective, Effective Emerging, Proficient Effective and Highly Effective for Student Impact and Professional Practice.

3. A previous AFI cited that the EPP assessment instruments do not meet the "sufficient level" as defined by the CAEP assessment rubric. Attached are four sample syllabi that show the changes made to make the embedded assessments and rubrics CAEP sufficient. Faculty continuously tweak syllabi to ensure reliability and validity of each assessment.

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
- 3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
- x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  [Louisiana_Board_of_Regents_Dashboard_Data_for_Xavier_University_of_Louisiana.docx](#)
-  [Dr._Caldwell__SyllabusSpring2019__EDU_2040_Final_\(4\).doc](#)
-  [EDCI_5130Fall_2018Syllabus_Page.docx](#)
-  [Educatioal_Psychology_Syllabus_2019_Sister.docx](#)
-  [Spring_2019_Syllabus_EDUC_2022_Multicultural_education_Rachel_\(1\).docx](#)

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

The CAEP coordinator is working with Xavier's IT department to develop a web page that will publicly display data that addresses each CAEP measure. The goal is to have the web page available for public viewing by the next annual report.

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 EPP Annual Report.

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Renee Akbar

Position: Faculty & CAEP Coordinator

Phone: 5047822090

E-mail: rvakbar@xula.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