

2021 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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 2019-2020 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)²

Total number of program completers 26

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2019-2020 academic year?

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: <https://www.xula.edu/caep>

Description of data accessible via link: The data on this page is relevant to each Annual Reporting Measure, both Impact and Outcome.

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2

Link: <https://louisianateacherprep.com/>

Description of data accessible via link: The performance profiles provide information relative to the quality of the preparation offered by each provider, the extent to which the provider is meeting Louisiana's educator workforce needs, and the impact of program completers on K-12 student outcomes.

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 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"/>

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?

Due to discrepancies found in data used to calculate Growth in Student Learning Scores and Compass Teacher Evaluation Scores for new teachers completing individual teacher preparation programs in the state of Louisiana, it was not possible to release 2019 Teacher Preparation Data Dashboards or create a 2019 Teacher Preparation Fact Book. In the past the dashboards helped us to gauge the effectiveness of our completers in the field. The Performance Profile is new and does not yet have the capacity to measure teacher effectiveness, especially if the program is not producing 10 completers per year (the case for our undergraduate program).

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: Praxis Content scores; Connecting content to practice; Student Research Projects, assessments across the EPP.

Because of COVID, we relied heavily on Praxis Exam scores to assess candidates' content and pedagogical knowledge. In 2017 and 2018, the CAEP annual reports required a review of the EPP's syllabi, which were redesigned to intentionally align with CAEP, INTASC and content standards. The coursework is more supportive of candidates' learning and making authentic connections to practice. Faculty meet monthly to discuss effective teaching practices that are modeled in class. For the graduate candidates who are Teachers of Record and student teachers, the transference of these skills and knowledge are reflected in candidates' instruction and is evident in the Principle of Learning and Teaching (PLT) scores of the EPP's candidates. The PLT is a Praxis exam that measures the basic principles of learning and teaching that are necessary for successful classroom teaching. The average elementary score (n = 8) for PLT was 174 (passing score = 160); for middle school (n = 6) was 175 (passing score = 160) and for high school candidates (n = 7) it was 182.5 (passing score = 157).

Discussions among faculty to include graduate level content courses within the MAT program continues. Praxis data indicated a need to include content courses, particularly in high school science. In 2018, 9 candidates scored on average 162 which did not meet the median score of 167 on the high school science content exams. This year's data (2019) shows slight improvement without the inclusion of content courses. The average science exam score for all candidates (n = 9) was 168. When the data was disaggregated by level, the average score for each was: elementary (n=5) = 173; middle school (n=3) = 157; secondary (n=1) = 183. Each scored, respectively, 16, 5, and 33 points above the passing score. The scores for the mathematics exam were also strong. The elementary graduate candidates (n = 4) had an average score of 192.5 (passing score = 157), the middle school graduate candidate (n=1) had an average score of 199 (passing score = 165), and the high school graduate candidates (n=2) had an average score of 164.5 (passing score = 160). We observed dips in the undergraduate scores as well, particularly in the STEM areas. Informal meetings were held with content professors to discuss the results and expectations of the Praxis exam. In 2019, undergraduates' (n=2) Praxis content scores for science were similar to the graduate students. Overall, they scored, on average, 165, which is 6 points higher than the passing score. The content exam scores for mathematics also showed improvements. The 2 elementary undergraduates had an average math score of 187 (passing score = 157) and the secondary undergraduate scored 165 (passing score = 160). Similar trends are also reflected in the English/Reading/Language Arts and Social Studies/History scores for both graduate and undergraduate candidates. Despite the increases, discussions to add content specific courses to the MAT program will continue as planned and formal meetings are planned to be held quarterly with content professors.

Student teachers, as a culminating activity, are required to complete a research project that assesses their impact on student learning. Unfortunately, because of COVID, this project was not completed.

The focus area of assessments across the EPP and the content connected to practice was differentiation. Each syllabi includes a "differentiation strand", with theory explanation and field activities that connected the theory to the practice. The strand was taught in each of the EPP's classes. However, because of COVID, the activity associated with differentiation was not completed. Please see the attached syllabi.

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 formal processes to ensure partner participation in the design, delivery and evaluation of field and clinical practice. They include an Advisory Board, Collaborative Partnerships, Alumni and Student Supports.

The Division of Education & Counseling (DOEC) has an Advisory Board. Membership includes the following stakeholders: a charter network administrator, a charter school principal, a Catholic School principal, a STEM Education faculty member from Johns Hopkins University, the Director of Recruitment and Selection for a local school district, a professor emeritus of education, a graduate student, an undergraduate student, and four community members. The serves the following roles 1.) Helps to ensure that the EPP has a curriculum which is current and provides our candidates with the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to meet the needs of diverse k-12 learners; 2.) Offers suggestions to EPP of needed resources; and 3.) Ensures that the EPP

continues to meet current workforce needs through programs offered.

The COVID-19 pandemic forced us to shift to virtual learning in the spring of 2020. The LA Department of Education waived all practicum experiences. The EPP did not convene an advisory board meeting in the spring of 2020 as planned but contacted advisory board members throughout the semester to provide candidates with virtual field practicums. The next meeting is planned May 11-12, 2021.

The EPP engages in collaborative partnerships with the stake holders to ensure workforce needs are met in the state of Louisiana. Xavier University's EPP collaborated with New School for New Orleans, teach NOLA of the New Teacher Project, RELAY Graduate School, and Teach for America on a US DOE SEED grant that was awarded \$13 million dollars to increase the number of effective teachers of color in New Orleans. Xavier University is the fiscal lead on the project. Each partner is engaged in diverse activities to meet this goal. This award allowed Xavier to create 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. This collaboration is the result of Xavier partnering with local Charter Management Organizations to collaboratively design the teacher residency program and associated activities.

In 2016, Louisiana adopted policies and laws designed to address their teacher shortage. The legislative body passed new laws which require initial licensure teacher candidates to complete a full year classroom residency alongside a state credentialed and experienced mentor. Xavier has been approved by the state of Louisiana to provide a mentor credentialing program in collaboration with Loyola University. We will begin our teach mentor training with Loyola University in the summer of 2021.

Alumni Support.-In 2021, K-12 Teacher Education alumni will be invited to respond to a survey in which they provide feedback on their experiences as candidates in our program. We hope to receive feedback on the usefulness of the field experiences, undergraduate curriculum, observations and changes that we can make to improve programs.

Undergraduate Support - At the undergraduate level, faculty members contacted schools who previously welcomed our students in practicum experiences. We scheduled meetings with principals to create partnerships (explaining expectations, desire to co-plan, evaluation of experiences, logistics). At this meeting, we shared information about our programs, what we needed from them and they shared their needs. 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.

In designing field experiences for Xavier students in collaboration with school partners, faculty members determined what was expected of the experience including the following:

- Assignments that center on the Application of Knowledge (linking content learned in classroom to application in field during Observations)
- Expectations of candidates while engaged in Observations
- Protocol of establishing contact with Observation Teachers
- Expectation of Mentor Teachers as they work with XULA students
- Details for contacting EPP during and after practicum relating concerns with candidate(s)
- Follow up with Administration Team at the completion of Observations to address successes/concerns.

The fall semester ran as expected. During the spring 2020 semester, we worked with one Catholic School and a local school system to place all undergraduate students in virtual field practicums. As the semesters 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. School Partners for the 2019 – 2020 school year were: Morris Jeff Community School, St. Mary's Academy and Jefferson Parish Public Schools.

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 have a cyber mentor, the content expert, 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 once a month to observe and provide actionable feedback. The exit interviews with MAT candidates reveal that the frequency and quality of these kinds of supports have helped them to become more confident as teachers by delivering more effective 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.

In 2016, Louisiana's State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education adopted policies and laws designed to address the teacher shortage in the state. The state legislative body passed new laws which require initial licensure teacher candidates to complete a full year classroom residency alongside a state credentialed and experienced mentor. The requirements for mentor credentialing are as follows. As of September 2020, every teacher who serves as the Mentor of an undergraduate or post-baccalaureate candidate must hold one of the three below:

a. Mentor Ancillary Certificate-Mentor Teacher ancillary certificates are issued to individuals who have successfully completed a state-approved Mentor Teacher training program, including state-led training, and have a passing score on the Louisiana Mentor

Teacher Assessment Series.

b. Provisional Mentor Ancillary Certificate - A one year provisional certificate may be issued to any individual who has completed training or is currently enrolled in Mentor training. The provisional certificate is valid for one year and is non-renewable.

c. Supervisor of Student Teaching credential - Teachers who hold the Supervision of Student Teaching credential may serve as a mentor until August 31, 2023

The MAT candidate who is a Teacher of Record or a resident, is assigned a credentialed mentor by the principal, based on student achievement data, mentor coaching ability, mentor credentials 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, model co-teaching strategies and culturally relevant pedagogy.

In 2018 we launched summer mentor teacher training and continues. The training provides coaching and mentoring resources, discussions on relationship building, and modeling behaviors of support. The teacher mentors also learn how to transition MAT candidates from small group instruction to whole class instruction 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

Mentor Teachers were given an opportunity to assess the training sessions at the end of each session.

At the undergraduate level, student teachers formally evaluate the Supervising Teacher. The information is used by the Student Teacher Coordinator to determine which schools student teachers will be placed. In the spring of 2020, there were three student teachers; two completed student teaching in elementary grades and one completed student teaching in Secondary Mathematics. Each completed a 20 item Likert-scale survey evaluating their supervising teacher 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.

At Xavier, the undergraduate teacher residency experience begins with students admitted to our program in the fall of 2018. Xavier has been approved by the state of Louisiana to provide a mentor credentialing program in collaboration with Loyola University. We will begin our teach mentor training with Loyola University in the summer of 2021.

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, Student Teacher Capstone Project, Classes, Observation and Feedback.

The Louisiana teacher evaluation system is called COMPASS and 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 based on school personnel observations. Unfortunately, "due to discrepancies found in data used to calculate Growth in Student Learning Scores and Compass Teacher Evaluation Scores for new teachers completing individual teacher preparation programs, it was not possible to release 2019 Teacher Preparation Data Dashboards".

To help student teachers understand the teacher's impact on student learning, they engage in a short research project in the Student Teacher Seminar course. The assignment is to talk to their supervising teacher about the research project and to ask

permission to conduct the project with the class. The candidate is required to administer pre- and post-test (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 a university-wide undergraduate research fair. Unfortunately, due to COVID-19, the project was not completed and Festival of Scholars was cancelled.

EDCI 5282 Survey of Assessment was offered Spring 2020 and is a graduate level course. During the spring 2020 semester, twenty students enrolled in EDCI 5282, Survey of Assessment. 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 teacher candidate begins by writing a brief description of the student rationale for student selection. Description should include behaviors exhibited by student, age, learning context and a brief description of student as an academic student.

Candidates obtain any standardized scores that may be available for the student and analyze and summarize the results.

Next, student develops and administers 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 might also conduct an interview with the student, if possible. Finally, they develop a plan of intervention for the student assessed based on the recommendations.

Ninety-five percent of the class (n=19) met or exceeded the Emerging Proficient Performance level.

Standard Deviation, σ : 12.162756906045

Count, N: 18

Sum, Σx : 1707.78

Mean, μ : 94.876666666667

Variance, σ^2 : 147.93265555556

The mean score was 94 and the Standard deviation was 12.16, indicating that the candidates are more than proficient in assessing students and using the results to impact student learning. There was one outlier. Student failed the course because he stopped coming midpoint (the stress of the pandemic was too much) and did not drop the class. His grade of 45.61 is included in the calculation.

Please see attachments for "Impacting student learning with math strategies", which is another course that has activities which measure candidates' impact on student learning.

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/12uz9z6MhE5cVMc4ZS5_DTsm9nlAZuHty?usp=sharing. This link leads to observation write-ups of candidates who are residents in NOLA public schools. The write ups capture what the University Supervisors observed around the candidates' content and pedagogical knowledge. They also provide actionable feedback. Moving forward, University Supervisors will engage in activities to better help calibrate scoring, analyze the data and use it to consistently improve the observation and feedback process.

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 in 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 developed an online form for assessing the employers' satisfaction with program completers.

In 2020, the EPP shared a Google link to the Employer Survey to ten (10) principals and received a 90% response rate (n=9); however, not all principals answered all questions. The number responded per question is in parenthesis and the responses are summarized below:

While reflecting on your experiences working with Xavier University of Louisiana graduates, please respond to the following statements that best describes your response. (strongly agree; agree; disagree; strongly disagree).

Xavier University graduates:

- Display mastery of their subject areas. (6)
 - o 30% strongly agreed 70% agreed

- Use the best pedagogical approaches to meet the needs of diverse learners. (5)
 - o 40% agree 60 % disagree

- Effectively design and implement lesson plans and units to meet the needs of diverse learners. (8)
 - o 88% strongly agree 12% agree

- Effectively design and implement lesson plans and units based on the district's current performance standards. (5)
 - o 100% agree

- Effectively use a variety of assessment tools to evaluate the growth of diverse learners. (5)
 - o 100% agree

- Provide diverse learners with real world applications of the concepts and ideas they present in class. (5)
 - o 100% agree

- Integrate technology into the grade level and subject they are teaching. (8)
 - o 88% strongly agree 12% disagree

- Believe all students can learn. (9)
 - o 100% strongly agree

- Advocate on behalf of all students. (9)
 - o 100% strongly agree

- Work well with parents and the community. (9)
 - o 100% strongly agree

- Work well with colleagues. (9)
 - o 100% strongly agree

- Manage the classroom environment. (5)
 - o 100% agree

- What strengths do Xavier University graduates possess? (5)
 - o Knowledge and passion 20%

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.

At the end of the academic year, the university administers an institutional created exit survey to all university-wide completers. Below are the survey results for the 2020 MAT completers. Completers are satisfied with the program; however, recommendations were shared to help strengthen the program.

Master of Arts in Teaching (Total = 15)

Poor Fair Satisf Good Excellent

Faculty implemented curriculum that exemplified equity and diversity 0% 0% 7% 13% 80%

Faculty implemented curriculum that included methods and strategies for applying technology 7% 0% 7% 13% 73%

Faculty evaluated and used data effectively to assess the needs of all students 0% 0% 7% 27% 67%

Faculty was available for advising 0% 0% 13% 20% 67%

The program included texts and other resources that were useful 0% 0% 20% 20% 60%

The field/practicum experiences were meaningful 0% 7% 7% 20% 67%

MAT: Perceived Strengths of the Program

Amazing professors are Xavier's greatest strength.

Caring and understanding faculty

Comprehensive program with revealing classes on the state of education from perspectives of race, gender, SES, etc.

Diversity of staff

Everything was super relevant

Faculty

Preparation and professionalism

Professors are very knowledgeable and available when you need. Also, they have given me great tools to use in my classroom.

Professors and NCFTR staff

Professors were always available when I needed help.

Professors were knowledgeable and very helpful.

Rigor

The faculty were all very hands on with the learning and made sure that we knew the material as well as were prepared for the road ahead of us.

The program provided a great support system.

The professors are great.

MAT: Perceived Weaknesses of the Program

Financial aid complications, lack of information and updates during the internship, inability to get into last class needed for the reading specialist endorsement

I didn't encounter any weaknesses in the program.

I think it would have been beneficial to actually practice teaching strategies or design student facing materials. Much of the program was theoretical study, and I think it would have helped to do more practical things. I also found that the rigor of the classes were fairly low.

I would have preferred a more hands on approach to teaching. Instead of learning history of education I would have liked to learn how to teach.

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 and the 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 works with the C & I Team to improve the assessment plans to better capture data from multiple sources, for quality assurance and continuous program improvements. Improve runs on 3-year reporting cycles. This includes an examination of the results from the previous three years to assess progress. Program 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 Program Coordinator and the C & I team review the status of the outcomes to determine if they were met and what are the next action steps. In addition to the Four-Column Report, the Teacher Preparation Program 2020 Key Effectiveness Indicators (Louisiana Board of Regent, 2020) are also used 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 data; and, 3). better collect, analyze, and disaggregate data for continuous program improvements.

In addition to the university-wide assessment system, the EPP developed a timeline of formal processes to ensure that all candidates: (1) develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions appropriate for their specialty field; and, (2) have field and clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration. Candidates cannot move to the next portal, until all requirements are met and documented. Please see the attached TEP Handbook for a complete description of the Portal System.

The EPP continues to identify data that can drive continuous improvement. One area of focus for the upcoming academic year is better, more consistent collection and analysis of observation data. During the first year of implementation of the EPPs observation and feedback system, one lesson learned included the need to better calibrate scores by University Supervisors and use that data to consistently monitor program performance. See attached observation data from our University Supervisors.

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, Mentor Teacher (residency and student teaching), State of Louisiana and Education Students.

Advisory Board

The Division of Education & Counseling (DOEC) has an Advisory Board. The membership of the Advisory board includes the following stakeholders: a charter network administrator, a charter school principal, a Catholic School principal, a STEM Education faculty member from Johns Hopkins University, the Director or Recruitment and Selection for a local school district, a professor emeritus of education, a graduate student, an undergraduate student, and four community members. The advisory board

advocates and offers support to the EPP and serves the following roles 1.) Helps to ensure that the EPP has a curriculum which is current and provides our candidates with the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to meet the needs of diverse k-12 learners; 2.) Offers suggestions to EPP of needed resources; and 3.) Ensures that the EPP continues to meet current workforce needs through programs offered.

The COVID-19 virus and pandemic forced education in the State of Louisiana to shift to virtual learning in the spring of 2020. The EPP did not convene an advisory board meeting in the spring of 2020 as planned but contacted advisory board members throughout the spring 2020 semester to seek advice on various issues and provide candidates with virtual field practicums to ensure seamless experiences for candidates and k-12 learners. The next meeting is planned virtually for May 11-12, 2021.

Mentor Teachers

The LA DOE defines mentor teachers as, "...local educators who have the knowledge and skills to effectively coach and support new and resident teachers in their district." Louisianabelives.com/teaching/Louisiana-mentor-teachers. Mentor teachers are an important part of our program. They participate in teacher formation and are heavily involved in evaluating our programs' outcomes – our teacher candidates. In 2016, Louisiana's State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education adopted policies and laws designed to address the teacher shortage in the state. The state legislative body passed new laws which require initial licensure teacher candidates to complete a full year classroom residency alongside a state credentialed and experienced mentor. As of September 2020, every teacher who serves as the Mentor of an undergraduate or post-baccalaureate candidate must hold one of the three below:

- a. Mentor Ancillary Certificate-Mentor Teacher ancillary certificates are issued to individuals who have successfully completed a state-approved Mentor Teacher training program, including state-led training, and have a passing score on the Louisiana Mentor Teacher Assessment Series.
- b. Provisional Mentor Ancillary Certificate - A one year provisional certificate may be issued to any individual who has completed training or is currently enrolled in Mentor training. The provisional certificate is valid for one year and is non-renewable.
- c. Supervisor of Student Teaching credential - Teachers who hold the Supervision of Student Teaching credential may serve as a mentor until August 31, 2023

The MAT candidate who is a Teacher of Record or a resident, is assigned a credentialed mentor by the principal, based on student achievement data, mentor coaching ability, mentor credentials 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, model co-teaching strategies and culturally relevant pedagogy.

In 2018 we launched summer mentor teacher training and continues. The training provides coaching and mentoring resources, discussions on relationship building, and modeling behaviors of support. The teacher mentors also learn how to transition MAT candidates from small group instruction to whole class instruction 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

Mentor Teachers were given an opportunity to assess the training sessions at the end of each session.

At the undergraduate level, student teachers are mentored by the Supervising Teacher. The supervisor of student teaching must meet the following requirements:

PLEASE SEE ENTIRE REPORT LABELED "STAKEHOLDERS..." AS AN ATTACHMENT to this report.

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.

Between 2018 and 2019, 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, CAEP standards, state teacher competencies, 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. Following the course and syllabi redesign, the EPP digitized and aligned the observation tool with state teacher competencies, INTASC standards and CAEP standards. During the summer of 2019, faculty 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. To improve the data collected from our students during the field experiences, the TORSH Talent platform was adopted and implemented Fall, 2019. All professors and graduate students enrolled in the MAT internship class were trained to use TORSH, which came in very handy during the pandemic. To get the most out of the TORSH system, we will revisit our observation, feedback and instructional coaching practices, which were not implemented consistently by University Supervisors. A state review of our program found that feedback sessions, tools and data reflected inconsistency in both approach and quality. In a focus group concerning observation and feedback, students were not able to communicate specifically how actionable feedback helped them to improve their practice. During a summer retreat, University Supervisors will further standardized the observation, feedback and instructional coaching practices to better ensure consistency and targeted support. Please see attachments for an example of a 2019-2020 "sufficient level" CAEP assessment rubric.

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?

Xavier's EPP is using the TORSH (Today's One Room School House- data system) Talent platform. TORSH is a system which allows the EPP to collect data from candidates in the field as they teach k-12 students in real time. TORSH is a video capturing platform that provides our faculty, candidates and school leaders with access to data we use to track whether or not our candidates are reaching professional goals. Using TORSH allows us to OBSERVE candidates in action, MEASURE the effectiveness of their classroom instruction, COACH candidates, REFLECT on instructional practice and COLLABORATE with our students and their mentors in real-time.

TORSH allows for video submission of candidates' teaching and allows the ease of providing results and providing actionable feedback. TORSH aids the instructors see whether coursework is transferred to effective k-12 instruction. TORSH provides candidates with real-time focused feedback that directly connects to their coursework.

TORSH was implemented in the fall of 2019. At the undergraduate level, TORSH is used by the supervisor of student teaching when observing student teachers. At the post Bac Level, candidates who are members of the NCF Residency Program are unobserved using TORSH during the first year of their 2 year program. These candidates co teach with a mentor teacher. All MAT candidates are observed using TORSH in the internship class. During the pandemic when schools moved to virtual instruction, 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.

Point 2

Xavier University Program Completers continue to positively impact the achievement of diverse k-12 students. The Louisiana Department of Education recently released the results of the Teacher Preparation Quality Rating System. The rating system is designed to provide teacher preparation providers with meaningful information for improvement, to identify programs of excellence and to reward providers for meeting Louisiana's educator workforce needs. Please follow the link to see the effectiveness of Xavier University's completers in the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 school years. <https://louisianateacherprep.com/>

Point 3

As a component of CAEP accreditation, every Education Preparation Provider (EPP) must report and prominently display data on its website relating to the eight Annual Reporting Measures established by CAEP. Our CAEP Data Display page is now live. You can access our data at <https://www.xula.edu/caep>.

Point 4

Xavier University's EPP engages in intentional, targeted and results-oriented recruitment efforts. Our teacher candidates reflect the diversity of local communities and meets teacher workforce needs in all areas especially STEM and Special Education. Our EPP an essential provides a pipeline of well-rounded teachers who meet community and workforce needs. On the state's performance profile, the EPP scored a 4 out of 4 for meeting workforce needs.

Point 5













Xavier University of LA's EPP strengthened the systems used to provide and receive feedback at the institutional level to provide continuous improvement for our EPP. Xavier University of LA has an Institutional Effectiveness & Research office that analyzes data related to performance indicators. Working with the effectiveness and research office, the EPP aligned key indicators to meet accreditation needs across accrediting bodies. These accrediting bodies include SACS, CAEP and The State of Louisiana. The information gathered is needed by the university to gauge the EPP's effectiveness. The Institutional Effectiveness & Research office also collects yearly data from the EPP's graduates in the form of an effectiveness survey. The analysis is reported to the EPP and the results are used to improve program. Xavier has other systems which are used for collecting and analyzing a variety of data that can be leveraged for continuous improvement such as the Improve analysis and reporting platform, the EAB student information system, SASO (Student Academic Success Office –six week surveys on student progress).

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 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
- 3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
- 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 4.4 Completer satisfaction
- 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 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
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
- A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
- x.1 Diversity
- x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  Section_5_Stakeholders_are_not_involved_in_program_evaluation_and_improvement._(1).doc
-  Student_Teacher_Syllabus_2019.docx
-  Impacting_student_learning_using_math_strategies.docx
-  Four_Column_Report_Education_Undergraduate_(1)__Copy.pdf
-  Four_Column_Report_Education_Graduate_(MAT)_(1)__Copy.pdf
-  Syllabus_EDUC3060A_Fall2019.docx
-  Syllabus_Spring_2020_EDCI_5282_Survey_of_Assessment.pdf
-  TEP_handbook.pdf
-  brochure_rubricDavis.docx
-  model_presentation_rubricDavis.doc
-  tech_evaluation_presentation_rubricDavis.doc
-  EDCI_5140Spring2021SyllabusPage.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, in collaboration with Xavier's IT department, developed the CAEP Data Display web page which publicly displays the data that addresses the eight CAEP annual measures.

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

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

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name:

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

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

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

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

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

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

Acknowledge