

# 2018 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10934	AACTE SID:	3475
Institution:	Truman State University		
Unit:	Professional Education Unit		

## Section 1. AIMS Profile

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

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

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

## Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2016-2017 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

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

**Total number of program completers 104**

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

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

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2016-2017 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements  
No Change / Not Applicable

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

**Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.**

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

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

1

Link: <http://www.truman.edu/majors-programs/academic-departments/about-the-education-department/mae-program-association-links/title-ii/>

Description of data accessible via link: Data from Title II report includes graduation, licensing/certification, ability to be hired in education positions based on preparation.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

2

Link: <https://mcde.dese.mo.gov/guidedInquiry/Pages/Education-Staff.aspx>

Description of data accessible via link: Annual Performance Report data from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education which addresses impact on PK-12 learning, teaching effectiveness, satisfaction of employers, and satisfaction of program completers.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

3

Link: [https://nslds.ed.gov/nslds/nslds\\_SA/defaultmanagement/cohortdetail\\_3yr.cfm?sno=0&ope\\_id=002495](https://nslds.ed.gov/nslds/nslds_SA/defaultmanagement/cohortdetail_3yr.cfm?sno=0&ope_id=002495)

Description of data accessible via link: Truman link to student loan default rates and other consumer information.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>	<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?*

In reviewing the Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years, the Unit notices positive, expected trends overall. Our number of program completers has increased modestly in a time of state and national decline. We maintain a strong pass rate on all state-required assessments as well as job placement rates for completers. Our Assessment Team continues to monitor our data, then share this information with the faculty in department meetings and departmental communications. Data are available from the Annual Performance Report on a yearly basis, and these measures continue to be edited at the state level, so the information varies from year to year. In addition, the numbers reported back to us from the state provide limited information because the state requires a certain n (sample size) for each cell to report out numbers. Even with this variation and limited information, we are able to identify trends in our program data and compare that to internally collected information regarding candidate performance and completer success.

With the implementation of new GPA requirements for all teacher certification candidates by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) in August 1, 2017, the Unit has developed a plan for sharing these requirements with stakeholders: prospective students and families, current students, current candidates, undergraduate advisors, Education Department advisors, and admissions staff. The Unit also created an interactive GPA calculation worksheet for each teacher preparation certification program so that students/candidates, and advisors can monitor candidate progress toward meeting this requirement. These worksheets have been developed and field tested by Education Department faculty and will be ready for widespread implementation in Fall 2018.

Beginning June 1, 2018, DESE is no longer requiring the administration of the Missouri Educator Profile (MEP) as a dispositions assessment within teacher certification programs. As a result, our Assessment Team has reviewed other disposition assessments and the department is voting on our new measure in May, 2018. The Assessment Team is working on a plan for the new dispositions assessment to be implemented in Fall 2018, as well as how the data will be collected and used in programmatic decision-making.

Beginning September 1, 2018, DESE is no longer requiring completion of the Missouri Pre-Service Teacher Assessment (MO-PTA) for teacher certification. As a result, efforts to examine this data for programmatic decision-making are being realigned to address the data that will be available from the new version of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System (MEES) to be used as the performance measure for candidates beginning in Fall 2018.

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

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

### **CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)**

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

**The EPP Quality Assurance System does not adequately monitor candidate progress throughout the program.**

Our last Accreditation Site Visit was February, 2016, with the final report shared October, 2016. In that report, we had one identified area for improvement: "The EPP Quality Assurance System does not adequately monitor candidate progress throughout the program." The rationale provided indicated: "Missouri Educator Gateway Assessment (MEGA) includes measures to monitor candidate progress at the beginning and end of the program only. There are no EPP developed assessments to complement the suite of state measures to monitor candidate progress." As we indicated in our response to this report and in our 2017 EPP Annual Report, the Unit does monitor candidate progress throughout the program in a variety of ways and are continuing work to evaluate the merit of additional measures.

As we described previously, we have developed a Professional Growth Plan (PGP) signature assignment that correlates with the administration of the state-required Missouri Educator Profile (MEP) as part of our monitoring candidate progress throughout the program. The PGP is created by the candidate and professor within the first field experience course, and follows the candidate

through the mid- and end- field experience courses. Rather than take a compliance approach to administering the MEP, we developed a program to incorporate it into an on-going system of evaluating dispositions and creating/revising professional growth goals that mirror the expectations of first year teachers to write professional development goals. Even though the MEP is no longer required by DESE after June 1, 2018, our PGP system remains in place and will incorporate the new dispositions assessment.

A second signature assignment used to monitor candidate progress involves development of a mini-unit in the ED 393 course. The instructors meet at least once per semester to review the directions, rubric, and scoring procedures, then review the data from each semester. These interactive discussions have led to increased commonality across the sections related to this assignment specifically, as well as an increased general consistency in the course content covered. This assignment allows us to monitor candidate progress related to lesson plan development and implementation from the early field experience.

Another EPP developed assessment is the Unit required intensive research project that is completed during the student teaching internship experience. This internship experience is also the time in the program where candidates have completed the Missouri Pre-Service Teacher Assessment (MO-PTA). Candidate feedback indicated the workload during internship is difficult to manage. Within the EPP, we have worked on curricular changes to address these concerns. This work, coupled with the removal of the MO-PTA as a DESE requirement starting September 1, 2018, will serve to support our candidates having a manageable workload while they engage in the student teaching experience which, we would argue, is the most important and transformative experience within the teacher preparation program. We will continue to monitor candidate progress in the internship experience through formative assessments, supervisory observations, and the Missouri Educator Evaluation System (MEES) assessment that is completed by the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher.

A third method for monitoring candidate progress throughout the program involves addressing the DESE requirements concerning GPA. Beginning August 1, 2017, candidates are required to meet three, distinct GPA measures: a 2.75 overall GPA, a 3.0 content GPA, and a 3.0 professional education GPA. As stated above, the Unit created an interactive GPA calculation worksheet for each teacher preparation certification program so that candidates and advisors can monitor candidate progress toward meeting this requirement. It should be noted these state mandated GPA requirements do not align directly with graduation GPA requirements, thus necessitating an additional method for calculation and monitoring. These GPA worksheets have been developed and field tested by Education department faculty within the 2017-2018 academic year, and will be ready for widespread implementation in Fall 2018.

The Unit in general, and the Assessment Team specifically, continue to assess the value of data derived from the state-required assessments. Concurrently, the Assessment Team continues to monitor the EPP developed measures to monitor both candidate progress and the need for programmatic review/revision as a result of these measures.

## 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?

The following illustrates 2017-2018 goals and progress within the EPP.

1. Goal: Develop an Assessment Manual and Calendar that includes assessment related process and procedures as well as technical manuals for state mandated assessments. The purpose of the manual is to establish a process for analyzing and disseminating data to relevant constituencies within the education department, and to establish processes for making data-based decisions to guide continuous improvement.

Progress: The Assessment Team continues work on this manual and calendar, with the initial draft used as a template in the 2017-2018 academic year. Adjustments have been made to the process as the Unit discusses the best time in the academic year to analyze data and consider programmatic review and change. Additionally, updates continue as the state mandated assessments change.

2. Goal: Make a final determination about the MEP/PGP Pilot.

Progress: The Unit has determined that the PGP signature assignment provides valuable information and is worth continuing. The state will no longer require the MEP as of June 1, 2018, but the new dispositions assessment will be incorporated into the PGP project.

3. Goal: Implement curricular modifications designed to provide candidates with requisite knowledge and skills to successfully complete the MO-PTA and Action Research.

Progress: During the Spring 2017 MAE Retreat, faculty and staff worked on reviewing and revising curriculum specifically focused on preparing students to complete research projects during their internships (culminating field experience). Based on this work, new research competencies were added to required courses for Fall 2017. A more complete overhaul of ED 601: Measurement and Evaluation took place during Summer 2017. Further curriculum revision was made based on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's requirement for updating Education Preparation Program curriculum matrices for each certification area offered by an EPP. All matrices were updated by July 1, 2017. Courses were added as needed and implemented beginning Summer 2017. With the removal of the MO-PTA requirement as of September 1, 2018, workload and course requirements within the internship semester were reviewed and revised. Future work on this goal will focus on curricular needs for students to successfully complete the Action Research project and pass the state mandated content assessments.

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

- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
- 3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 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
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities
- 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.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
- A.5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
- A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
- A.5.5 Continuous Improvement