

2021 EPP Annual Report

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

Section 1. EPP Profile

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

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

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

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

<https://www.truman.edu/majors-programs/graduate-studies/masters-in-education/certification/>

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 80

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.truman.edu/majors-programs/academic-departments/about-the-education-department/mae-program-reports/>

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. 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 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"/>	<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?

The Annual Performance Report for Teacher Preparation Programs reflects a slight decrease in completers when compared to the previous year. We continue to have a strong pass rate on all state-mandated assessments as well as high job placement rates for completers. There has been a change in administration since our last report and we are revisiting all of our assessments. Our Assessment Team has reviewed data sources, data and procedures to share and discuss with the faculty at department meetings and the annual retreat.

Data are available from the Annual Performance Report (APR) yearly and are dependent upon the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) requirements so the information varies from year to year. The Missouri Educator Evaluation System (MEES) is submitted for each intern by the mentor and the university supervisor upon completion of the internship. Data is collated and reported as part of our APR. In addition, DESE provides first-year teacher and principal reports. We are analyzing the data across multiple years for Truman to examine trends. We noted that our first-year teacher report was excellent in terms of outcomes.

Our graduates engage in reflective practice and our diverse learner question had a higher response than in previous years. We did

not have a principal report this past year due to a low n (less than 10). Our students have 100% pass rate on the Missouri Content Area Tests. Our Title II report will be shared with faculty. Our graduates complete a Graduate Survey Exit Questionnaire annually and that data was reviewed at the department retreat. We are asking for the data to be reported by MAE program rather than as a whole group. We added suggestions to the GSEQ, which Graduate Council is discussing. Overall, students reported that they were well-prepared. We are examining students who said they probably would not be returning to the MAE program. The unit has created a disposition document that we designed in fall 2018 and are piloting in spring 2019. We are collecting data from students, mentors, and supervisors in multiple courses that have field components and sharing it with the professors at the next level to determine areas of strengths and areas to grow for each candidate. The data was collected, evaluated by the Department Assessment Committee, and shared with faculty.

Due to changes with DESE requirements in terms of GPAs in overall, content, and professional, we have created GPA worksheets that are on each program's website within the MAE. We are currently surveying faculty on how they are using the GPA worksheets and will share that data with the department.

We are using a professional growth plan for all interns that was created and approved fall 2019. Data was analyzed summer 2020. Our intent is to analyze the data, revisit the instrument and then implement in earlier courses as appropriate.

ED 393 faculty shared the goals of the unit assignment and the rubric data at the faculty retreat. We had a rich discussion about the outcomes that we expect. We are analyzing the different assignments in ED 393 and all of the MAE 608 courses to determine if we have curricular alignment.

We have a survey for Truman transfer students interested in the MAE. Data will be shared in April at the faculty meeting. This information was also shared with the Northeast Missouri Advisory Board for the Education Department. One significant outcome was the proposal for and state approval of a Master's degree for gifted education certification.

We tried to measure our students' impact on K-12 education through their action research, but recognized that this data was not effective and voted to delete it from the research reflection.

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 previous reports, 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 we approved in fall 2019 and are implementing in one course spring 2019. After analysis, we will implement the assignment in other courses. Collected data in fall 2019 and spring 2020 was analyzed and indicated that students are asking for more professional development opportunities.

A second signature assignment used to monitor candidate progress involves development of a mini-unit in the ED 393 course. The instructors have collected data and shared their results at the department retreat. 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.

Another EPP developed assessment is the Unit required intensive research project that is completed during the student teaching internship experience. In addition, we 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 mentor teacher.

A third method for monitoring candidate progress throughout the program involves addressing the DESE requirements concerning GPA. 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. We are analyzing the use of the worksheets with education faculty and then will collect data from the students.

The Unit in general, and the Assessment Team specifically, continue to assess the value of data derived from the state-required assessments and Truman's 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 cataloging 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 2019-2020 goals and progress within the EPP.

1. Goal: To create a process of data collection and dissemination that is effective regardless of administration and distinguish if data is for compliance and/or improving our program. Progress: The Assessment Team has discussed all of our data sources and shared with the department faculty suggestions for what data sources to keep, delete, adapt, and how implementation and dissemination will happen. We are continuing to work on how to store the data effectively.

The Assessment Team and the Education Department is systematically collecting, analyzing and disseminating data results to make appropriate changes to programs. This work is completed as part of Faculty Retreats, regularly scheduled Department Meetings and Faculty/Staff Working Meetings, and Assessment Committee meetings.

2. Goal: Student enrollment has decreased at the University and we are becoming more intentional with transfer students.

Progress: We are collecting data about transfer students' experiences at Truman with the MAE and sharing with the faculty so that we can create plans that support recruitment and retention.

3. Goal: We are focusing on MAE 2028—what skills and knowledge we want a graduate to have in 2028. Progress: We have asked all of our stakeholders to participate in the process and have created a list of those characteristics. We are now creating priorities within different action plans to address those characteristics.

Social Justice

A specific concentration has been with Social Justice. The Education Department has established a definition for social justice through professional development and continues work on assignment program-wide assessments. The Department has developed a social justice disposition rubric with input from the Advisory Board. Social Justice emphasis is not only a department focus, but campus-wide focus as well.

Technology

Technology is a priority for 21st century learners. Truman candidates model and apply tech standards in design, implementation, and assessment in practice. Examination of the standards and indicators matrix indicates that technology is introduced early in the course sequence; and affirmed throughout. Technology is addressed as an essential component to candidate preparation.

Candidates are required to use a variety of technological devices, apps, and programs within instructional planning. Collaborative course activities require the use of Blackboard and Google Drive. The Education Department has received approval to install equipment with video conferencing capabilities which can include distance learning and opportunities for on-line student internship supervision.

The Education Department converted an old computer lab to a state-of-the-art classroom loaded with technology. We have a mobile Smartboard, VR/AR capabilities, 3 Nueva walls and flexible seating. We have a designated GTRA (Graduate Teaching Research Assistant) who offered professional development to faculty and students multiple times throughout the semester, conducted two research studies on the use of technology, and taught local NEMO fifth graders.

The Education Department has received approval to install equipment with video conferencing capabilities which can include distance learning and opportunities for on-line student internship supervision. Given COVID this past year, technology use with

remote learning has blossomed. All faculty have received professional development for using Zoom and Quality Matters. In addition, our teacher candidates have had a variety of experiences teaching virtually.

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
- 1.5 Model and apply technology 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
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
- 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.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.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
- A.3.4 Selection at Completion
- 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
- x.1 Diversity
- x.2 Technology
- x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses
- x.5 State Standards (if applicable)

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or s activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

Truman State University is proud to continue its tradition of preparing highly-qualified teachers in 13 initial certification areas and 3 add-on certification areas. Our completers educate and serve students in a multitude of districts within Missouri, many states within the United States, and several countries around the world. Our faculty model data-based decision-making and reflective practice within a continuous improvement frame.

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: Dr. Wendy Miner

Position: Education Department Chair

Phone: 660 785-6074

E-mail: wsm@truman.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

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

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

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

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

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

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

Acknowledge