

2018 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10148	AACTE SID:	3550
Institution:	Northwestern State University of Louisiana		
Unit:	Gallaspy College of Education and Human Development		

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 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 200

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 2016-2017 academic year?

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: <https://tlc.nsula.edu/accountability/>

Description of data accessible via link: EPP Annual Reports, State reports, candidate performance data, and completer and employer satisfaction data

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

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?

Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?

Are benchmarks available for comparison?

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

The EPP uses CAEP's eight annual reporting measures not only in its CAEP Annual Report (see AIMS or the EPP's Accountability Web page) but also in EPP and institutional reports. Of the four impact measures, completer data on P-12 student learning/development and observations of teaching effectiveness are evaluated annually using Louisiana Teacher Preparation Fact Books and Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Dashboards. The other two impact measures, employer satisfaction/completer persistence and completer satisfaction, are evaluated regularly; satisfaction survey data on these particular measures will be reviewed bi-annually by the TEAC as part of the EPP's phase-in plans for Components 4.3 and 4.4. Persistence data are provided in the Louisiana Teacher Preparation Fact Books. When analyzing data about the impact that completers' teaching has on P-12 learning and development from the Louisiana Teacher Preparation Fact Books and Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Dashboards, completers routinely earn mean ratings of 3 and above, and the EPP uses completer ratings as external benchmarks to which candidate performance on similar measures is compared. Bachelor's (BACH) candidates scored a mean of 2.85, but BACH completers scored a mean of 3.1, which shows a .25 point growth from pre-service to in-service performance. The PREP (practitioner) program also showed growth where pre-service candidates scored a mean of 2.83 while completers scored a mean of 3.1 (+.28). MAT candidates scored a mean of 2.83 as pre-service teachers with completer average of 3.3. This +.47 point difference is the greatest growth among all three paths. In comparing the three paths' data, no alarming

trends were identified. In addition, from this analysis of data the EPP can reason that candidate performance across all three paths is comparable, fostering the conclusion that the quality of programs in the three paths are comparable. For further benchmarking and comparison, these EPP data were compared to completer impact data of other Louisiana institutions of similar size and program offerings, which were Louisiana Tech University (Tech) and the University of New Orleans (UNO). Tech had 292 BACH completers (mean score of 3.3), and its MAT program had 290 completers with a mean score of 3.5. Its certification-only program had 83 completers and a mean score of 3.3. UNO had 203 BACH completers with a mean score of 2.9; 162 MAT completers with a mean of 3.1; and 82 certification-only completers with a mean score of 3.0. When comparing EPP completer Compass Final Evaluation scores with the 13 public universities in the state, EPP alternate path completers ranked third, and traditional path completers ranked fourth along with four other universities with the same mean scores. Survey data from the Employer Satisfaction Survey indicate that the effectiveness of the EPP completers is "Good" to "Outstanding." There were no areas of concern identified. Overall, completers indicate satisfaction with their preparation experience in the Completer Follow-Up Survey data. EPP completers rated the effectiveness of their programs in preparing them to improve student learning as "Outstanding." Areas of strength were noted with two (producing and using evidence of students' academic growth and applying knowledge and skills from coursework in professional practice) means of 4.0. Areas of weakness included 1) learning to identify and implement modifications for academic plans (such as IEPs) and 2) learning to design or mentor/support others in designing technology-supported lessons. Due to the low response rate for both surveys, no decisions have been made to significantly alter the programs based on these results alone. However, phase-in plans outline the EPP's strategies to increase response rates on both surveys. Once response rates increase consistently to 20% or above, the EPP in consultation with TEAC will lend more credence to survey results alone as bases for decision-making. Data on the four outcome measures are either collected or accessed annually and used as measures of operational effectiveness. Completer employment details are collected through the Completer Follow-Up Survey and the LDOE Regional Educator Workforce reports. The EPP's Office of Teacher Certification monitors candidate progress, processes candidates' licensure applications once recommendations for licensure have been awarded as described in the Standard 3 report, and tracks completer rates for the EPP. Of the candidates admitted for the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 academic years, 97% of BACH candidates completed programs in 3 years or less, and 100% of PREP candidates 100% completed in 1-2 years. In the MAT program, 75% were able to finish in 3 years or less. Furthermore, as demonstrated in the Standard 3 report and evidence, the EPP supports, tracks, and reports on candidate progress from admission to completion using various established measures. Additional measures of program outcome and consumer information are addressed by the EPP's quality assurance system. Graduation rates for the EPP's programs has risen over the past three cycles. In 2015-2016, the EPP experienced a 12% graduation rate increase. In addition, as Northwestern has set a goal to increase enrollment, the EPP has also set a goal to increase enrollment. In fall 2017, the university reached an all-time record enrollment of 10,572. The EPP's goal for enrollment was 1,277. This goal was exceeded with 1,288 candidates enrolled as of 14th day enrollment count. Licensure rates for all EPP programs, also reported in Standard 4, are admirable. The LBOR reported that 100% of the completers met state licensing requirements for the 3-year data cycle; however, employment rates for the licensed completers are lower, hovering in the 60% range for the traditional programs and near 80% alternate path programs. A fallacy of the LBOR data is that only employment in Louisiana's public P-12 schools are tracked; therefore, completers employed in private, parochial, or charter schools or out of state are not included in the reported rates. To that end, the EPP is working to forge stronger, lasting connections with completers in order to maintain communication with those individuals and provide more accurate employment rates, milestones, etc. Some of these efforts are already underway and include partnering with the Alumni Association for assistance in soliciting survey responses and obtaining contact information. Additionally, a social media campaign was launched fall 2017 with the hope of connecting a wide audience of completers with the EPP. Consumer information is collected and reported at <https://www.nsula.edu/consumer-information/> by the institution per the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008. The consumer information includes a cost of attendance calculator that reflects the average cost for one academic year. It includes estimated expenses for tuition, textbooks, supplies, room and board, transportation, and personal expenses in an attempt to educate students in advance about their total costs and financial assistance options. Other consumer information, such as information on student rights, support services, and campus safety are also provided. Student loan default rates are reported by the U.S. Department of Education at <https://www2.ed.gov/offices/OSFAP/defaultmanagement/cdr.html>. As of November 2017, Northwestern's most current default rate reported (2014) was 11.5% with 275 loans in default and 2,384 loans in repayment. This is a decrease of 3.9% from the 2010 rate of 15.4% and is only .1% higher than the national rate of 11.5%. An internal policy regarding default management is enforced by the Office of Financial Aid and outlines the institution's proactive efforts to assist students in being responsible borrowers.

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.

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?

A program-level data collection, review, decision-making, and reporting process provides an annual review that drives continuous improvement and is based on Deming's Plan-Do-Study-Act model for ongoing improvement (<https://deming.org/explore/p-d-s-a>). At the end of each academic year, the EPP reviews data (both aggregated and disaggregated), identifies patterns across programs, identifies strengths and weaknesses, and uses data for continuous improvement and to identify data trends that will guide the changes made to courses, assessments, and candidate requirements. During this process, each program provides a relevant analysis of trends, comparison of trends with identified benchmarks, and alignment of the results to future directions and plans. Beginning January 2018, the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) will be introduced to this process and work with EPP faculty in making decisions based on the program-level analyses. The outcome of this EPP-based process is an Annual Program Report that 1) articulates the program's mission, 2) shows alignment to departmental student learning goals and national program standards (e.g., SPA), 3) identifies student learning outcomes, 4) defines core values and strategic goals, 5) assesses benchmarks and achievement levels, 6) provides data from assessments, and 7) presents decisions based on the current data and updates from the decisions presented on the prior year's report. From this report, action steps are developed based on data results and analyses. This process is paralleled by an institutional process that results in an annual Assessment Cycle Plan in 2017. Comparable to the Annual Program Report process, the Assessment Cycle Plan process has an institutional scope and is governed by the University Assessment Committee (UAC) for SACSCOC accreditation purposes. These plans illustrate alignment with university, college, department, and program mission statements in addition to reporting data and data-driven decisions. UAC reports, templates, and other resources are available at <https://www.nsula.edu/institutionaleffectiveness/>. Data used in decision-making are used in disaggregated form by licensure area, path (traditional versus alternate), and cycle. Reports and evidence for CAEP Standards 1-4 provide assessments, data, and interpretations of data as examples of how the EPP's quality assurance system has a mechanism to collect, review, and use candidate performance data, completer impact data, faculty performance (namely, clinical educator performance), completer perceptions, and employer satisfaction feedback. This work of collecting, analyzing, monitoring, reporting, and using data effectively is facilitated to some extent by digital tools. Taskstream is the primary data collection medium for candidate assessments and all surveys. Moodle and the departmental Web site function as central repositories for data, reports, templates, etc.; as mentioned earlier, the confidentiality variable of each data set determines in which location it is made available. Formative and summative assessments, including common assessments reported in CAEP Standards 1 and 3 as well as program-specific assessments reported in SPA reports and forthcoming Program Review with Feedback reports (see AIMS), provide the EPP with a comprehensive overview of candidate performance, and all comprise a quality assurance system that permits review of data by candidate, by program, by path, and by cycle, as well as within-group and between-group comparisons of those. Assessments include those common assessments reported in CAEP Standards 1 and 3 plus others including, but not limited to: professional writings, oral and written exams, presentations, projects, portfolios, interviews, clinical observations, and performance-based assessments. EPP faculty and P-12 stakeholders work together to ensure EPP assessments and rubrics align with standards and are consistently applied and accurately evaluated across programs. P-12 stakeholders are systematically involved in decision-making, and efforts that began fall 2017 will serve to strengthen that group's capacity for input and participation in ensuring quality in all programs. During TEAC meetings, data are shared, and feedback is gathered. A 2018 TEAC task will be to collaborate with EPP faculty and staff on strategies to improve completer and employer survey response rates. Outside the TEAC, input from stakeholders has led to multiple innovations and resource allocations in the EPP's programs as evidenced in the partnership examples. One such example is presented the complete redesign of EDUC 4010,

a general secondary methodology course, where middle school partners worked hand-in-hand with the course instructor to design the course, assessments, and requirements. Numerous grant-related examples exist as well. Synergistic practices of preparing candidates and evaluating and monitoring their progress occur regularly between EPP faculty and P-12 partners through specific collaborations for specific curricular needs. Some such collaborations are ad hoc such as the initiative to redesign the EPP's clinical evaluation tool and processes while others are ongoing like the EDUC 4010 partnership mentioned earlier. Together with P-12 partners, including those on the TEAC, EPP faculty work as a cohesive unit to collect, analyze, monitor, and report data as part of the EPP's quality assurance system as demonstrated in a number of annual candidate performance reports discussed and reports on other measures that demonstrate operational effectiveness.

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 1.4 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
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 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.
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

 2017compiledannualreports.pdf

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

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

Section 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a successful transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful reflection regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPP's evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progress made on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use the Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level.

If there are no identified gaps, click the box next to "No identified gaps" and proceed to question 7.2.

No identified gaps

If there are identified gaps, please summarize the gaps and any steps planned or taken toward the gap(s) to be fully prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text applies.

One noticeable gap for Northwestern was the absence of "elevated" and systematic P12 partner input not only in course-level decision-making but in overall operational effectiveness and governance of the EPP. Snapshots of partnerships were identified, but systematic involvement was lacking. Efforts in 2016-2017 to address that remain underway, and several solid examples have emerged. That continues to be an area where the EPP focuses efforts. A second gap relates to completer and employer feedback. Survey response rates are quite low, and partnerships with local districts, advanced candidates, and the university's Alumni Association were initiated in 2017 in efforts to address that. Those, too, remain ongoing.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the text applies.

- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 4.4 Completer satisfaction
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
- A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

Yes No

7.3 If no, please describe any changes that mean that the EPP does not continue to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2018 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

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

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

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

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

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

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

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

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

Acknowledge