

Southeast Missouri State University College of Education

Self-Study Report

CAEP Accreditation Process

Table of Contents

Overview	3
Context and Unique Characteristics	3
Description of Organizational Structure	3
Vision, Mission, and Goals	4
EPP's Shared Values and Beliefs for Educator Preparation	5
Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge.....	6
1.1: Understanding of InTASC Standards.....	6
1.2: Use of Research and Evidence	7
1.3: Program-Specific Standards.....	7
1.4: College and Career-Ready Standards.....	8
1.5: Technology Standards.....	8
Standard 2: Clinical Partnership and Practice.....	10
2.1: Partnerships for Clinical Preparation	10
2.2: Clinical Educators.....	11
2.3: Clinical Experiences.....	12
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity	13
3.1: Plan to Recruit Diverse Candidates and Meet Employment Needs	13
3.2: Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement and Ability	13
3.3: Additional Selectivity Factors.....	13
3.4: Selectivity During Preparation	14
3.5: Selection at Completion.....	14
3.6: Expectations of the Profession	15
Standard 4: Program Impact.....	16
4.1: Impact on P-12 Student Learning	16
4.2: Effective Application of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions.....	16
4.3: Employer Satisfaction	16
4.4: Completer Satisfaction.....	17
Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement.....	18
5.1: Multiple Monitoring Measures.....	18
5.2: Relevant, Verifiable, Representative, Cumulative, and Actionable Measures	19
5.3: Continuous Improvement Measures	19

5.4: Use of Completer Impact Data	20
5.5: Involvement of Stakeholders.....	21

Overview

Context and Unique Characteristics

Southeast Missouri State University is a regional comprehensive institution located about 90 miles south of St. Louis near the banks of the Mississippi River. While the majority of its students (78%) hold permanent residence in Missouri, it is also positioned to draw from nearby Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Arkansas. The regional economy is heavily dependent upon agriculture, although small urban centers, like Cape Girardeau provide concentrated economic, commercial, educational, and health-related opportunities. The Missouri Economic Research and Information Center includes 13 counties in the Southeast Region, and 10 of those have average per capita incomes below the median for counties in the state. Three rank in the bottom 10 counties using the same metric.

Founded as a teacher's college in 1873, Southeast Missouri State University has grown to include over 145 undergraduate majors, 100 minors, and more than 75 graduate programs. In addition to an increasing number of online offerings, the institution offers courses on the main campus in Cape Girardeau, at regional campuses in Sikeston, Kennett, Malden, and at delivery sites in Poplar Bluff and at the Cape College Center in Cape Girardeau.

In the fall of 2017 nearly 12,000 undergraduates were enrolled at Southeast, and graduate programs had enrollments of almost 1100. The student body was 59% female and the ethnic/racial distribution was as follows: 8% African American, 80% White, and 6.45% Non-Resident Alien, with representation from no other groups topping 2%. Over a third of undergraduate enrollees claim residence in Cape Girardeau County and the three contiguous Missouri Counties. Approximately 13% come from the Greater St. Louis area.

The College of Education (COE) is currently one of five colleges at Southeast Missouri State University. It offers nearly 50 different programs in education and counseling, and over 35 of those prepare students for some sort of licensure. In the latest available Title II report (2016), Southeast had the 5th largest number of completers in the state (263) from programs leading to initial teacher licensure. Building on the institution's long history of excellence in preparing educators, the College has been the recipient of the AASCU Christa McAuliffe Showcase for Excellence Award (1989) and the AACTE Best Practice Award for Global and International Teacher Education (1999). Just this year, Apple added the COE to its global list of only 400 Apple Distinguished Schools. This last award was a direct result of the EPP's educational technology initiative, EDvolution™.

Description of Organizational Structure

(Note: The institution is currently undergoing major restructuring. The following is accurate in fall 2017, but the reality facing site visitors in fall 2018 will likely be very different.)

The EPP is housed in the College of Education (COE). While the COE offers programs outside of educator preparation (e.g. Mental Health Counseling), its primary role is providing preparation and professional development to school-based educators. The COE is one of five colleges at Southeast Missouri State University, with the others focusing on business, health and human services, liberal arts, and lastly, science, technology and agriculture. Each college is led by a Dean who, in turn, reports to the Provost. In addition to this head of academic affairs, the following executive officers administer major

divisions in the university and report directly to the President: Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Success, Vice President for Finance and Administration, and Vice President for University Advancement.

Programs in the College of Education are offered by the Departments of Elementary, Early and Special Education (ESEE), Educational Leadership and Counseling (ELC), and Middle and Secondary Education (MSE). Each department is led by a Chairperson who reports directly to the Dean. Chairpersons hold rank as faculty members and, also, have administrative authority in their departments, primarily in the areas of personnel, curriculum, program quality, and finance. To assist the Chairperson with duties related to curriculum and program quality, each licensure program also has a Coordinator.

Some programs have a slightly different structure as they are shared between the Department of Middle and Secondary Education in the COE and another department in one of the other colleges. For example, the English Education program, which leads to licensure in grades 9-12, is shared between MSE and the Department of English in the College of Liberal Arts. Curricular changes in these programs, then, must be approved by the initial departments and the college councils in both colleges, as well as the Educator Preparation Program Committee.

The COE has many college and departmental committees, but two are especially influential in the organizational structure. The Educator Preparation Program Committee (EPPC) reviews curricular changes in all programs leading to P-12 licensure. It also makes changes in EPP processes or, when appropriate, makes recommendations to the Dean. Curricular changes and major alterations in procedure must also be approved by the College Council.

In addition to Chairpersons, the Associate Dean and the Coordinator of the EDvolution Center have EPP-related responsibilities and report directly to the Dean. The Student Status and Certification Officer and the Office of Field Experiences are housed within the Office of the Associate Dean.

Vision, Mission, and Goals

[University Mission](#)

Southeast Missouri State University provides student-centered education and experiential learning with a foundation of liberal arts and sciences, embracing a tradition of access, exceptional teaching, and commitment to student success that significantly contributes to the development of the region and beyond.

[University Vision](#)

Southeast Missouri State University strives to be one of the nation's most academically competitive regional comprehensive universities, recognized for excellence in education, research, engagement, and creativity.

[College of Education Mission](#)

The mission of the College of Education is to prepare teachers, leaders, and counselors as highly effective professionals who possess a passion for lifelong learning.

[College of Education Vision](#)

Building upon our heritage, the vision of the College of Education is to transform Southeast Missouri and beyond through education.

EPP's Shared Values and Beliefs for Educator Preparation

EPP personnel share commonality around two particular goals, one old and one new. Southeast Missouri State began as a Normal School, and preparing teachers for the region is a long and cherished value in the EPP. Faculty and staff take pride in the number of alumni who work in area schools and district offices, and they feel a responsibility for the quality of education provided to students in Southeast Missouri. That concern for the educational well-being of the region led, more recently to the adoption of a new shared commitment. EPP personnel believe that schooling in the 21st century must make full use of the tools available and that it must include instruction in how to use those tools. To that end the EPP has embraced an initiative—called EDvolution—aimed at effective integration of educational technology.

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

1.1: Understanding of InTASC Standards

As teacher candidates progress through their respective programs (Initial Teacher Preparation Programs) The EPP evaluates its teacher candidates against criteria identified in the Missouri Teacher Standards (MTS). The MTS are aligned with the InTASC Standards, and EPP assessments are aligned with both (Southeast Assessments-Overview and Alignment). In evaluating programs relative to these standards, the EPP employs more than 50 common data points, drawn from seven major assessments, that are used to assess teacher candidates individually and the EPP, overall. Those seven assessment instruments are: the Formative Field Evaluation ([FFE Description and Data](#)), the Missouri Content Assessment ([MoCA Description and Data](#)), the Missouri Educator Evaluation System ([MEES Description and Data](#); [MEES Rubric Description](#)), the Missouri Preservice Teacher Assessment (MoPTA Description and Data), the Southeast Exit Survey (Exit Survey Description and Data), the First-Year Teacher Survey and the First-Year Teacher's Principal Survey ([FYTS and FYTPS Description and Data](#)).

Data derived from each of these instruments suggests that EPP candidates perform well using both norm-based (when available) and criterion-based measures. The EPP uses a 4-point scale for assessment, with a score of 3 indicating that the criterion has been met. Data collected over the past two academic years (data collected during the current academic year will be provided prior to the visit) suggests that candidates consistently earn scores of 3 or above on specific criteria within the identified assessments which, in turn, leads to similar overall scores. Candidates, for example, earn scores, on average, over 3.5 on the Missouri Educator Evaluation System ([MEES Description and Data](#)).

Some state-wide comparative data are also available for the MoCA, the MEES, the First-Year Teacher Survey, and the First-Year Teacher's Principal Survey. These data, also, provide evidence that EPP candidates are developing the skills and knowledge necessary for effective teaching. For example, in 34 of 39 categories, Southeast completers scored the EPP higher than other completers across the state scored their own preparation programs ([FYTS and FYTPS Description and Data](#)) during the spring of 2017. In the same year, principals of first-year teachers gave the EPP a higher mean score than other principals gave to other EPPs. Pearson offers 32 MoCA relevant to program areas offered by the EPP. In 16 of those areas, EPP candidates have scored, on average, higher than the state average. In addition, in 23 of those areas, EPP candidates had a higher first-time pass rate on an exam related to their program than their statewide peers on the first attempt.

Reliable research requires the use of multiple and varied data points to draw conclusions. While the 50+ pieces of data the EPP uses can be helpful for identifying program strengths and weaknesses, they are also disparate and difficult to combine into a coherent picture. To address that challenge, the EPP created a table ([Aggregate Program Scores Aligned with MTS and InTASC](#)) that allows for the combination of several points of data to generate an overall score for selected MTS and, also, for the four InTASC categories. This calculation is broad, but it does enable the EPP to more easily compare its candidates across the InTASC categories. All of the category scores suggest that candidates are, on average, demonstrating the knowledge and skills identified in the Missouri Teacher Standards and the InTASC Standards.

1.2: Use of Research and Evidence

EPP programs require that candidates inform their pedagogical decisions with evidence, and the MoPTA is one of the major tools used to introduce and assess that skill. Individual programs introduce pieces of the instrument at various points in the program. Scoring practices are currently developed at a program level, so data generated by these early iterations of the MoPTA are not being used for EPP assessment. However, EPP personnel will be discussing the possibility of standardizing the process so that an EPP-scored version of the MoPTA might be used as formative assessment.

The EPP does, however, use the state-required ETS version of the MoPTA as a source of data in multiple areas. In regard to candidate use of evidence, scores from three of the eleven Steps in the MoPTA provide useful information: Task 2, Step 2: Administering the Assessment and Analyzing the Data, Task 3, Step 3: Analyzing the Lesson, and Task 4, Step 4: Reflecting on the Sequence of Lessons within the Unit. In each of these Steps, candidates are required to draw conclusions from data and observations. Scores on these three Steps suggest that candidates are not as strong in this area as in other areas. When compared to all mean Step scores generated from the last two years of data, EPP scores for these three Steps have ranked 4th (Step 2.2.), 6th (Step 4.4.), and 10th (Step 3.3) out of 11. However, mean annual scores on each of the Steps have risen over the past two years ([MoPTA Description and Data](#)).

Comparison to statewide scores would be helpful, too, but those data have not yet been provided by DESE or ETS. The EPP has contacted both entities about receiving these data. Candidate MoPTA scores are generally lower than scores generated using other instruments, but the reason is difficult to discern. The state has set the passing score at 37, which represents an average of 2.46 on each Step. On the MoPTA, then, 2.46 generally represents the same thing as a score of 3 on other instruments used by the EPP: the standard has been met. In that context, mean scores of 2.7 (Task 3, Step 3), 2.77 (Task 4, Step 4), and 2.81 (Task 2, Step 2) aggregated over the past two years suggests that candidates are demonstrating the ability to use evidence in their teaching at a level commensurate with state expectations.

1.3: Program-Specific Standards

All EPP programs are accredited by the State Board of Education through processes facilitated by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). Because of changes to state rules regarding certification, all program curricula have undergone revision in the past few years and have, in turn, been reviewed and approved by DESE.

In addition, in 2016 the state instituted a new program review process based upon candidate data. The Annual Performance Reports for Educator Preparation Programs (APR-EPP) have evolved over the past two years, but in each year all programs have been approved to continue recommending teacher candidates for licensure ([AY16 APR-EPP](#); [AY15 APR-EESE](#); [AY15 APR-MSE](#)).

Lastly, a few programs reside in academic departments that have pursued broader accreditation in the field. Both the Instrumental and Vocal Music programs are accredited through the National Association of Schools of Music ([NASM Accreditation Notification](#)), and the Department of Art, which houses the Art Education program, is awaiting a decision based upon an accreditation visit last summer.

1.4: College and Career-Ready Standards

EPP programs are structured to ensure that teacher candidates are prepared to help P-12 students meet appropriate college- and career-ready skills. In particular, faculty aim to help candidates develop the skills necessary to teach students from diverse backgrounds how to think critically. To document this, the EPP relies on two overlapping types of evidence: data related to the teaching of critical thinking and data related to differentiating for diverse students. Two indicators from the Missouri Teacher Standards (MTS), 2.4 and 4.1, address these areas specifically. The EPP has identified several data points that address these two indicators and uses them both individually and in the aggregate to evaluate its programs. Of the 36 indicators associated with the nine MTS, the EPP has identified data relevant to 29 ([Southeast Assessment-Overview and Alignment](#)). Combining responses from mentor teachers and university supervisors at two levels, exiting candidates, first-year teachers, and the principals of first-year teachers from the past two years, composite scores for these two indicators rank 11th (4.1) and 16th (2.4), with both scores being well above the EPP's standard for meeting a particular criterion, a score of 3.

While aggregated data can be useful, it cannot currently be compared to statewide data. To gain a sense of how EPP candidates compare to their Missouri peers, it is necessary to analyze specific data points. For example, Item 38 on the First-Year Teacher Survey (FYTS) and Item 37 on the First-Year Teacher's Principal Survey (FYTPS) reflect on candidates' preparation to teach critical thinking. In both instances, the EPP earns scores higher than the state mean. Similarly, Item 13 on the FYTS and Item 12 on the FYTPS indicate that EPP completers in their first year of teaching and their principals rate the EPP higher than the statewide mean.

1.5: Technology Standards

The EPP's EDvolution initiative emphasizes the infusion of educational technology throughout the curriculum. Teacher candidates are required to have an iPad for use in every pedagogy course in all programs, but the development of skills that transfer across platforms is encouraged. Understanding that simply placing a device in a candidate's hands is not enough, the EPP has developed a structure developmental plan called "Tech for You; Tech for Us; Tech for Them". This sequence focuses, first, on developing candidate familiarity with the iPad. The next stage emphasizes the device's collaborative potential. Finally, the "Tech for Them" step prepares candidates to use personal electronic devices with P-12 students.

Although the use of educational technology is infused throughout all programs, the EPP is still in the process of developing appropriate instruments for assessing related skills and knowledge. As a first step the College of Education Technology Committee created a set of standards based upon the standards provided by the International Society for Technology in Education ([COE Educational Technology Standards](#)). Currently, the Committee is building a rubric that will be used to assess these new EPP standards, with the first collection of data occurring in spring 2018.

Although data that would enable the evaluation of the skills of specific candidates are not yet available, some data on the EPP as a whole are accessible. Three items from the Southeast Exit Survey ([Exit Survey Description and Data](#); items 15, 27-28), the First-Year Teacher Survey ([FYTS and FYTPS Description and Data](#); items 16, 28-29), and the First-Year Teacher's Principal Survey ([FYTS and FYTPS Description and Data](#); items 15, 27-28) provide insight into the preparation of candidates to use educational technology. Candidates complete the exit survey near the end of the culminating field experience, so their responses reflect their perception of their preparation in this area relative to peer

teacher candidates and mentor teachers with whom they interacted during that field experience. FYTS data reflects completers' perceptions of their preparation after a year of teaching, and FYTPS data reflects administrators' views of how well completers were prepared to use educational technology. Although these last two instruments address completers rather than candidates, both explicitly ask respondents to reflect upon the preparation of candidates. In the one year of SES data currently available, candidates ranked their preparation "to use technology as a communication tool" as the 7th strongest of 28 areas and their preparation "to use technology to enhance student learning" as the 12th strongest area of preparation. Preparation to "enhance students' skills in using technology as a communication tool", however ranked only 29th. None of the three areas were scored especially low, however, with the last earning a mean score of 3.39. First-year teachers in 2017, however, ranked preparation to use technology for communication 4th, preparation to use technology to improve student learning as 9th, and preparation to assist students in learning to use technology to communicate as 15th. Administrators working with first-year teachers ranked their skills with educational technology even higher, with the three items ranked as the 2nd, 5th, and 9th strongest areas in which the teachers had been prepared. In regard to all three prompts, both teachers and principals scored the EPP higher than the state mean.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnership and Practice

2.1: Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

During the 2014 and 2015 academic years, EPP personnel met every semester with P-12 representatives from the northern and southern parts of the institution's service region. Invitations were sent to wide range of administrators, but attendance was sparse and inconsistent. In 2016 these regular meetings were suspended while EPP personnel reconsidered how these meetings might be organized to better meet the needs of its partners. As a result, a plan for a new advisory system has been developed to target a more specific group of stakeholders. The first meeting of this new group will take place in early spring of 2018. In the intervening years, however, EPP personnel have continued to communicate regularly with school colleagues. Various combinations of EPP leaders have met with P-12 partners during that time, with the opportunity for input about field experiences being available each time. In 2016 the Dean and the Director of Field Experiences met with the leadership teams from the EPP's two largest school district partners, and in the summer of 2017 representatives from the same districts attended meetings with EPP leaders. Agendas for the meetings were created collaboratively, and there have been documented results. P-12 administrators, for example, requested that teacher candidates be required to pass all certification exams associated with their areas prior to the culminating field experience, and the EPP made that change. They also expressed a need for more substitute teachers. EPP personnel noted that many teacher candidates are available on Fridays, and the administrator indicated that that was a day of particular need. This discussion resulted in the EPP notifying candidates of the opportunity to be a substitute teacher and one of the districts providing training on the EPP's campus. During this break in regularly scheduled meetings, though, the EPP maintained consistent contact with P-12 stakeholders.

While university supervisors in both formative and culminating field experiences regularly deliver feedback provided by teachers and administrators at the schools in which they are working, the Director of the Office of Field Experiences (DOFE) functions as the most consistent liaison between the EPP and P-12 partners. The DOFE communicates regularly with administrators and brings their concerns to the Educator Preparation Program Committee (EPPC). Through this process, P-12 partners do not have to wait until a scheduled meeting to have their concerns addressed. In the spring of 2017 school administrators communicated that they were not content with the structure of the field experiences associated with Introduction to Education as a Profession (ED 280). Working with the DOFE, EPP chairpersons and faculty have revised that field experience over the past two semesters in accordance with P-12 wishes.

The DOFE also attends meetings of the regional superintendents group and the Missouri Association of School Personnel Administrators (MoASPA). In these and other contexts, the DOFE solicits input from P-12 partners. For example, P-12 partners indicated that they were frustrated at being contacted by multiple individuals associated with the EPP, including candidates, on occasion. They requested that there be a single contact through which communication would flow, and the DOFE assumed that role. The DOFE has also been involved in a state-level initiative aimed at improving relationships between EPPs and P-12 districts ([MoTEP State Partnership Goals](#)). This project was initiated as part of Missouri's involvement in CCSSO's Network for Transforming Educator Preparation. It has resulted in the development of a set of recommended practices for training mentor teachers and university supervisors and the creation of a survey instrument that can be used to assess the effectiveness of an EPP-P-12 district relationship ([Strengthening Partnerships Survey](#)). The EPP will soon be using that instrument to evaluate its relationships with districts in the region.

P-12 input is also collected through candidate evaluations completed by mentor teachers in the formative and culminating field experiences. Both evaluations (Formative Field Evaluation and the MEES, respectively) are aligned to Missouri and InTASC Standards, and provide EPP personnel with insight regarding how teacher candidates are applying skills and knowledge in the P-12 classroom. Quantitative data from these instruments are used in combination with multiple other data points to assist the EPP in determining where to direct efforts at improvement, and descriptive feedback provided therein are used to assist candidates in making specific improvements.

Through multiple avenues, P-12 partners assist with continuously improving the effectiveness of EPP programs. Input from mentor teachers, for example, led to the development of the Formative Field Evaluation (FFE), and ongoing feedback from teachers and administrators led to the inclusion of dispositional items related to candidate initiative and use of social media. P-12 partners also help to shape EPP programs in numerous other ways. Administrators work with the DOFE to try to make appropriate matches between candidates and mentor teachers. Curriculum decisions are also influenced by the concerns of school partners. The EPP's award-winning EDvolution initiative began, in part, because administrators shared a concern that completers were not prepared enough to use educational technology.

In an attempt to better acknowledge the value of P-12 partners in ensuring high-quality field experiences, the EPP created the Redhawk Schools of Distinction program in 2016. Schools in which a high percentage of qualified teachers offer to mentor teacher candidates, in either formative or culminating field experiences are publicly recognized. Redhawk Schools of Distinction receive a certificate, a small gift, and a formal expression of gratitude from the Dean of the College of Education.

2.2: Clinical Educators

EPP and P-12 personnel collaborate to make effective field experience matches between teacher candidates, university supervisors, and mentor teachers. Qualification, personality, and teaching styles are considered. Candidates indicate any preferences, and the Office of Field Experiences (OFE) attempts to incorporate that information into its requests to P-12 partners. School administrators consider the information and decides which, if any, of the school's faculty would fit best with the candidate. If any of the parties develops concerns regarding the placement, the OFE communicates immediately with appropriate district personnel. Per the Memorandum of Understanding ([Field Experience MoU](#)), both the P-12 district and the EPP have the right to end a field placement should either feel that conditions have become unfavorable. On occasion, for example, a mentor teacher will fail to meet the demands of mentorship, and a teacher candidate must be transferred to another placement. When sending student teaching requests to P-12 administrators, the EPP provides candidate information to assist partners in selecting an appropriate mentor teacher. This information includes: a background check compliance letter, a substitute teaching certificate, unofficial transcripts, letters of recommendation (if requested), philosophy of education (if requested), and an official application. However, the core criteria for both school-based and EPP-based clinical educators have been set by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE).

Mentor teachers in both formative and culminating field experiences evaluate candidates using the Formative Field Evaluation and the MEES, respectively. These instruments provide school-based clinical educators the opportunity to provide both quantitative and qualitative feedback, and those data are used, individually, to assist specific candidates and, in the aggregate, to assess and improve programs overall.

To improve fairness and interrater reliability, mentor teachers and university supervisors are trained in the use of the MEES in Triad Seminars prior to each semester. During this training, expectations for all three members of the triad—teacher candidates, mentor teachers, and supervisors—are shared so that all stakeholders will have a similar frame of reference. While the in-person training is most effective, much of this information is also available online. Mentors who participate in the Triad Seminars also receive credit for seven hours of professional development.

2.3: Clinical Experiences

Teacher candidates have robust, diverse field experiences. Multiple programs require extensive field experiences in three semesters prior to the culminating field experience, and all require at least two formative field experiences of more than 75 hours ([Field Experience Chart-MSE](#); [Field Experience Chart-EESE](#)). Each field experience is connected to a specific course, and, in many cases, the instructor of that course is also the supervisor of the field experience. In attempting to ensure diverse placements, the Office of Field Experiences (OFE) considers several attributes including race, size of school, community type (e.g. rural, urban, suburban), and grade level. For instance, if a teacher candidate had a formative field placement in a small, rural school with little racial diversity, the next placement would be in a larger district with greater racial diversity. The OFE also makes sure that candidates in programs that cover large age ranges (e.g. Elementary (1-6) or Art Education (K-12)) have field experiences that cover the full range of their certification. Data regarding the characteristics of each field experience are collected and stored in the Redhawk, the EPP's internally developed field experience placement system ([Diverse Field Placement Examples](#)).

Because of the coordination between field experiences and academic courses, teacher candidates are regularly assigned tasks to execute in the P-12 classroom. Candidates frequently complete tasks that mimic those found in the Missouri Preservice Teacher Assessment (MoPTA). While candidates submit tasks for the formal, ETS-constructed MoPTA during the culminating field experience, they submit similar tasks designed to prepare them for that process to instructors as a part of their coursework. These tasks require candidates to evaluate the individual needs of students, design and implement assessments, use assessment results to design lessons, and to report final student results in a manner that documents the degree to which learning occurred. Included in these activities is the requirement that candidates differentiate learning for focus students and report the progress made by these students as documented by assessment data.

The EPP's EDvolution initiative requires that all teacher candidates have an iPad and that they use it in their instruction. Candidates are prepared to use the device to collaborate with colleagues and as an instructional tool.

The EPP evaluates teacher candidates in formative field experiences using the Formative Field Evaluation (FFE) and in the culminating field experience with the MEES. Although these are different instruments, they are both aligned with the Missouri Teacher Standards (MTS) which are, in turn, aligned with the InTASC Standards. Both instruments ask assessors to evaluate candidates based upon actual performance in the classroom, with the MEES requiring a higher level of performance than the FFE.

To address professional dispositions, EPP disposition indicators have been added to the MEES to be addressed each time the candidate is evaluated as opposed to the end of the semester.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

3.1: Plan to Recruit Diverse Candidates and Meet Employment Needs

The EPP has identified five specific goals that will enable it to better meet the employment needs of employers in the region. These are detailed in the Regional Educational Needs Strategy (Regional Educational Needs Strategy), but they focus on the following: increasing the diversity of program completers, increasing the number of completers in the STEM fields, increasing the number of completers prepared to work with students that are ELL, increasing the overall number of TPP completers, and improving the processes by which the employment needs of P-12 schools in the region are identified. Although increasing the number of teachers prepared to work with students with disabilities has been identified by CAEP as an overall area of need, the EPP has chosen not to specifically target that area because of the current strong numbers in the Exceptional Child Education program.

RENS extends beyond a typical recruitment strategy. In harmony with national trends in educator preparation that have shifted focus from inputs to outputs, the plan emphasizes program completers. Increasing the number of completers, for example, in STEM fields requires attention to retention as well as recruitment, and RENS integrates this notion that diverse candidates must not only be convinced to pursue teaching as a career but must also be supported in that pursuit.

3.2: Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement and Ability

Candidates admitted to the Teacher Education Program demonstrate strong academic ability relative to their peers. For example, the mean high school GPA of candidates admitted to the TPP during the fall 2015, spring 2016, fall 2016, and spring 2017 were 3.47, 3.56, 3.45, and 3.60, respectively (TPP Admission Data). During those same semesters, the mean ACT scores of candidates admitted to the Teacher Education Program were 22.32, 23.40, 21.74, and 22.77. Over that period, a score of 22 was at the 63rd percentile for composite scores on the ACT (ACT National Distributions).

3.3: Additional Selectivity Factors

The EPP also uses non-academic data to evaluate candidates at various points in the program. Prior to admission, applicants for candidacy must complete the Missouri Educator Profile (MEP). The MEP is a work style preference inventory based upon the WPI-II (WPI-II Manual) and is normed using Missouri educators (MEP Normative Sample Composition Tables). Students complete the MEP during the introduction to teaching course, ED280, and then discuss their results with their advisor (Sample Student MEP Report). This process is not used to preclude students from entering the TPP but, instead, is intended to help them identify personality and dispositional traits that might make a career in teaching more difficult.

Once admitted to the TPP, teacher candidates are regularly monitored using a simple disposition assessment. The instrument is embedded (Questions 12-22) in an evaluation sent to mentor teachers near the end of every field experience prior to the culminating field experience (Formative Field Evaluation Instrument). Based upon provided criteria, these P-12 partners are asked if they have observed evidence of candidates meeting 11 identified dispositional standards. Once the evaluations have been submitted, university field supervisors discuss the results with each candidate. In addition, each program has chosen two courses in which the disposition assessment is to be completed

by instructors of non-field courses. In either case, if a dispositional issue seems particularly problematic the supervisor or the instructor discusses the situation with the relevant COE chairperson. If these two agree that the issue warrants additional formal measures, they may meet with the candidate to develop an Individualized Disposition Plan (Individualized Disposition Plan). In the IDP, specific goals and measures for meeting those goals are identified. Candidates must meet the IDP goals to continue in the program, and the chairperson reviews the candidate's progress to ensure that this takes place.

3.4: Selectivity During Preparation

The EPP monitors candidates as they progress through the TPP. Particular emphasis is placed on two gateways: admission to the TPP and approval to participate in the culminating field experience. At admission, the EPP ensures that candidates have demonstrated a minimum level of general knowledge and academic ability (overall GPA and passage of the MoGEA), have had the opportunity to explore teaching as a profession (completion of ED280 with a grade of B or better), and have reflected on how their dispositions compare to the field (consultation with advisor regarding the MEP). In order to be approved to begin their culminating field experience, candidates must again demonstrate a degree of knowledge, but the emphasis at this juncture is on the specific knowledge required for teaching rather than the general knowledge evaluated at admission. To demonstrate this knowledge, candidates must pass the certification exam(s) required for their particular area of study and they must have a 3.0 GPA in their content area coursework, all of which is required to be completed prior by this point in the program. Although there is not a specific minimum GPA required for professional education coursework (all of which must also be completed prior to the culminating field experience), these classes must be completed with the grade of C or above, and a candidate who earns less than C in a course twice is removed from the program.

While there are two explicit gateways, the EPP monitors candidates throughout. Mentor teachers are asked to complete the Formative Field Evaluation (Formative Field Evaluation Instrument) in every field experience. The data generated by the instrument are then reviewed by the university instructor who is supervising the particular field experience, and the instructor and the candidate discuss the evaluation. If the evaluation appears to indicate problems that may endure into the next field experience, the instructor meets with the chairpersons to determine if additional measures need to be taken. The FFE includes a final prompt which asks the mentor teacher to assign a level of confidence he or she has in the candidate's potential for success at the next level of field experience. If the mentor teacher's response suggests significant concerns, an automated notification is sent to the Associate Dean who, in turn, notifies the relevant chairperson(s), instructors, and program coordinators. It is unusual for a mentor teacher to express such a low level of confidence, so this "flag" always triggers a meeting with the relevant faculty to try to address the identified issues prior to the next field experience.

3.5: Selection at Completion

The EPP seeks to ensure that all completers are prepared to be effective teachers on their first day as a teaching professional. To that end candidates are evaluated in multiple ways before being recommended for certification. First, to demonstrate adequate content knowledge, candidates must pass the Missouri Content Assessment(s) (MoCA) required for their licensure area and, also, have earned a GPA of 3.0 or above in their content area as a prerequisite to being allowed to begin their culminating field experience. Alternately, a content GPA of 2.75, combined with a score on the MoCA that is at least 1 standard error of the mean above the state-mandated passing score, will qualify a

candidate for the culminating field experience. Ability to apply content knowledge in the P-12 classroom is documented through supervisor and mentor teacher responses to Item 1.1 on the MEES

General candidate effectiveness in the P-12 classroom is documented through the use of the MEES, overall. In particular, Items 1.2 and 4.1 assess candidates' ability to engage students in learning. Other items (e.g. Classroom Management (5.1), Effective Use of Assessments (7.1), and Differentiated Lesson Design (2.4) provide evidence that university supervisors and mentor teachers have observed professional behavior related to effective teaching.

While the Formative Field Evaluation (Formative Field Evaluation Instrument) is not used during the final semester, it is employed during the penultimate field experience, and it includes an item that provides some evidence about a candidate's direct impact on student learning. On Item 3, the mentor teacher is asked to document observation of demonstrable progress by students toward meeting the identified learning goals. Although this is limited data point, in combination with MEES data collected during the following semester, it suggests that teacher candidates are consistently able to successfully engage P-12 students in learning.

3.6: Expectations of the Profession

All candidates take coursework that addresses ethical and legal issues surrounding teaching. The majority of candidates take UI 506 Education Law and Society, and for the candidates in 9-12 and K-12 programs that do not take that course, those issues are integrated into their pedagogy courses. All teacher candidates also take at least one course in working with exceptional children, and those courses specifically cover legal issues. The EPP does not currently, though, have a process for gathering relevant, standardized data about these topics. Faculty are working to remedy this situation.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1: Impact on P-12 Student Learning

Currently, the EPP only has one source of data that allows it to directly assess completer impact on P-12 student learning. Item 39b of the First-Year Teacher's Principal Survey ([FYTS and FYTPS Description and Data](#)) asks administrators to rate the teacher's impact on the learning of students in the P-12 classroom. At this time data for only two years is available (2016 and 2017), but EPP completers have been rated favorably in those years, earning mean scores of 3.21 (2016) and 3.15 (2017) on a scale of 4. In both years EPP completers also earned higher scores than did their peers across the state.

EPP personnel are working on two projects to collect additional evidence of completer impact on P-12 learning. First, each year EPP faculty teach multiple graduate courses in which students complete action research studies. Many of these students completed one of more of the EPP's initial teacher preparation programs. Faculty are standardizing protocols for identifying appropriate graduate students, designing action research studies, and collecting data. Data from at least one semester will be available in the fall of 2018. The second project designed to assess impact on P-12 learning involves P-12 partners. Local districts have access to student data generated through standardized and local assessments. These data can be associated with specific teachers who can, in turn, be associated with particular educator preparation programs. The EPP is collaborating with local administrators to finalize the details for how these data can be collected, organized, and analyzed. This joint venture will enable the EPP to better understand how its completers compare to those who completed other programs and will allow local districts to make more informed hiring decisions.

4.2: Effective Application of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

The FYTPS also provides evidence that completers "effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions" for which the EPP's programs were designed. Based upon their observations, principals of first-year teachers are asked to evaluate the teacher's preparation to achieve certain tasks in the classroom ([FYTS and FYTPS Description and Data](#)). On a 4-point scale, EPP completers have earned mean scores of 3.24, 3.23, and 3.20 in 2017, 2016, and 2015, respectively. Over the same period, the relevant administrators have rated EPP completers higher than principals, statewide, have rated their own first-year teachers. Over the three-year period, EPP completers earned a higher rating than their statewide peers on 35 of 39 items, with classroom management being the area, generally, with the widest difference. Employers are clearly observing evidence of positive professional behavior from EPP completers.

4.3: Employer Satisfaction

Employer satisfaction with EPP completers seems strong. As noted above, administrators consistently record being pleased with the preparation EPP completers have received ([FYTS and FYTPS Description and Data](#)). Analyzing administrator observations regarding specific skills and behavior suggests a positive level of satisfaction, but the FYTPS also includes a prompt that reflects specifically on this question. Item 39 asks principals of first-year teachers to rate the overall quality of the EPP that prepared the teacher in question. Over the past three years principals have assigned the EPP a mean rating of 3.22, which is higher than their peers rated other EPPs across the state.

Employer satisfaction can also be gleaned from retention of EPP completers in P-12 school positions. Employment and retention data were only recently made available by the state, and only a

few years of data are available ([Employment and Retention Data](#)). However, in 2016 the EPP had 274 completers serving as first-year teachers. In 2017, there were 245 second-year teachers who were also completers of the EPP for a retention rate of 89.5%. Similarly, the retention rate between second-year teachers in 2016 and third-year teachers in 2017 was 85%. Data for Academic Year 2018 will be made available by the state in summer 2018.

4.4: Completer Satisfaction

Completers are largely satisfied with the preparation they receive. On the 38 individual indicators on the First-Year Teacher Survey ([FYTS and FYTPS Description and Data](#)), EPP completers assigned their preparation an aggregate mean score of 3.3 on a 4-point scale over the past three years, with 35 of those 38 items being rated at 3.0 or higher. In addition, EPP completers rated their preparation related to 28 of the 38 indicators higher than did their peers across the state. Completers seem particularly satisfied with their preparation to use educational technology.

Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

5.1: Multiple Monitoring Measures

The EPP collects relevant data in systematic ways and constantly seeks to improve those methods. In particular, faculty and staff have sought to improve efficiency of data collection, analysis, and dissemination using electronic tools. The development of Redhawk, the EPP's internally-created field placement system, has been a major project in this area. Data from both the Formative Field Evaluation (FFE) and the MEES are collected using Redhawk. When field placements are made in this system, a link is generated to a copy of the FFE in which the candidate's name and the mentor teacher's name has been inserted. Mentor teachers are then sent this link in the last third of the semester, and their responses are recorded in Redhawk. University supervisors can monitor these as they are submitted, enabling them to discuss FFE feedback prior to the end of the semester and helping candidates to reflect on how they might improve their practices prior to the next semester. FFE results for a given candidate, for all candidates in a course, or for all candidates in field experiences during a specific semester can be exported in CSV format. Similarly, university supervisors and mentor teachers involved in the culminating field experience complete the MEES in Redhawk. Formative assessments using the instrument are conducted at regular points in the semester, and teacher candidates can access these results to develop improvement plans. Final results may be viewed in Redhawk by candidates, university supervisors, mentor teachers, the Director of the Office of Field Experiences, and the Associate Dean. Data on all candidates in each semester can be exported in CSV format for distribution to programs.

The ability to export data in bulk from Redhawk has increased in value over the past year as the EPP has begun using the electronic assessment system Chalk & Wire. Data exported from Redhawk, provided by third-party vendors, and submitted directly into Chalk & Wire are now available to administrators and program coordinators from a single source. The Office of the Associate Dean has provided faculty with online directions for generating a variety of reports, and training sessions have been offered, also. In an effort to increase the value of time spent on assessment, faculty have been encouraged to link assignments in the institution's learning management system, Moodle, to Chalk & Wire so that candidates might submit key assessment artifacts directly to Chalk & Wire where faculty can score them a single time. In the fall of 2017 faculty completed the Candidate Disposition Evaluation (CDE) in Chalk & Wire for the first time. Overall, significant progress has been made toward creating a data management system that increases the ease of data collection and access to data by a larger number of stakeholders.

While the Associate Dean has formal responsibility for maintaining the assessment system, faculty and staff across the EPP regularly suggest improvements based upon their own interaction with the system. In addition to leading the College of Education Assessment Committee (CEAC) and the Educator Preparation Program Committee (EPPC), the Associate Dean regularly attends department meetings and College Council. These are all opportunities for faculty and staff to recommend revisions of the system. In addition, CEAC and EPPC regularly and intentionally address specific aspects of the system. For example, in the fall of 2017 CEAC reviewed the alignment of the FFE with the Missouri Teacher Standards, revised the guidelines for the Annual Program Evaluations (APE), and adjusted the timing for sending notifications about the FFE ([COE Assessment Committee Minutes-AY16 and AY17](#)). Lastly, the Associate Dean encourages EPP personnel to contact him directly when some part of the system functions incorrectly or inefficiently. While this last approach is less systematic than the regular reviews of committees, it is more organic. It does not rely on scheduled meetings but, instead, generates change out of the lived experiences of faculty and staff attempting to collect and use the data needed to make evidence-based decisions.

5.2: Relevant, Verifiable, Representative, Cumulative, and Actionable Measures

Most of the instruments used across the Teacher Preparation Program (TPP) are third-party assessments for which validity and reliability studies are the responsibility of the third-party provider. The Missouri Educator Profile (MEP) and the Missouri Content Assessments (MoCA) were created by Pearson, and the Missouri Preservice Teacher Assessment (MoPTA) was developed by ETS. The MEES, the First-Year Teacher Survey (FYTS), and the First-Year Teacher's Principal Survey (FYTPS) were all created by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), and their usage is mandated by that entity. Although the MEES is mandated by the state, the Director of the Office of Field Experiences provides training for mentor teachers and university supervisors in order to increase interrater reliability. The Southeast Exit Survey (SES) uses the same questions as the FYTS.

Although faculty are developing additional assessment tools, the only instruments currently used TPP-wide that were not created by DESE or a testing company are the Formative Field Evaluation (FFE) and the **Candidate Disposition Evaluation (CDE)**. The FFE is clearly aligned to the Missouri Teacher Standards (MTS). Mentor teachers are provided with guidance for completing the evaluation in the introductory notification and by university supervisors. Mentor teachers are provided with similar guidance in completing the CDE (which is attached to the FFE).

EPP personnel recognize that data are most useful when they are used in combination. No decisions are made based upon a single data point, and strengths and weaknesses identified by multiple measures are considered most actionable. To this end, the EPP has developed tables that facilitate triangulation based upon state and InTASC standards ([Aggregate Program Scores Aligned with MTS and InTASC](#)). These tables enable faculty and staff to compare multiple pieces of data—gathered at various points—aligned with particular standards. This tool also enables gap analysis, helping EPP personnel to identify those areas in which data are few or nonexistent.

5.3: Continuous Improvement Measures

The EPP creates regular opportunities for faculty and staff to review data and to suggest actions for improvement. Data of various kinds are frequently brought to department meetings, CEAC, and EPPC by the Dean, the Associate Dean, and the Director of the Office of Field Experiences (COE Assessment Committee Minutes, EPPC Minutes, MSE Minutes, EESE Minutes, and ELC Minutes). In addition, faculty and staff may access data directly through the Redhawk (FFE and MEES) and Chalk & Wire systems. While being provided with data by meeting organizers and guests may stimulate discussion leading to program changes, providing personnel with access to data on demand allows for a more constant review and revision of aspects of the assessment system that are most used.

The largest, most systematic continuous improvement project is the Annual Program Evaluation (APE). The APE process ([Guidelines for COE APE-AY2017](#)) requires program faculty to evaluate their program against the Missouri Teacher Standards (Missouri Teacher Standards). Reports are based upon data generated by program candidates who completed the program during the previous academic year. The reports are submitted in the fall, and then members of the College of Education Assessment Committee (CEAC) review them and provide feedback ([APE Review Form 2016](#)). In the course of preparing the APE report, faculty must analyze data and make judgments about the degree to which program completers are meeting expectations on the nine state standards. Based upon these judgments, they then identify a few specific changes that they will attempt to make over the next year in order to address relative deficiencies or build upon relative strengths. The very first section of the APE report is an update on the changes proposed the previous year. Data upon which proposed changes were based is referenced both

in this first section and in the section of the report that describes changes planned for the coming year ([Annual Program Evaluations AY2017](#)). APE processes themselves have evolved over the past few years in response to faculty feedback and so are, also, an example of EPP efforts at continuous improvement.

While evidence-based changes often occur at the program level and, so, are documented in the APE reports, the EPP has made a few notable alterations across its Teacher Preparation Program based upon available evidence. First, the first steps toward what would become the EDvolution initiative were made in response to regional school administrators' concerns that EPP completers were not prepared to effectively use educational technology. These comments were supported by results of the First-Year Teacher Survey (FYTS) and the First-Year Teacher's Principal Survey (FYTPS). Since the creation of EDvolution, however, responses to questions related to educational technology on both surveys have become more positive (FYTS and FYTPS Description and Data). Administrator input also led to the addition of a requirement for participation in the culminating field experience. Administrators asked that teacher candidates be required to pass all exams (MoCA) needed for certification in their areas. P-12 school personnel indicated that this would allow them to approve placements in the culminating field experience with greater confidence and would also enable them to assess effective candidates for open positions without fear that the candidate might not ultimately qualify for certification.

5.4: Use of Completer Impact Data

The EPP collects data to assess its impact, generally, on P-12 education in the region. Faculty and staff are working to develop more ways to measure, specifically, impact on student learning, but the one piece of data currently available, a response to a question on the First-Year Teacher's Principal Survey indicates that administrators are observing positive completer impact on P-12 student learning in their buildings. Similarly, responses from these same administrators suggest that EPP completers are effective during their first year—both objectively and relative to their peers across the state ([FYTS and FYTPS Description and Data](#)). Broadly, the FYTPS suggests that employers are pleased with the preparation their teachers received in EPP programs. Limited data available on retention in schools corroborates this conclusion ([Employment and Retention Data](#)). Completer responses on the First-Year Teacher Survey also indicate general satisfaction with the EPP.

Of course, these data also indicate that there is room for improvement. EPP personnel review these data annually in order to try to identify ways in which programs might better address weaknesses and build upon strengths. These data are made available to the public on the EPP's website, and they are also provided to regional P-12 stakeholders. As the EPP reinstates regularly scheduled meetings with area administrators, these data will be shared even more systematically.

The EPP also reviews data on outcome measures, although these seem to have less value for program improvement. While there are instances of candidates being removed or leaving EPP programs, the vast majority complete. The EPP attempts to provide potential candidates with opportunities to learn about the field of teaching prior to applying for admission to the Teacher Preparation Program, but personnel realize that more intense field experiences occasionally lead candidates to change their minds. Faculty and staff work with these candidates to help them find alternative professional opportunities, so candidates making informed decisions that teaching is not the appropriate professional path for them is not necessarily considered a negative outcome. Except for a few candidates who decide during the culminating field experience that they do not wish to be teachers and, therefore, do not submit some part of their MoPTA, all candidates complete their programs having met the state-mandated criteria for licensure. The EPP encourages all completers to apply for licensure immediately after graduation since requirements might change, but some completers still choose not to do so. Employment data has only

recently been made available by the state, and it is only available for public schools in Missouri. Since the EPP lies near the borders with four other states, it is unclear how those employment data should be interpreted.

5.5: Involvement of Stakeholders.

The EPP involves stakeholders in decision-making in multiple ways. Regular opportunities are organized for candidates, completers, teachers, and administrators to provide input. One venue for candidates to offer feedback is in the Student Advisory Board meetings hosted by the Dean. Leaders of all student organizations are invited to participate in twice during each semester. This group noted weaknesses in communication which led the Office of the Associate Dean to start publishing a weekly newsletter ([COE News AY18](#)). Advisory board members have since indicated that this additional source of information has been helpful.

The EPP seeks input from completers (aka alumni) via two surveys. The first is an exit survey ([Exit Survey Description and Data](#)) that candidates are asked to complete near the end of the culminating field experience. Although these novice educators are not officially “completers” at this point, they have for all practical purposes completed the program. The exit survey provides the EPP with data that can, later, be compared with that collected in the First-Year Teacher Survey ([Exit Survey Description and Data](#)). Although specific individuals cannot be explicitly matched, comparison of the two sets of data offer some insight into how program completers judge their preparation immediately at its end and, also, after spending a year as a professional teacher. Given the strong regional influence of Southeast Missouri State University, it should be noted that any feedback from educators in the area is likely to also be feedback from alumni.

Practicing teachers play an essential role in the preparation process, and their input is valued. Each semester, hundreds volunteer to mentor teacher candidates during field experiences. During the semester, these teachers interact informally with university supervisors, providing invaluable anecdotal information. Mentor teachers also complete the Formative Field Evaluation ([Formative Field Evaluation Instrument](#)), completed at the end of experiences prior to the culminating field experience, and the MEES, completed throughout the culminating field experience. Anecdotal data spurred the EPP to revise the FFE a few years ago because mentor teachers complained that it was too long and unclear. In addition to shortening and clarifying the FFE, the EPP also began distributing it electronically. Mentor teachers have responded positively to this change. The FFE and the MEES have been valuable sources of feedback, enabling the EPP, overall, and individual programs, specifically, to identify candidate strengths and weaknesses that exhibit themselves in the P-12 context.

The EPP also solicits feedback from P-12 administrators. These individuals are frequently composites of all the other stakeholders listed above. Many are completers of both initial and advanced programs offered by the EPP, have mentored EPP candidates as teachers, and now play a major role in coordinating field experiences and making hiring decisions. Given the importance and complexity of the relationship between P-12 administrators and the EPP, special attention is given to maintaining open lines of communication. Within the last five years the EPP held formal meetings with administrators each semester, but multiple unexpected projects undermined the scheduling of these in the last few years. Those formal, semiannual meetings will commence again in spring 2018. Despite this pause in regular meetings, EPP personnel have continued to maintain close contact with P-12 administrators. In 2014 and 2015 faculty revised all EPP programs in response to new state rules. When the new curricula were completed, departmental chairpersons met with P-12 administrators to help them better

understand the new programs, and principals and central office staff recently visited the EDvolution Center to determine how it might be used as a resource for their districts. The Director of the Office of Field Experiences has played the largest role in collecting input from school administrators in the region. In response to concerns channeled through her, requests for field placements have been made simpler. Recently, in response to concerns expressed by administrators in the region, work began on revising the field experience in Introduction to Education as a Profession (ED280). As noted above, the EPP also made major changes in its educational technology curriculum and its requirements for participating in the culminating field experience because of input from P-12 administrators.

Diversity

Standard 1: Candidates must demonstrate skills and commitment that provide all P-12 students access to rigorous college and career ready standards.

The EPP is committed to preparing teacher candidates to work with diverse students. To that end, it integrates knowledge and skills related to differentiating for the unique needs of all students throughout its programs. Data on diversity proficiencies is collected predominantly through evaluations completed on candidates during field experiences. Prompt 10 on the Formative Field Evaluation (Formative Field Evaluation Instrument) asks about appropriate differentiation and Prompt 18 in the disposition section of that instrument asks for information regarding the candidate's sensitivities to issues relate to differentiation and diversity. Items 2.4 and 3.2 on the MEES ([MEES Instrument](#)) assesses the degree to which teacher candidates both plan for and execute lessons for diverse students with unique needs. Faculty and staff review the quantitative data provided by these instruments while also considering comments included by mentor teachers and university supervisors.

Standard 2: Clinical experiences prepare candidates to work with all students.

The EPP has created a database system that facilitates the careful tracking of field experiences. The Office of Field Experience records a variety of data on each field experience in the Redhawk system. Subsequent field placement decisions are informed by data included in this database to ensure that our candidates have the opportunity to work with students from diverse backgrounds and, often, age groups. ([Diverse Field Placement Examples](#))

Standard 3: Providers are committed to outreach efforts to recruit a more able and diverse candidate pool.

The EPP's recruitment and retention plan ([Regional Educational Needs Strategy](#)) includes specific efforts to recruit a more diverse candidate pool. Initiatives toward this end have included starting a Holmes Group project, working with regional districts to develop Grow-Your-Own projects, and targeting testing supports toward candidates (and potential candidates) whose educational backgrounds places them at risk.

Technology

Standard 1: Endorses InTASC teacher standards. Providers are to "...ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students and improving learning and enrich professional practice."

The EPP does not effectively evaluate and record teacher candidate progress toward meeting technology standards. This is ironic because the EPP has been a leader in the state and nation in integrating educational technology throughout the curriculum. The award-winning EDvolution initiative has ensured that candidates will—in every course—practice using educational technology in a classroom setting. Each candidate has a personal device (iPad) and is expected to use daily. In addition, the EDvolution Center houses state-of-the-art technology resources (e.g. video creating and editing, 3D printers, collaboration stations) that are in constant use by candidates. However, the EPP has not developed tools for assessing candidates' proficiencies with all of these tools. The EPP is, however, addressing this. A set of technology standards has been developed ([COE Educational Technology Standards](#)), and rubrics are under construction. Some EPP-wide assessment of educational technology will take place in spring 2018. While the EPP does need to develop more in-program assessments in this area, exit survey and first-year data provide some information in this area ([Exit Survey Description and Data](#); [FYTS and FYTPS Description and Data](#)). In particular, the surveys completed by the principals of first-year teachers provide important feedback regarding the technology skills of completers.

Standard 2:

"Partners co-construct ...technology-enhanced learning opportunities" (2.1)

The EDvolution initiative was a direct result of feedback from local P-12 administrators. These educators noted that first-year teachers often lacked proficiency with various technologies. In addition, several noted that their districts were planning to initiate 1:1 projects and that they would need teachers able to adjust their pedagogy to meet these new demands. Responses from both first-year teachers and their principals over the past few years suggest that completers are improving in this area ([FYTS and FYTPS Description and Data](#)).

"In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications" (2.2)

"Clinical experiences, including technology-based collaborations" (2.3)

Standard 3: Candidates integrate technology into all learning domains.

Response to Previous AFIs

Response to Areas for Improvement (AFIs) from Previous Accreditation Decisions

Statement of progress and supporting evidence for removing the AFI(s)

NCATE Standard 4: The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates demonstrate the diversity proficiencies identified by the unit.

The EPP collects data on diversity proficiencies predominantly through evaluations completed on candidates during field experiences. Prompt 10 on the Formative Field Evaluation (Formative Field Evaluation Instrument) asks about appropriate differentiation and Prompt 18 in the disposition section of that instrument asks for information regarding the candidate's sensitivities to issues relate to differentiation and diversity. Items 2.4 and 3.2 on the MEES (MEES Instrument) assesses the degree to which teacher candidates both plan for and execute lessons for diverse students with unique needs.

NCATE Standard 4: The unit does not systematically track field placements to ensure that all candidates have opportunities to work with students from diverse groups.

The EPP has created a database system that facilitates the careful tracking of field experiences. The Office of Field Experience records a variety of data on each field experience in the Redhawk system. Subsequent field placement decisions are informed by data included in this database to ensure that our candidates have the opportunity to work with students from diverse backgrounds and, often, age groups. (Diverse Field Placement Examples)

NCATE Standard 5: Not all cooperating teachers meet the state and unit qualifications for supervision of student teachers.

The Office of Field Experiences (OFE) has increased efforts to inform school administrators of requirements for cooperating teachers (Field Experience MoU). The OFE is also engaged in enhancing processes for collecting data about cooperating teachers in order to be able to document their eligibility. Lastly, the OFE has created the Redhawk field placement system in which administrators match candidates to cooperating teachers. Data on teacher qualifications are stored in the system, and teachers do not appear as options to be mentor teachers in the system if they do not meet required qualifications.

NCATE Standard 5: The evaluation process for unit faculty is not consistent across programs.

The chairpersons, in conjunction with the dean, have worked to ensure that all faculty members are fully aware of the criteria and processes associated with regular evaluations, promotion, and tenure. Guidelines are available to faculty on a shared storage drive. In addition, the dean of the college has met with chairpersons to discuss the evaluation process, generally, and to review specific evaluations of particular faculty in order to ensure that all persons are afforded equal opportunities for constructive feedback.