

2018 EPP Annual Report

| | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----|
| CAEP ID: | 10558 | AACTE SID: | 980 |
| Institution: | East Central University | | |
| Unit: | Teacher Preparation Program | | |

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 204

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

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

9

Link: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1FSpj29j8Ji19F_TSnrtTYKIJhUwhYjqe

Description of data accessible via link: [5.1 Graduation Rates Initial and Advanced Programs](#)

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

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

10

Link: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1ZwPsqY8nddzITSdOEGD4cG68K9xSCHn8>

Description of data accessible via link: [5.2 Retention Rates Initial Programs](#)

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

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

11

Link: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1zColMj7orE2e4X9jSbBm8FJiJbOVQ2_x

Description of data accessible via link: [6.1 Title 2 Reports](#)

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

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

12

Link: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1F_QnRX8EcfJ7vHoZ4kyYbuy3T6yJ38ls

Description of data accessible via link: [7.1 Initial and Advanced Candidate Employment 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advanced-Level Programs | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

13

Link: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1I2sj3AXNnyWm6KvCOESm4SeN1p0gmK7v>

Description of data accessible via link: [8.1 ECU Default Rate Report](#)

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial

and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

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

14

Link: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1v8qHf1YuBoH1HOvVJbSOv7e1_9Ku83c5

Description of data accessible via link: Default Rate Summary Table

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

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

Our final NCATE focused visit was in fall, 2015. Since then, we have revisited all evaluation instruments and aligned them to CAEP, INTASC and SPA requirements. Meetings and input from school partners, students and education faculty resulted in feedback that we addressed before all assessments and program changes went live in fall 2017. The link to our Program Information, Assessments and Assessment Data has the current documents in use and data if data is available. While I feel that our EPP is making great strides in transitioning to CAEP from NCATE, being a legacy institution greatly impacted the speed at which we have been able to make this transition.

Measure 1: ECU will be gathering data on Impact on P-12 Learning and Development spring, 2018. The IRB indicates that we have an approved research design and can proceed with the study (IRB letter approval 1.1; IRB application 1.2: Annual Reporting Measure 1: Component 4.1). A table of data from our piloted Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT) has also been loaded (PPAT data 1.3: Annual Reporting Measure 1: Component 4.1). Data from both cycles of evaluations indicate that Task 3 and Task 4 are areas that need further work: Designing Instruction for Student Learning (TASK 3) and Implementation and Analyzing Instruction to Promote Learning (TASK 4). The learning curve was steep for this performance assessment and based on these scores we have implemented many program changes which are delineated in Section 6. We will be analyzing data to determine if the program changes result in an increase in PPAT scores. ECU will have data to compare PPAT scores prior to program changes and after program changes have implemented beginning in fall, 2017.

Measure 2: ECU's redesigned student teaching evaluation was implemented in fall, 2017 (2.1 Student Teacher Evaluation: Component 4.2). This instrument can be found at the website under the tab Initial Assessments. We identified some areas of weakness with the assessment instrument and data. For example, the numbers for students and cooperating teachers were less than the university supervisors' "N" possibly skewing data. In addition, standards 4 and 5 were lumped together as one outcome. Even though all cumulative averages were above 3.0 out of 4.0 or better than 80%, Standard 6 data points were the lowest for fall 2016 and spring 2017. This standard focuses on assessment in the classroom. The assessment instruments and process improvements that we have made since then are delineated in Section 6. Fall 2017, new assessments were approved and used. That data will be available for next year's report.

Measure 3: Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones are partially captured in the Annual First Year Teacher Survey conducted by the Office of Educator Quality and Accountability in Oklahoma (OEQA) for initial candidates. Employment Milestones are not yet collected and distributed to EPPs and this area is identified as a challenge in section 7 on transitions. For initial graduates for two cycles of data available, administrators were overwhelming positive about the quality and performance of ECU's completers. The data indicate that in 2015 95% of the responses were positive. In 2016 data indicate that 100% of the responses were positive (3.1 Employer Satisfaction Initial Candidates: Component 4.3/A.4.1). For the advanced level, we are in the process of collecting the data since the instruments had to be specific to each program and aligned.

Measure 4: Satisfaction of completers. Satisfaction of completers is also captured by the First Year Teacher Survey conducted by (OEQA) for initial programs. The table includes data from the items we have used in this report (4.1 Completer Satisfaction Initial Level: Component 4.4). Comprehensive tables are in construction that will include data from each item on the survey. In 2015 there were 31 questions and in 2016 there were 24 questions. The survey from OEQA has been revised and should be consistent in the future. The specific question about program satisfaction was not asked in the 2015 survey but the 2016 survey indicated that 94% of the completers who responded either Somewhat Agreed, Agreed or Strongly Agreed. We are in the process of developing a program completer survey for each program to be completed at the end of student teaching. This will be another measure to support data we get from OEQA. Advanced level candidates complete a program satisfaction survey at the end of their programs. One cycle of data is available which indicates that candidates are very satisfied with their program with an average of 4.6 out of 5.

The table disaggregates the satisfaction data by program (4.2 Completer Satisfaction Advanced Level: Component A.4.2). Measure 5: Graduation Rates. The tables uploaded for Graduation Rates include information from 2015-16 and 2016-17. Admission to Teacher Education data and graduation rates of those who graduated during the time period do not indicate trends (5.1 Graduation Rates Initial and Advanced Programs). The university implemented a new Student Management system in 2015-16 which allows us to get accurate information about our candidates' graduation rates. The retention rates are high for the education department as the second uploaded document indicates (5.2 Retention Rates Initial Programs). Advanced candidate retention rates are not yet available but the first cycle will be included in next year's report.

6. The number of candidates who complete our programs has declined over the past three years as evidenced by the Title 2 reports. Last year we saw an indication of our numbers stabilizing which was positive but the numbers of candidates in the pipeline have decreased in the 2017-18 year not yet captured in Title 2 data (6.1 Title 2 Reports). Our recruitment and retention focus has intensified with the addition of a Director of the Math and Science Education Institute and outreach by education faculty and recruitment at high school events. The result of these efforts have not yet been captured in data. The state of Oklahoma just passed a \$6000.00 increase in teacher pay to be implemented over the next three years. This should also contribute to an increase in enrollment. Those who complete the coursework in our programs are well prepared to complete certification requirements with one outlier, Early Childhood Education. These candidates are not passing their Oklahoma Subject Matter test. While the scores of our candidates are close to the scores of candidates across the state, a new Early Childhood Director has been named and curriculum revisions are being made. Advanced level program data indicate that ECU had 132 completers who finished programs and successfully passed certification exams. We do not get data to show who finished programs at the advanced level but did not take or did not pass certification exams.

7. ECU completers are hired in the state of Oklahoma without any difficulty. The nationwide teacher shortage is more critical in Oklahoma. Our traditional candidates are hired for the next year prior to completing student teaching. The data table uploaded indicates that some of our candidates are staying in Oklahoma (7.1 Initial and Advanced Candidate Employment Data). While this is encouraging the state of Oklahoma has issued over 1000 emergency certifications. The number of alternatively certified teachers has also increased. While our completers are being hired, our attempts at tracking graduates who leave the state has been unreliable and therefore, we are unable to get the statistics to determine how many of our candidates are teaching in field and how many are teaching out of field and the percentage of our completers who actually do teach.

8. The default rates provided are university rates (8.1 ECU Default Rate Report and 8.2 Default Rate Summary Table). ECU ranks above the nation in default rates by a percentage point. The average default rate for the latest 3 year cohort was 12.3. The national default rate was 11%. The EPP is working with Institutional Research Office to isolate the Education Completers to get more specific data on Education Candidates.

The changes that are being made to the EPP as a result of data analysis are summarized in detail in Section 6: Continuous Improvement. The changes that have been made, especially in the area of technology and assessment have been widespread. We have the instruments in place now to ensure that we are gathering accurate data to make informed decisions concerning our EPP at the initial and advanced levels. We have worked with students, education faculty and community partners to revise our program documents and we share this information with all education faculty at an annual retreat, teachers and administrators at a bi-annual cooperating teacher forum and with stakeholders through our website. All program changes have resulted from data that is gathered systematically so that data can drive the decisions that are made to ensure our candidates are ready for the P-12 classroom with the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to ensure student learning.

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.

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. The unit lacks procedures to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessment measures used to evaluate candidate performance in field placements. (ADV)

The previous Institutional Report identified assessment measures in our field placements as being problematic. From that feedback from NCATE, the Advanced Programs underwent dramatic changes. Prior to the previous institutional report, advanced programs at ECU worked mostly as independent units within an EPP. While the undergraduate program received accreditation without any AFI's, it was clear the advanced program assessment procedures needed to determine continuous improvement needed to be redesigned. While the AFI focuses on our assessment measures used to evaluate candidate performance in field placements, the changes in our evaluation instruments and processes were holistic and resulted in much more cohesive programs that have reliable instruments used to make determinations about candidate mastery of the objectives of the field placements. The first process implemented after appointing a Graduate Program Coordinator (3 credit hour reassigned time) was to standardize admission processes which ensured that we admitted high quality candidates. Second, processes were implemented to gather field placement data from all programs. Within this step was a comprehensive reevaluation of all field placement objectives and assignments. At this point it was clear that program director turnover had greatly impacted the quality of the field placements or our ability to capture necessary evidence. Each program director worked individually with the Graduate Program coordinator, NCATE head, and assessment coordinator to align their field experience documents with Unit, NCATE, and SPA standards. The alignment resulted in the development of assessment instruments that allowed the EPP to gather systematic data to determine whether our candidates were meeting or exceeding standards. Now we are using valid and reliable instruments to assess field experiences. Assessment instruments were reviewed by education faculty, current students, and former students who had graduated from our programs. Changes were made based on that feedback. The current instruments are completed by the supervisor at the placement site and the university supervisor to evaluate candidate performance in all field experience placements. These evaluations are reflected upon and uploaded into Chalk and Wire and then assessed using a rubric. Program Directors and the assessment

coordinator review this information each semester for any gaps that need to be addressed with program changes. This provides our EPP with multiple measures of our candidates' field experience effectiveness. This alignment also led to the development of individual graduate program handbooks with expectations clearly stated for the program, for field experiences, and for certification. All field experience data is collected and utilized for individual SPA reports. We are in the process of moving this data point to each individual program's annual report. While some programs utilize this data for the internal report required annually, not all program directors have used this as a data point. After the last SPA report submission, it became clear that this data is a necessary piece to review annually for program improvement. Candidate Performance" during their practicum.

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. There is limited evidence that candidates participate in field experiences or clinical practice that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups. (ADV)

East Central University is in the heart of south central Oklahoma. The traditional service area where most ECU advanced candidates' practicums and field experiences occur have students with above state averages in ethnic minorities, low socioeconomic (as determined by free and reduced lunches), and exceptionalities (link). Program directors require advanced candidates to upload practicum or field experience data into their electronic Chalk and Wire Portfolio. Credentials of the practicum supervisor as well as location of the practicum and locations are tracked to determine that Advanced level candidates are receiving diverse field experiences which ensure that candidates have the knowledge necessary to teach and impact diverse students in diverse settings. Program directors provide a list of approved practicum or internship sites to the Assessment Coordinator for review. Additionally, the program director reviews the credentials of the practicum or internship supervisor to ensure that the licensing area for which the advanced candidate is being prepared is an area the supervisor has had experience in and is credentialed for. In addition to tracking practicum and internship placements and supervisor credentials, all advanced programs have implemented course assignments specifically to address diversity issues. The assignments and rubric scores are tracked in the candidate program portfolios and data are reported in individual SPA reports. The changes in the advanced program that resulted from the previous Institutional Report have worked to provide assurances that our advanced candidates are prepared to work with all students in a school setting. These changes include standardized processes to gather all field placement data including hours logged, credentials of supervising teachers, placement demographics, disposition data, and revised practicum and internship rubrics. Requiring candidates to complete electronic portfolios ensures continuity in our programs regardless of faculty turnover. Maintaining a half time assessment coordinator ensures that unit data is collected yearly. Appointing a Graduate Program Coordinator has ensured that all application data (GPA, graduate writing exam, recommendation letters) are reviewed thoroughly prior to candidates being admitted to our programs. Dispositions are evaluated throughout the programs: during entry into the program, prior to practicums or internships, and at the end of practicums and internships. This continuous data collection enables us to affirm that our candidates participate in field experiences that includes exceptionalities and students representing diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups. If issues in the field experience occur, it has resulted in candidates choosing a different major or dropping our program but most candidates use the feedback as an opportunity for personal growth.

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?

First year teacher survey data from the state of Oklahoma provided evidence from our first year teachers that while most of them felt at least somewhat prepared for integrating technology throughout the curriculum, their confidence at the highest level of the scale was the lowest across the instrument. In 2016 (for 2015 first year teachers) only 17% felt "very well prepared" for integrating technology and in 2017 (for 2016 first year teachers) only 23% felt "very well prepared". This data along with changes in technology standards at the state level as well as the new CAEP standards indicated that we needed to implement more technology teaching strategies into our program. Our Administration was able to secure funding for a total remodel of our education building. At the time we had five fully equipped Smart classrooms. After the remodel every classroom (13) was equipped with state of the art teaching technology and improved wireless access. In the remodel, we were able to designate some space, and in doing so received some additional private support, to create a Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning. Through partnerships with area schools we were able to link into classrooms with video equipment supplied by the public school and housed in our Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning. A private company donated \$50,000 worth of Maker Space kits and provided free professional development for education faculty at ECU as well as area schools. With a technology fee we have been able to purchase 60 Chromebooks along with charging carts for student use as well as for professional development and whenever needed by instructors. Two 3-D printers have been purchased for the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning as well. Another private donation of \$350,000 allowed us to fund an Institute for Math and Science Education. A coordinator was hired in the summer of 2017. The Institute utilizes the resources in the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning to provide professional development for area teachers providing support for all teaching methods and professional education courses in the implementation of STEM kits and technology, and for recruiting high quality candidates to our Math and Science Education programs as well as our graduate programs.

In addition to the technology infrastructure improvements, the EPP at the initial level made changes to the professional education sequence to ensure that our candidates were getting the much needed instruction to utilize technology in the classroom to improve student learning. These program changes were approved spring of 2016 and went into effect fall of 2017:

1. Admission standard was raised to a 2.75 GPA.
 2. A one hour technology course was added to the first block in the professional education sequence, EDUC 2631 Foundations of Educational Technology;
 3. The two hour existing technology course was moved to the third block in the professional education sequence, EDUC 4632 Educational Technology Integration Strategies.
 4. WayFind was selected to independently evaluate candidate technology skills. These skills are based on the International Society for Technology in Education.
 5. Funds were identified to create a "Virtual Classroom" to simulate current teaching scenarios using Virtual Reality (VR) technology. One classroom in the education building is used for this purpose.
 6. WayFind was used to gather data on Current Student Teaching technology skills. That data will be compared to data on candidates who started our program in fall of 2017 to determine if the new professional education course sequence resulted in improved teaching technology skills.
 7. The Professional Education Committee voted to include a candidate self evaluation on technology skills to triangulate data on candidate technology skills. This instrument will be administered in spring of 2018 after being piloted in the fall of 2017.
 8. Students are also required to purchase a laptop or Chromebook during block one of the professional education sequence. The laptop or Chromebook is utilized in each technology course as well as throughout the methods courses.
- Advanced level programs have also focused on technology but their focus has been on the quality of course delivery as well as utilizing technology for data gathering and analysis.

1. At the Advanced Level all program directors have gone through Quality Matters Training for On Line Courses. All program directors have had at least one course reviewed through external quality matters reviewers and are in the process of submitting additional courses.
2. Two advanced level programs have been approved by the State of Oklahoma and the Higher Learning Commission to be delivered on line.
3. Chalk and Wire, as an electronic portfolio, is being used to gather unit and program level data for easy analysis and program improvement.

The second area of tremendous growth has occurred in the area of assessment. These changes have occurred as a result of the annual teacher education forum, first year teacher surveys, and field experience evaluations. ECU is similar to most institutions in that Classroom Management is identified by all evaluation instruments as an area needing improvement. Candidates verbalize this area as a concern on open ended comments on the first year teacher surveys as well as during their student teaching. In order to address classroom management concerns, a holistic view of the education program was discussed by the Education Department faculty which resulted in more thorough classroom management content integrated throughout the professional education program

and evaluations of that knowledge implemented in the first professional block and continuing on each block and into student teaching. Addressing this need as well as ensuring focus on student learning, led to the implementation of the PPAT performance assessment, first as a pilot in fall of 2016 with full implementation fall of 2017. As we piloted the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers, it became necessary to redesign the courses offered at each professional block (four) in order to scaffold the process for our teacher candidates throughout the program. East Central University's EPP was the first in the state to fully implement the PPAT as a required component of student teaching. While the state did not have a cut score, we did submit candidate PPATs for national scoring. Even though the scores did reveal some areas of concern, an independent evaluation of the projects from two individual teacher education faculty validated the evaluation process. The high scores on the PPAT national scores correlated to high scores on faculty evaluations of the project. Low scores from national scoring correlated to low scores by education faculty evaluation. Data from both evaluations indicate that Task 3 and Task 4 are areas that need further work: Designing Instruction for Student Learning and Implementation and Analyzing Instruction to Promote Learning. We will be analyzing data to determine if the program changes result in an increase in PPAT scores. The following assessments and documents were updated in the spring of 2017 for initial programs:

1. Field Experience 1 Evaluation
2. Field Experience 2 Evaluation
3. Field Experience 3 Evaluation
4. Student Teaching Evaluation
5. Disposition Evaluation
6. Disposition Concern Reporting document
7. All correspondence with public schools
8. Teacher Education Handbook
9. Teacher Education Interview questions

At the Advanced level the following evaluations and documents were revised:

1. Disposition Evaluation
2. Disposition Alignment Table
3. Dispositional Concern Reporting Document
4. Mid-Program Self-Evaluation
5. Final Program Director Evaluation

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 4.1 Complete impact on student growth and learning
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
- x.2 Technology

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  3.1_Employer_Satisfaction_Initial_Candidates.pdf
-  2.1_Undergraduate_Student_Teacher_Evaluation_Data.pdf
-  First_Year_Teacher_Survey_(2016).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.

Initial Level

Standard 4.1 is the most problematic standard for our initial program. The state of Oklahoma does not provide access to EPPs candidates' student standardized test scores. As a result, meeting this standard must come from research data derived from a representative sample of our P-12 teachers. The research design and subsequent IRB has been approved by our institution and the first cycle of data will be gathered spring of 2018. The design is a mixed method design utilizing qualitative methodology and quantitative classroom student standardized test scores to provide two pieces of teaching effectiveness data. The state of Oklahoma provides Teacher Leader Effectiveness (TLE) data on each of the completers who teach in Oklahoma. The research on the representative sample in addition to the TLE data should provide the evidence needed to meet 4.1.

The direction for this standard has been a little unclear. In the Accreditation Manual under explanation for Standard 4.1 it states that, "The CAEP Evidence Guide contains a section on options for measuring P-12 student learning in both pre-service and in-service situations, and includes information pertaining to states that make various forms of value-added data in teacher evaluations available to providers and those that do not." However, the CAEP Evidence Guide does not mention pre-service teachers in 4.1. Our EPP has piloted the EdTPA and The Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT) which we fully implemented in fall of 2017. The state of Oklahoma has adopted the PPAT as a requirement for certification. This requirement will be implemented in the state of Oklahoma for teacher certification. This is a comprehensive performance evaluation which requires our candidates, during their student teaching semester, to gather video data on teaching performance as well as pre and post-test data on the P-12 students. Our candidates must submit this growth data and analysis to national scorers. This performance assessment ensures that our candidates understand the complete learning cycle and can make decisions to truly impact student learning in P-12 settings.

5.4 The other area that is problematic for ECU is tracking all of our graduates. We do not have the resources to track all of our initial and advanced students because many of them leave the state of Oklahoma for better teaching salaries. Oklahoma is 49th in the nation in regard to teacher pay and every bordering state provides much better teacher salaries than Oklahoma offers.

Additionally, with the current system our EPP uses to recommend for teacher certification, we are unable to gather all the data needed on the initial candidates to determine if they are teaching "in field" or "out of field". The system simply states "Teacher" in the system. We are looking for more effective ways to track all of our graduates in a way that is systematic and accurate. These issues for our initial programs are our most challenging.

4.3/4.1 is also an area we are concerned about. Employment milestones are not currently captured and we hope to add that to the annual First Year Teaching Survey that all completers who teach in the state of Oklahoma complete as well as the administrators of those teachers.

Advanced Level

5.4 Tracking our advanced level students outside of the state of Oklahoma is also a challenge especially since we have two fully on-line programs. If candidates stay in the state of Oklahoma, their add-on certificate indicates what they are prepared for and what they are teaching.

Our EPP falls under a planning year for our advanced program. Our last accreditation visit was fall of 2015. "Since Advanced Program" is defined differently from NCATE, we have fewer programs that fall under the scope of advanced programs. However, with the last visit we created a standardized enrollment process, created and validated our assessment system and instruments, and required a Chalk and Wire portfolio from all candidates throughout their program. Our main challenge under NCATE involved ensuring diverse experiences for our candidates since most are currently teaching and lack opportunities to do field experiences at multiple sites. We implemented more curriculum in the form of case studies and then required multiple placements to ensure our candidates saw challenges related to diversity and could then make decisions based on current best practices. Our challenges with CAEP Standards have not yet surfaced since the actual planning phase is starting spring of 2018.

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

- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- A.5.4 Continuous Improvement

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: **Brenda Sherbourne**

Position: **Dean, College of Education and Psychology**

Phone: **580 559-5350**

E-mail: **bsherbrn@ecok.edu**

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

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

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

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site 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