

2021 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11854	AACTE SID:	4145
Institution:	Sam Houston State University		
Unit:	College of Education		

Section 1. EPP Profile

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

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

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

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

<https://www.shsu.edu/academics/education/center-for-assessment-and-accreditation/accreditation/caep/>

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2019-2020 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹

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

Total number of program completers 591

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2019-2020 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited

Added a Master of Science in Teaching and Learning designed for candidates seeking post baccalaureate teacher certification. We also now offer a double major for Secondary Education students that includes the education major and a major in the content area. 4+1 TEACH, a program funded by a grant from the Department of Education, allows students to graduate with a bachelors degree, replace traditional student teaching with graduate level coursework, and complete a supervised internship in a public school setting while completing a master's degree.

We added a PK-3 certification.

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

We now have a year-long residency option in addition to traditional student teaching for all candidates in EC-6 and Middle Level grades. It is anticipated that we will be moving to scale to include Secondary Education majors in the fall of 2022.

We added a PK-3 certification to our certification programs.

We implemented double majors for secondary education in the Fall 2020 semester.

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: <https://www.shsu.edu/academics/education/center-for-assessment-and-accreditation/accreditation/caep/2021-annual-report>

Description of data accessible via link: Candidate and completer data for each of the 8 annual reporting measures.

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

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

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the data from the last reporting period are somewhat limited and not necessarily representative of a typical year with our EPP. It is difficult to extrapolate meaning from several of our assessments. For example, because in-person field experiences were limited due to health and safety protocols, many of our field experiences were virtual. Additionally, the

Texas Education Agency (TEA) provides data for Component 4.1, Component 4.2 and Component 4.3, but these surveys were not implemented by the TEA during this year. However, some notable trends that we are able to observe are:

1. An increase in enrollment in our Reading Specialist program and in our School Counselor program. We attribute this to increased faculty participation in recruitment and retention efforts. Additionally, the EPP has placed an emphasis on recruitment and retention of a diverse pool of candidates to better meet the needs of Texas schoolchildren. We dedicated intentional meeting time and space to discussion and planning for this, focused specifically on the changing demographics of the state and developing plans to prepare a pool of educators who are more reflective of the demographics of Texas schools.

2. We see a downward trend in enrollment in the principal program. We have collected data (external to this report) as to the barriers to new students enrolling in the program and are working toward reversing this trend.

3. The majority of candidates continue to perform in the acceptable or exemplary range on the unit lesson plan.

4. We have a high overall pass rate for the TExES certification exam. The lowest score on this exam is the LOTE, with a 50% pass rate, however the number of candidates sitting for this exam during this reporting period was only 4.

Following up on data trends reported last year, we reported a trend that indicated that our candidates' certification exam scores on first-time attempts are not as high as we would like. Since that time, we have implemented the Certify Teacher program as a benchmarking and support tool to support candidates in successful mastery of the content evaluated by the content exam.

Additionally, we developed content support modules that are accessible to our teacher candidates from admission to completion. These are both the direct results and actions that have come from our review of the certification testing data. It is anticipated that at the next annual review of data we will reveal the impact of these improvements.

Last year we reported that at the advanced level, we learned that we were not effectively measuring candidate dispositions. Each of our advanced level

programs developed and implemented dispositions assessments in the 2020-2021 academic year. Data from these assessment will be included in our self-study report.

At both the initial and advanced levels, the Educator Preparation Program (EPP) continues the practice of regular and systematic sharing and review of data. Data are reviewed and analyzed at both the individual program level, as well as EPP-wide. Data are shared with program faculty and staff, school district partners, and faculty from other colleges that teach the content majors for our secondary education and all-level candidates. There are several mechanisms in place to promote the sharing of assessment measures and outcome data. Each year, we hold an annual college-wide assessment day in which the entire college reviews program and unit data. In the 2020-2021 academic year, we expanded this to once per semester rather than annually. Each semester, we have meetings with several vital groups: The Sam Houston State Innovative Partner Schools (SHIPS), the Educator Preparation Advisory Council (EPAC), yearlong residency governance meetings with school district partners, US PREP coalition meetings with cohort partners, and Raising Texas Teachers cohort partners. We are also involved with three outside entities for data sharing and program improvement: Learning by Scientific Design, WestEd, and Teaching Works.

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**
- Candidate level 1 and level 2 field experience assessment data are not regularly and systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed across initial programs at the unit level related to candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.**

(
I
T
P
)

The EPP continues to regularly and systematically collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data across initial programs at the unit level related to candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. Data are collected from candidates throughout the program. This begins with entry into the program, at specific benchmarks as they progress, at the end of the program, and after program completion. The Center for Assessment, housed within the College of Education, is dedicated to the collection and maintenance of assessment data for all programs in the EPP. The Center for Assessment employs a data analyst whose position is dedicated to the collection, maintenance, aggregation, and distribution of these data to faculty, staff, and school partners. We have mechanisms in place to ensure the regular dissemination and analysis of these collected data, with actionable steps made based on findings. The Educator Preparation Program (EPP) continues the practice of regular and systematic sharing and review of data at both the individual program level, as well as EPP and college-wide. Data are shared with program faculty and staff, school district partners, and faculty from other colleges offering the content majors for the secondary education and all-level candidates. There are several mechanisms in place to promote the sharing of assessment measures and outcome data. Each year, we hold two annual college-wide assessment events in which the entire EPP reviews program and unit data. Each semester, we have meetings with two vital groups: The Sam Houston State Innovative Partner Schools (SHIPS) and the Education Partners Advisors for Content (EPAC). SHIPS is comprised of school district partners and stakeholders. EPAC is comprised of faculty and staff in the secondary and all-level content area majors. Additionally, we have a College of Education Assessment Committee and ad hoc CAEP Standards Teams that regularly review data. There are several mechanisms in place to ensure the systematic and accurate collection of data in field experiences. These include continued use of electronic time logs in all field experiences to document ongoing candidate activity and time spent in diverse placements of teacher candidates across rural, urban, and suburban school districts. Candidates record the date and length of time, with a brief description of their activity within the classrooms. This information is reviewed by mentor teachers in the field, as well as by the supervising faculty. Use of the time logs, using the Tk20 platform, became fully operational in the 2017- 2018 academic year and was refined during the 2018-2019 academic year. The process continues to date. Additionally, the EPP continues the use of a modified version of the Texas

Teacher Evaluation and Support System (T-TESS) in all early field experiences for middle level methods courses and secondary education methods courses and EC-6 courses. This has been successfully occurring throughout each field experience, from the Field 1, the Field 2 and in the final experience, clinical teaching. T- TESS is the state adopted assessment system for classroom teachers, and is useful for teacher candidates to assess their work in the field to determine opportunities for improvement, and to provide data for supporting mentor teachers and EPP faculty to provide quality oral and written feedback to guide improvement. The Tk20 electronic platform is also used to these data. A benefit to Tk20 for this is that all parties involved in a candidates' field placement have access to T- TESS data for improvement at the individual candidate data, while EPP staff can run reports for program faculty and school partners to analyze and make decisions at the program level. Data from all field experiences are collected in Tk20, and the data are disseminated regularly to program faculty. Data are shared once per semester with school partners. In addition to regular program meetings, data are made available to program faculty for review annually at a college-wide assessment event held each fall and an EPP-wide event held each spring. These events are dedicated to reviewing collected, aggregated and summarized assessment data from the previous academic year. At this time, program faculty analyze the results from their individual programs as well as from the EPP as a whole to make decisions regarding candidate performance and program quality and operations.

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloguing continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

A new innovation since the previous annual report is the development of content modules for teacher candidates to support their knowledge in the content areas and successful completion of the TExES certification examination. Using TExES data to inform this decision, we had content experts in the areas of math, science, social studies, reading, special education, and bilingual education develop online modules which are made available to teacher candidates as an independently used resource to support their learning. These modules are made available to teacher candidates from the moment they are accepted into the EPP, and are available throughout their program. Our goal is to bring teacher candidates to a 95% pass rate on all certification exams on the first attempt. Faculty and staff in the EPP review TExES exam data regularly. Monthly reports are distributed to faculty for program review, and semester-long data are analyzed each semester at the EPP-wide assessment events. Once these modules have been in effect for one academic year, we will analyze for impact, and will continue doing so for while they are in use.

In this reporting period, we continued the Yearlong Residency (YLR) with EC-6 candidates. We are moving to scale with the YLR

program in the Fall 2021 semester, making this the standard final field experience for all EC-6 and 4-8 candidates. Data from the successful cohorts of YLR participants from previous semesters informed this decision. We are currently planning to implement YLR with all secondary education candidates in the 2022-2023 academic year.

We continued to improve our certification-testing support plan that provides a structure for supporting candidates from entry in the program through

successful passage of the content certification exam. This initiative was heavily influenced by the input of our school district partners, who support the idea of having all candidates entering their clinical teaching experience having passed the Texas content exam, so that they have demonstrated the requisite content knowledge to serve as an effective student teacher, as well as removing the burden of testing from them so that they may more fully engage in the clinical teaching process. This includes benchmarks for progress monitoring. Data from benchmarks are analyzed to provide academic support in the form of content remediation or test-taking skills and strategies. Faculty who are content experts developed support modules for math, science, reading, social studies, bilingual and special education that are available to teacher candidates from admission through completion. The Certify Teacher program is used as a diagnostic and support tool.

Double majors for teacher candidates seeking secondary certification began in the Fall 2020 semester. These programs have previously existed as a major within the content area with an education minor. This enhances our opportunity to ensure that the portion of secondary and all-level candidates' curriculum will have a more robust connection between content and pedagogy. We have worked closely with our content area partners in the various colleges to develop degree plans for double majors in each of the following areas:

- BS in Education and Mathematics
- BS in Education and Composite Science
- BS in Education and Interdisciplinary Agriculture
- BS in Education and Kinesiology
- BA in Education and Mass Communications
- BA in Education and History
- BA in Education and English
- BA in Education and Spanish

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

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

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

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 r regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the fo information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPPâ€™s evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progre

on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help 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 prepared by your CAEP site review in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text

With the adoption of the new revised standards (2022 Standards for Initial Preparation), the EPP is working through a revised approach to meeting the standards. We have currently identified the following gap:
CAEP Standard R4.1 is a difficult standard for which to provide multiple measures of evidence due to the lack of data that we receive from our state (Texas) for this. While the Texas Education Agency states that it is moving to a system that will provide EPPs with more data to demonstrate completer impact, we have not yet received these data. The EPP has a large DOE grant to support an innovative degree program entitled the 4+1 TEACH program. In this program, which entails agreements with school district partners for data collection, candidates complete both an undergraduate and master's degree, and obtain their teacher licensure. Data from the 4+1 TEACH program is used to determine the degree to which novice teachers in this program impact PK-12 student learning; implement research-based, appropriate practices; and demonstrates appropriate teacher dispositions. The SHSU College of Education is currently collaborating with the PK-12 school district partners involved in the 4+1 TEACH project to collect the following data: • STAAR scores associated with SHSU prepared novice teachers • Principal Survey (Perception of novice teacher performance) • Teacher Survey (Perception of strengths and opportunities for growth) • Student Survey (Perception of novice teacher performance) • Teacher Focus Groups (Perception of strengths and opportunities for growth) • Novice Teacher Observations (District Mentor & SHSU Faculty).

Researchers in the college also recently received approval to access the Education Research Center at the University of Houston, which houses data from the Texas Education Agency, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, and Texas Workforce Commission. These data will allow us to measure our completers' impact on K-12 student learning beginning in the 2021-2022 academic year.

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

4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning

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 2021 EPP Annual Report.

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Jannah Nerren

Position: Associate Dean

Phone: 936-294-3977

E-mail: jannahnerren@shsu.edu

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

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

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

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

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

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

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

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

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

Acknowledge