2020 EPP Annual Report

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

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	●	○
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	●	○
1.1.3 Program listings	●	○

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.ecok.edu/academics/colleges-and-schools/college-education-and-psychology/department-education and https://www.ecok.edu/academics/colleges-and-schools/school-graduate-studies/med-education

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 2018-2019 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure[1]

43

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]

53

Total number of program completers 96

---

[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 2018-2019 academic year?

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

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

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

3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

The Oklahoma Office of Educator Quality and Accountability (OEQA) established a new state-review process for Teacher Education programs. which was approved during the summer of 2019. OEQA also re-negotiated the partnership agreement with CAEP to include acceptance of the new process for
program accreditation. As a result of this new option for initial programs, Elementary Education, Math Education, Social Studies Education (all Approved with Conditions), and Science Education (Approved) were submitted for review on Sep. 15, 2019. Response to initial submission was received Nov. 20, 2019.

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://sites.google.com/tigerapps.ecok.edu/ecuedprogramdata/caep-evidence

Description of data accessible via link: East Central University Program Information and Assessment Data Website (links broken out below)

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	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Advanced-Level Programs			☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑

2

Link: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1WN5d6R_k7ifiHHqwpbbLBPsiAFmq6Pqw/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 4.1.1 IRB Letter Approval

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	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1CS3sGlyU9jfWqJtgrxW_BbaCiv-WyyWc/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link:	4.1.2 Growth 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	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs	▓	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

4

Link:	https://docs.google.com/document/d/10p5c0PnCZ7citpLE_7d5HZowSKeMtxR67EkrVXoArUQ/edit?usp=sharing
Description of data accessible via link:	4.1.3 Summary of Impact 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	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs	▓	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5

Link:	https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1plzAYfyM3IqnwZhuF4VFwPL6gWXKLNAs/view?usp=sharing
Description of data accessible via link:	4.2 TLE Summary

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	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs	▓	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

6

Link:	https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1plzAYfyM3IqnwZhuF4VFwPL6gWXKLNAs/view?usp=sharing
Description of data accessible via link:	4.3.1 Satisfaction of Employers- Initial

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	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs	▓	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

7

Link:	https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1HUQqfjA0g2ajBZCWtzXd_70MNTTf8QrQ/view?usp=sharing
Description of data accessible via link:	A4.3.1 Satisfaction of Employers- Advanced

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs	▪		☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

8

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1maeGJANEKZZwe0gadqs7ZoNBxnqXGYm_/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 4.3.2 & 7 Retention & Milestones- Initial

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	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐
Advanced-Level Programs	▪		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

9

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1Y0Yp0_NV5kN4qGKHPaCoLPwbQfNeUmpp/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: A4.3.2 & 7 Retention & Milestones- Advanced

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs	▪		☑	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐

10

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1SnIoDJYfC4UUCfl1OC6kX8NsrP5MmkL1/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 4.4.1 Completer Satisfaction- Initial

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	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs	▪		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

11

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1qXOt3Sh1PJbQ6CXFajkrFoz9Y2KE1AoL/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: A4.4.1 Completer Satisfaction- Advanced

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs	▪		☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐

12

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1l8dGduTaCznwgNEqxbMPcLT_nuhgc82P/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: A4.4.1 Completer Satisfaction- Advanced Summary

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs		☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	

13

Link: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1FSpj29j8Ji19F_TSnrtTYKIJhUwhYjqe/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 5.1.1 Graduation Rates

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs		☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	

14

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1qSLzFjE0_bR4CJVqX4_e5A6oaD03R2ZV/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 5.1.2 Retention Rates

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs		☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	

15

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1jCRMA6pOLDSh2-26ONbFNr6itsVRKByj/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 6 Title II Report (2019)

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs		☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	

16

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1H3-SwjRWraPGAve68YwJrLhnv3f-S31j/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 6 Title II Report (2018)

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs		☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	

17

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1Jc1Mn_qaOdcWhIbvOWKHRpS10oSasRUz/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 6 Title II Report (2017)

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs		☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	

18

Link: https://drive.google.com/a/tigerapps.ecok.edu/file/d/1Jc1Mn_qaOdcWhIbvOWKHRpS10oSasRUz/view?usp=sharing

Description of data accessible via link: 8 Student Loan Default 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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Advanced-Level Programs		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	

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?*

4.1 While steps have been taken at the state level to implement a comprehensive assessment system which would be used to gather data needed to determine the effectiveness of candidates, it has not yet been completed. As a result, the Professional Education Committee decided that meeting this standard must come from research data derived from a sample of P-12 teachers. The research design and subsequent IRB was approved by the university. As indicated in last year's annual report, this plan was not viable for a number of reasons. the EPP has formulated another plan for the collection of these data. MOUs have been established with the following partner school districts in our service area: Stonewall, Ada, Roff, Latta, Byng, and Vanoss. These partner schools have agreed to provide growth data from the students who are taught by EPP-prepared completers. The EPP's Data Steward will send a Data Request Form to each district's Federal Programs Director identifying the EPP-prepared completers in that district and requesting growth data from students in their classrooms. The Federal Programs Director will send such data to the Data Steward when it becomes available. A specific protocol has been designed and is described in the MOU to ensure rigorous confidentiality standards. These agreements go into effect for the 2019-2020 academic year. The EPP expects to receive the first full round of data in the summer of 2020. The MOUs will be renewed at the beginning of each 7-year accreditation cycle, guaranteeing these data will be available continually so the EPP can identify trends and implement changes based upon analysis. In the meantime, the EPP is in the process of piloting this new plan for assessing completer impact on student growth with 3 of the partner school districts in the new plan. In the meantime, the EPP requested data from two of the partner schools, Byng and Ada, in order to conduct a pilot study. These data were from AYs 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19, and those data are briefly analyzed as follows.

Two years of DIBELS data gathered from 2 completers' students are seen on the table. In 2017-18 a total of 47 students completed the pre and post assessments. These students had a pre-assessment average score of 42.0 on the DIBELS Next NWF-CLS, or Nonsense Word Fluency- Correct Letter Sound, and a post assessment average score of 90.5, showing growth of +48.5. In 2018-19 a total of 36 students completed those same pre and post assessments. These students had a pre-assessment average score of 39.3 on the DIBELS Next NWF-CLS and a post assessment average score of 83.6, showing growth of +44.3. In 2017-18 the same 47 students had a pre-assessment average score of 3.8 on the DIBELS Next NWF-WWR, Nonsense Word Fluency- Whole Words Read, and a post assessment average score of 27.3, showing growth of +23.5. Likewise, in 2018-19 the same students had a pre-assessment average score of 4.0 on the DIBELS Next NWF-WWR and a post assessment average score of 23.6, showing growth of +19.6.

STAR Reading Test data for 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 show an average Scaled Score Growth of +91.84 and a Reading Grade Equivalent (GE) increase which averaged +1.74. Over that same time period, the STAR Math Test data show an average Scaled Score (SS) growth of +91.84 and an average Grade Equivalent increase of +.43.

In addition, evidence that indicates the potential of completers to impact student growth is the PPAT. Data from the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers shows that candidates can impact P-12 student growth during their final semester of their education program. The TLE discussed in 4.2 along with Administrator Surveys discussed in 4.3, indicate that the completers from the EPP are effective teachers who positively impact P-12 students.
Data indicate that for domain 1, Classroom Management, cohort scores increased from 3.42 to 3.52. In domain 2, Instructional Effectiveness, cohort scores increased from 3.35 to 3.50. Scores also increased in domain 4, Interpersonal Skills from a 3.47 to 3.63 and in Leadership from 3.53 to 3.55. However, there was a decrease in domain 3, Professional Growth and Continuous Improvement. The scores decreased from 3.59 to 3.53. For the first year of data 100% of the candidates scored 3 or above and met state standards. The second year of data on this cohort indicated that scores actually decreased minimally in domains 1, 2 and 3 with the ranges widening in domains 1 and 2. There were a few more scores with a 4 or better but there were also a few low scores. Domains 4 and 5 were met at 100% with only a slight increase in the ranges. For the third year of data on the cohort some scores increased but only slightly. 95% of the cohort reached the state standard for domains 1, 2 and 3. 100% of the cohort reached the state standard for domains 4 and 5.

There were increases in each domain for this second cohort (2015-16). Domain 1, Classroom Management, increased from 3.36 to 3.42 for a .06% increase. Domain 2, Instructional Effectiveness, increased from an average 3.32 to 3.46 for a .14% increase. Domain 3, Professional Growth and Continuous Improvement, went from an average of 3.45 to 3.47 for a .02% increase. Domain 4, Interpersonal Skills, increased from a 3.29-3.54 for a .25% increase which was the largest increase. Domain 5, Leadership, increased from 3.32 to 3.41 for a .09% increase. It is interesting to note that even though there was an increase in domain 3, Professional Growth and Continuous Improvement, it was the smallest increase. Year 1 data for the second cohort indicated that for domains 1, 2, 3 and 4, 96% of the first-year teachers met the state standard. Only 1 candidate scored below the "3" standard in all four domains. 100% of the first-year teachers from this cohort met the state standard of "3" in domain 5. The range was the widest in domain 4 where one teacher received a score of "2" on Collegiality and Professionalism and one teacher received a score of "5". The range for domain 1 was 2.33 to 4.00. The range for domain 2 was 2.5-4.3. The range for domain 3 was 2.5-4.5. The range for domain 5 was 3-4. The ranges are in-line for what one would expect for first-year teachers. The majority of the scores are in the "Effective" range (3-4) with very few earning a Superior (5) on the high end and no teachers with an Ineffective (1) score.
In domains 1 and 2, 96% of 2016-17 cohort scored at a "3" or better. In the same cohort, 100% scored a "3" or better in domains 3, 4 and 5. The ranges were much tighter with no teacher receiving a score of "5" or a score of "1".
In examining the TLE scores by teaching level, the secondary (English, history, math, and science with a N=33) scored higher in every domain. These programs are housed in the content area departments. The differences were not significant though. The EPP's secondary completers scored highest in domains 3 and 4 (Professional Growth and Continuous Improvement, and Interpersonal Skills). The elementary, early childhood, and special education (N=35) are housed in the education department. The high scores were also in domains 3 and 4 even though the scores were .08 and .15 lower on average. This provides evidence that all programs are receiving the necessary knowledge, skills and dispositions throughout the professional education sequence and the specific methods courses. There is very little difference in the domain averages and ranges among three years of data for completers. Employers believe that completers from the EPP are effective teachers and contribute to student growth in the classroom.

Data are published and shared with stakeholders on this site:
https://sites.google.com/tigerapps.ecok.edu/ecuedprogramdata/home

Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations
Waived

Section 6. Continuous Improvement
Waived

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 2020 EPP Annual Report.*

☑ **I am authorized to complete this report.**

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Phyllis Isaacs

Position: Dean, College of Education & Psychology

Phone: 580-559-5350

E-mail: phylisa@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**