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INTRODUCTION

The Harris-Stowe State University (HSSU) Quality Assurance System Plan for the College of Education (COE) Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) consists of several components that work together to promote ongoing continuous improvement. Multiple measures have been incorporated into the Plan, as indicated below in Figure 1, to monitor candidate progress and completer achievements. The use of evidence-based practices ensures that analyses of data are valid and reliable. Likewise, measures of program impact are recognized by appropriate stakeholders and used for ongoing program improvement. In conclusion, HSSU’s EPP programs are systematically interconnected in an ongoing data-informed continuous improvement cycle.

![Figure 1. Harris-Stowe State University - EPP Cycle of Continuous Improvement.](image)

Within this document, Harris-Stowe State University provides details about the Quality Assurance System Plan and discusses every section according to, and in alignment with, the CAEP Standard 5 components. As HSSU discusses each section, it is delineated with the component number and description in bold font as a guide and point of reference.
STANDARD 5

Component 5.1
Component 5.1. The provider’s quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP standards.

The Providing of Operational Effectiveness

The Quality Assurance System Plan is an organizational control mechanism for the EPP and related programs to ensure that academic goals are met, implemented, and evaluated. It operates through formalization of roles and structures and specification of procedures. Organizational effectiveness is based on a problem-solving approach. In this approach, an effective EPP performs well in the following areas: goal-attainment, integration, adaptation, and pattern-maintenance. This quality assurance system maximizes effective performance in the EPP. The EPP Quality Assurance System Plan is designed to ensure continuous improvement in which the EPP better utilizes its resources, better implements its processes, and achieves its mission and goals. The continuous improvement model is based on the monitoring of whether unit goals are being achieved and is detailed below in Component 5.3. Data are shared with all invested stakeholders including the federal government (Title II), Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) via Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS) and the Annual Performance Report (APR); accrediting bodies such as CAEP and the Higher Learning Commission (HLC); HSSU Board of Regents, Provost, President; College of Education Advisory Committee/Teacher Education Council (TEC); HSSU Student Advisory Committee; HSSU candidates; HSSU Alumni Association; HSSU Colleges of Arts and Sciences and College of Business faculty; Superintendents Advisory Committee; Principals and Cooperating Teachers Committee; additional partners in local schools involved in collaborative grant development; and colleagues from Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs).

Formalization of Roles and Structures

The Provost coordinates and superintends academic programs and all related academic services for the success of academic programming across the University. The Provost is the senior academic officer working with the Deans to achieve the University’s academic vision, embedded within the mission statement. The Provost has responsibility for staffing policies of the University. The Provost leads and supports the development, delivery, and excellence of the University’s curriculum, student experiences, and scholarly information services. The Provost is supported in this role by the Associate Provost (Academic), who has responsibility for the development of academic policy, planning, and management for programs for improvement in teaching and learning. The Associate Provost (Academic) is also responsible for major change in academic programs and/or the delivery of those programs. The Provost is supported by the Associate Provost (Participation and Engagement) who has accountabilities for student equity, staff equity, and the student experience, as well as the Provost Fellow who provides academic leadership in relation to embedding graduate attributes, particularly those of community leadership and active global citizenship, through curricular and co-curricular opportunities.

The Dean has responsibility for the educational and administrative business of the faculty and its departments. Accordingly, the Dean is the primary accountable officer for management and delivery of teaching and learning in the faculty. The Dean has responsibilities for executing all policies of the
faculty and EPP, for the degrees and courses within their scope, and accountability for performance of individual teaching staff. In relation to teaching and learning, the Dean’s responsibilities include, but are not limited to: (a) the quality of courses and degrees and the quality of their delivery; (b) ensuring the faculty has processes in place for continuing review, course evaluation, and self-assessment of its academic offerings; (c) consultation with state and national agencies, the Provost, and other relevant committees on teaching and learning in relation to courses and faculty; (d) all aspects of academic management for the courses offered through their faculty, including assessment, student progress, examination, graduation; (e) supporting regular and systematic evaluation of courses and subjects, processes to facilitate feedback from and to students on those evaluations; (f) management of physical and human resources and infrastructure to support the continuing high quality course and subject delivery and outcomes; and (g) implementation and coordination of the Quality Assurance System Plan. The Dean is supported in this role by the Assistant Dean.

The Assistant Dean, who serves as the certification officer, is tasked with responsibility for teaching and learning operations under delegated authority from the Dean. In addition to delegated responsibilities, the Assistant Dean has responsibilities for: (a) advice to the Dean on all matters related to teaching and learning in the faculty; (b) communications within faculty and entities on academic and student management issues; (c) licensure recommendations coordinated with DESE. Licensure-area coordinators are responsible for major changes in academic programs and/or the delivery of those programs. Coordinators provide a single point of accountability for the responsibilities shared by faculties participating in their programs. Coordinators have responsibility, in relation to their respective licensure program, for academic leadership, teaching quality, curriculum review, academic leadership for policy implementation and student services, and communication of information to current students. Coordinators have responsibility to ensure that the design of the courses or subjects meet clearly defined learning and teaching objectives and processes are in place for achieving effective course or subject management and coordination. Additional responsibilities include, but are not limited to: (a) initiating student advising and work with adjunct faculty and other instructional and supporting staff, in order to ensure the coherence and high quality courses or subjects; (b) ensuring that a range of appropriate strategies are in place to facilitate the evaluation of teaching and learning outcomes, including review of course or subject objectives and preparation for content area testing; and (c) providing timely feedback to candidates, based on the above-mentioned teaching and learning outcomes, as well as feedback provided to the EPP via faculty meetings.

Both the Quality Assurance Committee and Data Committee work in tandem, vested with responsibility for quality assurance. They play a key role in evaluating teaching and learning in the University by: (a) providing advice to the EPP community on quality assurance policy and processes for teaching and learning in courses and subject matter; (b) having particular responsibilities in relation to quality assurance of assessment and examination policies, processes for course management, learning support, student progress and student transition into courses and careers; (c) developing, in collaboration with faculty, administration and related committees, appropriate qualitative and quantitative measures of performance of teaching and learning, taking into account national and international recommended practices, and overseeing, monitoring and reviewing their use; (d) advising the administration and faculty on priority areas for evaluation and quality assurance of academic programs and associated student support programs, and making recommendations on areas of teaching and learning for evaluation; (e) reviewing and evaluating quality in teaching and learning of all courses and associated student support services and programs, and making recommendations to relevant authorities on actions to improve the quality of teaching and learning in those courses and programs; (f) advising and making recommendations to the administration, faculty,
and interested committees on modifications to the structure, content, method of presentation and
delivery of courses in response to quality assessments received in the previous year in order to ensure
that these programs are of the highest possible quality; and (g) evaluating systems and structures for
the effective interaction between faculty, administration, and committees in the development and use
of measures to encourage adoption of best practices in academic programs.

Teaching staff at all levels – including adjunct and other instructional and supporting staff – have a
responsibility to incorporate appropriate methods and processes to ensure high quality learning and
teaching. These responsibilities include: (a) collaboration with colleagues to ensure that subjects and
courses in which they teach achieve agreed learning outcomes and graduate attributes; (b) use of
approaches to teaching that influence, motivate and inspire students to learn; (c) development of high
quality curricula and resources in order to maximize students’ command of their discipline area; (d)
use of approaches to timely assessment and feedback that foster independent, reflective learning; (e)
assistance of candidates to develop as individuals; (f) monitoring and demonstration that their
learning and teaching functions are informed by high quality research participation; and (g)
commitment to their own learning through self-reflection, review and evaluation of their teaching,
through a range of methods, including student feedback.

Candidates are supported by a range of support services. Among these support services are: student
support centers which provide a first point of contact for advice on administrative and transactional
services, as well as course planning; dedicated specialized services to support students’ learning and
academic skills development, and language development; dedicated services to facilitate enrichment
of students’ academic and social experience through study abroad and exchange programs,
volunteering and community engagement; careers advice and support; and specialized services such
as health, counselling, financial, and housing assistance, to support students’ well-being.

Candidates are expected to participate fully in their course of study, taking responsibility for their
learning and for moving toward intellectual independence as a member of the learning community of
the University. This includes: (a) engagement in the learning process through creating dynamic
partnerships with peers, instructors, and researchers; (b) providing feedback to the EPP and its staff
on the quality of teaching and services; and (c) participation in the EPP community through service on
academic and student liaison committees at the University.

Specification of Procedures

Internal and external data are collected regularly and consistently to ensure that the Educator
Preparation Provider (EPP) utilizes a system of assessment toward the continuous improvement of the
program. Internal assessment falls within four categories: Candidates, Curriculum, Faculty,
Resources.

Candidates

Candidates are regularly assessed as indicated throughout this document. The data collected and
analyzed is utilized toward ongoing improvement to both candidate knowledge, skills, and
dispositions, as well as on a programmatic level. Regarding recruitment, the EPP collects trend data
on the ACT/SAT scores for entering freshmen and transfer students to establish a baseline for
admission to the EPP. However, the University is open admission based on its mission. That said,
there is a commitment from the President to recruit and enroll more talented students. The EPP
monitors enrollment data to keep a record of the number of students admitted to the University indicating an interest in teacher preparation and the number who ultimately are admitted. Data were collected beginning fall 2016. Faculty and administrators receive a monthly report on all individuals who declare education majors in the COE. Advisors, supported by the Data Committee, disaggregate that data and use it to monitor students’ progress. For example, that data is significant in scheduling courses. The data is also significant to keep students on track for graduation, for budgeting, financial aid, internal annual reporting, and external reporting. In addition, the Dean uses the data to ensure adequate resources are identified.

**Curriculum**

The licensure-area curricula are aligned to Missouri Standards for the Preparation of Educators (MoSPE), specialized professional associations (SPAs), Missouri Learning Standards, College- and Career-Readiness Standards, and International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) standards. Each course syllabi and identified outcomes related to course learning and related assessments have been aligned to these standards. The curriculum is regularly reviewed to ensure that standard are being met. Each course is also aligned to the specific assessment that applies to its role in the curriculum. For example, the reading courses are aligned to the content course because candidates demonstrate the acquisition of knowledge and skills on the content course. Because content is so important and must be applied during student teaching, students must take and pass the test prior to student teaching.

**Faculty**

The Dean conducts an annual evaluation that assesses faculty in teaching, service, and research. In addition, faculty are evaluated by the candidates. That data is summarized by the Department of Information Technology (IT) and shared online with faculty. Faculty members discuss the student evaluations during the annual evaluation with the Dean. Professional development funds are available to attend professional meetings and other activities. All faculty members attend at least one annual conference that is paid by the University. The university also pays for faculty to join professional societies and organizations.

**Resources**

Funds are available for the professional development of faculty that includes travel. Resources have been allocated to develop a computer/technology center for the EPP. iPads have been purchased to allow supervisors to provide time-sensitive data. A new computer lab has been developed with smart board and other capabilities. Consultants have been hired to assist with data collection and analysis. Consultants have been also employed to provide ongoing professional development for faculty and students. According to the Higher Learning Commission, library funds have been found to be adequate for the program.

**Goal-Attainment**

The EPP employs regular and systematic assessment and use of evidence as part of quality assurance to improve candidate performance. Planning is guided by reflection on changes that need to be made. Analysis is conducted on the effectiveness of the implemented plans. This assessment iteratively leads to further reflection on possible needed changes. Inquiry is at the center of the EPP’s quality
assurance system. The EPP believes that the quality assurance system should be guided by an ongoing, iterative effort to address the following question: Does evidence of outcomes align with and confirm EPP learning goals? Using a backwards design model, the quality assurance system begins with the expression of this question. These purposes are bidirectional and engaged in as part of an assessment cycle. An ongoing examination of each of the purposes informs improvement in the performance of the EPP. The studying of whether outcomes align with and confirm learning goals both shapes and is shaped by data analysis. Thus, program goals are in place based on a continuous feedback loop from the systematic examination of assessment data. The EPP has set its goal as the preparation of reflective practitioners for a diverse society. Because content knowledge and related application is predictive of effective teaching, the EPP set measurable learning outcome goals by spring 2018 expressed in Figure 2.

*for second-time test takers

---

**Figure 2:** EPP Learning Outcomes: Goals, by Spring 2018.
As depicted in Figure 3, across the EPP the quality assurance system tracks whether evidence aligns with and confirms EPP learning goals.

Figure 3: Purposes of the EPP Quality Assurance System.
**The Monitoring of Candidate Progress**

The EPP utilizes the same common assessments across all certification programs to provide ongoing, consistent data related to the quality of the candidates’ preparation. A comprehensive system and timeline for the ongoing analysis of candidate performance data is provided within the system. After each semester, data from common assessments are compiled by the Data Committee utilizing Microsoft Excel software, and are analyzed, disaggregated by licensure area, and shared with EPP faculty via reports that contain both a visual depiction of data in the form of tables, graphs, or other visual, as well as a narrative that includes a detailed analysis. Additionally, review of data are conducted in weekly faculty meetings. A full review of data is conducted by all EPP faculty in October, February, and July.

Regarding proprietary assessments, raw data from the Missouri General Education Assessment (MoGEA) and Missouri Content Assessment (MoCA) are forwarded to the EPP from Pearson Assessments and Missouri Pre-Service Teacher Assessment (MoPTA) scores are forwarded to the university from Educational Testing Services (ETS). This data is accessed by the Assistant Dean/certification officer. Raw data for the MoGEA, MoCA, and MoPTA are provided to the Office of the Registrar, Institutional Research, the Provost, the Dean of College of Education, and licensure-area coordinators throughout each semester.

The Department of Information Technology (IT) Services provides the unit with additional institutional data as needed, such as candidate completion rates, Grade Point Average (GPA) and admissions information. The Dean collects graduate and employer surveys at the end of the spring semester.

Candidates who enroll in the initial certification programs must transition through five phases of the program (Table 1). Please find a detailed description of the transition points and related common assessments included in subsequent sections, and in Table 2. HSSU gathers data at each transition point and for each licensure-area program to verify how many candidates are barred from the next transition point. This allows licensure-area coordinators, who also serve as Academic Advisors, to reach out and offer support. When candidates are admitted, they are invited via the admission letter to make an appointment to review their admission status. The data is shared with faculty advisors who also inform candidates of their progress in the program. They also gather the data to see how many candidates continue to the next transition point based on the data from all programs and EPP-wide assessments (Table 2). Based on data from common assessments, HSSU’s Quality Assurance and Data Committee systematically review the initial certification programs and the EPP-wide data to continuously improve and identify patterns across programs. As a part of this continuous improvement plan, data from the student recruitment and retention plan and established goals are reviewed each year for successes and areas for growth, as well. After reviewing data, goals are adjusted for the upcoming academic year.
Regarding candidate monitoring, the EPP Quality Assurance System Plan is comprised of key candidate assessments, common across all licensure areas:

Table 1: Common Assessment Transition Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COE PROGRAM SEQUENCE</th>
<th>ASSESSMENTS ADMINISTERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RECRUITMENT</td>
<td>MoGEA, GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUCTION</td>
<td>Dispositions Assessment, Cooperating Teacher Early-Field Experience Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANDIDACY</td>
<td>Dispositions Assessment, MoCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINICAL PRACTICE</td>
<td>Dispositions Assessment, Cooperating Teacher Mid-Field Experience Assessment, Teacher Work Sample, Formative Observation Feedback, Formative Assessment, Summative Assessment, Administrator Evaluation of the Teacher Candidate, MoPTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOLLOW-UP</td>
<td>First Year Teacher Survey by Completer and Employer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidate progress, as well as completer achievements and provider operational effectiveness is monitored by the HSSU system stakeholders. There is also evidence provided by multiple measures as indicated below, to demonstrate that HSSU has satisfied all CAEP standards. For example, at least once during the semester, the Dispositions Assessment is utilized to assess candidates’ dispositions and professional behaviors, in four of the five transition points (recruitment, induction, candidacy, and clinical practice). The coursework instructors and clinical supervisors complete the survey and the students complete a self-assessment. The data that is collected is displayed on the COE Data Dashboard and shared with, and reviewed by, all system stakeholders. The data that is collected is also reviewed, analyzed, and monitored and reported in a coherent system as outlined in Table 2, which allows for application across specialty license areas and supports targeted change.

Faculty members systematically analyzed data. Suggestions for program changes based on data review include: (a) review data at midterm and final point each semester, (b) allow advisory groups to review data at spring meeting, (c) implement additional assessments during the fall 2016 semester to include an additional cycle of data, and (d) revise two EPP-constructed assessment tools.

The EPP ensures that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in the following assessments: Teacher Work Sample (TWS), MoPTA, Summative and Formative Assessment (collected and submitted as part of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System) (MEES), and via the elaboration and explanation included as part of the MoPTA process. Evidence that the EPP ensures that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards stems from the above-mentioned tools, as well.

Operational assessment also includes student evaluation of faculty members.

Candidate self-evaluation and reflective practices are interwoven throughout coursework in the form of written reflections as well as the student-completed Dispositions Assessment, and during clinical experiences. The teacher candidate demonstrates self-evaluation though assessing her/his performance
and reviewing results during clinical practice through reflection and self-evaluation documented in EPP-provided reflective journals and included as a component of lesson planning, the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) (completed during practicum), and MoPTA (completed during student teaching). Additional self-evaluation is exercised during candidate participation in the oral and written conferences conducted by the cooperating teacher and/or the university supervisor, and in continuously seeking better methods of dealing with situations that arise during the clinical practice. This is accomplished through candidates’ acknowledgment of recommendations and evaluations provided by the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor.

The EPP utilizes candidate data from common assessments, insights gleaned from candidate self-evaluations, and internal/external unit and program review data to make changes to the program and curriculum. The assessment system is designed to ensure that the EPP achieves two primary goals: 1) Prepare HSSU teacher education candidates who are reflective practitioners with the required knowledge, skills and dispositions to work in a global society and 2) ensure that the EPP uses data to strengthen teacher preparation practices. The EPP continuously strives to improve its data collection and analysis practices. In addition, content-area faculty are involved in the unit assessment system by service on the College of Education Advisory Committee/Teacher Education Council (TEC) and are committed to alignment of course objectives with EPP, State, InTASC, and SPA standards.

The EPP gathers data about students and the program at key transition points. The faculty and COE administration examine course syllabi to ensure that the content is in alignment with CAEP and InTASC standards. This review is also beneficial toward informing choices made by faculty in the annual review of textbooks that are chosen for courses. The unit is aided by changes in assessment practices in ensuring that early field placements and clinical practices are well organized and assessed. The State’s new performance assessments (MoPTA) enable candidates to have more opportunities to demonstrate their abilities in working with students and impacting P-12 student learning and development. Analysis of the data indicates strengths and weaknesses of candidates. Revisions in course syllabi are ongoing to ensure that alignment is accurate. With the change in matrices by DESE, all syllabi and courses will be reviewed and realigned. The unit has decided to ensure that students have access to consistent lesson plans and rubrics to ensure consistent evaluation of assessments.

**Transition Point 1: Recruitment**

- Recruitment plan designed and implemented in collaboration with Office of Admissions
  
  **Goal:** Collect appropriate assessment at the entrance to the University: GPA based on University requirements (COE 3.0 GPA) and ACT/SAT, Scholarships
- Meet with the University recruitment director, review recruitment plan, and jointly recruit students
  
  **Goal:** Ensure that at 100% of students admitted to the University as education majors are admitted to the college with cohort GPA of 3.0 and have a passing score on MoGEA

**Quality assurance and added value:**

- Enroll all education students in HSSU 100 which provides them with admission requirements – Dean of the COE taught class fall 2016
- Starting fall 2017, students will enroll in” Synthesis” course and take a prep for MoGEA and cost of test will be covered
- Aid in counseling, financial aid, retention, information about organizations
- Provide a list of tutors available for all courses
• Provide the Arts and Sciences faculty with the framework for MoGEA
• Meet with the Arts and Science faculty teaching education majors to stress importance of students being successful in mastering content and maintain a 3.0 GPA
• Meet with office of Academic Success and Academic Success Coach on a consistent basis
• In collaboration with Academic Success Coach, review grades each semester
• Invite education majors to professional development meetings in the COE to share admissions policies, share background/clearance items needed for field experiences and student teaching, share summarized data and rubrics for essay and interviews (COE Data Committee), attend break-out sessions with COE academic advisors
• Provide preparation class and cost of test for students to take and pass MoGEA
• Arrange location/school for observations associated with completing 60-hour Aide (Director of Field and Clinical Experiences)

Assessment:

• Monitoring students to ensure they meet requirements for admission (Director of Academic Success, Academic Success Coach assigned to the COE, in collaboration with COE Administrative Assistant)
• Changes made based on data from Transition Point 1

Transition Point 2: Induction (Initial Educational Coursework & Early Field Experiences)

• Student enrolls in unrestricted education courses such as Foundations of Education and Computers & Instructional Technology
• Have all students complete application for admission (Director of Academic Success, Academic Success Coach, in collaboration with COE Administrative Assistant)
• Academic Advisement will verify ACT scores, GPA, completion of all general education courses and MoGEA (Director of Academic Success, Academic Success Coach)
• Application will be sent to the COE Administrative Assistant who will verify personal statement, letter of recommendation, completion of 60-Hour Aide, essay and interviews (all faculty assess) scheduled upon receipt of complete application
• Faculty will conduct interviews and evaluate essays
• Observations from interviews and essays summarized
• In collaboration with COE Administrative Assistant, the Dean summarizes the essay and interview data along with feedback and the data is sent to COE Data Committee – students receive letters from the Dean indicating whether they have been admitted – if they are not admitted, they get a letter indicating the deficiency and what should be done to clear the deficiency
• Candidates transition from Academic Success advisement to COE licensure-area Academic Advisors
• Candidates enroll in EDUC 0210 Introduction to Field Experience course
• Candidates are placed in classrooms by Director of Field and Clinical Experiences, per major, with the expectation of observing and working as tutors with individuals and small groups – the classroom teacher co-constructs the placement expectations and helps to ensure that the experience provides data on potential for teaching
Assessment:

- Identify number of students meeting admissions requirements, analyze GPAs, essay, and interview results, compile and summarize MoGEA data (COE Data Committee)
- First formal observational assessment takes place during EDUC 0210 Introduction to Field Experiences where the Cooperating Teacher Early-Field Experience Assessment is completed
- Director of Field and Clinical Experiences collects data and sends to COE Data Committee, who summarizes and shares with faculty – faculty reviews, analyzes, and makes changes to improve the program
- Changes made based on data from Transition Point 2

**Transition Point 3: Candidacy (Professional-Level Coursework & Mid-Level Field Experiences)**

At this point, candidates have been fully admitted and are enrolled in methods course and/or mid-level field experiences. They are being taught by the faculty and are mastering content. To ensure that candidates are successful at this level, academic advisors for the COE and faculty closely monitor progress within coursework and in field experiences.

Assessment:

Assessments are administered including the Dispositions Assessment and the Missouri Content Assessment (MoCA). The MoCA is the first of two formal assessments necessary for licensure in the state of Missouri, and is required prior to the culminating clinical experience – student teaching. To provide support, faculty ensure that Missouri Standards for the Preparation of Educators (MoSPE) are aligned to coursework and candidate progress is consistently monitored to ensure content mastery. Candidates are encouraged to use library and computer resources for preparation, including opportunities to review the content, take a pre-test, and attend preparation sessions with faculty. Course grades, field experience assessments, and dispositions are reviewed each semester to ensure that candidates are progressing satisfactory.

For example, if a candidate is not attending class regularly, the academic advisor meets with the candidate and the instructor of record. If there is a problem, the advisor and instructor develop a plan to work with the student including allowing time to make up assignments, or allowing for receiving an incomplete. On the other hand, if dispositions are not appropriate, the advisor meets with the candidate along with the Dean to resolve. If not resolved, the student is referred to the Dispositions Committee who will develop a plan for improvement.

Syllabi are revised each semester to include necessary coursework and programmatic improvements based on the collection of data from Transition Point 3.

**Transition Point 4: Clinical Practice (Culminating Field Experiences – Practicum & Student Teaching)**

At this point, candidates are placed in schools for their practicum experience/methods courses and a final semester of student teaching. To ensure quality preparation, during practicum experiences, candidates work in schools implementing the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) to ensure that they understand and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions associated with P-12 student learning
and development. In collaboration with highly qualified cooperating teachers from the school district and clinical educators from the University, candidates are provided with opportunities for both structured observation and the implementation of lessons/activities. These opportunities provide authentic experience regarding how to structure lessons based on pre- and post-assessments and contextual factors of the setting(s). They learn how to develop and implement differentiated instruction to be inclusive of all students including ELL and those with special needs.

To ensure high-quality consistent experiences, a year-long placement is implemented for many of the candidates; with the first semester serving as the practicum, and the second semester serving as the student teaching experience. Ultimately, all candidates will be placed in a year-long experience, as the EPP is planning to create and implement a Professional Development Schools residency model, in collaboration with the local school district.

The specific focus of clinical experiences is to develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions reflective of the MoSPE standards, as well as those related to Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs), which are specific for each licensure area.

**Assessment:**

The performance of candidates during practicum is monitored via the implementation of the Teacher Work Sample and through the collection of informal teaching observations.

The performance of candidates during student teaching is initially monitored via Formative Observation Feedback which is summarized by the supervisor and shared with the candidates to improve performance. Four Formative Assessments are also administered and results are shared with the candidates, as well. In addition, a Summative Assessment is completed, as well. Data from the University supervisors, cooperating teachers, and school administrator(s) (Missouri Educator Evaluation System) (MEES) are summarized and used to improve student teaching experiences.

The second of two formal assessments necessary for licensure in the state of Missouri is the Missouri Pre-Service Teacher Assessment (MoPTA). During the student teaching semester, candidates participate in seminars on campus to prepare for this multi-task performance assessment. In addition, professional development opportunities are provided to student teachers, such participation in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and Data Teams at the school level, to ensure that they are using data to make instructional decisions that directly impact P-12 student learning.

The results from the MoPTA are compared with the results of the TWS and used to improve student performance in real-time, and to make necessary programmatic changes to the EPP. The faculty assesses Task I of MoPTA to ensure they understand how students are approaching the contextual factors, which directly impact subsequent teaching effectiveness and student learning. Faculty that specialize in reading and mathematics review Tasks 2 and 3. Coordinators in each of the majors review the entire test to find ways to help students improve.

Data from all assessments are collected and compiled by the Data Committee, shared with the COE faculty, and utilized in making necessary improvements to the EPP.
Overview of Data Analysis from Common Assessments

● The Teacher Work Sample over the last two semesters is helping candidates with the structure and time management necessary to be successful with MoPTA
● Those students in the year-long clinical experience appear to be more successful in student teaching, and several have been hired at their placement site as soon as student teaching has been completed
● In Fall 2016, 100% of the completers passed both the MoCA and MoPTA and were recommended for certification and graduation
● A comparative analysis of the two placements using the formative and summative data will be completed for two semesters at the end of the spring 2017
● Time management continues to be a problem, as urban students struggle with working, taking care of families, and limited resources; each of these negatively impacting the time required to complete student teaching successfully

A full analysis and discussion related to candidate data can be located on the COE Data Dashboard found on the College of Education website.

Transition Point 5: Follow-Up

This phase of the quality assurance system is utilized to determine the extent to which completers are employed and if they are making an impact on P-12 learning.

Data are collected and summarized from the completers, including surveys and case study details, as well as employer surveys.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Assessment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Measure</th>
<th>Collection/ Transition Point</th>
<th>How Often/ Frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Data Location/ Repository</th>
<th>Collected &amp; Analyzed by</th>
<th>Shared with for Review</th>
<th>Standard Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MoGEA, GPA</td>
<td>As one of the first MEGA assessments, MoGEA data identifies strengths and areas of challenge regarding candidates’ mastery of basic skills. GPA is also tracked, and a minimum standard is required for admittance to the EPP, as well as for licensure</td>
<td>Candidate Progress</td>
<td>Recruitment, Induction</td>
<td>MoGEA &amp; GPA data collected when being admitted to COE, GPA data reviewed continuously</td>
<td>Office of Academic Success in collaboration with Assistant Dean</td>
<td>COE Data Dashboard</td>
<td>Assistant Dean; Office of Academic Success; Data Committee; EPP Faculty</td>
<td>EPP Faculty; COE Advisory Committee/Teacher Education Council; Additional Stakeholders*; Quality Assurance Committee; Data Committee; the public via COE Data Dashboard</td>
<td>CAEP 1.3, 5.1 InTASC 1,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions Assessment</td>
<td>As a tool that is implemented at various points in the program, as an instructor-completed and</td>
<td>Candidate Progress, Survey</td>
<td>Induction, Candidacy, Clinical Practice</td>
<td>Twice a semester</td>
<td>Course Instructors and Clinical Experiences Faculty</td>
<td>COE Data Dashboard</td>
<td>Data Committee; EPP Faculty</td>
<td>EPP Faculty; COE Advisory Committee/Teacher Education Council; Additional Stakeholders*;</td>
<td>CAEP 5.1 InTASC 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teacher Early-Field Experience Assessment</td>
<td>As an observation tool implemented in early-level field experiences, and from the perspective of the cooperating teacher, data identifies the potential in candidates toward successful teaching experiences.</td>
<td>Candidate Progress, Observation Tool</td>
<td>Induction</td>
<td>Once at conclusion of semester</td>
<td>Cooperating Teacher under the direction of Director of Field and Clinical Experiences</td>
<td>COE Data Dashboard</td>
<td>Director of Field and Clinical Experiences; Data Committee</td>
<td>EPP Faculty; COE Advisory Committee/Teacher Education Council; Additional Stakeholders*; Quality Assurance Committee; Data Committee; the public via COE Data Dashboard</td>
<td>CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*identified throughout document
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperating Teacher Mid-Field Experience Assessment</th>
<th>As an observation tool implemented in mid-level field experiences, and from the perspective of the cooperating teacher, data identifies the potential in candidates toward successful teaching experiences.</th>
<th>Candidate Progress, Observation Tool</th>
<th>Clinical Practice (Field Experience Courses &amp; Practicum)</th>
<th>Once at conclusion of semester</th>
<th>Cooperating Teacher under the direction of Director of Field and Clinical Experiences</th>
<th>COE Data Dashboard</th>
<th>Director of Field and Clinical Experiences; Data Committee</th>
<th>EPP Faculty; COE Advisory Committee/Teacher Education Council; Additional Stakeholders*; Quality Assurance Committee; Data Committee; the public via COE Data Dashboard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Work Sample</td>
<td>As the final capstone for practicum courses, candidates must demonstrate a skill set related to planning, implementation, and assessment of learning, necessary to be effective teachers.</td>
<td>Candidate Progress, Performance Assessment</td>
<td>Clinical Practice (Practicum)</td>
<td>Completed throughout duration or practicum, submitted at conclusion of semester</td>
<td>Practicum Supervisor</td>
<td>COE Data Dashboard</td>
<td>Practicum Supervisor; Data Committee; EPP Faculty</td>
<td>EPP Faculty; COE Advisory Committee/Teacher Education Council; Additional Stakeholders*; Quality Assurance Committee; Data Committee; the public via COE Data Dashboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*identified throughout document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 5.1*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MoCA</th>
<th>As the MEGA assessment requires prior to certification, and at HSSU, prior to graduation, successful passage of the MoCA demonstrates candidate abilities necessary to be considered career-ready.</th>
<th>Candidate Progress, Summative Assessment</th>
<th>Candidacy</th>
<th>Taken prior to student teaching</th>
<th>Preparation and approval provided by licensure area coordinators</th>
<th>COE Data Dashboard</th>
<th>Assistant Dean; Data Committee; EPP Faculty</th>
<th>EPP Faculty; COE Advisory Committee/Teacher Education Council; Additional Stakeholders*; Quality Assurance Committee; Data Committee; the public via COE Data Dashboard *identified throughout document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formative Observation Feedback</td>
<td>As an observation tool related to a set of specific instructional strategies and implemented in an ongoing manner during student teaching from the perspective of the student teaching supervisor, data identifies strengths and</td>
<td>Candidate Progress, Formative Assessment, Observation Tool</td>
<td>Clinical Practice</td>
<td>Ongoing during student teaching</td>
<td>Clinical Experiences Faculty</td>
<td>COE Data Dashboard</td>
<td>Director of Field and Clinical Experiences; Clinical Experiences Faculty; Data Committee</td>
<td>EPP Faculty; COE Advisory Committee/Teacher Education Council; Additional Stakeholders*; Quality Assurance Committee; Data Committee; the public via COE Data Dashboard *identified throughout document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.3, 5.1 InTASC 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formative Assessment</th>
<th>Candidate Progress, Formative Assessment, Observation Tool</th>
<th>Clinical Practice</th>
<th>Ongoing during student teaching</th>
<th>Clinical Experiences Faculty &amp; Cooperating Teachers</th>
<th>COE Data Dashboard</th>
<th>Director of Field and Clinical Experiences; Clinical Experiences Faculty; Data Committee</th>
<th>EPP Faculty; COE Advisory Committee/Teacher Education Council; Additional Stakeholders*; Quality Assurance Committee; Data Committee; the public via COE Data Dashboard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summative Assessment</td>
<td>Candidate Progress, Clinical Practice</td>
<td>Near the conclusion</td>
<td>Clinical Experiences Faculty &amp;</td>
<td>COE Data Dashboard</td>
<td>Director of Field and Clinical</td>
<td>EPP Faculty; COE Advisory Committee/Teacher Education Council; Additional Stakeholders*; Quality Assurance Committee; Data Committee; the public via COE Data Dashboard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*identified throughout document

Areas of weakness that can be strengthened through support.

Formative Assessment

As an observation tool implemented in an ongoing manner during student teaching, and from the perspective of the student teaching supervisor, data identifies the potential in towards successful teaching and provides feedback necessary to making improvements throughout the process.

Summative Assessment

As an observation tool implemented

| CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.3, 5.1 InTASC 2, 8, 9, 10 |
| Administrator Assessment of the Teacher Candidate | As an observation tool implemented after the student teaching experience, and from the perspective of the building-level administrator, data identifies the potential in towards toward successful teaching. | Candidate Progress, Summative Assessment, Observation Tool | Clinical Practice | After student teaching | School-based administrator or principal | COE Data Dashboard | Director of Field and Clinical Experiences; Clinical Experiences Faculty; Data Committee | EPP Faculty; COE Advisory Committee/Teacher Education Council; Additional Stakeholders*; Quality Assurance Committee; Data Committee; the public via COE Data Dashboard | CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 4.1, 5.1 InTASC 1-10 |
| MoPTA | As the final capstone for student teaching, | Candidate Progress, Performance Assessment | Clinical Practice | Throughout the duration of student teaching | Clinical Experiences Faculty | COE Data Dashboard | Director of Field and Clinical Experiences; Clinical Experiences Faculty | EPP Faculty; COE Advisory Committee/Teacher Education Council; Additional Stakeholders*; Quality Assurance Committee; Data Committee; the public via COE Data Dashboard | CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 4.1, 5.1 InTASC 1-10 |
candidates demonstrate performance skills related to planning, implementation, and assessment of learning for P-12 students necessary to be successful in the field.

| Clinical Experiences Faculty; Data Committee | Additional Stakeholders*; Quality Assurance Committee; Data Committee; the public via COE Data Dashboard |

*identified throughout document

| InTASC 1-10 |
The Monitoring of Completer Achievements

Assessment:

The EPP collects State data to attain further details on completers including where they are employed and how many have been certified. Data on the performance of candidates toward impacting P-12 student learning after program completion is conducted through the collection and analysis of student-teacher surveys, employer surveys, and case studies. The EPP is working in coordination with the State as well as stakeholder groups to increase the response rate of completer surveys and to gain increased access to assessment data which demonstrates the impact of completers on student learning gains.

Analysis of Data

- Completers are indicating that realistic discourse including role play helps them to make decisions related to establishing a positive learning environment and classroom management
- Completers indicate a desire for alignment of methods coursework with the district curriculum mapping and instructional sequencing that they will address as teachers
- Completers indicate they benefit from a focus on long-term instructional planning and curriculum design, and would like increased training in this area in additional coursework
- Completers are indicating that increased time in field experiences would help them to be better prepared to handle the contextual factors involved in being educators, including working with parents, working with second-language learnings, working with exceptional learners, and making instructional decisions related to classroom management

In summary, procedures for the systemic collection, analysis, and dissemination of data have been detailed in this Quality Assurance System Plan. The following section, 5.2, addresses issues such as relevance and validity. Critical in Section 5.2, assessment data should be actionable. Indeed, analysis of data has resulted in key innovations as discussed in Section 5.3. Structures for collection and analysis of completer data are addressed on Component 4. Finally, structures put in place to promote stakeholder involvement are addressed in Component 5.

Component 5.2

Component 5.2. The provider’s quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

The HSSU Quality Assurance System Plan relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures and produces empirical evidence so that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

Relevant

Consequential relevance at each transition point is established through rigorous analysis of assessments that is conducted to ensure that faculty and other stakeholders understand assessment data and how to use it to inform educational decision making as well as how to use the data to inform assistance provided students. Faculty and other stakeholders have viewed, studied, and discussed CAEP and Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) Webinars on the
understanding of assessment data and the use of data to inform instructional decision making. Additionally, a consultant who is an experienced principal at a partner elementary school provided professional development for faculty, staff, and candidates on the understanding of assessment data to inform educational decision making. The EPP gathers data about students and the program at key transition points. The faculty and COE administration examined course syllabi to ensure that the content is in alignment with CAEP and InTASC standards. This has been identified as an area of needed improvement by the faculty. This review is also beneficial toward informing choices made by faculty in the annual review of textbooks that are chosen for courses. The unit is aided by changes in assessment practices in ensuring that early field placements and clinical practices are well organized and assessed. The State’s new performance assessments (MoPTA) enable candidates to have more opportunities to demonstrate their abilities in working with students and impacting learning. Analysis of the data indicates strengths and weaknesses of candidates. The unit has decided to ensure that students have access to consistent lesson plans and rubrics to ensure consistent evaluation of assessments. As described in Table 2, assessments are aligned with CAEP and InTASC Standard. At transition points, faculty study multiple measures of evidence related to candidate assessment. Regarding the Formative Observation Feedback Assessment, Formative Assessment, and Summative Assessment – all designed by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) – the HSSU student teaching supervisors and P-12 cooperating teachers have been trained on these to be implemented during the clinical experience semester/student teaching.

Verifiable

The Harris-Stowe State University COE Data Committee collects all data from common assessments, disaggregates data by licensure area, creates visual depictions such as tables and graphs, and writes a complete narrative utilizing descriptive analytics. The data is then published on the COE Data Dashboard. Licensure-area coordinators and faculty collaborate with representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Business at each transition and data collection point via their participation in the College of Education Advisory Committee/Teacher Education Council (TEC) to ensure that pertinent data for that term/transition point has been submitted and reviewed. Data is also shared with all stakeholders, as previously identified. Once the academic year has ended, another review takes places, intended to make necessary programmatic changes that will be implemented during the upcoming academic year. The Assistant Dean and the Data Committee have the raw data available to verify accuracy by recalculation at any time.

Representative

The Harris-Stowe State University faculty and other stakeholders occasionally check teacher candidate assessments and evaluation practices to diminish bias and certify impartiality. They are trained on how to use the identified scoring instruments. Thus, the candidate assessments are impartial, precise, and reliable because they are aligned with state and national requirements. The P-12 and university clinical educators independently complete the field and clinical experience assessments. The independent evaluations are then aggregated and disaggregated by licensure area, and compared as part of the annual data review and analysis.

Cumulative

The Harris-Stowe State University quality assurance system includes data from at least three or more cycles of administration/collection of all EPP-wide common assessments.
Valid

As requested in the CAEP Formative Feedback Report, reliability and validity assurance plans have been developed and are being implemented for the Cooperating Teacher Field Experience Assessment and the Dispositions Assessment. An inter-rater reliability study for the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) was conducted in spring 2017, and results were reported above .80. All other assessments in use by the EPP are considered proprietary in nature. These ongoing processes are a part of the continuous improvement model to ensure validity, reliability, and inter-rater reliability as indicated below in Table 3.

Table 3: Relevant and Verifiable Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Assessment</th>
<th>Established Content Validity</th>
<th>Inter-Rater Reliability at .80 or Above</th>
<th>Tagged/Aligned to Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MoGEA</td>
<td>Proprietary Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoCA</td>
<td>Proprietary Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoPTA</td>
<td>Proprietary Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative Observation Feedback Assessment</td>
<td>Proprietary Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative Assessment</td>
<td>Proprietary Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative Assessment</td>
<td>Proprietary Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator Evaluation of the Teacher Candidate</td>
<td>Proprietary Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teacher Field Experience Assessment</td>
<td>Plan has been developed</td>
<td>Plan has been developed</td>
<td>Yes (InTASC/CAEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions Assessment</td>
<td>Plan has been developed</td>
<td>Plan has been developed</td>
<td>Yes (InTASC/CAEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Work Sample</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (InTASC/CAEP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actionable

The Harris-Stowe State University COE Quality Assurance System Plan and data are accessible on the COE Data Dashboard. In Figure 5, please find the Continuous Improvement Cycle which is the driving force behind decisions that are made about the strengths and areas for growth within each program. The changes recommended by the program faculty and other stakeholders are based on consistent review of the data. The data is a critical part of the quality assurance system because it provides the information needed to determine what, if any, changes will be made within a program or EPP-wide.
Component 5.3

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.

The Assessment of Performance, Goals and Relevant Standards

The EPP utilizes candidate data from common assessments, insights gleaned from candidate self-evaluations, and internal/external unit and program review data to make changes to the program and curriculum. The assessment system is designed to ensure that the EPP achieves two primary goals: 1) prepare HSSU teacher education candidates who are reflective practitioners with the required knowledge, skills and dispositions to work in a global society and 2) ensure that the EPP uses data to strengthen teacher preparation practices. The EPP continuously strives to improve its data collection and analysis practices. In addition, content-area faculty are involved in the unit assessment system by service on the College of Education Advisory Committee/Teacher Education Council (TEC), and are committed to alignment of course objectives with EPP, State, InTASC, and SPA standards.

Further, the EPP systematically collects data and analyzes, monitors, and reports it across the EPP. In Figure 4, the EPP has illustrated overview of the continuous improvement cycle by way of the academic calendar. Before the academic year begins, the Data Committee, Assistant Dean, and support staff generate reports from the data housed on the COE Data Dashboard, as well as that from priority assessments, provided by Pearson and ETS. The reports are generated to share with the faculty during the fall semester to initiate the continuous improvement and reporting cycle.

Reports are generated, summarized, and analyzed by the Data Committee, and then reviewed by EPP program faculty and stakeholders. Figure 4 displays how the faculty positively impacts student learning by reviewing and discussing data at weekly faculty meetings to determine strengths and areas for growth. The cycle of continuous improvement includes four processes: (1) reflect, (2) plan, (3) implement, and (4) analyze. Based on this review cycle, if revisions are needed, the recommendations are sent to an external advisory committee who determine if changes are needed specifically to the assessment rubrics, a specific course, or an entire curriculum.

The Tracking of Results over Time

The data that is collected is tracked over a three-year rolling review cycle to allow stakeholders an opportunity to review and participate in the continuous improvement process. As a part of this review cycle, each program reports on the EPP progress to the Quality Assurance Committee regarding recommendations from the previous year.

Testing of Innovations

The Standard 5 Research Agenda (Table 4) details innovations that are underway. In spring 2017, the EPP began participating in the multi-state Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) Initiative through the Association of American Colleges and Universities. Faculty have been trained to participate in this initiative, include ways of using data generated with the aid of VALUE rubrics to improve instructional decision making. This participation helps the EPP to utilize the data system for information to analyze effectiveness of various components of EPP. For more details on this initiative, see: https://www.aacu.org/value.
The EPP has reformed its completer surveys and supervisor surveys. Additionally, the EPP has initiated focus group interviews and research (longitudinal design-based research and case study).

The conducting of research is intended to provide systematic feedback at various stages of program progress and at the completion point by candidates. In Table 4, the Research Agenda details how input is provided. The studies only began in fall 2016, and not all studies detailed in the agenda have been started.

### Table 4: EPP Research Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Data Collection and Analysis Methods</th>
<th>Conceptual Framework</th>
<th>Indications and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Thinking of Teacher Candidates (Pre-Student teaching)</td>
<td>During and After EPP Classroom Instruction following reflective writing, case study and/or unit design construction</td>
<td>Semi-Structured and Open-ended Interviews; Document Analysis. N = 9.</td>
<td>Third Generation Cultural Historical Activity Theory (Cole, Engeström) Pragmatic-based Four-Category Protocol of Examining Reflective Thinking in Writing (Kember; Schon); Distributed scaffolding in reflective thinking (Cole; Luria; Smagorinsky)</td>
<td>This project is ongoing. Findings are preliminary. Themes arising include the following: (a) Teacher candidates are in need of increased emphasis on reflective thinking and consistency in discussions on how to be reflective; (b) increased time in the field would benefit teacher candidates to reflect on practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Thinking of Beginning Teachers</td>
<td>First Year of Teaching and First Five Years of Teaching</td>
<td>Focus groups with Semi-Structured and Open-ended Interviews; Document Analysis. N = 12.</td>
<td>Third Generation Cultural Historical Activity Theory (Cole, Engeström)</td>
<td>This project is ongoing. Findings are preliminary. Themes arising include the following: (a) real-life examples of classroom management issues and conversation by faculty while beginning teachers during undergraduate study is beneficial; (b) beginning teachers indicate that they felt a need for increased preparation to meet district curriculum guidelines through long-term curriculum planning; (c) beginning teachers indicate that they would have benefitted from increased time in field experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Thinking of Teacher Candidates (Student-Teaching)</td>
<td>During and After EPP Classroom Instruction following reflective writing - journals</td>
<td>Semi-Structured and Open-ended Interviews; Document Analysis.</td>
<td>Third Generation Cultural Historical Activity Theory (Cole, Engeström)</td>
<td>This project is in the planning stage. It has yet to be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate</td>
<td>Student Teaching and Observation; Semi-Structured</td>
<td>Pragmatic and critical</td>
<td>This project is in the planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Instruction</td>
<td>Field Experiences and Open-ended Interviews; Document Analysis</td>
<td>understanding of effective teaching (Darling-Hammond)</td>
<td>stage. It has yet to be implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy of Teacher Candidates and EPP Graduates who are Teachers</td>
<td>Student Teaching and Field Experiences; First Year of Teaching; First Five Years of Teaching</td>
<td>Survey; Semi-Structured and Open-ended Interviews; Document Analysis</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy Theory (Bandura); Teacher Efficacy (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, and Hoy)</td>
<td>This project has yet to be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective thinking of Read and Feed Volunteer Participants (COE Teacher Candidates)</td>
<td>Teacher Candidates participate in “Read and Feed” activities. Before, during and after these activities the candidates receive training to reading to (and with) children. These activities are in conjunction with coursework.</td>
<td>Semi-Structured and Open-ended Interviews; Observation. N = 6</td>
<td>Third Generation Cultural Historical Activity Theory (Cole, Engeström)</td>
<td>This project is ongoing. Findings are preliminary. Themes arising include the following: (a) Teacher candidates are in need of increased emphasis on reading strategies especially in regard to ELL and special education; (b) increased time in the field would benefit teacher candidates to reflect on practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective thinking of participants in community service reading activities (COE Teacher Candidates)</td>
<td>Teacher Candidates participate in community service reading activities connected with a local organization called “Community”</td>
<td>Semi-Structured and Open-ended Interviews; Observation. N = 20</td>
<td>Third Generation Cultural Historical Activity Theory (Cole, Engeström)</td>
<td>This project is ongoing. Findings are preliminary. Themes arising include the following: (a) Teacher candidates are in need of increased</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Women Against Hardship.” Before, during and after these activities the candidates receive training to reading to (and with) children. These activities are in conjunction with coursework.

emphasis on reading strategies especially in regard to special education; (b) increased time in the field would benefit teacher candidates to reflect on practice.

The Effects of Selection Criteria on Subsequent Progress and Completion

As detailed in Standard 3 of the CAEP report, there is a positive correlation between GPA and program completion. This shows a relationship between a higher GPA upon selection to the EPP and program completion. Conversely, a student with a lower GPA upon entrance to the GPA has a lower chance of completing the program. Because of the University’s mission, the EPP admits some students who may have struggled in their prior academic experiences, with a lower GPA or lower SAT/ACT score. The EPP believes this has an inverse correlation on program completion rate.

The Use of Results to Improve Program Elements and Processes

Once the assessments have been analyzed at the program level, the process moves to the College of Education Advisory Committee/Teacher Education Council (TEC) who makes recommendations to the EPP. The TEC meets monthly to review and discuss various items such as the EPP data. This committee consists of internal and external stakeholders. Finally, at the end of the academic year, the Quality Assurance and Data Committees meet to review and discuss the EPP data and the recommendations of the TEC and EPP faculty. To conclude the academic year, the licensure area coordinators, in conjunction with the Dean, Assistant Dean, and Director of Field and Clinical Experiences collaboratively create a Quality Assurance Report (QAR) which is then reviewed by the Quality Assurance and Data Committees. This QAR helps the Committees to examine and deliberate on the data from each program. Based on most the current data received, the Committees discuss results throughout programs and formulate recommendations for modifications with the ultimate purpose of shaping candidates who will certainly influence P-12 student learning. Membership in the Quality Assurance Committee and Data Committee include full-time faculty, as well as a part-time consultant. Once the periodic review period has ended, the delegates create a final Quality Assurance Report (QAR) which is then reviewed by the Committees once more. The Committees discuss the QAR and make final recommendations for the EPP’s upcoming academic year. These recommendations close the continuous improvement loop. The final recommendations are disseminated to all internal and external stakeholders and displayed on the COE Data Dashboard.
Figure 4. Stakeholder Involvement/Meeting Schedule.

Figure 5. Educator Preparation Provider - Model for Continuous Improvement.
Component 5.4

Component 5.4. Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on PK-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.

To measure the completer impact as a part of the continuous improvement cycle detailed in the previous section, data is drawn from a variety of sources. Table 5 details the eight outcome and impact measures that are aptly examined and gives an account together with the following:

- Exact evaluation of trends
- Analogies with standards
- Future direction is informed by data

These data, standards, and trends are posted on the HSSU COE Data Dashboard disseminated extensively to identified stakeholders.

Table 5: Outcome and Impact Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/Impact</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-12 student learning and development</td>
<td>Data from selected school district partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data from P-12 student surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations of teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>Data from selected school district partners, including via interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and meeting conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data from Formative Observation Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data from Formative and Summative Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data from the Teacher Work Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MoPTA pass rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer satisfaction and completer persistence</td>
<td>Principal Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completer satisfaction</td>
<td>Alumni Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Teacher Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completer/graduation rate</td>
<td>Provided by Assistant Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensure rate</td>
<td>Provided by Assistant Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment rate</td>
<td>School district data (DESE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Dean – personal communication with graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer information, including student loan</td>
<td>Harris-Stowe State University financial aid office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>default rate</td>
<td>Harris-Stowe State University Registrar’s website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harris-Stowe State University Student Account Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 5.5

5.5 Stakeholder Involvement: The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.

As a part of the continuous improvement cycle as detailed in previous sections, and visually depicted in Figure 4, an extensive partnership of diverse stakeholders are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence. HSSU stakeholders include alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and HSSU professionals.

College of Education Advisory Committee/Teacher Education Council

Membership in this committee includes, but is not limited to, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Business, representatives from the library, the Director of the Clay Child Development and Parenting Education Center (HSSU lab school), and additional parties as determined on an as-needed basis. This group of internal and external stakeholders is involved in ongoing EPP-wide decision making processes. Responsibilities include (a) review the process for the admission of candidates; and (b) review data on recruitment, admission, candidacy, clinical experiences, and follow-up after graduation; necessary in making decisions that influence the entire educational program.

Superintendents Advisory Committee

Membership in this committee includes superintendents from the partner school districts. Meetings are held twice per year in the fall and spring. It is composed of local superintendents where the EPP places students and have memorandum of understanding. Responsibilities include (a) review data reports on EPP; (b) consider new programs; (d) discuss placement and performance of candidates; (e) advocacy for new programs, placement of candidates in school districts, collaborate on grants.

Principals and Cooperating Teachers Committee

Membership in this committee includes principals and cooperating teachers from the partnership schools of the EPP. This group meets annually. Meetings are held on campus at the end of the school year for EPP and school districts in June or July. Responsibilities include: (a) full day for professional development; (b) review of assessment data; (c) analysis of the use of data related to impact on P-12 students; (d) discussion and feedback on the placement of student teachers.

HSSU Alumni Association

Membership in this committee is on a volunteer basis and all graduates of the HSSU COE are invited to participate. The Association is primarily an advocacy group that supports the COE through the offering of various enrichment programs for current students, serving in various advocate roles within the community and on campus, and assisting with funding needs that are critical to the success of the COE.

Student Advisory Committee

Membership in this committee includes current students who have been recommended as exemplary leaders by COE instructors, coordinators, and administration. This committee was
established in spring 2017. The committee was designed to provide an opportunity for representative groups to provide input to EPP programming. Committee members will have opportunities to arrange professional development opportunities to current students, to confer with Dean and other faculty to make policy recommendations, will be involved in discussions related to curriculum, assessment, faculty roles, admissions policies, accreditation and other items pertaining to student roles and responsibilities. Students are encouraged to offer suggestions for improving the teaching and learning experience, to organize additional groups to respond to goals, and to be a critical friend to the College of Education.

Conclusion

The Harris-Stowe State University Quality Assurance System Plan exemplifies the fundamental components of the Educator Preparation Provider and establishes a plan for ensuring consistency among curriculum, instruction, participation in field and clinical experiences, and assessment of candidates and unit operations. It provides a vision of how to best prepare teacher education candidates in the delivery of high-quality educational services to children, youth, schools, families, and communities.

The Plan, which is grounded in best practices related to data-driven decision making necessary in continuous improvement, clearly outlines the cycle of the collection and analysis of candidate and operational data. These ongoing processes, and in particular the examination of trend data, provides an opportunity for reflection among vested stakeholders, that inform the practices of the EPP moving forward. The cycle of continuous improvement detailed ensures that Harris-Stowe State University graduates enter the field with the necessary content knowledge and pedagogical skills to positively impact P-12 student learning and success.
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