



## AAQEP Annual Report for 2022

Provider/Program Name:	College of St. Scholastica
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or "n/a" if not yet accredited):	June 30, 2026

### PART I: Publicly Available Program Performance and Candidate Achievement Data

#### 1. Overview and Context

This overview describes the mission and context of the educator preparation provider and the programs included in its AAQEP review.

The College of St. Scholastica is an independent private college located in Duluth, Minnesota. The College was founded in 1912 and sponsored by the Benedictine Sisters, with a mission of providing intellectual and moral preparation for responsible living and meaningful work in a context of Catholic Benedictine values.

The College offers programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels grounded in the liberal arts, with excellent professional programs and a particularly strong focus and reputation in the health sciences and nursing. The General Education program provides students with a foundation in the liberal arts and sciences, cultivating a conscientious use of knowledge that prepares them for responsible living in a global community. Central to these efforts is our particular attention given to the individual student. The College aspires to be a diverse and inclusive academic community of excellence.

The School of Education was first established as the Education Department in 1912, the same year that the College was founded. The College is in the process of moving from six disciplinary schools to three: School of Health Professions, School of Arts and Sciences and the Stender School of Leadership, Business and Professional studies, where the education department will reside.

*The Education Department Mission:* To prepare and support teachers who are firmly grounded in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to promote student learning.

*The Education Department Vision:* To be nationally recognized for developing skilled and caring professionals prepared to educate students in a diverse and changing world.

### **Education Programs**

The Education Department offers the following AAQEP approved programs:

- Undergraduate Teaching Licensure (*Initial Licensure*)
- Graduate Teaching Licensure (GTL) (*Initial Licensure*)
- Graduate Academic Behavior Strategist Licensure (*Additional Licensure*)
- Graduate K-12 Reading Teaching Licensure (*Additional Licensure*)
- Master of Education (MEd) (*Advanced Programs*)
- Doctorate in Educational Leadership (*Advanced Programs*)

### **Public Posting URL**

Part I of this report is posted at the following web address (accredited members filing this report must post at least Part I):

Direct Link to Report:

Part I of the report is also housed in the Accreditation portion of the following program web pages:

<https://www.css.edu/academics/programs/undergraduate/ba-bs-middle-secondary-education/?ecopen=accreditation>

<https://www.css.edu/academics/programs/undergraduate/bachelor-of-science-elementary-education/?ecopen=accreditation>

<https://www.css.edu/academics/programs/certificates/graduate-special-education-licensure/?ecopen=accreditation>

<https://www.css.edu/academics/programs/certificates/graduate-teaching-licensure/?ecopen=accreditation>

<https://www.css.edu/academics/programs/graduate/master-of-education/?ecopen=accreditation>

<https://www.css.edu/academics/programs/doctorate/doctor-of-educational-leadership/?ecopen=accreditation>

<https://www.css.edu/academics/programs/certificates/certificate-in-literacy-instruction/?ecopen=accreditation>

## 2. Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows current enrollment and recent completion data for each program included in the AAQEP review.

**Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2021-2022**

<b>Degree or Certificate</b> granted by the institution or organization	<b>State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential</b>	<b>Number of Candidates</b> enrolled in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/22)	<b>Number of Completers</b> in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/22)
<b><i>Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials</i></b>			
Bachelor of Science	Initial Certification: Elementary Education (Grades K-6)	83	26
Bachelor of Arts	Initial Certification: Biology (Grades 5-12)	3	1
	Initial Certification: Chemistry (Grades 5-12)	0	0
	Initial Certification: English (Grades 5-12)	9	5
	Initial Certification: Mathematics (Grades 5-12)	4	0
	Initial Certification: Social Studies (Grades 5-12)	8	5
	Initial Certification: Instrumental Music (Grades K-12)	2	0
	Initial Certification: Vocal Music (Grades K-12)	1	0
	Initial Certification: Spanish (Grades K-12)	2	0
Graduate Certificate	Initial Certification: Elementary Education (Grades K-6)	42	18
	Initial Certification: Biology (Grades 5-12)	11	3
	Initial Certification: Chemistry (Grades 5-12)	1	0

	Initial Certification: English (Grades 5-12)	21	9
	Initial Certification: Mathematics (Grades 5-12)	0	0
	Initial Certification: Social Studies (Grades 5-12)	22	10
	Initial Certification: Spanish (Grades K-12)	2	2
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials		211	79
<b><i>Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators</i></b>			
Graduate Certificate	Academic and Behavioral Strategist Licensure (Grades K-12)	16	6
Graduate Certificate	Literacy Instruction (Grades K-12)	51 (39 Med + Cert)	23 (18 Med + Cert [8 completed 12 credit Cert])
Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials		67	29
<b><i>Programs that lead to credentials for other school professionals or to no specific credential</i></b>			
Master of Education	Non-Licensure	109	48
Doctorate in Educational Leadership	Non-Licensure	12	0
Total for additional programs		121	48
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs		399	156
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers		360	138

### **Added or Discontinued Programs**

Any programs within the AAQEP review that have been added or discontinued within the past year are listed below. (This list is required only from providers with accredited programs.)

N/A
-----

### 3. Program Performance Indicators

The program performance information in Table 2 applies to the academic year indicated in Table 1.

**Table 2. Program Performance Indicators**

A. <b>Total enrollment</b> in the educator preparation programs shown in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals earning more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.				
348				
B. <b>Total number of unique completers</b> (across all programs) included in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals who earned more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.				
138				
C. <b>Number of recommendations</b> for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.				
96 total licensure recommendations.				
	Tier 4	Tier 3	Tier 2	<b>Total</b>
English (5-12)		12		<b>12</b>
Elementary Education (K-6)		40	3	<b>43</b>
Biology (5-12)		3		<b>3</b>
Social Studies (5-12)		11	3	<b>14</b>
Spanish (K-12)		3		<b>3</b>
General Science (5-8)*		3		<b>3</b>
Academic and Behavioral Specialist (K-12)**	5			<b>5</b>
Literacy Instruction (K-12)**	11	2		<b>13</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>96</b>
*General Science is offered in conjunction with Biology licensure.				

\*\*Additional Licensure Completers will often wait until their licensure renewal date to add these fields. As such, the number of completers who are recommended for licensure in any given year does not necessarily correlate to the number of completers in that year. Literacy Instruction students also have the option to complete a 12 credit non-licensure pathway.

**D. Cohort completion rates** for candidates who completed the various programs within their respective program's expected timeframe **and** in 1.5 times the expected timeframe.

Undergraduate: 100%

GTL: 93%

Literacy Instruction: 78%\*

Academic Behavioral Specialist: 100%

Master of Education: 83%

Doctorate of Educational Leadership- There are no program completers at this time. The first set of program completers will occur in May of 2025.

\*Many students complete the Literacy Instruction Certificate in conjunction with the MEd resulting in longer completion times.

**E. Summary of state license examination results**, including teacher performance assessments, and specification of any examinations on which the pass rate (cumulative at time of reporting) was below 80%.

Undergrad MTLE:

- Elem Education Content Subtest 1: 75%
- Elem Education Content Subtest 2: 64%
- Elem Education Content Subtest 3: 71%
- Com Arts/Lit Content Subtest 2: 36%
- Social Studies Content Subtest 1: 23%
- Social Studies Content Subtest 2: 18%
- Secondary Pedagogy Subtest 1: 69%
- Secondary Pedagogy Subtest 2: 59%

Undergrad edTPA (July-December 2021 only)

- Elementary Mathematics Planning: 73%
- Elementary Mathematics Assessment: 73%
- Secondary Science Instruction: 50%
- Secondary Science Assessment: 50%
- World Language Planning: 0%
- World Language Instruction: 0%
- World Language Assessment: 0%

#### GTL MTLE:

- Elem Education Content Subtest 1: 73%
- Elem Education Content Subtest 2: 76%
- Social Studies Content Subtest 1: 65%
- Social Studies Content Subtest 2: 37%
- Life Science Content Subtest 2: 67%
- World Language Content Subtest 1: 67%

#### GTL edTPA (July-December 2021 only):

- Elementary Mathematics Planning: 0%
- Elementary Mathematics Instruction: 33%
- Elementary Mathematics Assessment: 33%

#### Literacy Instruction MTLE:

- Subtest 2: 75%

### **Undergraduate Licensure Program**

The MTLE and edTPA scores provided above (for undergraduate, specifically) represent both success and areas of persistent challenge. The narrative below, then seeks to provide contextual information for these scores as well as an overview of our efforts to improve candidate performance. The narrative speaks broadly to programmatic changes (as opposed to specific changes in specific content areas).

Beginning in the ill-fated year of 2020, our undergraduate programs began the painstaking and intentional effort to strengthen instruction toward MTLE and edTPA in our curriculum. To that end, we vowed to begin by conducting a deeper dive on data (where possible) to identify what, specifically, needing strengthening. That deep dive resulted in two (contextually) noteworthy actions.

First, we began with a realignment of the edTPA instruction embedded within our courses. An analysis of in-class preparatory instruction related to all edTPA tasks revealed that the knowledge and skills necessary for success in Task 1 (preparation) were abundant and redundant, whereas instruction related to Task 2 (Instruction) and Task 3 (Assessment) were relegated to particular classes rather than situated in a dispersed fashion throughout the curriculum. It was, thus, uneven. We therefore endeavored to redistribute this instruction for students, spreading it out more broadly and evenly across the four years of time students spent in the preservice phase. Additionally, the faculty and staff from within our entire teacher education faculty group engaged in a yearlong professional development agenda focused on reorienting our entire group to the demands of the edTPA during

2021-2022. By focusing on best practice, local scoring simulation and helpful resources, we returned to our classrooms better equipped to prepare students for the rigors of the assessment. Finally - and perhaps most noteworthy - the education programs instituted a new edTPA policy beginning in fall 2022 that requires students to resubmit any task to Pearson that does not meet state established benchmarks, thus emphasizing the high stakes nature of the exam and requiring students to take it much more seriously during their first attempt. Unfortunately, discretionary variances (for spring 2022) that meant the edTPA was \*not taken make it impossible to measure the impact of our efforts (not to mention that, because of careful and thoughtful planning, many of the changes were only instituted in the last year).

Relative to MTLE scores, we note here that our pedagogy exam preparation (as evidenced by the data) was well established. This has not been the case for MTLE content exams and so we focused with laser-like precision on two areas of instruction pertinent to our elementary education candidates: reading and communication arts (Subtest 1) and math (subtest 2). This was for two reasons: Student feedback revealed that both were an area of needed improvement - a conclusion which was also data supported (from test scores and course grades). To that end, we made multiple changes. On the reading and communication arts side, a full revision of the English/Communication Arts major allowed us to work closely with the chair of the department to ensure that the content needed was up to date and focused on standards. On the math side, we worked tirelessly with the chair to completely redesign math instruction for our elementary education majors by revamping the course content as well as the support systems in place (for example, there is now a dedicated TA that holds “recitation sessions” twice a week to give students extra help). As change happens methodically, slowly, and bureaucratically on a college campus, the ‘22-’23 academic year is the first year of implementation for these changes, so we will not know their impact until our next report. This should not diminish the work and the seriousness with which we took our continuous improvement mandate.

That said, it is also worth noting that students taking their MTLE content exams during the data-set-timeline represented above likely took the bulk of their content courses during an incredibly disruptive and difficult moment in American educational history. For a unit to make decisions based on data from that time period is, therefore, ill-advised. We will, of course, monitor this closely during the next reporting cycle and make decisions and adjustments accordingly.

Finally, it is important to note that the most of the non-elementary-education content area subtests are sourced from a very small pool of students. The nature of this limited data set means that taking action without more test score information is inadvisable. We will certainly continue to monitor student performance on these tests and consider action after an adequate aggregate data set is available.

### **Graduate Teaching Licensure (GTL) Program**

Similar to our Undergraduate Initial licensure program, all teacher candidates in the Graduate Teaching Licensure (GTL) program must pass the edTPA, an evidence-based performance assessment of teacher candidate effectiveness and the Minnesota teacher



licensure examinations (MTLE), before being recommended for licensure by the Education programs at the College of St. Scholastica.

In 2021, the GTL program had less than ten students who completed the edTPA. Due to the continuous impact of COVID on teacher candidates and teacher preparation programs, the Minnesota Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board (PELSB) waived the edTPA in the spring of 2022. The low n associated with the fall 2021 graduate licensure edTPA data makes it difficult to conduct any reasonable analysis of this performance assessment.

Despite the limitations surrounding our edTPA data, the GTL program has continued to initiate and implement program improvement efforts to enhance program quality that would ensure an at or above 80% pass rate on the edTPA and the Minnesota teacher licensure examinations (MTLE). In reviewing our 2021-22 Minnesota teacher licensure examinations ( MTLE) data, we observed a lower than 80% pass rate on the MTLE content Elementary Education (K-6) Sub1 and Sub3; Secondary MTLE Pedagogy (5-12) Sub2, MTLE content Social Studies (5-12) Sub1, MTLE content World Language (K-12) Sub1. After a close examination of these lower than 80 % pass rates tests, we noted that most are content-specific exams. These test scores challenge our assumption that candidates who enroll in the GTL program with existing Bachelor's degrees must have covered the content required to demonstrate mastery on content-specific MTLE exams. We also noticed a gap in the secondary pedagogy exam scores, content covered as part of our teacher preparation curriculum.

At the program team level, efforts to improve candidates' performance based on the MTLE tests and the edTPA are multilayered-academic advising, curriculum revision, program schedule, and course instructors' professional development. The GTL program has implemented MTLE information sessions once each year. The program academic advisor facilitates each new cohort's MTLE information session in the fall. Students from previous cohorts are also invited. During this session, students are introduced to the MTLE as a critical component in their preparation experience, the MTLE website, resources, and curated MTLE resources available on the GTL community page on the College LMS. We hope to expand on the content covered during this session to include mapping test content to courses taken or content they might need a refresher before taking the test. In addition to being proactive in preparing students for the tests, curriculum revision is done with opportunities to explicitly address gaps in pedagogy-related test scores and prompt students to assess knowledge of the specific subjects and use available resources to improve on subject content specific knowledge. At the program scheduling level, students have guide about when to take MTLE exams based on their program study plan. This guidance will help teacher candidates learn necessary content, understand their knowledge gaps and prompt them to be more intentional about preparing and taking MTLE exams with the goal to pass at one attempt. Recently revised GTL methods and field experience courses focused on enhancing embedded components of the edTPA

and MTLE content in these courses. Some program courses have adopted new textbooks and course materials to improve candidates' understanding and opportunities to practice elements of MTLE tests and the edTPA before completing any of these assessments.

Course instructors' professional development is part of our efforts to improve candidates' performance on the MTLE exams and the edTPA. All GTL methods course instructors receive an orientation to the MTLE resources and how to navigate the website for resources specific to their methods courses. In January 2022, all student teaching supervisors completed edTPA 101:Assessment Overview and edTPA Task-by-Task Deep dive offered through edTPA Pearson professional development webinars. Course instructors' decisions to change course-required textbooks and curriculum materials have been partly informed by their awareness of the MTLE and edTPA gaps relevant to student learning and teaching pedagogies.

Finally, the GTL program has agreed to evaluate and revise the curriculum every couple of years using students' performance and other program-related data. We believe that this schedule will allow for a more intentional identification of innovative efforts at improving candidates' performance on the MTLEs, edTPA performance assessment, other assessments as well as their overall effectiveness at program completion and beyond.

### **Additional Licensure**

#### *Special Education and K12 Reading Licensure*

Additional licensure program scores in Special Education are strong with 100% passing rates.

Relative to the Reading licensure examination subtests, the provision of relevant contextual information highlights these test scores are sourced from a very small pool of students-four test takers. The nature of this limited data set means that taking action without more test score data is inadvisable. We will continue to monitor student performance on these tests and consider action after an adequate aggregate data set can be compiled. The program is undergoing a comprehensive curriculum review and revision to accommodate new second licensure hours requirements at the state level. The comprehensive revision includes the examination of all course resources, assignments, and assessments across the program to ensure there are no gaps and/or significant duplication in expectations and to verify alignment of state standards. This review and revision will support student success related to licensure examinations.

### **Advanced Programs**

The Master of Education and Doctorate of Educational Leadership programs do not have licensure exams.

F. Narrative explanation of **evidence available from program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

### **Licensure Programs:**

According to the 2021-2022 exit survey data from the completers of our licensure programs, students show significant strengths in the following noteworthy areas: preparedness to teach subject matter, instructional planning, design and strategizing, the use of formative and summative assessments, utilizing digital and interactive technologies to achieve academic goals, effectively teaching students from culturally and ethnically diverse backgrounds, creating environments where all can learn and be respected, collaborating with parents, students and other teachers, and the utilization of feedback to improve. Licensure programs here at St. Scholastica set a mean of 3.0 (out of 4) as the goal for each survey item; the above-mentioned categories fell well above that goal (most at 100%). In fact, on both surveys, the majority of survey items were consistently above 3.0. We are satisfied by these results. However, we also have work to do in other areas. The 2021-2022 exit survey data also point to needed improvement for our students (and, therefore, our program) in the following areas: designing long range curriculum, engaging students in self-assessment and self-analysis, and differentiation (of all types, with all students). In particular, the latter category (differentiation) has been - and continues to be - a significant area of focus for our licensure programs. Continued effort will be made to tune our programs more specifically to this need through curriculum investigation and (re)development, faculty inservice work, and the inviting of more diverse voices into our planning and teaching corps. That said, it is noteworthy that candidates who engaged in a special education minor reported feeling more prepared in the area of differentiation.

### **Additional Licensure**

#### *Special Education and K12 Reading Licensure*

An analysis of the 2021-22 Special Education program data is difficult due to small N size (3). Exit surveys and focus groups data demonstrate the following strengths and challenges. The target rate for survey responses is an 85% threshold on responses that meet or exceed the 3 or above mean score. Open ended comments are also collected and analyzed for trends to identify strengths and challenges. Overall, the results are strong with all scores on all Exit survey items scores ranging from 4.0-5.0 mean scores. Top mean scores and program completer comments suggest that the program has knowledgeable and supportive faculty, students felt the online synchronous sessions were valuable and courses were easy to navigate. While still overwhelmingly positive, the lower mean scores from the Exit Surveys suggest that further support may be needed in the area of advisement and the field course may need revision to ensure support and alignment between courses and fieldwork.

Exit survey data from K12 Reading Licensure completers are included in the overall Certificate program data. The target rate for survey responses is an 85% threshold on responses that meet or exceed the 3 or above mean score. The newly instituted Exit Surveys and Certificate Completer Surveys over the last year suggest students are very satisfied with the course and program structure, as well as the program faculty.

### **Advanced Programs**

#### *Master of Education*

An analysis of the program 2021-2022 exit surveys and the newly instituted alumni survey demonstrate the following strengths and challenges. The target rate for survey responses is an 85% threshold on responses that meet or exceed the 3 or above mean score. Open ended comments are also collected and analyzed for trends to identify strengths and challenges. Overall, the results are strong with all scores on all Exit survey items scores ranging from 3.85- 4.46 mean scores. Top mean scores and program completer comments suggest that the program had a positive impact on the student's ability to apply current education theory to increase student learning, effectively apply culturally responsive classroom practices and to think critically about their teaching practices. While still overwhelmingly positive, the lower mean scores from the Exit Surveys suggest that the overall structure of the course layout experience continues to need examination. The lowest scores continue to reflect a need to address the online course structure, both within the learning management system and specific courses within the program, as well as the use of webinars for improvement. The certificates/elective, as well as select core courses within the Masters in Education have been undergoing curriculum revisions. This continued work should support increased student satisfaction with course structure.

#### *Ed D*

The EdD program will not have program completers until 2025. However, ongoing feedback from students is gathered to support continuous improvement efforts. For example, we are examining how to strengthen the first year research and professional learning community courses to better support students in writing and research skills. We are also using information and data from dissertation chairs and student artifacts to support future curriculum improvement and design efforts.

G. Narrative explanation of **evidence available from employers of program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

### **Licensure Programs**

Data from our 2021-2022 Employer Survey (also known as the Transition to Teaching (TTT) survey) is very helpful in providing a snapshot of how our students are transitioning into the profession. Like the exit survey data, licensure programs here at St. Scholastica set a mean of 3.0 (out of 4) as the goal for each survey item. For the years in question, we again met our goal for all

criteria (though our 'n' was small, with data coming from only 7 employers and results combined from all licensure programs - baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate). In drilling down into the data, the following results are particularly noteworthy:

43 out of 45 criteria received responses at 3 or above from all (100%) of the respondents (for those qualities deemed "observable" by the respondents). The mean scores for each and every question were well above 3 (3.29 being the lowest, but this was due to some respondents considering the attribute as "unobservable" rather than poorly rated). The two areas that did not score at 3 or above by all respondents were:

-Identifies issues of reliability and validity in assessment. All licensure programs will continue curriculum revision in both assessment and methods courses to address this area.

-Effectively organizes the physical environment of the classroom for instruction. All licensure programs will continue curriculum revision in both field experience and methods courses to address this area.

We feel confident that these are covered effectively in our course revisions.

#### **Advanced Programs**

NOTE: The Master of Education program, K12 Reading and Special Education Programs do not collect data from employers. The EdD program does not have program completers yet and does not plan to collect employer data.

H. Narrative explanation of how the program investigates **employment rates for program completers**, with a characterization of findings. This section may also indicate rates of completers' ongoing education, e.g., graduate study.

We rely on a combination of student self-reporting, our alumni office, and annual public-school district employment data provided by PELSB for this information for our initial licensure candidates. This provided information for 33 of the 78 completers during the 2020-2021 academic year.

## **4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators**

Tables 3 and 4 report on select measures of candidate/completer performance related to AAQEP Standards 1 and 2, including the program's expectations for successful performance and indicators of the degree to which those expectations are met.

**Table 3. Expectations and Performance on Standard 1: Candidate and Completer Performance**

<b>Provider-Selected Measures</b>	<b>Explanation of Performance Expectation</b>	<b>Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation</b>
Entrance and Exit Mean GPA	<p>Undergraduate Admission Minimum GPA: 2.8</p> <p>Undergraduate Program Continuation Minimum GPA: 2.8</p> <p>Graduate Admission Minimum GPA: 2.8</p> <p>Graduate Program Continuation Minimum GPA: 3.0</p>	<p>Mean GPA for Completer Cohorts in each program:</p> <p>Undergraduate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Entrance: 3.34</li> <li>● Exit: 3.71</li> </ul> <p>GTL Certificate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Entrance: 3.30</li> <li>● Exit: 3.88</li> </ul> <p>ABS Certificate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Entrance: 3.89</li> <li>● Exit: 3.99</li> </ul> <p>Literacy Certificate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Entrance: 3.58</li> <li>● Exit: 3.97</li> </ul> <p>MEd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Entrance: 3.52</li> <li>● Exit: 3.93</li> </ul> <p>EdD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Entrance: 3.79</li> <li>● Exit: N/A - no completer data available yet</li> </ul>
Key Assessment Attainment	100% attainment of Standards evaluated in Key Assessments for UND and GTL Program.	Undergraduate: 131 of 134 students attained all standards in key assessments. Of the 3 who did not attain all standards: 2 students failed the full course and 1 student's final portfolio (key assessment) is in-progress. All student teachers attained all standards within their content area.

		GTL: 115 of 116 students attained all standards in key assessments. The 1 student who has not attained has coursework in-progress. All student teachers attained all key assessments within their content area.
Professional Behavior Forms	90% of responses for each question will be a 3 or higher meaning the behavior was observed most of the time	<p>Undergraduate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elem Ed Completers exceeded the 90% threshold in all responses received. Forms were not received for 2 students.</li> <li>• Secondary Completers exceeded the 90% threshold in all responses received. A form was not received for 1 Com Arts/Lit candidate.</li> </ul> <p>GTL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elem Ed Completers exceeded the 90% threshold in all responses received. A form was not received for 1 student.</li> <li>• As a whole, Secondary Completers fell below the 90% threshold in “Responsibility and Work Ethic: Is Prompt and Attends when Scheduled” with a score of 85%. All other responses exceeded the 90% threshold.</li> </ul>

**Table 4. Expectations and Performance on Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence and Growth**

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
Student Teacher Final Evaluations	85% of responses for each question will be a 3 or higher	<p>Undergrad:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Elem Ed cohort met or exceeded the 85% goal on 32 of 41 prompts. Of the 9 remaining prompts, 3 were at 81%, 2 at 77%, 2 at 73%, 1 at 65%, and 1 at 35%.</li> <li>• As a whole, the Secondary Ed cohort met or exceeded the 85% goal on 27 of 41 prompts. Of the 14 remaining prompts, 8 were at 82%, 4 at 73%, 1 at 64%, and 1 at 45%.</li> </ul> <p>GTL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Elem Ed cohort met or exceeded the 85% goal on 39 of the 41 prompts. The 2 remaining prompts were at 83% and 78%.</li> <li>• As a whole, the Secondary Ed cohort met or exceeded the 85% goal on 33 of 41 prompts. Of the 8 remaining prompts, 5 were at 80% and 2 were at 75%.</li> </ul>

Exit Survey	85% of responses for each question will be a 3 or higher	<p>Undergraduate and GTL (reported together due to low response rate):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Response rate: 9/79 (11%)</li> <li>● Scored below 85% on 21 out of 70 prompts. Of those, 12 were at 78%, 7 at 67%, and 2 at 56%.</li> </ul> <p>Academic and Behavioral Specialist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Response Rate: 3/6 (50%)</li> <li>● Scored below 85% on 4 out of 14 prompts. Those 4 prompts were met at 67%.</li> </ul> <p>Literacy Instruction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Response Rate: 2/23 (9%)</li> <li>● All prompts exceeded the 85% threshold.</li> </ul> <p>MEd:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Response Rate 13/48 (27%)</li> <li>● All prompts exceeded the 85% threshold.</li> </ul>
Employer Survey – sent to employers of previous year’s completer cohort	85% of responses for each question will be a 3 or higher	<p>Undergrad and GTL (reported together due to low response rate):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Response Rate 6/79 (7.6%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Response Rate Known Employers 6/33 (18.2%)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Scored below 85% on 4 of 45 prompts. Those 4 prompts were met at 83%</li> </ul>
Key Assessment	90% will score 86% or better on key assessments for Academic and Behavioral Specialist Program, Literacy Instruction Program, and MEd Program	<p>Academic and Behavioral Specialist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Key assessments for EDU 5605 did not meet the threshold. 5 of 7 students have key assessment assignments in-progress.</li> <li>● All other key assessments met the threshold.</li> </ul> <p>Literacy Instruction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● All key assessments met or exceeded the threshold.</li> </ul> <p>MEd:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Key assessments for EDU 6560 did not meet the threshold. 2 of 3 students have key assessment assignments in progress.</li> <li>● All other key assessments met the threshold.</li> </ul>

## 5. Notes on Progress, Accomplishment, and Innovation

This section describes program accomplishments, efforts, and innovations (strengths and outcomes) to address challenges and priorities over the past year.



## **Program Accomplishments (Licensure Programs)**

In the 2021-2022 academic year, the undergraduate licensure program accomplished several things: the institution and employment of a new lesson plan template (redesigned to focus on giving space for differentiation as well as student creativity), the completion of a full year of edTPA professional development (in the hope that it would yield dividends for student success), and a curriculum revision for all secondary methods courses. We also successfully saw through the final students in our Noyce Grant program (an NSF grant providing funding to recruit and prepare STEM majors to become K-12 teachers).

### **Graduate Teaching Licensure**

The accomplishments in the GTL program are somewhat similar to those identified in the undergraduate program, with a few differences due to the GTL program delivery modality, which presents unique opportunities and challenges, as stated in our 2021 report.

*Revised and Improved Lesson Planning Template and Guide:* Similar to the Undergraduate Licensure program, the GTL program adopted the same new lesson planning template for the same reasons stated above.

*edTPA Policy Change:* All initial Education licensure programs at CSS instituted a new edTPA policy beginning in fall 2022 that requires teacher candidates to redo and resubmit any task to Pearson that does not meet the state of Minnesota established benchmarks, thus emphasizing the high stakes nature of this performance assessment and requiring students to take it much more seriously during their first attempt.

*Online Delivery:* GTL adopted the Graduate Education programs standard online course design template to increase consistency with the look and feel from one course to the other while also improving accessibility, usability and transfer of LMS navigation skills from one course to the next. A standardized online course design template will also allow teacher candidates to find information efficiently and effectively while reducing basic processing time, and decrease confusion and frustration that creates barriers to a rich and engaging academic learning experience .

*Regular Substantive Interactions requirement:* The GTL program continues to improve and enhance requirements for regular and substantive interactions with and among students in multiple ways. The program increased the length of time allocated for synchronous course meetings from 90 minutes to 150 minutes each week. Program course instructors are required to post weekly announcements a minimum of twice a week. Course instructors' interactions with students also include recorded lectures and directions for completing learning tasks. All courses include structured professional virtual learning communities to encourage and support teacher candidates' peer interactions necessary for developing collaborative skills for future professional practices.

*MTLE Supports:* The GTL program has successfully systematized the Minnesota Teacher Licensure Examinations information session by including a consistent schedule on the program calendar, a course learning experience that helps candidates map

MTLE examination content to EDU courses and more strategic communication of MTLE resources available to teacher candidates on the GTL program community shell and on the MTLE website.

*Course Instructors and Supervisors Professional Development:* GTL program course instructors and supervisors professional development opportunities in the last year were well attended. All GTL methods course instructors receive an orientation to the MTLE resources and how to navigate the website for resources specific to their methods courses. In January 2022, all student teaching supervisors completed edTPA 101: Assessment Overview and edTPA Task-by-Task Deep dive offered through edTPA Pearson professional development webinars. We are gradually creating a culture of professional collaboration around course revisions as more instructors attend professional development session and connect with each other to understand the relationships and connections across program curriculum. The GTL program has adopted virtual classroom observations as one of its observation format to attract high-quality supervisors who prefer minimal travel and to reduce program delivery cost and enhance sustainability. A draft supervisor manual is in progress. In collaboration with MACTE and Education Minnesota all clinical supervisors and cooperating teachers have the opportunity to receive coaching and mentoring training developed for Minnesota cooperating teachers and college supervisors. Most GTL current supervisors have reported that they have completed the coaching and mentoring training as of November 2022.

### **Efforts to Address Challenges (Licensure Programs)**

Relative to undergraduate licensure program, please see the detailed description provided in section 3E. Efforts to address MTLE and edTPA performance scores challenges are discussed in section 3E.

In addition to the challenges identified and discussed in section 3E, designing teacher preparation for fully online requires a new understanding of how people learn online and what constitutes reasonable cognitive load for quality academic engagement and teacher candidate learning. Across all levels of the GTL program addressing the challenges with online learning has included sustained professional development with a focus on program quality. We have been using and sharing OLC resources with all program faculty. We also use resources provided by CSS Center for Excellence in Teaching and the College's Assessment team to gain insights about continuous improvements for online delivery. We are currently exploring the academic activities estimator adopted by the college to enhance meaningful learning in our online courses. Program curriculum revisions continues to focus on strengthening differentiation for all learners including ELL, Social Emotional learning and mental health components necessary for preparing new teachers. Our efforts towards equitable teaching practices will extend to examining ways in which we can systematize use of the College's Equity Assessment & Audit Toolkit at the GTL program level.

### **Priorities in the Current Agenda (Licensure Programs)**

During the 2021-2022 academic year, several gatherings of our advisory board (composed of local educators and administrators) energized the undergraduate licensure programs to place Social Emotional Learning (SEL) in a more prominent place in our

curriculum. This was the result of realizations that the need for this in teacher preparation (relative to SELs prominence in public education) was great, and that we were somewhat lagging behind. To that end, the undergraduate programs have set forth on a full year of professional development (for faculty and staff) on the topic of SEL as we seek to understand and find its place in our curriculum.

GTL program priorities will continue to evolve around quality online delivery while addressing differentiation, Social Emotional learning and equity pedagogies. In the 2022-23 academic year GTL program will continue to focus on professional development opportunities for course instructors on how to access and use the following course development resources; Academic activities estimator and Equity Assessment & Audit Toolkit.

GTL Program will collaborate with the CSS admissions team on recruiting efforts in rural minnesota and the paraprofessional community with existing bachelor's' degree.

### **Innovations (Licensure Programs)**

Moving into the future, one area of potential innovation is/are partnerships with local districts for “Grow Your Own” programs, focused primarily on the paraprofessional population. We are in discussions with districts about the viability and need for such an innovation, and will likely report on these efforts in future reports (if the programs are indeed viable and, therefore, launched).

The GTL program will collaborate with other Education online graduate programs on piloting an open-source rubric to ensure a high quality course experience. We are also examining research ideas about supporting strong instructor presence, frequent, timely and specific feedback in online learning.

### **Efforts to Address Challenges (Additional Licensure and Advanced Programs)**

*K12 Reading, Masters in Education, Special Education*

Relative to K12 Reading, please see the detailed description provided in section 3E related to MTLE scores. 3F also addresses challenges related to course structure in the MEd, as well as student satisfaction in Special Education.

### **Innovations (Additional and Advanced Programs)**

A significant innovation for the Education Department's advanced programs is the launch of the online Doctorate of Educational Leadership program in June of 2021. The program accepts students every other June and will accept the next cohort in June of 2023. The Education Department's advanced programs are all online, therefore, the program directors and chair of the online graduate programs are piloting an open-source rubric to ensure a high quality course experience. Over the next year, all advanced programs will work to adopt the rubric for full implementation in the fall of 2023.

Furthermore, all online graduate programs are focusing on an "equity pedagogy in action" to inform program policies and practices. The programs are creating online teaching expectations, utilizing course workload calculations, reviewing specifications grading implementation, implementation of the College's equity audit toolkit, creating engaging synchronous sessions, and ensuring that the online programs comply with the regulatory "regular and substantive interaction" or RSI of the federal Department of Education.

The Masters in Education program embarked on multiple revision projects during the 21-22 academic year, including K12 Reading and Educational Technology in an effort to better support student needs. K-12 Reading has focused on standards and course alignment, as well as new state licensure requirements. The Certificate in Educational Technology is focusing on integration and alignment to ISTE standards. In addition, we have signed the ISTE Digital Equity Pledge as a way to support and promote digital equity and inclusion within our educator preparation programs.