

2021 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10761	AACTE SID:	3097
Institution:	Millersville University of Pennsylvania		
Unit:	School of Education		

Section 1. EPP Profile

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

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

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

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

<https://www.millersville.edu/programs/?interests%5B0%5D=Education>

Section 2. Program Completers

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

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

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

Total number of program completers 265

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: <https://www.millersville.edu/education/caep1.php>

Description of data accessible via link: Data for Measure 1: Abilities of Completers to Meet requirements (includes attachment of ADV program Matrix submitted to site visit team) and Satisfaction of Completers:

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

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

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?

Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?

Are benchmarks available for comparison?

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

Indicators of Completer Effectiveness attachment (Trend Analysis) <https://www.millersville.edu/education/caep1.php> Due to COVID shutdowns our emerging unexpected trends will be an increased intentional instruction of our candidates for effective student engagement and instruction through remote teaching venues. Our present candidate ability to teach with integrated technologies is very good but, in the future, we expect more P-12 schools to move to remote instruction and our programs are preparing resources and professional development resources for our partners and completers. An example of this preparation was a free virtual conference held in October: Effective On-Line Teaching (shared with site visit team in Nov. 2020).

Our survey data, posted in D2L learning management system for data sharing among all programs, Microsoft Teams and emailed survey results for Cooperating Teachers, Cooperating Teaching training, Supervisor training, and onsite visit report confirm the trends for completer success are on target. From standard one site visit report:

The EPP indicates that the two-unit assessments (Professional Behaviors and MU Adapted Danielson) are aligned to InTASC. Three cycles of data and additional evidence provided in the addendum was confirmed during onsite interviews (Professional Behaviors aligned with InTASC; COOP MU Adapted Danielson aligned with InTASC; SUPER MU Adapted Danielson aligned with InTASC). Program level evidence for content and pedagogical knowledge is collected through multiple course-based assessments such as the Methods: Unit Planning Assessment and is highlighted in SPA program reports/data (AIMS). Additional data from Cooperating Teachers (COOPS) and University Supervisors for student teaching competencies using the MU Adapted

Danielson, State required PDE 430, and the Professional Behaviors unit assessments provide further evidence (Professional Behaviors and Data; PDE 430). Candidate surveys from EDHS and the state department of education (PDE) provide evidence of acquisition of content knowledge. Additionally, the EPP notes that unit assessments are aligned to the InTASC Standards (PEU Alignment with InTASC Portfolio; InTASC Master Crosswalk). The alignment chart indicates where the four required InTASC categories are assessed. Sample rubrics from Early Childhood and Middle Childhood confirm this alignment (PEU Alignment with InTASC Portfolio, Rubrics Aligned with InTASC). Submitted evidence indicates that InTASC categories are well represented across courses and initial license programs (Multiple Measures Assessing Content Knowledge).

Are benchmarks available for comparison? Test score data measuring state, institution, and non-education majors were reported in the site visit self-study, addendum, and shared with site visitors. The site visit team accessed the Microsoft team for sharing test data during the site visit Nov. 8-10, 2020.

Are measures widely shared? Yes. Benchmarks of Title II report, PA Standards and Program Approval, and test scores are shared through webpage: <https://www.millersville.edu/education/caep1.php>

Survey results are shared in various CAEP Measures:

- Employer survey, 3 Data Cycles for EPP created assessments: Indicators of Teacher Effectiveness
- PDE survey: Satisfaction of Completers
- Trend Analysis: Indicators of Teacher Effectiveness
- COOP Survey: Indicators of Teacher Effectiveness
- ADV Survey: Satisfaction of Completers
- MU Student Teacher Survey Indicators of Teacher Effectiveness
- ADV Matrix Cycle: Indicators of Completer Effectiveness, Impact on P-12 Learning and Effectiveness

How are you monitoring and measuring progress? Graduation and retention rates, annual PDE state completer survey results for ADV and Initial (attachment in) and with site visit team, A.2.2 Evidence of monitoring of candidates and providing support A.1.1

ADV plan for A.1: <https://www.millersville.edu/education/caep1.php>

How can the actionability of data be improved? (Actionable: Sufficiently detailed and

relevant to directly indicate or clearly suggest a course of action. Information is

actionable if it supplies the who, what, when, where, and why that allows one to

determine how to change current practice(s) to achieve the intended goal.) Please see the website: PA State Standards and

Program Approval: <https://www.millersville.edu/education/caep1.php>

Also, from the Site visit report:

Overall, achieving SPA and/or state approval/recognition for an initial license and post-bacc program indicates that the program is meeting requirements for content and pedagogical knowledge required by the SPA and/or state standards. The EPP reports "we have continued to use our assessment data and feedback from accrediting agencies and P-12 stakeholders to update/refine unit programs. Much of our continuous improvement has focused on these main areas: (1) responding to changes mandated by the state of PA; (2) revisions to programs/assessment based on feedback from alumni and other sources; (3) refining the evaluation and data collection on dispositions; and (4) addition/deletion of courses based on assessment data and student needs". The EPP provided several examples across programs for how the EPP uses data as part of their continuous improvement cycle for individual programs as well as the EPP as a whole.

What benchmarks or comparisons can you use to gauge your progress and add context?

CAEP Annual Reports, InTASC Categories, State Approval and Major Review Reports for all Programs for state approval, and Standards of Learning (SLO) Reports, President's Report for EPP are published through the University websites for all programs (these reports were reviewed by site visit team, site visit team held interviews with EPP Dean and University Associate Provost for SLO data collection: <https://www.millersville.edu/education/caep1.php>)

Employer survey: Indicators of Teacher Effectiveness

PDE survey: Satisfaction of Com

Trend Analysis: Indicators of Teacher Effectiveness

COOP Survey: Indicators of Teacher Effectiveness

ADV Survey: Satisfaction of Com

Student Teacher Survey Indicators of Teacher Effectiveness

ADV Matrix# Cycles: Indicators of Completer Effectiveness, Impact on P-12 Learning and Effectiveness

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

Waived

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

Waived

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2021

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Marcia Bolton

Position: Associate Dean

Phone: 7178717332

E-mail: marcia.bolton@millersville.edu

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

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

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

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

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

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

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

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

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

Acknowledge