2020 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10374	AACTE SID:	265
Institution:	Baker University		
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	◉	○
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	◉	○
1.1.3 Program listings	◉	○

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

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2018-2019 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

14

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]

104

Total number of program completers 118

---

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2018-2019 academic year?

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

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.bakeru.edu/caep/

Description of data accessible via link: This link provides tables and evidence of addressing the annual Reporting Measures 1-8

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

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑
Advanced-Level Programs		☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑

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

> *What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?*
> > *Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?*
> > *Are benchmarks available for comparison?*
> > *Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?*

Outcome Measures 1-4: Beginning in 2017-18 USOE faculty decided to pursue focus groups through a video conferencing platform. After conducting validity on the focus group questions, USOE held a spring 2019 reception for first-year teachers who were available to attend. After the reception, an hour was spent with six first-year teachers as a focus group (proceedings recorded on ZOOM). Afterwards two additional first-year teachers living in Arizona answered the same questions (recorded by ZOOM) with both the dept chair and the supervisor from Baker. During recorded sessions, graduates indicated they believed that Baker could help future students in the following areas: social/emotional/trauma issues, standards-based instruction, safe and civilized schools via CHAMPS (conversation-help-assignment-movement-participation-success), digital citizenship, Google products, i.e. Forms, etc. These recordings were sent to a GSOE research analyst for interpretation. During focus groups, it was learned that the head administrator isn't the individual working directly with first-year teachers (explaining prior very poor results via Survey Monkey). These employers were uncomfortable being part of a focus group discussing sensitive personnel information. Consequently, the plan for spring 2019 has been adjusted to find out who the direct supervisor is from members of the first-year teacher group. From there the first-year teachers will explain the future electronic survey that will be sent to their direct supervisor and the importance to respond to gather program feedback. Hopefully direct contacts will yield helpful feedback to better search for areas of improvement. A minimum sample size of 30 participants will be needed in order to test the reliability level with a quantitative analysis. At that stage, our research analyst will need student scores on every item of the survey to conduct a reliability analysis.

Outcome Measure 5: Graduation Rates

Baker assesses the Graduate School of Education (GSOE) programs' graduation rate by cohorts which is straight forward using specific students starting with both cohort and graduation dates.

USOE program graduation cohorts are more complex. To improve the collection process a new process has been created. For purposes of this annual report, we will be using initial enrollment in ED 100 for Academic Years 2011-12 through 2015-16. Students who indicated an interest orally in being part of the School of Education while in ED 100 will be counted in the cohort start. Students completing the program and graduating within the 3-, 4- and 5+-year period will be counted as graduates. We believe that this allows for a clear measure instead of who is eligible to graduate a year prior to graduation. ED 100, Intro to Education, is the first course candidates take and we expect some withdrawals at the end of the course. Being an educator is not for everyone and ED 100 helps students understand whether this is the career path for them. USOE data shows graduation rates of 72% and 70% respectively for Academic years 2011-12 and 2012-13 with 28-30% for withdrawal rates. Academic years for 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16 have 0% withdrawal rates and 100% graduation rates. Moving forward in the spirit of continuous improvement, we will be requiring students to declare their intent by completing a formal application to the School of Education after completing ED 100.

The GSOE rates of graduation for the Masters' programs are high and very acceptable. The cohort model supports the candidates as they progress through the program to completion. Typically, a masters' program candidate will complete the program in two years to two and a half years. The MSSL program graduation rates are 100% for cohorts 21, 24, 28, and 29 with cohort 23 at 92%, cohort 27 at 80%, and cohort 30 at 87%. Cohorts 27, 30 and 31 still have active enrollment. The MSSE program graduation rates are 55% for cohort 8, 90% for cohort 9, and 85% for cohort 10. Cohorts 11, 12 and 13 still have active enrollment.

The Ed.D. Program has a time frame for graduation based on the six years to complete coursework and dissertation. The program requires the candidate maintains continuous enrollment until the dissertation process is completed and graduation is achieved. Cohort twelve will complete the six-year time frame by August 2020. Some candidates are still actively enrolled and have requested an extension. Continuous enrollment helps support the candidates through the dissertation process. Graduation rates are shared with stakeholders annually through electronic means. Data from cohorts 12 through 18 indicate healthy graduation rates combined with active enrollment – measuring from 84.38% to 100%. For example, cohort 12 shows a completion rate of 71.88% and active enrollment of 12.5% (equaling 84.38%). Cohort 20 had a concerning dropout rate of 25.93%, however, Cohort 22 shows a low dropout rate of 3.7% and Cohort 24 shows 0%.

Outcome Measure 6: Pass Rates to meet Licensure

The pass rates on Principles of Learning & Teaching (PLT) and content tests for USOE remain high and above the 80% pass rate that the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) requires. Pass rates for elementary PLT (Praxis #5622) ranged from a high of 100% to a low of 92% from 2013 through 2019. Pass rates for grades 5-9 (Praxis #5623) were 100% for 2015-2017. Pass rates for grades 7-12 (Praxis #5624) ranged from a high of 100% to a low of 83% during 2013-2019. The summary PLT Pass Rate has ranged overall from a high of 100% to a low of 88%. The overall pass rate on Content Area tests has been 100% in 2014-15, 2015-16, 2018-19 and 80% in 2017-18. We encourage completers to retake the test and we offer support to assist them in preparation.

The 18-19 pass rates for Master of Science in Special Education (MSSE) indicate candidates understand their content. The pass rate was 100% for 6 examinees. Pass rates for Special Ed (Praxis #5543) ranged from 100% from 2013-2019 with the exception of 87.5% in 2017-18. The 17-18 pass rate was 87.5% for 8 examinees with one person not passing. This one person retook the test two more times and passed during 2018-19. Passing the exam allows each candidate to meet licensing requirements. Baker reviews these pass rates during the annual data retreat.

The Master of Science in School Leadership (MSSL) pass rate for 2018-19 was 95%. The state pass mean was 175.79 and the national pass mean was 174.43. Baker's pass mean is 176.85 which is higher than the state or national pass mean. Pass rates for the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (Praxis #6011) ranged from a high of 99% to a low of 89% from 2013-2019. The program believes that the pass rate for MSSL is an indicator of high performance of knowledge and content because it is higher than the 80% level required by CAEP. Due to a new SLLA assessment being implemented September 1, 2019 and anticipated building leadership standards in Spring 2020, faculty will be re-aligning the program objectives, assessments and assignments.

In 2018-19, the pass rate for the School Superintendent Assessment (Praxis #6021) was 100% for the five candidates taking the test. Pass rates have ranged from a high of 100% to a low of 86% from 2013 to 2019. This is evidence demonstrating knowledge of content. At the time of the fall data retreat, while the data did not indicate the need for any data-driven decisions about any program-wide changes, there is concern about the SSA test changing as of September 1, 2019 to SSA Praxis #6991 prior to Kansas State district leadership standards being approved by the Kansas Board of Education later in Spring 2020. Pass rates are shared annually with stakeholders through electronic means.

Outcome Measure 7: Employment Rate

The USOE 2018-19 employment rate was 94% and the 2017-18 rate was 100%. The longitudinal data indicate a range from a high of 100% to a low of 93% from 2010 to 2019. We believe that this speaks to school districts perceiving our graduates as competent educators.

Our GSOE graduates are already employed during the program and at the time of graduation. We are in the process of developing a different process to collect the promotion information that is needed. The Ed.D. Program graduates usually inform our faculty and administration when they receive a promotion. The MSSE graduates are classroom teachers and their promotion would be applying for a High Incidence endorsement and accepting a position in special education. MSSL program graduates usually apply for the building leadership license but do not always move to a leadership position. Many candidates enter the program prior to having five years of experience so they cannot apply for a building leadership license till they have five years of teaching experience. This illustrates our need for a different process to track their retention and promotions. The GSOE information will be added to the Baker University School of Education web page as it is finalized. This year we are adding the Ed.D. District Leadership and Masters' promotion information to the website.

Outcome Measure 8: Student Loan Default Rates

BU's current student loan default rate as reported to Baker Financial Aid Office is 5.9% for FY 2016. For profit colleges had highest rate of default at 15.2% compared to 9.6% at public and 6.6% at private colleges (September 26, 2019 www.insidehighered.com quick takes by Andrew Kreighbaum). BU FY 2016 rate was 5.9, FY 2015 was 4.8, and FY 2014 was 5.6. Baker's rate is fairly

stable over last three years of data as presented by NSLDS and below current 6.6% average at private colleges.

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

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)**   3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity

There is no formal plan to recruit high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations.

Diversity Plans and Partnerships
• Ongoing Partnerships
- School of Education Ambassadors (SEA) will arrange ongoing contact with students by assigning mentors, community involvement projects, school visits, Future Teachers of America Clubs, etc.
☐ SEA members emailed each student for follow up to the visit and to maintain ongoing relationships if they decide to attend Baker University
☐ During the 2019 Diversity Practicum a new partnership was formed with the Kansas City International Academy (KCIA), which is a K-8 charter school in Kansas City, Mo serving only immigrants and refugees. The partnership was formed from the contact of Janice Jackson, a Baker Alumni, who in the past was both an educator and principal and worked for BU SOE as a Directed Field Experience Supervisor. She is currently a school board member for KCIA. There are many opportunities for our students to volunteer at this school and in their community. For the 2019 practicum we had six students placed at KCIA. We have already had a couple School of Education Ambassadors return during spring break to continue building relationships with both students and staff. Also Dr. Prosser and two students (Hannah Greer-English Education major and Margaret Hempleman-Music Education major) presented about this experience while focusing on Personalized Learning with Social & Emotional standards at a state conference in April 2019.
☐ Dr. Richards has taken Elementary Education majors in his 2018-19 Science Methods course twice to lead science lessons in a KCMO elementary school. He plans on continuing this involvement.
☐ Dr. Prosser and Dr. Richards are collaborating on visiting high schools in diverse communities along with SEA members.
• Who
o KCK School District: Washington High School
☐ On April 9, 2019 a field trip plan similar to the original visit took place. On April 26, 2019 students had a field trip experience at the Baker Wetlands where in collaboration with the staff there had information on aquatic invertebrates along with a seining activity. Lunch and small hikes took place with Baker Education majors helping during the entire trip. We believe showing the unique education value the Wetlands provide for Baker students is a good resource to share.
o Charter School/KCMO-The Ewing Marion Kauffman School:
☐ Contact Person: Candace Potter placed students for the Diversity Interterm and student teaching.
☐ During the 2019 Diversity Practicum, four Baker students were placed here and are in contact with Candace about checking in with student tours on campus and community involvement. The Kauffman School is constantly sending information relevant to Baker students and Faculty for professional development opportunities; which are shared with all USOE students.
• Why:
o The Kauffman School is a new partnership for Baker. Four secondary students recently completed their Diversity Interterm and one is looking forward to student teaching there. The one student (Andrew Long) who planned on completing student teaching here, decided on a different placement. However, due to his diversity practicum experience he chose to accept a teaching position in KCK. We now have had a total of 8 students placed at the Kauffman School for the diversity practicum. This charter school began with a fifth grade class and now are up to a tenth grade class. The mission of this charter school is to have 100% of their graduates go to college and it would be an excellent opportunity to have students from the first graduating class in two years to attend Baker.

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)**   5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP lacks relevant, representative, cumulative and actionable measures to make decisions about candidate performance.

Baker's Undergraduate SOE (USOE) held its annual data retreat on August 7, 2019. The data review and analysis covered the academic year 2018-2019 data collected from EPP assessments, program assessments, program outcomes, and course assessments. The program assessments, specifically for professional skills survey and dispositions were validated by the Validity and Reliability Committee (VRC) by fall 2019. Reviewing and analyzing data is a programmatic process that has been in place for years at Baker University. Faculty thoroughly analyzes data to make decisions about assessments, rubrics, outcomes, and curriculum. If the data indicate that changes should be made for program improvement and for candidate learning and growth, then those changes are instituted in the program. Changes progress through the governance process appropriately. The data considered during the retreat also impacts the state required program review process as designated by our state/CAEP partnership. The discussions faculty have during the data retreat are integral to the process of program improvement. These discussions are not recorded but the consensus of the faculty for changes/revisions, no changes, and monitoring are recorded in the data retreat table.

The USOE EPP assessments have completed the validity component of the validity and reliability process using an expert panel process. The assessments will be utilized during the 2019-20 academic year and the data will be analyzed by our research

statistician for reliability. The USOE faculty and staff will review the 19-20 data and discussions will be held with the VRC for any necessary revisions. The data collected will undergo a reliability analysis by the research statistician. The data on reliability will be reviewed by the USOE faculty and the VRC. Prior information and minutes on the VRC will be uploaded in Section 6 of the annual report. GSOE EPP assessments are still in process with the VRC.

The Graduate SOE (GSOE) held its annual data retreat on December 11, 2019. The data review and analysis covered the academic year 2018-19 data collected from EPP assessments, program assessments and outcomes, and course assessments. None of the program assessments had completed the VRC process yet. Reviewing data and the analysis are a programmatic process that has been in place since the programs began and data were collected in TaskStream. Data Analysis Tables for both USOE and GSOE are uploaded into Section 6. If data do not indicate revisions or trend data do not indicate changes needed, then the program will continue to monitor data and review at the annual data retreat. After 19-20, reliability data collected will be available to VRC and research statistician. To date, VRC members have reviewed:
Document Ed.D. MSSE MSSL
Dispositions Final 3-2-2020 Final 3-2-2020 Final 3-2-2020
Professional Skills Final 3-2-2020 Final 3-2-2020 Final 3-2-2020

Data are shared with USOE's Council of Undergraduate Teacher Education (CUTE), Education Advisory Council (EAC), and with GSOE's Graduate Education Department (GED) and Graduate Education Council (GEC). Both councils have stakeholders in membership. Data have been shared electronically in the past with a request for input and questions. In GSOE, the adjunct faculty are active practitioners in PK-12 educational settings. The adjunct faculty have input on curriculum, assessments, and rubrics.

On January 26, 2017 School of Education (SOE) Dean, Dr. Marcus Childress established a Validity and Reliability Committee. The committee was directed to begin the process and procedures to determine validity and reliability for USOE and GSOE assessments and rubrics. He requested that they review the CAEP assessment rubric to guide the process. Content validity was established for USOE assessments and rubrics and were included in 2019-2020 handbooks. They were implemented during that academic year. The committee recorded minutes during 2016-2017, 2017-2018 and 2018-19 and will be uploaded as evidence in Section 6.

From 2016-2017 to October 1, 2019, Baker's former Director of Assessment and Accreditation has developed with two other private college EPP heads a clinical observation tool that is aligned to the InTASC standards. In conjunction with REL Central and Marzano Associates, Baker and seven other private colleges established validity and reliability for this tool, Kansas Clinical Assessment Tool (K-CAT, previously called SOAR) which will be utilized by USOE for student teaching. Validity and reliability data have been collected and analyzed by REL Central and Marzano. The factor analysis and reliability data from the REL Central study will be uploaded into Section 6. The instrument has high reliability. The factor analysis indicated that the performance indicators are highly related across the standards which is how the InTASC standards were developed so that did not seem surprising. REL Central developed a comprehensive Excel tool to assist collecting individual IHE data and then compiling automatically the state wide data. All participating institutions collected data through 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20.

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)**   5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP's Quality Assurance System does not ensure that alumni and employers are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.

The Undergraduate School of Education (USOE) experienced a gradual decline in employer response rates to surveys. Based on this trend, the department decided to develop focus groups meeting on the Zoom videoconferencing platform. Baker is aware that school districts are inundated with surveys from all EPPs in the state and we felt that the Zoom focus groups would assist in obtaining employer feedback on our graduates as first through third year teachers. We believe that Zoom-based focus groups will enable us to gather rich data from our alumni and their employers as well as provide them with opportunities to share their stories/data with us at time and place more convenient for their busy schedules. Recordings of the 2018 USOE graduate focus groups were shared with our research analyst. As our research analyst observed the past Zoom focus groups, she had some recommendations to help us refine the interview process more scientifically to enable it to be more objective along with consistent follow up questions to insure validity. Our plan to accomplish this is to have a single interviewer trained (for one year's time minimum) to dig deeper to gather more details with each of our graduate volunteers in the focus group. Focus groups will consist of smaller groupings of 2-3 persons. Ideally, the goal after program completion will be 10 graduates and 5 employers to be scheduled in smaller groupings. To match CAEP goals for gathering program impact data in an initial program, our research analyst will work on refining our focus questions with consistent follow up questions to target strengths and weaknesses to promote continuous improvement thereby addressing CAEP's goals. Invitations for focus group volunteers will come from advisors to take advantage of the strong (persuasive) relationships.

We plan to use MAXQDA to analyze our qualitative data for the following reasons: 1) coding is made easy with drag, drop, color assignments, and good coding visualization; 2) can analyze audio and video without transcript; 3) can generate professional report; 4) works well with textual data; 5) easy to learn and all relevant pieces of a project can be seen on one screen. When Baker reaches a critical mass of 30 on focus groups of the new-improved instruments, data will be collected so the research statistician will conduct reliability studies on the focus group responses. The results of the data collected will be shared with the USOE's CUTE and EAC.

EPP-wide dispositions and professional skills instruments have been validated during 2018-20 and will be added to TaskStream

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

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

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

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

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

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

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

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

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

department in the School of Education reviews longitudinal data to identify trends. (5.4)

The GSOE made several recommendations after analyzing the data.
• Faculty recommended a more-thorough orientation for new faculty and adjuncts. Although all new faculty/adjuncts are oriented/informed of policies and procedures for each program, a need to better-orient new faculty/adjuncts to work with TaskStream is critical. TaskStream (Watermark) is an integral piece of our data collection process, so new faculty/adjuncts must be more-thoroughly instructed on how to utilize more of its features, enter data and monitor their classes. (5.4)

• The Ed.D. PK-12 faculty in Educational Leadership previously expressed an interest to examine Praxis data by individual candidates (test scores and category scores for last 3 years), because test samples are below 5 and no aggregate data are available. While the question was posed to track data by previous experiences and licensure (teacher, building administrator, central office, administrator) to determine impact Praxis scores, the new tests implemented by ETS PRAXIS present a challenge. The "N" needs to be larger to make any analysis or program changes to respond to Praxis data. (A.1.1, A.5.4)

The Master of Science in School Leadership (MSSL) program team made the recommendation to continue to monitor candidates' writing ability that is tracked through TaskStream. Changes to the writing rubric were made at the 2016-2017 data retreat and continues to be analyzed at retreats annually. (A.5.3, A.5.4) During the 17-18 data retreat, the recommendation was made to add a sample piece of data to instructor orientation in order to discuss Baker's expectation of rigor. Also a discussion of rubric scoring with adjunct faculty will take place during orientation. A few rubrics are being revised with practitioner adjunct instructors and the director of the MSSL program. This process requires P-12 practitioner input. Data indicated a need to re-evaluate a summative assessment/rubric and then upload to TaskStream for the next cohort possible. (A.5.3, A.5.5).

The Master of Science in Special Education (MSSE) program team made the decision to review all curricula to realign to new state standards for special education standards for licensure. This cumbersome endeavor has taken most of 2017-2019, involving stakeholders in this process. Faculty met via Zoom and followed-up with email discussion. This process also involved revising some assessments and rubrics to align them to the new standards. This will impact the program's data collection on TaskStream. The program coordinator completed a new Curriculum Guide for MSSE. (A.5.3, A.5.4)

The USOE analysis and recommendations addressed the following areas. USOE students will take remedial courses (more beneficial) instead of retaking the isolated C-Base test again to improve missing skills. Students will complete an official application to the School of Education at the end of the ED 100 Introduction to Education course thus producing more accurate data such as Cum GPA, graduation rates, etc. Redesigned online format of ED 313 will prepare students with a different format thereby creating flexible learning styles. New rubrics in TaskStream will be updated by licensure officer. Faculty working on multiple sample lesson plans in handbook as a guide. KSDE will be permitting the Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (KPTP) to be used through 2020-21 but with local scoring. ED 366-368 Global Flipped Classroom E-pres course title changed to ED 366-368 Global Flipped Classroom - Electronic Presentation. ED 440 Developmental Portfolio Elementary/ED 460 Developmental Portfolio Secondary rubric updated (removed "notebook" and now being completed electronically, i.e. Google Doc). ED 450/470/480 Lesson Plan Writing – Department will revise the rubric so it will be adaptable for any content area. Department will work on clarifying advising process to promote USOE student success. (1.3) (5.4)

All programs made several recommendations for change based upon data. The Data Analysis Tables are uploaded in section 6. Each year during the data retreat, many recommendations are made for program improvement and although not all are substantive in nature, they are still data-driven. The data and recommendations are shared with stakeholders through USOE, CUTE, and EAC and for GSOE with GED and GEC (all described in AFI 5.1)(5.5). The academic year 16-17 focused on preparation for our April 2017 accreditation visit. During the 2017-2019, Baker's major focus has been organizing and conducting a validity and reliability process (facilitated by the Reliability and Validity Committee) with both undergraduate and graduate EPP-wide assessments (professional skills and disposition). This process involved many of our resources and stakeholders to begin the validity work. Members of our Educator Advisory Council serve as expert panel members. Next, we will follow-through for determining reliability as we collect data in 2018-2020. Additionally, state standards for many of our EPP programs are being updated this year so faculty will be reviewing curriculum, projects and assessments to make sure students and candidates are being prepared for their responsibilities appropriately. All handbooks are updated each year and syllabi are reviewed annually. The new assessments and rubrics will be included in the 2019-2020 handbooks and uploaded to TaskStream.

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

3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
4.3 Employer satisfaction
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

📎 **Std_5.1_CAEP_USOE_VRC_minutes.pdf**

📎 **Std_5.1_322020_GSOE_VRC_minutes.docx.pdf**

📎 **Std_1.1_5.1_5.2_factor_analysis_on_KCAT_(SOAR).pdf**

📎 **Std_1.1_5.1_5.2_reliabilty_from_REL_Central_Study.pdf**

📎 **Std_1.1_1.3_5.1_5.2_5.3_5.4_5.5_201819_USOE_Assessment_Data_Analysis_Action_Taken_TABLE.pdf**

📎 **Std_Adv_1.1_5.1_5.2_5.3_5.4_5.5_20182019_MSSLAssmtDataAnalysisChgsTable.pdf**

📎 **Std_Adv_1.1_5.1_5.2_5.3_5.4_5.5_20182019_Ed.D_PK12_AssmtDataAnalysisChgsTable.pdf**

📎 **Std_4.1_4.2_4.3_5.2_Graduate_questions_and_Employer_questions_for_focus_group.docx.pdf**

📎 **Std_3.1_Washington_HS_field_trips_1819.pdf**

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

○ **Yes** ◉ **No**

6.3 Optional Comments

Baker's website department spokesperson indicates that updates to www.bakeru.edu/caep will be completed by the end of April 2020.

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2020 EPP Annual Report.*

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

Report Preparer's Information

Name:	Dr. Pam Best
Position:	Director of Assessment and Accreditation
Phone:	913.344.1249
E-mail:	pbest@bakeru.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**