TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

APRIL 30, 2022

CAEP REPORT 2020-21 [NARRATIVE]

PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF ASSESSMENT AND ACCREDITATION

CAEP Accountability Measures [2020-2021] 2
1. Completer Effectiveness 2
2. Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement (R4.2|R5.3|RA.4.1) 6
Employer Satisfaction 6
Stakeholder Involvement 6
3. Candidate Competency at Completion (R3.3|RA3.4) 8
Initial 8
Advanced 9
4. Candidate Ability to Be Employed 11
Updates to Program (6.1) 11
Quality Assurance System Revisions 12
Context 13
Revised QAS Focus Areas 14
Systematic Assessment of Candidate Performance 14
Unit and Program Review 15
Data Collection 16
Validation and Reliability of Data Collection 16
Outcome 17
References 18

CAEP ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES [2020-2021]

- Measure 1 (Initial): Completer effectiveness. (R4.1) Data must address: (a) completer impact in contributing to P-12 student-learning growth AND (b) completer effectiveness in applying professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

- Measure 2 (Initial and Advanced): Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement. (R4.2|R5.3| RA4.1) Data provided should be collected on employers' satisfaction with program completers.

- Measure 3 (Initial and Advanced): Candidate competency at completion. (R3.3) Data provided should relate to measures the EPP is using to determine if candidates are meeting program expectations and ready to be recommended for licensure. (e.g.: EPP's Title II report, data that reflect the ability of EPP candidates to meet licensing and state requirements, or other measures the EPP uses to determine candidate competency at completion.)

- Measure 4 (Initial and Advanced): Ability of completers to be hired (in positions for which they have prepared.)

1. COMPLETER EFFECTIVENESS

The College utilizes annual data to examine candidate effectiveness and disposition within their teaching assignments given the use of observation and student growth data. The data consists of six (6) metrics reported by the state of Tennessee of provider impact on the effectiveness of a provider's cohort members in Tennessee public school classrooms. The Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) reports data from English language arts, math, science, and social studies. The baseline goal for the College is the state average; however, the College determines annual targets based on outcomes. TVAAS measures student growth year over year, regardless of whether the student is proficient on the state assessment. Given COVID-19 impacts across the State, the College is reporting results with the understanding that there was an impact on outcomes.

COVID-19 has impacted the 2020-21 data as state law allows teachers the opportunity to nullify their evaluation scores and those scores are not included, which impacts the overall n-size (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.). This result impacts the n-size of a given area.

The 6-metrics in this area for Tennessee State University completer effectiveness combine TVAAS and observation scores to measure the ***Percentage of Cohort Members whose Classroom Observation Scores are Level 3 or Above, the Percentage of Cohort Members whose Classroom Observation Scores are Level 4 or Above, the Percentage of Cohort Members whose Student Growth (TVAAS) Scores are Level 3 or Above, and Percentage of Cohort Members whose Student Growth (TVAAS) Scores are Level 4 or Above, Percentage of Cohort Members whose LOE Scores are Level 3 or Above, and Percentage of Cohort Members whose LOE Scores are Level 4 or Above***.

The scale ranges from 1-to 5, with five being the highest. A score of 5 is considered *Most Effective* with Significant *Evidence* that the teacher's students made more growth than expected; a score of 4 is *Above Average Effectiveness with Moderate Evidence* that the teacher's students made more growth than expected; a score of 3 is *Average Effectiveness with Evidence* that the teacher's students made growth as expected; a score of 2 is *Approaching Average Effectiveness: Moderate evidence that the teacher's students made less growth than expected;* and a score of 1 is *Least Effective: Significant evidence that the teacher's students made less growth than expected*.

Percentage of Cohort Members whose Classroom Observation Scores are Level 3 or Above

This metric reports the percentage of cohort members who earned an observation score of at least a 3 (“At Expectations”) on a scale of 1-5. (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.). Only cohort members who teach a grade or subject with a state assessment receive scores. Results (n=148) indicate a score of 93% compared to the state average of 95%. TSU candidates are near to the state average and increased by 2.2% compared to 2019-20.

Percentage of Cohort Members whose Classroom Observation Scores are Level 4 or Above

This metric reports the percentage of cohort members who earned an observation score of at least a 4 (“Above Expectations”) on a scale of 1-5 (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.). Results (n=148) indicate a score of 64.2% compared to the state average of 61.2%. TSU candidates are maintaining above the state average.

***Percentage of Cohort Members whose Student Growth (TVAAS) Scores are Level 3 or Above**

This metric reports the percentage of cohort members who earned a student growth (TVAAS) score of at least a 3 (“At Expectations”) on a scale of 1-5 (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.). For this metric, small n-sizes were suppressed. Only cohort members who teach a grade or subject with a state assessment receive TVAAS scores. Results (n=19) indicate a score of 42.1% compared to the state average of 61.3%. The College improved from the previous year by 7%.

Percentage of Cohort Members whose Student Growth (TVAAS) Scores are Level 4 or Above

This metric reports the percentage of cohort members who earned a student growth (TVAAS) score of at least a 4 (“Above Expectations”) on a scale of 1-5. Only cohort members who teach a grade or subject with a state assessment receive TVAAS scores (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.). Results (n=19) indicate a score of 26.3% compared to the state average of 20.2%. TSU candidates are maintaining above the state average.

Percentage of Cohort Members whose Level of Overall Effectiveness (LOE) Scores are Level 3 or Above

This metric reports the percentage of cohort members who earned a level of overall effectiveness (LOE) score of at least 3 (“At Expectations”) on a scale of 1-5, which includes all components of a teacher's annual evaluation required by state law and policy

(Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.). Results (n=138) indicate a score of 87% compared to the state average of 89.5%. TSU candidates are near to the state average.

***Percentage of Cohort Members whose Level of Overall Effectiveness (LOE) Scores are Level 4 or Above**

This metric reports the percentage of cohort members who earned a level of overall effectiveness (LOE) score of at least 4 ("Above Expectations") on a scale of 1-5, which includes all components of a teacher's annual evaluation required by state law and policy (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.). Results (n=138) indicate a score of 51% compared to the state average of 57%. TSU candidates are 6% below the state average.

In summary, the baseline for the performance of TSU educators is the state average; however, the bar is being established within the revised QAS to determine annual goals. The College acknowledges continued focus on the **Percentage of Cohort Members whose Student Growth (TVAAS) Scores are Level 3 or Above, the Percentage of Cohort Members whose Level of Overall Effectiveness (LOE) Scores are Level 3 or Above, and the Percentage of Cohort Members whose Level of Overall Effectiveness (LOE) Scores are Level 4 or Above**. These areas fall below the state average and are continued areas of focus. Compared to last year, the College did see an improvement of 7% in the **Percentage of Cohort Members whose Student Growth (TVAAS) Scores are Level 3 or Above** and 2.2% in **Percentage of Cohort Members whose Classroom Observation Scores are Level 3 or Above**. After examining those that scored 2 or below, the College found that these educators are not trending upwards in 2 or Approaching Average Effectiveness, but the opposite. The College is researching support needed by engaging partners with an enhanced employer survey and utilizing the survey to obtain specific context on smaller n-size content area impact.

*****Denotes area of improvement

2. SATISFACTION OF EMPLOYERS AND STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT (R4.2|R5.3|RA.4.1)

EMPLOYER SATISFACTION

The employer satisfaction surveys yielded no meaningful results for this reporting year. The survey (n=25) for initial and advanced employers yielded four (4) total responses. While there was some data, the responses did not articulate dissatisfaction or satisfaction. The respondents inputted statements such as "I don't believe I am the accurate person to answer," or there was no response. The survey response rate consisted of low feedback due to the limited distribution frequency to partner employers. The respondents that received the survey may have been the correct population, and a review of the questions indicated that they may not have been optimally constructed to obtain the necessary information. As a result, the College researched samples to adopt a revised survey that solicits the requisite information needed. The revised survey shall be disbursed on a schedule to yield a more significant response rate with relevant feedback. Also, a list of pertinent survey respondents has been collected to ensure relevant feedback. This task is now coordinated and monitored by the College's Office of Assessment and Accreditation (OAA).

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

The Metro Nashville Public Schools (MNPS) is heavily involved with the initial and advanced candidates from TSU. Minimally, 80% of candidates from TSU complete their experience within MNPS. The District is a primary partner and supports the College in various components, including admissions and candidate selection, recruitment, placement, logistical support, committees, and continuous improvement efforts for initial and advanced programs. The state of Tennessee requires a primary partner district and aligned the process in response to the revised CAEP standards (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.). The TSU and MNPS partnership has collaboratively developed criteria (skills and competencies) for selecting school-based clinical mentors (mentor teachers) and provider-based

clinical educators (master clinicians) annually. Support includes but is not limited to an overview of TSU and MNPS handbooks, edTPA©, and the co-teaching model. A partnership committee including EPP members and MNPS has been developed to enhance the communication skills, best assessment practices, knowledge about components such as edTPA©, and effectiveness in providing reflective feedback among school-based clinical mentors. Individual sessions are used so that school-based clinical mentors can become familiar with specific expectations.

The College collects feedback from this partnership through a primary partnership inventory to determine if staffing needs were met, which is distributed by the state of Tennessee. Results indicated that, on average, the College meets the staffing needs with an average of 3 on a 1-5 scale with 1 being not enough and 5 being too many. The survey provides context using various questions specifically gauging the quality of the partnership. The scale for those questions includes *Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, and Strongly Agree. MNPS responses did not include Strongly Disagree or Disagree*. Key areas on the survey include partnership has developed mutual goals, partnership jointly recruits and selects candidates for EPP programs, and partnership strategically places teacher candidates for clinical experience progression. Areas, where MNPS responded neutral, will require follow-up to determine the rationale for the response. Areas of neutral response include partnership has mutually agreed upon the design of clinical experiences, partnership reviews data to improve the educator pipeline related to endorsement areas, and partnership aligns coaching and feedback strategies for candidates with district expectations for context.

The College is currently developing a process for collecting deeper stakeholder opinions about the partnerships and practices. Currently, this information is solely anecdotal outside of the inventory. However, with strong support and participation in meetings, student support, and more, the College must collect this information systematically. With such a solid and long-standing relationship with MNPS, the data can support the improvement of the partnership and support the partnership and collaboration with the District outside of the primary partner.

The College does utilize other district sites where candidates are sent. While these partners are not identified as “primary” partnerships, the same approach is shared to ensure consistency and quality for all candidates. Again, the relationship with all partners is a highlight of the College. Thus, the College is developing ways to collect this information for continuous improvement. Strategies include updated partnership surveys, a mentor survey, event surveys with partners, advisory board outcomes, and possible interviews with school administrators

related to all candidates. Thus, the data currently retrieved from the primary partner shall also include all partnerships.

3. CANDIDATE COMPETENCY AT COMPLETION (R3.3|RA3.4)

INITIAL

Initial program candidates completed the **ETS Praxis©** content exams. There were 299 exam takers, with 211 passing the exams for a passage rate of 71%. When examining the number of exams taken, the passage rate is 55%. Focus areas include physical education, music, reading (elementary), history, English language arts, biology, and mathematics. Areas of growth include early childhood (80%), ESL (80%), special education core (77%), and speech pathology (88%). The scores indicate continued review of the program learning outcomes, curriculum, and in-course performance measures. The College is currently revising the QAS to align the content standards and exam objectives, as this concern was identified in the data review.

The College is in the sixth year of implementation for **Pearson edTPA©** and working to ensure implementation with fidelity. During this reporting period, the cut score for passage was 40. This score was supposed to progress to 42; however, Tennessee extended the score of 40, due to Covid-19, until January 1, 2023. The cut score for passing is based on 15 rubrics, with a score between 15-and 75. Of the 20 candidates who completed the 15 rubrics, 85% passed, whereas 15% did not. The outcomes show an average total performance score of 45 compared to 42 in 2018-19. The average rubric score is 3.0 out of 4.0. The College has identified areas of focus for rubric areas 8-10 and 14, as the average for these sections fell below 3.0. Overall, candidates are performing well using the assessment.

Note. Due to COVID-19 restrictions, teacher observation data has been excluded due to the challenge of observation during this period.

ADVANCED

Advanced program candidates completed the ETS Praxis© exams that consist of the Professional School Counselor (PSC) and School Leaders (SL) exams. The PSC is a passing score of 156 where 16 total exams were taken, consisting of 13 candidates, with nine (9) who passed for a passage rate of 69%. The previous years yielded a higher passage rate of 78%. The College is examining this through continuous improvement efforts to ascertain the objectives that present a challenge to candidates. This evaluation includes examining the curriculum and the alignment of objectives. The School Leadership Licensure Assessment (SLLA) passing score is 151, where 81 exams were taken by 78 individuals, with 72 who passed for a passage rate of 92%. The SLLA passage rates improved by 12%, indicating that the program's updates yield positive results.

i. Leadership

The program utilizes a comprehensive (comps) examination for program candidates. In the Fall 2020, the average scores on Scenario A of the comps ranged from 2.0 to 3.0. In Spring 2021, the average scores on Scenario A ranged from 2.17 to 3.0. The area where students scored lowest (1-2) was data, curriculum and interventions, which suggests that greater emphasis should be applied to building rigorous curriculum, using multiple forms of data to establish goals and strategies targeting student achievement, and growth and executing interventions to address all students learning needs. Given this is the first year of utilizing the new rubrics, there is no comparison data available. However, when examining overall scores, 100% of the students passed the examination over a two-year period. Although the pass rate was 100%, the faculty decided to revise the Field Experience Summary and Reflection assignment in the internships. This revision shall provide specific assignments that are aligned with TILS A, which would provide students with more in-depth learning in the areas of curriculum, data, and interventions.

ii. School Counseling

The program utilizes a year-long Internship. Those consist of Internship I for Elementary School Counseling and Internship II for Secondary School Counseling. The supervising counselors observe and evaluate the candidates while engaging in individual and group counseling, psychoeducational group, consultation and referral. The

professional school counseling candidates are observed two times in both Internship I and Internship II. The supervising counselors use the Learning Progressions for School Counselors (LPSC) Scoring Rubric for Practicum and Internship Field Experience Form to evaluate a candidate's ability to create, manage, deliver, and evaluate comprehensive school counseling programs. This form is based on both Tennessee State Professional School Counseling Standards and the American School Counseling Association (ASCA) national standards. A score of 2 on this rubric indicates an Acceptable performance and the minimum score required. A score of 3 is Good, and 4 is Great.

Results from the direct supervisor evaluation of group work indicates 100% (n=7) of students scored a mean of 2 or higher on the practicum final evaluation. The data indicates an increase in the evaluation score for evidence-based counseling techniques for large and small groups. The average mean scores went from 3.35% (2019-20) to 3.57%. This increase in by 6.6%.

Results from the direct supervisor evaluation of a candidate's ability to use resources to evaluate developmentally appropriate student learning indicates an average of 3.93 (n=9). Results showed a decrease in area associated with using technology-based resources (i.e., student management system). Data indicates that decreased attention focused on Student management Systems yielded negative results. There was a 1% decrease in this score from last year. As a result, action shall include increased instruction and additional readings specifically focused on data analysis and evidence-based practice design to increase student's competence in analyzing and interpreting school data.

Results from the direct supervisor evaluation of a candidate's effective teaching practices indicates a 12% increase in the mean score of 4.0 when compared to the 2019-2020. Data shows students improved in the use of counseling and learning theories to identify, problem solve, and present result in an appropriate manner to varying educational stakeholders.

4. CANDIDATE ABILITY TO BE EMPLOYED

Annually, the Tennessee Department of Education evaluates the performance of EPPs in preparing educators to start and remain as an educator in Tennessee public schools. Based on 20-21 results, TSU "exceeds expectations" in the retention of teachers within the school districts. The overall score consists of three metrics that include the ***Rate of First-Year Employment* (FYE)** in Tennessee Public Schools, ***Second Year Retention Rate* (SYR)**, and ***Third-Year Retention Rate (TYR)***. The FYE reports "the percentage of cohort members employed in Tennessee public schools within one year of completing their preparation program or within one year of enrolling in a job-embedded program" (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.) is unscored for this domain. The SYR reports the percentage of first-year employed cohort members who continue teaching in Tennessee public schools for a second year. The ***TYR*** reports the percentage of first-year employed cohort members who remain to teach in Tennessee public schools for three years (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d).

Results for the ***FYE*** (n=123) indicate a score of 90.2% compared to the state average of 76.8%. The ***SYR*** (n=89) results show a score of 93.3% compared to the state average of 92.9%. The ***TYR*** (n=50) results indicate a score of 78% compared to the state average of 81.1%. Collectively, the results are promising and show movement in the proper direction. The TYR component is added as a focus area for continuous improvement.

UPDATES TO PROGRAM (6.1)

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 two significant efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined changes and studying the results of those changes.

QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM REVISIONS

The Annual Cycle for Continuous Improvement (ACCI) process at Tennessee State University (TSU) provides the platform for the University leaders to build synergy and work in unison to advance the shared vision for students and the community. More specifically, the policy (No. 02.04) describes how TSU schedules, conducts, reviews, and approves assessment activities to ensure data are collected and used for improvement (Tennessee State University, n.d.). The outcomes assessment activities are expected to be informative and not punitive and are conducted to enhance student achievement and improve programs and services.

The College of Education (COE) created a Quality Assurance System (QAS); however, an internal audit found some improvements that are imperative to greater strength and consistency. The initial QAS has a solid foundation. Unfortunately, the data indicates there was no implementation with fidelity, misalignment of practices, gaps in processes and procedures, and silos. In the spirit of continuous improvement or PLAN, DO, CHECK, ACT (Bernhardt, 2015), this allowed for enhancements to the system that will shape the College, which has prompted broad support within the College from faculty and staff. Some issues are attributed to personnel changes in the OAA and what the College refers to as the COVID Effect, as the change in access to campus services altered process orientations. The unexpected change of practices caused disruption for faculty, staff, and candidates.

The QAS now embodies the mission to create Competent and caring facilitators of learning, committed to diversity and the success of all" and ensures balance between accountability and normal curricular evolution (Lessinger, 1976; Cullen, Joyce, Hassall & Broadbent, 2003; Nicholson, 2011). The alignment between summative reporting for accountability purposes and formative assessment for curriculum monitoring and improvement is now graphically represented in the TSU continuous improvement cycle. Thus, the COE aligned TSU's policy to the revised COE QAS to avoid repetitive functions. The QAS is now integrally linked to TSU's annual cycles for Continuous Improvement and Program Learning Outcomes. The process considers the iterative steps of the assessment cycle, intended to provide helpful feedback about what and how well students are learning. The intent is to develop a relevant curriculum, intentional program learning outcomes, assessment methods, criteria for success, collection of outcome information,

analysis of results, use of results, and evidence of improvement. The process also embodies processes and procedures, with roles and functions to ensure a systematic approach to continuous improvement.

CONTEXT

Since its implementation, the QAS did not operate the way intended due to various circumstances, including the Covid Effect, human resource changes, and accessibility to information. In this reporting year, the COE revised the QAS system based on an audit conducted by the revised OAA within the College to test the production. The overall results indicated the need for revisions. After some updates, the OAS is now the catalyst to systematically manage data validation, reliability, collection, analysis, and reporting efforts. The overall audit purpose was to discover the needed improvement and to:

1) inventory all resources and align them to the areas in the framework;
2) develop and refine the accountability system; and
3) facilitate the organization of all resources.

The findings centered on four themes: *Accountability, Culture and Climate, Data Collection (data entry and cleansing), and Communication*. Those themes indicated a need for revising the QAS to promote the improved program and course learning outcomes, appropriate measures to determine the intended outcomes, centralized data collection for all reporting, validation, reliability, analysis, storage, and access to data, detailed processes and procedures, and a schedule of activities with functions and responsibilities.

The process for revisions of the QAS includes QAS Facilitation or the focus on examining the range of processes, procedures, existing data analysis, new data collection and analysis, faculty feedback and engagement, and optimal storage. The process inventories all relevant information used to formulate the focus. This includes establishing various stakeholders in the process. This facilitation draws conclusions regarding the QAS functionality or “checks the temperature” of functionality.

The College created the QAS Management Process Review based on the facilitation, which operates independently. It must regularly perform quality review activities (internal audits) to ensure compliance with standards and practices (Manghani, 2011). The updated QAS internal audit shall review practices and produce an internal audit report shared with an overall committee that consists of various units. The report includes the following:

i. Description of the quality assurance system;
ii. Description of the procedure followed in conducting the internal audit;
iii. Presentation of the findings;
iv. Conclusions that staff draws from the findings; and
v. Discussion of the implications for the outcomes.

The revised QAS process fosters an assessment environment of continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based (Bucki, 2020). The system is comprised of multiple measures intended to monitor progress, the effectiveness of the system's outcomes, and operational effectiveness (Manghani, 2011; CAEP, n.d.). The system seeks relevant, representative, and cumulative data that are actionable.

REVISED QAS FOCUS AREAS

The focus areas were created in 2019 and are a solid foundation for revision. Those revised areas of the QAS include Systematic Assessment of Candidate Performance, Unit and Program Review, Data Collection, and Validation and Reliability of Data Collection (Asif, Raouf, & Searcy, 2012; OAA, 2022). The audit discovered improvements needed to align and support the consistency of processes across the programs within the College.

SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

This assessment of candidate performance shall include the review of:

i. Candidate performance expectations;
ii. Faculty performance and support;
iii. Curriculum standards alignment;

iv. Educator Preparation Provider performance; and
v. Processes and procedures.

This area is designed to assess the overall functionality of the College in the training of candidates after their preparation experience. This process includes candidate performance expectations (outcomes), faculty performance (candidate surveys), candidate support (support lab and advising), curriculum standards alignment (program review outcomes), educator preparation provider performance (TDOE data), processes and procedures review, and the frequency of reviewing the functionality. The improvements in this area depend heavily on a schedule or calendar of events to set "check-ins" for data review, the documentation of impacts, and the responsibilities and functions. Various policies may impact outcomes at a given time; thus, the schedule provides a clear check-in point to determine if policies and procedures need revision.

UNIT AND PROGRAM REVIEW

This process currently includes a faculty coordinator supporting the entry of program learning outcomes and the outcome measure into a management system to record information. The audit found that the process must consist of faculty, external the QAS workgroup, leadership team review, and a more comprehensive review. The goal is to refocus all processes to support the alignment of practices starting with admission and ending with program completion. The audit found that unit and program and review are not using a systematic process for the analysis and interpretation relative to the program, curriculum, and outcomes. The correct approach is designed to use the data to create action plans with recommendations to improve the effectiveness of a program and its impact on student outcomes collegewide. Thus, a collegewide process to support improvements is being developed. The College has begun aligning program outcomes to relevant measures, clear and appropriate course outcomes with performance measures aligned to standards and establishing the review of course material to ensure alignment and relevance.

DATA COLLECTION

For understanding the greater context of the College processes, the College has isolated Data Collection useful for continuous improvement. The data includes admissions, candidate progression and support, assessments including edTPA©, Praxis exams, surveys (i.e., student, faculty, staff, partners, alumni, and 2-year out), partnership agreements, evaluations (i.e., course, faculty, mentor teacher, supervisors, and coordinators), college performance assessments, dispositions, and state-supported educator preparation provider data. The audit found that while data collection occurs, there is no centralized storage location. Data was not readily available and used to inform processes and procedures. As a result, the College has restructured the OAA with a clear focus on centralizing data collection and storage efforts. This centralization includes utilizing AI (e.g., Microsoft BI) to provide immediate access to outcome data and concentrating resources (unit share folders). Also, a consulting firm that focuses on creating QAS functionality supports the work of placing all components in place and training faculty on the revised system.

VALIDATION AND RELIABILITY OF DATA COLLECTION

The purpose is to ensure the drawing of conclusions with greater accuracy. The audit found that the College has the systems to collect and analyze data and levels of validity in place. The College is constructing the codebook that shall contain the methods for measurement to ensure the continuance of valid or meaningful data and the consistency of a measure. Also, faculty shall integrate the context of validity and reliability when creating a program assessment. The focus on reliability and validity includes three basic questions:

1. What does the data say about each?
2. How are reliability and validity assessed?
3. How do reliability and validity relate?

The College currently uses the Lawshe method (Gilbert & Prion, 2016) for content validity when developing instruments to gather data. The process is not holistically or consistently used; thus, this shall become a standard as faculty will work with the

redesigned OAA to understand the rationale and need for following practices such as Lawshe when collecting data.

OUTCOME

Full implementation of the revised QAS that includes software to support the effort is scheduled for Fall 2022. This schedule allows all faculty and staff training on the revised system, initiated at the end of 2021. The result is updated program learning outcomes, syllabi, curriculum, processes and procedures, roles and functions, data collection practices, and reporting features.

END—

REFERENCES

Asif, M., Raouf, A., & Searcy, C. (2012). Developing measures for performance excellence: Is the Baldrige criteria sufficient for performance excellence in higher education? *Quality & Quantity*, 47(6), 3095– 3111. DOI: 10.1007/s11135-012-9706-3

Bernhardt, V.L. (Ed.). (2015). Data, Data Everywhere: Bringing all the Data Together for Continuous School Improvement (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315692081

Bucki, J. (2020, July 2). What is quality assurance? Small Business. https://www.thebalancesmb.com/definition-of-quality-assurance-2533665

CAEP (n.d.). Standard 5: Quality assurance system and continuous improvement. http://caepnet.org/standards/2022-itp/standard-5

Cullen, J., Joyce, J., Hassall, T., & Broadbent, M. (2003). Quality in higher education: From monitoring to management. Quality Assurance in Education, 11, 5–14. DOI: 10.1108/09684880310462038

Gilbert, E. & Prion, S. (2016). Making Sense of Methods and Measurement: Lawshe's Content Validity Index. *Clinical Simulation In Nursing*, 12 (12), 530 - 531. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecns.2016.08.002

Lessinger, L. M. (1976). Quality Control and Quality Assurance in Education. *Journal of Education Finance*, *1*(4), 503–515. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40703066

Manghani, K. (2011). Quality assurance: Importance of systems and standard operating procedures. Perspective in Clinical Research, 2(1), 34-37. DOI: 10.4103/2229-3485.76288

Nicholson, T. (2020). Nicholson 2011 - Orton Gillingham approach - what is it and is it research based - LDA Bulletin 43 No 1 May.

Quality Assurance (2022). [process]. Office of Assessment and Accreditation. College of Education.Tennessee State University.

Tennessee Department of Education (n.d.). Primary partnership agreement (policy).

https://www.tn.gov/education/licensing/educator-preparation/educator-toolkit.html

Tennessee State Board of Education (n.d.). Report card. https://teacherprepreportcard.tn.gov/

Tennessee State University (n.d.). Annual Cycle for Continuous Improvement: Outcomes Assessment Guidelines. https://www.tnstate.edu/assessment