



## AAQEP Annual Report for 2025

Provider/Program Name:	Maryville University
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or "n/a" if not yet accredited):	December 2029

## 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.

#### Maryville University, Overview & Context

Maryville University is a nationally recognized private nonprofit institution, located just over 20 miles west of Saint Louis, Missouri. The University was founded in 1872. Maryville has maintained HLC accreditation since 1941 and most recently affirmed their accreditation by The Higher Learning Commission in 2025.

Maryville University's mission is to be a revolutionary national university offering a comprehensive and innovative array of academic programs to learners across all platforms. Using sophisticated data analytics and artificial intelligence, Maryville University is laser focused on student learning, outcomes and success. This educational model is called the

Active Living and Learning Ecosystem and is built upon an innovative liberal arts foundation leading to completing programs in the Arts and Sciences, Health Professions, Education and Business that prepare students for a life of engagement and achievement.

Maryville's [strategic Plan](#), Maryville 2030: The Access & Opportunity Revolution is focused on the strategic vision of being an innovative leader in higher education by promoting a revolution in student learning that expands access and opportunity for all. The goals of the strategic plan are Collective Engagement, Collective Empowerment, Collective Responsibility & Collective Transparency.

For six consecutive years, The Chronicle of Higher Education has ranked Maryville University in the top five fastest-growing private universities. Current enrollment is over 9,200 students representing all 50 states and 53 countries. The university offers over 90 degree programs divided over undergraduate, graduate and doctoral levels as well as on ground and online. The average class size is fourteen students.

The university is also known for its value; ranking in the top ten percent of all major universities in the nation for the economic value of its degrees. The university hopes to maintain this status with a strategic plan to decrease the cost of tuition by a total of twenty percent by 2030. Maryville University also holds numerous other [national and regional rankings](#).

Effective June of 2025, Daniel Shipp became the eleventh President of Maryville University. In his first months as President, Dr. Shipp has created new positions and made some changes to the [organizational structure](#) at the university. Dr. Shipp has stated that he wants to "continue the tradition of shaping future higher education."

### **The School of Education, Overview & Context**

The mission of the School of Education at Maryville University is to prepare educators for a life of engagement and service in P-12 schools, higher education institutions, and communities that will strengthen the education profession's ability to serve all participants equitably and work against systemic inequities. The School of Education has three programs: Teacher Preparation, School Leader Preparation, and Higher Educational Leadership. Only the programs leading to state certification are included in this review.

The School of Education (SOE) is committed to working with other units within the university, as well as with our school partners in the simultaneous renewal of schools and teacher education. School of Education faculty meet regularly with

faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) to coordinate degree planning for secondary education candidates majoring in specific content areas. SOE faculty are paired with CAS faculty for each content area in which we certify to ensure smooth articulation. The School of Education is continually developing partnerships with neighboring rural, suburban and urban districts to identify quality placements for all field-based experiences.

The Maryville University School of Education embraces the [Active Learning Ecosystem](#) (ALE), which drives our program outcomes to prepare students with the content knowledge, pedagogical inquiry and practice, and professional knowledge needed to be successful in their respective degree programs and in their future careers. The School of Education at Maryville University has a proud history of preparing influential teachers and leaders in schools throughout the St. Louis region and beyond and plans to continue being a part of that legacy.

The School of Education at Maryville University is housed under Academic Affairs. The department is led by Dr. Mascheal Schappe, Dean who is supported by three program directors, staff and faculty.

### **The School of Education, Accreditation & Standards**

[The School of Education](#) (SOE) at Maryville University has been accredited since 1978. The school was previously accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Education Preparation (CAEP) with the most recent continuation visit occurring in 2015. In June of 2021, the SOE at Maryville decided to withdraw from CAEP in order to pursue accreditation through AAQEP, which it received in February of 2023.

The School of Education's Teacher Education programs are also fully accredited by the State of Missouri through the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). This accreditation involves a regular process of alignment with state standards for school leader preparation programs, compliance with all aspects of appropriate Missouri state law and code, and consistently meeting accountability standards set forth in the Annual Performance Report (APR).

All School of Education programs leading to Certification (Teacher, Principal and Superintendent) are state approved by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (MODESE). To ensure that all completers meet MODESE standards, the state provides a matrix for each program; the School of Education at Maryville must demonstrate how our provided coursework can meet these standards.

## Teacher Preparation, Overview & Context

Teacher Preparation Programs in the SOE at Maryville University are led by Program Director Lisa Merideth, EdD who is supported by staff members, full time faculty, adjunct faculty, cooperating teachers and university supervisors.

The SOE at Maryville offers 11 programs leading to endorsement for initial teacher certification. These programs include:

- Bachelor of Arts in Elementary and Early Childhood Education Double Major
- Elementary Education
- Bachelor of Arts in Middle Level Education in
  - English/Language Arts
  - Math
  - Science
  - Social Science
- Bachelor of Arts in Middle Level Education in ELA and English, Double Major
- Bachelor of Arts in High School Education in
  - Biology
  - Chemistry
  - Social Science
- Bachelor of Arts in High School Education in English and English, Double Major
- Bachelor of Arts in High School Education in Mathematics and Mathematics, Double Major

We have Alternative Certification in the Middle Level and High School certification areas above. Furthermore, we offer a Bridge to an MA in General Education, an MA in Education-Reading & Literacy Specialization with Certification, and Bridge to MA in Early Childhood Education.

Teacher candidates are also required to complete practicum placements and student teaching and maintain an overall GPA of 2.5 and a content-area/professional GPA of 3.00. Student teachers are evaluated using the Missouri Educator Evaluation System (MEES), a state-adopted instrument. Ratings for designated standards on the MEES are reported to MODESE annually and comprise a portion of the Annual Performance Report. Upon degree completion, graduates must also pass the state required standardized assessment in the appropriate content area in order to acquire certification.

## **School Leadership Preparation, Overview & Context**

School Leadership Programs in the SOE at Maryville University are led by Program Director Kevin Stokes, EdD who is supported by a staff member, full time faculty and adjunct faculty. School Leadership programs use a cohort plan, consisting of fifteen to twenty students who advance through their classes as a unit.

Maryville University SOE offers three programs leading to endorsement for school administrator certification. These programs include:

- Master of Arts in Educational Leadership leading to endorsement for initial K-12 principal certification
- EdD in Educational Leadership leading to endorsement for K-12 superintendent
- Bridge to the EdD with Principal Certification Program (This program provides an expedited pathway to completion of both certification programs.)

School Leadership candidates are also required to complete four major program components: a Professional Leadership Growth Plan, a Comprehensive Reflective Journal, a 300-hour internship at the building level for principal certification and/or a 300-hour internship at the district level for superintendent certification, and a Capstone Experience. Moreover, completers must maintain a GPA of 3.00 while enrolled in the program. Upon degree completion, graduates must pass all appropriate state licensure assessments.

## **The School of Education, Community & Partnerships**

Maryville University is located in a unique geographic region; in Saint Louis County, Missouri. The county is only 22 miles from Saint Louis City and is bordered closely by Saint Charles County and Jefferson County. Due to this particular location, there are over 41 surrounding school districts from which the School of Education can recruit and place students. The variety of districts contributes to who attends the university, where students are able to complete internships, and eventually where completers are hired. The districts differ widely in terms of ethnic diversity, socio-economic status of the student population and surrounding communities, and school funding/resources. Moreover, Maryville University is less than twenty-five miles from the Illinois border, which occasionally impacts licensure. The

School of Education is committed to working with our school and community partners in the simultaneous renewal of schools and teacher education. Therefore, Maryville University's School of Education partners with St. Louis area school districts with a focus on renewing teacher education and schooling. Our students are exposed to working with students from a variety of cultures, ethnicities, and socioeconomic backgrounds as they develop innovative teaching methods through enriching research, intensive field-based coursework, and strategic clinical placement to fully prepare them for professional practice in a variety of settings. Maryville is a leader in Missouri and nationally in this collaborative effort.

Maryville University fosters relationships for ongoing stability through meetings with key districts in the area. Furthermore, district members serve as mentors to our students, attend panel discussions, give presentations in our classes, and provide tours of their schools amongst other interactions. To make these relationships mutually beneficial, Maryville encourages students to substitute teach, conducts ongoing training, and hosts focus groups, amongst other actions.

The School of Education at Maryville University houses a unique department called the Center for Access and Achievement (CA2). The CA2's mission is to partner with high-need school districts and nonprofits to help prepare students with the skills and abilities they need to succeed in STEM field in college and the careers of the future. Associate Professor Steve Coxon serves as the Executive Director of the CA2 while also serving as a full-time faculty member in the School of Education. The CA2 offers a variety of programs and scholarships which are funded by Saint Louis businesses. The CA2 also offers support to teachers so that they can help students unleash their full potential in the STEM field.

Maryville University also has international partnerships, providing study abroad opportunities for our students in the summer semester.

The School of Education at Maryville is an active participant in the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the Association for Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education, and the Missouri Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

The School of Education also maintains an active membership in the Missouri Professors of Educational Administration (MPEA) organization. The MPEA is made up of professors from higher education institutions across the state with approved school leader preparation programs. This group meets monthly to share best practices and confer with representatives from MODESE regarding certification requirements.

As the field of education enters a significant era of change, challenge and opportunity, Maryville's faculty, staff, students and diverse network of school and district partnerships, combined with our commitment to preparing "socially responsible critical thinkers who are collaborative and reflective educators committed to the moral endeavor of schooling in a democracy," provides a rich environment for learning. Maryville has a proud history of preparing influential teachers and leaders in schools throughout the St. Louis region and beyond. We are honored to continue contributing to that legacy.

#### **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):

<https://www.maryville.edu/academics/accreditation/>

## 2. Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows current enrollment and recent completion data, disaggregated by program and license/certificate, for each program included in the AAQEP review.

**Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2024-2025**

<b>Table 1: Program Specification Enrollment and Completers Academic Year 2024-2025</b>			
<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 08/31/25)	<b>Number of Completers</b> in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 8/31/25)
<b><i>Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials</i></b>			
BA in Elementary and Early Childhood Education	Initial Teacher Certification	23	0
Elementary Education	Initial Teacher Certification	17	7
BA in Middle Level Education (ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies)	Initial Teacher Certification	4	5
BA in High School Education (Biology, Chemistry, ELA Math, or Social Studies)	Initial Teacher Certification	12	1
MA Certificate Programs in Reading/Literacy with certification	K-12 Special Reading	2	0
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials		58	13

<b><i>Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators</i></b>			
MA in Educational Leadership	K-12 Principal Certification	23	15
EdD in Educational Leadership	K-12 Superintendent Certification	73	33
Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials		96	48

#### **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.)

Not Applicable

### **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.
154
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.
68 - We used the Missouri Department of Secondary Education's 2024/2025 definition of a 'completer' as required in their Annual Performance Report. This is the number of candidates who completed all degree requirements for the given certification. However, they may have chosen not to complete the state assessment or may not have applied for certification.

**C. Number of recommendations** for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.

30 – This is the number of completers that fulfilled the additional requirements and application to become certified in their respective area.

**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.

100% - Candidates in both educator preparation programs and leadership preparation programs completed their degree within up to 1.5 times the expected timeframe.

**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%.

**Teacher Preparation Programs**

As indicated in Table 3, 100% of candidates in teacher preparation programs that attempted the state required assessment achieved a passing score.

**School Leader Preparation Programs**

As indicated in Section 3 Table 3, candidates in school leader preparation programs are required to pass the state established exams. MoDESE instituted some significant changes to the assessment requirements for both principal and superintendent certification during AY 24-25. Changes to the assessment requirements are summarized below:

**Revised Assessment Requirements for Principal Certification**

Previously, MoDESE had required that principal certification applicants successfully complete both a written nationally standardized assessment (Pearson-developed Principal 080 exam) in addition to the Principal Performance Assessment (PPA) developed by the Missouri Professors of Educational Administration (MPEA). Midway through AY 24-25, MoDESE changed the exam requirement from the Pearson-developed Principal 080 exam to the ETS-developed Praxis exam. This change became effective on March 1, 2025.

***Results from the Pearson Principal 080 exam for those who took this exam prior to March 1, 2025 are presented in Section 4 Table 3 and summarized below:***

*Candidates in school leader preparation programs for principal licensure passed the Pearson Principal 080 exam at the rate of 88%. The average score for the principal licensure content exam was 242, comfortably above the state's required score of 220. The state requires an additional Performance Assessment for principal licensure, and 100% of candidates passed this assessment.*

***Results from the ETS - Principal Praxis Exam:***

*At the time of this report, no data were available for candidates taking the new content exam for principal certification.*

Additionally, the scoring scheme for the PPA was revised such that scores are now reported by Domain, rather than by each Step in the PPA. Scores are reported for each of the five Leadership Domains (i.e., Visionary, Instructional, Managerial, Relational, Innovative). New scoring protocols were developed, and training was required for all scorers to help ensure inter-rater reliability. Two scorers grade each PPA, then scores are added together to obtain the final score. Each assessment has 20 points available, so with both scores the total possible points that can be earned on the PPA is 40. A minimum score of 25/40 has been established for the PPA going forward. These scoring changes are reflected in Section 4 Table 3 of this report.

In AY 24-25, 27 candidates took the PPA and 100% passed the assessment. The mean score for this academic year was 33.18, well above the minimum of 25 points required to pass. The range for the PPA was 25.59-40.0, with two of the 27 candidates earning perfect scores.

***Revised Assessment Requirements for Superintendent Certification***

A major change in assessment requirements for Superintendent certification was instituted by MoDESE for all candidates graduating from Superintendent Preparation Programs after September 1, 2025. Candidates graduating after that date no longer take any written content exam but are required to earn a passing score on the new Superintendent Performance Assessment (SPA) developed by the Missouri Professors of Educational Administration (MPEA). The SPA requires candidates to complete a district-level action research project focusing on an issue that may be concentrated in any area or areas of district level operations. Scoring for this new assessment is also reported by Leadership Domain (i.e. Visionary, Instructional, Managerial, Relational, Innovative). The SPA is made up of four Steps, each requiring students to respond to 4-5 prompts with a narrative plus specified artifacts where indicated. A perfect score on the SPA is 20 and is reported by domain aligned to the 5 leadership standards. To ensure validity, two faculty independently score each SPA, and the scores from both scorers are added together to comprise the final score. A minimum score of 25/40 has been established minimum for passing the SPA.

***Results from the New Superintendent Performance Assessment***

The first cohorts to graduate under these new requirements are currently completing their final semester (FA 25) of EdD coursework and are working to complete the SPA during this term. No data from the SPA results are available at the time of this report.

***Results from Pearson 059 Superintendent Exam***

Candidates who graduated from the EdD in Educational Leadership program between the 2024 AAQEP Annual Report and the September 1, 2025, deadline were required to take the Pearson 059 Superintendent Exam to earn certification. Results from those students are reported in Section 4 Table 3 of this report. The average score for the Pearson Superintendent Licensure Content Exam (059) was 234.16, also comfortably above the 220 minimum required score.

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

**Teacher Preparation Programs:**

As indicated by the evidence presented in Section 4, Table 3, completers are generally well prepared to successfully pass all state requirements for licensure with a 100% pass rate across all areas/levels. Additionally, graduates of our programs who completed the First Year Survey indicated that they consider themselves well-prepared to meet the challenges of the classroom in all areas measured by the MEES Standards. Expectations for Performance were met for every standard; students' highest score was a 4.5/5 in "Engage students in content areas". Their lowest recorded score was 3.92/5 in "Incorporate interdisciplinary instruction".

We did notice a drop in scores, which is unusual. This data was a small sample size, so we want to monitor the data to determine if lower performance on these standards is a trend or a data blip. While a score of 3 is Neutral and does not indicate that a respondent was dissatisfied, it is below our expectation of a 4. This data calls for us to take a deeper look at where the content is in our curriculum maps and implementation.

**School Leader Preparation Programs:**

Results from the AY 24-25 Missouri First Year Educator's Survey for new principals conducted by MoDESE reported that they were generally well prepared for their first administrative roles. They ranked their preparation on a number of areas within each Leadership Standard on a scale of 1-5 with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree that the program had prepared them to perform relative to a given Standard and Indicator.

Survey results indicate that first year principals are generally very pleased with their preparation to meet the challenges of school leadership. The overall mean ratings for each of the five Leadership Standards ranged exceeded minimum expectations of 4.0+, ranging from 4.41 - 4.55. Additionally, first year principals indicated that they either Agreed or Strongly Agreed that the program had prepared them to lead in each of the related 23 indicators surveyed (range from 85%-100%), with 21/23 indicators receiving ratings of 90%+ A/SA. Weaker results were obtained for two indicators, (3.14 - Preparedness to facilitate effective evaluation processes; and 4.20 - Preparedness to build partnerships with community members.)

There were also 5/23 indicators where first year principals rated their experience as Neutral (range from 10%-14%). These indicators included:

- 1.6 - Preparedness to implement strategies to engage the community in the school's vision, mission, and goals. (Neutral = 10%)
- 3.14 - Preparedness to facilitate effective evaluation processes. (Neutral = 14%)
- 4.15 - Preparedness to offer positive and constructive feedback to personnel. (Neutral = 10%)
- 4.20 - Preparedness to build partnerships with community members. (Neutral = 10%)
- 4.21 - Preparedness to identify key stakeholders in my community. (Neutral = 10%)

Further, there were 9/23 indicators where first year principals rated their experience as Disagree (range from 3-4%). Although the percentage of respondents indicating disagreement on the surveyed areas was quite small, any such responses indicate a need to review our practices to identify strategies for strengthening the program. These indicators included:

- 2.12 - Preparedness to use data and research to facilitate learning for all students. (D = 4%)
- 2.13 - Preparedness to work with personnel to develop professional growth plans for improvement of student learning. (D=3%)
- 2.16 - Preparedness to guide the effective use of resources to support student learning. (D=3%)
- 4.19 - Preparedness to collaborate with families to enhance the culture of learning. (D=3%)
- 4.20 - Preparedness to build partnerships with community members. (D=3%)
- 4.22 - Preparedness to facilitate community support networks to impact student learning. (D=3%)
- 4.23 - Preparedness to model personal and professional ethical behavior. (D=3%)

While the overall results were generally very positive, an analysis of the results indicates a need to focus much more specifically on Leadership Standard 4 – Relational Leadership as indicators within this standard emerged several times as areas in which first year principals rated their experience in the program as either neutral or lacking. Faculty will use this information to develop new strategies to strengthen the program's emphasis on Relational Leadership.

#### **G. Explanation of evidence available from employers of program completers, with a characterization of findings.**

##### **Teacher Preparation Programs:**

This data was a small sample size so we want to monitor the data to determine if lower performance on these standards is a trend or a data blip. In addition, based on the comments it appears that the data is not clean as some of the comments refer to teacher skill set in certification areas for which we do not have at this time, such as special education. While a score of 3 is Neutral and does not indicate that a respondent was dissatisfied it is below our expectation of a 4.

As indicated by the evidence presented in Section 4 Table 3 for the pre-service programs, principal of first-year teachers also indicate that Maryville graduates are generally prepared to meet the demands of the classroom. Principals of first-year teachers throughout the State of Missouri are surveyed using the same MEES Standards against which teachers rate themselves. While this data is important to us as we study the effectiveness of our program and determine places of growth, there are questions regarding the integrity of the data as some of the principal comments referenced teachers with certification for which we do not offer.

Principals' highest score awarded was a 4.40 for Standard 6: Effective Communication. The lowest score received was a 3.6 for Standard 2: Learning, Growth, and Development.

### **School Leader Preparation Programs:**

Results from the AY 24-25 Missouri First Year Educator's Survey conducted by MoDESE indicate that supervisors of new principals are generally pleased with the preparedness of the first-year principals. They were asked to rank their new principals within each Leadership Standard on a scale 1-5 (SD-SA) using the same questionnaire that the first-year principals completed. Additionally, supervisors responded to two additional questions not included on the survey for the first-year principals themselves:

*Question 1: What overall rating would you give the quality of the administrator preparation program your principal completed?*

*Response: Very Poor = 0%; Poor = 0%; Fair = 4%; Good = 42%; Very Good = 50%*

*Question 2: Based upon the performance-based evaluation of this first-year principal, how would you rate his/her impact on students, teachers, and the school community?*

*Response: Ineffective = 0%; Minimally Effective = 8%; Effective = 42%; Highly Effective = 50%*

These results indicate that supervisors were generally very pleased with the preparation their new principals received (92% positive responses for both of the above questions). Further analysis of the supervisors' responses have provided additional information that faculty will use to further enhance our preparation programs for school leaders.

Survey results indicate that supervisors of first-year principals are generally very pleased with their performance in the role. The overall mean ratings for each of the five Leadership Standards were slightly lower than those of the first-year principals themselves, but still exceeded minimum expectations of 4.0+, ranging from 4.27- 4.44. Additionally, supervisors of first-year principals indicated that they either Agreed or Strongly Agreed that, overall, the program had prepared them to lead in each of the related 23 indicators surveyed (range from 79%-96%), with 15/23 indicators receiving ratings of 90%+ A/SA. Weaker results were obtained for the following indicators:

#### Standard 2 - Instructional Leadership

- Preparedness to implement effective processes to identify unique strengths and needs of students. (88% A/SA)
- Preparedness to work with personnel to develop professional growth plans for improvement of student learning. (83% A/SA)
- Preparedness to facilitate effective evaluation processes. (80% A/SA)

#### Standard 4 - Relational Leadership

- Preparedness to facilitate a culture that nurtures positive relationships. (79% A/SA)
- Preparedness to collaborate with families to enhance the culture of learning. (88% A/SA)
- Preparedness to build partnerships with community members. (88% A/SA)
- Preparedness to build community networks to support student learning. (88% A/SA)

Like results reported by the first-year principals themselves, indicators for Standard 4 - Relational Leadership were given some of the lowest ratings by supervisors of first-year principals. As noted above, 4/9 indicators under Standard 4 were rated below our 90% standard for A/SA. Additionally, indicators under Standard 2 - Instructional Leadership may need additional attention in our programs. Specifically, working with teachers to provide effective evaluation and providing strong professional development support for teachers emerged as areas of concern.

The results from supervisors of first-year principals bolster the perceptions of first-year principals themselves that greater emphasis on preparation to provide effective teacher evaluation and support as well as a more deliberate focus on building relational leadership skills should be a priority for faculty in the school leader preparation programs going forward.

H. 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.

#### **Teacher Preparation Programs**

The Program Director tracks student employment internally. For the Academic Year 2024/2025, 100% of students either obtained a position in their certified area or are pursuing further education in the field.

#### **School Leader Preparation Programs**

The Program Director tracks student employment internally. For the Academic Year 2024/2025, all candidates were employed in either teaching or administrative positions during their enrollment. Records are unofficial and rely on self-reporting of candidates. According to the information available, approximately 53% were promoted into new administrative roles in their area of certification; 47% continued their education to pursue additional certifications. Faculty recognize the need to develop a more formal process for tracking graduates' employment situations going forward.

I. Explanation of how the **staffing capacity** for program delivery and administration and quality assurance system monitoring have changed during the reporting year, if at all, and how capacity matches the current size of the program.

Staffing capacity has not changed in the most recent academic year, but there have been staffing changes. Certification Programs at Maryville University are led by the Dean, Mascheal Schappe. Educator Preparation and School Leader Preparation programs are each led by a Program Director who is supported by full time faculty and a staff person.

In May of 2025, the Educator Preparation Program Director, Michelle Hunter retired. This position was filled by the promotion of former full time faculty member, Lisa Merideth. The full-time faculty position was filled by former adjunct faculty, Loralee Mondl. Because both of these roles were filled by promotion from within, the candidates were familiar with Maryville programs, procedures and policies. The changes did not seem to have an effect on program delivery or quality assurance monitoring. At our current enrollment, capacity seems to match the current program size well.

## 4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

Tables 3 and 4 report on select measures (3 to 5 measures for each standard) of candidate/completer performance related to AAQEP Standards 1 and 2, including the program's expectations for performance (criteria for success) and indicators of the degree to which those expectations are met.

**Table 3. Expectations & Performance on Standard 1: Candidate & Completer Performance: Teacher Preparation Programs**

**Scale:**

Expected Growth Achieved  
Approaching Expected Growth  
Cause for Concern

**Table 3**  
**Expectations and Performance**  
**Standard 1: Candidate & Completer Performance**  
**Educator Preparation programs**

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation 2023-2024	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation 2024-2025
GPA	3.0 GPA on all pedagogical and content coursework for secondary education teacher candidates and 3.0 GPA for pedagogical GPA for elementary and elementary/early childhood teacher candidates.	Secondary education completers: Content GPA – 3.8 Pedagogical GPA - 4.0  Elementary and Elementary/Early Childhood education completers: Pedagogical GPA – 3.6	Secondary education completers: Content GPA 6/6 Met the requirement 3.64 GPA Average Content GPA 3.94 Pedagogical GPA Elementary and Elementary/Early Childhood completers: 7/7 Met the standard Pedagogical GPA 3.95 Average Pedagogical GPS
*MoCA Scores (Missouri Content Assessment)	220 – pass score	100% of completers passed Elementary Education. 247 average in math/science	100% of completers passed. Elementary/EC all 8 passed Average 255.37 for Math/Science Average 244.37 for ELA/Social Studies

		<p>241.5 average in English/language arts and social science</p> <p>236 average in early childhood</p> <p>Secondary average pass rates ranged from 223 – 244.</p>	<p>Range of Scores for Elementary/EC on Math/Science Test 228 - 272 1 students below 230 2 students between 231 - 260 3 students 261-270 2 students 271+</p> <p>Range of Scores Elementary/EC on ELA/SS 229 - 250 1 student below 230 2 students 231-240 4 students 241 - 250 1 student 251+</p> <p>No completers in the Elementary/Early Childhood program.</p> <p>Secondary Average 237.6</p> <p>MS ELA 2 students 222 - 240</p> <p>HS LEA No Students</p> <p>MS Math 2 students 228, 234</p> <p>HS Math 1 students 242</p> <p>MS Science No Students</p> <p>HS Chemistry No Students</p> <p>HS Biology No Students</p> <p>MS SS - 1 student 244</p> <p>HS SS - No Students</p> <p>Range 222 - 244</p>
MEES Standard 1 (Content Knowledge Aligned with Appropriate Instruction)	Score of 3 - The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and effectively demonstrate it in performance.	<p>Cooperating Teacher Standard 1 Average – 3.39</p> <p>University Supervisor Standard 1 Average - 3.37</p>	<p>Cooperating Teacher Standard 1 Average – 3.51</p> <p>University Supervisor Standard 1 Average - 3.44</p>
First-Year Teacher and Principal Data for MEES Standard 1	Score of 3 – Neutral Score of 4 – Agree Score of 5 – Strongly Agree	First-Year Teacher Survey Standard 1 Average – 4.36 Principal	First Year Teacher Survey 4.29 Incorporate interdisciplinary instruction was lowest at 3.92

<p>(Content Knowledge Aligned with Appropriate Instruction) Note: Data was collected over a two-year period (AY 2022-24) due to a small data size for AY 2023-24.</p>		<p>Standard 1 Average – <b>4.24</b></p>	<p>Engage students in content areas was highest at <b>4.5</b>            Principal Standard 1 Average – <b>4.01</b>            Incorporate interdisciplinary instruction <b>3.89</b>            Engage students in his or her content <b>3.89</b></p>
<p>MEES Standard 2 (Student Learning Growth and Development)</p>	<p>Score of 3 - The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and effectively demonstrate it in performance.</p>	<p>Cooperating Teacher Standard 2 Average – <b>3.35</b>            University Supervisor Standard 2 Average - <b>3.21</b></p>	<p>Cooperating Teacher Standard 2 Average – <b>3.41</b>            University Supervisor Standard 2 Average - <b>3.18</b></p>
<p>First-Year Teacher and Principal Data for MEES Standard 2</p>	<p>Score of 3 – Neutral            Score of 4 – Agree or            Score of 5 – Strongly Agree</p>	<p>First-Year Teacher Survey Standard 2 Average – 4.07 and Principal Standard 2 Average – 4.02</p>	<p>First-Year Teacher Survey Standard <b>3.83</b> Average            Implement instruction on IEP <b>3.88</b>            Modify instruction for ILL <b>3.29</b>            Modify for gifted leaners <b>3.46</b>            Above a 4 design lessons that include differentiation <b>4.25</b>            Create lessons that engage all learners <b>4.29</b>              Principal Standard 2 Average – <b>3.6</b>            All indicators were below a <b>4.0</b>            Differentiated instruction            Implement instruction based on IEP            modify instruction for ELL            Modify instruction for gifted            Create lesson plans to engage all learners</p>
<p>MEES Standard 6 (Effective Communication)</p>	<p>Score of 3 - The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and</p>	<p>Cooperating Teacher Standard 6 Average – <b>3.45</b></p>	<p>Cooperating Teacher 6 Average – <b>3.56</b>            University Supervisor Stan Standard dard 6 Average - <b>3.44</b></p>

	effectively demonstrate it in performance.	University Supervisor Standard 6 Average - <b>3.25</b>	
First-Year Teacher and Principal Data for MEES Standard 6	Score of 3 – Neutral Score of 4 – Agree or Score of 5 – Strongly Agree	First-Year Teacher Survey Standard 6 Average – <b>4.27</b> and Principal Standard 6 Average – <b>4.33</b>	First-Year Teacher Survey Standard 6 Average – <b>4.24</b> Below 4 effectively communicate with parents highest was prepared to promote respect for diverse cultures/genders, intellectual/physical abilities Principal Standard 6 Average – <b>4.04</b> Below 4 Effectively communicate with parents
MEES Standard 7 (Student Assessment and Data Analysis)	Score of 3 - The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and effectively demonstrate it in performance.	Cooperating Teacher Standard 7 Average – <b>3.45</b> University Supervisor Standard 7 Average - <b>3.37</b>	Cooperating Teacher Standard 7 Average – <b>3.34</b> University Supervisor Standard 7 Average - <b>3.329</b>
First-Year Teacher and Principal Data for MEES Standard 7	Score of 3 – Neutral Score of 4 – Agree Score of 5 – Strongly Agree	First-Year Teacher Survey Standard 7 Average – <b>4.31</b> and Principal Standard 7 Average – <b>4.07</b>	FYTS Standard 7 Average <b>4.0</b> Analyze assessment data to improve instruction (8% strongly disagree) Work with colleagues to set learning goals and using assessment results (8% strongly disagree)  Highest: Prepared to use assessments to evaluate learning <b>4.29</b>  Principal Standard 7 Average – <b>3.86</b>  Below 4 Develop assessments to evaluate learning Analyze assessment data to improve instruction Help students set learning goals based on assessment results Work with colleagues to set learning goals using assessment results

MEES Standard 3 (Curriculum Implementation)	Score of 3 - The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and effectively demonstrate it in performance.	Cooperating Teacher Standard 3 Average – 3.42 University Supervisor Standard 3 Average - 3.32	Cooperating Teacher Standard 3 Average – 3.41 University Supervisor Standard 3 Average - 3.36
First-Year Teacher and Principal Data for MEES Standard 3	Score of 3 – Neutral Score of 4 – Agree or Score of 5 – Strongly Agree	First-Year Teacher Survey Standard 3 Average – 4.48 and Principal Standard 3 Average – 4.23	First-Year Teacher Survey Standard 3 Average – 4.35 Principal Standard 3 Average – 3.92 Below 4 deliver lessons for diverse learners
MEES Standard 4 (Critical Thinking)	Score of 3 - The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and effectively demonstrate it in performance.	Cooperating Teacher Standard 4 Average – 3.36 University Supervisor Standard 4 Average - 3.37	Cooperating Teacher Standard Average – 3.52 University Supervisor Standard 4 Average – 3.41
First-Year Teacher and Principal Data for MEES Standard 4	Score of 3 – Neutral Score of 4 – Agree or Score of 5 – Strongly Agree	First-Year Teacher Survey Standard 4 Average – 4.36 and Principal Standard 4 Average – 4.24	First-Year Teacher Survey Standard 4 Average – 4.39 implement a variety of instructional strategies 4.67 Principal Standard 4 Average – 3.86 Below 4 Engage students in critical thinking Model critical thinking and problem solving
MEES Standard 5 (Positive Classroom Environment)	Score of 3 - The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and effectively demonstrate it in performance.	Cooperating Teacher Standard 5 Average – 4.44 University Supervisor Standard 5 Average – 4.21	Cooperating Teacher Standard 5 Average – 3.54 University Supervisor Standard 5 Average – 3.39

First-Year Teacher and Principal Data for MEES Standard 5	Score of 4 – Agree or Score of 5 – Strongly Agree	First-Year Teacher Survey Standard 5 Average – 4.18 and Principal Standard 5 Average – 4.17	<p>First-Year Teacher Survey Standard 5 Average – 4.17</p> <p>below 4 prepared to use a variety of classroom management 3.96 prepared to keep students on task 3.92</p> <p>high foster positive student relationships 4.92</p> <p>create a classroom environment that encourages student engagement 4.5</p> <p>Principal Standard 5 Average – 3.95</p> <p>Below 4</p> <p>Create a classroom, environment that encourages student engagement</p> <p>Use a variety of classroom management strategies</p> <p>Motivate his or her students to learn</p> <p>Keep his or her students on task</p>
MEES Standard 8 (Professionalism)	Score of 3 - The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and effectively demonstrate it in performance.	Cooperating Teacher Standard 8 Average – 3.6 University Supervisor Standard 8 Average - 3.56	Cooperating Teacher Standard 8 Average – 3.54 University Supervisor Standard 8 Average - 3.55
First-Year Teacher and Principal Data for MEES Standard 8	Score of 3 – Neutral Score of 4 – Agree or Score of 5 – Strongly Agree	First-Year Teacher Survey Standard 8 Average – 4.43 and Principal Standard 8 Average – 4.20	First-Year Teacher Survey Standard 8 Average – 3.94 Principal Standard 8 Average – 3.84

MEES Standard 9 (Professional Collaboration)	Score of 3 - The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and effectively demonstrate it in performance.	Cooperating Teacher Standard 9 Average – 3.56 University Supervisor Standard 9 Average - 3.47	Cooperating Teacher Standard 9 Average – 3.55 University Supervisor Standard 9 Average - 3.36
First-Year Teacher and Principal Data for MEES Standard 9	Score of 3 – Neutral Score of 4 – Agree or Score of 5 – Strongly Agree	First-Year Teacher Survey Standard 9 Average – 4.33 and Principal Standard 9 Average – 4.18	First-Year Teacher Survey Standard 9 Average – 3.94 Principal Standard 9 Average – 3.95
Cumulative MEES Standard Average Scores	Score of 3 - The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and effectively demonstrate it in performance.		University Supervisor Average Cumulative Score: 3:48 Cooperating Teacher Average Cumulative Score 3:46
Cumulative MEES Total Scores	Score of 42 is what is required by Missouri Department of Education for a candidate to be recommended for a certification. The score is determined by the sum of the total score of the university supervisor and cooperating teacher.		Average Score 62.55 Score Range 54 -72

*\*MOCA was the official required test through June 23, 2024. Passing scores achieved 6/23 and prior will still be honored in the certification area. Praxis became the official required assessment July, 1, 2024.*

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

**Leadership Preparation Programs**

<b>Provider-selected measures (name and description)</b>	<b>Criteria for success</b>	<b>Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation</b>
Missouri Content Exam: Principal 080 (Pearson)*	Cut score to pass = 220+	88% Pass Rate Mean = 242
Missouri Content Exam: Principal (ETS)**	Cut score to pass = 135	No data available at this time
Missouri Content Exam: Superintendent 059 (Pearson)*	Cut score to pass = 220+	80% Pass Rate Mean = 234.16
<b>Missouri Principal Performance Assessment (MPEA)</b>	Cut score to pass (Domain Scoring) = 25/40	100% Pass Rate Mean = 33.18 Range = 25.59 - 40.0
Principal Performance Assessment - (MPEA): Domain: Visionary	Possible Score = 4.0 Cut Score to Pass = NA Score Expectation = 3.0+	Mean= 3.36/4.0 Range = 2.67 - 4.0
Principal Performance Assessment - (MPEA): Domain: Instructional	Possible Score = 4.0 Cut Score to Pass = NA Score Expectation = 3.0+	Mean = 3.33/4.0 Range = 2.25 - 4.0
Principal Performance Assessment - (MPEA): Domain: Managerial	Possible Score = 4.0 Cut Score to Pass = NA Score Expectation = 3.0+	Mean = 3.23/4.0 Range = 2.67 - 4.0
Principal Performance Assessment - (MPEA): Domain: Relational	Possible Score = 4.0 Cut Score to Pass = NA Score Expectation = 3.0+	Mean = 3.41/4.0 Range = 2.25 - 4.0
Principal Performance Assessment - (MPEA): Domain: Innovative	Possible Score = 4.0 Cut Score to Pass = NA Score Expectation = 3.0+	Mean = 3.21/4.0 Range = 2.25 - 4.0

Superintendent Performance Assessment - (MPEA)	Cut score to pass = 25/40 (Domain Scoring)	No data available at this time
Superintendent Performance Assessment - (MPEA) Domain: Visionary	Possible Score = 4.0 Cut Score to Pass = NA Score Expectation = 3.0+	No data available at this time
Superintendent Performance Assessment - (MPEA) Domain: Instructional	Possible Score = 4.0 Cut Score to Pass = NA Score Expectation = 3.0+	No data available at this time
Superintendent Performance Assessment - (MPEA) Domain: Managerial	Possible Score = 4.0 Cut Score to Pass = NA Score Expectation = 3.0+	No data available at this time
Superintendent Performance Assessment - (MPEA) Domain: Relational	Possible Score = 4.0 Cut Score to Pass = NA Score Expectation = 3.0+	No data available at this time
Superintendent Performance Assessment - (MPEA) main: Innovative	Possible Score = 4.0 Cut Score to Pass = NA Score Expectation = 3.0+	No data available at this time



**Section 4, Table 3: Expectations & Performance on Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence & Growth**

<b>Table 3: Expectations and Performance</b> <b>Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence &amp; Growth</b> <b>Leadership Preparation Programs</b>		
<b>Provider-Selected Measures</b>	<b>Explanation of Performance Expectation</b>	<b>Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation</b>
Self-Assessment on Leadership Standards Pre/Post Program	<p>Candidates rate themselves against the Leadership Standards on a Likert Scale:</p> <p>1= Superintendent Candidate  2= Emerging Superintendent  3 = Developing Superintendent  4 = Proficient Superintendent  5 = Distinguished Superintendent</p> <p>Expect Exit Rating of 3.0+</p> <p>Expect growth over the course of the program of 1+ points on the Likert Scale</p>	<p><b>1.1 Develop and Articulate a Vision</b>  Entry = 2.14  <b>Exit = 3.5</b>  <b>Growth = 1.36</b></p> <p><b>1.2 Implement and Steward a Vision</b>  Entry = 1.93  <b>Exit = 3.36</b>  <b>Growth= 1.43</b></p> <p><b>2.1 Promote Positive School Culture</b>  Entry = 2.43  <b>Exit = 3.45</b>  <b>Growth = 1.02</b></p> <p><b>2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Program</b>  Entry = 2.21  <b>Exit = 3.09</b>  <b>Growth = 0.88</b></p> <p><b>2.3 Ensure Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans</b>  Entry = 1.93  <b>Exit = 3.64</b>  <b>Growth = 1.71</b></p> <p><b>3.1 Manage the Organizational Structure</b>  Entry = 1.71  <b>Exit 3.18</b>  <b>Growth = 1.47</b></p> <p><b>3.2 Lead Personnel</b>  Entry = 2.21  <b>Exit = 3.0</b>  <b>Growth = 0.79</b></p> <p><b>3.3 Manage Resources</b>  Entry = 2.0</p>

		<b>Exit = 3.36</b> <b>Growth = 1.36</b> <b>4.1 Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members</b> Entry = 2.14 <b>Exit = 3.27</b> <b>Growth = 1.13</b> <b>4.2 Respond to Community Interests and Needs</b> Entry = 2.43 <b>Exit = 3.36</b> <b>Growth = 0.93</b> <b>4.3 Mobilize Community Resources</b> Entry = 2.07 <b>Exit = 3.09</b> <b>Growth = 1.02</b> <b>5.1 Personal and Professional Responsibility</b> Entry = 2.57 <b>Exit = 3.73</b> <b>Growth = 1.16</b> <b>6.1 Understand the Larger Context</b> Entry = 2.0 <b>Exit = 2.73</b> <b>Growth = 0.73</b> <b>6.2 Respond to the Larger Context</b> Entry = 1.93 <b>Exit = 2.73</b> <b>Growth = 0.80</b> <b>6.3 Influence the Larger Context</b> Entry = 1.71 <b>Exit = 2.27</b> <b>Growth = 0.56</b> <b>7.1 Increase Knowledge and Skills Based on Best Practices</b> Entry = 2.21 <b>Exit = 3.45</b> <b>Growth = 1.24</b>
--	--	---

## School Leader Preparation Programs

The table below displays an analysis of assessment results from the principal and superintendent preparation programs at Maryville University. Assessments analyzed here include both state-required certification assessment results and the program-instituted pre/post self-assessment against the Leadership Standards. The “stoplight protocol” has been used to indicate areas of strength and areas that require attention so that faculty can make informed decisions regarding curriculum and/or instructional changes that may be needed going forward to maximize student success. Newly adopted state certification assessments that have no data yet available are not included in this table.

**Scale:**

Expected Growth Achieved

Approaching Expected Growth

Cause for Concern

Provider-selected measures (name and description)	Criteria for success	Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation
Missouri Content Exam - Principal 080	Cut Score to Pass = 220+ Pass Rate Expectation = 85%+	Mean = 242.0 Range = 191-271 Pass Rate = 88%
Missouri Content Exam - Superintendent - 059	Cut Score to Pass = 220+ Pass Rate Expectation = 85%+	Mean = 234.16 Range = 207-260 Pass Rate = 80%
MPEA - Missouri Principal Performance Assessment (PPA)	Cut Score to Pass = 25/40	Mean = 33.18 Range = 25.59 - 40 Pass Rate = 100%
MPEA PPA Domain I - Visionary	Possible Score = 4.0 Cut Score to Pass = NA Score Expectation = 3.0+	Mean = 3.36 Range = 2.67 - 4.0
MPEA PPA Domain II - Instructional	Possible Score = 4.0 Cut Score to Pass = NA Score Expectation = 3.0+	Mean = 3.33 Range = 2.25 - 4.0
MPEA PPA Domain III - Managerial	Possible Score = 4.0 Cut Score to Pass = NA Score Expectation = 3.0+	Mean = 3.23 Range = 2.67 - 4.0

MPEA PPA Domain IV - Relational	Possible Score = 4.0 Cut Score to Pass = NA Score Expectation = 3.0+	Mean = 3.41 Range = 2.25 - 4.0
MPEA PPA Domain V - Innovative	Possible Score = 4.0 Cut Score to Pass = NA Score Expectation = 3.0+	Mean = 3.21 Range = 2.25 - 4.0

The table below displays results from the Comprehensive Self-Assessment Against the Leadership Standards that candidates in the superintendent preparation program take in the first and last semesters of their doctoral program. Candidates rate themselves on key Leadership Standards and Indicators, then use the results to establish goals for their Professional Leadership Growth Plans in semester 1 of their program. During the final semester of the program, candidates again assess themselves on the same Standards and Indicators, then analyze the Pre/Post results to help them better understand their growth over the course of the program. Faculty also analyze these results to better understand areas of relative strength and weakness that emerge over time, using the outcomes to inform changes to curriculum and instruction.

## COMPREHENSIVE SELF-ASSESSMENT AGAINST THE LEADERSHIP STANDARDS PRE/POST PROGRAM

Self-Assessment on Leadership Standards Pre/Post Program: Candidates rate themselves against the Leadership Standards on a Likert Scale:

- 1= Superintendent Candidate
- 2= Emerging Superintendent
- 3 = Developing Superintendent
- 4 = Proficient Superintendent
- 5=Distinguished Superintendent

Provider-selected measures (name and description)	Criteria for success	Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation		
		ENTRY	EXIT	GROWTH
Standard/Indicator 1.1 - Articulate a Vision	Expect Exit Rating of 3.0+  Expect growth over the course of the program of 1+ points on the Likert Scale	1.63	3.34	1.71
1.2 - Implement a Vision	Expect Exit Rating of 3.0+  Expect growth over the course of the program of 1+ points on the Likert Scale	1.80	3.63	1.83
2.1 Promote Positive School Culture	Expect Exit Rating of 3.0+  Expect growth over the course of the program of 1+ points on the Likert Scale	2.16	3.67	1.51
2.2 Provide an Effective Instructional Program	Expect Exit Rating of 3.0+  Expect growth over the course of the program of 1+ points on the Likert Scale	1.92	3.74	1.82

2.3 Ensure Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans	Expect Exit Rating of 3.0+  Expect growth over the course of the program of 1+ points on the Likert Scale	2.07	3.58	1.51
3.1 Manage the Organizational Structure	Expect Exit Rating of 3.0+  Expect growth over the course of the program of 1+ points on the Likert Scale	1.54	3.28	1.74
3.2 Lead Personnel	Expect Exit Rating of 3.0+  Expect growth over the course of the program of 1+ points on the Likert Scale	1.95	3.50	1.55
3.3 Manage Resources	Expect Exit Rating of 3.0+  Expect growth over the course of the program of 1+ points on the Likert Scale	1.48	3.43	1.95
4.1 Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members	Expect Exit Rating of 3.0+  Expect growth over the course of the program of 1+ points on the Likert Scale	2.09	3.55	1.46
4.2 Respond to Community Interests and Needs	Expect Exit Rating of 3.0+  Expect growth over the course of the program of 1+ points on Likert Scale	1.67	3.29	1.62

4.3 Mobilize Community Resources	Expect Exit Rating of 3.0+  Expect growth over the course of the program of 1+ points on the Likert Scale	1.63	3.47	1.84
5.1 Personal and Professional Responsibility	Expect Exit Rating of 3.0+  Expect growth over the course of the program of 1+ points on the Likert Scale	2.31	3.91	1.60
6.1 Understand the Larger Context	Expect Exit Rating of 3.0+  Expect growth over the course of the program of 1+ points on the Likert Scale	1.48	3.58	2.10
6.2 Respond to the Larger Context	Expect Exit Rating of 3.0+  Expect growth over the course of the program of 1+ points on the Likert Scale	1.75	3.38	1.63
7.1 Increase Knowledge and Skills Based on Best Practices	Expect Exit Rating of 3.0+  Expect growth over the course of the program of 1+ points on the Likert Scale	2.15	4.03	1.88

## 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.

### Teacher Preparation Programs

#### **Challenge/Priority Item: Curriculum Alignment**

Over the past year, we have continued to work on curriculum alignment to ensure that our programs in elementary education, elementary/early childhood, and secondary education are cohesively structured. This year the curriculum alignment focused on technology and critical consumer of information.

#### **Accomplishments:**

We reviewed how we approached technology throughout all of our courses. This lead us to a revised curriculum map that has a shifted focus from programs, applications, and devices to an approach that is focused on technology to lead to critical thinking. We aligned the curriculum to align help our teachers develop to be proficient at the following standards:

##### **1. Evaluate**

Candidates will investigate and/or troubleshoot new technologies (programs, apps, etc.)

##### **2. Creativity**

Candidates will effectively create technology resources used for teaching and learning (Digital Storytelling, flipcharts, Green screen)

##### **3. Teaching Tool**

Candidates will effectively use a variety of technological programs and applications during the teaching process (Air Play, Assessment-Socrative)

##### **4. Management**

Candidates will effectively use a variety of technological programs and applications to manage routines and procedures within the classroom setting (transitions, DOJO, etc.)

##### **5. Engagement**

Candidates will effectively use a variety of technological programs and applications to engage students with learning

##### **6. Professional Communication and Connection**

Candidates will effectively use a variety of technological programs and applications to communicate/connect with students, parents, and/or peers

Additionally, we looked at the course outcomes and learning experiences to determine the level to which we help our students develop skills to be critical consumers of knowledge and information. As we evaluated the courses we looked for opportunities where students developed the following:

- **Active Evaluation:** They don't just passively consume information but actively question its validity and reliability, including the credibility and expertise of the source.
- **Source Evaluation:** They consider the credibility and expertise of the source of information.
- **Bias Awareness:** They are aware of potential biases in the information presented and try to account for them.
- **Fact-Checking:** They verify information against multiple sources to ensure accuracy.
- **Diverse Perspectives:** They actively seek out different viewpoints on a topic to gain a comprehensive understanding.
- **Critical Thinking Skills:** They use their analytical skills to evaluate information, identify logical fallacies, and draw informed conclusions.

Finally, as Maryville University launched the implementation of MCORE in Fall 2025, we made necessary adjustments to the course offerings and progressions for each certification area. The changes allow the students to have more choice in their general education courses in areas that are aligned with the Scientific, Social, Civic, Cultural and Creative Discovery areas.

#### **Efforts:**

To address the challenge of curriculum alignment, we conducted an in-depth analysis of our current offerings. We started by defining the outcomes we desired for both technology and critical consumer information which lead to the development of our desired outcomes. The outcomes were informed by the Missouri Teacher Standards. By identifying these end goals, we were able to align courses to ensure that they effectively prepare our students. This alignment not only enhances the learning experience for our students but also fosters a more integrated approach to teacher preparation.

To ensure compliance with state curricular requirements, we utilized the state matrices provided by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. This thorough review process guarantees that our courses include all necessary content and meet the required standards.

## School Leader Preparation Programs

### **Challenge/Priority Item#1: Effectively Implement Transition to New Superintendent Certification Assessment Requirements (SPA)**

Changes to certification assessment requirements implemented by MoDESE emerged as one of the major challenges during AY 24-25. The content exam required for Initial Principal Certification changed from the Pearson Principal Exam (080) to the ETS-developed Praxis. The MPEA-developed Principal Performance Assessment (PPA) remained in place. Additionally, the MPEA was continuing to make final revisions to the newly developed Superintendent Performance Assessment (SPA) that had been piloted by several universities during AY 23-24 and 24-25. It had been anticipated that the new assessment requirements for Superintendent Certification would include the Praxis and possibly the SPA, although there was uncertainty about whether the State Board of Education would approve the SPA for use statewide. While the faculty had spent time in AY 23-24 preparing for program revisions/modifications that would be needed as a result of these changes, this work took on greater significance in late spring 2025 when MoDESE announced that the newly developed Superintendent Performance Assessment would become the only assessment for this certification beginning September 1, 2025.

#### **Efforts and Accomplishments - Challenge/Priority #1:**

The major program modifications made in direct response to the new state assessment requirements for Superintendent Certification included revising the Internship course (EDL 769) as well as changing the course sequence for the program to move the Superintendency course (EDL 767) into the final semester of the program.

EDL 769 - *Advanced Internship* was revised to embed experiences needed to successfully complete the SPA into this component of the program so that both field-based mentors and candidates would have this project on their radar from the outset of the internship experience. The rationale was that emphasizing the required end-product at the beginning of the internship would allow candidates substantial opportunities to become involved in a district level initiative or operational issue under the direction of their field-based mentors. Initial meetings that faculty advisors hold with their advisees and the field-based mentors supervising the internship hours were restructured to emphasize the requirements of the SPA to ensure that everyone had a clear understanding of what this assessment would entail. Modifications to the Internship Handbook were undertaken and are still being finalized.

Additionally, it was decided to move EDL 767 - *The Superintendency* to the final semester of the program and to embed successful completion of the SPA as a required component of the course. This move was made to better accommodate the new SPA requirement as well as to honor feedback from previous graduates who recommended that having the Superintendency class in the final semester made more sense as it is a culminating experience that pulls together all components of district level leadership that have been studied throughout the program.

## Ongoing Challenges/Priorities - Continuing Efforts

### **Challenge/Priority Item#2: Alignment of Key Assessments to Student Learning Outcomes**

In AY 23-24, faculty in the PK-12 Educational Leadership programs identified quality assessment as an important “key to providing a strong program that ensures students are gaining the knowledge and insights needed, as well as developing the skills and dispositions, to become strong and effective school leaders.” We undertook a close review and revision of the assignments and assessments within each course in both the principal and superintendent preparation programs to ensure they were useful in helping track student progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.

#### **Efforts & Accomplishments - Challenge/Priority #2:**

As reported in the 2024 AAQEP Annual Report, full-time faculty undertook an effort to identify and align major projects, assignments and assessments in each course with program goals and the specific student learning outcomes these assessments were designed to measure. A comprehensive spreadsheet was developed that helped to ensure alignment of assignments/assessments with course and program goals and student learning outcomes. During AY 24-25, faculty worked to monitor results of these assignments and assessments as part of our commitment to ongoing analysis, reflection and continuous improvement efforts.

### **Challenge/Priority Item #3: Infusion of Inclusive Dispositions and Practices Throughout Leadership Program Coursework**

Our commitment to developing school leaders who understand the issues and challenges of meeting the needs of ALL students continued to be a focus over the past year. While this commitment is clearly stated in our program goals, we had conducted a curriculum trace during AY 23-24 to ensure that content focusing on inclusivity and meeting the needs of ALL learners was deliberately woven throughout our leadership programs.

#### **Efforts and Accomplishments - Challenge/Priority #3:**

During AY 23-24, we implemented a number of efforts to more fully prepare our leaders to understand how best to meet the needs of each unique learner while simultaneously navigating the increasingly challenging environment within schools and the broader community today. Candidates in both principal and superintendent preparation programs continued to develop Professional Leadership Growth Plans (PLGP) during the first semester of study that included goals for ensuring inclusive learning environments for all students. To assist with establishing PLGP goals, candidates conducted a series of self-assessments to identify potential areas for growth to focus on during the course of their studies. They continued to take the Gallup Strengths Finder and the Comprehensive Self-Assessment against the Leadership Standards, and in AY 24-25, the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) was added. The (IDI) provides candidates with an in-depth look at their own cultural awareness and internal/external biases that may impact their decision-making. Armed with this knowledge, as well as a better understanding of themselves in terms of personal strengths and development as leaders, candidates were able to design goals that focused on more broad-based development for themselves as leaders. Candidates are continuing to monitor and

reflect upon their PLGP goals, and by December 2026, we anticipate the first set of post self-assessment results from the cohorts with which we first implemented this effort. We are eager to see how these efforts manifest themselves at that time in the Professional Conversations that occur in the final semester of the EdD program.

In addition to implementing and monitoring course revisions, we continued to monitor the frequency with which Capstone Project topics focused on issues of inclusivity, differentiation, and/or belonging. These topics continued to comprise the majority of Capstone topics for cohorts graduating during AY 24-25 at a rate of 61.1%.

#### **Innovations - Challenge/Priority #3:**

The decision to revise the course sequence for the EdD program offered a golden opportunity to address a concern that graduating students had expressed periodically during Professional Conversations for a number of years. Several graduates indicated that they wished that EDL 768 - *Urban Policies and Leadership* could be held during a regular 16-week semester rather than in the compressed 8-week summer term. While the number of contact hours for the course is the same, (the class time during the summer term is doubled to account for the difference in duration of the semester), some students expressed that it felt “rushed” and believed that the 16-week format would be more conducive to learning the often challenging and sensitive content included in the course. It was decided that we would honor this recommendation as part of the overall changes to course sequence. The first group of doctoral students to take EDL 768 in the 16-week format will go through the course in the spring 2026 term. We are eager to gather feedback from these students regarding this change.

#### **Challenge/Priority Item #4: Ongoing Analysis of Assessment Data to Determine Needed Programmatic Revisions**

As stated in the 2024 AAQEP Annual Report, faculty within the PK-12 graduate educational leadership programs operate under an expectation of continuous improvement. This governing principle requires that we engage in ongoing analysis of student assessment data and discussions of implications for possible curriculum revisions that may be indicated by the results. Faculty continued to be guided by this principle throughout AY 24-25.

#### **Efforts & Accomplishments - Challenge/Priority Item #4:**

Faculty again conducted regular analysis of data from the Missouri Content Assessment (MOCA). Analysis of this data from AY 23-24 and prior had indicated a need to place greater emphasis on encouraging students to take the Superintendent MOCA, even if they did not plan to seek superintendent-level positions upon or shortly following graduation from the EdD in Educational Leadership program. Throughout AY 23-24 and again during AY 24-25, faculty made a concerted effort to increase the rate of our graduates taking this state exam. The rate of graduates taking this exam increased from only 6 takers in AY 22-23 to 25 takers in AY 23-24, and 25 takers again during AY 24-25. The number of takers for the past two years is much more reflective of the number of EdD graduates for both years, [ADD COHORT NUMBERS FOR AY 23-24 AND 24-25 HERE]. Passage rates continued to be relatively strong in AY 24-25, although the passage rate did decline as compared to AY 23-24 (e.g., 80% in AY 24-25 as compared to 88.0% in AY 23-24). However, mean scores remained relatively flat, (233.72

in AY 23-24 as compared to 234.16 in AY 24-25). With the elimination of the content exam for Superintendent Certification, emphasis will be placed on preparing students for the SPA going forward. Additionally, as the SPA has now been embedded into EDL 767 - *The Superintendency*, completing the state assessment will be a requirement for all graduates going forward.

Another example of efforts to engage in continuous improvement is demonstrated by our analysis of student self-assessment against the Professional Leadership Standards at the beginning and end of the EdD in Educational Leadership program. Faculty continued to examine data trends from this assessment to determine areas of relative strength and weakness. In AY 24-25, data indicate that expectations were met for both Exit Ratings and Growth for all of the Standards and Indicators. These results surpass those of the previous year in that all Exit Ratings and Growth Factors met the levels, (i.e. 3.0+ for Exit Ratings and 1.0+ for Growth factors). In AY 23-25, some standards did not meet Growth Factor expectations.

Exit Ratings for AY 24-25 ranged from 3.28 (for Standard 3.1 - Manage the Organizational Structure) to 4.03 (for Standard 7.1 - Increase Knowledge and Skills Based on Best Practices). The Exit Ratings do provide some indication of students' perceptions of themselves as leaders and of relative strengths and weaknesses in the leadership preparation provided within the program. The lowest three Exit Ratings were for:

Standard 3.1 - Manage the Organizational Structure = 3.28

Standard 4.2 - Respond to Community Interests and Needs = 3.29

Standard 1.1 - Articulate a Vision = 3.34

Standard 4.2 has traditionally been one of the areas in which students rate themselves relatively lower than other standards. While this year's results indicate some positive movement with regard to students' confidence in responding to community interests and needs, this area remains one that may deserve further attention going forward. Students have tended to rate their confidence with standards relating to management and vision in the lower to middle range in terms of mean Exit Ratings for these areas over the years. Additional attention may need to be given to these areas as well for upcoming cohorts.

The highest three Exit Ratings were:

Standard 7.1 - Increase Knowledge and Skills Based on Best Practices = 4.03

Standard 5.1 - Personal and Professional Responsibility = 3.91

Standard 2.2 - Provide an Effective Instructional Program = 3.74

Students have tended to rate their confidence with these three standards in the mid-high to high range relative to ratings for other standards over the years. These ratings indicate that students believe they have increased their knowledge and skills over the course of their doctoral programs. They also indicate that students see themselves as generally highly responsible and professional, and that they feel confident in their ability to provide an effective instructional program. As areas of relative strength, discussions are in order for how best to capitalize on these areas to further enhance our preparation of school leaders.

Additionally, data from the First Year Principal Survey conducted by MoDESE indicated that while first year principals felt generally very well prepared by the program, an area of relative weakness emerged for Leadership Standard 4 – Relational Leadership. As previously indicated, first year principals rated their preparation in several indicators within Standard 4 as Neutral or Disagree when asked how well their EPP prepared them to deal with those areas of school leadership. Faculty will establish a goal to focus on strategies to shore up program content relative to Relational Leadership during the 25-26 academic year.

## Part II: Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth

AAQEP does not require public posting of the information in Part II, but programs **may** post it at their discretion.

### 6. Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth and Improvement

This section charts ongoing improvement processes in relation to each AAQEP standard and recent activities related to investigating data quality. Table 5 may focus on an aspect of one or two standards each year, with only brief entries regarding ongoing efforts for those standards that are not the focus in the current year.

**Table 5. Provider Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement**

<b>Teacher Preparation Programs Standards 1 and 2</b>	
<b>Goal #1 for the 2025-2026 Academic Year</b>	Synthesize all the curriculum trace outcomes from the previous three years into all courses and evaluate the viability of changes and the implementation of recommendations.
<b>Actions</b>	Look at the individual curriculum trace outcomes for all areas from the past three years and synthesize into a single document. Meet with all instructors (full time and adjuncts) to determine the viability of all additions. Meet with all instructors (full time and adjuncts) to determine the level of implementation of recommendations.
<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	Improved MEES Scores
<b>Reflection or Comments</b>	Over the past several years the preservice full-time faculty have completed curriculum traces for several areas. However, with the change in faculty both full-time and adjunct, some of the recommendations have not been fully implemented. In addition, there is concern that with the curriculum traces occurring in isolation, all the recommendations may not be viable within each course.
<b>Goal #2 for the 2025-2026 Academic Year <i>NEW</i></b>	Collect, organize, and use data more effectively to identify issues and make appropriate program revisions.
<b>Actions</b>	Develop electronic systems for data collection for benchmark assessments.

	Determine benchmark scores for each assessment for each academic year. This data will be used to replace the ParaPro exam data. This will help us monitor individual success and develop individual support for students.
<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	Efficient and timely use of data to support students and inform potential revisions.
<b>Reflection or Comments</b>	Currently, all data is entered into our learning management system for individual students. The program director is then required to look up individual student scores and enter them into a spreadsheet. The system is time consuming and clunky. The goal is to develop a platform that when the instructors enter scores (digitally) the automatically transfer to a data collector. This would allow us to use the data in aggregated and disaggregated ways to support individual students as well as look at program effectiveness.
<b>Goal #3 for the 2025-2026 Academic Year Continued</b>	Collect, organize, and use data more effectively to identify issues and make appropriate program revisions.
Actions	Understand how to use the new ETS data tools and use those to plan curriculum reviews. - Continued
Expected Outcomes	Effectively use the ETS data tools to understand the results of the new exam, Praxis, that our students will be taking. - Continued
Reflections or Comments	Missouri adopted new assessments for the 24-25 academic year. We need to understand the results and data tools that ETS provides for our use. Continued
	Standards 1 and 2
<b>Goals #4 for the 2025-26 year <i>Continued with a couple of new additions</i></b>	<p>These actions toward this goal were started in 2024-2025 academic year. However, they were not completed. This work will continue through the 2025-2026 year.</p> <p>Use information uncovered during the writing of the QAR and yearly data analysis to address identified areas of relative weakness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementing instruction for diverse learners (EL and Gifted)</li> <li>• Communicating with parents</li> <li>• Generate a positive classroom environment</li> <li>• Participating in professional organizations</li> <li>• Accessibility (NEW)</li> <li>• Course Rigor (NEW)</li> </ul>
Actions	Implement curriculum revisions based on the results of our curriculum trace

Expected Outcomes	Improved MEES, First-Year Teacher Survey, and First-Year Principal Survey results in identified areas of relative weakness
Reflections or Comments	We completed a curriculum trace for each of the areas of relative weakness, so this is a logical next step.

<b>School Leadership Program</b> <b>Standards 1 &amp; 2</b>	
<b>Goals for the 2025-26 year</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collect, organize and use data more effectively to monitor the impact of program changes and to identify potential areas of concern as part of continuous improvement efforts</li> <li>2. Make appropriate curricular revisions to build more robust programs that fully prepare our candidates to be effective building and district-level leaders</li> </ol>
<b>Actions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fully implement changes to EDL 769 - <i>Advanced Internship</i> and EDL 767 - <i>The Superintendency</i> to ensure candidates and field-based mentors understand the requirements of the new Superintendent Performance Assessment (SPA) so that appropriate experiences are embedded throughout the internship experience.</li> <li>• Use results of the SPA and insights gained from scoring these assessments to systematically identify areas of relative strength/weakness in candidate performance that may indicate needed changes to program curricula.</li> <li>• Use results of the new Domain Scoring for the Principal Performance Assessment (PPA) and insights gained from scoring these assessments to systematically identify areas of relative strength/weakness in candidate performance that may indicate needed changes to program curricula.</li> <li>• Analyze results from the Principal Praxis Exam to identify areas of relative strength/weakness in candidate performance that may indicate needed changes to program curricula</li> </ul>
<b>Expected outcomes</b>	<p>Provide more relevant programming that effectively prepares candidates to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pass required state assessments leading to certification</li> <li>• Understand their own strengths, biases, and areas for needed growth</li> <li>• Implement best practices in curriculum, instruction, and assessment within their schools and districts</li> <li>• Develop skill and confidence in working with their school communities to support student learning</li> <li>• Effectively navigate the challenges of building and district level leadership</li> </ul>

<b>Reflections or comments</b>	<p>Faculty have successfully implemented the new Domain Scoring for the PPA and are in the process of refining how best to use the added information provided by this scoring method to enhance the effectiveness of our principal preparation programs.</p> <p>Faculty have been trained as scorers for the new SPA. We are in the process of implementing changes made during AY 24-25 to prepare our candidates for this assessment. We are also in the process of scoring the first SPAs for our institution and working to understand how best to use the results to enhance the effectiveness of our superintendent preparation program.</p>
<b>Goals for the 2025-26 year</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Analyze course content focusing on Relational Leadership and identify strategies to help candidates build skill and confidence working with their school communities to enhance the learning environment and support student learning.</li> <li>2. Analyze course content focusing on Instructional Leadership, particularly with respect to Teacher Evaluation and Support for Professional Growth/Improvement Plans and identify strategies to help candidates build skill and confidence working with their teachers to enhance the learning environment and support student learning.</li> </ol>
<b>Actions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify and implement strategies to strengthen candidates' experience and skills in the area of Relational Leadership.</li> <li>• Identify and implement strategies to strengthen candidates' experience and skills with implementing effective teacher evaluation and targeted professional development support.</li> </ul>
<b>Expected outcomes</b>	<p>Provide more relevant programming that effectively prepares candidates to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement best practices in teacher evaluation and supervisory support</li> <li>• Develop skill and confidence in working with their school communities to support student learning</li> </ul>
<b>Reflections or comments</b>	

### Update on Activities to Investigate Data Quality

Data quality investigations are essential to work across the standards. This section documents activities in the 2024-25 reporting year related to ensuring data quality

Faculty have successfully implemented the new Domain Scoring for the PPA and are in the process of refining how best to use the added information provided by this scoring method to enhance the effectiveness of our principal preparation programs. We continue to participate in annual calibration workshops with other members of the MPEA to help ensure inter-rater reliability across institutions.

Faculty have been trained as scorers for the new SPA. We are in the process of implementing changes made during AY 24-25 to prepare our candidates for this assessment. We are also in the process of scoring the first SPAs for our institution, scoring these individually and comparing results to assess inter-rater reliability. We continue to work through and with members of the MPEA to participate in annual calibration workshops to help ensure inter-rater reliability across institutions. Additionally, we are working to understand how best to use the results to enhance the effectiveness of our superintendent preparation program.

## **7. Evidence Related to AAQEP-Identified Concerns or Conditions**

This section documents how concerns or conditions that were noted in an accreditation decision are being addressed (indicate “n/a” if no concerns or conditions were noted). If a condition has been noted, a more detailed focused report will be needed in addition to the description included here. Please contact staff with any questions regarding this section.

## **8. Anticipated Growth and Development**

This section summarizes planned improvements, innovations, or anticipated new program developments, including description of any identified potential challenges or barriers.

As indicated in the AAQEP Annual Report for AY 23-24, during the Fall of 2022, Maryville University introduced the “V2MOM” goal setting framework to encourage collective engagement, empowerment, responsibility and transparency.

“V2MOM” = (Vision-Values-Methods-Obstacles -Measures)

Under this process each staff, faculty, program, department and school within the university uses shared language to align their goals to Maryville’s vision and values as summarized below:

**Vision:** Maryville is the innovative leader in higher education promoting a revolution in student learning that expands access and opportunity for all.

**Values:**

- Data Informed
- Personalized, Learner-Centered Flexibility
- Courageous
- Diverse, Equitable, and Inclusive
- Five Star Service

As presented in the AY 23-24 AAQEP Annual Report, the School of Education's 2024-2025 V2MOM summarized planned improvements, innovations and anticipated developments. These plans are inclusive of both the teacher and school leader preparation programs and have been updated for 2025-2026 with analysis of progress toward goals that were established in the prior year. New goals have been added to reflect the impact to programs resulting from university and state level changes. These are displayed in the table below:

Value (Title)	Summary of the AA Value (Description)	Measure & Obstacle (Measure)
<b>Data Informed</b>	Continue to leverage data and intelligence to proactively serve learners and leaders in a trusted relationship.	<p>Collect, organize, and use data more effectively to identify issues and make appropriate program revisions. <b>Ongoing – Continuous Improvement Process</b></p> <p>Review and revise the SOE Outcomes to ensure they reflect the vision and needs of the School of Education including all undergraduate and undergraduate programs – <b>Completed AY 24/25; ongoing monitoring needed</b></p> <p>Review alignment of course outcomes to the revised SOE Outcomes - <b>Completed AY 24/25; ongoing monitoring needed</b></p> <p>Develop assessment spreadsheets for each program and course – <b>Progress made in AY24/25, ongoing</b></p> <p>Ensure course outcomes, activities and assessments align to program assessments. - <b>Progress made in AY24/25, ongoing</b></p>

		<p>Continue to assess, analyze, and lead meaningful curriculum work across all programs (alignment to outcomes/assessments, resources, inclusion, technology, developing critical consumers of knowledge) - <b>Analysis completed in AY 24/25, Ongoing monitoring needed.</b></p> <p>Assess impact of program changes, both course sequencing and curricular changes, made to accommodate newly instituted state assessments required for certification. - <b>New Action Item</b></p> <p>Assess impact of pre-service program changes made to accommodate implementation of MCORE - <b>New Action Item</b></p> <p>Create a curriculum review/update cycle, including timeline, responsible parties, and a platform to share the data driven changes - <b>Progress made in AY24/25, ongoing</b></p> <p>Create a tool to capture data driven decision making and a cycle to share this information - <b>Progress made in AY24/25, ongoing</b></p> <p>Utilize data to focus our efforts in order to increase our enrollment 5-10% across all of our programs – <b>Still to be Accomplished</b></p>
<b>Personalized, Learner-Centered Flexibility</b>	<p>Provide dynamic learning environments that customize and accelerate students' progress. Offer learner choice through constant diversification and expansion of ALE formats and options.</p>	<p>Develop and offer innovative and engaging programs, delivered in flexible formats maximizing the Active Learning Ecosystem – <b>Ongoing; Continuous Improvement Process</b></p> <p>Ensure Flexible, Personalized Teaching and Learning by continually encouraging and supporting student choice in assignments and flexible due dates. When these practices are not practical, being approachable and open minded regarding alternate paths and flexible deadlines (say yes when you can) - <b>Ongoing; Continuous Improvement Process</b></p> <p>Implement practices to analyze formative assessment data to observe student progress and encourage self-reflection and improvement over the course of their program. - <b>Ongoing; Continuous Improvement Process</b></p>

		<p>Provide a supportive environment to nurture students' knowledge, skills, dispositions and competencies as effective teachers and leaders committed to the moral endeavor of schooling in a democracy - <b>Ongoing; Continuous Improvement Process</b></p>
<b>Courageous</b>	<p>Reward innovation and risk-taking to reimagine and reinvigorate the higher education environment.</p> <p><i>*Support and facilitate innovative and creative approaches to educate all students*</i></p>	<p>Continue our commitment to innovation and cutting-edge practices by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop online alternative certification programs to address current and projected teacher shortages – <b>Still to be Accomplished</b></li> <li>• Continue to maximize the use of technology to enhance student learning - <b>Ongoing; Continuous Improvement Process</b></li> <li>• Continue to stay abreast of and conduct relevant research to ensure our students have access to the most current content and best practices in teaching and learning - <b>Ongoing; Continuous Improvement Process</b></li> <li>• Launch a pilot virtual, low residency doctorate Program – <b>Still to be Accomplished</b></li> </ul>
<b>Inclusive</b>	<p>Develop and foster an inclusive community and culture that empowers our teachers and school leaders to meet the unique needs of all learners.</p>	<p>Continue our commitment to inclusivity throughout all programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inventory and adjust our resources as needed – <b>Completed AY 24/25; ongoing monitoring needed</b></li> <li>• Continue to expand professional development for all SOE faculty using the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) - <b>Completed AY 24/25; ongoing monitoring needed</b></li> <li>• Incorporate the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) work into all graduate and undergraduate programs within the School of Education with a goal of 100% of our graduates participating in the IDI, including but not limited to, completing the IDI during their first and last semesters with a minimum of one mid-program DEI activity and reflections throughout their program – <b>Significant progress made during AY 24/25; ongoing monitoring needed</b></li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update curriculum maps through to ensure inclusivity for all programs and adjust as needed - <b>Completed AY 24/25; ongoing monitoring needed</b></li> <li>• Continue efforts to recruit students of color, particularly for our teacher preparation programs – <b>Still to be Accomplished</b></li> </ul>
<b>Five Star Service</b>	Build exceptional experiences by anticipating learner needs, continuously removing barriers, and creating an inclusive and supportive environment.	<p>Continue and expand our commitment to student success through Five Star Service (FSS):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase our recruitment – <b>Still to be accomplished</b></li> <li>• Personalized advising – <b>Ongoing; continuous improvement process</b></li> <li>• Building relationships with our students - <b>Ongoing; continuous improvement process</b></li> <li>• Providing one on one support - <b>Ongoing; continuous improvement process</b></li> <li>• Continually identify and removing barriers to student success - <b>Ongoing; continuous improvement process</b></li> </ul>

Note: The V2MOM format for comprehensive planning in units across the university was developed prior to the retirement of our former university president in the spring of 2025. The new leadership has not revised this template to date; however, changes to the process and template may be forthcoming in the coming years. Future AAQEP Annual Reports will reflect any changes instituted by university leadership.

## 9. Regulatory Changes

This section notes new or anticipated regulatory requirements and the provider's response to those changes (indicate "n/a" if no changes have been made or are anticipated).

### **Educator Preparation Programs:**

Effective with the 2025-2026 Academic Year, Maryville University launched MCORE, which is a 36 credit hour universal general education program for all Maryville undergraduate students. It is an innovative approach that streamlines the requirements needed to graduate into a single format which includes interdisciplinary courses and active learning opportunities about the real world. As a result, the School of Education was required to redesign the degree plans for each of the certification areas to ensure a variable sequence of courses.

The 2025-2026 graduating class is the first group required to take the Pearson exam Praxis through ETS. This was a change implemented by the Missouri State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. It has not had an impact on our overall pass rate or students' success. However, we need to analyze the number of attempts students needed for a passing score. This will lead to a review of the content in the courses that are designed to prepare students for the exam.

Finally, The Missouri State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education ended financial support for the optional ParaPro exam. When the exam became optional at the state level, Maryville University opted to keep the exam at the sophomore level and used it as a requirement to be admitted to the School of Education. This decision was made due to the correlation between success on the ParaPro and success on the Praxis. We used the results as a coaching tool with students to indicate areas of general knowledge that needed improvement. With the loss of financial support for the exam in the 2025-2026 academic year, the decision was made to no longer require our students to take the ParaPro.

### **School Leader Preparation Programs:**

#### **New State Certification Assessment Requirements for School Leader Preparation Programs - Principal Certification**

As indicated in Section 3E above, MoDESE instituted some major changes in the required state assessments for both principal and superintendent certification during AY 24-25. After the department's contract with Pearson expired, a new contract was signed making ETS the provider of standardized assessments for teacher preparation and principal preparation programs. Principal certification now requires candidates to pass the Praxis Exam in addition to the Principal Performance Assessment developed by the Missouri Professors of Educational Administration (MPEA). The latter exam has been in place now for a number of years. Several of our students elected to take the Pearson exam before it was discontinued, and their results are reported in Section 3E. To date, we have not received data regarding how our students are performing on the Praxis Exam. The transition to the new assessment structure for principal certification has been relatively smooth at the time of this report.

### Transition Efforts to Incorporate New State Assessment Requirements - Superintendent Certification

The change in state assessment requirements for K-12 Superintendent Certification have been more significant. MoDESE decided to drop any nationally created superintendent content exam in favor of using only the newly created Superintendent Performance Assessment (SPA), developed by the MPEA. The change went into effect for all candidates completing a superintendent preparation program after September 1, 2025. The timing of the change necessitated that faculty within the PK-12 Leadership Programs work with current EdD cohorts to ensure they complete the new SPA requirement in the final semester(s) of their programs.

Adjustments to program curriculum and course sequencing needed to effectively prepare future cohorts for this assessment were instituted during AY 24-25 in anticipation of these changes and based on feedback from prior cohorts. The new SPA requires candidates to complete an action research project at the district level. Faculty decided to embed this project into the requirements for the existing district-level internship so that it can be completed in the most authentic setting possible and with ample time to allow the highest quality work. The internship is designed to encompass the entirety of the EdD program, with candidates logging hours devoted to district-level internship activities. All candidates identify a district-level administrator to serve as their field-based mentor during the first semester of the program. Then, during that first semester, candidates set up a meeting that includes themselves, their field-based mentor and university advisor (determined by the faculty). During this meeting, the university advisor provides a copy of the SPA Handbook and discusses expectations for completing an authentic action research project over the course of the internship. Over the subsequent semesters, candidates work closely with their field-based mentors to complete the project and check-in with their university advisors periodically. EDL 767, the Superintendency course, was moved to the final semester of the EdD program, and completion of the SPA write up is being embedded into this course as a culminating program requirement.

During AY 24-25, full-time faculty participate in scoring training for the new SPA led by members of the MPEA team that helped to develop and pilot the instrument. At the time of this report, faculty are working to score the first batch of completed SPAs within Maryville University.

## 10. Sign Off

Provider's Primary Contact for AAQEP (Name, Title)	Dean/Lead Administrator (Name, Title)
 Jess R McKay Certification & Accreditation Specialist	 Maschael Schappes, Dean

Date sent to AAQEP:	12/30/2025
---------------------	------------

