2019 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	13388	AACTE SID:	5003
Institution:	William Carey University		
Unit:	School of Education		

Section 1. AIMS Profile

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

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

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	●	○
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	●	○
1.1.3 Program listings	●	○

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure[1] — `45`

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)[2] — `81`

Total number of program completers 126

---

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2017-2018 academic year?

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

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

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

Ed.S. Emotional and Behavioral Disorders (Specialist) was added during the 2018-2019 academic year.

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

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link:	https://www.wmcarey.edu/page/wcu-school-education-dashboard
Description of data accessible via link:	WCU School of Education Dashboard

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

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

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

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

WHAT HAS THE PROVIDER LEARNED FROM REVIEWING ITS ANNUAL REPORTING MEASURES OVER THE PAST THREE YEARS.

ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: Faculty and Administration have continued an initiative to review and update syllabi. This includes aligning all courses to CAEP Initial and Advanced Standards. KEY ASSESSMENTS CONTENT VALIDITY - Reviewing CAEP Standards and internal data indicates the importance of completing Content Validity studies on each of the 84 Key Assessments. This study has been started and should be completed this spring. It is planned to be an annual project conducted by the Accreditation office. KEY ASSESSMENT TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY STUDY - This study has been initiated this spring to test the reliability of key assessments across terms. It will continue as an annual review. KEY ASSESSMENT INTER-RATER RELIABILITY STUDY - This third review was based on concerns brought up by faculty on the Fall 2018 Data Day about mentors and adjuncts proving to be reliable inter-raters. This will be an annual review by the Accreditation Office. SPA and INTASC ALIGNMENT - During Data Day, the discussion focused on REVISED SPA Standards and INTASC Standards and updating syllabi across programs. Faculty agreed to complete this revision for the Spring 2019 term. Transition period continues moving from NCATE Legacy Standards to the New CAEP Initial and Advanced Standards. TECHNOLOGY - The university continues to provide data showing increased technology use across the CANVAS platforms. Faculty training has increased with new university training documents provided each term.

DISCUSS ANY EMERGING, LONG-TERM, EXPECTED OR UNEXPECTED TRENDS.
UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT - Declining enrollment has been a serious trend over the past four years affecting program effectiveness with such small candidate groups. Admission GPA and ACT group means have been affected due to the low numbers. Faculty members used to 20-25 students in a class, regularly see 4-8. The Dean and the Executive Council (Chairs,

Directors, and Coordinators) have redesigned the admissions process including seeking outside recruitment companies to move the recruiting outside the state of Mississippi (Alabama, Georgia, Florida, and Louisiana). The financial investment is significant.

GRADUATING CANDIDATES - FIVE YEAR FOLLOW-UP - Follow-up data trends have increased over the past three years. An open-ended communication system designed in 2018 has implemented the following elements: 1) Mississippi Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (MACTE) is in its third year surveying principals state-wide requesting that they evaluate their new teachers. These reports come back to the university with an analysis of Carey first year teachers. This gives the school one point of evaluation following our new graduating candidates. 2) InSpar - This Mississippi Department of Education data report provides the university School of Education a report of teachers and their impact on student learning. This is the first time private institutions gained access to this state test data. 3) WCU School of Education Exit Survey of new graduates - provides program evaluation information. 4) WCU University Exit Survey - a triangulated assessment that provides additional program review information from the graduating candidates. 5) School of Education Alumni Survey was completed two years ago with 5,000 responses. This survey is scheduled to be repeated in the next year.

EDUCATOR RETENTION IN THE PROFESSION - Survey data indicated that WCU Education Graduates have maintained an 80% retention rate in the profession. This is well over the state rate of 50% and the national rate.

EDUCATOR LICENSES STATEWIDE - Have dramatically fallen off from 7,000 less than ten years ago to 700 this past year. The School of Education has not seen a serious reduction in licenses because of our large alternate route program. The undergraduate annual rate of licenses has seriously declined.

ARE MEASURES WIDELY SHARED?
Through the School of Education Dashboard, current data exhibits are available to all stakeholders: Undergraduate and graduate candidates, Mississippi Department of Education, universities, community colleges, school districts, school administrators, local teachers, partner schools, and the general public. The Teacher Education Council disseminates information across the university community. The Superintendent's Councils are communication avenues for WCU information. The School of Education has Twitter, Instagram, and a Facebook account focused on the general public. ACT Camp is a community outreach program (Hattiesburg and Gulfport) which provides week-long intensive ACT training for high school students. This free camp is a Carey outreach designed to bring more families into contact with the School of Education and its programs. PREPS (Program of Research and Evaluation for Public Schools) and MAPE (Mississippi Association of Partners in Education) are headquartered at William Carey University School of Education providing research resources and tools to all school districts in the state. These partnerships build a communication network across the state. Data provided through anecdotal discussions and surveys have shown an increasing need for strong effective communication between educational entities. The redesign on the university website has simplified and clarified access to all university data and information.

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS - 2018-2019 Changes
Data analysis by the Undergraduate Committee indicated that EDTPA Key Assessments meant the school was initiating a second formative/summative assessment tool alongside the required Mississippi Evaluation Tool (Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument TIAI). These EDTPA assessments were deactivated.
Through anecdotal and advisor records, the committee recognized the need expressed by students for the development of a course rotation plan and rescheduling class meetings to later in the day. This effort to streamline the undergraduate program assists in the field experience placements which had become cumbersome with multiple field experience placements per trimester.

Program Level:
• Created a course rotation plan for fall 2019
• Move class start times to 3:30 – remove morning classes

FIELD PLACEMENTS - The number of hours for field experience needed to be better organized around the courses. K-2 placements would be one term, and 3-6 placements in a second term. The committee was mindful not to reduce the total number of field placement hours and final internship hours. Residency 1 and Residency 2 combined is a 22 week program. According to statewide surveys, WCU is one of the leading schools for field experience hour requirements.

Field Experiences: Fall 2019 Implementation
• Placements – move to one placement per trimester when possible.
• Create new Memorandum of Understanding with districts – principals to reflect this move and Teacher Assistant placements.
• TA placements – course hours can be completed in classroom employed in with the exception of nine hours of field experience in grades 3-6
• Residency II – three visits unless fourth is needed, implement revised Professional Dispositions.

COURSE REVISIONS - The committee reviewed undergraduate courses to insure syllabi were aligned to CAEP and SPA requirements. The rigor of the coursework would be updated for current effective instructional practices. Particular emphasis was placed on Special Education and the standard changes taking place nationally. We are not changing the course catalog descriptions remaining within the boundaries of the catalog.

Course Revisions:
• EDU 372 Survey of the Exceptional Child
• EDU 440 – close sections and open EDU 409 – Principles of Early Childhood
• EDU 300 and 300.1 – revise to course catalog description as a general education writing intensive course

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

2018 - Ed.D. Educational Leadership - Due to anecdotal data and the large increase in student enrollment, the school needed more faculty serving as chairs on dissertation committees. The school implemented a Professional Learning Community with faculty members who agreed to serve as chairs. The weekly meetings discuss student work, the whole dissertation process, and the development of an online Canvas Dissertation Shell accessible to all committees and graduate students. The committee has now met for a year. All syllabi have been realigned to CAEP and SPA standards. Syllabi are being updated to meet new effective instructional practices. Future planning includes a meeting with all educational leadership faculty to review all assignments for gaps and duplications in order to effectively prepare students for the SLLA examination and new PSEL standards.

Graduate Programs - All M.Ed. programs are being reviewed (syllabi and assessments) in order to align them to CAEP Standards and SPA Standards. Three reviewers have been assigned to review the field experiences within courses and the program field experiences requirements. Data Day analysis indicated an important trend in technology (CAEP Standard Four), therefore the School of Education has initiated syllabi reviews to update and increase the impact of technology.

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

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

NCATE: **Areas for Improvement related to Standard 6 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:**

1. The faculty teaching load limits opportunities for scholarship and professional development.   (ITP) (ADV)

The Vice President for Academic Affairs met with the Dean, CAEP Accreditation Coordinator, and the CAEP Consultant (Dr. Michael Plumley) on February 12, 2019. The Vice President charged the Dean with developing a financial report describing the financial impact of adjusting faculty and administrator teaching loads. Faculty advising loads were adjusted this past year to more equally distribute students among faculty thus reducing the individual faculty load. Faculty have been encouraged with financial support to attend more professional development training conferences (i.e. PREPS Conference February - all fees paid).

The University Administration has approved the following recommendations:
1) Department Chairs have had their teaching loads decreased to 15 (This is a significant adjustment in teaching requirements allowing the Chairs to concentrate on administrative tasks);

2) The Dean's teaching load has been reduced to 6 hours.

2019-2020 contracts will be released in May.

Recommendations:
Nine-month faculty teaching load to be adjusted to 24 hours to provide for advising, professional development in the districts, and research.
Faculty has been increased this past year with plans for new faculty in 2019. These increases will help to reduce overall faculty teaching loads.

Section 6. Continuous Improvement
CAEP Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.
CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3
The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

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

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.

- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

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

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

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

DESCRIBE HOW THE EPP REGULARLY AND SYSTEMATICALLY ASSESSED ITS PERFORMANCE AGAINST ITS GOALS AND THE CAEP STANDARDS.

Data Days occurring within departments (Curriculum and Instruction; Health, Physical Education, and Recreation; Educational Leadership) focus on analyzing gathered data from three years review. These meetings produce acknowledged trends and patterns of impact on student data (Example: the mean scores for SLLA Educational Leadership examinations show a trend of leadership candidates having difficulty passing the exam on the first attempt). (CAEP A.1.1; A.4.2)

WHAT INNOVATIONS OR CHANGES DID THE EPP IMPLEMENT AS A RESULT OF THAT REVIEW?

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP SLLA EXAM - A policy change introduced in the Data Day discussions was approved by the faculty, Teacher Education Committee, and the university administration. The policy allows educational leadership candidates to graduate from the program without successfully completing the SLLA (School Leadership Licensure Assessment). This allows the graduate to continue his/her professional work while preparing for the SLLA. The Educational Leadership Faculty have committed to a long-term SLLA preparation intervention in the coursework. These changes continue to take place with the goal of 80% or higher of all candidates completing the SLLA before graduation. (CAEP A.1.1; A.4.2)

EDTPA Audit - Based on data-driven responses on the EDTPA, the undergraduate committee determined it was best to focus on INTASC standards for novice teachers and teacher candidates. Within the Residency I (10 weeks) and Residency II (twelve weeks), INTASC is used as the diagnostic tool to assist in auditing internships and designing professional intern development.

INTERNSHIPS - Residency I and Residency II. Based on key assessment data on intern professional development (Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument - Formative and Summative which produces a learning growth report; The Value-Added Project - shows the interns' skills in pre-assessment and post-assessment for the Ten Day Unit; Unit Lesson Plan; Unit Action Plan - the interns exhibit skills in designing and implementing an action plan in improve learning growth across Student Learning Outcomes); Portfolio is designed to exhibit their internship experiences and tasks; Teacher Internship Assessment Instrument Certificate project must be completed by the intern and cooperating teacher (This PREZI was developed by the University of Mississippi and is a certificate program used throughout the state). These encompass the internship experience in both Residencies. The Residency I and Residency II are a total of 22 weeks. The previous Internship program was 13 weeks. This is an increase of 9 weeks making this one of the strongest Residency experiences in the state of Mississippi.

CAEP Standards - Once CAEP Standards were finalized, undergraduate and graduate faculty are revising and updating the syllabi to the new standards. Also Key Assessment rubrics are being aligned to CAEP Standards.

HOW ARE PROGRESS AND RESULTS TRACKED? HOW WILL THE EPP KNOW THE DEGREE TO WHICH CHANGES ARE IMPROVEMENTS?

Progress is tracked through joint faculty meetings where faculty members report on project changes. TK20 and CANVAS provide the ongoing continuous data stream for analysis.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) contracts have been in effect since 2014. It is projected that 2019 will serve as the year to renew all MOU contracts with the school districts. This will allow for more clarity on co-selection of district cooperating teachers by the district and the university. (CAEP 2.3)

WHAT QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM DATA DID THE PROVIDER REVIEW?

There were 80 Key Assessments including:
1) Curriculum Projects (All departments);
2) Content Knowledge examinations (in-class all departments);
3) National Examinations (Principles of Learning and Teaching; PRAXIS II Content Examinations; Dyslexia Training);
4) Lesson Planning (Elementary and Secondary Undergraduate and Graduate program; Gifted Education; Special Education; Dyslexia Training);
5) Case Studies (Special Education; Educational Leadership; Gifted Education; Dyslexia Training);
6) Behavior Analysis (Special Education; Gifted Education);
7) School Analysis (Educational Leadership; Elementary and Secondary Graduate programs);
8) School Improvement Projects (Educational Leadership; Elementary and Secondary Graduate programs);
9) Leadership Implementation Projects (Educational Leadership).

WHAT PATTERNS ACROSS PREPARATION PROGRAMS (BOTH STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES) DID THE PROVIDER IDENTIFY?

Patterns across the preparation programs are primarily in the area of state and national examinations. The State of Mississippi has added the Foundations of Reading examination for Elementary Teacher Candidates and Alternate Route Elementary Graduate Candidates. The Foundations of Reading recent test results show a significant increase in students failing the examination on the first attempt. Workshops and syllabi infusion of reading concepts have been established in the past six months to increase test results. The goal is 80% of all candidates will pass the Foundations of Reading examination on the first attempt.

HOW DID THE PROVIDER USE DATA/EVIDENCE FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT?

TK20 and CANVAS are the vehicles for organizing and analyzing data within and across programs. These data streams are analyzed by the three departments (Physical Education, Elementary Education/Secondary Education, Educational Leadership) in separate Data Day programs. Action plans are developed and implemented based on these meetings. Continuous departmental meetings throughout the year raise questions and analyze the effectiveness of ongoing Action Plans.

Each faculty reviewed TK20 key assessments to determine teacher impact on student learning. During the annual evaluations, all faculty planned actions to implement to improve student learning impact based on student course evaluations. Feedback from cooperating teachers and principals are collected both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Statewide surveys initiated by the university system (Mississippi Association of Colleges of Teacher Education) collected data from principals and their first year teachers on learning growth.

HOW DID THE PROVIDER TEST INNOVATIONS?

The Key Assessment System (TK20) provides a variety of learning goals and growth assessments to document the effectiveness of innovations.
RECRUITMENT - The School has now designed and implemented in its second year a recruitment plan including four personnel (undergraduate and graduate programs). This has resulted in communities of graduate students (cohorts) located across the state. The strong emphasis is on increasing the diversity of future candidates. The ACT camps (Tradition and Hattiesburg) encourage a wide variety of diverse high school students to consider education as a career and offers training in the ACT test at no cost.

PARTNERSHIPS WITH DISTRICTS - The School of Education partners with districts who have hard-to-staff schools or teacher shortage implementing the "Grow Your Own" program. The School works with principals and districts to identify Teacher Assistants and community people to wish to become licensed teachers.

CAEP STANDARDS - In future faculty meetings, faculty and administrators will present ways they are meeting CAEP Standards. This is to develop a change in culture that explores CAEP standards as an integral part of the educational business of the school.

WHAT SPECIFIC EXAMPLES SHOW THAT CHANGES AND PROGRAM MODIFICATIONS CAN BE LINKED BACK TO EVIDENCE/DATA?

Examples of Changes and Program Modifications:
1) Development of Residency I and Residency II;
2) Redesign of EDU 300 Introduction to Education;
3) Placement of interns in diverse settings across grade levels;
4) Development of SLLA (Educational Leadership) training programs within the syllabi;
5) Redesign of the Alternate Route Graduate Program for teacher preparation;
6) Foundations of Reading preparatory experiences within classrooms.

HOW DID THE PROVIDER DOCUMENT EXPLICIT INVESTIGATION OF SELECTION CRITERIA USED FOR STANDARD 3 IN RELATION TO CANDIDATE PROGRESS AND COMPLETION?

Selection criteria has been has been increased to improve the quality of candidates entering the program. EDU 300 is part of the selection process.

HOW DID THE PROVIDER DOCUMENT THAT DATA-DRIVEN CHANGES ARE ONGOING AND BASED ON SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE, AND/OR THAT INNOVATIONS RESULT IN OVERALL POSITIVE TRENDS OF

IMPROVEMENTS FOR EPPs, THEIR CANDIDATES, AND P-12 STUDENTS?

Key Assessments (80) across all programs prove the data required to make data-driven changes. These assessments are ongoing and are reviewed by the Accreditation Office when supplying this information to the individual departments and faculty members.

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

1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
1.5 Model and apply technology standards
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
4.3 Employer satisfaction
4.4 Completer satisfaction
5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
A.5.5 Continuous Improvement
x.2 Technology
x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

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

◉ Yes ◯ No

6.3 Optional Comments

Section 7: Transition
In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a succe transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful r regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the fo information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPP's evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progress n

addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use
Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level
programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level

If there are no identified gaps, click the box next to "No identified gaps" and proceed to question 7.2.

☑ **No identified gaps**

If there are identified gaps, please summarize the gaps and any steps planned or taken toward the gap(s) to be
prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text ap

Our assessment team recognizes the need for content validation and reliability of key assessments (new CAEP standards). Annual
reports continue to be designed to more clearly define key assessment data aligned with CAEP standards and aligned to program
improvements. Departmental meetings involving CAEP consultant, Dr. Michael Plumley, have gone into depth concerning the
changes in the CAEP Standards, We have an effective orchestrated assessment system which meets CAEP standards with only a
few alterations. Departments monitor all professional organizations for new standards development. As these standards come
online, we have revised syllabi, assessments, and student learning objectives.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the text applies.

Not applicable

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC (
Principles, as applicable.

◉ Yes ◯ No

7.3 If no, please describe any changes that mean that the EPP does not continue to meet legacy NCATE Stand
TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2019
EPP Annual Report.*

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

Report Preparer's Information

Name:	Dr. Barry Morris
Position:	CAEP Accreditation Coordinator
Phone:	601-318-6587
E-mail:	bmorris@wmcarey.edu

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data

entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

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

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

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

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

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

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

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