

2020 EPP Annual Report

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

Section 1. EPP Profile

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

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

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

1.2 [For EPP seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation¹ applies to CAEP eligible EPPs] Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial Licensure and/or Advanced Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).

Section 2. Program Completers

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

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

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

Total number of program completers 169

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: <https://www.wmcarey.edu/page/wcu-school-education-dashboard>

Description of data accessible via link: WCU School of Education Data 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Advanced-Level Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					

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

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

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

ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: There was a major emphasis on faculty (meeting by departments) aligning their syllabi to the National Standards for that particular content area. These meetings had a goal of building a curriculum map for each of the 30 programs. These maps are still in the development stage as national standards are updated and advanced technologies are implemented.

NATIONAL ACCREDITATION STUDY: The university completed its three-year study in preparation for its SACS National Accreditation visit in 2019. The results from the SACS visit and the Accreditation self-study brought faculty together to update their programs at the departmental level. The School of Education implemented updates and revisions to the school's goals and objectives based on the recommendations made by SACS.

UNEXPECTED TRENDS - The Covid-19 has dramatically changed our operations.

1-All classes have moved to an online environment. Hybrid and face-to-face courses have moved to virtual instruction through

WebEx.

2-Interns in the field have had to move to an online environment with mentors evaluating their online performance.

3-Mississippi Department of Education has adapted to the teacher crisis through a series of policy changes making it much easier for a person to become eligible for the Undergraduate and Graduate Alternate Route paths to Teacher Certification. This has proven to be an opportunity for our recruitment department.

4-Assisting graduates in job placements has been much more difficult since districts are not providing job fairs. We plan to do a virtual Teacher Ed Round-Up within the next two weeks.

5-The Educational Leadership Internship Program has been challenged with schools and districts closures. Although, many assignments for their internship program are embedded in the coursework now.

6-Dissertations involving schools and/or districts have had difficulty. Defending dissertations are proceeding via WebEx. Many students are still able to survey teachers and districts using online surveys. Some have rewritten their research questions to reflect using last year's data since there is no state testing this year.

7-Advisement will be done virtually (email/phone)

UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT: Over the past ten years there has been an enrollment decline. This trend was reversed this past year with significant increases in undergraduate enrollment in all programs: elementary, secondary, and physical education. This was due to a school-wide media program throughout three states as the school partnered with a media company. The company provided in-house staff to work full-time on recruitment. Grants were won from national foundations which provided significant financial assistance to undergraduate future teachers. A strong Teacher Assistant to Teacher Program designed a smooth transition for Teacher Assistants in the classroom to complete their education degrees.

MACTE GRADUATING CANDIDATES - FIVE YEAR FOLLOW-UP: MACTE (Mississippi Association of Colleges of Teacher Education) designed two years ago a survey of new teachers in the state. This district by district principal survey and teacher survey allows the School of Education to adjust programs to better meet the professional needs of new teachers when coming into the school environment. These survey results compare WCU with the other Colleges of Education in the state. The survey results center on the teachers' impact on student learning.

EDUCATOR RETENTION IN THE PROFESSION: Survey data indicated that WCU teacher retention remains at 80% which is well above the national average of 50% remaining in the profession.

EDUCATOR LICENSES STATEWIDE: WCU led the Colleges of Education in Mississippi with the largest number of graduates in teacher education in 2019. This is the first time WCU School of Education has led the other Colleges of Education.

ARE BENCHMARKS AVAILABLE FOR COMPARISON

Yes, the Mississippi Department of Education regularly reviews all programs of each of its Colleges of Education. WCU is due to be reviewed in 2020. During our last review, the School of Education met all State Accreditation Standards with one recommendation for improvement: design and implement a dashboard for educational statistics. The Educational Dashboard displays current statistics for all stakeholders to review. Our stakeholders include the Department of Education (Mississippi), parents, students, principals, superintendents, teachers, and community business partners. The School of Education has implemented a Superintendent's Council, PREPS (organization designed to inform districts and communities about education innovations), and the Teacher Education Committee.

In TK20 (an online assessment system), we track the following assessments:

1-Key assessments for coursework assignments (undergraduate, Alternate Route, Masters, Specialist, and Doctorate).

2-Key assessments for field assignments in the Undergraduate Residency I and II programs.

3-Undergraduate teacher candidate evaluations by host teachers, university supervisors, and self-reflections including Professional Dispositions and TIAI

(Teacher Internship Assessment Instrument).

4-Mentor evaluations of candidates in the Educational Leadership Principal Certification program.

5-Candidate evaluations of mentors in the Educational Leadership Principal Certification program.

6-Program surveys measuring student satisfaction in the undergraduate and graduate program.

7-Alternate Route candidate evaluations by mentor, university supervisor, principal, and self-reflection including TIAI and Professional Dispositions.

8-Program portfolio for field hours.

CHANGES IMPLEMENTED OR IN PLANNING STAGES

GIFTED EDUCATION M.Ed.

We have taken the gifted program to almost fully online. The only course that is still hybrid is 652 Teaching the gifted child which has a three day practicum experience for gifted learners grades 2-6. If a student is a distance learner too far to come to campus, faculty also offers 652 as an independent study online course with video and portfolio development.

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM CHANGES AND ENHANCEMENTS

COURSE CHANGES AND ENHANCEMENTS DRIVEN BY DATA-BASED ANALYSIS:

1-EDU 372 (Survey of the Exceptional Child) – added explicit lessons on differentiated instruction in lesson plans.

2-EDR 308 (Literacy I) and EDR 311 (Literacy II) – added lessons on how to write constructed responses to prompts from an informal reading inventory (decoding and retelling).

3-EDR 407 (Communication in the Elementary School) – added lessons on improving reflection writing.

4-EDU 409- added a new course “Principles of Early Childhood Education to replace the Kindergarten Practicum (EDU 440).

5-EDU 450 (Test, Measurement, and Evaluation) – added lessons on adding pre- and post-tests to lesson plans to be used in Residency I & II along with question item analysis lessons.

FIELD EXPERIENCE:

- EDU 300.1 – designated that students obtain 24 hours by staying at their school placement 4 days for six hours
- Field experience by trimesters shifted from counting hours to the following:
 - o 1st-3rd trimesters - students are expected to stay with their host teacher 4-6 hours for approximately 8 weeks
 - o 4th trimester - students are expected to stay with their host teacher approximately 2 days a week for 8 weeks
 - o 5th trimester is Residency 1 – students are expected to stay with their host teacher approximately 3 days a week for 192 hours
 - o 6th trimester is Residency II - students are expected to stay with their cooperating teacher for 60 days
 - o Students applied for their pre-service license through MDE immediately following EDU 300

Program Assessments:

- TIAI – spent time on the following TIAI items during seminars each trimester
 - o Communicates assessment criteria
 - o Prepares appropriate assessments
 - o Adds appropriate pre and post assessments to lesson plans
- Professional Dispositions – included this document as an evaluation in other courses
- Foundation of Reading – in addition to incorporating the “science of reading” to EDR 308 & 311, students attended a review workshop before taking the assessment
- Praxis II and PLT – workshops were offered before students took the assessments

Secondary Education Majors:

- Provided more time for secondary majors to spend with their Residency Supervisors to focus on methods, strategies, and lesson planning (additional seminars)
- Scheduled one-on-one time for advisement for each trimester

Department changes/enhancements:

- Faculty, adjuncts included, have been able to meet approximately 3 times a month to discuss student concerns, scheduling, advising, events, courses revisions
- Faculty, including adjuncts, added webex technology to their courses in order to meet with Teacher Assistants not able to attend class and to meet as needed with small groups of students
- The department hired Field Experience Coordinators for Tradition and Hattiesburg to make placements for students each trimester
- A Coordinator for the MS Teacher Residency Grant through MDE was hired to oversee the program offered through the Tradition

campus

· Community Partnerships:

o SOE is partnering with Excel by 5 in the Hattiesburg area in the role as Certification Manager

o SOE is partnering with the Hattiesburg Early Childhood Learning Collaborative to provide PD and credentialing to early childhood centers and teachers

o SOE is partnering with United Way to host a summer camp for struggling 3rd graders on the Hattiesburg campus

· Recruitment – the faculty have been active in attending career fairs at high schools and community colleges along with hosting a “Signing Day” and “Teacher Roundup” on the Hattiesburg campus. The SOE hosts Teacher Academies on campus sharing new techniques in education.

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 teaching load limits have been addressed by the significant reduction of the advising load, increase in salary by the university, reduction of teaching load by giving course credit for special projects and coordinator positions, and the addition of more faculty and adjuncts to reduce course demands on faculty.

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?

WHAT QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM DATA DID THE PROVIDER REVIEW?

Student and stakeholder surveys, principal surveys, teacher intern observations by mentor teachers, formal standardized content examination, course examinations, project rubric assessments, research paper rubric assessments, student assignments (rubric), Superintendent Council Recommendations, Teacher Education Committee Recommendations, anecdotal information from mentor teachers and mentor principals, mentor principal observations, and state survey program evaluations.

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

STRENGTH: Recruitment at the undergraduate and graduate level continue to be a major emphasis because of the declining undergraduate enrollment. Overall School of Education enrollment in 2019 has been at historic highs. Undergraduate enrollment has increased dramatically.

STRENGTH: Graduation rates surged this year giving WCU the highest graduation numbers of any other College of Education in the state.

STRENGTH: Recruitment has been a major source of increased student admission rates with higher student GPAs and ACT scores than previous years.

STRENGTH: Technology continues to be an important factor in online delivery of courses.

WEAKNESS: Online test security continues to be a problem when assessments are delivered through CANVAS online courses.

WEAKNESS: SLLA School Leadership Licensure Assessment remains a continuing problem for Educational Leadership Program students. The School of Education decided to adjust its graduation requirements to not require SLLA passing score for graduation.

STRENGTH: Departmental meetings to design curriculum maps for each program is ongoing and producing a much improved alignment of objectives to standards.

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

Departmental meetings regularly update the program improvements being implemented based on data. School of Education bring school leaders together to analyze data and implement new program plans. The School of Education's Leadership Team along with Program Coordinators meet often to discuss new programs, revisions of programs, and collection of data for purposes of accreditation (SACS and CAEP).

HOW DID THE PROVIDER TEST INNOVATIONS?

TK20 is the assessment data system used by the School of Education to coordinate and analyze data coming in from more than 80 student data assessments. Using this data analysis, programs test innovations to see if the effectiveness of the innovation is working. Example: the Educational Leadership's innovation to raise SLLA scores by assigning different SLLA themes to individual Educational Leadership courses.

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

Educational Leadership SLLA Exam - A policy change allowed students additional time to prepare for the SLLA Exam. Data analysis indicates that the SLLA group scores are increasing the percentage of passing students.

EDTPA Audit - allowed faculty to review Audit standards to produce program improvements in the two intern residencies. This increase in student internship hours has had a direct impact on student pass rates on Content Area Examinations and Pedagogical Exams.

FOUNDATIONS OF READING EXAM (Mississippi Department of Education) - a recent new requirement for all elementary education teacher interns to receive licensure. This has been an unexpected requirement which now demands that an Elementary Education Teacher must pass six assessments to be licensed (PRAXIS Core, Elementary Education Content, Elementary Education Pedagogy, and Foundations of Reading).

Examples of changes and modifications:

- 1-Developmental 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 training programs within the syllabi
- 5-Redesign of the Alternate Route Assessments and Program Content Improvements
- 6-Foundations of Reading preparatory experiences inside the collage 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 increased to improve the quality of candidates entering the program. EDU 300 (Introduction to Education) is part of the selection process. The School of Education uses the Quality Assurance Assessment System (TK20) to track student progress and completion through individual course project assessments, internship observations, internship placements, professional examinations, and faculty recommendations.

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?

Key assessments (80) across all programs provide the data required to make data-driven changes. These assessments are

ongoing and are reviewed by the Accreditation Office when supplying information to the individual departments and faculty members.

ADVANCED GRADUATE PROGRAMS

HOW WAS STAKEHOLDERS' FEEDBACK AND INPUT SOUGHT AND INCORPORATED INTO THE EVALUATION, RESEARCH, AND DECISION-MAKING ACTIVITIES?

Decision-making was based on the evaluation of data, research of new educational strategies, and the collection of stakeholder evaluations and suggestions for improvement. Stakeholders include

- 1-district superintendents' surveys, stakeholder meetings (i.e. Teacher Education Committee; Superintendent's Regional Conferences);
- 2-PREPS Statewide conference;
- 3-Graduate Mentors in the Educational Leadership program;
- 4-Graduate Mentor Teachers in the M.Ed. Art of Teaching programs (Elementary, Secondary, Mild and Moderate Disabilities, Emotional and Behavioral Disorders);
- 5-Graduate Mentor Principals in the M.Ed. Art of Teaching programs;
- 6-MAACTE - Mississippi Association of Accredited Colleges of Education Annual Principals and New Teachers Statewide Survey;

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

TK20 is the database implemented by the School of Education to develop student profiles as they progress through the teacher developmental and professional standards required for effective teaching. These 80 assessments (tests, surveys, state and national examinations, projects, internships, mentorships, and data analysis) are provided to each department for the purpose of data analysis, research into new strategies, and data-driven decision-making. These Data Analysis Days design future professional development plans, course changes, and syllabi revisions.

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 EPP'S. THEIR CANDIDATES, AND P-12 STUDENTS?

The use of course objectives, professional goals, School of Education goals, INTASC objectives, state objectives, and departmental goals are aligned into curriculum maps and evaluated on an ongoing regular basis using multiple sources of data collection from students, community stakeholders, district superintendents, principals, district teachers, parents, and university professors.

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
- 3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
- 3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
- 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.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities
- A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
- A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
- A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
- A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
- A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
- A.3.4 Selection at Completion
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
- A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
- A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
- A.5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
- A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
- A.5.5 Continuous Improvement
- x.1 Diversity
- x.2 Technology
- x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses
- x.5 State Standards (if applicable)

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 success 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 progre on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's™ assessment of its evidence. It may help the Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial lev 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 applies.

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 Quality 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 Standards or 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 2020 EPP Annual Report.

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Dr. Barry Morris

Position: CAEP 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 completion 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