

# 2018 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	13388	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	5003
<b>Institution:</b>	William Carey University		
<b>Unit:</b>	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	<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"/>

## 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 2016-2017 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure<sup>1</sup>

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.)<sup>2</sup>

Total number of program completers 430

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

<sup>2</sup> 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 2016-2017 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.  
No Change / Not Applicable

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

**The M.Ed. in Emotional and Behavioral Disorders was implemented in fall 2016. It offers a credential in Emotional and Behavioral Disorders.**

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  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements  
No Change / Not Applicable

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

## 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.

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

**Description of data accessible via link:**

The dashboard data describes PRAXIS Subject Area Examination scores, PRAXIS Principles of Teaching and Learning scores, Title II Reports, Exit Interview Surveys, Students Evaluations of Faculty, Diversity analysis (Candidate skills, faculty diversity, candidate diversity, diversity by course across all programs), Enrollment figures, National Program Reviews, Library Resources).

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?

Clinical Practice - Through Blue Ribbon State Initiative, clinical field practice was increased by 50% across internships and practica. We have seen a need to build more field experience hours into the internships and practica. Because of that, we have developed the Teacher Residency Model in the undergraduate programs nearly doubling the candidate internship from 13 weeks to 23 weeks. This has allowed intern candidates to experience Residency I which is much more developmental, diagnostic, and prescriptive to work on individual skills and performances within a protected environment before the final internship (Residency II). Clinical faculty have remarked that this increased time in the field is producing a much stronger, competent, instructional professional. We have noticed a marked increase in professional dispositions, instructional assessments (TIAI Instrument), and stronger evidence of student learning in the classroom (edTPA instrument). Video assessments are now being conducted by outside evaluators producing a much stronger and more valid evaluation of the candidates' skills, content knowledge, and dispositions.

Classroom Management - Principals over the three years have commented about the need for more practical experiential development of management skills. This has led to the redesign of the undergraduate classroom management courses, the expansion of teaching experiences early in the EDU 300 course - Introduction to Education, and the expansion of the Teacher Residency Model from one experience to two residencies. Observations by university observers and clinical faculty have shown a significant increase in management skills as based on the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (Indicators: Classroom Environment, Attends To Tasks, Behavior Strategies, Fairness, Maximizes Time).

Field Experience - Data (Key Assessments: Professional Dispositions EDU 300, IEP Plan EDU 372, Literacy Lesson Plan EDR 308) from our candidates indicated the early field experiences were a platform of growth allowing them to quickly move from observers to practitioners in the first undergraduate course of their programs. There were field experiences in each of the three core introductory courses. Candidates must earn a B or higher in these three CORE courses to be admitted to the School of Education.

Ed.D. in Educational Leadership - Data (Key Assessment: EDL 789 Research Project) indicated that the research process should be redesigned more efficiently allowing a close mentoring relationship with research faculty and the candidates. The program was redesigned into courses where the research project is set to a timeline (EDL 826 - Research Question and Review of the Literature; EDL 811 - Chapter Two Review of Literature; EDL 812 - Chapter One Introduction and Chapter Three Methodology; EDL 813 - Proposal Defense, IRB Approval, and Data Collection; EDL 814 - Chapter Four Analysis of Data and Chapter Five Conclusions and Recommendations). This has allowed for a scaffolding effect in the curriculum.

Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected or unexpected trends?

Online undergraduate sections - As the school moves to more online undergraduate course delivery, grade point average will be an admission factor into those online sections (i.e., EDU 300 Introduction to Education, EDU 372 Survey of the Exceptional Child, and EDR 474 Language Arts in the Elementary School). Undergraduates need a strong prescriptive approach to professional development. A long term goal will be providing the mentor relationship and technical support for online delivery. Key assessments in all three courses are being used to evaluate candidate learning in an online environment.

Greater Proficiency in Graduates Follow-up - Devising a system to move out into the field following graduating candidates during their first two years of teaching. This will include our MATs and undergraduates. A system of support needs to be further developed to provide the mentorship required for excellent professional development.

Educator Retention in the Profession - Based on the 2017 Teacher Survey of 5,000 WCU graduates, our teachers have maintained a high percentage (80%) retention in the profession. This is well above the reported national and state average of 50%.

Graduate Level - Implementing changes in following up graduate candidates is progressing. More information is being collected each term through key graduate courses (EDU 640-M.Ed.; EDL 608 M.Ed. Leadership; EDL 789 - Ed.S. and Ed.D.).

Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?

Are benchmarks available for comparison?

Undergraduate - Elementary Education and Secondary Education

All syllabi are aligned to the spa standards and INTASC standards. They are also aligned to university and School of Education standards. Benchmarks are milestones for the school to improve instructional delivery and candidate professional progress. The field experience has now been aligned to the edTPA benchmarks. The edTPA is a performance-based, subject-specific assessment and support system used by teacher preparation programs throughout the United States to emphasize, measure and support the skills and knowledge that all teachers need from Day 1 in the classroom (edTPA.com). Based on data (Key Assessments: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument, surveys, IEP Developmental Plan, and Unit Plan rubrics), we have increased clinical practice hours for the past three years to align with best practices for teacher candidates. The school has implemented candidate performance assessment using the edTPA tools. Teachers must prepare a portfolio of materials based on the architecture focused on three common tasks: Planning, Instruction, and Assessment. Candidates must demonstrate readiness to teach through lesson plans designed to support their students' strengths and needs; engage real students in ambitious learning; analyze whether their students are learning; and adjust their instruction to become more effective. Reports of candidate proficiencies started arriving at the school in the fall of 2017. This allows us to show competency in the areas of pedagogical practice, content knowledge, instructional differentiation, and professional dispositions. Syllabi are transitioning from the NCATE Legacy Standards to the CAEP standards.

Graduate School - The School programs are aligned with INTASC and SPA standards. The syllabi and programs are transitioning from the NCATE Legacy Standards to the new CAEP Advanced Program Standards. All syllabi are being updated to meet these benchmarks.

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

The School of Education Dashboard exhibits current data to the community, other universities, State Department of Education, local partner schools, and the general public. Information is disseminated through the Teacher Education Council and its local partners. The Superintendents' Council is another avenue of information dissemination.

Long term goals: Annual publication is to be designed to go to partner schools, districts, and community sources. The School of Education blog, Facebook, and Twitter accounts are growing and adding outcome results. We want this form of social media to be expanded across states. The redesign of the WCU website has offered opportunities for the School of Education to manage information and its effective presentation to a wider community.

## 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)

University administration is meeting with the dean to negotiate the contracts for twelve month employees to reduce teaching loads. Negotiations are being conducted with the university administration concerning adjusting the nine month faculty contractual teaching loads to provide release for advising, research, and scholarly activity. Four new faculty members in the past twelve months have been hired to reduce overall teaching loads. Two faculty positions are requested for the next academic year.

School of Education scholarly activities include published journal articles, books, research activities with other EPP institutions (i.e. CEEDAR Grant: Delta State University, University of Mississippi, and State Department of Education), presentations at state, regional, national, and international conferences/conventions (i.e., Association of Teacher Educators, Kappa Delta Phi Convocation, American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, WCU Pedagogy Research Symposium, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, National Association of Teachers of Science, International Reading Association Conference).

Faculty and administrators reported their annual scholarship activities and professional development programs. Additional scholarly activities include Institutional Research for accreditation purposes, program evaluation, and program improvement. The entire faculty contributes to the data analysis, conclusions, and recommendations.

The School of Education participated in:  
WCU CANVAS COURSE SYSTEM TRAINING;  
WCU Professional Relationships - Faculty and Students;  
Technology updates linking instructional effectiveness to classroom learning impact;

Scholarly Activities and Professional Development by faculty member:

Dr. Ben Burnett  
PREPS Conference - Presenter  
Making Connections Convention - Participant  
Convocation Corinth - Key Note  
Convocation Pearl - Key Note  
Ms. Association of School Superintendents - Presenter  
Ms. Bandmaster's Association - Presenter  
EPIC Principal's Training - Presenter  
Multiple Teacher Academy Programs - Presenter

Dr. June Hornsby  
Making Connections - Participant  
Mississippi Professional Educators - Participant  
Pedagogy Conference - Presenter  
MDE LTRS Training - Participant  
CEEDAR National Conference - Presenter  
CEEDAR State Conference - Participant

Mrs. Phyllis Armstrong  
Mississippi Reading Conference - Participant  
WCU Pedagogy Conference - Presenter  
MDE LTRS Training - Participant  
WCU Professional Office Relations  
EDTPA National Observer Training Course

Dr. Barry Morris  
Mississippi Educational Computers Association Convention - Participant  
Mississippi Professional Educators Convention - Participant  
Mississippi Reading Association Convention - Participant  
WCU Pedagogy Conference - Participant  
MDE - CAEP Training - Participant  
CEEDAR Conference - Participant

Dr. Christina Liveritt  
National Association for Gifted Children - Poster Session  
Mississippi Association for Gifted Children Convention - Participant  
PREPS - Program of Research and Evaluation for Public Schools - Presenter  
WCU Pedagogy Conference - Participant

Dr. Chuck Benigno  
Pedagogy Conference - Presenter

Dr. Susan Whitcomb  
International Dyslexia Association Conference - Participant  
Southeastern Delta Kappa Gamma Conference - Participant  
Cedar Conference - Participant  
Article - "Being a change agent in the schools" - In Progress

Dr. Bitsy Miller  
PREPS Conference Participants  
Making Connections - Participant  
Children's Book Festival - Participant  
SECA Southern Early Childhood Association Participant  
Mississippi Early Childhood Association Participant  
Cedar Conference Participant  
Pedagogy Conference Participant

Dr. Tammie Brown  
WCU Pedagogy Conference - Participant  
CAEP National Conference - Participant  
CEEDAR Conference - Participant  
Association of Teacher Educators - Presenter and Conference Organizer  
Chair - Network of Secondary Educators  
Southeastern Regional Association of Teacher Educators - Board of Directors  
Contributor to Mississippi Teacher Internship Collaborative Assessments

Dr. Allison Downing  
AERA Conference - Presenter

Dr. Jeannie Lockley  
Institutions of Higher Learning Conference - Presenter  
AERA Convention - Presenter  
Article "Differentiated Instruction" In Progress  
Advance Mississippi Conference - Presenter

Dr. Liesa Weaver  
PREPS Conference - Presenter  
ASCD Educational Leadership Conference - Participant

Dr. Irene Dearman  
ASCD Educational Leadership Conference - Participant

Dr. Walter Cooper  
NFL Facilities Conference - Participant

Dr. Mark Yeager  
Rehab Association of Mississippi - Presenter  
Council on Exceptional Children - Participant  
PREPS Conference - Participant  
Pedagogy Conference - Presenter

Dr. Jalynn Roberts  
Institutions of Higher Learning Conference - Presenter  
PREPS Conference - Presenter  
AERA Conference - Presenter  
Article "Differentiated Instruction" - In Progress  
Advance Mississippi Conference - Presenter

Dr. Melony Hanson  
Article "Teacher attitudes about I-Ready and instructional time" In progress  
Mississippi Science Teachers Association Convention - Participant

Dr. Noal Cochran  
Making Connections State Department of Education - Participant  
State Department of Education CAEP Training - Participant  
Pedagogy Conference - Presenter

Dr. Cassie Conner  
SACS Annual Meeting Dallas - Participant  
ASCD Educational Leadership - Participant  
SACS Annual Meeting Georgia - Participant  
President Elect Training Rotary - Participant  
Mississippi Reading Association Convention - Participant  
Article "Literacy Pre-Assessments Survey" - In Progress

## 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 using faculty across all programs focus on analyzing the data presented in report format from the key assessments. The School of Education sets annual goals at the beginning of each academic year combining all faculties (Tradition and Hattiesburg) and departments (Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Leadership, and Health, Physical Education, Recreation). These goals are assigned to action committees to initiate reviews of data, recommend action initiatives, and monitor progress linking all activities back to our conceptual framework outcomes and CAEP standards. There are follow-up School of Education faculty meetings throughout the academic year.

What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?

Redesign of the Clinical Education Experience for undergraduate candidates has been the single greatest innovation. Although the redesign of the clinical education experience occurred prior to the past year, it has been in the process of evaluation and refinement, assessment, and the addition of EdTPA standards and clinical assessment tools incorporated into the candidates' experience.

Based on feedback from the partnership in the service area (i.e. school districts in southern Mississippi) and the candidates, the Ed.D. Educational Leadership program went through a major redesign this academic year to better define the research process and incorporate it into a more efficient timeline.

The redesign of EDU 300 Introduction to Education enabled candidates to move into the field as apprentices under the guidance of mentors on the first day of their field experience. Candidates also wrote co-teaching lesson plans with their mentors. They were also evaluated on their instructional delivery, content knowledge, and professional dispositions.

The feedback from principals and completers indicated a need for a greater focus on classroom management skills. Therefore, an additional field experience was established called Residency I which effectively added ten weeks to the original thirteen week residency. The feedback from key assessments, observations by EPP faculty observers and clinical faculty in the P-12 setting has generated data that indicates significant increase in classroom management skills. Candidates who do not meet the classroom management benchmarks as established by the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument will repeat the Residency I experience. This has resulted in 100% pass rate of Residency II, as well as candidates demonstrating improved classroom management skills.

How are progress and results tracked?

TK20 is the electronic database system linked to CANVAS (a course delivery system) to track all candidates' progress (undergraduate and graduate) across their professional development, content knowledge, pedagogy, instructional delivery, technology skills, and professional dispositions. These data are analyzed by faculty in teams to determine innovation and instructional improvements. All faculty, especially clinical faculty in the field, have access to TK20 and Canvas to input data from the field. The data input are tied to field assignments across coursework, tied to SPA outcomes, INTASC, Conceptual Framework, and CAEP standards.

How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

Program changes have now been in place for a full year (undergraduate and graduate). The EPP is collecting data from key assessments for analysis on candidate performance. Course adjustments have been made through faculty discussions in Professional Learning Community meetings (Dissertation Chairs) and departmental faculty meetings. Surveys have been implemented this year to assess completer program satisfaction and their recommendations for program and instructional revisions.

What quality assurance system did the provider review?

Departmental leadership has reviewed the EdTPA QAS which evaluates candidate performance in the field. The leadership and faculty have approved adding the EdTPA to the School of Education's Quality Assurance System.

What patterns across the preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?

Candidates' skills in classroom management was indicated by stakeholders to be a weakness. Candidates recommended longer field experiences including the first course of the undergraduate program. The field experiences have been doubled by developing the Residency I program and EDU 300 apprenticeship. The MAT graduate program increased its focus on classroom management during the seminars providing practical tools for immediate implementation in the candidates' classrooms.

An important program strength from completer data showed that our completers are remaining in the profession at a much higher percentage than the national and state average. There is also a strong career satisfaction among completers indicating that they were well prepared to enter into the profession. Program satisfaction was also a strength among those surveyed.

How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?

The School of Education's QAS documents from multiple measures, i.e., Teacher Internship Assessment Instrument, PRAXIS Content Knowledge Scores, Comprehensive Examinations, Content Knowledge examinations, unit planning, differentiation of instruction lesson analysis, and lesson planning, that program candidates contribute to an expected level of student learning growth. Faculty and administration met on multiple occasions to analyze data, seek out trends, and build improvements to correct identified weaknesses, such as length of internship and strengthening differentiated instruction projects.

How did the provider test innovations?

The EPP tested innovations through the use of surveys, multiple performance measures, and feedback from stakeholders.

How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?

In undergraduate settings, the EPP uses ACT, PRAXIS Core (Reading, Writing, Mathematics), cumulative GPAs, professional dispositions, and performance in core courses (EDU 300 Introduction in Education, EDU 300.1 Field Experiences, EDR 318 Early Literacy Instruction I, and EDU 372 Survey of the Exceptional Child). The EPP's admission GPA mean for 2017 was 3.17 which exceeds the CAEP expectation.

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?

Data Day (semi-annual) completes program data analysis (TK20 reports, surveys, stakeholder interviews, faculty members collecting anecdotal data from clinical faculty and administrators from our service area, and state department mandates - Foundations of Reading examination requirement). Anecdotal comments from clinical faculty requested, that due to the lack of differentiation in classroom instruction among clinical faculty, could the EPP focus more strongly on adding differentiated instruction lesson planning in its professional preparation. This activity was increased across all curriculum classes (Science, Social Studies, Reading, Mathematics, and Language Arts).

How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

The EPP surveyed 5,000 completers (graduate and undergraduate) on teacher retention, program satisfaction, recommendations for program improvements, and satisfaction of their own professional career. The data analysis showed a strong positive satisfaction in their professional preparation in their individual programs. Our completers' retention rate (remaining in the profession after five years) was over 80%. This is an ongoing annual process to update data on our alumni.

MACTE (Mississippi Association of Colleges of Teacher Education) Survey was implemented in 2017 to reach all educators in the state collect data on their professional development and program satisfaction. This data were disaggregated by the MACTE and distributed to the EPPs. The data show there was a high completer program satisfaction concerning their own professional development. The data showed the same outcome as the first survey concerning teacher retention in the profession. This will continue to an annual event.

A new survey for graduate students in our programs was initiated in summer of 2017 in EDU 640 and initiated in EDL 789 and EDL 608 in spring of 2018. The survey documents milestones of completers in their professional careers.

The survey data was compiled and reviewed by faculty in all departments. Program changes continue to be implemented in all online courses to assure better communications among students and their faculty in an online setting. The university has initiated an evaluation instrument for online courses which has produced a number of major innovations to increase communication and strengthen relationships by developing an intellectual community of colleagues rather than candidates in a cohort.

Major changes in the undergraduate and graduate programs were driven by feedback coming from completers, administrators, candidates, and clinical faculty in the field. This data was derived from official surveys, interviews, and anecdotal feedback. Course evaluations allow candidates to offer recommendations for course changes which have been followed up and considered. Superintendent meetings have offered valuable insight into the quality of our candidates' preparation. This year the data surveys will be analyzed for future program plans and improvements.

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
- 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.

-  Ed.S.\_Educational\_Leadership\_(Principal\_License).docx
-  Ed.S.\_Emotional\_and\_Behavioral\_Disorders.doc
-  M.Ed.\_Art\_Education.docx
-  M.Ed.\_Art\_of\_Teaching\_(MAT)\_Elementary\_Education.docx
-  M.Ed.\_Art\_of\_Teaching\_(MAT)\_Secondary\_Education.docx
-  M.Ed.\_Biology\_Education.doc
-  M.Ed.\_Dyslexia\_Therapy.docx
-  M.Ed.\_Educational\_Leadership\_(Principal\_License).docx
-  M.Ed.\_English\_Education.docx
-  M.Ed.\_Gifted\_Education.docx
-  M.Ed.\_Mathematics\_Education.docx
-  M.Ed.\_Mild\_and\_Moderate\_Disabilities.docx
-  M.Ed.\_Secondary\_Education.doc
-  M.Ed.\_Social\_Studies\_Education.docx
-  M.Ed.\_Teaching\_and\_Learning\_Globally.docx

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or service 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 successful transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful reflection regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the following 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 made on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use the 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 fully prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text applies.

Working towards establishing collaborative partnerships with our constituents/stakeholders (faculty, students, communities, districts, EPPs, schools). We are also work on a more collaborative placement protocol involving all of our field experiences. The School of Education is aligning all data collection points to link and support the program/learner outcomes. This year was the beginning of a major initiative to reach out to alumni concerning their professional experiences and recommendations for the School of Education's programs. Faculty will be exploring establishing clear data points to show graduates of our program impact on the K-12 classroom. A major initiative about impact on learning is dependent on the State of Mississippi releasing student data information aggregated by EPP. The software has been completed to collect data statewide. This year could be the first EPP WCU Student Impact Report from the state. At this time we use our own impact report in EDU 640 Curriculum Planning.

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

- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 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
- 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
- A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
- A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
- A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
- x.2 Technology

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 2018 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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