

2021 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 EPPs seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation]. Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial-Licensure Level and/or Advanced-Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).

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

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 2019-2020 ?

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 119

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 2019-2020 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?

- Discuss 1) emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends;
 2) programmatic/program-wide changes being planned as a results of these data;
 3) are benchmarks available for comparison; and
 4) are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

***Initial Licensure Programs**

Based on the data of these assessments during the 2017-2018 through 2019-2020 academic years, improvements were made to ensure that candidates receive adequate preparation for these exams during the program of study. The content categories of each assessment were analyzed and addressed in appropriate course(s) in the program of study. Test objectives covered on the Foundations of Reading Test are integrated in EDR 308 Early Literacy I and EDR 311 Early Literacy II. After successful completion of both courses, a Foundations of Reading Workshop is held on campus to review material identified by the test objectives, provide test-taking strategies, and equip students for success on the writing component of the test. This workshop is provided free of charge to students.

*Instruction: Pedagogical Skills

The program is designed to provide candidates multiple opportunities to learn core content and lesson planning using high-quality materials and aligned to standards. Candidates are also provided opportunities to apply skills in diverse P-12 settings. Students are introduced to basic lesson planning components in EDU 3000/3001 Introduction and Foundations of Education. Candidates are introduced to the needs of diverse learners in EDU 372 Survey of the Exceptional Child, and candidates are shown how to use the MDE Access for All Guide to enhance each child's learning. In EDR 308 Early Literacy I, candidates are given opportunities to create lessons using the gradual release of responsibility format focusing on key early literacy components: oral language development, concepts of print, phonological awareness, and phonics. In EDR 311 Early Literacy II, candidates continue to develop lesson planning skills and are introduced to the MDE Scaffolding Document, which they use as a tool to sequence lessons and plan whole/small group instruction specifically related to standards that include the following: fluency, vocabulary, literary text comprehension, informational text comprehension, pair-texted comprehension, and text connected writing. Refinement of planning quality lessons based on Mississippi College- and Career- Readiness Standards continues throughout the remaining EDU/EDR courses in the program as content is taught with an increase in expectations of candidates' knowledge of how to implement standards, measure learning, provide remediation/enrichment based on assessment data, and provide for the needs of diverse learners. An emphasis is placed on using instructional methods designed to promote higher-level learning and provide equity of learning for all students. By the end of the program at William Carey University, the goal is that students will meet or exceed expectations in the Teacher Internship Assessment Instrument domains.

*Assessment: Data-Driven Instruction

In all EDU/EDR classes, candidates are introduced to and practice using a variety of formative and summative assessments to inform instruction/professional practices and adjust instruction based on assessment data. Assessments are aligned with standards and include pre/post-tests, quizzes, unit tests, rubrics, checklists, exit tickets, and technology-based assessments. Methods of providing actionable, meaningful feedback to help students understand what they did well are modeled by professors. Candidates reflect on lessons taught and feedback provided to learners to better understand how to communicate to learners what steps need to be taken to improve learning.

How Data Was Used to Improve Program: Despite the data suggesting that candidates met or exceeded expectations for TIAI indicators 20-24, the pandemic clearly identified that there is still room for improvement in the program as to equity for all learners. During the 2020-2021 academic year, the importance of equity for all learners is being introduced to candidates and addressed in coursework. Candidates are also being equipped better handle issues related to emotional health due to the pandemic.

*Instruction: Technology - 2020 pandemic school shift to virtual learning

From the beginning of admission to the teacher education program through the student teacher experience, candidates practice using technology effectively to design, implement, and assess learning experiences based on state standards. An understanding that integrating technology into the learning environment is far more than using an interactive whiteboard as a projector. Candidates are required to include in lesson plans opportunities for learners to use technology to propose solutions, forge new understandings, solve problems, and imagine possibilities by making content relevant to learners in both in-person and virtual environments. Candidates are introduced to and implement in lessons discussion boards, Flipgrid, Kahoot, Padlet, etc.

How Data Was Used to Improve Program: Despite the data suggesting that candidates met or exceeded expectations for TIAI indicator 6, the pandemic clearly identified that there is still room for improvement in the use of technology to meet learning goals. It was immediately noted by university professors that there was a need to help candidates learn how to take a lesson plan "off the paper" and into a digital format. In EDR 311 Early Literacy II, candidates began creating digital literacy units in place of the traditional "paper" unit.

*Professional Responsibilities

Candidates are introduced to the Mississippi Educator Code of Conduct and Professional Dispositions in EDU 3000/3001 Introduction and Foundations of Education. Candidates complete the Professional Disposition Training provided at Mississippi Common Assessments Training (olemiss.edu) as part of the coursework for EDU 3000/3001 Introduction and Foundations of Education. Candidates are provided a Mississippi Educator Code of Conduct brochure, complete an assignment related to this document, and sign a notification that they received and understand both the Mississippi Educator Code of Conduct and Professional Dispositions. The signature sheet for both are kept in the candidate's file located in the School of Education Office. As noted in the chart below, the Mississippi Educator Code of Conduct and professional dispositions are embedded and assessed at multiple checkpoints throughout the program.

How Data Was Used to Improve Program: When candidates qualify for admission to the teacher education program, they obtain a membership in Mississippi Professional Educators (MPE). Candidates are kept apprised of updates and information related to the Mississippi Educator Code of Conduct.

*Diverse Clinical Experiences

According to Levine (2006), the most effective teacher preparation programs offer field experiences that are sustained over time, begin early, and provide application of theory to practice in real classrooms. WCU teacher education students begin field experience in their first trimester, observing in a variety of K-6th grade classrooms. In a students' junior year, a total of 98 hours of field experience is accrued (see course rotation sheet). Add to that number 718 hours from the year-long residency, and students graduate with 816 total hours of diverse and varied clinical experiences.

Since the fall of 2017, significant changes have occurred in the area of clinical practice. The most significant change occurred in the number of placements students accrued each trimester. For example, if a student were enrolled in three classes, which is full-time for a trimester, then the student would have three different placements in three different schools or one placement per course.

By the end of one year, the student would have been in nine or more different schools. Results from the 2017 SACS Effectiveness Report, reveal that students were not able to have high-quality experiences with students and teachers because the length of the time spent in each classroom did not allow for relationship building and deeper mentoring from the host teacher. In the winter of 2018, the program changed to one placement per trimester.

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 five more faculty and adjunct positions to reduce course demands on faculty. Overloads are not required. Faculty may choose not to add overloads after reaching their contractual credit hours' limit. Faculty members have been interviewed to determine their professional needs. Professional development is supported by funds set aside by the university and the School of Education. Professional development is provided for free by the university. Scholarship is encouraged and supported by the School of Education. Collaborative scholarship projects are encouraged among 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?

1-What quality assurance system data did the provider review?

The Mississippi Association of Colleges of Teacher Preparation (MACTE) has designed and implemented new state-wide initiatives which provide data on Impact on P-12 Learning and Development (State Assessment Scores by institution); Indicators of Teaching

Effectiveness (Principal's evaluation on five key areas: Leadership, Respectful Environment, Content Knowledge, Facilitating Learning, and Reflective Practice); Satisfaction of Employers and Employment Milestones (Mississippi Department of Education Survey); Satisfaction of Program Completers (Mississippi Department of Education Survey); Undergraduate Program Rates (University Graduation Rates Annual Report); Ability of Completers to be hired (Mississippi Department of Education Title II Report); and Consumer Information (University Financial Aid Office). Fifty content knowledge and practice assessments within courses are part of the assessment package which is reviewed by faculty annually. PRAXIS Assessment data across all licensure programs is reviewed annually. Faculty assessment of their own courses and changes they wish to make to improve effectiveness of instruction. Surveys of students for each course is also a key assessment as to the faculty's effectiveness of instructional delivery.

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

*Strength - Undergraduate and graduate recruitment project. Enrollment continues to climb at both the undergraduate and graduate program levels. For the past four terms, the School of Education has marked historically high enrollments breaking the enrollment figures of the past year.

*Strength - Graduation rates for the past year have been at historic highs in the undergraduate and graduate programs. In the teacher licensure programs, the School of Education continues to have highest rate of graduation for licensed practitioners.

*Strength - ACT scores and GPA scores have risen significantly as the quality of student applications have grown.

*Strength - Course alignment with national, CAEP, and state standards has continued with the entire curriculum in each program reviewed and aligned.

*Weakness - The impact of Covid on school operations has created a gap in faculty delivery to teacher preparation and advanced level candidates when discussing highly effective instructional strategies for students who are at home due to a closed school.

*Weakness - SLLA School Leadership Licensure Assessment remains a challenge for faculty to assist students to increase their pass rate for the assessment. Licensure rates have been affected by the pass rate issue.

3-How did the unit provide and use data/evidence for continuous improvement?

Teacher Education Committee works with secondary and elementary units to improve teacher effectiveness at the program level for all degrees. Proposals are presented to the Teacher Education Committee for review and recommendations. Annual Data Day reviews incorporating all faculty across campuses allow stakeholders to recommend new instructional and curricular strategies based on key assessment data analysis. Superintendents' Council and Principals' Council allow for interaction among stakeholders to build program improvement recommendations. The School of Education's Leadership Team (CAEP and SACS) serve as a planning unit to analyze program data and bring solutions to weaknesses in programs and courses.

4-How did the provider test innovations?

TK20 is our electronic assessment system that provides data on program changes and innovations through key assessments. Department chairs assign faculty committees to evaluate program changes (example: Educational Leadership team overseeing doctoral dissertation procedures). Another Educational Leadership team oversees Doctoral curriculum changes to improve and streamline the dissertation process. These two committees are active throughout the year drawing on faculty and student recommendations for program improvement. Undergraduate Internship Committee works on the design and implementation of internship and residency instructional strategies based on faculty and student recommendations/evaluations. Alternate Route Committee oversees the alternate route programs and analyzes program designs especially critical during the time when much of the curriculum went online due to the pandemic. School of Education faculty had to respond to the need for distance learning instructional strategies for schools that closed across the state.

5-What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?

*SLLA Test Preparation - Courses have been redesigned to focus on differing parts of the SLLA Leadership Examination in order to raise the pass rate on the first time students took the examination. This was based on the SLLA scores from the national examination.

*Foundations of Reading Test Preparation - The Mississippi Department of Education instituted a new test requirement for Elementary Education candidates in the undergraduate program. Initial data from the first administration of the examination allowed faculty to concentrate on specific areas of the examination. Courses were revised to focus on specific test preparation objectives as the candidates moved to their first administration of the Foundations of Reading examination. Subsequent examination administration scores allow faculty to monitor student success on the first administration of the examination.

*Undergraduate Residency Project - Based on Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) data, candidate residency courses have been redesigned to increase candidate scores on TIAI.

*Alternate Route (Master in the Art of Teaching) Internship - TIAI evidence and the issues of school closures have created an immediate demand for more instructional emphasis on distance learning. Candidates having to do curriculum conversions to an online distance project were supported by their faculty mentors. TIAI data and principal evaluations provide information on candidates' instructional effectiveness.

*Program changes based on data -

Developmental Residency I and II (TIAI key assessments);

Redesign of Educational Leadership content knowledge (SLLA data);

Redesign of Educational Leadership Internship program hours (Student Satisfaction Surveys);

Redesign of Dissertation Procedures (TK20 Writing Key Assessments).

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

Selection criteria in the Alternate Route program was abruptly changed by the Mississippi Department of Education eliminating PRAXIS scores (Reading, Writing, and Mathematics) as a criteria for admission for 2019-2020. This change is being considered for extension for the new year. This has created an unusual situation where candidates are judged on GPA and recommendations

alone. Key assessments in the first two courses are determining whether students are qualified to continue in graduate work. The first two courses are now considered part of the admissions process for continuation in the program. The Quality Assurance Assessment System monitors student progress through key assessments, observations, faculty recommendations, and student participation in course work.

7-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?

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

Decision-making includes collecting data from a wide-ranging variety of stakeholder organizations:

*District Superintendent Surveys;

*Principal Council;

*Two Superintendent Councils;

*PREPS Statewide conference;

*PREPS surveys;

*Educational Leadership mentors' evaluations (principal);

*Mentor teachers in the field in the Residency programs;

*MACTE - Mississippi Association of Colleges of Teacher Education meetings.

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
- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
- 3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
- 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
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
- A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
- A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
- x.2 Technology

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 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 on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's™ assessment of its evidence. It may help with 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 prepared by your CAEP site review in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text

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 2021 EPP Annual Report.

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Barry Noland Morris

Position: CAEP Coordinator

Phone: 6013186587

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 reviews.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount complete 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 review 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**