2018 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10875	**AACTE SID:**	4900
Institution:	Western Carolina University		
Unit:	College of Education and Allied Professions		

Section 1. AIMS Profile

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

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

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

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2016-2017 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

`196`

2.1.2 Number of completers in <u>advanced</u> 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]

`168`

Total number of program completers 364

---

[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 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

No Change / Not Applicable

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.

┌ 1
Link:	https://www.wcu.edu/learn/departments-schools-colleges/ceap/about-the-college/ceap-office-of-assessment/
Description of data accessible via link:	Surveys of principals and beginning teachers, exam pass rates, state data reports

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

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

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

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

Many of our Annual Reporting Measures are newly implemented or newly available to us. This includes impact data on P-12 students based on the NC Department of Public Instruction (DPI) value-add model, principal ratings of beginning teachers, the NC Employer Survey and the DPI Beginning Teacher Survey. These data generated by NC DPI have been released to our university over this academic year. These data sources provide benchmarks based on either all beginning teachers in the state or disaggregated by teacher preparation pathway.
As most of the data shared is new, we can say very little regarding trends at this point. On most measures, alumni who are beginning teachers are generally comparable to beginning teachers from other preparation pathways. Overall, NC principals are equally or more satisfied with WCU alumni on 21 key aspects of teaching than teachers prepared though alternative programs or out of state.
One item we are watching closely is the three Pearson exams that are required for licensure in elementary education and special education in NC. Pass rates on the first attempt at the exam are in the 40% to 60% range depending on the test and year. The scores on the Mathematics exam are the lowest of the three on the first attempt. We are reviewing our current efforts to prepare candidates for these exams, particularly math, and what additional activities we can engage in to prepare them for these exams. These data are shared on our college's assessment website and with governing bodies in the college, including the Professional

Education Council (a university committee that governs teacher education curriculum), the CEAP Leadership Council, and the CEAP Assessment Committee. The data are provided to these groups and a summary presentation is provided during meetings for discussion. Data that can be disaggregated is provided to individual programs through their assessment folders on the university's secure network drive. These data are discussed among programs on the annual Assessment Day and at other times during the academic year.

Most of the data on our website pertains to initial programs. Our CAEP Assessment Steering Committee is formulating plans to satisfy Standard A.4 and how to communicate those results widely.

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 4 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse candidates. (ITP) (ADV)

After our NCATE Legacy visit in 2015, the College of Education and Allied Professions facilitated a university-wide plan for Teacher Recruitment for the University of North Carolina General Administration. Each UNC IHE created such a plan, in which there were four sections: Situation Analysis, Recruitment Goal-Setting, Formulating Key Recruitment Strategies, and Developing Action Plans. The WCU Situation Analysis included descriptions of environmental factors, market characteristics, institutional practices, and financial incentives as both driving forces and restraining forces. In 2015-2016 grant money was used to fund a recruitment position to help initiate the activities within this plan.

Four Goals were developed for this plan. Goal 3 relates specifically to the Area for Improvement cited in our NCATE Legacy review: Increase minority representation among teacher education candidates by 10% over the next five years.

The Key Strategies developed for Goal 3 include the following:

a. Send recruitment materials and information about programs to local black sororities, fraternities, and churches.

b. Visit high schools (and send materials to these schools) with higher populations of minority students.

c. Take minority teacher education candidates on recruitment visits and to events.

d. Seek funding for scholarships to support underserved students of color (e.g., funding to support tuition and/or other costs). Or, seek funding to support graduates of targeted high schools with higher populations of minority students.

Five Action Plans were developed and four of these related directly to Goal 3 including:

a. Inquiry & Interaction Tracking
b. Focus on Freshman
c. Developing Prospects
d. Web & Social Media

Key Strategies within these Action Plans included:

a. Track teacher education inquiries, contacts, enrollment, retention, and program completion and use information to make additional contacts;

b. Maintain and enhance opportunities for freshman teacher education prospects;

c. Engage and interact with prospects in Western North Carolina and beyond with the goal of increasing enrollment in teacher education;

d. Engage the public, teacher education prospects, and current teacher education candidates through an active and professional social media and web presence.

Tasks that we have engaged in related to these strategies include:

a. Build an electronic system for tracking all inquiries (i.e., web, email, phone calls, mailings, events, etc.). Utilize tracking system to make additional contact with prospects via social media, email, and document campus visits.

• In 2015-2016 we began exploring the possibility of a tracking system and hope to have a system in place for the 2018-2019 school year.

• In 2015-2016 updates were done to the College website related to recruitment

b. Send recruitment materials and information about programs to local sororities, fraternities, student organizations, clubs, and churches with diverse populations.

• In 2015-2016 recruitment materials were sent out to a wide variety of local organizations but there are very few that have a diverse population

c. Participate in university-wide events to recruit undeclared students and major changes (e.g., Majors Fairs, Recalibrate Your Compass, etc.).

• This is an ongoing activity but the lack of a diverse student population is consistent across the university so there are few individuals with diversity attending these fairs.

d. Target high schools outside of Western North Carolina to recruit diverse candidates for teacher education programs. Visit high schools and other events outside Western North Carolina to recruit diverse candidates for teacher education programs (e.g, personal outreach).

• In 2015-2016 we participated in the WCU on Tour which visits high schools in the Greensboro, Raleigh and Charlotte areas where there are more opportunities to recruit diverse candidates.

e. Partner with Cherokee Central to connect current teacher education candidates with junior/senior students.

• We are still working out the details of this activity
f. Seek funding for scholarships to support underserved students of color (e.g., funding to support tuition and/or other costs).
• No specific scholarships to support underserved students of color have been identified.
g. Seek funding to support graduates of targeted high schools with higher populations of minority students.
• This activity is still in progress

Our efforts to recruit a more diverse population to our teacher education programs have been ongoing for many years with some new efforts implemented within the past year. Despite many obstacles, including the location of Western Carolina University, both the university and the School of Teaching and Learning within the College of Education and Allied professions have seen some improvement in enrollment of diverse students from 2011 to 2017. The following charts provide data regarding these improvements:

WCU Student Diversity Enrollment
Black or AA: 6% of students enrolled in 2011 to 6% of students enrolled in 2017
Hispanic: 3% of students enrolled in 2011 to 6% of students enrolled in 2017
Other: 9% of students enrolled in 2011 to 9% of students enrolled in 2017
White: 82% of students enrolled in 2011 to 79% of students enrolled in 2017

College of Education and Allied Professions: School of Teaching and Learning
Student Diversity Enrollment
Black or AA: 2% of students enrolled in 2011 to 4% of students enrolled in 2017
Hispanic: 2% of students enrolled in 2011 to 4% of students enrolled in 2017
Other: 10% of students enrolled in 2011 to 10% of students enrolled in 2017
White: 86% of students enrolled in 2011 to 82% of students enrolled in 2017

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?

THE CATAMOUNT SCHOOL (TCS)

A North Carolina General Statute was passed in 2016 requiring the University of North Carolina System to establish laboratory schools affiliated with university colleges of education in partnership with local school systems. The expectation for these lab schools was that they would provide classroom environments modeled after best practices and focused on researching and implementing enhanced education practices. The focus was on both improving student outcomes as well as providing high quality teacher and principal training.

Western Carolina University was one of two universities selected under this statute to develop the first lab schools in the state opening for the 2017-2018 school year. Additional lab schools will be opened by other universities for the 2018-2019 school year. Western Carolina University worked in partnership with the Jackson County Schools to establish The Catamount School for 6th, 7th, and 8th graders. The school is located on the Smokey Mountain High School campus and is built around a commitment to a small community of teachers and leaners with an enrollment of up to 75 students. The school employs 5 teachers (4 content areas and 1 exceptional children's), and 3 staff (principal, enrichment coordinator, and data manager/admin). In addition, 3 university faculty have part-time loads (Health and PE Teacher Leader, EC administrator, and Mentor Coach), 3 university faculty provide internship supervision, and 2 university faculty supervise field experiences. Numerous other faculty, staff, students, and community volunteers provide other services and enrichment.

This lab school provides WCU teacher education candidates with a wide range of opportunities for expanding teaching experiences. A model has been developed that consists of a combination of classes, observations, teaching, and internships provided to candidates each semester. Some examples of this include:
• Math Methods courses taught on-site by an Assistant Professor in Middle Grades Education who also teachers full-time at TCS.
• Other WCU faculty teach undergraduate middle grades coursework with accompanying clinical experience on site.
• Opportunities for WCU candidates to complete teaching internships at TCS supervised by TCS teachers serving as their cooperating teachers.
• Opportunities for Middle Grades majors to observe classes and work with individual TCS students.
• Health and Physical Education Candidates complete yearlong internship under the supervision of a WCU clinical instructor.
• Preservice teachers are able to participate in enrichment programs and clubs.
• School Counseling graduate assistants provide counseling opportunities to TCS students.
• School Psychology graduate students have opportunities to assist with MTSS interventions and data collection as well as psychological assessments completed as part of practicum requirements within the McKee Assessment and Psychological Services Clinic.

Since The Catamount School is just completing the first year of operation, the evaluation data being collected has not been completed, analyzed, or summarized. It is clear that this school has provided many more opportunities for our teacher education candidates and graduate students in support services programs to experience and participate in educational best practices. We look forward to continuing this work and having more data to analyze in the future regarding the impact of this school on the WCU candidates as well as the Middle School students enrolled in this program.

EDTPA – NATIONAL SCORING

Our state is moving towards requiring initial teacher candidates to pass an assessment such as edTPA or PPAT. In anticipation of this, our initial teacher education programs adopted the edTPA assessment with local scoring in 2014. We established an edTPA Commission to oversee implementation and policy of this assessment, made up of faculty from multiple teacher education programs. In the spring semester of 2017, for the first time we required all candidates to submit their edTPA portfolios to Pearson for national scoring. Based on candidate local scoring performance, the practices of other states, and guidance from SCALE on setting a cutscore, our campus set cutscores for each of the three tasks as follows: Task 1 – 13; Task 2 – 13; Task 3 – 11. Candidates had to meet all three task cutscores to pass the assessment. Results from that term indicated that our average scores were Task 1 – 14.9; Task 2 – 14.0; Task 3 – 14.0. Our pass rate was 69% based on our cutscores. Candidates who did not pass national scoring with our custscore system were required to revise and resubmit their portfolios for local scoring.

We were surprised that our candidates scored better on Task 3 than we hypothesized from our local scoring experience. We also found the system of separate cutscores for each Task was cumbersome to manage and difficult for candidates to understand. Further, the edTPA commission concluded that students that have some weakness in one task can learn from the experience, particularly if they are very strong in the skills exhibited in other tasks. Following an examination of the score data distribution and a logistic regression analysis of the score data from that term, the edTPA commission set a single cutscore of 40 for all 15-rubric edTPA programs.

As of the end of this spring semester (Spring 2018), we will have an entire academic year of edTPA data on all our candidates. Once we compile that data, we will look at individual rubrics and individual academic programs for patterns that indicate strengths and weaknesses.

MAED IN ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE GRADES EDUCATION

In 2013-2014, the MAEd in Elementary (ELED) and MAEd Middle Grades (MG) programs were placed on a university action plan due to a trend of declining enrollment numbers. At that time MAEd ELED enrollment was 8 students and MAEd MG enrollment was 4 students. The action plan included multiple changes to the programs, including a revision of the programs' mission and vision, revision of student learning outcomes, reduction in total required hours (to 30), changing to fully online delivery of the programs, and revisions of individual courses.

In addition, multiple recruiting strategies were implemented. In 2014, the program worked with the university marketing unit to run ads on Facebook for the MAED MG program. Since that time, the program coordinator has periodically created messaging for program recruitment for faculty to share on various social media platforms. In addition, every spring the program works with our distance education unit to purchase a list of North Carolina teachers that do not have an MAEd and email them marketing materials. We also email the North Carolina Curriculum Facilitators across the state with information on the program. Finally, in our undergraduate elementary and middle grades courses, we discuss the MAEd programs with juniors and seniors so they are aware. As of 2016-2017, there were 26 students enrolled (25 in the literacy track and 1 in the AIG track). Also, in the MAED MG program,

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.
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
3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
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
x.1 Diversity

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 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.

WCU's NCATE accreditation was reaffirmed in 2015-2016. We are preparing for our first CAEP accreditation visit in the Fall of 2021. In preparation for that visit, we have established a CAEP Steering Committee that began work during the 2016-2017 school year. Our initial work involved becoming familiar with the CAEP standards and Evidence Sufficiency criteria. This year our focus was on identifying gaps that we had in meeting the criteria for each of the CAEP standards. We began our work in the area of Initial Level programs and are now doing the same analysis for our Advanced Level programs. The results of our work and plans for future work are outlined below for each of the CAEP standards:

Initial Level Programs
Standard 1: The majority of the key assessments that we identified for this standard were considered strong enough to meet CAEP sufficiency criteria. We have identified one EPP created assessment that we have begun work on to develop reliability and validity data for and that work should be completed within the 2018-2019 school year. We also identified the need for a Dispositions measurement that met CAEP standards for reliability and validity and made the decision to change what we currently had in place for the Educators Disposition Assessment (EDA) offered through Tk20 so as to meet those standards.

Standard 2: No significant gaps were identified in this area but improvements were identified to further enhance our ability to meet the sufficiency criteria for this standard. We have implemented a method for each program to document the sharing of program data and input from outside constituencies during Program Advisory Board meetings. Over the summer we will review and update surveys of Candidates and Cooperating Teachers regarding field placement experiences.

Standard 3: The only gap identified within this standard was the need to collect more data regarding recruitment. We have a strong recruitment plan in place and this plan is being implemented but more follow-data regarding the impact of those recruitment activities is needed.

Standard 4: A review of data available to us within this standard indicated that we have data provided to us by the state on End of Grade Testing scores for our graduates. We recognize this as meeting the criteria related to impact on P-12 student learning at a very basic level and are considering other sources of data that may support this area further. This work will continue in the 2018-2019 school year. We also have employer satisfaction and completer satisfaction surveys but recognize that we need to review these to make sure they meet the CAEP Sufficiency Criteria. In addition, the state has started collecting and sharing some of this same information with EPPs and so we will be looking at those surveys compared to our own to determine what the best source of information will be for meeting this standard.

Standard 5: No significant gaps were identified related to this standard. Our university is very engaged in setting program goals, assessing achievement of goals, and using that data for continuous improvement. However, we do recognize the need to continuously review these plans and annual reports to ensure that we are meeting sufficiency criteria.

Advanced Level Programs
For our Advanced Level Programs, we have just begun our work on identifying key assessments within each of the standards and analyzing those assessments in relation to the CAEP Sufficiency Criteria. We recognize that meeting the criteria for these programs will be more of a challenge than for the Initial LevelPrograms but are putting a plan into place to make progress in this area. This plan will address the following identified gaps:

Standard 1: Most of our Advanced Level programs utilize EPP created measurements related to Standard 1 and these do not have reliability and validity data on them. We are currently identifying which measurements are of most importance within each of the Advanced Level Programs and during the 2018-2019 school year we will be doing reliability and validity studies on these measures.

Standard 2: Similar to our Initial Level programs, our Advanced Level programs all have Advisory Boards and have also been asked to document the sharing of program data and input from outside constituencies during their Advisory Board meetings. Efforts will also be made to ensure that partner feedback on clinical experiences are sought out and incorporated into plans for improvements to clinical experiences.

Standard 3: Our Advanced Level programs already engage in a wide-variety of different activities related to Candidate Quality and Selectivity. Programs are being encouraged to consider how best to measure success in this area in order to meet the CAEP Sufficiency Criteria

Standard 4: This is the standard where we have the greatest gap in being able to meet CAEP Sufficiency Criteria. All of the Advanced Level programs are starting to consider how best to obtain employer satisfaction and completer satisfaction data. Some programs currently have surveys in place but these need to be reviewed for sufficiency. This will also be a significant focus for our assessment work in the 2018-2019 academic year.

Standard 5: As with the Initial Level programs, our Advanced Level programs are very engaged in setting program goals, assessing achievement of goals, and using that data for continuous improvement. However, we do recognize the need to continuously review these plans and annual reports to ensure that we are meeting sufficiency criteria.

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

1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
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
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
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

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

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: Lee Nickles

Position: Director of Assessment & Technology

Phone: 828-227-3299

E-mail: lnickles@email.wcu.edu

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

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

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

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

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

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

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

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