2019 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 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

252

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]

181

Total number of program completers 433

---

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

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

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

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

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

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.wcu.edu/learn/departments-schools-colleges/ceap/about-the-college/office-of-assesment.aspx

Description of data accessible via link: We address all items related to annual reporting measures on this page.

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?*

In reviewing our Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years, we have considered data from each category.

1. Impact on P-12 Learning and Development

Over three years of data provided to us from North Carolina Department of Public Instruction IHE reports, our alumni track closely with all beginning teachers in the state on their contributions to student academic success. Percentage of WCU alumni who do not meet expected growth has fluctuated over this time frame, but are generally close to beginning teachers across the state. One area of some improvement is in the percentage of WCU alumni who exceed expected growth. This has been rising and is higher than the state percentage for the first time in 2017-2018. It remains to be seen if this is a trend, but could indicate WCU is producing a number of students who are able to achieve strong growth rates.

2. Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

One indicator or teaching effectiveness is beginning teacher performance ratings in North Carolina public schools. The ratings are completed by principals are performance areas are aligned to state teaching standards:
• Standard 1: Teachers Demonstrate Leadership
• Standard 2: Teachers Establish a Respectful Environment for a Diverse Population of Students
• Standard 3: Teachers Know the Content They Teach
• Standard 4: Teachers Facilitate Learning for Their Students
• Standard 5: Teachers Reflect on Their Practice

The data show our alumni track closely with all beginning teachers in the state on their rated performance. High percentages (92% and up) of our alumni are proficient or higher on the standards and percentages have increased in this three year period. In all five standards, the most recent data shows our candidates are rated the same or higher on average than all beginning teachers statewide.

3. Satisfaction of Employers and Employment Milestones

The NC Employer Survey has been developed by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and the Education Policy Initiative at Carolina (EPIC). The survey requires NC principals or assistant principals to rate all beginning teachers on 21 items that are aligned to the state's professional teaching standards. This survey was first administered in 2017 and the current results show WCU as comparable to other preparation paths. One area that has slightly lower numbers is working with English Language Learners.

4. Satisfaction of Program Completers

The NC Department of Public Instruction administers beginning teacher surveys. The data compare teachers who are WCU alumni, teachers prepared by all other campuses in the UNC System, and all teachers prepared by private NC universities. This data has been collected since 2016. These graphs indicate that WCU graduates have responses generally comparable to other beginning teachers in the state. Beginning teachers from WCU most highly value student teaching, fieldwork, and faculty.

5. Graduation Rates

With respect to graduation rates, students may enter the university intending to major in one area of teacher education but eventually select another teacher education major. Thus, we are reporting a single graduation rate for all programs in aggregate. We disaggregate only on cohort (calendar year of first enrollment at the university) and undergraduate vs. graduate degree. Our Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness has just begun to compile program-level graduation rates and we do not yet have information for other programs for comparison. In addition, we have no state-level comparative data. We will monitor this and compare to benchmark data when available.

Undergraduate Program Graduation Rates

Undergraduate program graduation rates range from 32 to 38% within four years of enrollment and 41 to 47% within six years of enrollment. For example, of all students who enrolled at WCU for the first time in 2012 AND who declared a teacher education major at some point in their time at WCU, 36% graduated in a teacher education program within four years of enrollment and 47% graduated in a teacher education program within six years of enrollment. Note that the percentage of teacher education graduates dips in 2010 but rises again after this. It is difficult to point to a single factor, but it should be noted that pass rates on exams required for licensure have risen over time in parallel.

Graduate Program Graduation Rates

Graduate programs graduation rates have been relatively steady since 2011 and range from 77 to 80%.

6. Abilities of Completers to be Licensed

Our percentage of program graduates who hold a NC teaching license one year after graduation fluctuates and ranges between 81 and 100 percent. The numbers are generally comparable to state averages. Recent testing requirements for some programs such as elementary and special education have impacted percentages of graduates who are licensed. We have created a Test Preparation Task Force to address related issues and have implemented related workshops and gathered resources to support our students. In spring 2019, North Carolina has changed these testing requirements and we expect to see higher licensure exam passing rates in these areas.

7. Abilities of Completers to be Hired

Once again, our percentages fluctuate and are generally comparable to state averages. The percentage of program graduates who hold a NC teaching position one year after graduate ranges from 62 to 73 percent. We do know that a number of our completers plan to teach outside of North Carolina after graduation. We do not have data on hiring numbers for our completers outside of North Carolina.

8. Consumer Information

Western Carolina University is an NC Promise campus, where we aim to address college affordability by reducing the cost of tuition with funding from the state of North Carolina. This ensures the same high-quality educational experience for an even greater value. Tuition rates are reviewed and set annually by the North Carolina legislature. Beginning in Fall 2018 semester, all undergraduate students, both residential and online, attending WCU receive dramatically reduced student tuition costs as part of a new program from the State of North Carolina called the NC Promise Tuition Plan.

The current default rate for all WCU students entering repayment is 6.5. This rate encompasses both undergraduate and graduate students that have gone into default. We are not able to accurately determine this rate by major and thus are not able to separate

out only programs accredited by CAEP.

Overall, most of the data on our website pertains to initial programs. Our advanced-level programs are formulating plans to satisfy Standard A.4. We have drafted generic satisfaction surveys that are being adapted by each program for its own needs. In addition, we are working on a project with our campus Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness to generate graduation rates for all initial-level programs in aggregate and all advanced-level programs in aggregate.
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.

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)**

Since our NCATE Legacy visit in 2015, the College of Education and Allied Professions has prioritized efforts related to increasing opportunities to interact with diverse candidates. These efforts include recruitment of a diverse pool of candidates, retention and successful completion of candidates, and integration of events and activities to promote, embrace, and advocate for diversity and inclusivity.

Recruitment

In 2015, the College of Education and Allied Professions facilitated a university-wide plan for Teacher Recruitment for the University of North Carolina System Office. One goal in this plan 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. Our recruitment efforts have focused on three main areas to meet these goals.
1) We seek to eliminate barriers to access through intentional events and partnerships with B-12 and community college partners.
2) We work to promote teaching as a profession with an intentional emphasis on high needs areas in the state.
3) We intentionally seek out and participate in opportunities that promote the recruitment of a diverse student body within our teacher education programs.

We accomplish these goals through activities that are developed in consultation with community partners, are collaborative efforts between faculty, staff, and administrators, and are informed by feedback from participants.
• We visit high schools, community colleges, teacher professional development events, and community events to provide information and resources related to college access and teacher education and intentionally participate in opportunities that have potential to increase diversity.
• We host events at WCU such as Teachers of Tomorrow days.
• We participate in recruitment fairs.
• We advertise our programs through websites, social media, videos, and mailings.
• In 2018 we became one of three anchor institutions with the Future Teachers of North Carolina (FTNC). The purpose of FTNC is to encourage high-achieving high school students with strong academic, interpersonal, and leadership skills to consider teaching as a career.
• We partner with larger initiatives focused on recruitment of a more diverse pool of teacher candidates, especially in high needs areas. For example, in February 2019 WCU joined an inaugural cohort of teacher preparation programs to partner with BestNC on an initiative called Teach NC, which aims to inspire interest in the teaching profession and generate a stronger, more diverse pool of applicants to Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs), and ultimately to school districts in North Carolina.

Retention and Successful Completion of Diverse Candidates

We prioritize academic excellence and supporting students to successfully complete degrees within professional education and allied professions by:
• Providing exemplary holistic advising to our students so they will develop the skills and attitudes necessary to make informed decisions regarding their academic goals and overall well-being.
• Providing high-quality field/clinical experiences throughout the teacher education program that engage students in developing the skills and dispositions necessary to be successful in the education profession.
• Providing quality support and resources related to professional education examinations and portfolio assessments.

Events and Activities

Faculty, staff, and administrators collaborate to purposefully plan and host events and activities that promote, embrace, and

• Transformative Rural Urban Exchange [TRUE] is a collaborative undertaking involving the College of Education and Allied Professions (CEAP) at WCU and our partner, the School of Education at North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University (NC A&T SU), a Historically Black University (HBCU) in Greensboro, NC. Every year, a small group of students from WCU and NC A&T SU is selected to spend a week at their partner university and, in turn, host their counterparts at their home university. TRUE provides teacher-education students with experience in working with diverse higher education/public school faculty, candidates, and P-12 students.
• Initiatives planned and implemented through the College of Education and Allied Professions Diversity Committee such as our Diversity Speaker series, Diversity Dialogues, book studies, and a diverse settings requirement for all teacher education candidates which focuses on cultural competence and culturally responsive practices.
• Prioritization at the university and college levels to build a more diverse and inclusive student, faculty, and staff community to provide an environment in which all can be successful academically and professionally, as demonstrated in WCU Strategic Plan updates approved in 2018.

In Summary

Our efforts to recruit a more diverse population to our teacher education programs have been ongoing for many years with updated efforts implemented each year. We see the importance of considering diversity using a range of demographics including race and additional characteristics such as socioeconomic status and the number of first-generation college students served. As of 2018-2019, forty-three percent of Western Carolina University's students receive Pell grants and forty percent are first-generation college students. In Spring 2019, we have created a teacher recruitment task force to collaboratively discuss our progress since the comprehensive recruitment plan was created in 2015, current efforts, and a plan for strategically moving forward. Despite many obstacles, including the location of Western Carolina University, the university, the College of Education and Allied Professions, and WCU's teacher education programs remain highly committed to increased diversity among our candidates.

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?

edTPA National Scoring

In 2014 we began using the edTPA assessment as a meaningful way to assess our candidates content and pedagogical knowledge and to ensure that program completers can teach effectively and have positive impacts on P-12 students. We established an edTPA Commission, comprised of faculty from multiple teacher education programs, to oversee implementation of and policy related to this assessment, and we began with local scoring. In spring 2017, we began requiring all candidates to submit their edTPA portfolios to Pearson for national scoring. Based on a variety of factors including candidate local scoring performance, the practices of other states, and guidance from SCALE on setting a cut score, we initially set cut scores for each task (Task 1-Planning: 13, Task 2-Instructing: 13, Task 3-Assessment: 11). Candidates had to meet all three task cut scores to pass the assessment. Results from that term indicated that our average scores were Task 1—14.9, Task 2 -13.9, and Task 3 – 13.9 and our pass rate was 69%. Candidates who did not pass national scoring were required to revised and resubmit their portfolios for local scoring. In this first round of national scoring in spring 2017, we were surprised that our candidates scored better on Task 3-Assessing than we hypothesized from our local scoring experience. We also found the system of separate cut scores for each task was cumbersome to manage and difficult for candidates to understand. Further, the edTPA commission concluded that students that have some weaknesses in one task can learn from the experience, particularly if they are 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 cut-score of 40 for all 15-rubric edTPA programs.

Since spring 2017, we have consistently reviewed our national scoring data to identify areas of strength and need. While the scores on Task 3-Assessing are higher than our original local scores, they continue to be slightly lower than the scores on Tasks 1 and 2. This has reinforced the need for programs to ensure careful attention to preparation in the area of assessment. To consider Task 3 more closely, we looked at the 5 assessment rubrics. In most semesters, our lowest average scores were on rubric 13 which focuses on student use of feedback. From this we saw a need to help our candidates know, describe, and use strategies to help their students understand and use feedback. Another area of need is rubric 14 which focuses on academic language and analyzing students' language use and subject-specific learning. These areas of need inform course content across programs. For example, an assignment was modified in a mathematics methods course to help teacher candidates plan and teach lessons based upon analysis of student work. We will continue to monitor our edTPA data to evaluate the impact on outcomes.

Diversity

In an effort to give our candidates more exposure to diverse school environments, we worked over 2016-2017 to create a policy on diverse settings in field experiences. We focused on providing opportunities for our teacher candidates that would help them gain experience working in a range of schools. The policy was discussed, revised, and adopted by our Professional Education Council which includes IHE faculty, staff, administrators, and students as well as public school partners. This new policy was implemented in the 2017-2018 academic year. When placements were made throughout a student's academic program, a variety of settings were chosen to help our teacher candidates interact with diverse populations and schools. Then when students began their final year internship experience, the Director of the Office of Field Experiences reviewed placements. If students did not meet the diversity policy expectations at that time, they were given the opportunity to complete an additional 10-hour field experience in a setting that fulfilled the requirement. We are now collecting data related to this policy and will review and analyze the data annually as part of our continuous improvement efforts.

New Innovation: 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 to develop the first lab schools in the state opening for the 2017-2018 school year. WCU worked in partnership with the Jackson County Schools to establish The Catamount School (TCS). TCS is a middle school located on the Smoky Mountain High School campus and is built around a commitment to a small community of teachers and learners with an enrollment of up to 75 students. The Catamount School is designed to serve the whole child with a focus on resiliency and project-based learning. By legislation, NC laboratory schools serve students who may not be reaching their full academic potential in the traditional classroom.

The Catamount School offers a unique opportunity to provide more in-depth and practice-based preparation experiences to pre-service teachers and school leaders. 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:
• WCU faculty teach undergraduate middle grades coursework with accompanying clinical experience on site, individually or in a co-teaching context with the TCS content teacher.
• Opportunities for WCU candidates to complete early field experiences and teaching internships at TCS supervised by TCS teachers serving as their cooperating teachers.
• School Counseling graduate assistants provide counseling opportunities to TCS students.
• School and Clinical Psychology graduate students have opportunities to assist with MTSS interventions, data collection, and psychological assessments.
• Speech Language Pathology and Masters in School Administration students have supported students and teachers.

As stated in the November 2018 Review and Evaluation of the Educational Effectiveness of the Laboratory Schools report

presented to the North Carolina Joint Education Oversight Committee, WCU placed 28 middle grades licensure candidates—13 juniors and 15 seniors—at The Catamount School for clinical experiences. Most of these candidates participated in early field experiences such as observing laboratory school classes and working in small groups with laboratory school students. Three of the senior year middle grades candidates completed their student teaching (Intern 1 and 2) at The Catamount School. In interviews, these three candidates reported feeling well-prepared (particularly with classroom management and relationship-building skills) and ready to work with high-need students. Additionally, WCU placed 22 health and physical education candidates at The Catamount School. Eleven of these health and physical education candidates were completing a behavior management and pedagogy practicum, and 11 completed their Intern 1 semester (six in the fall, five in the spring) at The Catamount School. Three of the Intern 1 health and physical education candidates stayed at The Catamount School for their Intern 2 placement (student teaching) in spring 2018.

In 2017-2018, TCS students met growth targets for economically disadvantaged students and in math. Overall growth in math was 67%, in reading with 71.4%, and in science was 91.7%. More than half (58%) of eighth-graders took Math I and 71% of the Math I students earned high school credit. All of the eighth graders learned both eighth grade science and ninth grade Earth and Environmental Science. High school course credit for Earth and Environmental Science was earned by 92% of the eighth graders.

While it is too early to identify best laboratory school practices, based on interviews with COE faculty and laboratory school personnel, it is possible to highlight several practices or tenets that the laboratory schools strongly support and that may lead to desired academic and social-emotional outcomes. These practices or tenets include prioritizing relationships with students, focusing on the needs of the whole child, and embedding university resources and supports in the laboratory school.

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 TCS middle school students and continual improvement efforts. We are committed to deep immersion of the professional preparation programs through course-based field experiences, internships, and the exchange of faculty between the lab school and campus. We are also committed to P12 academic growth and performance and a continued focus on targeted interventions.

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

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
1.5 Model and apply technology standards
2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
3.3 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
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
5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
x.1 Diversity

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

📎 **Section_6_2019_Data.pdf**

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

⊙ **Yes** ○ **No**

6.3 Optional Comments

Section 7: Transition

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

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

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

☐ **No identified gaps**

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

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. In 2017-2018 our focus
was on identifying gaps that we had in meeting the criteria for each of the CAEP Initial Level standards. In 2018-2019, we have
continued work on Initial Level Standards and added in the same analysis for our Advanced Level programs. The results of our
work and plans for future work are outlined below:

Overall

A significant focus area that past year was clearly categorizing each of our programs into the correct level for CAEP standards.
While this seemed simple at first, it became clear that some areas were unclear. We worked with our state liaison and she has
confirmed our classifications related to initial and advanced standards. In addition, she has helped us determine which of our
programs fall into the advanced standards as add-on programs and consequently need to address only component A.1.1.

Initial Level Programs

Key assessments and evidences have been identified for all standards and data collection has begun.

Standard 1: The majority of the key assessments that we identified for this standard were considered strong enough to meet CAEP
sufficiency criteria. Over the past year, we created, validated, and began to use one assessment (Professional Development Plan)
that specifically addresses diversity and technology. 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 had in place to the Educators Disposition
Assessment (EDA). We began using the EDA in Fall 2018. Ongoing work focuses on the reliable use of these assessments.

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. This past year we reviewed, updated, and validated surveys including Clinical Educator
Evaluation of the Field Supervisor; Intern Evaluation of the Clinical Educator, Field Supervisor, and OFE; and an Early Field
Experience Evaluation that is completed by host teachers about early field experience students. We have focused on enhancing
existing processes to ensure co-construction of mutually beneficial partnerships. For example, 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. In addition to our regular Professional Education Council meetings that include faculty, administrators, teacher
candidates, and P12 partners, we routinely meet with school partners to discuss current education issues and needs and ways we
can collaboratively meet these needs.

Standard 3: An initial gap identified within this standard was the need to collect more data regarding recruitment. While we have a
strong recruitment plan in place and this plan is being implemented, more follow-up data regarding the impact of those recruitment
activities was needed. Over the past year, we have begun to collect and review this data to inform our practices. As stated in

Standard 1, we also adopted and began using a new dispositions assessment that is used for all students at least three times throughout their programs.

Standard 4: A review of data available to us within this standard indicated that we have data provided to us by the state on principal ratings of beginning teachers and on End of Grade Testing scores for our graduates. From the UNC System, we also have survey data from recent graduates and employers.

Standard 5: No significant gaps were identified related to this standard. Our university is highly engaged in setting program goals, assessing achievement of goals, and using that data for continuous improvement. We do recognize the need to continuously review these plans and annual reports to ensure that we are meeting sufficiency criteria. This past year this included teacher education programs reviewing and revising (as needed) student learning outcomes, curriculum maps, and assessment plans. We have worked to validate several new measures (Professional Development Plan and field experience surveys) and also to ensure reliability.

Advanced Level Programs

We recognize that meeting the criteria for these programs will be more of a challenge than for the Initial Level Programs but are making progress. We created an Advanced Level Standards Subcommittee, identified programs that are part of the advanced standards, and differentiated between programs that need to address all standards and those that need to address only A.1.1. Programs have begun creating tables that list assessment measures and additional key evidences and identifying strengths and gaps within each of the standards. Initially most of our measurements were EPP created and did not have validity and reliability data. We are analyzing and revising those assessments in relation to the CAEP Sufficiency Criteria and working towards ensuring that our measures are valid and reliable, as needed. We plan to begin related data collection during the 2019-2020 academic year and to also have related plans for full implementation of our assessments.

Standard 1: Most of our Advanced Level programs utilize EPP created measurements. We are working on revisions, validations, and reliability.

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 is sought out and incorporated into plans for improvements to clinical experiences.

Standard 3: Our Advanced Level programs already engage in a wide variety of 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. They are also being asked to clearly document criteria and processes.

Standard 4: Our Advanced Level programs are revisiting and revising existing surveys related to employer and completer satisfaction data and creating new ones as needed. We plan to have surveys ready to use by Fall 2019 and to collect data in the 2019-2020 academic year.

Standard 5: As with the Initial Level programs, our Advanced Level programs are highly engaged in setting program goals, assessing achievement of goals, and using that data for continuous improvement.

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

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
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

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

⦿ **Yes** ◯ **No**

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

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

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

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

Report Preparer's Information

Name:	Patricia Bricker
Position:	Associate Dean, Director of Teacher Education
Phone:	828-227-3352
E-mail:	bricker@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**