2020 EPP Annual Report

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

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	⦿	◯
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	⦿	◯
1.1.3 Program listings	⦿	◯

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

Section 2. Program Completers

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

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure[1]   174

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]   168

Total number of program completers   342

---

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

> 1
>
> **Link:** https://www.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 was higher than the state percentage for the first time in 2017-2018 and continued to be so in 2018-2019. 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 of teaching effectiveness is beginning teacher performance ratings in North Carolina public schools. The ratings completed by principals are performance areas 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 (95% 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.

In the 2019-2020 academic year, our advanced programs piloted a survey of the satisfaction of employers with our recent graduates (graduates in the range of 2016-2019) they have hired. These results indicate employers are satisfied with our recent graduates with mean ratings scoring over 4 on a 5-point scale for all factors (apply skill and knowledge, apply research, lead collaborations, professional communication, professional standards and ethics, respect diversity, prepared for career path, and overall satisfaction). A relative strength is professional standards and ethics and a slightly lower average that may warrant attention, yet still over 4 on the 5-point scale, is the ability to apply research. These data do not indicate a significant area of weakness to address.

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, field work, and faculty.

In the 2019-2020 academic year, our advanced programs piloted a survey of the satisfaction of recent graduates with our programs. These results indicate graduates are satisfied with our programs with ratings averaging 4.5 and above on a 5-point scale on all factors (apply skill and knowledge, apply research, lead collaborations, professional standards/ethics, respect diversity, faculty support, field experiences, curriculum, and overall satisfaction). These data do not indicate a clear area of weakness to address.

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 33 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.

Most Advanced level programs, such as the MAED in Comprehensive Education and Masters of School Administration are designed so that at the completion of the program, the graduate has met all requirements for state licensure. We are in the planning stage of how to collect this information and report it for the advanced level programs.

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 60 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.

We are in the planning stage for acquiring and reporting this information for graduates of our advanced-level programs.

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.

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 and action. 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 and used in our continuous improvement efforts. An example is licensure exam data leading to content back mapping and curricular revision in programs such as Social Science, Inclusive, and Elementary Education.

Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 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, CEAP 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, CEAP facilitated a university-wide plan for Teacher Recruitment for the University of North Carolina System Office. 2019-2020 marks the end of that Teacher Recruitment plan, and 2020-2021 will usher in new recruitment goals and strategies. Increasing minority representation among teacher education candidates remains a primary focus. Our recruitment efforts focus on three main areas.
1) Eliminate barriers to access through intentional events and partnerships with B-12 and community college partners.
2) Promote teaching as a profession with an intentional emphasis on high needs areas in the state.
3) 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, administrators and students, and are informed by feedback from participants. Examples include:
• Personalized access events in our most rural public school districts to facilitate the completion of FAFSA and college applications at home schools.
• Visits to high schools, community colleges, teacher professional development events, and community events to provide information and resources related to college access and teacher education.
• Conference-style events at WCU, recruitment fairs, and advertising our programs through websites, social media, videos, and mailings.
• Serving as an anchor institutions with the Future Teachers of North Carolina.
• Partnering 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.
• A working group of faculty and staff tasked with exploring options for new initiatives for recruiting and retaining underrepresented students into our teacher education programs. To date, this working group has conducted focus groups and interviews to determine the perceived causes of our lack of diversity, consulted with other institutions who have had success in diversifying their TEP student populations, and invested many hours of professional development.

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

- 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?

Western Carolina University's programs operate within a Quality Assurance System that prioritizes systematic and regular assessment and continuous improvement. All WCU programs have established assessment plans that include goals, measurable outcomes, and assessment methods, targets, and implementation plans. These are dynamic documents that are informed by relevant standards and evidence-based practices. Within our education programs, they are accompanied by curriculum maps are and created by faculty in consultation with program advisory councils, the College of Education and Allied Professions Director of Assessment, Assessment Committee, and Associate Dean, and the Western Carolina University Director of Assessment. While there are program-specific curriculum maps and assessment plans, within our initial-level programs there are common assessments and evidences used to measure our performance.

All programs and faculty are engaged in an annual assessment process and progress towards goals is used to continue, modify, or reinforce aspects of our programs in order to ensure continuous improvement in program quality. To help facilitate this process, the College of Education and Allied Professions facilitates three annual events including a strategic planning day, an assessment day, and a partnership forum. This dedicated time helps faculty, staff, and partners develop shared understanding of our efforts to improve student learning and development and think intentionally about programmatic learning design. We are able to dive deeply into goals, outcomes, and continuous improvement efforts. In addition to our efforts within programs, our continuous improvement takes places across programs. Three examples from this past year follow.

edTPA Scores Driving Program Changes

Since Spring 2017, we have reviewed our national edTPA scoring data by program to identify areas of strength and need. Program faculty examine individual rubric scores in each program, with a target of students achieving a 3 on each rubric.

For one example, the BSED in Elementary Education program found that in 2017, less than 80% of candidates scored at least a three on rubrics 13 and 14. Several course level changes were made to address this; in particular, changes in the Intern I seminar course to add content and assignments to address assessment skills. As of Fall 2019, data on rubrics 13 and 14 have improved slightly but have not passed the threshold of at least 80% of candidates earning a three or higher. The program has continued to adjust the coverage of assessment in the Intern I seminar and will continue to watch results on those rubrics for indications of the effectiveness of that change.

Also, in the BSED in Secondary English program, less than 80% of students were passing all five Task 1 rubrics with at least a score of three in spring 2017. In response, the program added a mock edTPA Task 1 assignment to a core program course. Since then, data in different semesters has fluctuated between meeting and not meeting the 80% threshold. The program is continuing the intervention and monitoring as students move through the program to determine if additional intervention is needed.

Praxis Core Exams Driving Change

We regularly review exam scores across all programs. The Praxis Core Math score pass rate has been low for some years, preventing students from being admitted to teacher education. Of the three Praxis Core exams required for admission, math has the lowest first time pass rate for students in our programs. In some cases, this results in creating course schedules during advising that will let them continue with courses not required in the program while they attempt to bring up their score. However, this can delay graduation or result in an otherwise qualified student from being able to continue in teacher education.
After discussing licensure exam score data with our Professional Education Council, we set up a Teacher Education Test Prep Task Force. One intervention has been a series of workshops focused on the mathematics content required for the Praxis Core Math exam and was established in spring 2019. This has been offered in subsequent semesters, marketed to students in the introductory courses who are applying for admission to teacher education. Since offering these workshops, first time pass rates increased from 47% in fall 2018 (before the workshops) to 77% in fall 2019. It should be noted that over this period of time that the Praxis Core Math content was updated and our results may in part reflect this change.

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 Public Schools (JCPS) 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 leaners 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 TCS model focuses on middle-grade students that are academically, socially, and emotionally at-risk. These students are taught by experienced teachers who hold advanced degrees in their content areas. In addition, our lab school model incorporates university faculty and pre-service teacher, counselor, psychologist, and nursing interns, as well as high school students and staff, as additional supports for our students. In 2018-2019, a total of 121 WCU professional education students participated in clinical experiences at TCS including 101 in early field experiences, 12 in Intern I, 7 in Intern II (full-time student teaching), and 1 in school administration.

Changes that have occurred for the 2019-2020 school year include the implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), modified PBL format, modified Health/PE (H/PE) format and intervention formats, and the inclusion of a new school nurse with a more substantial nurse practicum experience. The modified PBL format resulted from professional development with the Buck Institute at the conclusion of last school year. H/PE scheduling was modified to separate the student population into smaller groups to allow for a more focused teaching and learning experience for both TCS students and WCU H/PE undergraduate interns. Additionally, because of the H/PE split, we were able to offer TCS students an additional non-core period to allow them to use for intervention, homework, or for guest speakers and enrichment activities that did not reduce core instruction time. We refer to this time as W.I.N. time which stands for What I Need. The new school nurse has organized and implemented a substantial improvement to both the services that TCS students receive and the experience that undergraduate nursing students receive.

One example of continuous improvement at TCS is focused on literacy instruction and supports. A collaboration between the regular education teacher, inclusion teacher, WCU faculty with expertise in literacy and middle grades education and his research team (WCU undergraduate middle grades and inclusive education teacher candidates) allows all students to participate in a baseline reading assessment and for the regular education and inclusion teacher to work side by side to plan and provide instruction that meets the needs of individual students in reading. To further support literacy instruction, identified students receive one-on-one and small group support for forty-five minutes two times a week. These focused intervention periods are facilitated by faculty at TCS, but also supported by TCS interns and WCU education majors. In addition to these scheduled intervention times, students whose data show intensive reading support needs receive one-on-one reading support provided by members of the research team under the direction of WCU faculty. Members of the team meet with students during the WIN intervention period to deliver one-on-one support to students who need it. Furthermore, this applies to other content areas as students receive help in the content area where they see the most deficits. Additionally, a research-based reading intervention protocol was put into place this year. It helps guide the undergraduate students working one-on-one with middle-grade students during intervention time. We look forward to continuing this work and having additional data to analyze regarding the impact of these innovations on the WCU candidates and completers as well as TCS students.

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
3.4 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
5.4 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 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 progre
on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may hel
the Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial lev
programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level

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

☐ **No identified gaps**

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

WCU's NCATE accreditation was reaffirmed in 2015-2016. We continue to prepare for submission of our Self Study Report in Fall
2020 and our first CAEP accreditation site visit in the Fall of 2021. We 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 continued work on Initial Level Standards and added in the same analysis for our Advanced Level
programs. Over the past two years we have worked with our state liaison to determine our program classifications related to CAEP
initial and advanced standards and update them as needed based upon new guidance provided by CAEP.

Initial Level Programs
Key assessments and evidences have been identified for all standards and data is being collected, analyzed, and used for
continuous improvement.

Standard 1: Key assessments are in place to address all components of this standard. They include an EPP-created and validated
Professional Development Plan, the Educators Dispositions Assessment, a Diversity Inventory, Early Field Experience Evaluations,
the state-required Certification of Teaching Capacity, edTPA, and licensure exams (Praxis II and Pearson). In 2019-2020, our
Elementary and Middle Grades Education programs are also piloting the preCPAST and CPAST evaluations.

Standard 2: Over the past several years, improvements have been made to meet the sufficiency criteria for this standard. We have
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 in
formal and informal settings to discuss current education issues and needs and ways we can collaboratively meet these needs. We
have also created evidence logs for this work.

Standard 3: We continue to work on our recruitment and retention efforts, are creating a new recruitment plan, and are prioritizing
recruitment of diverse candidates. In addition, over the past year we have enhanced processes to monitor our candidates progress
through our programs as can be seen with revised ways we use dispositions data and enact our internship gateway.

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: Western Carolina University's programs operate within a Quality Assurance System that prioritizes systematic and regular assessment and continuous improvement. All WCU programs have established assessment plans and curriculum maps that include goals, measurable outcomes, and assessment methods, targets, and implementation plans. These are dynamic documents that are informed by relevant standards and evidence-based practices and are reviewed by faculty in consultation with program advisory councils, the College of Education and Allied Professions Director of Assessment, Assessment Committee, and Associate Dean, and the Western Carolina University Director of Assessment. While there are program-specific curriculum maps and assessment plans, within our initial-level programs there are common assessments and evidences used to measure our performance. All programs and faculty are engaged in an annual assessment process, and progress towards goals is used to continue, modify, or reinforce aspects of our programs in order to ensure continuous improvement in program quality. To help facilitate this process, the College of Education and Allied Professions facilitates three annual events including a strategic planning day, an assessment day, and a partnership forum. This dedicated time helps faculty, staff, and partners develop shared understanding of our efforts to improve student learning and development and think intentionally about programmatic learning design. We are able to dive deeply into goals, outcomes, and continuous improvement efforts. In addition to our efforts within programs, our continuous improvement takes places across programs. We have worked to validate several new measures (Professional Development Plan and field experience surveys) and also to ensure reliability.

Advanced Level Programs
Given the timing of our accreditation Self Study Report, the expectation for our advanced level programs is that we have plans in place for all standards and fully meet expectations for some standards (A 1.2, A 5.1, A 5.5). We created an Advanced Level Standards Subcommittee and identified programs that are part of the advanced standards. Programs are creating tables that list assessment measures and additional key evidences for each standard. Initially most of our measurements were EPP-created and we did not have validity and reliability established. We are in the process of validating these instruments which has proven to be challenging. Pilot data collection has begun during the 2019-2020 academic year and plans are being developed 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 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 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 have revised existing surveys related to employer and completer satisfaction data and created new ones as needed. Data collection began in the 2019-2020 academic year. Pilot data will be reviewed and surveys revisions are planned.

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
1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
1.5 Model and apply technology standards
2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning

4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
4.3 Employer satisfaction
4.4 Completer satisfaction
5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities
A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
A.3.4 Selection at Completion
A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
A.5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
A.5.5 Continuous Improvement
x.1 Diversity
x.2 Technology

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC (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 2020 EPP Annual Report.*

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

Report Preparer's Information

Name:	Patricia Bricker
Position:	Associate Dean, College of Education and Allied Professions
Phone:	828.227.3352
E-mail:	bricker@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**