

2018 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10575	AACTE SID:	3545
Institution:	Northwestern Oklahoma State University		
Unit:	Division of Education		

Section 1. AIMS Profile

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

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

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 2. Program Completers

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

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)²

Total number of program completers 63

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.nwosu.edu/school-of-education/education>

Description of data accessible via link:

The Teacher Education Assessment Management System (TEAMS) report is a review of all program data by a committee comprised of stakeholders, university administration, university assessment director, and educator preparation provider faculty. The data are reviewed and recommendations made for program improvement based upon evaluation of the data. The final report of the TEAMS committee is on the Northwestern Oklahoma State University Division of Education web site. Multiple points of data at the initial and advanced levels are within the report.

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

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2

Link: <https://www.nwosu.edu/uploads//factbook.pdf>

Description of data accessible via link:

The Northwestern Oklahoma State University includes the data for graduation rates and the student loan default rates.

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

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3

Link: <https://www.nwosu.edu/uploads//division-of-education/title-ii-program-report-2016-2017.pdf>

Description of data accessible via link:

The Title II report for 2016-2017 includes the data for addressing the ability of completers to meet licensing requirements for certification. The report breaks down the passing rate for multiple tests that

are required for certification in Oklahoma.

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

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4

Link: <https://www.nwsu.edu/uploads//division-of-education/hiring-2016-2017.pdf>

Description of data accessible via link: The data reflect the hiring information for initial level candidates graduating in 2016-2017.

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

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?

Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?

Are benchmarks available for comparison?

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

Component 4.1 The EPP is putting in place "multiple measures" to meet component 4.1. Within the Teacher Assessment Management System (TEAMS) report are data from the first year teacher survey that is completed by first year teachers who graduated from the EPP, and by the teacher's mentor and administrator. The data indicate completers have a positive impact on student learning as assessed with the current survey. The next first year teacher survey will have a specific question regarding impact on student learning. Other measures that are being put in place include: Pre/post benchmark testing from stakeholder schools; case studies through a mentoring program in which completers are employed. The first year teacher survey is widely shared in that it is part of the TEAMS report that is on the EPP's web site. The data from the report are shared with the faculty in the educator preparation program. The benchmark data and the case studies data will be made available at the same location on the EPP's web site and shared with EPP faculty, the advisory board, and the TEAMS committee.

Component 4.2 The EPP is currently disaggregating data from the 2016-2017 statewide teacher assessment system (Teacher Leader Effectiveness, "TLE"). The data are from the evaluation completed by the school site administrator as part of the required teacher evaluation system in Oklahoma. The data address the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of completers of the EPP. The first year mentor/administrator survey data are included in the TEAMS report at the URL listed in this section. The data indicate there were fifty data points for "strongly agreed" to the statement that the first year teacher was prepared for the classroom in the categories assessed that are aligned with the InTASC standards. One hundred twenty data points responded "agree"; forty-six data points for "somewhat agree"; twenty data points for "somewhat disagree"; four data points for "disagree". There were no data points for "strongly disagree". Overall, according to the mentor teacher and the administrator, first year teachers who are completers of the EPP are prepared for the classroom in the categories assessed that are aligned with InTASC standards.

According to qualitative data, classroom management is the area in which first year teachers need additional guidance. The initial level program has two courses for classroom management. Additionally, instruction is provided throughout the program to assist candidates in developing classroom management skills along with many hours in classrooms through field experiences. The challenge with this survey is the low rate of response on the part of teachers, mentor teachers, and administrators. The state and the EPP are putting in place strategies for receiving a greater response rate. A survey of administrators comparing the EPP's completers to those of other institutions is being designed and will be administered in 2017-2018.

Component 4.3 The EPP will use the data from the mentor/administrator first year teacher survey as part of this measure (see data results in TEAMS report; narrative in 4.2). The Teacher Leader Effectiveness data is being disaggregated with subsequent analysis as part of component 4.3. Note in section 7 of this report, the EPP has identified a gap with data regarding "...employment milestones such as promotion and retention..." and is in the process of determining how that data can be extracted. There is qualitative data from the first year teacher survey asking if the completers had received any honors or recognition. Overall, those who responded said "no". The EPP will also use the administrative survey that is being implemented in 2017-2018 that will compare the EPP's completers to those of other institutions as a measure for component 4.3.

Component 4.4 The first year teacher survey is one measure for this component. The data from this survey can be found in the TEAMS report. The EPP is developing a survey for completers who are participating in the case studies project as part of the mentoring program. The initial data from this will be available in 2017-2018.

Outcome measure #5. The graduation rate is tracked by the institution and is reflected in the "Factbook". At the advanced level, the graduation rate is reflected in the number of degrees awarded for the academic year. For 2016-2017, twenty degrees were

awarded at the advanced level for programs leading to additional licensure. Specific data for the graduate rate at the initial and advanced levels are needed. The EPP will enlist the aide of the institution's instructional technology department to determine if better reporting measures are available through that department or if the EPP will need to design its own system for gathering this data.

Outcome measure #6. According to the Title II report, the EPP's completers meet licensing requirements. The EPP has identified certification exams by which the pass rates are lower and have changed curriculum to focus on those areas by examining the sub-area tests and the competencies for those sub-areas. Completers have met all other state and program requirements to be designated as "completer". Passing the Oklahoma General Education Test and the Oklahoma Subject Area Test are program requirements. The Oklahoma Professional Teaching Examination is a certification requirement but is not a program requirement by the EPP. In summary, all completers have passed the Oklahoma General Education Test and the applicable Oklahoma Subject Area Test(s), thus, there is an overall pass rate in each test of 100%. One candidate in 2016-2017 did not take the Oklahoma Professional Teaching Examination, thus the passing rate on that examination is 98%. Completers at the advanced levels have a 100% passing rate.

Outcome measure #7. In the past, the EPP has relied upon self-reporting to determine those who have been hired in positions for which they are prepared. The institution's assessment office attempts to get this information, but the response rate is exceedingly low, especially at the advanced level. The EPP is determining a better process than self-reporting. The data that are available at the initial level are published on the EPP's web site. It will become a part of the review by the Teacher Education Management Assessment System committee, thus, it will become part of the annual report that is published on the EPP's web site. The job placement is high at the initial level. Because data at the advanced level is sparingly reported, no conclusions can be drawn about candidates being hired into the positions for which they were trained for reading specialist, school counselor, and educational leadership. There are limited data points at the advanced level in the TEAMS report.

Outcome measure #8. The default rate is reflected in the institution's Factbook and is reported by fiscal year, not academic year and is based upon a three year average. The default rate has fluctuated throughout the timeline presented in the Factbook. In summary, the three year rate reported in February, 2016 (fiscal years 2013-2016), was 13.3. For the report date in February, 2017 (fiscal years 2014-2016), the rate was 14.6. For the report date in February, 2018, (fiscal years 2015-2018), the default rate was 11.3. The institution's Factbook is available on its web site as indicated above with the URL presented.

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 5 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. Professional education faculty are not actively engaged in scholarly work that is appropriate for the mission of the unit and the institution. (ITP) (ADV)

EPP faculty were involved in scholarly work that is appropriate for the mission of the unit and the institution in 2016-2017 at the national, state, and local levels. Eight educator preparation faculty attended five national conferences, and sixteen faculty attended approximately fourteen state conferences. Nine educator preparation faculty gave presentations at seven different scholarly conferences/meetings during the 2016-2017 academic year. A science education faculty member presented at the national Physics Teacher Education Coalition conference. Three faculty presented their research study, "Why Teach?", at Oklahoma Research Day in March, 2017, and two faculty presented at the Career Tech summer conference. Two faculty presented at the state Oklahoma Association of Colleges of Teacher Education conference. One presentation was on the use of instructional technology titled "Writing Instruction Using Multimodal Literacies" and the other was "Why Teach? Perennial Problems and Possible Solutions". "Integrating Technology Writing into Writing Instruction" and "Becoming a 21st Century Teacher" were presentations by an educator preparation faculty member at the statewide Student Oklahoma Education Association conference. Further evidence of faculty engagement in scholarly work appropriate for the mission of the unit and the institution included the collaboration of an educator preparation faculty member and the Oklahoma State Department of Education to produce a series of four videos on classroom management specifically designed to assist individuals seeking certification through the alternative pathway. The writing, taping and editing of the videos began in 2015-2016 but were completed and published on the Oklahoma State Department of Education web site in fall, 2016. Further demonstration of scholarly work by an educator preparation faculty member is by the selection of a faculty member to be a part of a statewide course equivalency project for alignment of coursework across the state at the request of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. Local presentations by educator preparation faculty included a lecture by a social sciences education faculty member at an area museum and a presentation of record keeping as it pertains to agriculture education candidates by an agriculture education faculty member.

Four educator preparation faculty are continuing in doctoral programs. Two of the four are in the research phase of their respective programs. Two faculty members served on mentoring committees for first year teachers who completed the NWOSU educator preparation program. The faculty were invited to serve as mentors at the request of the respective P-12 schools in which the first year teachers work.

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?

Data indicates a decrease in the number of candidates at the initial level. This data can be found in the annual Title II report, the annual CAEP report, institutional reports, and the EPP's Teacher Education Assessment Management System (TEAMS) report. This is a trend that is also reported in various statewide measures. As part of the recruitment plan to increase the number of candidates and to recruit more diverse candidates, the EPP partnered with two regional high schools that participate in a program titled "Teach Oklahoma." This program consists of a daily class within the high school curriculum that focuses on all aspects of the teaching profession including interning in P-12 classrooms. The program is sponsored by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. A grant received by the EPP from the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education enabled the EPP to work with the high school students through their participation in educator preparation courses, tours of two campus locations, and a research project titled, "Why Teach"? Educator preparation faculty worked with the students on conducting research with career teachers on the reasons to teach. The research data was compiled and trends noted. The results of the research were presented in a poster session by the high school students and EPP faculty at Oklahoma Research Day in March, 2017. The partnership has resulted in students from the Teach Oklahoma program choosing to attend the EPP and major in education. The partnership has also enabled the EPP to recruit diverse candidates as the diversity within the two high schools is greater than those found in other communities from which the EPP draws its candidates.

Anecdotal data from completers who teach in hard-to-staff (high needs) schools revealed they did not feel prepared to teach in those schools. Data from the first year teacher survey (see file in section below) also indicate this. The analysis of the data reveal guidelines for field experiences in P-12 schools were not sufficient as the guidelines were focused on diversity in location only. New guidelines were needed that would require candidates to complete more diverse field experiences including the final internship (student teaching). The EPP, with input from stakeholders, developed a system for designating the level of diversity for a school site using available public information in five areas of diversity. Those were (1) ethnicity, (2) free/reduced lunch, (3) mobility, (4) English Language Learner, and (5) special needs. For school sites that were above the state average in three of the five categories, they were designated as "highly diverse". For school sites that were above the state average in two of the five categories, they were designated as "diverse". School sites that were above state average in one or no categories were designated as "not diverse". Among the two major field experiences and the final internship, each candidate must complete at least one experience in a highly diverse school site. A chart was developed by the EPP showing the diversity designation for the schools in which the candidates complete field experiences and the internship. The chart will be reviewed and updated every three years. Candidates submit a plan for completing the diversity requirements early in the educator preparation program. They are encouraged to plan "backwards" in that they select where they want to complete their final internship first, then complete the two main field experiences in schools that satisfy the diversity requirements. To assist candidates in meeting the "highly diverse" school requirement, all candidates participate in a full day field trip to Oklahoma City to visit high needs schools as part of their first field experience. This is especially important because the EPP is located in a rural area. Throughout the educator preparation program, candidates work with their advisor to ensure they meet the diversity requirements as they matriculate through the program. Before




the final internship, a check of the diversity of the schools in which field experiences have been completed is made to confirm the final internship placement is within the guidelines. By having candidates complete field experiences and the internship according to these guidelines, candidates are immersed in hard-to-staff schools. It is the goal of the EPP to have more completers choose to work in hard-to-staff schools and for them to be fully prepared to do so.

Data from the survey completed by first year teachers, mentors, and administrators indicated completers of the EPP's initial level program were lacking in the use of instructional technology. Additionally, completers were not as strong in their ability to design and use assessments and evaluate data from the assessments to make instructional designs as needed in today's P-12 classrooms. The EPP designed and implemented an Educational Technology course and an Assessment Design course as program requirements. The 2016-2017 academic year was the first year for full implementation of the two courses. Further instructional technology and assessment requirements in lesson planning and field experiences are being piloted with data being available in 2017-2018. The file uploaded in the section below is from a first year teacher survey for 2016-2017. These results, along with other data, will serve as a baseline to determine the extent to which completers are confident in their ability to use instructional technology, design assessments, and evaluate the results of the assessments.

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

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
x.1 Diversity
x.2 Technology

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

 collegiate_grant_report_June_1_2017.docx
 School_Diversity_Ratings_20162017(Spring_2017_until_Spring_2019).xlsx
 First_Year_Teacher_Survey_(20162017).pdf

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.

5.2 The EPP has identified a gap in assuring the "interpretation of data are valid and consistent". The EPP has made a change in the vendor that houses its data collection system. The transition has been made to a vendor that is more responsive to the EPP's needs than the previous vendor. While the new vendor has the capability to meet the EPP's needs, putting in place a system that meets the criteria for 5.2 (relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable), the initial focus has been on the ability to conduct assessments within the new system. Moving the system to a data output system as well as input system for the EPP to review for continuous improvement is in the early stages. The relationship between the EPP and the vendor is very good, and the vendor has demonstrated a responsiveness that will enable the EPP to have data that "...are valid and consistent".

5.3 The gap regarding component 5.3 is due to the issues identified in 5.2. A new data gathering system is being implemented. The EPP is in the initial stages of being able to "test innovations" using the new system. Testing performance against the EPP's goals is not underway because the EPP is updating its goals, thus the reason the testing of performance against those goals has not taken place. Upon confirmation of the goals, the EPP will be able to do that.

5.4 The EPP has a gap regarding "external benchmarked" data for completer impact. The EPP has put in place measures by which to do that, but the data is incoming at this point. The EPP has identified the means by which to benchmark completer impact.

2,1 The EPP has identified a gap in co-construction of clinical experiences in that the co-construction has, in the past, been informal. Formalization of the process has begun as well as identifying areas in which co-construction has not been taking place.

Surveys of cooperating (mentor) teachers and administrators occurs and feedback from those surveys is used to improve school and community arrangements. All entry, preparation, and exit requirements are approved by a committee that includes representatives from schools and community. Representatives from the communities served by the EPP are now participating in entry and exit interviews. The EPP is focusing upon the co-construction of assessments pertaining to clinical experiences by sending for review to clinical educators assessments pertaining to field experiences and internships.

2.2 A gap has been identified by the EPP in co-selecting, preparing, evaluating, supporting, and retaining high-quality clinical educators. The EPP has criteria in place for those who serve in the role of clinical educator. Other times the selection of the clinical educators has been at the discretion of the school site principal. Some principals make recommendations to the EPP for clinical educators, others allow teachers to choose to take on the role of clinical educator. While the EPP has a very good relationship with its P-12 school partners, a more collaborative approach is warranted and is being designed. The advisory board for the EPP has approved the criteria for clinical educators. Training for clinical educators will occur through a combination of video taped training and on-site training. The EPP is revising its exit survey of student teachers/interns in which they evaluate their clinical experience to provide more quantitative data that is valid and reliable.

3.6 The EPP has identified a gap regarding evidence that candidates understand expectations of the profession, specifically codes of conduct. The EPP does provide this information, but formalizing the evidence has not occurred. The EPP will be documenting this to provide evidence.

4.1 The EPP has identified three data points to meet this component at this time. Two partner schools have agreed to provide pre/post benchmark data, and the EPP is contacting more schools to ask for this data. Case studies are being conducted by graduates who are in their first year teaching, and the EPP is contacting other graduates to assist in the case studies project. The EPP is meeting with more recent graduates regarding their participation in the case studies project. The state will be providing data from a spring survey of first year teachers who are graduates of the EPP. The response rate on the part of the teachers, mentors, and administrators has been very low. The state and the EPP are putting in place measures to raise the response rate on this survey.

4.3 The EPP has identified a gap in having valid and reliable data for employment milestones. A survey of the superintendents of partner schools has been developed. A statewide survey of first year teachers asks if any of them received honors, awards, promotion, etc. This data is qualitative. Further information in this regard will have to come from personally contacting graduates. Data from state mentor/administrator surveys are being disaggregated that are relevant to 4.3.

1.2 The EPP has identified a gap regarding candidates using research to develop an understanding the teaching profession. The EPP modified the lesson plan template to include research as a part of lessons the candidates write. The new template will be implemented for the 2017-2018 academic year. At that time, the data will be evaluated to determine the impact on candidates knowledge of research and the teaching profession.

A2.1 The EPP has identified a gap in the co-construction of "...mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements..." at the advanced level. The EPP has in place internships that are mutually beneficial but the co-construction of other elements of advanced programs is not documented or is absent. The EPP Advisory Board was established to assist in part with this. The committee that approves all changes pertaining to advanced programs includes members of P-12 schools and the community. The EPP is in the process of identifying ways by which advanced candidates are able to apply appropriate technology, but, first the definition of "appropriate technology" is needed. Schools partners can assist with this.

A 4.1 The EPP has identified a gap for 4.1, specifically, "...that employers are satisfied with completers' preparation and that completers reach employment milestones.." The EPP and the institution send out surveys to employers, but the response rate is very low. The EPP has determined personal communication is needed regarding employers responding to the surveys.

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

- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
- 3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers

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: **Christee L. Jenlink**

Position: **Associate Dean, School of Education**

Phone: **580-327-8450**

E-mail: **cljenlink@nwsu.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