

2018 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11864	AACTE SID:	4485
Institution:	Stephen F. Austin State University		
Unit:	James I. Perkins College 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 627

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: <http://coe.sfasu.edu/facstaff/caep>

Description of data accessible via link: Annual CAEP Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4/A5.4)

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

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

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

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

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

Are benchmarks available for comparison?

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

Reflection on Annual Reporting Measures

1. Impact on P-12 Learning: Data used for this measure are provided to Stephen F. Austin State University Perkins College of Education by the Texas Education Agency. More specifically these data are from the Center for Research, Evaluation, and Advancement of Teacher Education (CREATE) at the University of Houston. CREATE provides SFASU Performance Analysis for Colleges of Education (PACE) data annually.

To facilitate consistent long-term assessment of institutional impact, and afford comparative analysis, CREATE has established a Proximal Zone of Professional Impact (PZPI) for CREATE institutions which includes SFASU. SFASU's Proximal Zone of Professional Impact is comprised of the university and all school districts and campuses within a seventy-five mile radius. This proximal zone describes a "P-16" professional community in the immediate vicinity of each university, and provides The Perkins College of Education a professional laboratory setting in which to collaboratively design and implement program improvements over time and to gauge their long-term success.

While this Proximal Zone of Professional Impact does not convey the complete impact scenario of the university's teacher preparation programs, it does provide a common and consistent setting in which the university may measure program effects over

time. From CREATE's perspective, the PZPI offers a useful frame of reference for The Perkins College of Education to utilize in assessing teaching and learning trends over time in the particular geographic area nearest SFASU. Data utilized to examine impact of P-12 learning include a performance summary of student academic performance in the PZPI on State Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) at the elementary, middle and high school levels.

Analysis of these data reveals the following for each level:

Elementary

□ Students consistently scored slightly below the state of Texas average score for Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science. However, a positive upward trend toward reaching the state average is clear from 2014-16.

Middle School

□ Students score at or above the state average for one or more years with a flat or upward trend for most testing areas (Reading, Writing, Mathematics, Science). However, students consistently score slightly below the state average for Social Studies.

High School

□ Students scored above the state average in 2014 and 2015 for English I, II and Algebra I. However, for these same testing areas scores were slightly below the state average for 2016 and on an upward trend from 2014-16.

□ Biology scores were at the state average 2014-16, while US History scores were slightly below the state average for the same testing window of time.

These measures are widely shared by the Texas Education Agency (TEA). SFASU has an Early Childhood Research Center charter school on campus that was specifically designed to meet the early childhood needs in Nacogdoches, TX as they relate to academic preparedness for school. However, the EPP may need to more formally discuss such results in relation to the implications of STAAR scores in our PZPI for all EPP programs at SFASU.

2. Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness (4.2)

These data represent clinical teacher scores on a formal teaching evaluation conducted by their field supervisor. The instrument used was the Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System (TTESS). The rubric uses a 1-5 rating system. Distinguished = 5, Accomplish = 4, Proficient = 3, Developing = 2, Improvement needed = 1. As expected candidates across all certification areas scored at the Proficient and Developing levels. This is to be expected as the TTESS is the evaluation system used for all teachers in Texas public schools. As a result, a new teacher making appropriate progress should score at the proficient and developing levels. Overall, candidates scored highest on the Classroom Climate Dimension while multiple programs scored lowest on the Planning Dimension related to data and assessment. Field Supervisors consistently scored clinical teachers lower on the Professional Practices and Responsibilities Dimension than any other rubric elements. These data are shared with each program. A goal is to expand by sharing these results with stakeholder committees such as the EPP Advisor Board and Professional Educators Council.

3. Satisfaction of Employers: Component 4.3/A4.1

The TEA-Administered Principal Survey for AY 2016-17

These data represent results from the Texas Education Agency administered Principal Survey. More specifically these data represent how principals scored all SFASU prepared first-year teachers.

The rubric utilizes a 1-4 scoring system: 4=Well prepared, 3=Sufficiently prepared, 2=Not Sufficiently prepared 1=Not at all prepared. The range of mean scores across all questions was 3.07-3.36. Overall SFASU prepared first year teachers were rated lowest for questions about working with students with disabilities while scoring highest on questions about integration of technology. These data were shared and discussed with the EPP Advisory Board as well as the Professional Educators Council. A goal is to disaggregate these data by program.

These data are not currently available for advanced programs.

4. Satisfaction of Completers: Component 4.4/4.2

At the completion of clinical teaching all initial certification candidates complete a program satisfaction survey. Questions on this survey align with each INTASC Standard and candidates rate the extent to which the EPP prepared them to perform each INTASC Standard. The rating scale is 1= Unacceptable, 2= Acceptable, 3= Exemplary. The range of scores across all programs was 3.00-2.50. The INTASC Standards candidates consistently scored lower than others were:

□ INTASC- 2010.1 How well was I prepared by the program to demonstrate understanding of how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.

□ INTASC-2010.10: How well was I prepared by the program to seek appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning; to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth; and to advance the profession.

The INTASC Standards candidates consistently scored higher than others were:

□ INTASC- 2010.3 How well was I prepared by the program to demonstrate understanding of individual differences, diverse cultures, and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.

□ INTASC-2010.8 How well was I prepared by the program to demonstrate understanding and use of a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas, their connections, and build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

As previously indicated these data were shared with program areas. However, these data could also be further shared with EPP

committees such as the Advisory Council and Professional Educators Council.

Pilot data for program satisfaction are being collected in advanced programs in 2018.

5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)

Percent of Full-Time, First-Time Undergraduates who were admitted to the Ed prep program Fall 2011 and Graduated within 6 years (6-yr Graduation Rate): 96.7%

Full-Time, First-Time Undergraduate Transfer Students who were admitted to the Ed prep program Fall 2013 (4-yr Graduation Rate): 90.3%

These same data were available for graduate programs however they are currently under review to determine the level of accuracy. There is a need to pull out those in graduate courses seeking advanced licensure only (not a degree).

Source: Stephen F. Austin State University Office of Institutional Research

6. Ability of Completers to Meet Licensing (certification) (initial & advanced)

The test pass rate for both initial and advanced certification areas demonstrates a positive upward trend for 2015-2017.

7. Ability of Completers to be Hired in Education Positions for which They have been Prepared (initial). The EPP is working with the Texas Education Agency to get advanced level data.

2016

In 2016 there were 335 initial level SFASU completers

TEA Reports indicate 350 new teachers hired in TX were from SFASU

$335/350 = 96\%$ of completers were hired for their certification area

2015

In 2015 there were 402 initial level SFASU completers

TEA Reports indicate 371 new teachers hired in TX were from SFASU

$371/402 = 92\%$ of completers were hired for their certification area

8. Student Loan Default Rate

The latest information available indicates SFASU's student loan default rate decreased from 2012-2014 with an increase in the number of graduates in repayment each 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 1 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. The unit does not regularly and systematically assess professional dispositions of all advanced program candidates. (ADV)

In order to continue progress toward regularly and systematically assessing professional dispositions of all advanced program candidates, the following action steps were successfully accomplished for AY 2016-17:

a) The Advanced Professional Dispositions Assessment Instrument (APDAI) was created and aligns with the Stephen F. Austin State University (SFASU) Advanced Program Dispositions Statement, the Texas Educator Code of Ethics and Standard CAEP A.1 and A.3. The SFASU James I. Perkins College of Education CAEP Assessment Committee created the APDAI. This CAEP Assessment committee is made up of a group of content experts including faculty, program coordinators, and unit heads representing all initial and advanced certification areas. All committee members agreed the items included in the Advanced Dispositions Assessment Instrument align with and are all essential to achieving high standards for practice for applications of dispositions, laws, codes of ethics and professional standards appropriate for all advanced certification areas offered at SFASU.

b) Goals for AY 2017-18 and beyond were set and included:

a. Pilot the instrument in all advanced programs.

b. Begin use of a checkpoint system to regularly and systematically administer the new dispositions instrument. This system will include measurement of candidate dispositions upon entry to the program, at the midpoint, and during the final semester of the program.

c. As data are collected results will be summarized and shared with stakeholders including program areas as part of our annual Data Day, the SFASU Educator Preparation Program Advisory Council (made up of school district and community partners, SFASU faculty and administrators) as well as the Professional Educators Council (made up of all SFASU Educator Preparation Program Coordinators, Unit Heads, as well as a student).

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. The unit does not systematically share assessment data with faculty across initial programs to support continuous improvement. (ITP)
2. The unit does not systematically collect data for some assessments to improve the unit and its programs. (ADV)

In 2016/17 the following four mechanisms continued to be utilized to systematically share assessment data with faculty across initial programs: (a) The Professional Educator's Council (PEC), (b) The Educator Preparation Program Advisory Council (EPP Advisory Council) (c) EPP Wide Data Day, (d) LiveText Field Experience Module.

Collectively these mechanisms enhance the unit's capacity to make more informed evidence-based decisions that support continued improvement.

a) The Professional Educator's Council (PEC) consists of representatives from every initial and advanced certification program across the college, and from the colleges whose majors seek educator certification as well as students. This includes the program coordinator for each of these programs, as well as each department chair or director. PEC met three times creating multiple opportunities for shared decision-making and dissemination of assessment data. The types of assessment and data discussed at PEC meetings included but were not limited to: Results from unit level assessments such as candidate dispositions, work sample, Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System (T-TESS), Candidate Evaluation of the Program, as well as candidate pass rates on required state content exams. The PEC Representatives then communicate the information to their departments, schools, and programs during regularly scheduled meetings. Noteworthy for 2017 was the decision of PEC to increase from three to four meetings each academic year. As a result, PEC will meet four times in 2018.

b) The Educator Preparation Program Advisory Committee (EPP Advisory Committee) is comprised of faculty members, associate deans, clinical faculty, university supervisors, and P-12 partner school district leaders. This committee met twice creating multiple opportunities for shared decision-making and dissemination of assessment data.

c) EPP- Wide Data Day. This event occurs each September, and provides time and space for faculty across all initial and advanced programs to share and analyze both unit and program data, as a means to make strategic data-informed program decisions. In 2017 Data Day was rebranded as the Assess, Collaborate, Transform Event or A.C.T. Event to better convey the purpose and alignment of the day with recent university goals related to creating transformational experiences for all SFASU students. The ACT Event allowed programs to meet individually for several hours in the morning, and then to come together as a unit in the afternoon to share findings from the program sessions, as well as to review unit data. In 2017 enrollment management was a central focus for the college wide afternoon portion of A.C.T. Event/Data Day and included a review of university, college, and program area enrollment trends. In addition to reviewing enrollment data presented by the Associate Dean of Assessment and Accountability and Vice-President of Student Affairs, faculty participated in discussion with the day culminating with the creation of program specific enrollment management action plans. Unit heads reported their faculty found the A.C.T. Event a useful way to: (a) create new levels of awareness related to enrollment data patterns in the last five years and (b) engage in program discussions to identify specific strategies for moving forward.

d) LiveText and LiveText Field Experience Module (FEM). A fourth mechanism utilized for sharing of data is the use of our data management system. EPP faculty (which includes field supervisors), mentor/cooperating teachers, program coordinators, and unit heads have access to LiveText, our adopted data-management system, as well as the benefit of a college-wide data management coordinator. The Office of Assessment and Accountability and the data management coordinator assist all stakeholders with utilizing the system to access and examine program and unit data. On-site trainings are held annually to support new users and provide updates for those already using our data management system. A goal for 2018 includes use of webinars for such trainings to enhance availability of trainings to off-site faculty and school partners.

Last, as a means to continuously improve the unit's ability to utilize 21st century technology to collect, manage, and share data, numerous trainings focused on utilization of online collaborative tools took place 2017 and will continue. These included teaching faculty how to utilize: Collaborate, Skype for Business, and Yammer.

In order to systematically collect data for additional assessments to improve the unit and its advanced programs the following action steps were successfully completed in 2016-17:

The CAEP Unit Assessment Committee continued to work closely with the Office of Assessment and Accountability to develop a more comprehensive framework for advanced programs to systematically collect data. The assessment framework included:

- (a) Use of the data management system, LiveText Field Experience Module (FEM) which continued to be phased into field experiences in advanced programs. As a result, field experience data can be tracked.
- (b) Progress was made toward systematically collecting and assessing unit level data for advanced programs. It was determined the advanced programs would adopt unit assessments to measure candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.

* As previously mentioned in the narrative for AFI 1 above, the Advanced Professional Dispositions Assessment Instrument (APDAI) was created and aligns with the SFASU Advanced Program Dispositions Statement, the Texas Educator Code of Ethics and Standard CAEP A.1 and A.3.

* Work also took place toward establishment of two additional unit assessments including: a work sample to assess candidate proficiencies to understand and apply knowledge and skills appropriate to their professional fields of study as well as a survey to determine satisfaction of advanced program completers.

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. The unit does not ensure that all candidates have field experience and clinical practice with P-12 students from different socio-economic groups, and diverse ethnic/racial groups, and English language learners and students with disabilities. (ITP) (ADV)

In order to ensure that all candidates have field experience and clinical practice with P-12 students from different socio-economic groups, and diverse ethnic/racial groups, and English language learners and students with disabilities the following action steps were successfully completed:

a) The unit continued to expand its use of Live Text Field Experience Module (FEM), a data management tool, allowing the unit to more thoroughly document and track initial and advanced candidate's placements.

b) Demographic data collection continued on clinical practice and expanded to practicum sites utilized by the unit for initial and advanced programs (N= 470 placement sites (initial and advanced sites combined). Data analysis revealed the following demographic information for P-12 students across placement sites: Demographic data on each site were collected from the Texas Education Agency.

Initial Programs

Overall

Total clinical practice sites: N= 281, 51% are male, 60% are from Ethnic Minority Populations; 46% are Economically Disadvantaged; 11% are English Language Learners, and 9% are in Special Education Programs (data can now be desegregated by program).

Advanced Programs

Overall:

Total Practicum Sites Used N= 189, 52% are male, 62% are from Ethnic Minority Populations, 51% are Economically Disadvantaged, 12% are English Language learners, and 9% are in Special Education Programs.

c) It was concluded that overall both initial and advanced candidates have field experiences with P-12 students from different socioeconomic groups, and diverse ethnic/racial groups, and English language learners and students in Special Education Programs.

d) In order to further refine the system for tracking and documenting diversity of placements as candidates move through the program, along with stakeholders, discussion took place with the CAEP Unit assessment committee about ways to define a diverse placement. Although not finalized, the unit entertained defining and tracking diversity classification in four categories: Special Education/Disability, Economically Disadvantaged, Limited English Proficient [LEP], and Ethnicity/Race. Discussion also took place on whether to adopt a dichotomous system of "Yes" or "No" for determining diversity of placements or implementation of a 1-5 rating scale for each site (1-2pts = Not diverse, 3-4 pts = Moderately Diverse, 5-6 pts Highly Diverse). In each system whether or not the site was above or below the national average for each category may be used to determine the extent to which the site is considered diverse (below national avg. = 0 pts, at national avg. = 1 pts, above national avg. = 2 pts). The goal is to finalize this system for determining and tracking diversity in 2018.

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloguing continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

1. One major effort the EPP made was that the following unit level data were not only collected but also disaggregated and summarized for all initial level programs. This included: Exit level professional dispositions as rated by field supervisors, mentor teachers, and candidates; teaching effectiveness as evaluated by the Texas Teacher Evaluation Support System (T-TESS) a Texas Education Agency instrument completed by trained field supervisors; candidate impact on student learning as measured by a Work Sample Assignment scored by faculty; and a Candidate Program Satisfaction Survey. These were compiled into a report that was shared with each program area. Individualized reports were made available to programs for review as part of a unit wide data day. Each report included the following assessment information: Total N, mean and standard deviation overall and by item. The culminating A.C.T. Event/data day activity was creation of program area action plans.

A goal for 2018 is to disaggregate and summarize unit data for advanced programs as well. As indicated previously advanced programs are adopting unit assessments and expanded use of the LiveText Data management system will allow the Office of Assessment and Accountability to provide such information.

c) A second major effort made by the EPP was implementation of a plan to ensure that a case for validity and reliability can be made for the initial level EPP created Work Sample Unit Assessment. The CAEP Unit Assessment Committee discussed ways that validity was established as the assessment was created prior to 2017. It was determined a case for validity could be made based on the following: The CAEP Assessment committee made up of a group of content experts including faculty, program coordinators, and unit heads representing all initial and advanced certification areas created the Work Sample Unit Assignment. All committee members agreed the elements included in the Work Sample Unit Assignment align with and are each essential to the content and pedagogical knowledge appropriate for all initial certification areas offered at SFASU. It was also determined the Work Sample Unit Assessment Assignment aligns with CAEP Standard 1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (1.1 excluding professional responsibility, 1.2-1.5). Goals for 2018 include establishing inter-rater reliability with each program area administering the Work Sample Unit Assignment. Additional goals for 2018 include utilizing these same steps with advanced programs to ensure a case for validity and reliability can be made for the EPP created Advanced Work Sample Unit Assignment as well.

d) Additional important work in 2017 included more formal efforts related to recruitment of students. One such effort included work toward establishment of articulation agreements with five different regional community colleges each serving a diverse student body. As 2017 came to a close progress on finalizing these agreements was at various stages. Such agreements are designed in ways that will allow for students to more efficiently transfer to SFASU with limited to no loss of academic credits, time, or money. A second form of recruitment that took place was increased involvement with regional school districts and the Texas Association of Future Educators (TAFE). The EPP hosted P-12 student groups on the SFASU campus that included a tour of EPP facilities and interaction with students and faculty. The EPP also hosted a recruitment table at regional and state TAFE events. Goals for 2018 include finalizing articulation agreements, continuing to establish a presence with TAFE organization and hosting P-12 students on campus for the purpose of recruiting them into the EPP.

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
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
- 4.4 Completer satisfaction
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

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

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

Section 7: Transition

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

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

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

No identified gaps

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

Initial Level

The EPP currently has sufficient evidence for all required CAEP Standards: 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.3, 5.4

Quality Assurance System Indicators

o The EPP needs to further clarify the extent to which a functioning process is in place for regularly reviewing and monitoring candidate progress and performance, on the CAEP cross-cutting theme of diversity.

Standard 1

o 1.4 –The EPP will seek further clarification on how best to demonstrate this element.

Standard 2

o 2.1 The EPP needs to more formally determine the extent to which partnerships with P-12 schools are mutually beneficial through data collection.

o 2.3 The EPP will continue to develop and refine the best ways to document sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence and duration of clinical practice.

Standard 3

o 3.1 Recruitment of diverse candidates must continue.

Advanced Level

The current focus for advanced level programs is on determining the extent to which required and cross-cutting themes are being met.

The EPP currently has sufficient evidence for the following required CAEP Advanced Standards: A.3.2, and A.4.2

GAPS in Required Standards:

A.4.1—Advanced programs are currently discussing best ways to collect employer satisfaction data. The goal is to finalize a plan and begin data collection for most programs in the 2018/19 school year.

A.5.3 Further clarification is need on advanced program goals and ways to regularly and systematically assess

A.5.4 Employment rate data newly available from the Texas Education Agency are being analyzed.

Additional Areas for Growth:

Quality Assurance System Indicators

o The EPP needs to further clarify the extent to which a functioning process is in place for regularly reviewing and monitoring candidate progress and performance, on the CAEP cross-cutting theme of diversity and technology.

Standard 2

o A2.1 The EPP needs to more formally determine the extent to which partnerships with P-12 schools are mutually beneficial through data collection.

o A2.2 The EPP will continue to develop and refine the best ways to document varied and developmental clinical settings.

Standard 3

o A3.1 A plan for recruitment of diverse candidates needs to be further developed.

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

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement

x.1 Diversity

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: **Christina Sinclair**

Position: **Associate Dean of Assessment and Accountability**

Phone: **936-468-3964**

E-mail: **sinclaircd1@sfasu.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 complete data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

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

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

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site 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