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...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Contact person</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 EPP characteristics</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Program listings</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2. Program Completers
2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2017-2018?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

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.)

Total number of program completers 202

1 For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual
2 For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

Section 3. Substantive Changes
Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2017-2018 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.
3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited
3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited
3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:
3.6 Change in regional accreditation status
3.7 Change in state program approval
Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Initial-Licensure Programs</th>
<th>Advanced-Level Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial-Licensure Programs</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced-Level Programs</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

Data generated from TEC Unit assessments include: Impact on Student Learning, Candidates’ Quality Assurance and Diversity Awareness, Clinical Evaluation (PDE 430) and Professional Dispositions. Raw data and summary results are available on our accreditation webpage. Generally, data is gathered by each program and as a Unit. For the proposes of this report, data in this section represents Unit level data across certification programs. We acknowledge that there are limitations, specifically comprehensive results from all program areas. Therefore, the analysis below reflects outcomes from the 2017-18 AY and are not contextualized in a disaggregated or benchmark comparison. As part of our Unit Assessment System, data is reviewed from the fall semester in January of the following semester, and the spring data is reviewed at the Teacher Education Retreat in August of the next semester. As a result of these data analysis retreats, the improvement goals are established at the course and program level and are reviewed by the TEC Unit. There will be changes to the distribution method in an attempt to gather more consistent data at the initial and advanced levels since the TK20 data management system was not used by all programs.

In the data summary, evidence from all four instruments indicated that our recent adaption to the assessment delivery from TK20 to Survey Monkey has impacted the results in all instruments. Namely, we selected Survey Monkey as a tool because it is able to be used by all programs and in our previous instrument distribution, not all programs used TK20. As a result of formalizing Survey Monkey for both initial and advanced programs, we now have goals for capturing data at the Unit level from all programs. We will continue to refine both our delivery method and the instruments themselves. For example, in reviewing criteria outlined in each instrument as well as the instruments’ designs, we have learned that we need to refine some of the questions to better gather perspectives across and within each program. See section 6.1 for specific examples of possible instrument adjustments for the upcoming academic year. Ultimately, we must ensure that we are collecting robust data in a consistent manner so that we can continue to contextualize our trends, outcomes, and comparisons within and across programs.
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 has not provided clear evidence that advanced candidates have the professional dispositions to help all students learn (Advanced).

   Progress: The TEC Unit has systematized the delivery of a Professional Dispositions Assessment at three transition points, specifically at the Foundational Status, Candidacy Status and Clinical Status Gates. Although we acknowledge that we are intentionally implementing this assessment measure at the initial level, we continue to make improvements with delivering this key assessment at the advanced level for some programs (i.e., Educational Leadership) but we continue to work to administer the assessment across all advanced programs. To that end, we are identifying clinical courses for all advanced programs to determine a path for implementing the assessment consistently across the TEC Unit. Please see data analysis related to professional dispositions for all certification candidates in section 6.1 of this report.

2. The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates at the advanced level create positive learning environments for student learning in the Special Education and the Curriculum and Instruction programs (Advanced).

   Progress: The TEC Unit has made a significant impact. In summer 2017, an Interim Associate Dean was appointed to guide the implementation of the Unit Assessment System. Under the direction of the Interim Associate Dean, the TEC Unit has worked to delineate a more comprehensive and cohesive plan that includes tracking candidates’ transitions, known as Gates and Status Levels. A systematic communication system has been implemented that informs each candidate of his/her status and essential criteria for meeting the next gate in his/her progression toward certification. In addition, this work is supported by the creation of a new position for assessment and accreditation coordination which was staffed by a new hire. In his role, the assessment and accreditation coordinator maintains all student records related to certification and works with district partners to ensure that they work consistently with the Unit to review and analyze data for course and programmatic changes for initial and advanced programs.

   Please see data analysis related to impact on student learning for all certification candidates in section 6.1 of this report.

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

1. The unit does not systemically collect and assess candidate impact on student learning (Advanced). (ADV)

   Progress: The TEC Unit acknowledges that advanced programs include SPA level assessments that measure impact on learning, yet the TEC Unit has struggled to align each individual program’s assessment related to student learning across the Unit. As reported in the Standard 1 AFI, the TEC Unit has maintained robust data collection and analysis at the initial level and continues to align criteria and assessment practices at the advanced level. We have established a goal for the 2018-19 AY that includes mapping impact on student learning criteria across all programs, and most especially, in relation to candidates’ outcomes measured during clinical experiences. Please see data analysis related to impact on student learning for all certification candidates in section 6.1 of this 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 peers from diverse backgrounds. (ITP) (ADV)

2. The unit does not ensure that all candidates have experiences with diverse P-12 learners. (ITP) (ADV)

   Progress: The TEC Unit has struggled to document interactions with diverse initial and advanced candidates and P-12 learners, so the TEC Unit created a survey to analyze candidates’ interactions. Evidence from this instrument are included in Section 4. In addition, the TEC Unit has developed a goal related to enrollment, retention and persistence of diverse candidates. A Unit Enrollment Task Force will be charged with exploring curricular options that attract candidates, and thereby, enhance the candidate pool. In addition, we strive to develop a more robust instrument that captures district data used to guide field placements. Please see data analysis related to diversity awareness for all certification candidates in section 6.1 of this report.

**NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 6 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:**

1. The unit does not provide adequate personnel resources to implement the unit’s assessment system. (ITP) (ADV)

   Progress. In this AFI, the TEC Unit has made a significant impact. In summer 2017, an Interim Associate Dean was appointed to guide the implementation of the Unit Assessment System. Under the direction of the Interim Associate Dean, the TEC Unit has worked to delineate a more comprehensive and cohesive plan that includes tracking candidates’ transitions, known as Gates and Status Levels. A systematic communication system has been implemented that informs each candidate of his/her status and essential criteria for meeting the next gate in his/her progression toward certification. In addition, this work is supported by the creation of a new position for assessment and accreditation coordination which was staffed by a new hire. In his role, the assessment and accreditation coordinator maintains all student records related to certification and works with another new hire in field services. Under the Dean in the College of Education and Human Services, the director of the redesigned Office of Partnerships, Professional Experiences, and Outreach administers the key assessments to all candidates at various intervals.
During the semester. In addition, she coordinates data distribution to programs for their analysis discussions.

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?

Unit Assessment System Protocol to Document Synergy at the Initial and Advanced Levels:
The TEC Unit is committed to collecting data to assess candidates' performance at the course level and throughout their programs. Faculty members teaching or supervising a data-rich course (i.e., methods, student teaching or practicum) continue to collect and analyze data according to the Unit Assessment System Protocol. At the end of the semester, after entering scores into a data management system and assigning student grades, faculty members continue to use the Course Assessment Rubric (CAR) to measure the course outcomes against the Conceptual Framework (CF) goals. Then, programs submit a Data Report via email to the Unit-Wide Assessment Committee chairs as part of the TEC Unit. By the end of the first month of classes in a given semester, departments analyze candidate performance data and other data pertaining to candidates' Gates and Status Levels from the previous academic year using the Program Assessment Rubric (PAR). Findings are discussed at department/program meetings and as part of the monthly, Unit-Wide Teacher Education Council (TEC) meetings and recorded in the minutes. The department/program chairs continue to prepare a Data Report per program and presents the information at the annual Assessment Retreat sponsored by TEC. This retreat is attended by the members of the Unit-Wide Assessment Committee, the department/program chairs and the Dean in the College of Education and Human Services. At this meeting, all data are analyzed using the Unit Assessment Rubric (UAR) and the Dean shares data on the Unit's operation criteria described in the UAR. Data are aggregated and summarized, and specific actions on the use of results to improve candidate performance, program quality and Unit operations are identified. For reporting purposes, the Dean creates and disseminates an executive summary to the Provost's Office containing provisions for budget allocations informed by the assessment findings. The Dean's office posts an annual report with a summary of the assessment findings and the recommendations for improvement. The report is made available to the entire Unit and the professional community via the College of Education and Human Services website for accreditation purposes.

Goals Identified from Data Analysis during the 2017-18 Academic Year
Key Assessments:
1. In order to prepare candidates to respond to district needs as new teachers in PK-12 classrooms, candidates at both the undergraduate and graduate levels will continue to analyze student learning outcome assessment data in their courses and field experiences, including data analysis for three assessments: Professional Dispositions (PD), Capstone/Practicum/Internship Assessment (PDE 430) and the Impact on Student Learning (ISL) Assessment during student teaching or professional practicum. Evaluating candidates' diversity awareness is included in criteria outlined in assessments. For example, the ISL assignment addresses differentiated instruction, including honoring PK-12 learners with disabilities, students learning English, and students from economically and culturally diverse backgrounds. Results will continue to contextualize candidates' levels of mastery and allow each program and also the Unit to determine possible alterations to courses assignments and field experience outcomes to better align with the conceptual framework as they relate to school districts' practices.

Diversity Awareness:
2. As part of the Unit's focus on diversity awareness (cultural, cognitive, linguistic, regional and socio-economic), faculty teaching methods courses will continue to assign activities that will equip candidates to understand and use a variety of instructional methods to encourage PK-12 learners' critical thinking, problem solving and performance skills, especially as they relate to diverse students' needs. As a result of course assignments, candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions will be analyzed in a more robust format. The creation of a new Unit level diversity awareness key assessment will be positioned within the Gates and Status Levels for both Initial and Advanced programs. The TEC Diversity Subcommittee will guide the creation and analysis of the Diversity Awareness Assessment for all programs, titled as Quality Assurance and Diversity Awareness.

Conceptual Framework Alignment with Curricular Design:
3. Using both the Conceptual Framework (CF) and the Program Assessment Rubric (PAR), faculty teaching a course associated with a field experience and clinical practice will continue to assign candidates data driven instructional activities that reflect identified practices in public schools. Each semester and over the academic year, each program must continue to review CAR and PAR data to determine programs level compliance with the CF. The Unit-Wide Assessment Committee must continue to provide training for all faculty on how to report programmatic data. The Unit Wide Assessment Committee will continue to assess the PARs currently submitted and identifies inconsistencies. The committee chairs will meet with specific department chairs to streamline the use of the PAR.

Advising Candidates:
4. While the current assessment instruments for dispositions indicate competency-based mastery, the Unit must collect data according to the newly established Gates and Status Levels to document candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositional growth across the enrollment status levels. The Unit must ensure that all graduate and undergraduate programs collect, analyze and report data from faculty, cooperating teachers, school administrators, or school supervisors. Advisors (and other institutional members) bring to department chairs any special cases. Department chairs send special cases to TEC. In addition, the Unit is currently in the development stage of creating processes and procedures for the implementation of individualized action plans for candidates. This will allow candidates additional opportunities for learning, growth, and improvement. In addition, our intent is to communicate any or all limitations with candidates and advisors in meeting PDE policy and program requirements. Candidates' limitations will be tracked on an ongoing basis as they progress through the various status levels.

Candidate Enrollment, Retention and Persistence:
5. The Unit must create a strategic enrollment committee to examine both recruitment and retention, especially for diverse candidates. TEC must identify and invite faculty, admissions staff, candidates and school partners to join a newly formed Unit Enrollment Task Force. The Task Force will delineate specific strategies to increase enrollment of diverse candidates and strengthen retention for all candidates.

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

1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
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
A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

📍 Annual_Data_Analysis_and_Summary__20172018.pdf
📍 Data_from_Assessment_Instruments(1).pdf

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or other activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?
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 Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level.

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

☐ No identified gaps

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

Since the TEC Unit is moving from an NCATE to CAEP accreditation review, there is a general concern regarding the validity and reliability of the key assessment instruments, including documenting inter-rater reliability expectations. To that end, the TEC Unit has begun to explore alternatives to both the Unit Assessment System Protocol and the instruments themselves. We strive to meet CAEP standards and expectations. We sincerely appreciate the ongoing support we have from CAEP personnel as we prepare for our 2022 self-study team visit.

In addition, we strive to contextualize our practices in relation to technology usage by faculty in courses and as part of key assessments and by candidates during field experiences.

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

| 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress |
| 1.5 Model and apply technology standards |

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 2019 EPP Annual Report.
I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Dr. Lynn A. Baynum
Position: Interim Associate Dean
Phone: 717-477-1373
E-mail: lbayn@ship.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