2019 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10621	AACTE SID:	4385
Institution:	Southwestern Oklahoma State University		
Unit:	Department 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	⦿	◯
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	⦿	◯
1.1.3 Program listings	⦿	◯

Section 2. Program Completers

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

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure[1]   `100`

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]   `94`

Total number of program completers   194

---

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

> 1
>
> **Link:** https://www.swosu.edu/academics/education/accreditation.aspx
>
> **Description of data accessible via link:** Accreditation documents, such as annual reports, certification exam pass rates, and other documents
>
> Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.
>
> | Level \ Annual Reporting Measure | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. |
> |---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
> | Initial-Licensure Programs | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☐ |
> | Advanced-Level Programs | | | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☐ |

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

> *What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?*
> > *Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?*
> > *Are benchmarks available for comparison?*
> > *Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?*

The addition of TLE data to consider regarding our completers impact on student learning has provided clearer evidence to support the anecdotal notion that our completers are well prepared in the areas of Classroom Management and Instruction. We look forward to utilizing this new data source to refine our efforts to effectively survey the needs of our emerging teachers. The trend of consistently lower performance of our Early Childhood candidates on certification exams has lead to focused curriculum realignment and the addition of an Early Childhood specialist faculty member. Alignment efforts and conversations shaped by the expertise of the new faculty member have broadened unit level understanding of the ECED program as well as the systemic interconnection of all education programs among faculty. We continue to consider how to best revise disposition rubrics to capture the professional and personal attributes that must be exhibited by professional educators. Connecting new disposition tools to be readily deployable within appropriate context, while facilitating data collection/ analysis has proven to be more challenging due to organizational adjustments beyond the Department level. However, resulting conversations regarding the Department of Education's need to deploy these resources for the purpose of ongoing, real-time data gathering have informed the organizational level decisions. These conversations may result in resources being made newly available. Survey costs have historically been absorbed at the program level. These may now be provided university-wide to support needs for broader student data analysis.

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 clearly identified nor provided data on the professional dispositions expected of candidates. (ITP) (ADV)

The unit continues to recognize the importance of assessing expected professional dispositions of candidates. Professional dispositions are assessed at three different points within the undergraduate degree program: at program entry (Foundations of Education course), admission into the teacher education program, and program completion. In Foundations of Education, candidates create their Philosophy of Education, which is graded by the instructor and becomes a part of their Level 1 Portfolio. Their Philosophy of Education provides an early indication of the candidate's professional dispositions. In addition, candidates must also complete 30 hours of observation (with at least 10 hours of observation in a diverse school) in the public schools under the supervision of certified teachers. The cooperating teachers are asked to complete an evaluation of the candidates' performance and dispositions.

Dispositions are also measured during interviews for candidate admission into the teacher education program. Two interviewers, a SWOSU faculty member and a public school teacher or administrator, ask the candidate a set of 8 predetermined questions regarding professional motivation, knowledge of subject matter, adapting instruction for individual needs, incorporating technology, classroom motivation and management skills, communication skills, parent involvement, professional commitment and responsibility, and professional manner and speaking skills. Once again, results of the interviews are reviewed and discussed by the Department Chair and faculty members. Any concerns related to the professional dispositions of the candidates are addressed with the candidate, if necessary.

Furthermore, candidate dispositions are also assessed on the Student Teaching Summative Evaluation for all teacher candidates. Data on professional dispositions of candidates is currently located on Canvas. Implementation of Chalk and Wire, the new E-portfolio and data management service, has been delayed due to University-wide discussions regarding the need for improved data analysis capabilities. University leadership is now considering adding components to our LMS Canvas in the form of "Portfolium" to meet data gathering needs as well as to greatly limit the cost to students. We had anticipated a Fall 2017 launch of this service. However, with faculty training and University level organizational needs assessment, it will occur this upcoming Fall. This assessment system will aid in accurately tracking information on applicant qualifications, candidate experiences, graduates, and overall unit and program quality on a consistent basis.

The teacher candidate disposition rubric is currently being redesigned to include focus on candidate proficiency levels regarding the Oklahoma General Competencies for Teacher Licensing and Certification (InTasc Standards) and personal and professional dispositions appropriate for teaching professionals.

In advanced programs, candidates are required to submit a completed, signed copy of their most recent teaching evaluation as evidence of appropriate professional dispositions relative to their specific role in the school setting. Under the Teacher Leader Effectiveness (TLE) framework, each professional position within the school system has a specific evaluation protocol and measure. Within each course, candidates are held additionally to expected "Student Dispositions and Standards of Performance". Beyond the common expectations for academic behavior in advanced programs, candidates are also required to demonstrate dispositions aligned with collaboration with colleagues; ethical behavior, honesty, and integrity; commitment to life-long learning, including professional development. These required dispositions are part of program syllabi. Additionally, candidates in internship settings are evaluated by supervising mentors on personal and professional dispositions necessary for educational professionals as part of the Cooperating Administrator Summative Assessment.

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

1. Revised: The unit does not consistently analyze data for unit and program improvement. (ITP) (ADV)

The collection of data from multiple assessments to evaluate candidate, faculty, and program performance continues to be systematic and ongoing. Data collected comes from both internal and external sources, such as Certification Examinations for Oklahoma Educators (CEOE) scores, student teacher evaluations, and the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (TLE) evaluation system. Data for the unit and program improvement is entered into a central data base as soon as it becomes available in Canvas, our learning management system, for all faculty members to access and review. Departmental meetings are held to discuss changes, weaknesses, strengths, and concerns of the data for overall program improvement. This data base is managed by the Unit's Accreditation Coordinator and Coordinator of Field Experiences and Certification. The Accreditation Coordinator and Coordinator of Field Experiences and Certification is also responsible for providing appropriate assessment data annually to designated faculty members, such as program report writers and administrators, in each department. These faculty members along with the Department Chair are assigned the responsibility of reviewing, analyzing, and evaluating assessment data for the program.

The Department Chairs hold monthly meetings (or as needed) with all faculty members to review and analyze data for recommendations for program improvement. The Teacher Education Council is comprised of the Education Department Chair and Education faculty members and usually meets several times each year. The council's mission is designed to focus on unit evaluation of procedures, instruments, and evaluation criteria that ensures competence of candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions and is responsible for data analysis. Copies of agendas and minutes of meetings are available in Canvas.

In addition, the Office of Institutional Research, the University's Assessment Center, and Information Technology Services department also collect data and generate a number of reports from the university data base regarding enrollment, GPA, degrees granted, course/instructor evaluations, etc. as requested by the Accreditation Coordinator, Department Chairs, and other faculty members and administrators. The Assessment Center collects and tabulates data from all student teacher summative evaluations

by use of scantron forms. While the collection of data has been systematic over the years, the unit plans on adopting Chalk and Wire or Portfolium for a standard protocol for analysis and evaluation of the data to better document the analysis of data and how it's used for programmatic improvement. This new form and procedure will be implemented in the Fall.

The University Assessment Center also collects and analyzes data from course/instructor evaluations each semester and makes the data available to faculty in hard copy or digital format. The Assessment Center collects, analyzes and reports data from student teacher summative evaluations and the Teacher Work Sample. We are planning to make our follow-up surveys for graduates and administrators available online through our new data system. These surveys allow for external sources to provide input to improve program and candidate performance.

Our unit understands the importance of multiple data assessment analysis to screen candidates for admission, monitor their progress, and evaluate their competency as well as the unit's. The unit is cognizant of the importance of analyzing evaluating the unit for continuous program improvement in order to offer a quality teacher education program and produce competent program completers.

NCATE: **Areas for Improvement related to Standard 3 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:**

1. **The unit does not ensure that candidates in the M.Ed. programs of Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education participate in field experiences.** (ADV)

Field and clinical experiences are an integral component of the unit's EBTE conceptual framework (Best practice field experiences). Field experiences provide the opportunity for candidates to apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions learned and developed throughout the teacher education program. Field experiences are developed for M.Ed. candidates to provide authentic learning opportunities that allow them to demonstrate their ability to support learning of all students. The unit ensures that candidates in M.Ed programs participate in field experiences. In Education Administration, for example, candidates must develop artifacts with reflections in conjunction with course assignments and field experiences. These artifacts demonstrate that the candidates have met the first six ELCC Standards, all of which specifically address the candidates "knowledge and ability to promote success for all students." Advanced candidates in School Counseling, Psychometry and Psychology also participate in authentic learning activities involving the guidance or evaluation of actual students in the public schools. Most of these activities require documentation of their impact on student achievement or success. Additionally, all candidates in M.Ed. programs participate in a supervised practicum or internship. All M.Ed. candidates must meet the requirements for the first transition point before starting their clinical experience. Most M.Ed. candidates have a bachelor's degree and a teaching certificate. However, those with a degree but no teaching certificate must have completed 18 hours of professional education courses and 12 weeks of student teaching as an undergraduate. Successful completion of their clinical practice (and the program) requires a satisfactory evaluation from their supervisor and satisfactory completion of their exit portfolio. The Unit's evaluation of the field experiences provided to our candidates is systematic and ongoing. The Coordinator of Field Experiences surveys school administrators and clinical faculty relative to field experiences each semester. Candidate surveys are also administered at the conclusion of student teaching during the Teacher Candidate Completion Day. Follow-up surveys are also mailed to initial and advanced candidates within a year after program completion. The unit uses the data from these surveys to assess the overall effectiveness of the teacher education program, including the field experiences provided. A graduate catalog can be found at this link http://www.swosu.edu/resources/catalog/pdfs/graduate/graduate-catalog-a.pdf for more information on further requirements of M.Ed. programs. Following is a list of total field experience hours for each advanced program offered:
Education Administration 120 hour internship
Reading Specialist 90 hours total
School Counseling 150 hour internship
School Psychology 150 hour internship
School Psychometry 150 hour internship/ 1200 practicum

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

1. **The unit does not ensure that candidates have experiences with P-12 students from different socioeconomic groups, students from diverse ethnic/racial groups, English Language Learners, and students with disabilities.** (ITP) (ADV)

The unit understands the importance of providing our candidates with the opportunity for field experiences involving diverse student populations. Diversity in field experiences begins in Foundations of Education. The Foundations of Education field experience requirements are as follows: 1) Teacher candidates must observe for a total of 30 hours. Observations will be split between two different school districts, one being diverse. 2) The minimum number of hours in one school district is 10. 3) At least 10 hours of observation must be in a school district(s) designated as diverse by the Department of Education. 4) In order for a school to be diverse, a school district must have at least 40% diverse ethnicity and/or at least 50% socio-economic diversity (free/reduced lunch) according to www.schoolreportcard.org.

This emphasis continues throughout the courses in the program and the placement for student teaching. It is closely monitored by faculty and the Coordinator of Field Experiences. Data on the ethnic, racial, and gender diversity of students in the school districts in which candidates do their field experiences and clinical practice is gathered and shared in Canvas and logged in their Portfolio

Log C (Documentation of Diverse Field Experiences).

The data attests to our commitment in providing field experiences in a variety of settings with diverse student populations. Additional field experience opportunities are available at locals schools like Burcham Elementary in Weatherford and elementary schools in Clinton. Both of these school districts serve children from low-income households and culturally diverse students. Many of our candidates also volunteer their time to work with exceptional children in Special Olympics competition each semester and Student Council for Exceptional Children/Kappa Delta Pi's Glow Prom each Spring. Members of student organizations, such as SWOSU READ, SCEC, KDP, and Student Oklahoma Education Association (SOEA) assist in Special Olympics and other local events.

Student diversity is not only recognized by our candidates but also analyzed for purposes of instructional planning and delivery. An important component of the Teacher Work Sample is completed during student teaching, which requires candidates to recognize, plan, and modify their teaching based on the diverse learning needs.

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

1.	**Revised: Workload policies limit the engagement of professional educational faculty members in scholarship and assessment.**	**(IT P)**	**(AD V)**

Even with the state's continued large budget deficit, faculty members are given the opportunity to attend professional development at local, state, and national conferences to improve teaching and learning. Faculty members are also encouraged to collaborate with P-12 partners through field experiences and volunteer opportunities of special events. Ongoing professional development that addresses changes in curriculum, instruction, and assessment is an important faculty resource to the unit. The university also supports professional development through funds budgeted for faculty travel each year. Additional funds are available through the Office of Sponsored Programs.

The unit provides professional development opportunities for all faculty members through programs on-campus, off-campus, and by distance learning. During the past year, several unit faculty members attended the 2017 OACTE/OEQA Fall Conference in Tulsa, OK. This conference provided opportunities for faculty members, accreditation coordinators, and department chairs to understand how to meet SPA and CAEP standards. The conference also included upcoming transitions and other important information for preservice teacher education programs, such as the PPAT (Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers). In addition, faculty members have attended a variety of national and state conferences within the last year, including the National Social Science Association National Conference, International Literacy Association, Conference, Annual Oklahoma Reading Conference, Oklahoma Association of Colleges of Teacher Education Conference, Kappa Delta Pi 51st Biennial Convocation, and CAEPCon. All of these conferences provided faculty members with new ideas, strategic tools, and resources for the classroom as well as continuous improvement efforts.

Each faculty member is required to complete an annual professional development chart that outlines his/her required professional service and volunteer experiences in public schools. This can include providing staff development workshops in public schools, professional growth through attending meetings of professional organizations, and scholarly activity such as writing papers or articles for presentation/publication. Faculty members are given three hours of release time for advisement and scholarship each semester. If faculty members request the option of teaching courses in addition to their normal load due to personal interest in the course material and student engagement, then this may result in an increase in course load. Additionally, there are intersessions in which faculty members may elect to teach one course, which is outside the regular semester period. However, it is reported as load during the regular semester. Currently, there are two faculty members working on their doctoral degrees.

The unit realizes the importance of providing candidates with quality instruction, field experiences, and partnership opportunities with P-12 students in Oklahoma public school districts. The unit seeks professional development opportunities at the local, state, and national levels for professional educational faculty members and uses assessment analysis for unit and program improvement.

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?

The unit understands and recognizes the need for ongoing and continuous improvement in order to meet the university and unit's mission as well as state and CAEP accreditation requirements. The unit continues to strive to provide teacher candidates with the essential knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions required of high quality teachers. The unit uses state and EPP created assessments to collect and analyze candidate performance and discusses possible changes as needed based on candidate performance.

Over the past year, our unit has explored ways to clearly address Areas for Improvement. Specifically, the unit seeks to ensure continual improvement in tracking professional dispositions expected of the candidates, analyzing data for unit and program improvement, and documenting P-12 field experiences in diverse settings. Therefore, the unit adopted Chalk and Wire, an ongoing assessment system (electronic portfolio), which would aid the unit in assessing and documenting student progress on learning outcomes, professional dispositions, and field experiences throughout the program. However, Implementation of Chalk and Wire, the new E-portfolio and data management service has been delayed due to University-wide discussions regarding the need for improved data analysis capabilities. University leadership is now considering adding components to our LMS Canvas in the form of "Portfolium" to meet data gathering needs as well as to greatly limit the cost to students. However, with faculty training and University level organizational needs assessment, implementation of the new assessment system will occur this upcoming Fall. We look forward to adopting an assessment system that will aid in accurately tracking information on applicant qualifications, candidate experiences, graduates, and overall unit and program quality on a consistent basis.

The unit acknowledges the importance of continuous improvement and continues to seek measures that will ensure course and program alignment with SPA (Specialized Professional Association) and CAEP standards.

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

3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
A.5.5 Continuous Improvement
x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

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 se

activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

　⦿ **Yes**　○ **No**

6.3 Optional Comments

Section 7: Transition

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

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

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

☐ **No identified gaps**

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

The unit firmly believes that the preparation of effective and competent teachers requires rigorous and ongoing evaluation of the program. Specifically, the unit focuses on how the program is delivered and the effectiveness of its program completers. Moreover, the unit understands the importance of using CAEP standards as a guide in the process of continuous improvement. As mentioned in the previous, the implementation of Chalk and Wire should have occurred last Fall. However, Implementation of Chalk and Wire, the new E-portfolio and data management service has been delayed due to University-wide discussions regarding the need for improved data analysis capabilities. University leadership is now considering adding components to our LMS Canvas in the form of "Portfolium" to meet data gathering needs as well as to greatly limit the cost to students. We had anticipated a Fall 2017 launch of this service. With faculty training and University level organizational needs assessment, it will occur this upcoming Fall. This assessment system will aid in accurately tracking information on applicant qualifications, candidate experiences, graduates, and overall unit and program quality on a consistent basis. The unit acknowledges the importance of continuous improvement and continues to seek measures that will ensure course and program alignment with SPA (Specialized Professional Association) and CAEP standards. The unit continues to plan on taking the following steps to close these gaps:
1. Use multiple measures to monitoring student growth at different points throughout the program (ex. professional dispositions, assessments, course assignments).
2. Conduct student surveys to determine teacher effectiveness and program completer satisfaction.
3. Conduct employer surveys to gather employer's satisfaction of our teacher education program.
4. Use ongoing multiple measures in data collection to enhance overall program improvement through external tools such as TLE (Teacher and Leader Effectiveness) evaluation system. TLE data is now available (since 2017) for the unit to use as evidence of program completers' impact on student learning and development.

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

　4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
　4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
　4.3 Employer satisfaction
　4.4 Completer satisfaction
　5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
　5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
　5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation

A.5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation

A.5.3 Continuous Improvement

A.5.4 Continuous Improvement

A.5.5 Continuous Improvement

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

◉ **Yes** ○ **No**

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

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

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

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

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Veronica Aguinaga

Position: Accreditation Assessment Coordinator/Assistant Professor

Phone: 5807747115

E-mail: veronica.aguinaga@swosu.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**