2017 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID: 14021	AACTE SID:

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.

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<u> </u>	0
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<u> </u>	0
1.1.3 Program listings	箴	0

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 2015-2016 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to $\underline{\text{initial}}$ 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.)

50	 	
59		

240

Total number of program completers 299

*2.2 Indicate whether the EPP is currently offering a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure.

Yes, a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification is currently being offered.

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2015-2016 academic year?

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

No Change / Not Applicable

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

The following is being added as an off-site elementary education program: Elementary Education at Chesapeake College, Wye Mills, Maryland.

The program was in place when we were accredited in 2013. However, it was not listed as a separate off-site program. In the last accreditation report, it was incorporated into the campus program. We understand now that under CAEP, this program should be listed as a separate off-site program.

3.3 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

3.4 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:

3.5 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.6 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

Section 4. Display of candidate performance data.

Provide a link that demonstrates candidate performance data are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the school, college, or department of education homepage.

Answers to frequently asked questions about program and University information, default rates, time to degree, P-12 connections, survey reports, pass rates, employment rates: <u>http://www.salisbury.edu/seidel/peu.html</u>

Section 6. 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.

that included a unit level Assessment/Accreditation Team (AAT) of faculty members.

This AAT meets biweekly since 2016 and leads the rebuilding work around developing quality rubrics at program and unit levels. We also made special efforts to attend all of CAEP's conferences and brought back and shared with the faculty and our field partners information that justified the need for change not just to meet the new accreditation standards, but more for our own program improvement benefits. These efforts initiated some much-needed changes in the general culture of the school and mindset of the faculty.

As was mentioned above, a critical part of the rebuilding was the development and implementation of an assessment structure with built-in accommodations for systematic use of program data at the unit and department level to evaluate the efficacy of courses, programs, and clinical experiences. This effort also includes revamping the poor quality instruments that were used to gather and provide evidence for the 2013 accreditation visit. Again, this work is ongoing. It is hoped that all assessments used across programs and unit will be at or above CAEP's "sufficient level" by the end of this spring 2017 semester and ready for full implementation in fall. This will allow us to confidently collect meaningful and useful data going forward.

2. A major understanding developed from attending CAEP's conferences over the years has been the emphasis placed on the quality of rubrics used to generate evidence. Our EPP-created assessments that were used for the last NCATE visit do not meet the CAEP Evaluation Framework's (CEF) "sufficient level." Therefore the data resulting from these instruments were of little true value in terms of informing unit level decisions. Given his background, the major work in the unit, as was mentioned above, is to

cultural competencies among all faculty that will positively influence their pedagogical practices as well as their interactions with underrepresented students in other aspects of the school community.

Section 7. Accreditation Pathway

Selected Improvement. Summarize progress on the Selected Improvement plan for the standard(s) or component(s) selected.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and clinical practice is the selected standard on which the unit is moving to the target level.

The unit continues to make improvement on this standard. The strong working relationships between the PEU and the 33 Professional Development Schools (PDS) in eight counties in Maryland continues to receive national attention and awards. The University was honored with the 2017 Exemplary PDS Achievement Award from the National Association of Professional Development Schools (NAPDS). The award applauds the outstanding school-university partnerships that shape current and future