

2018 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11193	AACTE SID:	1450
Institution:	High Point University		
Unit:	Stout School 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 85

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://www.highpoint.edu/education/program-completion/>

Description of data accessible via link: Information and data requested above.

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 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?

The EPP continues to offer several BA to M.Ed. programs that allow students completing the initial license to continue for an additional year of study and earn a master's degree in a specialization area such as STEM, Literacy, Special Education or Leadership. Specializations continue to allow our students to have positive impacts on P-12 learning as is indicated by K-12 student performance test data and principal evaluations of our graduates. Additionally, the EPP continues to monitor teaching effectiveness by also asking principal to complete surveys about our graduates in their first three years of teaching. As a result of continued comments about the need for additional coursework in classroom management and intervention, the EPP added a second behavior management course in 2016 to the eElementary Education program of study that moves candidates from understanding "prevention" strategies to "intervention" strategies. The second course focuses on more significant behavioral issues and introduces functional behavior assessment and other strategies to provide interventions when needed. The response to this course has been most positive and the EPP will continue to track principal survey data to determine the course's impact. A second change implemented by the EPP was to add additional content in special education required courses that would enable non-special education majors to receive more information on the characteristics and needs of K-12 students with various learning needs. This revision of an existing course (EDU 3100) was also initiated in 2016. As the EPP continues to monitor its own graduation rates and trends in enrollment it has been noted that there has been a general decline in the number of students declaring education as a major at High Point University. Additionally, it has been noted that the vast majority of graduates leave

the state to teach elsewhere. North Carolina continues to suffer from a significant teaching shortage and therefore several strategies have been initiated by the EPP in an effort to address these data trends both internally within the institution as well as statewide. In an effort to stimulate interest in majors offered within the School of Education, the EPP has added additional tracks of study that encourage students from the majors to consider minoring in education or majoring in a new liberal arts Education Studies major. Within the minor and the major students can choose a cluster of courses that could potentially lead to a teaching license in a particular area of interest. Internships within the minor and the major can be customized to allow students in other majors to explore careers in education, thus stimulating interest in teaching in K-12 settings. While the new Education Studies major was created in 2016, our enrollment data shows the EPP has already attracted 40 new students to the School of Education. The EPP intends to carefully track graduates who complete this major to determine how much impact this program of study has had on attracting new persons to the teaching profession. The Dean of the School of Education now sits on the Guilford County Schools Superintendent's "Think Tank" which is designed to encourage collaboration across all the IHE School of Education deans which currently serve Guilford County Schools in North Carolina. As a result, the EPP is working to develop a Residency model in a partnership with Guilford County to increase the number of graduates from the EPP who will remain in the area to teach while completing final licensure requirements. The School of Education and GCS are committed to developing a clinical preparation model that is high-quality and results in graduates who are well-prepared and ready to teach. The EPP continues to collect data on the awards and recognitions received by our graduates in their teaching and administrative careers. During the 2016-2017 year, EPP graduates continued to be named Rookie TOY, school level TOY as well as those in advanced programs receiving statewide recognition such as ASCD Educator of the Year and others. It is noted that graduates of the EPP Doctoral program in Educational Leadership has resulted in three 2016 Ed.D. graduates being named as North Carolina School Superintendents. In October of 2016, the EPP was awarded a 1.87 million dollar grant to prepare aspiring teachers to become school leaders in eight North Carolina School districts. In 2016-2017, the EPP prepared 30 candidates through the N.C. Association of School Leadership Development grant at its HPU Leadership Academy. The grant will continue to be funded for 2017-2018 and beyond. Baseline data have been collected on these candidates and will be tracked to determine program impact. To date, five of these 30 individuals have already received principal appointments within the 8 school districts the EPP is partnering with. It is also noted in 2016, that the National Council of Teacher Quality (NCTQ) ranked the EPP within the top 10% nationally (97th percentile) for Elementary Education and Secondary programs of study out of 875 undergraduate institutions offering educator preparation.

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.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators

Ongoing, sustained P-12 faculty professional development is limited.

Beginning in 2016, the EPP has been redesigning its Clinical Educator model of program delivery in an effort to develop a stronger, more collaborative and sustained level of involvement of P-12 faculty. Within this model, the EPP is working with surrounding school districts to pilot an innovative model of educator preparation that will target and actually utilize a select cohort of current teachers from underperforming P-12 schools to serve as clinical adjuncts for the university. By restructuring the traditional field experiences model, clinical educators will become partners in the preparation of preservice teachers as they revision their own classrooms to serve as learning "laboratories" for P-12 students. Specifically, the revised model has two target goals: (1) to reinvent the recruitment process to actually help under-performing schools better attract high quality teachers and incentivize truly aspiring teacher leaders to remain in their present positions and (2) to transform training and professional development of P-12 faculty provided by the EPP through reciprocal partnerships that utilize a clinical educator model for school improvement. The emphasis placed on Educator Preparation Programs to increased accountability standards regarding clinical field experiences can sometimes limit the capacity for university educator preparation programs to place preservice teachers at highly impacted schools, particularly for upper level experiences such as student teaching. As more and more universities move to sustained year-long internships and residency models, the stakes become even higher to provide high quality opportunities for novice teachers to see and learn from the very best. It is desirable for all schools to be able to benefit from strong partnerships that bring invested university faculty, teachers and local school leaders together to transform underperforming schools into places of learning that successfully recruit and retain the best and the brightest educators. Using the model of "Improvement Science" the EPP has introduced a newer model of P-12 Faculty Involvement by piloting an intervention that identifies a selective cohort of teacher leaders from highly impacted schools who are willing to become clinical adjunct faculty. Clinical faculty receive adjunct salary to serve as mentors and clinical supervisors in their own classrooms which, in partnership with the university, will provide carefully controlled "lab opportunities" for preservice teachers as well as demonstration classrooms for other teachers at the school. Professional development is planned and organized through the IHE-School District partnership and clinical educators work with university faculty to receive sustained training on hosting, mentoring, and evaluating interns at all levels of the EPP program including serving as site supervisors for the student teaching internship. It is expected that teachers who participate in this revised model of P-12 clinical faculty involvement will fully invest themselves as they become recognized for their leadership roles at their school and are incentivized as "salaried" adjuncts to the university. The model offers an innovative way for a university educator preparation program to build in accountability for the quality of clinical field experiences as P-12 faculty receive much more sustained and ongoing professional development by the EPP, thus improving the clinical field experiences offered to preservice teachers. Through this revised model "clinical adjuncts" receive financial compensation which further reinforces accountability and investment in the process. Opportunities for professional development, additional classroom

resources and recognition creates partners in underperforming schools who are committed to a model of preservice preparation that improves the preparation of future teachers but also will allow these teacher leaders to serve as facilitators to other teachers at their own school, slowly building a larger cohort of P-12 faculty involvement.

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?

In 2016-2017 the implementation of the required edTPA performance based portfolio as well as the incorporation of new requirements resulting from the passing of N.C. Senate Bill 599 were implemented by the EPP. In 2016 the EPP began the implementation of the edTPA portfolio and conducted a pilot of seven candidates completing their respective programs of study during student teaching. Licensure areas represented were Elementary Education, Middle Grades Social Studies, Special Education, and Secondary Mathematics. The data from 2016-2017 will be used by the EPP as baseline and edTPA portfolio scores will be added to the EPP Assessment Plan for the final gateway (Exit from the Program) moving forward. Along with edTPA, in 2016-2017 the EPP submitted all current approved licensure programs to the N.C. State Department of Public Instruction for reauthorization. With this reauthorization request the following changes were made by the EPP with regard to all initial licensure programs including the addition of a required 16-week student teaching internship, and one designated clinical field experience in a "low performing school". The EPP field-tested the 16-week internship requirement by restructuring the fall Internship I (EDU 4134/44/54/64/74) to Introduction to Student Teaching (EDU 4134/44/54/64/74) which adds a full-time week at the beginning of the fall semester and another full-time week during final exams in the fall for Elementary and Special Education majors and adding a full-time week at the conclusion of the spring semester: Student Teaching Continuation (EDU 4230/40/50/60/70) for Middle, Secondary and Health/PE majors. Using the new 16-week model of student teaching, the EPP also spend 2016-2017 determining how best to incorporate required edTPA components as well as how to provide prior experiences for candidates earlier in the program to learn about edTPA and have opportunities to practice assignments, lesson plan development, videotaping and developing commentaries prior to the final internship. Initial data collection this year will be benchmarked and includes reviewing annually the scores on required multiple choice tests for juniors to demonstrate an understanding of the edTPA handbook (now part of the final Gateway Assessment at the conclusion to the junior year), the scores on all practice assignments in earlier methods courses and using edTPA portfolio scores to determine program quality and need for revision. The edTPA portfolio data base will be set up to track passing scores for program completers as well as the usefulness of earlier practice assignments and

their impact on edTPA scores, disaggregated by licensure area. As mentioned previously, when submitting existing licensure programs to the NC State Department of Public Instruction for reauthorization the elementary program of study included the addition of a second behavior management course designed to further develop an understanding of how preventive strategies may occasionally require interventions based on functional assessments. This addition was based on ongoing review of Employer Satisfaction surveys of our graduates during their first three years of teaching. Literacy courses have been restructured to further focus on primary (Early Childhood) and Intermediate reading/literacy methodologies. A second Math/Science Integrated methods course was also added to be more consistent with the EPP focus on STEM areas. Finally, a new program completer survey designed to be administered at the start of student teaching was distributed to all seniors during the fall of 2017. Candidates were asked to respond to a series of items which were clustered under the categories of Disposition, Diversity, Content, Parents and Personal that sought to identify key areas of concern as they began their year-long internship. Data were desegregated by licensure area and GPA. Interestingly, candidates with lower GPA tended to self identify as being less concerned about the various items assessed and special education majors identified themselves as the least concerned of all groups surveyed. Finally, the category of "Personal Issues" (not having enough time, etc.) ended up being the category of items candidates expressed the most concern about. The survey will be administered again next fall 2018 with the goal of using the information to better meet the needs (and concerns) of student teachers during Orientation to Student Teaching.

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

- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 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
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
- A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
- A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
- A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
- A.3.4 Selection at Completion
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement

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 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:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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 completion 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