

2019 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 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹ 43

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 66

Total number of program completers 109

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: <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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

Are benchmarks available for comparison?

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

In spring 2018 the EPP was granted approval to begin an internal fellows program that provides candidates with outstanding high school records to enter the university as an EDU-Fellow. In 2018-2019 the EPP admitted 27 outstanding candidates across all licensure areas to participate in a cohort experience that is designed to increase both recruitment and retention efforts. Data from this first cohort indicated that their first semester collective GPAs were the highest across all university discipline-specific fellows programs. Additionally, applications for the 2019-2020 cohort have increased significantly with a plan to admit 35 EDU-Fellows for the upcoming academic year. The EPP continues to offer 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. To date, approximately 50% of EPP candidates opt to continue into one of the BA to M.Ed. programs thereby allowing our students to develop advanced content knowledge in the STEM and Literacy areas. As beginning teachers it is clear that the continued networking with EPP faculty during the fifth year of study and the advanced coursework maximizes the positive impact on P-12 learning that our BA to M.Ed. candidates have on K-12 student performance. Student performance test data and principal evaluations of our graduates seemingly confirm this. Additionally, the EPP continues to monitor teaching effectiveness and several program revisions were made across various licensure areas including adding a second math/science methods course for elementary education majors, reducing the required number of concentrations for middle grades majors to enable them more opportunity to study a content area in depth, and adding required fieldwork for all middle and secondary majors in highly impacted schools. The EPP will continue to track principal survey responses regarding these program revisions to determine impact on elementary, middle and secondary candidates. The EPP continues to monitor its own graduation rates and trends in enrollment and 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, the majority of graduates leave the state to teach elsewhere. North Carolina continues to suffer from a significant teaching shortage and the EPP faculty have implemented strategies that have been designed to address these data trends both internally within the institution as well as statewide. The EPP has made progress with

the addition of its liberal arts Education Studies major and minor. To date, more than 40 students have either declared the major or minor in Education Studies, thus allowing the EPP to interact with students from across campus in related majors such as Psychology, Sociology, Political Science and Human Relations. Students choosing to double major or minor in Education Studies become exposed to education faculty, EPP related events and opportunities in K-12 schools that can serve to stimulate interest in teaching. The EPP customizes internships within the major and the minor allowing students in other majors to explore careers in education. Recent graduates have gone into School Counseling, teaching in Charter Schools, and working in organizations the focus on K-12 education such as the Guilford Education Alliance. As noted previously, the EPP was awarded a N.C. Association of School Leadership Development (NCASLD) 1.87 million dollar grant in October of 2016 and this has been refunded until 2020 with an additional 33 candidates being admitted into the HPU Leadership Academy from across eight school districts in North Carolina. To date, 90% (27) individuals have received principal appointments within the 8 school districts the EPP is partnering with. In October 2018 the EPP was awarded a TQP (Teacher Quality Partnership) federal grant for 3.8 million dollars to develop a clinical residency program in partnership with A&T State University and Guilford County Schools. The grant is designed to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers for low performing in Guilford County in Elementary STEM and Secondary Mathematics. Candidates selected for participation will complete Master of Arts (MAT) teaching degrees in Elementary Education or Secondary Mathematics while completing a year clinical residency with a mentor teaching at a highly impacted school.

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.

In 2017 the EPP designed a clinical residency model of program delivery that will be implemented as part of a federal TQP grant received from the US Department of Education. In this model, teacher assistants will be placed in highly impacted schools with mentor teachers who will work in partnership with the EPP and A&T State University to prepare elementary and high school mathematics teachers. The 25 mentor teachers will be selected by the district in collaboration with the two EPPs participating in the Clinical Residency PREPARE program each year for four consecutive years. Through this model the PREPARE Clinical Residency program will allow for a more collaborative and sustained level of involvement of P-12 faculty with EPP faculty. The selection of cohort mentor teachers from underperforming P-12 schools will allow these individuals to professionally engage with the EPP, serve as clinical adjuncts for the university and participate in all the professional development opportunities being provided to the 25 "teacher residents" each year. These professional developments currently include a two-day Summer Institute on culturally relevant pedagogy and a series of STEM Saturday workshops that will provide advanced opportunities for participants to learn about various STEM topics as they apply to K-12 classrooms including "Using a Children's Garden to Teach Math and Science", "Engineering is Elementary", "Coding", "Robotics", etc. University faculty will work alongside of mentor teachers in the residency classrooms to provide further instruction and feedback to "teacher residents" in applying content learned in MAT coursework to the classroom. By restructuring the traditional field experiences model, mentor teachers will actually become partners in the preparation of preservice teachers as will likewise have opportunities to revision their own classrooms 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 (2) to transform training and professional development of P-12 faculty provided by the EPP through reciprocal partnerships that utilize a clinical residency model for school improvement. The model further offers an innovative way for EPPs to build in accountability for the quality of clinical field experiences as the P-12 mentor teachers who will participate in this grant-funded program will receive sustained and ongoing professional development by the EPP.

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 2017-2018 the EPP continued in its implementation of the newly required edTPA performance based portfolio and submitted 30% of these performance-based assessments for candidates across all licensure programs. The data received from 2017-2018 was used by the EPP to determine necessary programmatic revisions including adding additional preparatory assignments for Secondary Education and Health/PE candidates. In 2017-2018 the EPP developed a new course which will now be required of all students completing the edTPA portfolio which will be taken in the fall semester when the year-long clinical internship begins. Along with these changes the EPP has created two pathways in all degree programs (Elementary Education, Middle Grades Education, Special Education and Health/PE), thus allowing students to choose either the "Licensure Track" or "Non-Licensure Track". Students choosing to complete the degree program with the license are expected to complete all related requirements including the edTPA portfolio, specialized Praxis, CKT or Pearson exams and the 16-week clinical internship which extends across the final two semesters. Students choosing the non-licensure track complete the major coursework only and exit the program without being recommended for a teaching license. This revision has allowed the EPP to develop clearer policies for completion of required tests for the license and subsequently has been able to be more accountable for those exiting the program who are recommended for licensure. These policy changes have been incorporated into the EPP Assessment Plan and are reflected in the final gateway (Exit from the Program). In accordance to HB 599 the EPP has implemented the required 16-week student teaching internship and one designated clinical field experience in a "low performing school" during the last year (as noted in the 2016-2017 report) and plans to make adjustments in scheduling for secondary licensure candidates who have been challenged by adding the two additional weeks of internship in the fall given their extensive course load in the College of Arts and Sciences.

With regard to advanced-level standards the TQP grant received by the EPP focuses specifically on the recruitment of diverse candidates who must complete a year-long clinical residency in a highly impacted school through the Master of Arts (MAT) teaching program. Additionally program completers are required to teach a minimum of three years in a highly impacted school in Guilford County. The program evaluation of the PREPARE Residency program is designed to track diversity statistics of candidates admitted into the program and the impact of the residency program on teacher quality and preparation, retention, and impact on P-12 student learning. The TQP grant was written in 2017-2018 with key stakeholders from Guilford County Schools and A&T State University. Currently two doctoral dissertations are currently being written by EPP candidates both employed in the public school district that focuses on research evaluating the efficacy of models used to prepare "teacher residents" in areas of culturally relevant pedagogy and a comparison of residency programs with more traditional alternative teacher licensure pathway programs.

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

- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.3 Employer 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.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities
- A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
- A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
- A.3.4 Selection at Completion
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
- x.1 Diversity
- 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 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 2019 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 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**