2018 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11908	AACTE SID:	3155
Institution:	Mississippi State University		
Unit:	College 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 2016-2017 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to <u>initial</u> teacher certification or licensure[1]

`307`

2.1.2 Number of completers in <u>advanced</u> 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]

`21`

Total number of program completers 328

---

[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: https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/p12/

Description of data accessible via link: Impact on P-12 Learning – Three cohorts, comprised of completers graduating with a bachelor's degree in teacher education programs in academic years 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016 and who started working as a teacher in a Mississippi public school the following academic year, were identified. Analysis of the data showed learning outcomes of Mississippi public school students taught by the College of Education program completers in their first year of teaching. Data were collected from statewide assessments established by the Mississippi Department of Education. Assessments, which were administered in diverse subjects and grades, were implemented in public school districts in Mississippi.

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			☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2

Link: https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/teaching-effectiveness/

Description of data accessible via link: Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness – Data from the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument, which assesses the professional knowledge and skills for program completers/candidates, were analyzed to determine teaching effectiveness. These data include formative and summative assessments from Classroom Mentor Teacher and University Supervisors from fall 2014 through spring 2017.

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			☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3

Link:	https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/milestone/
Description of data accessible via link:	Satisfaction of Employers and Milestones – The Employer Survey 2016 and 2017 results provide information from employers about the knowledge, skills, and dispositions (preparedness) of the College of Education's completers as they enter the workforce and assume the responsibility of teaching P-12 students. The Milestones Data include results of the first year teachers (2014-2015 completers and 2015-2016 completers) who were retained in Mississippi public schools the following academic year. Satisfaction of Employers data for advanced program level is not available at this time but will be available in one year.

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

Link:	https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/exitsurvey/
Description of data accessible via link:	Exit Surveys of Completers-Initial program completers' data show results beginning in 2009-2010 through 2016-2017 and Advance program completers' data show results beginning 2011-2012 through 2016-2017.

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			☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐

5

Link:	https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/gradrates/
Description of data accessible via link:	Graduation Rates – Graduation rates are provided for completers who were admitted into initial programs in academic years 2012-2013, 2013-2014, and 2014-2015. Graduation rates for completers of advanced program are not available at this time but will be available in one year.

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			☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐

6

Link:	https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/title2/
Description of data accessible via link:	Praxis II/Title II Reports – Data for institutional-level pass rates and single assessment pass rates for initial programs are provided for academic years 2000-2001 through 2016-2017. Data for traditional (initial) and alternative institutional level and single assessment pass rate data are provided for academic years 2014-2015 through 2016-2017.

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			☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

7

Link:	https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/licensure/
Description of data	Licensure Scores – A three year pass rate history of the Praxis Subject Assessments for initial program

completers (2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017) are provided. Data for advanced program level are not available at this time but will be available in one year.

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			☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐

8

Link: https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/employmentstatus/

Description of data accessible via link: Employment Status – Data are included for the employment status of initial program completers and advanced program completers (2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017) who are employed in a Mississippi Public School.

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			☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐

9

Link: https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/student-loan-default-rates/

Description of data accessible via link: Student Loan Default Rates & Consumer Information – Student Loan Default Rates for the FY2012, 2013, and 2014 are provided along with Consumer Information that shares general information, educational programs, financial information, health & safety, research, and service/outreach.

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?

In reviewing the Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years, the Provider has determined that using multi-dimensional measures of assessments impact programs at different levels. The Impact on P-12 Learning data of the first year teachers indicates that the academic performance of the P-12 students are comparable to the statewide performance level. However, when reviewing the data, it was noted that the Mississippi Department of Education changed state testing assessments in 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016. Therefore, determination of Impact on P-12 Learning over a period of three years was not clear. Using the 2015-2016 first year teacher cohort compared to the overall state results, the greater impact came from the Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) English Language Arts with classroom students' achieving at a higher percentage (1.9%) at the proficient or advanced performance level. The lower impact came from the MAAP Math with classroom students scoring 2.4% less than the state at the proficient or advanced performance level. The MAAP measures student progress in grades 3 through 8 in English Language Arts and Math. High school students take end-of-course exams in Algebra I, English II, Biology, and US History to determine the impact on student learning. In reviewing data on all three cohorts of the first year teachers using the end of the course exams compared to the state, it showed that the first year teachers had less impact on the student growth than the overall state results. The emerging trend indicated that first year teachers may not be teaching in the primary content area of the degree earned.

The Provider requires that the statewide Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) be used by Classroom Mentor Teachers and University Supervisors to assess completers' effectiveness on applied professional knowledge and skills in the field preparation experiences. The TIAI has 25 indicators and uses a Likert scale of 0 (Unacceptable), 1 (Emerging), 2 (Acceptable),

and 3 (Target). The faculty use the TIAI as an assessment in their annual Institutional Effectiveness Reports and have set as a benchmark that at least 80% of the completers will perform at the Acceptable level (2) or higher on all 25 indicators. The data (Fall 2014-Spring 2017) show that the benchmark has been met with the exception of the English Education program in the Fall 2014 semester on item 18 ,"Uses family and/or community resources (special guests or materials) in lessons to enhance student learning," and Music Education program in the Fall 2016 on item 17, "Engages students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking," and item 18, "Elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses. Makes adjustments to lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses." The Provider is reviewing the current TIAI with the Mississippi Department of Education and other EPPs in the state for modifications to ensure validity and inter-rater reliability. The modified TIAI will be implemented in fall 2018.

The Provider began surveying employers through a statewide survey two years ago. The trend data showed in the first year that 15 of the 18 survey items were rated at least 82% Agree/Strongly Agree satisfaction by employers (principals). For the second year deployment of the survey, the Provider expanded the population of the employers to evaluate first year and third year completers. For the second year deployment, 17 of the 18 survey items received 80% Agree/Strongly Agree satisfaction by the employers (principals). Overall, the Provider anticipated positive results from the employers with no unexpected trends. The emerging trend from milestones was 89% of the 2014-2015 completers were retained as a teacher the following year in a Mississippi Public School as well as 87.2% of the 2015-2016 completers were retained the following year. Overall, of the 148 schools districts in the state of Mississippi, the Provider's first year teachers (2014-2015 or 2015-2016) were employed in 91 school districts which consist of 217 Mississippi public schools which indicates a positive economic impact on the state and the Provider.

The three year trend data (Fall 2012-Summer 2015) regarding Graduation Rates of students who were admitted into teacher education initial programs were as follows: 85.8%, 84.2%, and 88.8%. However, of those students who did not graduate in the teacher education initial programs, overall graduate rates at the University were as follows: 93.5%, 89.2%, and 91.9%. The trend determined that a benchmark of at least 85% is being met for the Provider.

For Title II/Praxis II, the Provider has statewide comparison passage rate data since 2000. The last three year trend (2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017) showed that the Provider's initial (traditional) program completers performed at or above the statewide passage rate (91% or higher). For the alternative teacher initial program completers, the three year trend showed that completers did not perform at or above the statewide comparison rate for the first two years, but were 2% higher than statewide the last year. The Provider has established an improved process to better align the Title II definitions for the alternative teacher initial program due to this unexpected trend.

Based upon the Mississippi State Board of Education's licensure guidelines/cut scores, all initial programs with the exception of Secondary Education Math and Secondary Education Foreign Language have at least 88% or higher passage rate based upon the three year trend. Based on this data, the Secondary Education Foreign Language initial program has been suspended due to lack of enrollment and is to be closed as of fall 2018. The Provider in collaboration with other EPPs in the state has proposed to the Mississippi Department of Education that the cut score be adjusted for Secondary Education Math. The proposal is being considered for approval by the Mississippi State Board of Education.

The employment status for initial and advanced programs were based upon completers who were employed in the Mississippi Public Schools. The emerging three year trend shows that at least 75% of the initial teacher education completers were employed in the Mississippi Public Schools and that 96% of the advanced program completers were employed in the Mississippi Public Schools. The Provider is investigating sources to track completers that have gained employment out of state and/or private schools.

The multi-dimensional measures of assessments have been shared in various ways through the Provider's Assessment Committee which has faculty representation from each area of the initial programs as well as advanced programs, the External Advisory Board, and the Education Administrative Council which includes the Dean, Associate Dean, and Assistant Dean along with department heads from the initial and advanced programs. Department heads, assessment committee members, and program coordinators share assessment information with the faculty during retreats and monthly meetings. This information has also been published on the Provider's website for public review.

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 4 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. The unit does not ensure that candidates work with English language learners during some of their field experiences or clinical practice.   (ITP) (ADV)

Candidates in the College of Education (COE) at Mississippi State University (MSU) interact with P-12 students from a broad range of diverse groups. COE partner school districts have diverse P-12 populations, including students with exceptionalities and English language learners (ELLs).
In initial teacher education programs, candidates complete field experiences in diverse P-12 educational settings. The COE Office

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 EPP annually assesses and updates its performance against its goals through the University's Institutional Effectiveness process which consists of Institutional Effectiveness Reports that 1) identify the expected outcomes (goals), 2) set an assessment protocol to measure the outcomes, 3) report the results of the protocol, and 4) provide evidence of improvement based upon the analysis of the results. The EPP collects data through fall and spring and then reflects and makes modifications/adjustments using these results for continuous improvement.

One of the EPP's goals was to measure student success with respect to student achievement. Student enrollment, graduation rates, and employment rates were used as the assessment protocols. The benchmark for student enrollment and graduation rates was that the EPP will show an increase from the previous year. Hence, student enrollment in the initial programs showed a decrease of 4.15% from the previous year but in the advanced programs an increase of 92.86% from the previous year occurred (1-Enrollment attachment). Graduation rates in the initial programs went from 84.2% to 88.8% which was a 4.6% increase (2-Graduation rates attachment). Employment rates (3-Employment rates attachment) in the initial programs went from 70.6% to 74.3% which was a 3.7% increase and in the advanced programs, there was an increase of 13.3% (86.7% to 100%). From the data analysis, the EPP focused on student enrollment in the initial programs since there had been a 4.15% decrease. Additionally, a five year trend showed digression in enrollment since Fall 2012 at 9.16% with the exception of Fall 2015 (1 student increase from the previous year).

The EPP took action by revitalizing the EPP Recruitment Committee (4-Recruitment Committee attachment) as a standing committee with representatives from each department including ex-officio representatives from the University's Graduate School and Office of Admissions and Scholarships to assist with strategies to increase enrollment. An overall recruitment calendar was created encompassing events that all departments participate in and/or host in order to utilize resources efficiently and effectively. Approximately 62 high schools and/or community colleges were visited in the 2016-2017 academic year. The EPP participated in the University's new recruitment event, Stately Dinners. The first Mississippi Excellence in Teaching Program (METP) Scholars Day was hosted by the EPP that correlated with the University's national Merit Event with approximately 75 students and parents attending the event as prospects. From the recruiting event, 45% of these students were selected for the METP. The METP is based upon academic achievement, service, educational experiences, and passion for teaching. Competitive applicants are expected to have a minimum ACT score of 28 or SAT score of 1310, and a minimum high school GPA of 3.5. Transfer students must have completed at least 48 hours of transferable community college courses applicable to a bachelor's degree in education at the EPP with a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.5. The EPP participated for the first time in the Phi Theta Kappa Annual Convention for transfer students being a Bronze sponsor with 4,000 students and 750 faculty advisors in attendance. From this event, the EPP's recruitment coordinator corresponded with 1,518 prospective undergraduate transfer students interested in majors in the EPP.

The EPP received a recruitment grant from a non-profit agency which provided funding for an additional recruitment coordinator. Also, the grant monies were used for billboards, radio advertisements, two commercials, rack cards, updated brochures, Google Ads, and Facebook Ads. (5-Billboard). Approximately 60,939 impressions from Facebook ads and 3,582 impressions from the Google ads occurred. Through these innovations funded by the grant, the enrollment for the Fall 2017 semester increased by 5.58%. Additionally, the billboards across the state and one of the commercials focused on the online elementary education program due to the large amount of job openings (elementary, middle, early childhood, kindergarten, etc,) noted on the Mississippi Department of Education's website (http://teach.k12.ms.us/index.html?district=All). For Fall 2016, the online enrollment for the EPP was 356. With the implementation of the marketing strategies mentioned above, the Fall 2007 online enrollment increased by 20.51% (429 students).

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

> 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
> 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
> 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

📎 1Enrollment_by_Program_and_Concentration_(Fall_2011Fall_2017).pdf

📎 2Graduation_Rates.pdf

📎 3Employment_Rates_FY_1415_1617.pdf

📎 4Recruitment_and_Outreach_Committee_Members_20162017.pdf

📎 5COE_Billboard_June_2017.pdf

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

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 the 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 fully prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text applies.

Identified Gaps included the following:
1) When reviewing the State data for Impact on P-12 learning and development, it became evident that the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) had changed state testing assessments in 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016. Therefore, determination of the impact over a period of three years was not clear. The MDE has not indicated any changes for the upcoming year, and hopefully, longitudinal data can be defined more clearly.
2) For Advanced Programs, when defining an "admitted student," the EPP found that some candidates begin as unclassified students taking up to nine hours and then the students' classifications changed to continued instead of first-time graduate students within the EPP's administrative software system. Therefore, the EPP found it difficult to calculate graduation rates. The EPP has determined that program coordinators need to discuss and define an admitted student and implement an electronically accessible tracking process to determine graduation rates.
3) The employment status for initial and advanced programs were based upon completers who were employed in the Mississippi Public Schools. The gap is tracking completers who were employed outside of the state and in private schools. The EPP is investigating sources to track completers that have gained employment out of state and/or in private schools.
4) For Advanced Programs, there was a gap on tracking the satisfaction of employers. The EPP is developing a more comprehensive survey that aligns to the newly approved CAEP Advanced Standards that will be deployed to all advanced program completers.

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

4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement

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 2018 EPP Annual Report.*

☑ I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Mitzy Johnson

Position: Assistant Dean

Phone: 662-325-2245

E-mail: mitzy.johnson@colled.msstate.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