2018 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11688	AACTE SID:	3030
Institution:	The University of Memphis		
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]

119

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]

34

Total number of program completers   153

---

[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

Secondary Education Math Program has been added at the Bachelor's level in addition to that offered at the Master of Arts level. Both are Initial Licensure programs. There are 13 students at the freshman and sophomore level presently. They will apply to the Teacher Education Program by the end of this semester. No data are available on their progress in the Teacher Education Program at this time.

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

<div align="center">No Change / Not Applicable</div>

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

<div align="center">No Change / Not Applicable</div>

3.7 Change in state program approval

<div align="center">No Change / Not Applicable</div>

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.memphis.edu/caep/caep/index.php
Description of data accessible via link:	Data for the four Impact and four Outcome measures are noted at the top of the page.

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?

Review of Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years
We have a solid program that is respected and appreciated by our partner schools. Our completers believe that they are well prepared to enter the workforce as a teacher and that perception is shared by administrators and mentor teachers who work with our candidates at both the graduate and undergraduate Initial Licensure area (CAEP Impact Measures 3 and 4). Our Initial Licensure completers score well, as shown on their Summative Teaching Evaluations completed by the Pre-service Instructive Mentor (PIM) or Mentor Teacher and University Supervisor (US) and pass rates on the Educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) (CAEP Impact Measures 1 and 2). These data suggest that completers at the Initial Licensure level are ready to become entry-level teachers. The edTPA is consequential for licensure at the University of Memphis and for the Master of Arts in Teaching (Graduate level) candidates, it is also consequential for graduation since the majority of our candidates are on a Job-Embedded teaching license.

Candidates at the Initial and Advanced Licensure levels complete their studies with a retention or graduation rate around 85%

(79% to 88% as noted on CAEP Outcomes Measure 5). Most Master or Arts in Teaching Initial Licensure candidates are already employed in their area of intended licensure and most others (Bachelor of Science in Education) attain jobs, for which they were prepared, shortly after graduation. Over one-fourth (27%) of Initial Licensure candidates have signed contracts in hand before graduation (CAEP Outcomes Measures 7).

Emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends
An expected long-term trend is the high pass rates on the Educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) for our Bachelor of Science in Education candidates. The overall pass rates for this group is 95%. We began using edTPA in 2010 and have experienced continued success with this. The Master or Arts in Teaching Initial Licensure candidates do not score as well, yet. Their initial pass rate is about 50% for initial submissions; with resubmissions, the rate is about 80% overall. We have not been able to support these candidates as well as we would like to since we began implementing the edTPA with this group in fall 2014. In addition, anecdotal notes from professors show that some candidates do not value this assessment and thus do not put forth their best efforts. This is an ongoing topic of conversation within the department and with those who teach courses outside of the Department of Instruction and Curriculum Leadership.

Another trend is that while our tuition must increase, the University of Memphis President publically committed to keeping it reasonable for students. The most recent increase was only 2% (CAEP Outcomes Measure 8).

As with many programs across the country, our enrollments are decreasing. An emphasis is on recruitment and increasing the number of students who graduate from local high schools and return to Shelby County School classrooms. Available data show that 80% of our teacher education students do not come from Shelby County High Schools, yet many of our completers teach in Shelby County Schools.

A long-term discussion that does not show up in specific data but is a frequent discussion point among our school district stakeholders and the University of Memphis faculty and administration is the preparedness of our candidates for teaching in urban areas. This relates to an unexpected trend that shows our candidates' impact scores (value-added), as reported on our state report card, are not as high as we would like them to be. Discussions among faculty members in the Department of Instruction and Curriculum Leadership and the Office of Teacher Education and Clinical Practice focused on the need to involve stakeholders so we more nearly align our expectations and assessments with those that completers will face in the field. Teacher Education Advisory Committee, consisting of program level representatives and representatives of local school system partners formally discussed this at the February 2018 meeting.

Programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data
Similar versions of Educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) components placed more prominently in formative program coursework will afford students familiarity with the expectations of the portfolio. We abide by Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE) requirements for helping candidates by asking candidates to complete projects that are LIKE those of the edTPA but scored with EPP-created rubrics. We encourage all faculty members teaching the foundational courses in the Initial Licensure programs to deeply engage with the edTPA (e.g., tasks, academic language, and expectations) they can aid candidates in their understanding. This familiarity by faculty members and all candidates will allow our next phase to begin. We will work to replace our edTPA-focused seminar with the former version of the professional seminar where we discuss issues related to the profession (e.g., classroom management, grading, collaborative relationships with parents and colleagues) as these relate to the candidates in their final semester.

Another change is the addition of an Urban Education track (River City Partnership) under the Teaching All Learners (Dual Elementary and Special Education) Licensure Program. This is in direct response to the expressed needs of representatives of the largest district in our area and was created in full collaboration with these partners. Courses have been revised to include a very strong urban focus through outside readings, intentional and purposeful assignments, and targeted clinical experiences. Generous funding from a local entity was offered to get the program running. It begins in Fall 2018.

An additional program related to the River City Partnership is the Summer Bridge Program, also in direct response to the expressed needs of Shelby County Schools (the largest school system in our area). The Summer Bridge Program will invite 25 aspiring Shelby County high school students to campus for a week-long institute intended to introduce these Cadets to teaching in urban schools as a career choice.

Benchmarks available for relevant comparisons and for measuring success
The Tennessee Report Card reports on measures such as candidates employed by public schools in terms of diversity, value added scores, student impact. Data are provided for our EPP and against other public and private institutions in the states. These data are helpful us in judging our success. The state will require completion of the Educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) as consequential for Initial Licensure beginning January 1, 2019. The state-determined pass or cut score (42) will also help us judge our successes. The University of Memphis has had a pass, or cut, score of 42 for at least 5 years. Title II data provides another opportunity to measure our candidates' successes on the various PRAXIS exams.

The University of Memphis has embarked on a strategic plan that includes specific benchmarks for recruitment and graduation for the next 5 years. This plan has correlations to our College of Education's Strategic Plan. This plan was developed from a Think Tank who nominated individuals to serve as a Steering Committee. The Steering Committee nominated individuals for 5 focus groups: Faculty, Staff, Students, On-Campus Partners, and External Community. Using the data gathered from the Focus Groups,

the Steering Committee developed several drafts of the Strategic Plan. This draft, which is aligned with the University's Strategic Plan, has been vetted by the Steering Committee, Focus Group members, the Dean's Executive Leadership Team, and the Dean. The larger community was asked to comment on the document before a final version will be released for a second round of vetting. An Implementation Team will then be created to oversee the Application of the plan in all areas of the College of Education.

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?
Several stakeholder meetings occurred in Spring 2018 to gather, inspect, and share data. These meetings are held by the major divisions in the Instruction and Leadership Department (I.e., Early Childhood, Special Education, Literacy and Learning, and Teacher Education Advisory Council).

Data from our 8 CAEP Annual Reporting Measures are publically available on our website and shared specifically through the stakeholder meetings, individual meetings with donors, and talks in the community.

The College of Education's Strategic Plan is a direct result of collaborative conversations between a group of faculty, staff, students, administrators, and community partners. The process began with members of a Think Tank who nominated individuals to serve as a Steering Committee. The Steering Committee nominated individuals to participate in five focus groups: Faculty, Staff, Students, On-Campus Partners, and External Community. Using the data gathered from the Focus Groups, the Steering Committee developed several drafts of the Strategic Plan. This draft, which is aligned with the University's Strategic Plan, has been vetted by the Steering Committee, Focus Group members, the Dean's Executive Leadership Team, and the Dean. The larger community was asked to comment on the document before a final version will be released for a second round of vetting. An Implementation Team will then be created to oversee the Application of the plan in all areas of the College of Education.

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 lacks sufficient evidence that candidates in the advanced programs; Advanced Early Childhood Education, Advanced Special Education, Educational Leadership Building Level, and Curriculum and Instruction have in-depth content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge and skills in their disciplines. **(ADV)**

The EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP BUILDING LEVEL Scholars II program uses LiveText to track individual students' knowledge according to state and national standards. This tracking began with the current cohort in Fall 2016 and continues through Spring 2018. Individual Scholars II students' reports will reveal the extent to which candidates master each standard (TILS and ELCC). The Department of Instruction and Curriculum Leadership Programs (ADVANCED EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION, ADVANCED SPECIAL EDUCATION, & CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION) Assessment Committee (comprised of representatives of each program) began conversations during the last month of the 2016-17 academic year and continued through the 2017-18 academic year. The plan is to develop a scenario or other task to which candidates respond relative to their individual content areas that would be scored by faculty in their content area. This scenario or task will include a common rubric that addresses content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge and skills. An additional task relative to the content and pedagogy will assess students as they approach graduation. All candidates seeking advanced licensure will be required to submit these, yet to be decided upon, tasks.

Several unforeseen college-wide leadership changes in the past few years (i.e., several interim department chairs, the hiring of a new dean) and hiring a new Assistant Dean for Student Success have occurred. Additional demands on faculty time included multiple national searches to replace six unfilled positions in one department, state-mandated implementation of the new ILA Literacy Standards, and university-driven strategic planning for the College of Education, and a new funding model that requires faculty members teaching more courses rather than hiring adjuncts; thus, little progress has been made in this area. We anticipate moving forward on this to have concrete evidence by Spring 2020.

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

1. The unit does not systematically and comprehensively monitor candidate performance at the transition points. **(ITP) (ADV)**
2. The unit does not consistently disaggregate and analyze candidate and completer data to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. **(ITP) (ADV)**

1. The unit does not systematically and comprehensively monitor candidate performance at the transition points. (ITP) (ADV)
A discussion of transition point assessments was begun the final month of the 2015-16 academic year by the Instruction and Curriculum Leadership Department's Assessment Committee. This committee was comprised of representatives of each program during the 2015-16 academic year and was to continue through the 2016-17 academic year and beyond. We have beginning and ending benchmarks in the PRAXIS Exams and edTPA. The midpoint benchmarks remain incomplete.

Due to unforeseen circumstances, the Assessment Committee's work has not progressed appreciably. An Interim Department Chair installed in August 2016 chose to dissolve the original Assessment Committee in Fall 2016 due to faculty increased responsibility. A replacement Interim Department Chair was installed in fall 2017, but the Assessment Committee was not reinstalled. Additional demands on faculty time included multiple national searches to replace six-eight unfilled faculty positions in the Department of Instruction and Curriculum Leadership, state-mandated implementation of the new ILA Literacy Standards, and university-driven strategic planning for the College of Education, and a new funding model that requires faculty members teaching more courses rather than hiring adjuncts; thus, little progress has been made in this area. A national search will be underway, and we expect a permanent Department Chair to begin working in Fall 2019.

Other leadership changes included the selection and installation of a new permanent College of Education Dean in January 2017 and an Assistant Dean for Student Success in October 2017. They have begun to motivate and encourage faculty actions regarding candidate performance, success rates, program quality and operations. With these mitigating factors, a comprehensive revision of all programmatic benchmarks is slated to be in progress, and to have concrete evidence by Spring 2020.

2. The unit does not consistently disaggregate and analyze candidate and completer data to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. (ITP) (ADV)
Annual Deep Dive Data Days are scheduled in May of each academic year to review specific data and/or make changes to programs. Highlights of the days and the decisions, changes, data reviewed are noted below.

May 11, 2016: Programs examined their own courses and determined where the College of Education's Diversity Standards were addressed and how they were addressed in their respective program courses. The same was done for the InTASC Standards and all appropriate Specialty Professional Association (SPA) Standards. Finally faculty members determined how the needs of ELL/ESL children would be met through the various course assessments and what formative and summative assessments would be used by professors in their respective program courses.

May 10, 2017: Data from several sources (e.g., PRAXIS; Summative Teacher Evaluation; Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation; edTPA) were provided (by program) to program faculty members to analyze, find strengths and plan next steps. Faculty members in different programs decided several common "Next Steps" that included (1) Counselling failing students in order to help them succeed or into a more suitable program; (2) Advising Advanced Level candidates at key milestones such as: residency, comprehension exams, proposal and dissertation completion to keep students on track for graduation; (3) Further embedding components of the edTPA tasks and language into coursework (i.e., professors using the academic language in their courses in order to model for candidates); and (4) Increase the number of students who take the School Library and Information Science Practicum.

May 9, 2018: A short Mini Data Day was held March 30 to gather collaborative feedback across the Department of Instruction and Curriculum Leadership around three areas. The areas for discussion among the whole group, and then within program areas were: 1. What are our Core Competencies? 2. How do we assess them? And 3. Are we effective?

The May 9th Deep Dive Data Day will include examination of data specifically requested by programs so we tailor the day to their needs. Some of the requested data is as follows.
• The Special Education faculty members want to look at specific pre-post evaluative data, and the number of students who specifically choose SPED as their area of concentration. They also want to look at the differences between the edTPA for Special Education and that for Elementary Literacy or Elementary Mathematics.
• Elementary Education faculty members want to look at PRAXIS data, TVASS data from our completers, Candidate Summative Teacher Evaluation data, and edTPA data.
• Secondary Education faculty members want to look at data surrounding feedback from employers and completers.

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?

1. RIVER CITY: An Urban-Track under the heading of Teaching All Learners (Dual Elementary and Special Education) Licensure Program. River City Partnership will place unique emphasis on recruiting and training local teacher candidates, with a special focus on finding educators from underrepresented groups (i.e., African-American males and Latinos) (Standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1). THIS IS IN DIRECT RESPONSE TO THE EXPRESSED NEEDS OF THE LARGEST SCHOOL SYSTEM IN OUR AREA (SHELBY COUNTY SCHOOLS) AND WAS CREATED IN FULL COLLABORATION WITH THEIR REPRESENTATIVES. The University of Memphis and the Shelby County School District cooperated in the design process. The River City Partnership expects to develop candidates' cultural competency by helping them recognize their own individualities and how these inform their teaching practices to serve all students in the minority-rich Shelby County Schools. Faculty members from the University of Memphis AND the Shelby County School District collaborated to revise courses so they include a very strong urban focus through outside readings, intentional and purposeful assignments, and targeted clinical experiences (Standard X.1). This is a concerted effort to fill the chronic need for culturally-competent, licensed teachers in Memphis.

The River City Partnership and the existing Teaching all Learners program degree plans offer the same courses, assessments, testing needed for SPA Recognition, SACS data collection, CAEP data gathering, and state licensure requirements. The River City Partnership Program's courses include added requirements tailored to the specific needs of the Memphis and Shelby County community. Funding was provided by a local entity and the US PREP Consortium. This program begins in Fall 2018. Visit: https://www.memphis.edu/coe/ for more information.

The Summer Bridge Program falls under the River City Partnership, and places an emphasis on increasing the number of students who graduate from local high schools and return to Shelby County School classrooms as licensed teachers (Standard 3.1). Available data show that nearly 80 percent of University of Memphis teacher education candidates do not graduate from Shelby County high schools, yet most of our completers teach in Shelby County elementary, middle and high schools (SEE ATTACHED DATA). The River City Partnership's Summer Bridge Program encourages 25 aspiring Shelby County high school seniors to intentionally select the urban education pathway as a career. The College of Education will invite these high school seniors to serve as Teacher Cadets in a one-week residential summer program in Summer 2018. The Teacher Cadets will learn first-hand about the University of Memphis' Teacher Education program. Visit: https://www.memphis.edu/coe/ for more information.

2. STRATEGIC PLAN: The University of Memphis embarked on a strategic plan that includes specific benchmarks for recruitment and graduation for the next 5 years. The College of Education embarked on its own Strategic Plan that corresponds to the University-wide Plan and updates the existing Conceptual Framework, last revised in 2015. The College of Education's plan was developed from a group of internal and external individuals who nominated additional individuals to serve as a Steering Committee. The Steering Committee invited individuals to take part in five focus groups: Faculty, Staff, Students, On-Campus Partners outside of the College of Education, and External Community members (i.e., school districts, businesses, community leaders) held at various times on a single day (Standards 5.5, A.5.5). The focus groups provided the Steering Committee with voluminous data during the various conversations. Using the data gathered from these Focus Groups, the Steering Committee used established research strategies and developed several drafts of the Strategic Plan. The Steering Committee, Focus Group members, the Dean's Executive Leadership Team, and the Dean vetted by the current draft, which aligned with the University's Strategic Plan. The larger community may comment on the document before Steering Committee releases the next version for a second round of vetting by the above-named groups or individuals. After the final vetting, an Implementation Team will then oversee the application of the plan in all areas of the College of Education. Visit: http://www.memphis.edu/coe/about/coestratplan.php and http://www.memphis.edu/presweb/stratplan/

3. REPLACING PROFESSIONAL SEMINAR: As we adopted the Educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) in 2010, faculty members adapted the existing Professional Seminar in focus on helping candidates think through the requirements of the

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

> 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
> 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
> 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
> 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
> 3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
> 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
> A.5.5 Continuous Improvement
> x.1 Diversity

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

📎 candidatedata20152017.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

6.3 Optional Comments

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.

Our gaps concern consistent content and pedagogical data collection for Advanced Licensure Candidates and tracking/monitoring Benchmark Assessments for all candidates. These are our NCATE AFIs addressed earlier in this report.
An additional gap is in the collection of data relative to the standards for Advanced Licensure candidates. Our Advanced Licensure programs are quite different from each other making any common assignment, assessment, or data gathering difficult. Most of our candidates are currently working, so clinical placement, even in our partnership schools, presents challenges. Tracking and surveying Advanced Level Candidates and Completers is set to begin.

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

> A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities
> A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
> A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
> A.3.4 Selection at Completion
> A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
> A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
> A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
> A.5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation

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:	Mary Ransdell
Position:	Director of Assessment
Phone:	9016785336
E-mail:	mransdll@memphis.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