2021 Annual Accreditation Report

CAEP ID:	10447	**AACTE SID:**	4860
Institution:	University of West Florida		
Unit:	College of Education and Professional Studies		

Section 1. EPP 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	◉	○

1.2 [For EPP seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation] Please provide a link to your webpage that accurately lists the Initial Licensure programs and/or Advanced Level programs currently offered by the EPP that were reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC) during the EPP's last site review.

https://uwf.edu/ceps/departments/teacher-education-and-educational-leadership/about-us/accreditation/#:~:text=The%20Professional%20Education%20Unit%20at,national%20accreditor%20for%20educator%20preparation.

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 2019-2020 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

596

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]

149

Total number of program completers 745

---

[1] For a description of the scope for Initial and Advanced programs, see Policy II 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 2019-2020 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 Provider shares a direct link to the EPPs website where data relevant to each of the 8 Annual Reporting Measures are clearly tagged, explained, and displayed. Additional links will be provided only if data on any specific measure is not on the same webpage as the one already provided. The additional link should also lead to a page on the EPPâ€™s own website.

1

Link: https://uwf.edu/ceps/departments/teacher-education-and-educational-leadership/about-us/accreditation/caep-annual-reporting-measures/

Description of data accessible via link: The data shared provide information which address all eight (8) measures and are obtained from a variety of data sources. Additional reports providing more detail will be added to the page as they are developed and data becomes available.

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 accordance with the Professional Education Unit (PEU) Data review schedule, the Continuous Improvement Team (CIT) reviewed the eight (8) annual measures in February and March 2021. Measures are shared with the TEEL Advisory Council and the Professional Education Council for external stakeholder input.

Measure 1: Currently, program completers' impact on P-12 learning and development is captured by using Value-Added Model (VAM) scores provided by the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) in the Annual Program Performance Report (APPR) each year. The FLDOE uses an algorithm which factors in several variables to determine a teacher's contribution to K-12 student learning. Positive scores indicate a positive contribution attributed specifically to the classroom teacher. Neutral or negative scores indicate no positive contribution attributed specifically to the classroom teacher. FLDOE only provides data for teachers who teach in Florida public school settings (grades 4-8 math and language arts), representing a small percentage of our graduates. Data provided through the 2018/19 academic year show that, of the programs in which data was received [Initial Programs: Elementary

Education (EE), Exceptional Student Education/Elementary Education (ESE), TeacherReady (EPI), Advanced Program: Reading], only the ESE program completers showed a positive impact on student growth (based on most current APPR raw data). Of the most recent published APPR reports, Average Student Learning Growth Results for 14/15, 15/16, and 16/17 program completers employed in an in-field instruction apposition in 17/18, the program performance level and state average performance level for like programs is given. Performance levels are from 1–4 and based on the state developed rubric. Performance levels are as follows: ESE (1)/State (2.6); EE (3)/State (2.8); Reading (3)/State (3.1). Metric scores were not available on other programs. The following programs are not represented, as no VAM data is provided by the FLDOE via an APPR report/data feed: Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE), B.S. – English language arts and mathematics are NOT taught/measured by this discipline; UWF-Teach – there have not been completers working in-field long enough to have VAM data collected; Educational Leadership (EDL), M.Ed. In summer 2021, teams are meeting to further address the timeliness of data and will develop plans based on CIT recommendations that meet CAEP's level of sufficiency.

Measure 2: Evaluation scores received by the FLDOE in the APPR are used to measure teaching effectiveness. Completers are scored on a four–level performance scale. Of the most recent published APPR reports, Teacher Evaluations for 14/15, 15/16, and 16/17 program completers employed in an instructional position in 17/18, the program performance level and state average performance level for like programs is given. Performance levels are from 1–4 and based on the state developed rubric. Performance levels are as follows: ESE (4)/State (3.8); EE (4)/State (3.6); Music (3)/State (3.8); PETE (4)/State (3.7); Reading (4)/State (3.9); EPI (4)/State (3.8). UWF-Teach programs have not yet matured enough for completers to meet the state criteria. The most recent APPR raw data scores are reflected on UWF's website. NOTE: EDL programs do not receive APPR report/scores.

Measure 3: The Office of Assessment, Accreditation and Strategic Planning (OAASP) surveys employers annually in the spring for the previous 3 years' completers. Employer survey data from 2019 and 2020 show strong satisfaction for all program completers. On a 10-point scale, initial program completers received mean scores of 7.3 and 8.9, respectively. For advanced programs, EDL program completers received mean scores of 8.3 and 9.0, respectively and Reading 9.0 and 8.5, respectively. Programs are showing an upward trend for employer satisfaction overall. In 2021, initial program surveys will undergo revisions to capture data aligned to InTASC standards and streamline the survey process for employers. Based on research of example institution reports provided in the CAEP 2020 Annual Report Technical Guide, OAASP has proposed to create a small focus group of local employers to provide additional qualitative data on employer satisfaction.

Measure 4: OAASP surveys the previous 3 years' completers each spring. Completer survey data from 2018, 2019 and 2020 show strong satisfaction for the programs. On a 10-point scale, mean scores from initial program completers rated their satisfaction with the programs as 7.6, 7.8, and 7.4, respectively. For advanced programs, EDL program completers reported mean scores of 8.4, 8.5, and 8.5, respectively and Reading 8.4, 9.3, and 9.3, respectively. The initial and EDL program satisfaction scores are remaining stable, while Reading has seen a recent uptick in satisfaction. In 2021, initial program surveys will undergo revisions to capture data aligned to InTASC standards. Based on research of example institution reports provided in the CAEP 2020 Annual Report Technical Guide, OAASP has proposed to create a small focus group of local completers to provide additional qualitative data on employer satisfaction AND impact on P-12 learning and development. The CIT is reviewing best practices and determining the best way to provide information for this measure moving forward.

Measure 5: UWF's Annual Measures website provides the most recent completer numbers for certification programs. The Educational Leadership program experienced a 19% decrease from the previous year as a result of more stringent entrance requirements and University policy. The EPI program experienced a 19% decrease as well. Other programs either maintained or saw an increase in completers. EPP programs do not operate in a cohort model and engage non-traditional candidates, making it difficult to track a true graduation rate. Candidates are admitted into initial programs based on FL Statute guidelines and typically have two years of coursework remaining. In a first attempt analysis, EE/ESE candidates showed a median time to program completion in 7 semesters. For advanced programs, the median semesters to complete the programs for Reading and EDL are 6 and 7 semesters, respectively. EPI candidates typically complete their program in 13 months. OAASP is continuing to work with the advising and information technology team to compute a graduation rate which can then be benchmarked to UWF graduation rates. In summer 2021, teams are meeting to further explore options and will develop plans to fully address this measure that meet CAEP's level of sufficiency.

Measure 6: GPA at graduation is one measure currently reviewed to determine program success (EPI is not a 'grade-based' program). Initial programs show a slight decrease in GPA's, with the exception of the PETE program, who saw a jump in average GPA from 2.92 to 3.52. Advanced programs showed a slight increase, but overall, GPA remained stable.

All program candidates are required to pass Florida Teacher Certification Exams (FTCE) prior to graduation. Two new interactive reports were added this year for faculty and advisors to utilize. One report utilizes Pearson edReports and provides data for statewide test takers and UWF candidates on the average percent correct by exam for first time test takers and further drills down to competency areas. Reports will be pulled annually and reviewed by faculty. CIT noted lower scores than the state average on the Professional Education test in AY 19/20 for three programs. In summer 2021, teams will review course work to identify gaps. A second report was developed that calculates first time pass rates on FTCE exams. Filters enable the user to disaggregate information by term, program, EPP/EPI candidates, and candidates who have attempted at least one time, but not yet passed the exams. Data are updated monthly.

Measure 7: The FLDOE metric for retention rates, as defined in the APPR are used to measure employment rates. Retention rates computed as the average number of years program completers were employed in a full- or part-time instructional position in a FL public school district across a five-year period following initial employment in either of the two subsequent academic years following program completion. Performance levels are from 1–4 and based on the state developed rubric. Performance levels are as follows: ESE (3)/State (3.2); EE (3)/State (3.3); Reading (4)/State (3.8); EPI (3)/State (3). Metric scores were not available on

other programs. The most recent APPR raw data scores are reflected on UWF's website. NOTE: EDL programs do not receive APPR report/scores.

Measure 8:. The PEU reviewed three areas to meet this measure. The student loan default rate (for the university as a whole) was reviewed. According to the latest three years of data provided by the U.S. Department of Education, UWF's default rates are consistently below the national average. Average teacher salaries for the three surrounding school districts were obtained from the FLDOE and compared to the state average. In most cases, the average local teacher salary was lower than the state average, and is reflective of the lower cost of living in the Panhandle. Scholarship data show that the EPP has awarded a large number of grants and scholarships to candidates to support their educational efforts. Additional information on the EPI shows their strong support of service members in the number of candidates receiving scholarships.

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)**   1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

The EPP provided limited evidence of disaggregated data results by specialty areas across multiple indicators. (Component 1.3).

To strengthen the EPPs interconnection with the EPI, a collaborative-work team was established in summer 2020. The team meets monthly and includes leaders from both the EPP and the EPI. The team reviews EPP-EPI program alignments; shares best practices between the two programs; reviews FLDOE requirements/reporting; reviews curriculum; and reviews data points.

Specialty Area: The EPI is a post-baccalaureate program, which focuses on pedagogy and not content area. As such, candidates have the option to sit for 35 SAE's offered by the State of Florida Department of Education (FLDOE). At the time of application, EPI candidates identify which Subject Area Exam (SAE) they plan to take to meet licensure, which will be used to disaggregate by specialty area and align multiple indicator data across the Professional Education Unit. The SAE's have been cross-walked to EPP programs to develop a method by which indicators across the EPP and EPI can be identified by specialty area. The team identified nine areas where a direct alignment between the EPP program and the SAE (identified by the EPI candidate) exist. These include (FORMAT: UWF Program – SAE): UWFTeach Biology – Biology (6-12); UWFTeach Chemistry – Chemistry (6-12); UWFTeach Environmental Science – Earth-Space Science (6-12); UWFTeach Math – Mathematics (6-12); UWFTeach Physics – Physics (6-12); K-9 Elementary Education/ESOL/Reading – Elementary Education (K-6); K-6/K-12 Elementary Education/ESE/ESOL/Reading – Exceptional Student Education (K-12); Physical Education Teacher Education – Physical Education (K-12); Music Education – Music (K-12). Additional SAE's were grouped into five categories to further enable reporting by specialty area (Foreign Language, Middle Grades, All Grades, Special Needs, and Early Education). Reporting will be based on the number of candidates in each group/program that exceed 10.

Multiple Indicators: The team has worked to identify areas of congruency throughout both the EPP and the EPI. In summer 2021, the team will continue to revise assignments/assessments and plans to deploy the following measures in both programs in fall 2021: Unit Plan (Standard 1), Analysis of Student Impact (Standard 1), Dispositions (Standard 1/3), Florida Teacher Certification Examinations (FTCE) (Standard 3), Completer Survey (Standard 4), Employer Survey (Standard 4). All indicators will be assessed and disaggregated by program/specialty area.

With the alignment of the SAE's to the EPP programs, UWF will be able to support disaggregated data results for both programs across multiple indicators. Additional indicators, specific to each program and its method of delivery, will be used to further support the CAEP standards.

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)**   2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The EPP provided limited evidence of partnerships involvement in shared decision making (Component 2.1).

Partnership Structure:
To strengthen the EPPs interconnection with the EPI, collaborative-work team was established in summer 2020. The team meets monthly and includes leaders from both the EPP and the EPI. The team reviews EPP-EPI program alignments; shares best practices between the two programs; reviews FLDOE requirements/reporting; reviews curriculum; and is developing a shared approach/methodology to future CAEP reporting.

An EPI representative attends all of the Continuous Improvement Team and Professional Education Council meetings. Starting in Summer 2021, an EPI representative will serve on the Teacher Education and Educational Leadership Advisory Council (TAC). This will provide a platform for the EPI to work with the local school district partners to receive input and identify ways to enhance candidate clinical experiences and outcomes. During the curriculum review process by the EPI, information concerning field experiences for all EPI candidates is shared with the appropriate EPP group. The EPI provides proposals and action plans for improvement of the EPI based on EPP review feedback.

The EPI hosts 6 annual meetings of the Partnership Network with membership of Superintendents throughout the country. Discussion occurs around success of candidates in the classroom and what would create greater success for the candidate and K12 students.

Candidate Outcomes:
In May of 2020 the position of Clinical Experience Manager within the EPI program became a full time position with the objective of creating a stronger connection between Mentors and the EPI program. In May 2021, the EPP designated a Clinical Coordinator to oversee the EPP's clinical program. In summer 2021, the positions will begin to collaborate with each other as well as communicate with mentors, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors on a regular basis. Open office hours and on-going support will be provided. The collaborative-work team will expand to include the EPP and EPI clinical manager/coordinator to facilitate a platform for additional communication.

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)**   2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The EPP provided limited evidence that candidates use technology in clinical applications. (Component 2.2)

EPP: At the time of the site visit, the EPP had two technology assignments in place. The Class Website was housed in the culminating field experience (student teaching) and required candidates to: Create a class website to provide families with information about class activities, share resources to support students and families and enhance learning, and encourage communication with families and students. The second technology related assignment, Content Explanation Video was housed in the methods courses and required candidates to: Create a video recording of a lesson segment explaining a concept in your content area (5 –10 minute in length). You should select the concept from college and career-ready standards such as the Florida Standards. Explain the concept as you would to a group of students using appropriate visual representations (e.g., diagrams, models) or hands-on manipulatives. Show how you would address common misconceptions or student errors. Upload the video to share with your classmates and instructor. While both addressed the candidates' use of technology, the focus was not placed on the use of technology to support k-12 learning. As such, EPP faculty have drafted a new assignment to be housed in the culminating field experience and piloted in fall 2021. The new assignment looks at best practices and addresses (at a minimum): the use of technology to support k-12 active engagement in learning; the technology used aligned to the objectives, instruction and assessment in the classroom environment; and a reflection on why the technology was developmentally appropriate and provided p-12 students with an active learning experience. The EPP has also revised a course to further candidate use and understanding of technology, EDG 4373 Integrated Arts and Contemporary Educational Tools. This course prepares students to effectively integrate the arts and technology into instruction delivered in K-12 classrooms and community settings. Emphasis is on engaging learning experiences for learners that are designed to deepen and integrate their knowledge and understanding of subject matter across disciplines and support teaching and learning in inclusive settings.
EPI: Field experiences offer candidates an opportunity to integrate technology in meaningful ways to enhance P-12 student learning. Monitoring the sequential and intentional practices of the field experience - applying knowledge learned in course work, integrating technology instruction (e.g., assistive technology; Smart Boards for translations), developing professional proficiencies and practice skills, and engaging in reflective practice – is embedded in the TR instructor's review of field experience assignments.

During lesson 7, Engaging Students in STEAM, candidates evaluate and create strategies for incorporating technology across content areas. Other assignments include using digital media and a variety of educational technology tools for the classroom.

During lesson 8, culminating experience, technology is used by the candidate to collect, manage and analyze pre and post assessment results to improve teaching and learning. The candidate uses a pre and post assessment during the week, analyzes the growth of students during instruction. and engages in reflective practice with the mentor. Additional application of technology will be incorporated into field experiences through instructional tasks during 2021 curriculum updates.

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)**   2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The EPP provides insufficient evidence that all programs document a sequence of clinical experiences with specific goals that are focused, purposeful, and varied.(Component 2.3)

Partner collaboration: To strengthen the EPPs interconnection with the EPI, collaborative-work team was established in summer 2020. The team meets monthly and includes leaders from both the EPP and the EPI. The team reviews EPP-EPI program alignments; shares best practices between the two programs; reviews FLDOE requirements/reporting; reviews curriculum; and is developing a shared approach/methodology to future CAEP reporting.

The EPP ensures that a representative from the EPI serves on all relevant partnership committees, i.e. Professional Education Council, Continuous Improvement Committee, etc. Starting in Summer 2021, an EPI representative will serve on the Teacher Education and Educational Leadership Advisory Council (TAC). This will provide a platform for the EPI to work with their local school district partners to receive input and identify ways to enhance candidate clinical experiences and outcomes. Additional avenues for consideration moving forward include adding an EPP representative to the EPI Partnership Network, additional EPI representation on EPP committees such as clinical, recruitment, etc.

During the curriculum review process by the EPP, information concerning field experiences for all EPI candidates is shared with the appropriate EPP group with a request for feedback on proposals and action plans for improvement of EPI experiences.

Additionally, the EPI hosts 6 annual meetings of the Partnership Network with membership of Superintendents throughout the country. Discussion occurs around success of candidates in the classroom and what would create greater success for the candidate and K12 students.

Candidate Effectiveness:

In May of 2020 the position of Clinical Experience Manager within the EPI program became a full time position with the objective of creating a stronger connection between Mentors and the EPI program. In May 2021, the EPP designated a Clinical Coordinator to oversee the EPP's clinical program. The positions will collaborate to evaluate and make recommendations for the clinical programs to provide sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. As well, the collaborative-work team will expand to include the EPP and EPI clinical manager/coordinator to facilitate a platform for additional communication.

The team has worked to identify areas of congruency throughout both the EPP and the EPI. In summer 2021, the team will continue to revise assignments/assessments and plans to deploy the following measures in both programs in fall 2021: Unit Plan (Standard 1), Analysis of Student Impact (Standard 1), Dispositions (Standard 1/3), Florida Teacher Certification Examinations (FTCE) (Standard 3), Completer Survey (Standard 4), Employer Survey (Standard 4). All indicators will be assessed and disaggregated by program/specialty area.

To further demonstrate p-12 student impact, both the EPP and EPI will utilize technology to have candidates collect, manage and analyze pre and post assessment results to improve teaching and learning. The candidate will use a pre and post assessment during the field experience, analyze the growth of students during instruction, and engage in reflective practice with their mentor/cooperating teacher.

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)**   5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP provided limited evidence that the quality assurance system includes multiple measures, monitors candidate progress, the achievements of completers, and the operational effectiveness of the provider. (Component 5.1)

To strengthen the EPPs interconnection with the EPI, a collaborative-work team was established in summer 2020. The team meets monthly and includes leaders from both the EPP and the EPI. The team reviews EPP-EPI program alignments; shares best practices between the two programs; reviews FLDOE requirements/reporting; reviews curriculum; and reviews data points.

Specialty Area: The EPI is a post-baccalaureate program, which focuses on pedagogy and not content area. As such, candidates have the option to sit for 35 SAE's offered by the State of Florida Department of Education (FLDOE). At the time of application, EPI candidates identify which Subject Area Exam (SAE) they plan to take to meet licensure. Candidates may take one or more, depending on their individual goals. However, only one is identified at the time of application. The SAE's have been cross-walked to the EPP programs to develop a method by which indicators across the EPP and EPI can be identified by specialty area. The team identified nine areas where a direct alignment between the EPP program and the EPI (SAE) exist. These include (format: UWF Program – SAE): UWFTeach Biology – Biology (6-12); UWFTeach Chemistry – Chemistry (6-12); UWFTeach Environmental Science – Earth-Space Science (6-12); UWFTeach Math – Mathematics (6-12); UWFTeach Physics – Physics (6-12); K-9 Elementary Education/ESOL/Reading – Elementary Education (K-6); K-6/K-12 Elementary Education/ESE/ESOL/Reading – Exceptional Student Education (K-12); Physical Education Teacher Education – Physical Education (K-12); Music Education – Music (K-12). Additional SAE's were grouped into five categories to further enable reporting by specialty area (Foreign Language, Middle Grades, All Grades, Special Needs, and Early Education). Reporting will be based on the number of candidates in each group/program exceeding 10.

The team continues to develop a matrix of evidence to ensure all CAEP standards are addressed with evidence that meet CAEP standards. In addition to program specific data, the team worked to identify areas of congruency throughout both the EPP and the EPI. In Summer 2021, the team will continue to revise assignments/assessments and plans to deploy the following measures in both programs in fall 2021: Unit Plan (Standard 1), Analysis of Student Impact (Standard 1), Dispositions (Standard 1/3), Florida Teacher Certification Examinations (FTCE) (Standard 3), Completer Survey (Standard 4), Employer Survey (Standard 4). All indicators will be assessed and disaggregated by program/specialty area.

With the alignment of the SAE's to the EPP and EPI programs, UWF will be able to support disaggregated data results for both programs across multiple indicators. Additional indicators, specific to each program and its method of delivery, will be used to further support the CAEP standards.

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)**   5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP created assessments used for the evaluation of candidates in all programs do not meet the CAEP sufficiency criteria limiting the ability to interpret the results and make improvements (Component 5.2)

To strengthen the EPPs interconnection with the EPI, a collaborative-work team was established in summer 2020. The team meets monthly and includes leaders from both the EPP and the EPI. The team reviews EPP-EPI program alignments; shares best practices between the two programs; reviews FLDOE requirements/reporting; reviews curriculum; and reviews data points.

The EPI has developed a QAS document to provide additional information and clarification on their culture of evidence. The document provides alignment and evidence of how the key CAEP areas of relevance, validity, reliability, representativeness, cumulativeness, fairness, robustness and actionability are supported by each EPI created assessment. The document was shared and reviewed by the collaborative-work team. Additionally, the EPP's coordinator from the Office of Assessment, Accreditation and Strategic Planning (OAASP) was asked to review the document and offer comments.

The EPI has found opportunities for additional improvement to strengthen their evidence. OAASP was also able to identify some areas that may further benefit from adding additional psychometric testing. Upon completion of an evidence matrix in Summer

2021, the team will engage in the process to review and create a common QAS document that addresses common measurements/indicators throughout the Professional Education Unit, as well as assessments specific to EPI programs and EPP programs. We anticipate this to take place during academic year 2021/22. This work will lead to a single document housing all evidence and ensuring evidence is at or above the sufficient level based on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)   5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP provides insufficient evidence that annual measures are systematically summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, and shared widely (Component 5.4)

To strengthen the EPPs interconnection with the EPI, a collaborative-work team was established in summer 2020. The team meets monthly and includes leaders from both the EPP and the EPI. The team reviews EPP-EPI program alignments; shares best practices between the two programs; reviews FLDOE requirements/reporting; reviews curriculum; and reviews data points.

EPI data are collected and reported in the 2019 CAEP Annual report. Following are the measures and data, which were included. If additional planning is needed, it is noted in Section 4, Display of Annual Reporting Measures. Plans will be linked through the website as additional documentation to the annual report after they have been developed and approved.

2019 ANNUAL REPORT MEASURES
Measure 1: The FLDOE Value-Added Model (VAM) scores were provided for all programs for which the data was available: Elementary Education, Exceptional Student/Elementary Education, TeacherReady (EPI), and Reading, M.Ed. The EPP acknowledges that VAM data have limited value, as the FLDOE does not provide current data, nor are a large number of completers captured in the focus of the VAM scores. After a review of best practices noted in the CAEP 2019 Annual Report Technical Guide, plans are being developed to provide additional data to support this measure.

Measure 2: The FLDOE provides Annual Program Performance Report data on teacher evaluation scores, which is subsequently analyzed by the EPP. Programs for which FLDOE data was provided include: Elementary Education, Exceptional Student/Elementary Education, Music Education, TeacherReady (EPI), and Reading, M.Ed.

Measure 3: The EPP and EPI collect employer satisfaction in a yearly survey. The following programs were represented: Initial programs (aggregated data), Educational Leadership, M.Ed., TeacherReady (EPI), and Reading, M.Ed.

Measure 4: The EPP and EPI collect completer satisfaction in a yearly survey. The following programs were represented: Initial programs (aggregated data), Educational Leadership, M.Ed., TeacherReady (EPI), and Reading, M.Ed.

Measure 5: Completer numbers for all programs were reported for all programs, including the EPI.

Measure 6: Two pieces of data are used to support this measure. Completer GPA's are provided for all EPP programs. As the EPI is not a 'grade-based' program, no data are provided. Additionally, Florida Teacher Certification Exam/Florida Educational Leadership Exam first time pass rate data are provided for both the EPP and EPI. As all exams must be passed prior to completion, a first time pass rate is used to support a completer's ability to meet licensing requirements.

Measure 7: The FLDOE provides Annual Program Performance Report data for completers who are employed the two years following graduation. The EPP acknowledges that retention data have limited value, as the FLDOE does not provide current data, and data only applies to those who work in a Florida public school setting. After a review of best-practices noted in the CAEP 2019 Annual Report Technical Guide, plans are being developed to provide additional data to support this measure.

Measure 8: To better represent EPI data for this measure, scholarship and loan information was added.

BENCHMARKS: After a review of best-practices noted in the CAEP 2019 Annual Report Technical Guide, discussions about appropriate benchmarks are occurring in the Continuous Improvement Team meetings and will be included as a part of Section 4, Display of Annual Reporting Measures. Plans will be linked through the website as additional documentation to the annual report after they have been developed and approved.

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 based on 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 relevant for advanced-level programs
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

Continuous Improvement #1: During Fall 2019 and Spring 2020, the teacher education programs at the University of West Florida went through a CAEP on-site accreditation and a Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) Continued Approval visit, which is based on the TPI-US Inspection Framework. The Professional Education Unit at UWF, which is houses both an EPP and EPI, used the review and subsequent feedback as a valuable opportunity to review programs and quality assurance systems. Both CAEP and the FLDOE noted that the EPP and EPI appeared to be two distinct programs, rather than two programs under a single umbrella. As such, the EPP and EPI took the opportunity to establish an on-going Advisory-Work Team in summer 2020 to regularly meet, discuss issues and work on aligning assessments and processes in a more cohesive manner.

The EPP and EPI are different paths to certification and minimal cross-over of goals and assessment of performance was built into the two programs. The team started by cross-walking assignments, rubrics, assessments and identifying other opportunities to have a more connected program review, based on like-data. After encountering some alignment challenges, the team stepped back to revisit the methodology. After attending the 2021 CAEP Conference, and based on current CAEP initial standards, the team was able to identify five common assignments that can be used in each program: Unit Plan (Standard 1), Analysis of Student Impact (Standards 1 & 2), Florida Teacher Certification Exams (Standards 1 & 3), Completer and Employer Surveys (Standard 4), and Dispositions (Standard 1). Summer 2021 work will include finalizing each of the assignments, a common rubric, and a plan to review data and make joint decisions moving forward for program improvement. The team has taken the opportunity to identify and adopt best practices within each program, moving the EPP and EPI towards a more unified program assessment system. EPI and EPP data will be yearly in tandem to discover strengths and gaps, as well as look for areas to enhance candidate experiences and learning opportunities.

The team also recognizes the need for a joint QAS document (Standard 5) to ensure that evidence is documented and is at or above the sufficient level based on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments. Upon completion of the Summer 2021 work and development of an evidence matrix, the team will engage in the process to create a common QAS document that addresses measurements/indicators through the Professional Education Unit, as well as assessments specific to the EPI and EPP programs. We anticipate this to take place during AY 2021/22.

Continuous Improvement #2: The Florida Department of Education continued approval process culminated in a visit in February 2020. The review identified several areas of weaknesses in our teacher candidates' knowledge and skills in applying assessment, academic feedback and questioning, classroom management and differentiation/UDL. While all four core teaching skills are critical, the UWF Teacher Education and Educational Leadership (TEEL) faculty chose to prioritize efforts on assessment. These efforts entailed three major steps.
STEP ONE: Create a task force. To address this concern, in March 2020, TEEL created an ad hoc committee comprised of eight faculty members with specialization in each of the four core teaching methods. The team examined course content, syllabi, and met with instructors. One-on-one instructor meetings provided the committee the opportunity to offer suggestions for revisions regarding content and controlled demonstrations. The team reviewed all four Core Teaching Skills with an emphasis on assessment. The ad hoc committee held monthly virtual meetings through Summer 2020.
Courses specifically targeted for enhancement of the assessment content and application included: RED 3310: Literacy Instruction for the Intermediate Learner, MAE 4310: Teaching Mathematics in the Elementary School, SSE 4113: Social Studies for Elementary Teachers, SCE 4310: Teaching Science in the Elementary School, EDG 4351: Education Assessment, TSL 4081: Teaching English to ESOL Students. Committee members met individually with instructors of methods courses to provide recommendations for revisions to the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and enhancement of assessment instruction.
STEP TWO: Update Courses. During Summer and Fall 2020 semesters, instructors of the methods courses added or strengthened the content related to formative and summative assessment, which is reflected in the past, current and future syllabi. Some

revisions are demonstrated in SLO changes, while enhancements may be found within content of the course modules. Some enhancement examples include focused instruction on providing p-12 student feedback, error analysis, and writing learning outcomes. Most instructors fully implemented the revised content in Fall 2020; however, two courses were not able to implement revisions as noted: RED 3310 – instructor change, SSE 4413 – the course not offered in Fall 2020. These two courses will implement the changes to syllabi and content in Spring 2021.

To further assist candidates, a website page was added to the library resource bank that includes resources for the core teaching skills. Each core skill has multiple pages to provide information and resources for students' use. https://libguides.uwf.edu/c.php?g=1055364&p=7666311

STEP THREE: Continuous Improvement. Being mindful of the continuous improvement model and culture TEEL has developed, faculty will gather data and evidence to determine if the enhanced curriculum has improved candidate's knowledge, skills and performance related to assessment. The review will occur during the Spring 2021 semester and new or additionally enhanced demonstrations will be added for Summer or Fall 2021.

After the completion of the pilot year, faculty will review candidate performance data in the field courses and analyze the effectiveness of the enhanced content, as compared to previous data (before enhancements. Candidate performance data includes two Danielson indicators (1f: Designing Student Assessments, 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction) as well as a review of FTCE Professional Education Competency 4 data (Knowledge of various types of assessment strategies for determining impact on student learning).

Continuous Improvement #3: The UWF Teach-to-Avatar (TtA) program aims to provide experiential learning to students that connects theory learned in classrooms to practice in a real-time virtual reality simulation. The program began with internal funding that provided UWF-Teach secondary STEM Education majors an opportunity to develop classroom management skills learned in a classroom management course. Prior to implementation, data across three semesters (Fa19/Sp20/Fa20) showed that just under half of the candidates in secondary STEM Education majors (n=26), 42% were at a level of "Needs Improvement/Developing", versus 58% received a score of "Effective" as scored using Domain 2 of the Danielson Framework for Teaching. Results from the initial study of utilizing the TtA learning process to augment candidate experiences highlighted preservice teachers' "recognition of metacognition and practice in adapting stress and classroom management strategies" (Gul & Pecore, 2020, p. 58).

The program was expanded to provide an opportunity for pre-service elementary majors to practice culturally linguistic responsive teaching. Candidates were asked to submit a lesson plan, teach the plan and then write a reflection. Results of this work revealed that the TtA program "provided a more authentic teaching experience in coursework to particularly help preservice teachers make meaningful connections between theory and practices of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching" (Lew, Gul, & Pecore, 2021, p. 18). Faculty plan to further supplement the TtA experience with additional exposure through a clinical experience in the ESOL Principals and Practices course.

Funding from an NSF IUSE grant allowed the TtA project to be expanded to work with preservice elementary and secondary majors on developing questioning and discussion skills when teaching science and mathematics in fall 2021 and included 23 candidates. The theoretical framework for the TtA research project combined Ericsson's deliberate practice with Kolb's experiential learning theory. Prior to implementation, data across four semesters (Fa18/Sp19/Fa19/Sp20) was reviewed for candidates enrolled in the Elementary Education and Exceptional Student/Elementary Education programs. Data included scores from the Danielson Framework for Teaching for Domain 3 in Field Experience 2 (FE2). These data showed that in FE2 (n=201), 1% received a rating of Unsatisfactory, 64% received a rating of Needs Improvement/Developing, versus 32% rated at Effective/Highly Effective (16% of candidate scores were not recorded). Preliminary findings from teaching scores and participant self-ratings indicated a gradual increase in questioning and discussion skill growth. Three cohorts of candidates were included in the project. Through an external evaluator, three focus groups were conducted and interview data revealed an increase in confidence along with skill growth through repeated practice. Focus group data noted that throughout the process, mentor feedback was identified as the most helpful element to skill growth. It also revealed the importance of mentor feedback with guided and engendered student self-reflection. With internal funding, the TtA program has been expanded to our graduate educational leadership program. Educational leadership majors will practice communicating with parents and teachers in various simulated scenarios. Data collection commenced in spring 2021. Additional analysis of impact on candidate growth in all programs is planned.

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

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards

1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress

1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge

1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability

3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students

4.3 Employer satisfaction

4.4 Completer satisfaction

x.5 State Standards (if applicable)

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 s 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 2021 EPP Annual Report.*

☑ **I am authorized to complete this report.**

Report Preparer's Information

Name:	Elizabeth Arthur
Position:	Director, Office of Assessment, Accreditation and Strategic Planning
Phone:	850-474-2154
E-mail:	earthur@uwf.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 V.3.01 Annual Accreditation Report

The Annual Accreditation Report (Annual Report) process, along with CAEP's review of any complaint against an EPP, is used to monitor and evaluate an EPPs continued compliance with CAEP's Standards. The Annual Accreditation Report requires, at a minimum:

    a. Information demonstrating that the EPP is correcting or has corrected any conditions leading to the identification of Areas for Improvement and Stipulations from prior accreditation decisions;
    b. Key data and indicators, including but not limited to, fiscal information and measures of candidates' effectiveness and impact on P-12 student learning;
    c. Current headcount enrollment data which will be used to monitor overall growth of the EPP; and
    d. Report substantive changes that may affect an EPP's accreditation status or eligibility.

In January of each year, CAEP will notify an EPP with an accreditation status that the Annual Accreditation Report has been opened. Such notification may be dispatched through CAEP's electronic accreditation platform. No later than 90 days after receiving access to the Annual Report template, an EPP must submit a complete Annual Accreditation Report using CAEP's reporting form.

An EPP's Annual Accreditation Report will be reviewed and evaluated by CAEP staff and a team of volunteer Annual Report Reviewers, selected pursuant to Section VI.2, and the EPP Transparency, Accountability, and Improvement Committee of the Accreditation Council.

Following receipt of information from CAEP regarding an Annual Report deficiency, an EPP must take timely action to correct the deficiency in accordance with instructions provided by CAEP staff and, if applicable, provide any additional information requested so that CAEP can adequately monitor the growth of programs at any freestanding EPP experiencing significant enrollment growth. Any deficiency identified as serious must be corrected within a timeline established by CAEP. Evidence of an EPP's correction of any deficiency not identified as serious may be included in the EPP's next annual report.

Neither the lack of any Annual Report deficiencies nor an EPP's correction of Annual Report deficiencies are to be considered an assurance that an EPP is prepared or on track to successfully demonstrating compliance with CAEP Standards.

An Evaluation Team assigned to review the EPP and the Accreditation Council may consider an EPP's Annual Reports as

evidence in making any accreditation decision or in instituting a Warning action.

Policy V.3.02 Continued Compliance with Standards

Failure to maintain compliance with all applicable Standards will be considered cause for immediate initiation of an Accreditation Council decision to revoke accreditation by issuing a directive that the EPP bring itself into compliance within a period of time specified by the Accreditation Council. The period of time specified for an EPP to take corrective action and come into compliance will not exceed:

    a. 12 months, if the longest program offered by the EPP is less than 1 year in length;
    b. 18 months, if the longest program offered by the EPP is at least 1 year, but less than 2 years, in length; or
    c. 2 years, if the longest program offered by the EPP is at least 2 years in length.

If the EPP does not bring itself into compliance within the specified period, the Accreditation Council will take immediate Adverse Action unless it, for good cause, extends the period for achieving compliance.

CAEP may consider any concerns raised about an EPP by any nationally recognized accrediting agency as evidence of any EPP's failure to maintain compliance. The CAEP President may request, and the Accreditation Council may consider, a report from any such accreditor that describes the nature of the issues giving rise to concerns.

If the Accreditation Council determines that a Virtual Site Review or On-Site Review is required in order to verify that an EPP has come into compliance, it may require an Special Review and the EPP must undergo the Review within the timeline specified by the Council and remit payment for CAEP's invoice of all costs directly associated with the Review.

☐ **Acknowledge**