

2020 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10719	AACTE SID:	725
Institution:	Clarion University of Pennsylvania		
Unit:	School of Education		

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	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1.2 [For EPP seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation¹ applies to CAEP eligible EPPs] Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial Licensure and/or Advanced Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).

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 2018-2019 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹ 93

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 8

Total number of program completers 101

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 2018-2019 academic year?

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP

- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.

- 3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited

- 3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited

- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4 A.5.4)	
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3 A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4 A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

4.1 Provide a link or links that demonstrate data relevant to each of the Annual Reporting Measures are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's website.

1

Link: https://clarion.edu/academics/colleges-and-schools/school-of-education/accreditation_data.html

Description of data accessible via link: SPA reports (Program Data); Validity data for Unit and selected program assessments; Impact data from teacher candidates and inservice graduates; satisfaction data from alumni and employers; employability data from career services; student loan default rate; Licensure pass rate data

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

Are benchmarks available for comparison?

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

All eligible programs are currently Nationally Recognized. Attempts to submit the Science SPA were unsuccessful due to issues with AIMS that went unresolved by CAEP until NSTA ceased their collaboration with CAEP. Issues with the listing the Science program correctly under Program Options still persist.

SPA reports indicate that candidates across programs are gaining the KSD to become successful as classroom teachers and reading specialists. Unit Assessments are fully in use across the Unit and have undergone review for Validity. Review indicated the need to revise the Diversity, Technology, and Teacher Work Sample assessments. All revisions have been completed and data is now being collected using the new rubrics. A second round of Validity review is in order within the next year. Validity review was also conducted for all Early Childhood key assessments (data provided) and Reliability was established for the STPP (CPAST already established). The valid and reliable STPP and CPAST assessments show positive impact on student learning for candidates. Impact data for in-service teachers is difficult to attain due to lack of cooperation by PDE, however, focus group data is very positive. The focus group process will continue bi-annually with intentional sampling across programs. Though new strategies are necessary to gain more employer data, satisfaction among alumni and employers is relatively high across programs. Both surveys will be revised to be more program specific for future iterations. Retention is a focus for the university as a whole with efforts to better retain minority students, first-gen students, and better service non-traditional students. Our population has a

significant number of Pell grant recipients, first-generation college students, and non-traditional students - affecting both the student loan default rate and retention. Graduation rate for the Special Education 5 year program is 100% but is not mirrored across other programs. Program admission and certification requirements tend to deplete the field of potential graduates. Added costs for Education majors are also a factor (clearances, testing, Chalk & Wire, transportation to field experiences, etc.) Surveys of those who do not persist are warranted given the relatively low 6 year graduation rate. When compared across the University, this rate is not out of line given the factors already mentioned, however. The discernible pass rates on licensure exams are laudable for several programs and acceptable for others. Revisions to certification requirements and subsequent revisions to programs should improve these numbers. With a low n reported for many subject areas, further analysis at the individual student level is necessary. Of those answering the Alumni survey, 95% are employed satisfactorily in an education related field, and 30% of those had earned tenure though a majority of respondents had been in the field less than 5 years.. Of those reporting to the Career Services office, 1/3 of the May 2019 graduates had jobs before the end of the year. Measures are shared on the website and with stakeholder groups including the advisory board meeting quarterly. All unit data including surveys was shared and will continue to be shared annually with the School of Education faculty for review and analysis at both the unit and program level. Data is shared through the Institutional assessment process (ISLAC) for review by university committees. A new effort to publish an annual report to be disseminated to stakeholders is underway by the Dean's office. The CAEP site visit scheduled for March 2020 was delayed due to the pandemic. The FFR was received on 1/21/2020 and the addendum was submitted prior to the 60 day deadline. Further analysis of Unit data and adherence to the CAEP standards can be found throughout the SSR and addendum documents.

Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Waived

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

Waived

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 2020 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Gwyneth Price
Position: Dean, School of Education
Phone: 8143932298
E-mail: gprice@clarion.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 complete 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**