

2019 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11626	AACTE SID:	9145
Institution:	University of Saint Francis		
Unit:	Department of Education		

Section 1. AIMS Profile

After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate.

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹ 33

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 6

Total number of program completers 39

¹ For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

² For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2017-2018 academic year?

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP _____
- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP. _____
- 3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited _____
- 3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited _____
- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements _____
- Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:
- 3.6 Change in regional accreditation status _____
- 3.7 Change in state program approval _____

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: <https://accreditation.sf.edu/academic-program-accreditation#education>

Description of data accessible via link: Data for CAEP to meet Annual Reporting Measures 1-8

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?

Emerging, expected, or unexpected trends are not derived from the limited data the EPP receives from the licensure exams due to its low 'n'. However, other sources of data are examined for trends. The EPP's graduate enrollment has nearly doubled in the past year. The EPP believes this is due to a confluence of events: the EPP mirrored the graduate level Special Education program course hours to the already existing popular Transisiton To Teaching program, the university partnered with another online provider who has a greater marketing presence, and special education is a high need field. The data the EPP reviews does not show any unexpected trends in any of the programs. The EPP does expect that additional attempts at licensure (Elementary Generalist) will lower due to the breakout of its methods courses. In 2016, the EPP had 2 methods courses: an integrated Science and Math, and an integrated Social Studies and Language Arts. Next year, 2019-2020 will be the first year that the four areas for elementary licensing in Indiana will delivered as separate courses.

The Education Department as a whole has a Program Improvement Day each fall semester where we discuss trends and data from the past three years. This data is also shared with the Dean of the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Director of Assessment and Accreditation, and the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) each year. The licensure test data is reviewed each year to determine areas of improvement. As an example, candidates did not score well on the Indiana Reading CORE assessment for Mild Intervention licensure, therefore, the instructor revised courses READ 200 and READ 302 to meet the objectives of the test. The data from the reading course change is not available at the time of this report, however, candidates expressed more confidence in their performance on the Indiana Reading CORE assessment for Mild Intervention licensure.

We remain cautious in making systemic changes due to the reality that our enrollment numbers are low resulting in incomplete data sets from the testing company. The testing data from the annual Title II reports is not robust enough to make any strong conclusions so will rely on multiple years of data. Additionally, we are not given the data in a user friendly way from the testing

company, so it takes time to calculate our pass rates for course and program evaluation. Furthermore, the data shared with the public is incomplete or not provided because we do not have 10 completers in each test subject. Because of the licensure test incomplete data sets, the EPP relies on its feedback from candidates, course instructors, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers to share with us areas of improvement and the strengths of the program. The feedback is collected using EPP created assessments for field experiences and key assessments in courses.

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

Provider does not ensure candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession.

The EPP has multiple measures of high frequency to ensure candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession.

Teacher candidates are required to identify the classroom and school demographics prior to each formal lesson to provide the candidate with contextual knowledge of their learners. Each teacher candidate is required to select a researched based strategy when writing their formal lessons, delivering lessons, and formally reflecting on the lesson's strengths and areas for improvement. Teacher candidates are required to assess learners' growth and achievement after each formal lesson is delivered. The candidate selects researched-based instructional strategies best suited to the classroom demographics, group setting, content standards, prior knowledge, and desired learner outcome. The candidates pre-assess and post-assess learners for each formal lesson. An analysis of the pre and post assessment data is presented graphically and narratively, displaying the candidates' ability to analyze and reflect on the learners' performance for that specific lesson. These requirements are found in the Learning Experience Map (LEM) and the Post Observation Lesson Analysis Narrative (POLAN).

Additionally, the EPP is collecting course level information from its faculty and adjuncts to assess the use of research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession. The faculty has undertaken a full alignment and mapping of its courses to the Indiana REPA Standards, Indiana CORE Assessments and Exam Objectives, and the Candidate Field Assessment Process (CFAP) and cross-walked these standards to CAEP EI. Ed. INTASC, and CEC standards. Each course has a defined body of research which is presented to the candidates to inform the knowledge and skills candidates are expected to master in each course. The drafts of the course maps will be presented to full faculty at its annual Program Improvement Day (PID) and at the EPP's annual Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) for further improvements and edits. The TEAC consists of P-12 partners, completers, faculty, adjuncts, community members, and candidates.

Monitoring and measuring progress on the use of evidence and research to develop an understanding of the teaching profession is done repeatedly throughout the candidates' preparation in applying their knowledge and skills to plan, instruct, and assess lessons through the completion of each LEM and POLAN, and by faculty and adjunct adherence to the course maps.

Effective practices result in effective performance. Candidate performance of the strategies and practices used to deliver lessons is tracked and monitored through the EPP's LMS system on the LEM and POLAN. Candidates' overall performance in which effective pedagogy, content knowledge, and knowledge of the learners and their environment is frequently tracked using the Candidate Progress Assessment (CPA). The EPP plans to create growth charts to show candidate progress on their LEM, POLAN, and CPA throughout their preparation, from their very first evaluation to their final evaluation.

The above-cited EPP assessments (LEM, POLAN, and CPA) are undergoing validity and reliability evaluation in the 2019-2020 academic year; they were under revision during the 2018-2019 academic year. The course maps with designated bodies of research will be implemented in the 2019-2020 academic year.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

4 Program Impact

The provider does not demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective

The EPP uses three measures that are implemented by the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) under the House Enrolled Act (HEA) 1388 and are therefore deemed to provide to the EPP valid and reliable data on the following: P-12 Student Learning (4.1), Teacher Observation Evaluations (4.2), Employer Satisfaction with Preparation (4.3), and Completer Satisfaction with Preparation (4.4). These measures are administered annually by the IDOE and results are sent to each EPP and posted on IDOE website and the USF website for public review. The three measures are the IDOE Principal Survey, IDOE Teacher Survey, and IDOE Teacher Effectiveness Ratings. We only received two years of Teacher Survey data so more data is needed. The EPP had hoped the IDOE annual surveys could replace the EPP's Surveys of Employer Satisfaction and Alumni Surveys but the IDOE Principals' Surveys of Teacher Effectiveness are only measured at two and three years out. No first year teacher data is available from this survey.

The EPP administers an EPP Employer Satisfaction Survey every 3 years to principals who evaluate EPP's completers. The data from the EPP Employer Satisfaction Survey is aggregated to provide the EPP an overall view of employer satisfaction. Since the EPP's CAEP accreditation in 2017, the EPP has not solicited information from this survey. At the next administration, to ensure content validity, all questions on the revised survey will be aligned to INTASC standards and categorized into the following domains: Learner and Learning Environment; Planning, Instruction, and Assessment; Content and Content Pedagogy Knowledge; and Professionalism, which will align to the aforementioned IDOE surveys. The EPP also administers the USF

Survey of Graduating Students (SGS) to its completers every 3 years. The data from the SGS is aggregated to provide an overall view of completer satisfaction. Since the EPP's CAEP accreditation in 2017, the EPP has not solicited information from the survey. At the next administration, to ensure content validity, all questions on the revised survey will be aligned to INTASC standards and categorized into the following domains: Learner and Learning Environment; Planning, Instruction, and Assessment; Content and Content Pedagogy Knowledge; and Professionalism which align to the aforementioned IDOE surveys. Stakeholders are engaged in this process in the following means:

1. Director of Field Experiences met with principals who receive the EPP's candidates for field experiences and employ the EPP's completers to collect anecdotal data on completer and candidate preparation. Ideas from these meetings are discussed with full faculty to determine topics and training gaps for course development and enhancement.
2. Data from the Indiana Department of Education Principal and Teacher surveys are analyzed and shared with the faculty at the EPP Program Improvement Day (PID) and the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) each year.
3. Progress and changes to the preparation program based on the data are taken under consideration when examining the n of the data, areas of less than high satisfaction, and further ways to collect principal and completer satisfaction with preparation. Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) has leveraged the existing data sources from employers and completers by mandating the survey completion to submit evaluations for Indiana teachers and to apply for yearly licensure updates; up to the third year in the profession.

The data thus far is very favorable to the satisfaction of the EPP's preparation. However, when the EPP analyzes the data for improved action with faculty at its Program Improvement Day (PID) and in meetings with TEAC, defined plans are created. As an example, completer preparation of classroom management and gifted have been rated as 'Agree' on a four-point scale (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree) on the IDOE Teacher Survey. The EPP faculty will review its courses and seek input from completers who serve on the TEAC on these areas and make revisions accordingly if deemed necessary. Both employer and completer surveys administered by IDOE and the EPP will be aligned to INTASC standards which will provide the EPP with a means to compare data relevant to each INTASC standard. The EPP will establish benchmarks for the IDOE surveys to be at or above the Indiana state ratings in all criteria; and 80% of respondents at either a 3 or 4 (scale of 1-4) on the EPP's Employer Satisfaction and SGS surveys.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP assurance system does not rely on measures that are valid and reliable.

As part of the strategic plan required by the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences, during the 2018-2019 academic year, the EPP focused its efforts on the following 3 initiatives:

1. Full implementation of the Candidate Progress Assessment (CPA) (its pilot year was academic year 2017-2018), create an Evidence Guide and "Look Fors" to accompany the CPA for reliability and ease of use, determine in which courses the CPA must be applied to candidate field experience so the data collected would show candidate growth throughout their program, develop training of university supervisors and cooperating teachers, and determine the best means to collect data from the CPA. Education faculty and University supervisors (US) would take the role of training the cooperating teachers (CT). This work was completed by the end of the 2018-2019 academic year. The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness was consulted in creating data sets from the data collected from the candidates' field experience collected from the CPA.
2. Alignment of courses to the Indiana REPA Standards, Indiana CORE Assessments and Exam Objectives, and the Candidate Field Assessment Process (CFAP). The faculty mapped the courses to the standards, wrote learning objectives for the courses based on the standards, and assigned the national standards (CAEP EL ED, INTASC, and CEC) to the Indiana REPA standards for each course.
3. Revise and pilot the Learning Experience Map (LEM) and the Post-Observation Lesson Analysis Narrative (POLAN) assignments and rubrics, determine which courses the CPA must be used and data collected to show candidate growth throughout their program, and implement the revised instruments.

Two surveys were created with candidate input during the 2017-2018 academic year, were put into action: Candidate Survey of CT and Candidate Survey of US. These surveys, aligned to the INTASC standards, allow the EPP to assess US and CT responsiveness and effectiveness in candidate support while in the field.

Future plans with the suite of EPP field assessments include:

1. Additional assessment which focuses specifically on lesson delivery / instruction
2. Develop video training of how to use EPP's instruments (CFAP)-the training of use is currently done via paper copies for each CT and US
3. Create video training to establish reliability of instrument use of CFAP
4. Survey users of EPP to establish content validity (using Lawshe method) of all EPP assessments
5. Establish 4 Learner Outcomes (Learner and Learning Environment; Planning, Instruction, and Assessment; Content and Content Pedagogy Knowledge; and Professionalism) within the EPP's LMS (Canvas) system to pull data from all CFAP assessments by Outcome

Stakeholders (P-12 partners, academic and clinical faculty, staff, administrators, community members, candidates, and completers) are integral to the work described above. P-12 Partners will assist the EPP in establishing validity and reliability with its assessments. Faculty is intimately involved in course alignment, learning objectives for each course; and communicating directions and expectations for field work and use of assessment tools; and applying the EPP assessments to course expectations. Candidates use the EPP assessments to evaluate themselves in the field and participated in creating two surveys used to evaluate support of the CT and US during field experiences. During the revision of the LEM and POLAN, senior level candidates provided input on the length and clarity of criteria. At this time, we have not engaged completers in this work. All of the changes to the EPP's assessments are annually vetted with the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) at its annual meeting. Adjunct instructors will meet in the Spring of 2019 to discuss the graduate course alignment to Indiana Standards and CORE Assessments to write newly aligned learning objectives.

Currently, the EPP is considering efficient means to analyze the data from the EPP field assessments. Monitoring and measuring

progress is done each semester in the courses in which the CFAP process is implemented. Each year in the fall, the Indiana Principal Survey data, and Completer Satisfaction Survey data are released to the EPP, the EPP then engages in a Program Improvement Day where all data sets from the prior year are reviewed and analyzed. This data and any action to be implemented is shared with the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) prior to implementation. To determine the effectiveness of the actionable items selected from the Program Improvement Day and TEAC, the faculty assesses candidate performance on Indiana CORE Assessments, and course and field performance assessments.

The efforts described for this AFI complement existing initiatives by bringing into full focus the strategic plan of the EPP. The EPP believes that mapping the standards for each course, cross-walking the Indiana standards to C AEP Elem Ed., INTASC and CEC standards, writing learning objectives reflective of the course standards, and revising field assessments will assist the EPP in determining its strengths and weaknesses in preparing teacher candidates. In additional efforts toward validity of its assessments, the EPP cross-walked the Indiana CORE Assessment objectives and blueprints with the standards mapped in each course taken by teacher candidates. This crosswalk allowed the EPP to determine overlaps and gaps in content knowledge and skills as defined by the Indiana CORE Assessments' objectives. When gaps were identified, the EPP faculty added standards to courses to ensure candidates were receiving sufficient knowledge and practice of the Indiana CORE Assessment objectives.

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?

Entering the 2018-2019 academic year, the EPP recognized several important tasks to undertake in its efforts of continuous improvement and progress monitoring of candidate performance. This recognition of direction came from the CAEP Accreditation feedback in 2017, and awareness to become more efficient and intentional in EPP direction. Annually, the EPP engages in its Program Improvement Day (PID). During this full-day meeting in the fall, the EPP analyzes all data points to determine needs and changes to its programs. Additionally, the EPP seeks advice and direction from its candidates, completers, and P-12 partners. The majority of candidate and completer input is sought and recorded as anecdotal notes and discussions, while the advice and input of the TEAC are memorialized in minutes. Each action the EPP puts into action has been vetted by either the faculty, faculty and candidates, faculty and CAEP, or faculty and P-12 partners. Timelines are established for the work and duties assigned to appropriate stakeholders. Due to the high level of reflection and input from stakeholders, CAEP, and faculty expertise, the EPP selected the following tasks toward continuous improvement:

1. The EPP implemented the Candidate Progress Assessment (CPA), created an Evidence Guide and "Look Fors" to accompany the CPA for reliability and ease of use, determined in which courses the CPA must be applied to candidate field experience so the

data collected would show candidate growth throughout their program, developed training of university supervisors and cooperating teachers, and determined the best means to collect data from the CPA. Education faculty and University supervisors (US) took on the role of training the cooperating teachers (CT). This work was completed by the end of the 2018-2019 academic year. The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness was consulted in creating data sets from the data collected from the candidates' field experience collected from the CPA.

2. The EPP engaged in full alignment and mapping of courses to the Indiana REPA Standards, Indiana CORE Assessments and Exam Objectives, and the Candidate Field Assessment Process (CFAP). The faculty mapped the courses to the standards, wrote learning objectives for the courses based on the standards, and assigned the national standards (CAEP EL ED, INTASC, and CEC) to the Indiana REPA standards for each course. The EPP believes that mapping the standards for each course, cross-walking the Indiana standards to CAEP Elem Ed., INTASC and CEC standards, writing learning objectives reflective of the course standards, and revising field assessments will assist the EPP in determining its strengths and weaknesses in preparing teacher candidates. In additional efforts toward the validity of its assessments, the EPP cross-walked the Indiana CORE Assessment objectives and blueprints with the standards mapped in each course taken by teacher candidates. This crosswalk allowed the EPP to determine overlaps and gaps in content knowledge and skills as defined by the Indiana CORE Assessments' objectives. When gaps were identified, the EPP faculty added standards to courses to ensure candidates were receiving sufficient knowledge and practice of the Indiana CORE Assessment objectives. During the mapping process, the EPP created a course template that displays learning objectives aligned to state and national standards, its central topics (essential questions), research and evidence strategies within the course content, and cross-cutting themes of technology and diversity.

3. The EPP revised and piloted the Learning Experience Map (LEM) and the Post-Observation Lesson Analysis Narrative (POLAN) assignments and rubrics, determined which courses the CPA must be used and data collected to show candidate growth throughout their program, and implemented the revised instruments Spring 2019.

4. The EPP, with the guidance and input of teacher candidates, the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) created and implemented the Candidate Survey of Cooperating Teachers (CT) and the Candidate Survey of University Supervisors (US). These two tools are aligned to the INTASC standards and will provide the EPP with valuable information in relation to the level of support and guidance its candidates are receiving from their CTs and USs. This data will facilitate the work of the Director of Field Experiences in his requests for field placements.

Future plans with the suite of EPP field assessments include:

1. Additional assessment which focuses specifically on lesson delivery/instruction
2. Develop video training of how to use EPP's instruments (CFAP)-the training of use is currently done via paper copies for each CT and US
3. Create video training to establish the reliability of instrument use of CFAP
4. Survey users of EPP assessments to establish content validity (using Lawshe method)
5. Establish 4 Learner Outcomes (Learner and Learning Environment; Planning, Instruction, and Assessment; Content and Content Pedagogy Knowledge; and Professionalism) within the EPP's LMS (Canvas) system to pull data from all CFAP assessments by Outcome

The Survey of Graduating Students indicated Elementary Education Majors wanted more Math and Science Methods courses so the EPP changed our Elementary Education program for the 2019-20 Academic year to split the Math and Science Methods course into two separate courses.

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
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 4.4 Completer satisfaction
- 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

The links in this report may not be accessed by simply clicking on them since the university switched from http:// to https:// url prefix. The EPP suggests the reviewer copies and pastes the URL in their browser to access the reports.

Last year the links were not able to be accessed by the CAEP annual reviewer because between the time when the EPP submitted its links in the 2018-2019 annual report and the review of the report the university embarked on a total redesign of its website.

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2019 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completer data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site visit report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted

and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

Acknowledge