

2019 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11314	AACTE SID:	990
Institution:	East Tennessee State University		
Unit:	Clemmer College		

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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input 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 152

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 70

Total number of program completers 222

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:

Description of data accessible via link:

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?

Candidate Recruitment and Selection: 2014-2017 completers had Praxis Core Reading, Writing and Math scores that are all higher than the state average. While the ACT/SAT scores do not exceed the state average, ETSU has adopted an admission policy that would require all scores to meet or exceed the state minimum and cohort averages for CAEP. Based on the 2018 performance report, ETSU has met the expectations for our admissions assessment inclusive of minimum and average GPA.. Diversity, defined as race and ethnicity, is not a strength of our EPP. In the 2014-2017 completers, 96.8 % of the students were Caucasian. Per 2017 U.S. Census Bureau, Populations Estimates Program, in Washington County where ETSU is located, 91.7% of the population is Caucasian. Our demographics are reflective of the racial/ethnic diversity found in our region. In addition to the diversity data reported at the state level, ETSU is collecting information from our candidates related to 1st generation college student status and economic status. Outreach initiatives for recruiting diverse candidates are underway with partner schools and districts who have increased diversity populations (e.g., Hamilton County). The Washington County NAACP has identified retired African-American teachers who are willing to recruit with and for us. Given the data on completers from 2014-2017, ETSU produces less teachers for the high need endorsement areas than the state average. Initiatives to increase the number of completers who are prepared to teach in these areas are underway.

Candidate Assessment: Candidates are assessed on the edTPA and Praxis II. Our EPP consistently has a slightly higher average than the state average for our edTPA score per TN Atlas. The average score for the edTPA for ETSU is 47.4 for the 2014-2017 completers, which far exceeds the required scores for each testing area. See Clemmer College link for an overview of each of our edTPA testing areas compared to required test scores. Internally, data for candidates from 2015-2018 cohort demonstrate proficiency for the first task (planning). ETSU has made several adjustments over the past three years on the lesson plan template, making it more aligned with the expectations of the edTPA. Workshops were implemented to support faculty and candidates in the understanding of Academic Language, a previously area of need (rubrics 4 and 14). In most programs, candidates begin working on the Planning Commentary in the fall (Residency I), which affords them more time to complete the

task. Findings note that the second task (instruction) is our main area that needs improvement most notably Rubric 9 and 10, which highlight subject specific pedagogy and analyzing teaching effectiveness. Targeted instruction are needed for understanding the prompt, best practices that are specific to the content area, and lesson requirements prior to planning and recording of learning segments. While overall our candidates are performing well on Task 3 (assessment), targeted instruction in seminar classes on understanding the edTPA prompts and planning for collection of evidence are needed specific to Rubrics 13 and 14.

Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) is an exam that covers candidates' pedagogical knowledge. In 2014-2017 our candidates have performed exceptionally well with an average of 96.9-100% pass rate on PLT exams. In the future, edTPA will be the primary source of assessment for pedagogy replacing the PLT as the licensure requirement by the state. For the Praxis II Specialty Area Assessment for the 2014-2017 cohort, there is a range of 91.7-100% pass rates (TNAtlas). See Clemmer College link for an overview of each of our Specialty Area Test data inclusive of pass rate and averages. For the Praxis II Reading: Elementary Education, which serves as a literacy assessment, for the 2014-2017 cohort, 97.2% of the candidates passed the examination. Each year the average improved from 95% to 97% to 100% for the last year of record. With the state of Tennessee's new literacy standards, each program within our EPP has refined their programming related to literacy.

Completer, Employer, and Partner Satisfaction: The Teacher Educator Survey from spring 2018 assessed educators' perceptions of the quality of their teacher preparation. Completers indicated high levels of satisfaction with clinical experience and coaching/mentorship, coursework and faculty expertise/relationships, and overall preparation for teaching in their current school setting that are similar to that of the state average (TNAtlas). Internally, our EPP piloted a completer survey to assess completer satisfaction. Sixty-five undergraduate students and seven graduate students responded to the survey. To summarize the findings, 97.03% of completers agreed/strongly agreed on their self-confidence in their subject matter content knowledge related to the INTASC content areas. In addition 91.4% of completers agreed/strongly agreed that their program prepared them adequately with the ability to implement the INTASC-related teaching behaviors. Finally, 88.9% of completers rated agreed/strongly agreed that their mentor teachers modeled and demonstrated INTASC-related teaching behaviors during residency placements. Overall completers felt well prepared. Our EPP is reviewing our placement process with LEA partners to improve upon placement experiences.

At the end of the 2017-2018, Principals (n=12) rated their satisfaction with ETSU trained teachers they hired at the beginning of the 2017. Principals were asked on a 4-point scale (strongly disagree/strongly agree) their perceptions on the capability of the ETSU teachers in relation to INTASC teaching behaviors. Principals reported that they agreed/strongly agreed (all means >3.0) that the teachers were meeting expectations for all teaching behaviors. Principals noted that the teachers hired from ETSU were specifically strong in their ability to assess student performance (M= 3.42), collaboration with various stakeholders (M= 3.42), and overall professionalism (M= 3.33). Teaching behaviors that were reported the lowest by Principals were the ability to plan instruction based on assessment data (M=3.0), use verbal and nonverbal communication with individuals with diverse cultural backgrounds (M=3.08), and to recognize learning misconceptions of a discipline to build future learning experiences (M=3.08). One limitation of these data is that principals rated employed teachers from the 2017-2018 school year collectively. As a result, a principal at a specific school who hired three ETSU graduates for 2017-2018 rated all three employees collectively. Though the study address specific licensure areas, it is unable to differentiate specific teachers (unless only one teacher was hired from ETSU in a school year).

Completer Effectiveness and Impact: For TN teachers prepared at ETSU for the 2014-2017 cohort of completers, data indicates a positive impact on P-12 students. Close to 97% of the teacher completers (96.7% in 2014-2017) who were prepared by ETSU earned a Level of Effectiveness (LOE) score of 3 or higher (5-point scale). The LOE rating is a quantitative score comprised of teacher observations by school leaders using the TEAM, student growth scores gathered from the TVAAS, and student achievement data. State benchmarks are available for comparison. For each year between 2014-2017, ETSU has performed higher than the state average for LOE scores of 3 or higher. Completers also scored higher than the state average for all observation domain areas including instruction, planning and environment. The Educator Preparation Report Card is routinely shared with LEA partner districts, faculty, and students.

Employment and Retention: The state collected employment and retention data on completers from three cohorts who were employed in TN public schools: Cohort 1 (2014-15) includes people who completed preparation programs between Sept. 1, 2014-Aug. 31, 2015; Cohort 2 (2015-16) includes people who completed preparation and those who were candidates enrolled in job-embedded preparation programs between Sept. 1, 2015-Aug. 31, 2016; and Cohort 3 (2016-17) includes people who completed preparation and those who were candidates enrolled in job-embedded preparation programs between Sept. 1, 2016-Aug. 31, 2017. Unaccounted for are completers who sought employment outside of TN, in a private setting, or continued their education. Data for our EPP is incomplete for the cohorts reported by the state. Moving forward, the state will continue to collect and report these data in a consistent format for cross year comparison within the EPP and for comparison across the state. Per the available data for our EPP (TN Atlas), 71.5% of the completers have maintained employment in TN, which is lower than the state average.

Sharing EPP Data: The EPP provides multiple means for accessing the data for annual measures. Under a College Data and Reports hyperlink on Clemmer College's webpage, a Clemmer College link is provided on the 2019 EPP Annual Report. Links are provided to the 2019 EPP Report Card and the Title II Report on National Teacher Preparation. In 2018-2019, data on annual measures were shared at 4 meetings with EPP faculty. Data for targeted measurements were analyzed, summarized and plans of action were made. All data and plans are housed on a secure drive for faculty. Meetings with our partners were held to review measures and proposals. Data were reviewed and insights were obtained as a reflective evaluative process on the needs of our current teacher candidates, our completers, and the trends in the field. In 2019 a meeting between the State Board of Education, our faculty, and candidates was held. Candidates shared their experiences in the field and after reviewing ETSU's report card, gave feedback on the usefulness of its measures.

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.

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?

Our EPP has reviewed and refined all annual measures in the quality assurance system annually to ensure that our needs for data are being met. At the initial licensure level, our EPP uses consistent measures across all programs. At the advanced level, measures are individualized according to program needs. For EPP constructed instruments, Completer Survey, Principal Survey, and Lesson Plan, our LEA partners assisted in the development and revision of the instruments (Standard 5.5, 2.1, 2.2, 3.3).

Our EPP held 4 data meetings (Standard 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4) this year with EPP faculty. In the fall data meetings, edTPA, Praxis II, Completer, Principal, and Diversity survey data were reviewed. In the spring, TEAM evaluation, lesson plan, Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA), student demographic data, and report card findings were reviewed. Select faculty and chairs participated in data review (i.e., Praxis II and edTPA data) and literacy proposal meetings with the LEA Network (Standard 5.5, 2.2). LEA Network members, business leaders, current students, alumni and faculty participated in a review of all secondary education programs facilitated by an outside consultant (Standard 5.5). Data reviewed included edTPA and Praxis II data as well as perspectives of the programs' effectiveness.

Each year our candidates have improved their performance on the edTPA (Standard 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 5.1, 5.2). In 2018-2019, we added a new edTPA coordinator who is a dynamic force in providing supports (based on edTPA data in section 4.2) for candidates and faculty in improving their performance and instruction.

EPP faculty analyzed Praxis II scores (Standard 3.6, 3.5, 3.4, 3.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3) and made plans to address need areas. While the findings are highly individualized across programs, strategies to address areas were similar. Strategies included infusing Praxis II-related content into exams and coursework, offering boot camps, considering timing of exam completion, and providing online resources. Praxis II scores were reviewed and analyzed at an LEA Network meeting with Kingsport City Schools (KCS) and Johnson City Schools (JCS) partners.

ETSU piloted a completer survey (Standard 1.1, 4.4, 5.1) and a survey of principals (Standard 1.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5) to assess completer and employer satisfaction. See findings in section 4.2.

To gain a greater understanding of the experiences that our candidates receive from people of diverse background and abilities, we

created the Diversity Survey (Standard 2.1, 2.3). For each field experience, candidates report on the types of diversity (i.e., low socioeconomic status, disability, English Language Learners (ELL), race/ethnicity) they encounter in those placements. The data allow us to ensure that candidates are receiving at least one experience with P-12 students from the diversity areas assessed and provides us with the data to share with our LEA partners for meeting the diversity exposure needs of our candidates. The highest area of need for diversity experience for our candidates is ELL. As a result, we have identified districts with a higher percentage of students who are ELL to place our candidates.

Candidates are assessed with the TEAM (Standard 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.4, 3.5, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3), which was added based on LEA feedback (Standard 5.5). Findings are highly individualized across programs, yet there were several consistent findings. Many programs had candidates who excelled in environment and respectful culture. Teacher knowledge of students was a common area for improvement. The graduate level program in Early Childhood plans to increase focused observations and reflections of field experiences to address this issue. The Elementary Ed. program planned to incorporate students' funds of knowledge, interest inventories and case studies across the curriculum. Another common area for improvement across many programs was formative and summative assessment. In response to that need, the Special Ed. program planned to integrate more activities and instruction to align assessment to lesson objectives and showcase methods for collecting a variety of forms of summative data.

In the Fall 2018, we refined our lesson plan template with our LEA partners (Standard 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.4) through survey and collaborative meetings. Training was conducted with EPP faculty on the refined lesson plan template. At our Spring data meeting, we reviewed lesson plan data. Findings for the strengths and need areas are highly individualized across programs. Each program determined a plan of action to address any areas of concern. For example, Elementary Ed. will target formative assessment by integrating more modeling of formative assessments and more explicit instruction on the topic in coursework. Early Childhood conducted a curriculum map that resulted in three assignments being added to address academic language. Of the greatest concern is data from the secondary education history and English Language Arts programs. Given the number of areas that need improvement regarding candidate performance on the lesson plan, faculty who teach in this area from Clemmer College and Arts & Sciences will meet beyond the data meeting to identify an enhanced plan of action to address the concerns.

In Fall 2018, we adopted the EDA (Standard 3.3, 3.6, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3) which is completed by supervisors with mentor teacher feedback. Our data review noted the following strengths and need areas. Our Early Childhood candidates have an appreciation of cultural and academic diversity. They also exhibit social-emotional intelligence to promote personal and educational goals/stability. For some programs (e.g., Elementary Ed., Secondary Ed., Special Ed., Middle Grades) written communication was viewed as a strength and for other programs (e.g., Early Childhood Ed.) it was identified as an area for improvement. Collaborating effectively with stakeholders was viewed as a strength for many programs (e.g., Elementary Ed., Special Ed., and Physical Ed.). Nearly all programs identified the need to present the assessment tool earlier in the candidate's programs so that candidates would become further familiarized with the expectations around professional dispositions. Earlier introduction of the tool will begin in Fall 2019.

Candidate demographic data (i.e., overall GPA, Gender, Race/ethnicity, financial aid status, 1st generation college student status, transfer student status, high school, rural status) were reviewed (Standard 3.1, 3.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3). Candidates in our program must meet a minimum GPA and test scores. A new BucPoints process will remove subjective measures when assessing whether a student meets the requirements of admission (Standard 3). Candidate demographic data will be documented in DegreeWorks, an academic advising and degree audit tool, and collected via residency applications. Programs will review the data and determine areas for improvement and future goals for recruitment and selection of quality candidates.

At our final data meeting, we reviewed the 2018 Educator Preparation Report Card. We maintained our overall score of 3 out of 4. Our provider impact was shown to be an area of strength. Our overall performance in employment increased from a 2 to a 3. However, our candidate profile score decreased to a performance category of 1. Areas for improvement include diversity and candidates entering high need endorsement areas. Outreach initiatives outlined in section 4.2 are underway to recruit from a pool of diverse students. Curriculum redesign efforts and collaborations across programs are also in the works to increase the endorsements in the high need endorsement areas. We were recently funded a NOYCE grant that will fund STEM-focused candidates.

In 2018-2019, we have tested innovations (Standard 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.4, 5.3) in Clinical Partnerships and Practice (Standard 2). We started a Kingsport Academy for Teaching (KAT) with KCS. During their year-long clinical residency, candidates receive an enhanced residency experience. KAT participants are co-selected by the LEA and EPP. Once selected for the program, the candidate receives a LEA mentor who guides them through the KAT experience including serving as a substitute teacher, co-teaching in a classroom, or working with administrator/faculty/staff on a special project. The LEA pays the EPP \$2000 for each KAT participant and the EPP stipends them. Preliminary feedback has been positive from all key stakeholders.

In Spring 2019, we partnered with JCS for the Candidate to Substitute program. Teacher candidates in their Residency II semester can apply to be considered for substitute work with JCS. The candidate receives the substitute training and is added to JCS's substitute list. Candidates are prioritized for subbing in their residency placements, then their residency school, and finally the district. Sub days are agreed upon by the university supervisor, mentor teacher, and the principal. These days may not compete with the days already in the residency placements.

We continue to expand upon the instructional experiences and supports that are provided to our candidates for the edTPA. Our edTPA coordinator provided workshops (i.e., live and online), bootcamps, and a social media presence. Our edTPA scores continue to meet and often times exceed the required passing scores.

Technology is a target area for innovations. For example, the Curriculum and Instruction has integrated coding, computational

thinking and digital learning into their coursework. Early Childhood and Curriculum & Instruction piloted Google I certification for their candidates and will be expanded to other program in the upcoming year. Finally, EPP faculty participated in an online instruction training conference aimed at putting the most up-to-date technology into the classroom.

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.
- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
- 3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
- 3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
- 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
- A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities
- A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
- A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
- A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
- A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
- A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
- A.3.4 Selection at Completion
- x.1 Diversity
- x.2 Technology
- x.5 State Standards (if applicable)

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

 20172018CAEP_ANNUAL_REPORT_Information_for_the_CC_website42619.docx

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 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a successful transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful reflection regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPP's evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progress in addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use the Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level.

If there are no identified gaps, click the box next to "No identified gaps" and proceed to question 7.2.

No identified gaps

If there are identified gaps, please summarize the gaps and any steps planned or taken toward the gap(s) to be prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text applies.

Presently there are gaps in our systematic collection of data for our advanced level programs. Our EPP faculty and leadership for the advanced level programs have met and determined a plan of action for data collection for the standards that we are not presently addressing across all programs (i.e., A.4.1, A.4.2, A.5.1, A.5.2, A.5.3, A.5.4, A.5.5). Although we have been collecting some of the data for some programs, there is not a systematic way to showcase those data in a manner that is easily shared with the public. Within the plan of action, programs are developing EPP created instruments and reframing data that are collected into a manner that is ready for public display. Each advanced level program has outlined their own list of assessments that addressed the standards so the process is highly individualized.

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

A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
A.5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
A.5.5 Continuous Improvement

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

Yes No

7.3 If no, please describe any changes that mean that the EPP does not continue to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

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