

2020 EPP Annual Report

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

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 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"/>

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

https://www.etsu.edu/coe/aboutcoe/cc_programs.php

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

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

Total number of program completers 212

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:

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 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: 2015-2018 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 2019 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 2015-2018 completers, 96.8 % of the students were Caucasian. Per July 1, 2019 U.S. Census Bureau, Populations Estimates Program, in Washington County where ETSU is located, 91.4% 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. A Community Conversation focused on recruitment of candidates from diverse populations was held with a variety of stakeholders in our area (i.e., business leaders, school district administrators and teachers, workforce development officials and EPP faculty and staff). We also have formed a focus group for minority candidates and teachers to build supports for these professionals. We have also been funded two grants to target high need endorsement areas: special education (CILNT) and the STEM areas (NOYCE).

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 48.4 for the 2015-2018

completers, which far exceeds the required scores for each testing area (TNAtlas). See Clemmer College link for an overview of each of our edTPA testing areas compared to required test scores. Based on the data, supervisors have completed intensive work to help candidates improve in needed areas. Workshops have been provided to students, faculty and mentor teachers to better prepare them to support our candidates in preparing for the edTPA. Seminar leaders meet on a regular basis to share ideas and strategies for improving need areas. While we continue edTPA bootcamps, an innovative practice we have started is edTPA Coaches (from a pool of graduates).

For the Praxis Specialty Area Assessment for the 2015-2018 cohort, there is a range of 52.9-100% pass rates (TNAtlas). Per TN Atlas, the Mathematics: Content Knowledge examination area is one of great concern for ETSU and across the state. During our data meeting on Praxis II, secondary education and math faculty discussed the scores. In planning they determined that both students and faculty needed to be made more aware of the testing requirements and that the students be encouraged to take the examination earlier in their program. For the Praxis II Reading: Elementary Ed., which serves as a literacy assessment, for the 2015-2018 cohort, 96.7% of the candidates passed the examination, which exceeds the state value of 95.69%. With the state of Tennessee's new literacy standards, each program within our EPP is implementing the refined programming to address these literacy standards. See Clemmer College link for an data overview of each of our Specialty Area Tests.

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). These are the same data reported by the state during last year's annual reporting period.

ETSU Internal Data on Satisfaction: During the completion of the 2018-2019 school year, ETSU surveyed in-service teachers who (a) completed their first year of teaching in public schools and (b) were graduates of an ETSU teacher licensure initial licensure program. The purpose of the survey was to request feedback on the impact teacher preparation at ETSU had on the current classroom instruction of in-service teachers. The survey provided statements related to instructional practice and professional dispositions (aligned with the InTASC Standards) and graduates to respond based on the impact it had on their teaching today. Of those graduates 66 completed their educator preparation at ETSU at the bachelor's level (90.4%), and 7 at the graduate level (9.6%). Overall completers felt well prepared at ETSU (all means > 3.18 on 4-point scale). This year's data seem to demonstrate that our graduates feel highly confident related to planning, and assessment based on diverse student needs. Our EPP is reviewing our placement process with partnering local education agencies to improve upon the placement experiences of our candidates.

At the end of the 2018-2019 school year, Principals from local partnering schools were asked to rate their satisfaction with teachers they hired at the beginning of the 2018 school year who were graduates from the ETSU teacher education program. Fifty-one (N= 51) Principals participated in this survey for this year, but 4 of the Principals agreeing to participate did not hire ETSU graduates, thus leaving the final sample size at 47. This is a drastic increase from the 12 principals who completed the survey in the previous pilot year (2017-2018). Based on the inTASC teacher behaviors presented related to the ETSU graduates hired Principals reported that they strongly agreed with 39.1% of the behaviors, agreed with 58.5% of the behaviors, and disagreed with 2.4% of the behaviors. No Principals reported strongly disagreeing with any teaching behaviors.

Completer Effectiveness and Impact: For TN teachers prepared at ETSU for the 2015-2018 cohort of completers, data indicate a positive impact on P-12 students. Ninety-five percent of the teachers in TN during 2015-2018 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 2015-2018, 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, students and the community.

Employment and Retention: The state collected employment and retention data on completers from three cohorts who were employed in TN public schools. See definitions of cohorts in the 2018 Annual Reports for Tennessee Educator Preparation Providers Technical Guide. Data per TN Atlas indicate that across the years 2015-2018 63.4% of our initial licensure graduates obtained teaching jobs within 1 year of obtaining their initial license. While this initial year of employment is lower than the state value, the metric analyzing those individuals who were employed for a single year and eligible for employment for a second (94.2%) and third year (86.0%) exceeds the state values.

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 2019-2020, 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. ETSU LEA Network meetings with our partners (i.e., Johnson City Schools, Kingsport City Schools, and University School) 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. State values and regional information are used as benchmarks for data comparison purposes.

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?

We use consistent measures across all initial level programs. InTASC standards and key stakeholder insights (LEA partners, students, completers) were used to develop and refine EPP constructed instruments (Standard 5.5, 2.1, 2.2, 3.3). At the advanced level, measures are individualized according to program needs and are developed in partnership with key stakeholders via advisory boards. We held 4 data meetings (Standard 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4) this year with faculty to review key assessment data. Data meetings allow faculty to analyze program data from the most recent cycle, compare data to past cycles, and to assess the effectiveness of action plans developed at prior data meetings. Select faculty and chairs participated in data review during LEA Network meetings (Standard 5.5, 2.2). Data are shared with partners, discussed, and plans are developed together to make improvements in programming and partnership initiatives.

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 edTPA coordinator who is a dynamic force (based on edTPA data in section 4.2) for candidates to improve performance on the edTPA and faculty and mentor teachers to improve their instruction and supports for candidates.

Praxis II scores were analyzed (Standard 3.6, 3.5, 3.4, 3.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3) and plans were made for need areas. While the findings are 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. Programs recognized the need to identify candidates who may potentially struggle with Praxis II early and start supports earlier.

ETSU used 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. The surveys were designed with key stakeholders (LEA partners, completers, students, EPP faculty) based on InTASC standards and with additional feedback, these instruments continue to be reviewed to determine if there are more effective means for collecting data. For instance, we partnered with school systems to issue surveys to principals in an in-person format during principal meetings to increase the return rate.

The Diversity Survey (Standard 2.1, 2.3) is used for each field experience. Candidates report on the types of diversity they encounter in placements. Data allow us to ensure that candidates are receiving at least one experience with P-12 students from the diversity areas and provides us with the data to share with our LEA partners for meeting candidates' diversity needs. ELL continues to be a need area and as a result, we have identified districts with a higher % of ELL students to place our candidates and some programs have integrated other projects to increase exposure.

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, respectful culture, activities & materials, and lesson structure & pacing. Exemplary questioning was a common area for improvement. Last year the early childhood program recognized this as an area of need and they implemented an increased focus of this area in coursework and field experiences, which resulted in program improvement. The continuous improvement process allows programs to look at each cycle of data separately or together to analyze trends to make plans that benefit their candidates in future years. At LEA Network meetings, key stakeholders expressed gratitude for our EPP using the TEAM. They indicated that our completers come in far more prepared to meet the evaluation methods in their districts since implementing the TEAM as a key assessment.

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 faculty on the refined template. Calibration training has continued on an annual basis. Based on student and supervisor feedback, revisions to the lesson plan template are under revision as a part of our continuous improvement process.

The Educator Disposition Assessment (Standard 3.3, 3.6, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3) is completed by supervisors with mentor teacher feedback. Since being trained initially, calibration trainings have continued on an annual basis. Strengths and areas of need varied among programs. Programs highlighted ways to improve candidates' dispositions in their action plans. Sample plans include reflection assignments, additional feedback on oral communication during field observations, discussion board assignments, self-evaluation and peer-evaluation activities to target key disposition attributes noted in the EDA.

Given some system changes, a new method of collecting 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) was established with EPP faculty, staff, and candidates (Standard 3.1, 3.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3). A partnership between professional advisors, the residency staff and the certification staff will facilitate candidate collection of data to note demonstration of candidates having met admission criteria (Standard 3). Programs will review the data and determine areas for improvement and future goals for recruitment and selection of quality candidates at an upcoming data meeting. LEA partners have expressed less of a desire to evaluate GPA and test requirements as they have stated that they give more weight to their interview processes. However, they are interested in the racial demographics of our candidates. Together, we have expressed a desire to see more diversity in our programs and schools.

Given the desire for more diversity in our programs, business leaders, students, completers, LEA teachers and administrators, and community leaders joined together for a Community Conversation on recruitment into the teaching profession with an emphasis on recruitment of candidates from diverse populations. Many marketing and programmatic initiatives were outlined at that meeting. Some of those ideas have been on standstill given COVID-19. However one of our completers who is a school board member has been running a focus group with minority candidates and teachers. This group wishes to formalize to become a place of support for its members.

The 2019 Educator Preparation Report Card has been shared widely in the newspaper, website, newsletter, emails to partners, and social media. We received a rating of exceeds expectations with provider impact and employment as strengths. Our candidate profile rating was scored as does not meet expectations. Improvements areas include diversity and candidates entering high need endorsement areas. Outreach initiatives in section 4.2 as well as above with the Community Conversation are underway to recruit diverse students. We were funded a NOYCE grant that will fund STEM-focused candidates and a personnel preparation grant in special education to meet high need endorsement areas.

In 2018-2020, 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). During their year-long clinical residency, candidates receive an enhanced residency experience. Participants are co-selected by the LEA and EPP. Once selected for the program, the candidate receives a LEA mentor who guides them including serving as a substitute teacher, co-teaching in a classroom, or working with administrator/faculty/staff on a special project. The KAT participants receives \$2000 funded by the LEA. Feedback has been positive from all key stakeholders and expansion efforts are underway

In Spring 2019 and 2020, we implemented the Candidate to Substitute program. Candidates in Residency II can apply to substitute. The candidate receives the substitute training and are prioritized for subbing in their residency placements, then their residency school, and finally the district to meet district and student experience needs.


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. Given COVID-19, partnerships between school districts, EPP faculty and students and parents of children in the community have formed to meet the online instructional needs of children in our region. For instance, we formed a Homework Hotline that assigned candidates with schools districts to help students with their instructional needs and will continue beyond COVID-19. A Facebook resource run by EPP Faculty and students was formed to provide ETSU Education Support. An online community of learning was developed for teachers and parents of students with severe disabilities to share successes, challenges and resources in serving children online through weekly meetings. We also held a Virtual Career Fair to assist our candidates in getting jobs during the pandemic.

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.5.4 Continuous Improvement
- x.1 Diversity
- x.2 Technology

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

 **20182019CAEP_ANNUAL_REPORT_Information_for_the_CC_website.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 on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help 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, although improvements in the planning have been made over the past year. Our EPP faculty and leadership for the advanced level programs continue to meet and work on a plan to address needed standards (i.e., A.4.1, A.4.2, A.5.1, A.5.2, A.5.4, A.5.5). 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 address 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.5.4 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 2020 EPP Annual Report.

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Cynthia Chambers

Position: Associate Dean of Educator Preparation

Phone: 4234397586

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