

2018 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11215	AACTE SID:	1715
Institution:	Keene State College		
Unit:	School of Professional and Graduate Studies		

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 2016-2017 ?

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 144

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 2016-2017 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
No Change / Not Applicable

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.
No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited
No Change / Not Applicable

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
No Change / Not Applicable

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements
No Change / Not Applicable

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

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://www.keene.edu/office/teachered/accreditation/national/data/>

Description of data accessible via link: Average Cumulative GPA: 2016-2017 Program Completers; Praxis II Pass Rates: 2016-2017 Program Completers; Foundations of Reading Pass Rates: 2016-2107; Employer Survey summary report; Alumni Survey summary report; Licensing and Certification data (Title II report)

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?

The NH Department of Education does not share data with IHEs related to the impact IHE graduates have on P-12 student learning and development. As a result, we do not have state-level impact data to report. This includes measures related to impact Keene State College EPP program completers have on P-12 learning and development (Annual Reporting Measure 1, Standard 4.1) and indicators of teaching effectiveness (Annual Reporting Measure 2, Standard 4.2).

As an example, the NH Department of Education does not disseminate K-12 student statewide assessment data at the classroom level to IHEs. We are only able to access and analyze assessment trends to the grade level in NH public schools, which does not link to KSC completers. Additionally, we do not have access to teacher evaluation data linked to student achievement. Efforts to collaborate with districts regarding sharing assessment data are underway; however, this can be challenging due to a variety of factors, including confidentiality, district policies and procedures, and bargaining unit agreements.

Based on CAEP guidance to IHEs (When States Provide Limited Data: Guidance on Using Standard 4 to Drive Program Improvement – July 2016), we began preliminary work during the 2016-17 academic year to implement a pilot follow-up project in

2017-18. This project will collect multiple measures at the school and classroom levels to demonstrate impact of our completers working in the field on P-12 learning and development, and teaching effectiveness. The pilot project is in process; however, we are finding it difficult to access data regarding current employment for program completers. Complicating this is that many of our completers teach in other states after graduating. Our goal is to evaluate the work of the pilot project and revise as necessary, and implement across all EPP programs during the 2018-19 academic year. A placeholder is included on the EPP website for sharing this data in the future.

We are working on a variety of activities to address impact measures, including participation in the REL-NEI NH Department of Education Teacher Preparation Data Catalog Project. This is part of a larger NTEP project with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and addresses their goal of development of a data system to support IHEs for continuous improvement and inform P-12 needs.

After reviewing annual reporting measures, it is clear that more work is needed to effectively collect and analyze data specific to EPP completers (initial and advanced), both internally and externally. We are working with our Institutional Research and Financial Aid offices to identify strategies for disaggregating existing institutional data regarding graduation and loan default rates, in order to analyze data specific to EPP completers. This work will include developing a system to accurately identify EPP cohorts. We expect to have this data posted after administrative review and approval by fall of 2018. A placeholder is included on the EPP website for sharing these data in the future.

Employer and completer surveys are currently in process and will be included in 2017-18 data collection; previous survey summaries are linked on the EPP website.

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.

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 3 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. Input from professional communities other than the partnership school in Marlborough is limited and has not led to pervasive program changes. (ITP) (ADV)
2. The depth and extensiveness of field experiences at the middle and secondary level is not sufficient to help candidates develop necessary knowledge, skills and dispositions prior to clinical practice. (ITP) (ADV)

1. The following work has been accomplished with regard to input from professional communities leading to program changes:

A. School Partner input regarding the development of EPP-wide Assessments.

Feedback regarding the newly revised EPP Assessments (Dispositions Assessment and Clinical Experience Evaluation) was collected from P-12 cooperating professionals and college faculty involved with supervision in Methods/Practicum, Student Teaching and Internships during the 2016-2017 academic year pilot. Feedback and content validation of the instruments from clinical partners and college faculty was reviewed by the KSC Educator Preparation Council (EPC) subcommittee and changes were made to the EPP assessments. The following actions were taken by the Council: (a) Approval of the KSC Clinical Experience Evaluation form and rubric; (b) Adoption of the KSC Teacher Candidate Dispositions Assessment form and rubric; (c) Approval of the KSC Clinical Experience Observation form; and (d) Design and implementation of training for cooperating professionals and college faculty to clarify purpose and use of forms. We will continue to develop validity and reliability activities related to these assessments moving forward.

B. Development of the "Keene State College-School Partnership Framework".

It was clear from the Spring 2016 "Analysis of Input from Professional Community" that we needed to develop a formalized process for input as well as a framework for partnership efforts with P-12 schools. To this end, a subcommittee of the EPC was formed to develop the KSC-School Partnership Framework with representatives across all EPP programs to provide a wider perspective and involvement beyond our formal partnerships efforts in the Elementary Education program. CAEP Standard 2 guidelines were used in the development of the framework with a focus on developing systematic ways to design partnerships including obtaining formal input and evidence about the effectiveness of our programs. School partners provided initial feedback on the values and design elements included in the framework, and this will continue as we work to improve the framework and systematize our approach to gathering input from partners. The Framework was approved as a by the EPC during the 2016-17 academic year.

C. The Educational Leadership program developed a Regional School Leadership Consortium (RSLC) of districts, which included the development of formal partnership agreements with four school districts in our region. The Early Childhood program also developed a formal partnership agreement with two elementary schools in collaboration with the Elementary Education program.

D. Advisory Committee Purpose and Role. The purpose and role of the EPP Advisory Committee or Collaborative was approved by the Educator Preparation Council in May 2017 to provide guidance in the development of the EPP Advisory Committee, to be implemented in 2018.

2. Secondary Education continues to refine its field experience descriptions and practices for EDUC 331 (Secondary Methods I) & EDUC 431 (Secondary Methods II). The description for EDUC 331 includes the common field experiences (observation, tutoring,

small-group instruction, whole-class instruction) in which candidates across all programs will participate during their 20 hours of fieldwork. College faculty continued to work with cooperating teachers to determine the distribution of these 20 hours of common field experiences. Consequently, many EDUC 331 students have begun to take on more classroom responsibilities, such as more whole-group instruction and lesson plan development during their field experience. Many EDUC 331 students exceed the required minimum 20 hours of fieldwork. Furthermore, EDUC 331 course faculty continue to implement and refine the reflection piece that students engage in to better understand their fieldwork experience.

The description for EDUC 431 includes how candidates use their 30 hours of field work (depending on subject area): observing, tutoring, monitoring small group work, grading quizzes, talking to staff, helping in laboratory situations, and discussing what they will teach with their cooperating teachers. Candidates are required to teach a minimum of three lessons during the semester, keep a log of all their field hours, and reflect on their activities, lesson plans, and observations. Program faculty continue to work with cooperating teachers to help expand fieldwork opportunities for the students. Many students exceed the required minimum 30 hours of fieldwork. Furthermore, many EDUC 431 students elect to continue with their placement as they matriculate into student teaching. This opportunity to stay with the same placement has enhanced field work continuity and has motivated students to invest more time and commitment into their EDUC 431 field experiences. Furthermore, students have committed more hours, taken on more responsibilities, and developed a deeper engagement in the fieldwork.

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. The unit does not ensure that all initial and advanced candidates have field experiences and clinical practice with P-12 students from diverse ethnic/racial groups and English language learners. (ITP) (ADV)

1. We continue our transition to CAEP standards and the requirements related to the cross-cutting theme of diversity. Our EPP CAEP Transition Plan incorporates activities to address diversity, including the development of an EPP-wide assessment process for addressing this area. We will pilot this process in 2017-18 and examine the data collected in this area, as well as engage in other activities to address this theme.

2. Another component of our transition work to CAEP standards and the cross cutting theme of diversity included the previously developed the "KSC Internal Diversity Rating Scale" that documents and ensures representation of all youth attending P-12 schools. This spreadsheet is maintained in the Educator Preparation Office and includes data on all placement sites for Methods/Practicum, Student Teaching and Internships. We continue to update the rating scale based on clinical placement decisions and consult with individual program faculty Coordinators and the Chair to ensure diversity in our placements.

3. Fields have been updated in the TK20 electronic assessment system to collect additional cooperating professional information, including dates when candidates were placed in classrooms and the grade/level of the placement. This was the first step in collecting data to link the candidate, cooperating professional and site to provide more detailed placement information. Having this data populated in the TK20 system will allow us to more easily track candidate placements in diverse settings.

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?

EPP ASSESSMENTS COMMITTEE

The EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards by establishing an EPP Assessments Committee to review, revise and disseminate EPP-wide assessments. The EPP Assessments Committee began its work in spring 2016, and received a grant to continue its work during summer 2016. This work resulted in (1) revisions to, and the renaming of, the KSC Summative Clinical Evaluation form and its accompanying rubric; and (2) revisions to the Keene State College Teacher Candidate Dispositions Assessment form and its accompanying rubric, and (3) development of a new Clinical Experience Evaluation Observation form.

The EPP implemented the following innovations and changes across programs as the result of the EPP Assessments Committee work:

- The revised forms were piloted during fall 2016 in selected Methods courses. At the end of the semester a feedback survey was sent to all cooperating professionals and college faculty using the documents. The response rate from this survey was approximately 18%. Based on the feedback received, the following changes were made: (1) instructions were added to the KSC Clinical Experience Evaluation form and the Clinical Experience Observation form; (2) a "Not Observed" was added to the rubric rating. Candidate performance can now be assessed at levels 1, 2, 3, 4, or Not Observed. This was done since many programs use the form at the Methods/Practicum level, where some candidate expectations/responsibilities differ from those during Student Teaching.
- The forms were then piloted during spring 2017 in all Student Teaching courses. At the end of the semester a feedback survey was sent to all cooperating professionals using the documents and to all Educator Preparation faculty. The response rate from this survey was approximately 26%. Based on the feedback received, the following change was made: on the KSC Clinical Experience Evaluation form and its accompanying rubric, under Instruction, element 3a was changed from "Articulates Expectations" to "Articulates Instructional Expectations".

The committee met for a final time on May 9, 2017 to review feedback received, and as a result made the following final recommendations:

- Adoption of the KSC Clinical Experience Evaluation form and rubric (see attached)
- Adoption of the KSC Teacher Candidate Dispositions Assessment form and rubric (see attached)
- Adoption of the KSC Clinical Experience Observation form (see attached)
- Design and implementation of training for cooperating professionals and college faculty to clarify purpose and use of forms. This training should be designed and implemented at the EPP level, since these are EPP assessments, and all who use them should receive the same information. Individual programs could provide support in the use of the documents, but should not be responsible for the initial training on them.

The relationship between the ratings on the KSC Clinical Experience Evaluation form and the KSC Teacher Candidate Dispositions Assessment and the revised Decision Points must be clearly articulated. The validity and reliability needs to be determined. Training could be first step in accomplishing this goal.

Progress and results are being tracked through the TK20 assessment system as revised assessment forms are being used across all EPP programs as of the 2016-17 academic year. As we review data results from these revised adjustments, we will make modifications as necessary.

REVISIONS TO DECISION POINTS

The EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards by reviewing and making revisions to our EPP Selectivity and Decision Points processes, as a means to standardize decision-making and implement rigorous requirements for moving through the program.

The EPP implemented the following innovations and changes across programs as the result of this work:

- Implementation of testing requirements for recommendation for certification regarding content knowledge of candidates
- Additional Selectivity Factor – Dispositions Assessment added at Decision Point 1 (Admission to EPP)

This includes faculty review of candidates disposition at the time of application for admission to Educator Preparation
These changes were approved by the EPC during the 2016-17 academic year for full implementation as of all 2017.

Progress and results are being tracked through the TK20 Admissions module and assessment system. Spreadsheets for faculty review of dispositions at Admission are being maintained by the Educator Preparation Office. As we review data results from these revised adjustments, we will make modifications as necessary.

PARTNERSHIP AND OUTREACH EFFORTS

The EPP continues its outreach and innovative professional development for Southwestern NH school partners through the SW Center for Educational Supports (SW Center). We also developed the "KSC-School Partnership Framework" to help guide our efforts in developing mutually beneficial relationships with schools (see Section 5 and attached). The SW Center is critical to our partnership efforts and the professional development we provide includes institutes, workshops, coaching, and collaborative grant writing. For example, the SW Center co-hosted the two-day Southwest NH Summer Educators Institute in June 2017, along with NH Department of Education Quarterly Innovation meetings for SW educators in spring 2016 and fall 2017.

Keene State continued its collaboration on statewide grant projects to enhance professional development for in-service educators and administrators. The Next Steps grant project targets transition and career development for individuals with disabilities, focusing on special education preservice curriculum development and managing and designing the statewide website for the project. The SAHE grant project, "Improving Teacher and Leader Quality" began in November 2016, and provides support for professional development in three strands: STEM, student mental health/substance misuse, and regional school leadership development.





With the support of the SW Center and the SAHE grant project, The Educational Leadership program developed a Regional School Leadership Consortium (RSLC) of districts, which included the development of formal partnership agreements with four school districts in our region. The Early Childhood program also developed a formal partnership with two elementary schools in collaboration with the Elementary Education program.

KSC EPPs coordinate various ongoing gatherings of Southwest NH professional communities to provide professional learning and also obtain feedback about our programs. The SW Center continues to host monthly meetings of the Southwest NH Principals Collaborative and the Southwest NH Special Education Directors. The Director of the SW Center and Assistant Dean of Educator preparation are members of the SW Superintendents and Curriculum Directors groups. Faculty across EPP programs participate in a range of NH Department of Education initiatives and taskforces. Currently, KSC is also a member of the New Hampshire Institution of Higher Education Network (IHE Network) subcommittee on Clinical Practice and Partnerships, and the RELNEI NH Teacher Prep Data Catalog work group. The statewide "IHE Network Clinical Practice and Partnership Conceptual Framework" was co-authored by KSC.

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

- 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
- 3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
- 3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 4.3 Employer 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
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
- A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
- 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
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
- x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  KSC_Clinical_Experience_Evaluation_2017.pdf
-  KSC_Teacher_Candidate_Dispositions_Assessment_2017.pdf
-  KSC_Clinical_Experience_Observation_Form_2017.pdf
-  KSC__School_Partnership_Framework_Endorsed_EPC_5117pdf.pdf

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or service activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

Yes No

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 made on 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 fully prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text applies.

A comprehensive EPP CAEP Transition Plan was developed during the 2016-17 academic year as a means to (1) systematically align programs and practices to CAEP standards, (2) identify evidence needed for documentation of this alignment, and (3) determine a course of action to prepare for submission of our Self-Study report in 2020 and subsequent Site Visit in 2021. The 2017-18 academic year marks the first of our three-year cycle of data collection. In implementing the CAEP Transition Plan, we have identified the following gaps in our transition from NCATE to CAEP Standards:

Standard 1

• We recognize the need to collect data from multiple measures to demonstrate competency for CAEP Standard 1 in the areas of:

Technology

Professional Development

Diversity

Research as Resource in Planning

Goals & Objectives Aligned w/State Standards

Reflection (Research & Evidence Based for Student Progress & Own Professional Practice)

• Work was done during the 2016-17 academic year, with CAEP consultation, to develop a process to use data from each licensure program to demonstrate these criteria within the framework of an EPP-wide assessment

• The goal is to ensure we have consistent data points across all licensure programs with common rubric criteria language

• We will need to ensure the validity and reliability of these assessments moving forward

Standard 4.1: impact on student learning

• We began preliminary work during the 2016-17 academic year to implement a pilot follow-up system in 2017-18

• The pilot project is in process; however, we are finding it difficult to access data regarding current employment for program completers (the NH DOE did provide some data on this, but what we have is outdated)

• Our goal is to implement this work across all EPP programs during the 2018-19 academic year

We began initial review of our Advanced Programs in light of the CAEP Advanced Program Standards (2017), to assess areas in which there may be gaps. An Advanced Program is being developed during the 2017-18 academic year.

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

- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
- 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
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities
- x.1 Diversity
- x.2 Technology
- x.5 State Standards (if applicable)

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 2018 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 complete data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

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

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

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

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

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

Acknowledge