

2020 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11471	AACTE SID:	1603
Institution:	Indiana University Southeast		
Unit:	School of Education		

Section 1. EPP Profile

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

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

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

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

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2018-2019 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

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 168

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2018-2019 academic year?

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.
- 3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited
- 3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited
- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: <https://www.ius.edu/education/quality-assurance-system/index.phpu>

Description of data accessible via link: Teacher Effectiveness Data

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

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

2

Link: <https://www.ius.edu/education/quality-assurance-system/caep.php>

Description of data accessible via link: Employer Surveys - Satisfaction of the Employers Data

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

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

3

Link: <https://www.ius.edu/education/quality-assurance-system/caep.php>

Description of data accessible via link: Alumni Surveys - Satisfaction of the Completer Data

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

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

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
----------------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

4

Link: <https://www.ius.edu/education/quality-assurance-system/caep.php>

Description of data accessible via link: Graduate Rates

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

5

Link: <https://www.ius.edu/education/quality-assurance-system/reports.php>

Description of data accessible via link: Title II Reports

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

6

Link: <https://www.ius.edu/education/quality-assurance-system/caep.php>

Description of data accessible via link: Ability of completer to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels) employer surveys

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

7

Link: <https://www.ius.edu/education/quality-assurance-system/caep.php>

Description of data accessible via link: Default Rates

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

In addition, the SOE has developed a case study of completers that demonstrates the impact of the preparation on P-12 student learning and development "A Case Study of Early Teaching Years to Program Effectiveness" (Evidence 4.1.1 - Purpose of the case study & 4.1.2 - Case Study & Grant and Approval).

During the year 2017-18, a group of faculty proposed a case study with our completers in our local Indiana school districts. We were not able to include Kentucky completers since school districts approval was not received. We are still in the process of getting permission to include their completers. We completed the IRB (Evidence 4.1.3 - IRB Approval and case study materials) and received an internal grant to start this study. The unit focused on elementary teachers since that was the SOE's largest program. We received approval from Indiana school districts to conduct this case study with our completers (Evidence 4.1.4 - Approval email - Case Study). Six teachers who graduated from Indiana University Southeast and employed in our school districts were selected for the case study. The purpose of this case study focused on continuous improvement, educator development, and teacher quality.

The study was a mixed method of both qualitative and quantitative data. Method of study included observations, student surveys, lesson plans, student learning outcomes, principals' evaluations and follow-up interviews. Since the study included P-12 students, permission from the parents and schools were required. We are in the process of completing our observations fall 2019 semester and will have two cycles of data during the site visit. A case study progress plan is attached (Evidence 4.1.5 - Case Study Progress Report).

The first case study with the elementary education completers took place fall 2019 and we will move forward with another group of elementary education completers in spring 2020. This study will allow triangulation of multiple sources of data for program impact. The SOE has shown a commitment to data-driven decisions regarding teacher preparation. This is the beginning of a long term plan to collect completer data. The data, through validated observation instruments and surveys, shows that completers effectively apply the designed professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions. (Evidence 4.1.6 - Initial Data from the Case Study)

The SOE does not have access to State P-12 Student Learning data. Indiana State Department of Education does not provide data to SOE's on P-12 learning and development. Thus, student growth measures are not available at this point. We are definitely working on gathering data from Indiana and also from our Kentucky completers. In Summary, the IU Southeast School of Education has developed and implemented a multidimensional approach of compiling, soliciting, and using data regarding Initial Level Program Completers. The strategies used are consistent with the overall SOE's Quality Assurance system for collecting, analyzing, and implementing continuous improvement. Where applicable, assessments and surveys have been revised, established content validity, aligned to standards to meet CAEP criteria. Faculty and staff use data to continually improve and inform the development of the QAS and data collection system, increase interaction with the P-12 stakeholders, and consider changes in the degree programs. Future plans include a continued focus on: developing and refining assessments, following completers, identifying strategies to increase response rates, increasing the collecting of employer and completer feedback, and expanding the scope of measuring completer performance in the field through case studies or state-assisted measures (Evidence for Standard 4 - Initial Continuous Improvement document). The strategies used are consistent with the Initial Licensure Programs for collecting Employer and Alumni data using multiple sources and data points. Overall, principals rated our advance program completers as well prepared, knowledgeable, competent in content knowledge, and caring as professionals. SOE has used employer and alumni data to improve and inform the development of the QAS and data collection system and to increase the interaction with the P-12 stakeholders. Future plans include a continuous focus on disaggregated data by licensure and concentrations within the graduate programs. IU Southeast Office of Institutional Research is working with the SOE to come up with strategies to reach more of our completers.

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 2 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. Unit-wide data are not aggregated for review by the entire unit. (ITP) (ADV)

There are specific campus programs and tools that assist the EPP in addressing the Areas of Improvement (AFI). Task Stream, our data management system, was purchased and adopted for use in spring 2016. After the adoption, training for faculty, staff and administrators began immediately and implementation of the system began in fall 2016. Once faculty and students submit and store data in Task Stream, personnel in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) aggregate the data and create the unit reports. Additionally, the EPP has access to an electronic storage repository called "the Box". In this repository, personnel in the EPP are able to store and share program and unit materials necessary for program planning and improvement, as well as for evidence necessary for accreditation purposes.

A few strategic actions were identified by the EPP to address the AFI:

1. All Direct Response Folios were created and finalized in fall 2016. Since that time, all student data are entered and stored each semester. All data reports are shared with and reviewed by faculty twice a year at Program Review Days. At these meetings, faculty review their SPA/key assessment data and identify strengths and weakness in their program based on this student performance data. Based on these results, faculty make purposeful program changes.
2. During these Program Reviews Days, faculty also review results from the following: Employer and Alumni surveys, Assessment

of Candidate Dispositions, Licensure test data and state administered teacher effectiveness survey data. Results from these surveys are shared and discussed with stakeholders at the Administrators' Breakfast, Advisory Board meetings, etc.

3. Task stream has allowed our students and faculty to more effectively and efficiently report and store data. It has also created a more effective system of reporting and analyzing this data.
4. A new faculty line in the SOE was opened and designated as the CAEP and Assessment Coordinator in fall 2016.
5. Quality Teams were reorganized based on the new CAEP standards. These teams meet to discuss the how each program can address and align to the CAEP standards.
6. All program Decision Points were reviewed and revised as needed. This included the review of all program key assessments that are found within each Decision Point. In addition, all key assessment rubrics were revised and aligned accordingly.
7. All Initial programs, (elementary, special education, secondary, T2T, A2T) adopted and developed a clinical practice assessment of candidate performance, which is consistent with the Danielson framework.
8. All rubrics have been consistently aligned to all professional program standards using a four-column rubric.
9. Revisions were made to the previous Assessment of Candidate Dispositions Evaluation. This revised instrument is being piloted this semester, spring 2020. Based on the feedback from this revised instrument, changes may be made before full implementation in fall 2020.

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?

The design of the QAS supports regular and systematic review of data. The QAS generated reports, such as completer and principal surveys, allow for data analyses and interpretations completed at the individual program level, as well as during Program Review Day each semester by the entire faculty and staff. Changes for improvement are linked to program goals, candidate data, and relevant CAEP standards (Evidence 5.1.8 - Program & Quality Teams annual goals). Previously, the SOE relied on Scantron forms to collect candidate data. It was a challenge to manually generate reports and study data in a way to observe trends using this format. The SOE purchased Taskstream to provide an efficient and much improved method of collecting, storing, and generating reports based on candidate performance data. The School of Education reports are prepared in a manner for faculty and stakeholders to observe trends, reflect, and make actionable changes. The School of Education plans to do a review of the

usefulness and flexibility of Taskstream to determine its viability for the future. The facilitation of Program Review day for each semester is evidence of continuous improvement. For example, in Standard 3, candidates are evaluated on a set of nine dispositions at several points throughout their program. Failure to exhibit dispositions befitting a professional educator may result in a warning, placement on a Program improvement plan (PIP), or dismissal from the program, depending upon the severity of the infraction. Previously, each program used a different method of assessing the same set of nine SOE dispositions. However, a SOE committee has developed a universal rubric for assessing dispositions that is now used unit wide. There is a self-review of candidate dispositions. The faculty along with clinical faculty, complete additional dispositional forms on each candidate. The rubric was piloted and was used in spring of 2018. It will be reviewed again spring 2020 based on feedback from faculty. SOE Graduate Programs responded to feedback from stakeholders and program completers through the following actions: 1. developed a stand-alone ENL masters concentration; 2. collaborated with content faculty from other academic units to provide more graduate content area concentration for dual credit teacher credential as required by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC); 3. increased online and hybrid course offerings to meet the needs of the teachers who work full time in K-12 classrooms; 4. collaborated with IU Online to add a Master of Science in Technology for Learning program; and 5. built a more positive media coverage by creating flyers, rack cards, and digital media to promote programs. SOE is working on updating the website with positive quotes from Alumni and adding videos, to be more user-friendly. The SOE Graduate programs work closely with the IUS Graduate Program to provide more open house sessions for advising and recruitment. Graduate program faculty plan to create liaisons from among our alumni to serve in the schools and community for spring 2020 to help with recruitment. SOE distributed IUS pennants to recognize alumni and to help us with program promotion and recruitment effort. Graduate faculty will be using the IUS Horizon newspaper to advertise and promote alumni guest speakers who visit our graduate classes. Education Leadership program invited several program completers and other administrators to review SPA assessments and their relevance to what practicing school leaders need to know and be able to do. Assessments were modified to better represent what school leaders face in today's school environment. Feedback from program completers through advisory board meetings resulted in the reduction of credit hours for certain graduate concentrations from 36 to 30 to better serve the regional needs of our teachers. IU system wide focus on online collaborative programs led to partnerships with other IU campuses in the development of a fully online graduate Technology program. Additional concentrations to Master of Science in Secondary Education now meet HLC requirements for preparing dual credit teachers to continue to teach dual credit courses in our local schools. Many examples exist to show the SOE assurance that appropriate stakeholders are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence. Our goal is to be professional educators engaged in growth and to support our candidates and program completers to adopt a similar philosophy. It is through continuous improvement that the SOE remains relevant to our candidates, school districts, and the communities we serve.

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

- 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
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- 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

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

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

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

In our last CAEP Annual Report there was feedback on the availability of the LINKs. WE apologize if the links did not work. It was under some construction and they changed it a little bit. However we have been collecting and reporting data on all the measures

for the past three years.

Another feedback was on the Performance data. Reviewer mentioned that it was not available. Title II reports had the performance data.

Feedback 3: Default Rates. Default rates are based on 3 year periods: FY 2016(2016-2019) would be the most recent data available.

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 reporting 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.

Standard 3.2 and 4.1 seems to be hard for the EPP and it considers as a challenge. EPP is working hard to meet all the standards. The switch from NCATE to CAEP was pretty stressful and time consuming. EPP took time to understand the standards and how we meet those with evidence. EPP also had a hard time aligning the assessments to state standards and making changes to the existing rubrics for SPA submissions. It has been a long road but definitely worth it. And CAEP taking the "required components" from the standards definitely made it easier and kind of made sense that all components are important. And Meeting program impact for standard was hard and now we have a case study approved to conduct in the schools.

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

3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
4.1 Complete impact on student growth and learning
x.2 Technology

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

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Dr. Rachel Star

Position: CAEP Coordinator

Phone: 812-941-2641

E-mail: rpstar@ius.edu

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

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

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

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount 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