

2021 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10575	AACTE SID:	3545
Institution:	Northwestern Oklahoma State University		
Unit:	Division 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 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).

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 2019-2020 ?

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 47

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 2019-2020 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.nwosu.edu/school-of-education/education>

Description of data accessible via link: A link on the EPP's web site provides summary data for the 8 Annual Measures and is available for public viewing. The link provides access for public viewing of all applicable data for the 8 Annual Measures from one site clicking on the desired link(s) from the one site.

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

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

2

Link: <https://www.nwosu.edu/school-of-education/education>

Description of data accessible via link: The EPP's annual Title II report is available for public viewing on the EPP's web site. The report contains data pertaining to the ability of completers to meet licensing requirements for certification. The data are listed for each content area at the initial and advanced levels. This information is also available in the in the 8 Annual Measures summary.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3

Link: <https://www.nwosu.edu/school-of-education/education>

Description of data accessible via link: The CAEP Annual Report is available to the public on the EPP's web site.

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

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

4

Link: <https://www.nwosu.edu/school-of-education/education>

Description of data accessible via link:

The EPP's Quality Assurance System is reviewed by the Teacher Education Assessment and Management System (TEAMS) committee. The annual report of the committee's review and recommendations based upon the data review is available to the public on the EPP's web site. The TEAMS committee is comprised of stakeholders representing public schools, career tech, and businesses as well as institutional and EPP personnel. The data reviewed include the 8 annual measures plus data deemed essential to the QAS. Recommendations by the committee are considered by the Teacher Education Committee, the policy making body for the EPP. The EPP revised its QAS in preparation for the site visit in fall 2019. The 2019-2020 TEAMS report reflects the first review of the data within the QAS since the changes were incorporate

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

The EPP's revised QAS has been fully implemented with the 2019-2020 academic year to provide a streamlined, systematized way of collecting data that are meaningful and substantial. The QAS is monitored by the Teacher Education Management Assessment System (TEAMS) committee and is comprised of stakeholders and institutional representatives meeting annually to review the data from the QAS inclusive of the 8 Annual Measures. Data specific to Components 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 are derived from an annual survey of first year teachers and their mentors/administrators. The survey consists of statements aligned with InTASC standards to which the respondents mark "Strongly Disagree", "Disagree", "Agree", or "Strongly Agree". The data from the survey, administered by the Oklahoma Office of Educational Quality & Accountability, show that first year teachers are confident in their preparation in the 4 InTASC areas: Learner & Learning; Content Knowledge; Instructional Practice; Professional Responsibility. The response rate to the survey is low (13) thus a statistical analysis using percentages only is an inconclusive measure. Raw numbers are analyzed. The EPP is contacting completers to encourage them to respond to the survey so the subsequent data are substantial. One teacher respondent marked "Strongly Disagree" to each statement on the survey. In its analysis the EPP could not determine if the individual incorrectly interpreted the rating scale or if the individual's responses are a true representation of that person's assessment of the program. For each section related to the InTASC standards far more respondents "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" to the statements than "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree". The section with the largest number of "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" is Instructional Practice. Four respondents disagree with the statement that the program had prepared them to use technology to manage student and assessment data. Candidates are required to research student assessment systems in a required program class. Further emphasis and application of that assignment are needed. Tools of inquiry and tying concepts to local and global issues are sub-sets of the Content section for which there are 4 "Disagree" responses. The EPP's lesson plan template requires both of these concepts to be addressed but, according to the survey results, this is an area to be addressed. "Instructional Practice" is an area of strength according to the respondents. The responses to the survey by mentor teachers and administrators (4.3) show "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" in all areas by a large majority. The areas with the highest number of "Disagree" and "Strongly Disagree" are in Instructional Practice, specifically planning and using a variety of instructional practice. The number of respondents to the mentor/administrator survey is 10. The mentors/administrators cite classroom management in the comment section of the survey as the area in which the EPP's program needs to be strengthened followed by differentiated instruction and working with students from diverse backgrounds, specifically English language learners. The first year teachers also state they need more preparation in classroom management followed by using technology in the classroom and working with English language learners. The EPP requires 2 courses in classroom management in its initial program and a course in educational technology. Use of educational technology is also required in instructional planning throughout the program. The EPP is incorporating additional experiences in working with English language learners for teacher candidates to better prepare them for working with that population of learners. Nine out of 10 mentors/administrators "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" that the EPP's program

effectively prepares the completer to have a positive impact on P12 student learning and development. Eleven out of 13 first year teachers responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" to the same statement. An additional measure for determining the impact on student learning is the mentoring program. This program consists of EPP faculty serving as mentors to completers when they are teachers in schools in the service area. Data from benchmark testing from each completer's classroom is provided to the EPP for analysis of the impact on student learning. Five completers participated in the mentoring program in 2019-2020: 2 in early childhood; 2 in elementary; 1 in chemistry. The average gain for early childhood as assessed with benchmark testing is 50.67. The average gain for elementary is 11. The chemistry teacher did not have an opportunity to conduct the post benchmark assessment due to the closing of schools in the pandemic. The EPP has increased the number of participants in the mentoring program, particularly in the secondary areas. The increase in the number of participants will provide a better statistical measure for analysis. For the purpose of this report, the pre- and post-data available indicate completers have a positive impact on student learning as assessed through the mentoring program. Another data source to determine the impact on student learning is through Oklahoma's Teacher Leader Effectiveness (TLE) assessment. This assessment is the teacher evaluation system used by all public schools in Oklahoma. The data from that assessment has previously been provided to the EPP for completers of the initial program. Oklahoma did not collect data from the TLE for 2019-2020 due to the pandemic. Assessments for standards A.4.1 and A.4.2 were delayed due to the pandemic. The EPP began the process of assessing employers' and completers' satisfaction through focus groups in summer and fall 2019. Additional focus groups were planned in spring 2020 but were delayed due to the pandemic. This also resulted in a delay in formally surveying employers and completers. The EPP has drafts of a formal survey for employers of advanced completers and a formal survey for advanced completers when they are in the roles for which the advanced program prepared them. The surveys will be piloted and validated so data regarding the satisfaction of employers and advanced completers will be available. The EPP determines graduation rate by comparing the number of completers from one academic year to the next. Because the EPP is small a percentage analysis is not a conclusive statistical measure. The graduation rate at the initial level has risen in the last 3 years. In 2019-2020 there were 36 completers as compared to 33 completers in 2018-2019. In 2017-2018 there were 30 completers. At the advanced level in 2019-2020 there were 11 completers as compared to 20 in 2018-2019 and 10 in 2018-2019. There is continuation of recruitment at both the initial and advanced levels, and the EPP provides information to initial level candidates regarding the advantages of completing an educator preparation program to not completing a program. At the advanced level it is unclear why individuals are not choosing to complete an advanced degree leading to additional certification. Preliminary data from 2020-2021 shows a slight increase in enrollment in advanced programs. Qualitative data indicate individuals interested in completing an advanced program are concerned about the cost of the program compared to the return on the investment with salary. Qualitative data also indicate individuals eligible for advanced programs are dealing with "burnout" regarding PK-12 education. The EPP is working with the institution's Graduate Studies office in the recruitment of advanced candidates. Data for Annual Measure #6 consist of the passing rate on the Oklahoma Subject Area Test (OSAT) for both initial and advanced levels and the Oklahoma Professional Teaching Examination (OPTE) at the initial level. The OPTE and OSAT are required for certification at the initial level. The OSAT is required for certification at the advanced level. At the initial level, candidates took OSAT's in 8 areas. In 5 of those areas, the EPP's pass rate is above the state average. The 3 areas that are below the state pass rate are physical education, mild/moderate disabilities, and English. The "N" for each of those tests is small: 6, 4, and 1 respectively. At the advanced level completers took OSAT's in 3 areas. In 2 of the areas, the EPP's pass rate is above the state average. The 1 area in which the pass rate is below the state average is the secondary principal test with a pass rate of 60% compared to 62.7% at the state level. The EPP is incorporating more case studies requiring data analysis and problem-solving based upon the data to address the pass rate on the OSAT for secondary principal. Thirty-four initial completers took the PK-8 OPTE with a passing rate of 74%. The state average is 89.3%. Eight completers took the 6-12 OPTE with a pass rate of 100%. The state pass rate is 94.9%. Annual measure #7 shows 27 initial completers were employed in the field in which they were trained. An additional 4 completers were employed in content areas for which they were not trained. One initial completer chose the private sector for employment. At the advanced level 5 completers were employed in the positions for which the advanced program prepared them; 2 in educational leadership, 2 as a reading specialist, 1 as school counselor. For Annual Measure #8 the institution does not disaggregate the default loan by initial and advanced levels. The most recent loan default rate for the institution is 10.7. Data analyzed by the TEAMS committee is published in a report posted on the EPP's web site. The 8 Annual Measures, the CAEP Annual Report, the Title II report, and the Oklahoma State Report are also located on the EPP's web site for public viewing. Reports from previous years are also available on the EPP's web site for comparative analysis. The reports and data are accessed from one link on the EPP's web site for ease of use by the public for viewing.

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?

The EPP revised its QAS during its self-study in preparation for the site visit in November 2019. The EPP determined the amount of data generated was too large and that some data were not pertinent in determining the strengths and weaknesses of both initial and advanced programs. The EPP revised its QAS by defining the assessments that provide useful data by which program decisions can be made. The 2019-2020 academic year is the first full academic year of implementation of the revised QAS. At the initial and advanced levels the QAS is comprised of (1) proprietary assessments, (2) EPP-created key assessments, (3) surveys, and (4) EPP-created key progress assessments. The data from the QAS are analyzed by the Teacher Education Assessment Management System (TEAMS) committee. The committee is comprised of stakeholders, institutional administration, and EPP leadership. The committee meets annually to analyze data derived from the QAS and make recommendations via an annual report for program improvement to the governing body of the EPP, the Teacher Education Committee (TEC). The TEC is comprised of stakeholders (including candidates) and EPP faculty representatives including arts and sciences. If program changes involve advanced programs, upon approval by the TEC, they are referred to the institution's Graduate Committee for consideration. The Graduate Committee membership includes advanced candidates as a means to have stakeholder input. All recommendations must be approved by the institution's Vice President for Academic Affairs and, if required, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. Initial proprietary assessments reviewed by the TEAMS committee and subsequent annual report consist of the Oklahoma Subject Area Test (OSAT) and the Oklahoma Professional Teaching Exam (OPTE). A candidate must pass the applicable OSAT and OPTE to be recommended for certification. EPP-created key assessments at the initial level consist of assessment of 3 clinical experiences, lesson plans, and the student learning unit (work sample). EPP-created key progress assessments at the initial level are interviews (admission and exit) and dispositions (4 assessments). The cohort GPA at the initial level is a key progression data point. EPP-created assessments are validated as per CAEP guidelines by a committee comprised of stakeholders, institutional administrators, and EPP faculty. Inter-rater reliability training for those who use the EPP-created assessments is held on an annual basis or more frequently if needed. Impact on student learning data consist of a first year teacher, and mentor/administrator survey (state created and validated) and a mentoring program that generates benchmark data. The advanced level proprietary assessment is the OSAT, a requirement for certification (Educational Leadership, Reading Specialist, School Counseling). The EPP-created key assessment for the advanced level is an Action Research Project that begins mid-program. Successful conclusion of the project is a requirement for program completion. The Action Research Project has been in pilot phase as it replaced the state mandated portfolio. Candidates who began a portfolio were allowed to stay with that assessment as the Action Research Project was phased-in. In 2019-2020 advanced candidates in the portfolio phase exited resulting in the ability to fully implement the Action Research Project with all candidates in three advanced programs that lead to certification: Educational Leadership (building level), Reading Specialist, School Counseling. Data from the Action Research Project proposal (Milestone 2) and the final Action Research Project presentation (Milestone 3) are analyzed. The academic year 2020-2021 will result in the first set of significant data from the Action Research Project across the three advanced certification programs. Preliminary data from the piloting of the project have been analyzed by the TEAMS committee with recommended changes presented to the TEC and the Graduate Committee. Survey data for advanced programs have been delayed due to the pandemic. Focus groups comprised of employers and completers were conducted in summer and fall of 2019. The qualitative data from the initial focus groups (2 employer groups; 1 completer group) show employers and completers are very satisfied with the advanced programs. Further focus groups will be scheduled. Employer and completer satisfaction surveys were also delayed. Drafts of the surveys are ready to be piloted and validated. The most significant impact of the revised QAS is affirmation of the changes as they resulted in manageable but meaningful data. The data sets are easier to analyze yet provide a complete profile of what is working and not working within the programs. An example is at the initial level data analysis of the admission and exit interviews revealed the previous year's inter-rater reliability training was not effective. The previous year's data showed significant discrepancies in raters' assessments. As a result of the analysis, another inter-rater reliability training session was held. Analysis of

the OSAT data show progress in the passing rate of candidates taking the early childhood and elementary tests. Previously, the passing rate of the EPP's candidates was significantly lower. At the advanced level, the OSAT for the secondary principal is below state average. The 2 constructed response sub-tests of that OSAT are a weakness. The program has instituted case studies involving data driven decision making in its coursework to address this. Candidate dispositions are an area of strength at both the initial and advanced levels. A new disposition assessment instrument was piloted at the advanced level. The instrument has been approved for full implementation for 2020-2021. Data-driven changes are documented through the report generated by the TEAMS committee and the minutes of meetings of the TEC and the Graduate Committee. After the annual meeting of the TEAMS committee a report stating the recommendations for improvement is reviewed by the TEC for consideration of the recommendations. Minutes from the meetings of the TEC and the Graduate Committee are reviewed for accuracy by the respective committee to ensure program changes are documented. The TEAMS report, the Title II report, the CAEP Annual Report, the 8 Annual Measures, and the annual Oklahoma State report are available for public viewing on the EPP's web site.

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 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
- 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
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
- 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.

 QAS__TEAMS_final_10.19.pdf

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

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

The file attached is an overview of the EPP's revised QAS presented to the accreditation team for the site visit in November 2019.

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 2021 EPP Annual Report.

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Christee L. Jenlink

Position: Associate Dean, School of Education

Phone: 580-327-84550

E-mail: cljenlink@nwsu.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 reviews.
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 review 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