2020 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11499	AACTE SID:	2010
Institution:	Manchester University		
Unit:	Teacher 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	◉	○
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	◉	○
1.1.3 Program listings	◉	○

1.2 [For EPP seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation—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 licensure[1]

16

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]

1

Total number of program completers 17

---

[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.manchester.edu/academics/colleges/college-of-education-social-sciences/academic-programs/education/education-home/accreditation/caep-2019-self-study/standard-4-program-impact

Description of data accessible via link: SCE Impact on Student Learning

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	✔	✔	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs			☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2

Link: https://www.manchester.edu/docs/default-source/academics/by-major/education/epp-report-2019-manchester43a5f9922d02625b9ff6ff0100763cab.pdf?sfvrsn=f1a79b62_2

Description of data accessible via link: IDOE Surveys regarding satisfaction of employers and completers

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	☐	☐	✔	✔	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs			☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3

Link: https://www.manchester.edu/academics/colleges/college-of-education-social-sciences/academic-programs/education/education-home/accreditation/graduation-rates

Description of data accessible via link: Graduation 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	☐	☐	☐	☐	✔	☐	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs			☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

4

Link: https://www.manchester.edu/academics/colleges/college-of-education-social-sciences/academic-programs/education/education-home/accreditation/annual-reports

Description of data accessible via link: Annual Reports including Title II

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	✔	☐	☐
Advanced-Level Programs			☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5

Link: https://www.manchester.edu/academics/colleges/college-of-education-social-sciences/academic-programs/education/education-home/accreditation/student-loan-default-rates

Description of data accessible via link: Student loan 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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	✔
Advanced-Level Programs			☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

6

Link: https://www.manchester.edu/academics/colleges/college-of-education-social-sciences/academic-programs/education/education-home/accreditation/employment-rates

Description of data accessible via link: Employment 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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	✔	☐
Advanced-Level Programs			☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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?*

Since 2018, the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) provides EPPs with an annual report which includes data collected from the formal surveying of employers and completers. It also offers the Program the performance ratings of completers at year one, two, and three of employment. Additionally, the report provides comparison of the Manchester University (MU) performance on CASA and Pearson licensure exams to other state EPPs. MU EPP's analysis of data of the IDOE annual reports indicate the EPP

graduates candidates who are prepared for the classroom, who are effective or highly effective, who are satisfied with their preparation, and whose performance and knowledge satisfy employers. While the IDOE's formal surveying of employers' is relatively new, the data reflects strength of the program, and it corroborates data collected from institutional graduate surveys. For completers included in this report, the EPP's candidates perform above the state average on the CASA tests required for admission to the program. Because the number of completers is less than 10 in disaggregated data, the IDOE report does not offer comparison of content exams against the state average. However, it should be noted, the EPP's programitic decision to require the passing of all content Pearson licensure exams prior to student teaching has had a positive impact on its program. Initially, the number of candidates qualifying for student teaching was not as high as it is three years later. Candidates understand the requirements and prepare differently for the licensure exams. Because the EPP implemented this requirement, it has 100% pass rate for the content exams for its completers for the past three years. Feedback from administrators who attend the annual administrators' luncheon and those who sit on the Teacher Advisory Council have affirmed the positive impact the policy has had on the student teaching experience and the Program. In regards to overall satisfaction of employers with completers, 92% of the employers surveyed indicated they were satisfied or highly satisfied with the completer. Additional information, offered on page 10 of the IDOE report, indicates the EPP prepares high quality educators. Of 51 teachers, 50 earned highly effective or effective ratings on their school corporations' annual evaluations. The EPP sees 98% of completers earning effective or highly effective ratings as a positive trend. In terms of impact on student learning measured by the EPP, the EPP is working on articulation with EdTPA, and it will employ the program in the spring of 2021. Besides the employers' surveys and reporting of effectiveness for completers, the EPP has used an Impact on Student Learning project during the student teaching experience. The assignment and associated rubric have posed problems in terms of validity and reliability; therefore, moving to the EdTPA will improve the EPP's measurement of its teacher candidates' impact on student learning. The IDOE report is shared with the Teacher Education Committee, the Teacher Advisory Council, members of the EPP, and the document is published on the Program's web site so all teacher candidates and prospective candidates have access to the report. Throughout the academic years 2018- 2019 and 2019- 2020, the EPP spent hours spread across department meetings and a two-day retreat focused on looking at testing blue prints, InTASC standards, and CAEP standards/expectations. It has identified aspects of the program it is doing well, and it articulated areas it will focus on in a five year plan. The EPP is in the process of revising its elementary, all-grade, and secondary programs with these outcomes. It will submit program changes to the EPP's governing bodies: the Teacher Education Committee and the Teacher Advisory Council. The revised program, while not changing drastically, will have a revised, aligned, and clear program outcomes; additionally, the scope and sequence of curriculum will be revised through the lens of CAEP standards and content evaluated on the survey. Finally, since the CAEP visit in April 2019, the EPP is in the process of making key changes to its program: (1) adopting EdTPA as a way to measure impact on P-12 student learning (4.1) will increase the validity and reliability of the EPP's measurement; (2) the EPP has dedicated funds to two faculty members within the program to revise key rubrics and employ appropriate validity and reliability measures. For example, the lesson plan rubric has been revised based on CAEP guidelines, and the EPP has shared the rubric with stakeholders for initial feedback; other rubrics which will be revised in June and July 2020 include the unit plan assignment/rubric, disposition instructions/rubrics, admission to the program and permission to student teach directions/rubrics, and evaluation of cooperating teacher and supervisors directions/rubrics; (3) MU's Office of Institutional Effectiveness has supported the EPP's work on an accessible Quality Assurance System. MU's IT team has created a non-expiring Canvas class for teacher candidates and completers. Currently, all data regarding progress in the Program is accessible to all teacher candidates admitted to the Program.

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.

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)**   1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

The EPP provides limited evidence to ensure that candidates demonstrate a deep understanding of the critical categories: the learner and learning; content, instructional practice; and professional practice. (component 1.1)

The EPP is currently revising major assignments and corresponding rubrics to meet CAEP regulations. In particular, the rubrics associated with the sophomore and junior interviews used to permit progression in the program are being redesigned for validity and reliability. In both interviews, teacher candidates must demonstrate depth of knowledge of the InTASC categories (learner and learning; content, instructional practice; and professional practice). While the EPP has used rubrics to evaluate candidates in these areas, prior to the summer of 2020, neither rubric has been evaluated for reliability and validity. The EPP's scope and sequence provides an organized structure for intentionally introducing, practicing, and mastering the InTASC standards throughout the four years of teacher candidates' experience. Additionally, the EPP is working with the Instructional Design Specialist at Manchester University to develop a system in Canvas that will allow candidates and EPP faculty to track student growth based on the rubrics and standards.

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)**   1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

The EPP provides limited evidence that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to SPA standards. (component 1.3)

Since the last SPA cycle, the EPP has assigned individuals from within the education faculty and content faculty to organize and write the next SPA report. Key assessments are being developed to ensure alignment with content and pedagogical knowledge required of individual SPA standards. In particular, the content specific rubrics used to evaluate teacher candidates during their student teaching experience are in the process of having the validity and reliability established according to CAEP recommended

methods. Because the EPP had not established content validity or reliability in time for the accreditation visit, this is a key area of focus for the EPP. The institution has committed financial support in establishing content validity and reliability. These rubrics will be aligned with appropriate standards including the InTASC standards, as well as the content standards so that the different programs will meet the SPA standards. Additional information regarding content and pedagogical knowledge reflected in Pearson content and pedagogy assessments will provide a different data point for the EPP to consider as it evaluates its programs' evaluation of SPA standards.

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)**   4 Program Impact

The EPP provided limited evidence of the use of multiple measures to demonstrate that program completers contribute to an expected level of student learning. (component 4.1)

Based on feedback from the CAEP visit team in the spring of 2019, the EPP has designed a plan of action to address areas for improvement. This includes the clear articulation of expected performance and knowledge at key check points throughout the program. Working with the institutional Instructional Design Specialist, the MU EPP has developed a system in Canvas that allows candidates to monitor their progress in the program. EPP faculty and clinical faculty evaluate candidate dispositions (a rubric currently being evaluated for validity and reliability), and each candidate from the first semester in the Program will establish a professional growth plan using SAT/ACT scores, high school performance, identification of professional dispositions, and other key characteristics of professionalism. Each semester, candidates will revisit their professional goals, use data from check points throughout the program, reflect on their professional development and progress in the program, and establish new goals. Multiple measures to demonstrate completers' contributions to student learning will come through the development of curriculum in earlier courses to the development of a unit plan in upper level education courses and ultimately in the curriculum development, teaching, and evaluation of teaching in EdTPA.

CAEP: **Stipulation (ITP)**   5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP's QAS does not rely on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are reliable, valid, and consistent. (component 5.2)

Since the CAEP accreditation visit in April 2019 and the identification of the stipulation, the EPP has been addressing Standard 5 in several ways. First of all, each of the rubrics associated with key assessments and checkpoints is currently being revised and evaluated for validity and reliability. Second, the EPP is working closely with the institution's Instructional Design Specialist to create an effective QAS housed in the institution's course management system, Canvas. Teacher candidates currently have access to performance on assessments and progress towards program goals. At all times and in any location, with Internet access, they can see their progress. When completed, the EPP will use the Canvas course Education Department Checkpoints to house all key assessments/rubrics, monitor progress such as GPA, SAT/ACT scores, licensure exams, etc. From here, the EPP will pull reports to share information regarding candidate performance.

CAEP: **Stipulation (ITP)**   5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP's does not provide regular and systematic assessment of candidate performance against its goals and relevant standards, or track results over time for continuous improvement. (component 5.3)

The EPP has a long standing tradition of sharing information of its completers' performance; however, it has not clearly articulated to CAEP the process for sharing, the information shared, and the tracking of the changes towards continuous improvement. Since the CAEP visit in 2019, the EPP has created a tracking document (Continuous Improvement: Tracking EPP's Program Goals) which it has housed in the Sharepoint site CAEP 2026. Each of the members of the MU EPP has access to this document, and it provides the EPP with the following information: date, type of data/information analyzed, summary of discussion, action/goals established, person or people in charge, and the due date for the action. By housing this tracking document in an Office Sharepoint, the EPP will generate evidence for tracking results. Improving the rubrics will also offer the EPP clear and measurable goals which can be tracked through scope and sequence of the Program's curriculum. Key stakeholders include the EPP which meets weekly, the Teacher Advisory Council which meets twice a year, the administrative lunches which meet one to two times a year, and the Teacher Education Committee which meets monthly. All information collected regarding candidate performance is posted on the EPP's website for teacher candidates an the public to view.

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?

Since the April 2019 CAEP visit, the MU EPP has taken steps to improve the program. In May 2019, the EPP held a two-day retreat off campus. At the retreat, the EPP examined feedback from the CAEP accreditation team. Using the InTASC standards, the CAEP standards, and the initial feedback from the accreditation team, the EPP outlined changes it will make in its program over the next two years. These changes have been shared with the Teacher Advisory Council and the Teacher Education Committee. In particular, the changes reflect areas indicated on employer and completer surveys as needing improvement. While the majority of the employers "Agree" with the statements included under knowledge, pedagogy, and dispositions, the EPP would like to increase the percentage of responses in the "Strongly Agree" ratings. The EPP will be able to use data collected each year from the Indiana Department of Education employer and completer surveys to assess effectiveness in the changes. Changes to the program will take place over the next two years. These changes include the implementation of a Professional Learning Community (PLC) course, a course which will be required of all students in the program. Focused on the development of a professional growth plan, the course will be centered on collaboration between exemplary mentor professionals, EPP faculty, and teacher candidates as they investigate open ended questions such as "can education be equitable?" This course will meet CAEP standards 1.1 (InTASC standards 9 and 10) and 3.6. Professional journey journals will be used as measurement of professional growth. Eventually, over the next five years, the EPP will see an increase in performance/satisfaction reported by employers and completers. Another change planned for the 2021-2022 program includes the requirement of EDUC 223, Child Development. In particular, Child Development aligns with feedback on employer surveys that indicate completers understand how children and young adults learn and develop at each grade level. This course will meet CAEP standard 1.1 (InTASC standards 1, 2, and 3). The EPP is also designing a stand alone Educational Technology course to be taught by the institution's Instructional Design Specialist, a former public school teacher. Previously, the EPP has integrated technology into various courses in the curriculum, offers a technology workshop each year, and for the past two years has required teacher candidates to design an e-learning lesson. It believes a stand-alone, required educational technology course which not only offers technology as a way to deepen understanding but also wrestles with the appropriate use of technology, will increase the EPP's ability to demonstrate completers meet CAEP standard 1.5. Multiple rubrics, as mentioned in previous sections of this report, are being revised and measured for validity and reliability. The dispositions rubric, however, directly impacts continuous improvement as it will be more intentionally used with students in the required PLC course to develop professional goals. The revised dispositions rubric will reflect CAEP standard 3.3, and it will be measured through the employer satisfaction survey. In particular, in its revisions, the language used will reflect CAEP expectations which is reflected on the Indiana Department of Education employer satisfaction survey. Another change being implemented in the spring of 2021 is the adoption of EdTPA as a valid and reliable way to measure teacher candidates' impact on student learning (CAEP standards 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 4.1). The EPP has struggled to adequately meet this important CAEP standard, and based on feedback from the accreditation team, as well as through collaboration with other small EPPs in the geographic region, the MU EPP believes this platform will offer more credible data regarding its teacher candidates' impact student learning. Through the implementation of EdTPA, the EPP will also see an increase in ratings reflected on the employer satisfaction survey. Finally, the EPP has worked with the institution's Office of Institutional Effectiveness, IT, and the Instructional Design Specialist to improve its QAS. The new system will be housed in Canvas, accessible to teacher candidates at all times, and reflect progress in the program for all teacher candidates.

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

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress

1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
1.5 Model and apply technology standards
3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

📎 **CAEP_5.3_Continuous_Improvement_Tracking.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 MU EPP has learned a great deal from its initial CAEP site visit in the Spring of 2019. Because none of the members of the EPP had ever organized an accreditation visit, it recognizes its weaknesses; however, through the experience, the EPP has implemented several changes in the way it collects and tracks data.
As the accreditation team indicated, the EPP is spread thin in regards to the number of faculty and staff. Due to institutional budget constraints, the EPP will continue to work under duress. However, because of the site visit, the institution's Office of Institutional Effectiveness has provided additional support in terms of creating an effective Quality Assurance System. Candidates will now have access to all data in one location. Changes to the program will be implemented in the fall of 2021. Most importantly, the EPP is actively pursuing establishing validity and reliability of all rubrics used in the program.

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2020 EPP Annual Report.*

☑ **I am authorized to complete this report.**

Report Preparer's Information

Name:	Heidi Wieland
Position:	Field Experience and Assessment Coordinator
Phone:	2609825961
E-mail:	hewieland@manchester.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**