

# 2018 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	11499	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	2010
<b>Institution:</b>	Manchester University		
<b>Unit:</b>	Teacher Education		

## Section 1. AIMS Profile

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

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

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

## Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2016-2017 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure<sup>1</sup>

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.)<sup>2</sup>

Total number of program completers 20

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

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

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2016-2017 academic year?

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

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

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

3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited  
No Change / Not Applicable

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

## Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

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

**Description of data accessible via link:** EPP Annual Reports, Traditional Title II Reports, Alternative 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2

**Link:** <https://www.manchester.edu/academics/colleges/college-of-education-social-sciences/academic-programs/education/education-home/accreditation/survey-data>

**Description of data accessible via link:** Survey regarding the impact on P-12 learning and development

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 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"/>

3

**Link:** <https://www.manchester.edu/academics/colleges/college-of-education-social-sciences/academic-programs/education/education-home/accreditation/survey-data>

**Description of data accessible via link:** IDOE survey for satisfaction of employers and employment milestones

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

4

**Link:** <https://www.manchester.edu/academics/colleges/college-of-education-social-sciences/academic-programs/education/education-home/accreditation/survey-data>

**Description of data accessible via link:** Office of Institutional Effectiveness survey regarding satisfaction of 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	<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"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5

**Link:** <https://www.manchester.edu/academics/colleges/college-of-education-social-sciences/academic-programs/education/education-home/accreditation/survey-data>

**Description of data accessible via link:** Office of Institutional Effectiveness survey regarding ability of completers to be hired

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

6

**Link:** <https://www.manchester.edu/academics/colleges/college-of-education-social-sciences/academic-programs/education/education-home/accreditation/observation-data>

**Description of data accessible via link:** Indicators of teacher effectiveness (Danielson rubric 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 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"/>

7

**Link:** [https://www.manchester.edu/docs/default-source/oie/2017-factbook-\(external\)\\_oie\\_oct2017.pdf?sfvrsn=8a778262\\_4](https://www.manchester.edu/docs/default-source/oie/2017-factbook-(external)_oie_oct2017.pdf?sfvrsn=8a778262_4)

**Description of data accessible via link:** Factbook with 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	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8

<https://www.manchester.edu/academics/colleges/college-of-education-social-sciences/academic->

Link: [programs/education/education-home/accreditation/student-loan-default-rates](https://www.manchester.edu/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	<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 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 has looked at the trends from Title II reports with respect to number of completers, GPA of admitted candidates and completers, and pass rates. While the number of completers has fluctuated, the EPP is actively seeking to admit quality candidates into the teacher education program. The median GPA of those admitted has increased since 2013 from 2.747 to 3.04, which the EPP feels is a direct result of implementation of several checkpoints prior to admittance into the program. Teacher candidates must have an overall and major GPA of 2.5 or higher to be admitted. In addition, their dispositional rubrics filled out by professors and field experience evaluations must be favorable. They must also pass a basic skills assessment or have a high enough SAT or ACT score to be admitted. In addition to these factors, the Director of Teacher Education meets with and mentors students who are struggling academically or dispositionally; these steps have assisted candidates to explore different majors or become more aware of the high expectations to be admitted into the program. In addition, EPP implemented a policy with the 2017-2018 cohort which requires teacher candidates to pass their content tests prior to being given permission to student teach. While this will result in an initial decrease in the number of completers for 2018, feedback from clinical faculty and administration has indicated an increased confidence in the quality of those completers.

The downward trend in completers is reflective of the state-wide trend because more expectations and responsibilities are put upon teachers, without more compensation. However, the EPP is actively working with other departments, especially in STEM, to identify students who would be quality teacher candidates to recruit in high need areas.

Title II reports and Annual EPP reports are public on the Manchester University Department of Education's website for stakeholders to access. In addition, measures are shared internally with the Teacher Education Commission, Teacher Advisory Council and departments across campus who house secondary and all-grade education majors.

## 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 frequently reflects on collected data during weekly department meetings. Additionally, the Teacher Education Committee, comprised of content faculty, meets monthly to evaluate candidates to be admitted to the program. Standard 1: During a teacher candidates' junior year, they are required to submit an application to student teach and interview with the Director of Education. During this interview, they are assessed on their knowledge of the InTASC standards and how said standards have been applied in their various course work. In addition, field experience evaluations are aligned to the InTASC standards. Various reports required by the Department of Education provide EPP with pass rates, trends of enrollment in the program, basic skills assessment rates and other valuable measures to determine areas of improvement. One such change EPP implemented four years ago, came into effect with the 2017-2018 cohort. EPP had noticed some teacher candidates had not passed content tests a few years after their completion. The new policy requires teacher candidates to pass their content tests prior to being allowed to student teach. This will ensure that teacher candidates possess the necessary knowledge in their content to be licensed. In accordance with CAEP, the EPP has submitted SPA reports for eight of their programs with enough completers. In regards to content knowledge, overall, EPP teacher candidates have a higher pass rate than the state. With implementation of the new policy regarding passing the content exams prior to student teaching, all teacher candidates graduating from EPP with an education degree will have passed their content exams. EPP teacher candidates have an extremely high pass rate for the pedagogy exams, and it is the belief of the EPP that teacher candidates will continue to pass in two or less attempts.

Standard 2: EPP meets with the Teacher Advisory Council (TAC), made up of current and retired teachers and administrators from several corporations across northern Indiana, twice a year to present data, rubrics, standards and other information. TAC provides feedback, ideas for improvement and regarding said information, which EPP gathers to implement changes for continuous improvement. In addition, an administrative luncheon is held annually, inviting local administrators to EPP in order to gain feedback of teacher candidates that have been in their schools, qualities they would like to see in their first year teachers, provide information on current practices and other valuable criteria used to shape decisions for improvement and change. EPP has strong relationships with many local school corporations, which provide field experiences from first years through student teaching, a diverse set of experiences (urban and rural, Spanish emergence, etc).

Standard 3: The EPP has been actively involved in recruiting and supporting diverse candidates into their program. Just this winter, the Director of Teacher Education traveled with admissions to Atlanta, Georgia for a recruitment weekend to assist in recruiting diverse candidates. The EPP regularly and systematically assesses performance of teacher candidates, with several check points prior to them being admitted into the Teacher Education Program, and continuing to monitor them through graduation. Professors complete dispositional rubrics, measuring students on InTASC standards, as well as CAEP standards throughout their four years. Dispositional concerns are addressed and teacher candidates are mentored to grow into their professional self. EPP will submit their self-study in July 2018 and prior to this, it was NCATE accredited.

Standard 4 and 5: EPP reviews the results of the Indiana Department of Education survey despite a low return rate, determining if changes should be made to more effectively prepare teacher candidates. In addition, EPP receives surveys of completers which are also used to determine if any dissatisfaction can be remedied and the program improved to ensure completers are satisfied with the preparation they received. The University also has seniors and recent completers do an internal survey which provides the EPP with important evidence. The EPP meets as a department weekly and an end of the year retreat to scrutinize data, discuss possible changes to support and improve teacher candidates' experience, knowledge and pedagogical skills, and improve the program as a whole. In addition, as stated above, TAC provides ample opportunity for stakeholders to be involved in shaping the decisions and improvement of the EPP.

Technology: Across the education classes, the integration of technology is modeled and expected. In the special education courses, various forms of assistive technology are explored. This assures preparation of teachers not only for the use of technology, but for its use pertaining to universal design for learning applications, too. In addition, we have a SMART interactive whiteboard in one of our education-designated classrooms and faculty frequently demonstrate 1:1 on ipads with the elementary education candidates. Faculty and candidates are learning to use the technology. All candidates are expected to integrate technology into lesson plans as appropriate for maximum engagement of their students, and in the spring of 2018, candidates in the literacy courses modify one of the lesson plans in their designed unit to fit a proficient e-learning lesson. All teacher candidates take Educational Psychology where they examine assessment data available to teachers and use statistical knowledge necessary

to understand, analyze, and use that data for the purpose of planning future instruction. Additionally, each fall, the Unit hosts a Technology Summit which requires attendance for sophomores, juniors and seniors to attend (optional for first years). This summit consists of a technology expert to spend a half-day with elementary, secondary and all grade majors teaching them different ways to integrate and use technology in the classroom. In addition, faculty often integrate some of these ideas into their own courses so students become more familiar and comfortable using different technology. Finally, most of the field experience placements are 1:1 or have a wide variety of technology infused in instruction. Since most school corporations are also turning to e-learning, we are exploring ways to integrate this pedagogy and curriculum design into our courses.

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 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
- 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 4.4 Completer satisfaction
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- 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
- x.1 Diversity
- x.2 Technology

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 service activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

Yes  No

6.3 Optional Comments

---

## Section 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a successful transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful reflection regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPP's evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progress made on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use the Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level.

If there are no identified gaps, click the box next to "No identified gaps" and proceed to question 7.2.

No identified gaps

If there are identified gaps, please summarize the gaps and any steps planned or taken toward the gap(s) to be fully prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text applies.

CAEP standard 1.5, modeling and applying technology standards, continues to pose a difficulty for the EPP as it strives to understand and reflect the use of technology in public schools. Because it is an ever changing platform, the EPP struggles to understand the diverse and intentional use of the tool. The EPP believes technology should not simply be used as a replacement, but rather as a way to enhance learning and deepen students' understanding of content. In an effort to close the gap, the EPP hosts an annual technology summit, provides opportunities for clinical faculty to model the use of technology, supports student learning with the Canvas course management system, and is in the process of requiring teacher candidates to create e-learning lessons which employ the SAMR model and engage learners. Additionally, the EPP does not have access to complete data regarding employer and completer satisfaction as the Indiana Department of Education continues to have a low response rate to

the satisfaction surveys. To close this gap, the EPP is in the process of creating its own electronic survey as well as working with the Office of Alumni Relations to locate current employment records to which it will email the surveys.

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

1.5 Model and apply technology standards  
4.3 Employer satisfaction  
4.4 Completer satisfaction

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

Yes  No

7.3 If no, please describe any changes that mean that the EPP does not continue to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

---

## Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2018 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Heidi Wieland

Position: Field Experience and Assessment Coordinator

Phone: 260-982-5961

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