

2019 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10135	AACTE SID:	1915
Institution:	Louisiana Tech University		
Unit:	College of 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 2017-2018 ?

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 143

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 2017-2018 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://regents.la.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/FINAL2018TeacherPrepFactBook4.9.19.pdf>

Description of data accessible via link: 2018 Teacher Preparation Fact Book

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://regents.la.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/LaTECH2018ALTDATADASHBOARD.pdf>

Description of data accessible via link: 2018 LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION DATA DASHBOARD

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"/>

3

Link: <http://www.latechcrrc.org/>

Description of data accessible via link: Clinical Residency Center...District Partners and Data Sharing, MoU, Completer/Exit Surveys

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

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input 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 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?

List of Annual Reporting Measures: Measure 1: Impact that completers' teaching has on P-12 learning and development (See page 25 of 2018 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Fact Book). Measure 2: Indicators of teaching effectiveness (See pages 26 and 27 of Louisiana Teacher Preparation Fact Book). Measure 3: Results of employer surveys, and including retention and employment milestones (See pages 49 and 50 of the 2018 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Dashboard). Measure 4: Results of completer/exit surveys (See www.latechcrrc.org). Measure 5: Graduation rates from preparation programs (See www.latechcrrc.org). Measure 6: Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements (See www.latechcrrc.org). Measure 7: Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they are prepared (See pages 49 and 50 of the 2018 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Dashboard). Measure 8: Student loan default rates and other consumer information (See <https://www.latech.edu/current-students/financial-aid/types-of-assistance/loans/>).

Using the 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17 Louisiana Board of Regents & University of Louisiana System 2018 Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Dashboard and 2018 Fact Book, the EPP reviewed their Compass Teacher Effectiveness Levels and compared them with other higher education public institutions within the State. Both documents are available in links above.

Means and Effectiveness Levels for Compass Evaluation Scores by Undergraduate Programs for First and Second Year Teachers Who Taught in 2014-15, 2015-15, and 2016-17 are as follows (See page 27 of the 2018 Teacher Preparation Fact Book):

Compass Final Evaluation

Louisiana Tech University Mean 3.4/n=256

Ineffective 0% Effective Emerging 4% Effective Proficient 51% Highly Effective 45%

When compared to the other 13 Louisiana public institutions of higher education, 9 other institutions had 51% or higher percentages at the EP Level. Three other institutions had 45% or higher percentages at the HE Level. Reviewing these data indicate that the EPP is effectively preparing its candidates to teach.

Means and Effectiveness Levels for Compass Evaluation Scores by Alternate Programs for First and Second Year Teachers Who Taught in 2014-15, 2015-15, and 2016-17 are as follows (See page 35 of the 2018 Teacher Preparation Fact Book):

Compass Final Evaluation

Louisiana Tech University Master of Arts in in Teaching Mean 3.5/n=242

Ineffective 1% Effective Emerging 3% Effective Proficient 37% Highly Effective 60%

When compared to the other 9 Louisiana public institutions of higher education that offer Master of Arts in Teaching programs, 8 other institutions had 37% or higher percentages at the EP Level. Only 1 other institution had 60% or higher percentages at the HE Level. Reviewing these data indicate that the EPP is effectively preparing its candidates to teach.

Louisiana Tech University Certification-Only Mean 3.6/n=26

Ineffective 0% Effective Emerging 0% Effective Proficient 39% Highly Effective 62%

When compared to the other 10 Louisiana public institutions of higher education that offer certification-only programs, 9 other institutions had 39% or higher percentages at the EP Level. No other institution had 62% or higher percentages at the HE Level. Reviewing these data indicate that the EPP is effectively preparing its candidates to teach.

Means and Effectiveness Levels for Value-Added Scores by Undergraduate Programs for First and Second Year Teachers who Taught During 2014-15, 2015-15, 2016-17 (See page 41 for Mathematics and page 42 for Science of the 2018 Teacher Preparation Fact Book):

Mathematics (Grades 4-8) and Science (Grades 4-8)

Mean -2.9/n=16 Mean -2.7/n=16

Mathematics 4-8 Ineffective 31% Effective: Emerging 25% Effective: Proficient 38% Highly Effective 6%

Science 4-8 Ineffective 25% Effective Emerging 50% Effective Proficient 6% Highly Effective 19%

When comparing Mathematics 4-8 percentages with the other 9 Louisiana public institutions of higher education, 1 other institution had 38% or higher percentages at the EP Level. Nine other institutions had 6% or higher percentages at the HE Level. When comparing Science 4-8 percentages with the other 9 Louisiana public institutions of higher education, all other institutions had 6% or higher percentages at the EP Level. Four other institutions had 19% or higher percentages at the HE Level. Note: The EPP only offered a dual certification undergraduate program in Middle Grades Mathematics and Science (Grades 4-8) before applying and receiving approval in 2016 to offer a UTeach (See <https://uteach.utexas.edu/>) STEM Middle or Secondary Minor in Biology, Engineering, Computer Science, Chemistry, Physics, and Mathematics. Upon approval of UTeach, the EPP stopped offering middle and secondary education mathematics and science BS degrees.

Means and Effectiveness Levels for Value-Added Scores by Alternate Programs for First and Second Year Teachers who Taught During 2014-15, 2015-15, 2016-17 (See page 44 for Mathematics and page 45 for Science of the 2018 Teacher Preparation Fact Book):

Mathematics (Grades 4-8) and Science (Grades 4-8) Master of Arts in Teaching

Mean -2.3/n=20 Mean -1.6/n=11

Mathematics 4-8 Ineffective 20% Effective: Emerging 40% Effective: Proficient 30% Highly Effective 10%

Science 4-8 Ineffective 8% Effective: Emerging 54% Effective: Proficient 31% Highly Effective 8%

When comparing Mathematics 4-8 percentages with the other 5 Louisiana public institutions of higher education offering MAT programs, 1 other institution had 30% or higher percentages at the EP Level. Three other institutions had 10% or higher percentages at the HE Level. When comparing Science 4-8 percentages with the other 5 Louisiana public institutions of higher education offering MAT programs, all other institutions had 6% or higher percentages at the EP Level. Four other institutions had 19% or higher percentages at the HE Level. It should be noted that the EPP does not require a BS in Mathematics or Science for admission to the program.

Reviewing these data indicate that the EPP was not effectively preparing its candidates to teach in middle mathematics and/or science. However, Middle and Secondary Mathematics and/or Science should improve with the preparation of UTeach STEM Minors majoring in one of the above mentioned middle and/or secondary majors. However, beginning in the Summer of 2019, the EPP will include Praxis Prep in the MAT Middle Grades 4-8 and Secondary 6-12 Mathematics and Science programs and in the Sophomore/Junior years for the UTeach candidates, which should increase content knowledge and level of teaching effectiveness. The EPP had its first 4 Mathematics Majors/UTeach Secondary Mathematics Minors graduate in Spring 2018. Another graduated in Winter 2019.

Means and Effectiveness Levels for Value-Added Scores by Undergraduate Programs for First and Second Year Teachers who Taught During 2014-15, 2015-15, 2016-17 (See page 43 of the 2018 Teacher Preparation Fact Book):

English Language Arts (Grades 4-8)

Mean .5/n=31

Ineffective 7% Effective: Emerging 48% Effective: Proficient 23% Highly Effective 23%

When comparing ELA 4-8 percentages with the other 10 Louisiana public institutions of higher education, 7 other institutions had 23% or higher percentages at the EP Level. Four other institutions had 23% or higher percentages at the HE Level.

Means and Effectiveness Levels for Value-Added Scores by Alternate Programs for First and Second Year Teachers who Taught During 2014-15, 2015-15, 2016-17 (See page 46 of the 2018 Teacher Preparation Fact Book):

English Language Arts (Grades 4-8)

Mean 1.6/n=13

Ineffective 15% Effective: Emerging 31% Effective: Proficient 23% Highly Effective 31%

15% 31% 23% 31% When comparing ELA 4-8 percentages with the other 6 Louisiana public institutions of higher education, 5 other institutions had 23% or higher percentages at the EP Level. One other institution had 23% or higher percentages at the HE Level.

The EPP does not offer a Middle Grades 4-8 ELA Program, only a Secondary Grades 6-12 ELA Program. When reviewing the data, the EPP is effectively preparing its candidates in ELA. However, beginning in Summer 2019, the EPP will include Praxis Prep in the MAT Secondary ELA program and in the Sophomore/Junior years for undergraduate candidates, which should increase content knowledge and the level of teaching effectiveness. All of these measures are shared with Partner Districts on the www.latechcrrc.org site.

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)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP lacks formal systems and structures for stakeholders to provide feedback, analyze data, and have input in programmatic decisions. (component 5.5)

Evidence of EPP establishing and maintaining formal systems and structures for stakeholders to provide feedback, analyze data, and have input in programmatic decisions. (component 5.5) are as follows: (1) Decision-Making: (a) List of district partners: <http://www.latechcrrc.org/school-partnerships.html>, (b) Clinical Handbook with sample MoU: <http://www.latechcrrc.org/team-model-resources.html>, note: the EPP has established MoUs with each of the district partners provided in the link above. Clinical Residency Handbook, pages 7-8, identifies key components of the TEAM Model for description of K-12 district partner involvement. On pages 11-12, delineate Mentor Teacher, School Leader and K-12 District Liaison involvement and program implementation. University TEAM, pages 16-17, describe TEAM being composed of members University Faculty and K-12 School District Personnel.

At the conclusion of Spring 2019, stakeholders will be surveyed on items related to programmatic items. Beginning Fall 2019, the EPP will present results of survey and other programmatic items at a K-16 meeting at a site on campus where EPP will receive additional feedback and share programmatic data such as Fact Book and Data Dashboard. Selection and implementation of changes for improvement will occur using processes identified in the Clinical Residency Handbook (MoU) and K-16 feedback process mentioned above.

(2) Program Evaluation: The EPP used TaskStream from Fall 2007 thru Spring 2016. Currently, the EPP is using Dean's for Impact common indicator instruments (See https://deansforimpact.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Learning_Together_Through_Evidence_DFI_2019.pdf). Also, using the COE SurveyMonkey to collect and analyze student teacher and clinical resident evaluations, professional practice, and completer/exit surveys. The EPP also collects candidate ACT, UGPA, and other portal assessments/check points each quarter and shares with stakeholders each spring quarter (To be posted in the <http://www.latechcrrc.org/>). (See attached proposed BS Elem/SPED M/M Grades 1-5 plan of study in the next section.)

The EPP receives data but does not have a process or plan to use that data in decision-making. (Component 5.4)

The EPP, in addition to established methods monitored and reported during the recent CAEP review, (1) has established a common indicator system to (a) monitor relevant data and analyze trends, (b) provide evidence of resource allocations, and (c) indicate alignment of results to future directions. (2) Data will be reported during our annual K-16 meeting. In addition, Measures of Program Impact, Outcomes and Consumer Information as well as Common Indicators, CAEP Annual Report, Title II, Fact Book, Data Dashboard, etc. will be posted <https://education.latech.edu/about/assessment-accreditation/>. The EPP has reestablished Assessment, Curriculum, and Policy committees (Action Items are attached in next section) and ensure that district and community stakeholders are invited to participate. The EPP, in addition to working with the Dean's for Impact, is working with Louisiana Tech Office of University Research to generate, collect, analyze and report data on an on-going basis. The EPP works closely with all district partner/liaisons when making program changes (See <http://www.latechcrrc.org/>) and developing MOUs (See sample MOUs). Additionally, the EPP in conjunction with University Research is reviewing Qualtrics as a new assessment system. These changes and improvements should ensure that any programmatic changes made by the EPP are data driven and shared with all stakeholders.

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 reviewed the 2018 Louisiana Board of Regents Teacher Preparation Data Dashboard and Fact Book, COE Completer Surveys. Next year, the EPP will also have Dean's for Impact data. The EPP identified both strengths and weakness in undergraduate, alternate, and advanced programs by reviewing dashboard, fact books, and surveys. The EPP used data/evidence from same sources as well as Title II, ETS, and LDoE data to ensure continuous improvement. In addition, the EPP has re-established assessment, curriculum, and policy committees this spring in order to conduct quarterly meetings and annually share data with all stakeholders via www.latechcrrc.org. In 2014, the EPP piloted a full-year clinical residency. Each year, the EPP uses feedback from its residents and partner districts to continuously improve their experience. Based on this feedback, in Fall 2019, residents will be in PK-12 classrooms 4 days a week and in Louisiana Tech University Classrooms 1 day a week. The proposed Elem/SPED M/M Plan of Study (Attached) show an example of changes and program modifications linked back to evidence/data.

Candidates must meet gpa, ACT/SAT or Praxis I requirements prior to admission to a teaching program. The median gpa of individuals accepted in the program in academic year 2017-18 was 3.2, The median gpa of individuals completing the program in academic year 2017-18 was 3.4. The EPP has its own COE Recruiter housed in Woodard Hall who meets with parents and prospective students on a daily basis. In addition, the EPP hosts recruiting events at the Academic Success Center in Bossier City, LA and on its own campus, i.e., Davison Athletic Complex (See www.latechcrrc.org). The EPP also monitors candidates' progress as they progress through programs (See attached plan of study). <https://education.latech.edu/academic-programs/department-of-curriculum-instruction-and-leadership/1-undergraduate-programs/#content>. Data-driven changes to programs are also guided by state teacher preparation competencies (<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/teaching>) and workforce attributes <https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/workforce-attributes>. The EPP offers an undergraduate UTeach STEM minor and plans to offer an undergraduate secondary UTeach major and MAT STEM major.

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
- 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
- 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
- 3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
- 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
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities
- A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
- A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
- A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
- A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
- A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
- 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
- x.1 Diversity
- x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  Rejoinder_to_Site_Visit_Report_Submitted_7.18.2018.pdf
-  Advanced_Programs_Exit_Survey__4.23.19.pdf
-  20142017_Exit_Survey_Responses.pdf
-  Copy_of_Proposed_ELEMENTARY_EDUCATION__SPECIAL_EDUCATION_4.7.19.xlsx
-  TEAM_MidYear_Recruitment_Event_final_edit.docx
-  Thank_you_for_attending_Bossier_Recruiting_Event.pdf
-  Residency_1_CompassDanielson.xls
-  Residency_2_CompassDanielson.xls
-  teacherpreparationcompetencies.pdf
-  Advisory_Council_Actions_44.docx
-  Assessment_Committee_Actions_44.docx
-  CIL_Action_Team_Minutes_45.docx
-  CIL_Competency_Alignment_Working_Group_Actions_44.docx
-  Curriculum_Committee_Actions_45.docx
-  NonCommittee_Actions__Responsibilities_44.docx
-  Policy_Committee_Actions_44.docx
- 
-  DeansforImpact_CommonIndicatorsSystemNetwork_ImprovingTeacherReadiness_external_vF.pdf
-  DFI_Data_Use_Diagnostic_22819_DS_DB.docx
-  TPI_Onsite_Review_Rubric_with_notes_2.19.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

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 2019 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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

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 completion 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