

2021 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10558	AACTE SID:	980
Institution:	East Central University		
Unit:	Teacher Preparation Program		

Section 1. EPP Profile

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

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

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

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

<https://www.ecok.edu/academics/colleges-and-schools/college-education-and-psychology/department-education/accreditation>

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2019-2020 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure ¹	50
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	41

Total number of program completers 91

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2019-2020 academic year?

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: <https://www.ecok.edu/academics/colleges-and-schools/college-education-and-psychology/department-education/accreditation>

Description of data accessible via link: 8 Annual Reporting Measures (2019-2020)

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

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

4.2 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?

Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)

While steps have been taken at the state level to implement a comprehensive assessment system which would be used to gather data needed to determine the effectiveness of candidates, it has not yet been completed. As a result, the Professional Education Committee decided that meeting this standard must come from research data derived from a sample of P-12 teachers. The research design and subsequent IRB was approved by the university. As indicated in last year's annual report, this plan was not viable for a number of reasons. The EPP has formulated another plan for the collection of these data. MOUs have been established with the following partner school districts in our service area: Stonewall, Ada, Roff, Latta, Byng, and Vanoss. These partner schools have agreed to provide growth data from the students who are taught by EPP-prepared completers. The EPP's Data Steward will send a Data Request Form to each district's Federal Programs Director identifying the EPP-prepared completers in that district and requesting growth data from students in their classrooms. The Federal Programs Director will send such data to the Data Steward when it becomes available. A specific protocol has been designed and is described in the MOU to ensure rigorous confidentiality standards. These agreements go into effect for the 2019-2020 academic year. The EPP expected to receive

the first full round of data in the summer of 2020; however, the pandemic interfered. We are currently expecting to receive at least

another partial round of data in the summer of 2021, with expectations of the first full round moved to the summer of 2022.. The MOUs will be renewed at the beginning of each 7-year accreditation cycle, guaranteeing these data will be available continually so the EPP can identify trends and implement changes based upon analysis. In the meantime, the EPP is in the process of piloting this new plan for assessing completer impact on student growth with 3 of the partner school districts in the new plan. In the meantime, the EPP requested data from two of the partner schools, Byng and Ada, in order to conduct a pilot study. These data were from AYs 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19, and those data are briefly analyzed as follows.

Two years of DIBELS data gathered from 2 completers' students are seen on the table. In 2017-18 a total of 47 students completed the pre and post assessments. These students had a pre-assessment average score of 42.0 on the DIBELS Next NWF-CLS, or Nonsense Word Fluency- Correct Letter Sound, and a post assessment average score of 90.5, showing growth of +48.5. In 2018-19 a total of 36 students completed those same pre and post assessments. These students had a pre-assessment average score of 39.3 on the DIBELS Next NWF-CLS and a post assessment average score of 83.6, showing growth of +44.3. In 2017-18 the same 47 students had a pre-assessment average score of 3.8 on the DIBELS Next NWF-WWR, Nonsense Word Fluency- Whole Words Read, and a post assessment average score of 27.3, showing growth of +23.5. Likewise, in 2018-19 the same students had a pre-assessment average score of 4.0 on the DIBELS Next NWF-WWR and a post assessment average score of 23.6, showing growth of +19.6.

STAR Reading Test data for 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 show an average Scaled Score Growth of +91.84 and a Reading Grade Equivalent (GE) increase which averaged +1.74. Over that same time period, the STAR Math Test data show an average Scaled Score (SS) growth of +91.84 and an average Grade Equivalent increase of +.43. In addition, evidence that indicates the potential of completers to impact student growth is the PPAT. Data from the Praxis

Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)

Performance Assessment for Teachers shows that candidates can impact P-12 student growth during their final semester of their education program. The TLE discussed in 4.2 along with Administrator Surveys discussed in 4.3, indicate that the completers from the EPP are effective teachers who positively impact P-12 students.

Data indicate that for domain 1, Classroom Management, cohort scores increased from 3.42 in 2016-17 to 3.59 in 2018-19. In domain 2, Instructional Effectiveness, cohort scores increased from 3.35 to 3.50. Scores also increased in domain 3, Professional Growth and Continuous Improvement from a 3.53 to 3.63 and in Leadership from 3.55 to 3.67. However, there was a decrease in domain 4, Interpersonal Skills. The scores decreased from 3.63 to 3.58. For the first year of data 100% of the candidates scored 3 or above and met state standards. The second year of data on this cohort indicated that scores actually decreased minimally in domains 1, 2, and 3 with the ranges widening in domains 1 and 2. There were a few more scores with a 4 or better but there were also a few low scores. Domains 4 and 5 were met at 100% with only a slight increase in the ranges. For the third year of data on the cohort some scores increased but only slightly. 95% of the cohort reached the state standard for domains 1, 2 and 3. 100% of the cohort reached the state standard for domains 4 and 5. There were increases in each domain for this second cohort (2016-17). Domain 1, Classroom Management, increased from 3.36 to 3.42 for a .06% increase. Domain 2, Instructional Effectiveness, increased from an average 3.32 to 3.46 for a .14% increase. Domain 3, Professional Growth and Continuous Improvement, went from an average of 3.45 to 3.47 for a .02% increase. Domain 4, Interpersonal Skills, increased from a 3.29-3.54 for a .25% increase which was the largest increase. Domain 5, Leadership, increased from 3.32 to 3.41 for a .09% increase. It is interesting to note that even though there was an increase in domain 3, Professional Growth and Continuous Improvement, it was the smallest increase. Year 1 data for the second cohort indicated that for domains 1, 2, 3 and 4, 96% of the first-year teachers met the state standard. Only 1 candidate scored below the "3" standard in all four domains. 100% of the first-year teachers from this cohort met the state standard of "3" in domain 5. The range was the widest in domain 4 where one teacher received a score of "2" on Collegiality and Professionalism and one teacher received a score of "5". The range for domain 1 was 2.33 to 4.00. The range for domain 2 was 2.5-4.3. The range for domain 3 was 2.5-4.5. The range for domain 5 was 3-4. The ranges are in-line for what one would expect for first-year teachers. The majority of the scores are in the "Effective" range (3-4) with very few earning a Superior (5) on the high end and no teachers with an Ineffective (1) score. In domains 1 and 2, 96% of 2016-17 cohort scored at a "3" or better. In the same cohort, 100% scored a "3" or better in domains 3, 4 and 5. The ranges were much tighter with no teacher receiving a score of "5" or a score of "1". Employers believe that completers from the EPP are effective teachers and contribute to student growth in the classroom.

Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3 / A4.1)

The Oklahoma Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (OEQA) annually administers the Administrator/Mentor Survey to mentors/administrators with Oklahoma who have hired the EPP's completers as first year teachers. The survey is aligned with the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards, and it is used to evaluate the preparedness and overall satisfaction local area administrators/mentors have in regard to the EPP's completers. Overall, as shown by data for the last 3 years, employers indicate that 91% strongly agree or agree that first year teachers have the knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity to effectively and appropriately use for instruction and for collaboration.

Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4 / A4.2)

The Oklahoma Office of Educational Quality and Accountability also administers the First Year Teacher survey every spring to recent completers who are employed in an Oklahoma school. This survey is aligned to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards and data collected examines how prepared recent completers feel their preparation was at the EPP. In addition, the EPP surveys students during their final semester. The Satisfaction survey is given to Student Teachers

as well as Internship/Practicum students. Data for the last 3 years show first year teachers indicate that 85% feel like they have the necessary knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity to effectively and appropriately use for instruction and for collaboration.

Graduate Rates (Initial & Advanced Levels)

Data for the last 3 years demonstrate the graduation rates for initial programs range for 98-100% and for advanced level programs from 87-91%.

Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (Initial & Advanced Levels)

Over the 3 year period, the percentage of completers meeting licensing requirements for initial programs ranged from 78-83% and for advanced programs from 87-91%.

Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (Initial & Advanced Levels)

For the last 3 years the data shows a low of 89% hired for positions aligning with their areas of certification in 2016-17 to a high of 100% hired in 2017-18.

Student loan default rates and other consumer information (Initial & Advanced Levels)

Data from the last 3 years demonstrate a range of 16.4% in 2017 down from 19.3% in 2015 in the area of student loan default rates.

Data are published and shared with stakeholders on this site:

<https://www.ecok.edu/academics/colleges-and-schools/college-education-and-psychology/department-education/accreditation>

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)

3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity

The EPP provided limited evidence of a plan for the recruitment of diverse candidates to meet employer needs. (Component 3.1)

In September 2020, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education awarded the EPP a \$6,000 grant to be utilized for the purpose of recruiting teachers. It was decided to focus the efforts of this project toward recruiting among the undecided majors at the institution. At that time there were 228 students whose majors were undecided. The decision was made to begin with this population, because it is representative of the diversity of the institution which is 55% White, 44% Minority, and 5% unknown ethnicity. Of the 44% minority the percentages break down as follows: 41% Native American, 16% Black, 10% Hispanic, 21% Asian, 1% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and 11% multiple races. The program is called Recruiting Tigers to Teach (RTT). During the 20-21 AY, the events took place:

Open House: October 20, 2020 from 11:00am-1:00pm ; 20 attendees; 4 possible major changers and 1 in process of changing major

Seminar 1: October 26, 2020 from 4:00-5:30pm; 4 attendees

Seminar 2: November 2, 2020 from 4:00-5:30pm; 6 attendees

Seminar 3: November 9, 2020 from 4:00-5:30pm; 10 attendees

Open House: January 12, 2021 from 11:00am-1:00pm; 50 attendees; 3 possible major changers

Seminar 4: February 1, 2021 from 4:00-5:30pm; 2 attendees

Seminar 5: March 1, 2021 from 4:00-5:30pm; 3 attendees

Seminar 6: April 1, 2021 from 4:00-5:30pm; 3 attendees

Nacho Ordinary Teacher Celebration in conjunction with the Professional Education Conference: April 9, 2021 from 9:00am-12:00pm; 95 attendees

As a direct result of these efforts, 17 students changed their major to professional education. As these students make application into the program, they will be asked to disclose their race/ethnicity. This is a new addition to our application which will enable us to better track the diversity of our candidates, as well as determine effective methods of recruiting diverse candidates to meet the needs of the employers in our area of service.

The EPP recruitment plan also specifically targets Native American candidates. The university is located in the heart of the Chickasaw Nation and borders on the Choctaw Nation to the south. To focus on some of the unique area schools' needs, the EPP implemented a mandatory Professional Development Day in the fall for teacher candidates that focuses on situations that teachers face in area schools, such as social media, mental health, communicating with stakeholders, poverty, and behavior management. Based on data which represents the needs of area P-12 schools, the EPP identified special education, STEM, as well as Native American needs and teachers as three targeted areas for recruitment efforts.

In the Spring of 2018, the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma's Teach to Reach (T2R) Career Development Program was started and is funded by a grant awarded to the Choctaw Nation (2.3.3). "The focus of this funding is to train more Native Americans to enter teacher education programs and become highly qualified educators". As one of five partner institutions, the EPP has seen an

increase in the number of Native American students who are interested in teacher education . Since the Spring of 2018, five candidates applied and were awarded scholarships from this program. The EPP just signed the MOU again regarding continued participation in this program as the Choctaw Nation pursues the continuance of the grant for an additional 3 years. These promotional materials will be provided at every recruitment event.

The current recruitment plan also includes focuses on EPP recruitment through events such as EngageOK held statewide during the summer, Oklahoma Technology Association (OTA) each fall in which the EPP focuses on recruitment efforts through a collaboration with Pitsco. The EPP is also currently making new efforts to focus on the recruitment of high school students and graduate level students through the Office of Advancement.

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 university's quality assurance system is built upon the quality and integrity of faculty, curriculum, technology and assessments. The continuous improvement model requires that all elements of the quality assurance system be regularly reviewed. The annual reports required to be completed by the EPP ensures that all components of the system function at a high level. The University Annual Program Assessment process ensures that program data is collected and evaluated annually. The university's commitment to data driven decision is exemplified by the annual program assessment report. Many program changes originate from the data collected annually on program outcomes or from external state or national initiatives. Additionally, the university continually assesses data in yearly external reports required by Title II (4.2.2), CAEP Annual Report (4.3.3), and Oklahoma's annual report (2.2.1). In the

Title II report EPP faculty examine enrollment trends, completer trends, and demographic data of candidates enrolled in our EPP. Title II data also allows us to

examine our progress toward meeting annual enrollment goals in high need areas. Title II reports capture yearly technology changes, program changes employed to address diverse learners, as well as candidate pass rates for each subject area. The CAEP Annual Report is aligned with the CAEP self-study report so provides a yearly opportunity to review data related to CAEP standards, identify gaps in current reporting measures or assessment data, analyze data trends and share data with the faculty, administration, students and stakeholders via the public website which reports the Annual Reporting Measures in addition to other program data and information. The Oklahoma Annual Report is also used to systematically review all Oklahoma requirements and

ensure that they are being met. The Oklahoma Annual Report is particularly helpful to ensure that all faculty are involved in at least ten public school contact hours and that all faculty are involved in partnership activities with schools, as well as participating in professional development activities that improve their teaching.

To monitor progress of the EPP's candidates through the program, the EPP has developed assessment instruments based on InTASC standards and the EPP's conceptual framework. Dispositions are monitored throughout both the initial and advanced programs. The disposition instrument has been validated at the advanced level in a study conducted by a graduate student. At the advanced level the study investigated how reliable and consistent evaluator rankings on students' graduate admission evaluation predicted academic success, measured by their last 60 hours of coursework before applying to the graduate program and their grade point average (GPA). EPP data from dispositional scores collected from archival data was reviewed. The results indicate that a student who applied to the university's Graduate program, and who had high scores from their evaluators, also had an above average GPA score. Inter-rater reliability between evaluators' rankings was shown to have a significant positive correlation. The two evaluators gave similar rankings regarding specific dispositional characteristics and skills for each student. This supports the idea that the graduate admissions recommendation process is a reliable process in determining whether an entry-level graduate student will be a potential success in the graduate program. In addition, composite dispositional rankings for both evaluators indicated a significant positive correlation with the applicants' last 60 hours of coursework, thereby, establishing concurrent validity between student past performance and evaluators' judgment of the students' ability. The review of data is continuous.

If there is a dispositional concern, the faculty member and the department chair address this immediately through conversations, TigerAlert, anecdotal notes, or disposition concerns. If there is a grade issue, the faculty member provides support for the candidate. If it is an attendance issue in field experience, the CoFE addresses the issue immediately. All other data is examined at the time it is submitted. After it is organized and summarized by the Assessment Coordinator, it is reviewed by the Director of Teacher Education in March to be used for the Title II report, the CAEP Annual Report, the State Annual Report, and the College of Education and Psychology Annual Report. Any needed changes can be identified through this process and sent to the Professional Education Committee for review and further analysis. The feedback from field experience evaluations, student teaching evaluations, first year teacher evaluations, employer surveys and webinars are also discussed. Daily interactions with public schools through the Institute for Math and Science Education, supervision of student teachers, service learning projects, and other collaborative projects allows the EPP to constantly communicate with public schools and receive anecdotal evidence of program strengths and weaknesses to share in department or college meetings. This annual review of anecdotal, as well as formal evidence ensures that data is informing all changes in the EPP. The spring review of data by the Professional Education Committee is used to identify course changes needed for the portfolio, as well as changes that need to be addressed at the annual Teacher Education Committee retreat in the fall semester. The Teacher Education Director shares monthly updates with the stakeholders across the institution in the monthly unit report. Each program director shares data with an advisory committee and data is posted on the Education Department website or in MyECU. This assessment system is designed around a continuous improvement cycle that ties assessment, planning, and budgeting from the EPP level to the university level. The planning process incorporates the Plan, Do, Check, Act (PDCA) cycle of continuous improvement that engages stakeholders in a regular review cycle which allows them to have input into the system and thus help make meaningful decisions about improving the quality of the teacher education programs.

One change that took place during the 2019-2020 AY was the creation and pilot of the P.R.I.D.E. choice board for Field Experiences. Due to qualitative feedback provided on Field Experience evaluations, as well as student comments, the Professional Education Committee (PEC), developed and piloted a choice board of activities that are scaffolded to fit expectations of growth and learning for each block. The PEC developed the P.R.I.D.E. choice board as an opportunity for the students to have something to discuss with the mentor teachers as well as options for the teacher candidates to engage in during this time in the field experience. During the Spring of 2020, the choice board was piloted with Block III students.

In addition to changes to the Field Experience expectations, ethnicity, gender, and location of permanent home were questions added to the Teacher Education application. Through the addition of these questions, Block I students demographics can now be analyzed to identify how it compares to the retention of students throughout our program. The need to track this criterion is tied to CAEP Standard 3 and it will not only assist us in understanding the diversity of our candidates, but also provide useful information to assist us in future deliberate efforts to recruit diverse candidates.

In terms of advanced programs, during the 2019-2020 AY the EPP created an Advanced Professional Education Committee (APEC). This committee focuses on aligning advanced programs to meet the requirements set forth by CAEP. During the reporting period, the APEC met twice and during the two meetings, a Practicum Application for all programs to use was developed for implementation the following year as well as a discussion about the purpose of the group and ways to assess dispositions, practicum placements, satisfaction, and diversity were discussed. Unfortunately, due to quarantine, significant changes to advanced programs were not made until the 2020-2021 AY.











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

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
3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
x.1 Diversity
x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  **2019_October_15_APEC_Minutes.pdf**
-  **2020_January_28_APEC_Minutes.pdf**
-  **2020_March_24_APEC_Minutes.pdf**
-  **Advanced_Programs_Performance_Assessment_(APPA)_Crosswalk_Draft.pdf**
-  **PEC_Minutes_19_November_2019.pdf**
-  **PEC_Minutes_24_September_2019.pdf**
-  **PEC_Minutes_26_March_2020.pdf**
-  **PEC_Minutes_27_August_2019.pdf**
-  **Undergraduate_Field_Experience_Activities.pdf**
-  **Undergraduate_Teacher_Application__Google_Forms.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 2021 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.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

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

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

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site reviews.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount 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 review report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

 **Acknowledge**