

2020 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10326	AACTE SID:	4930
Institution:	The University of Montana Western		
Unit:	School of Education, Business and Technology		

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://w.umwestern.edu/departament/education/>

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2018-2019 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure ¹	114
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	0

Total number of program completers 114

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2018-2019 academic year?

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: <https://w.umwestern.edu/section/privacy-and-security/>,
<https://w.umwestern.edu/section/accreditation/>

Description of data accessible via link: These links take the user to a Registrar's Page and to an Accreditation Page. The former is a resource for data about graduation and retention rates, as well as information about student loans, i.e. Annual Reporting Measures 5 and 8. The latter is a resource for information/data regarding CAEP accreditation, i.e., Annual Reporting Measure 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7.

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"/>	<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?

From its review of the annual reporting measures over the last three years, our EPP has learned many things. As we have noted in past reports, the EPP continues to place a strong emphasis on the necessity of putting powerful tools in place for measuring our completers' abilities as teachers and their capacity for impacting the learning of their P-12 students. Attending the CAEP conference held in Spring 2019 was a very beneficial investment of institutional and personal resources, and we learned a great deal from that experience. One of the biggest "take it to the bank" lessons learned at the conference came in the form of repeated encouragements to identify a small but powerful set of critical assessments to use in the construction of an EPP's quality assurance and continuous improvement system. Another key lesson can be expressed in the admonishment to "tell your story," when it comes to presenting an accreditation narrative to CAEP and to the state of Montana.

In 2018 - 2019, we adopted an approach of using frequent meetings—which we called "data dips"—for data analysis and discussion. These meetings were often of relatively short duration, which made them more palatable to everyone, and also made them more sustainable and productive. With several new core tenure-line faculty members having joined our EPP in 2018 - 2019,

some of our early meetings also took the form of “orientation meetings,” serving the purpose of introducing those faculty members to CAEP, and reminding the rest of us of the accreditation journey we had been on. As a result, we examined some older key documents used in framing our previous CAEP accreditation; notably, two of them led to a great deal of discussion and generative questioning concerning our current trajectory. The first of those two documents was a crosswalk of the Danielson Framework, the InTASC Standards, our EPP’s conceptual framework, and the critical assessments listed for our 2015 CAEP visit. Most of the work done on that document stood up well under the scrutiny we applied during 2018 - 2019, with the exception of our list of critical assessments, and some elements of the conceptual framework. Clearly, the current discrepancies between that document and our current views and practices needed to be addressed. The second document was the Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) which we provided in 2015. It took little time to see that this document was seldom (if ever) used as a plan for the EPP in the following years, and it bore little resemblance to the current path we were following.

It should be noted that our EPP was one of the very first to achieve accreditation under standards and protocols where were, at the time, still very new to everyone, including CAEP itself. Because of this, we relied far less on long-established patterns of data collection, and far more on putting plans in place for upcoming data collections and analyses. Fast forward to the 2018 - 2019 academic year, and it was remarkably clear to us that we needed to do some serious re-visioning which would accommodate our new understandings and the ways in which our faculty had grown and changed over the last few years. Much of AY 2018 - 2019 was devoted to this kind of work. It should be noted that we tried to be as disciplined and objective about this work as we could be. To that end, one approach that we took should be highlighted here: We used the Deans for Impact Diagnostic Tool, developed in 2018. This tool is designed to assist EPPs in establishing greater coherence, objectivity, and shared language with respect to data use. Implementing this tool substantially improved our ability to have productive conversations about how well our EPP is currently performing on a wide range of criteria related to data collection and analysis. It helped move our self-study along significantly, and it helped to strengthen our ability to make data-driven decisions.

Unlike past years, our EPP adopted a more formalized approach to documenting our data analysis efforts and action plans. The accreditation officer maintained a document which tracks the division’s data analysis meetings, the conclusions drawn from the analyses, and the subsequent actions taken with regard to such activities as improving evaluation tools, adopting needed critical assessments, refining/improving critical assessments, and developing greater clarity in terms of the EPP’s plan of self-study. This tracking document, entitled “CAEP Data Analyses and CAEP-Related Discussions,” is attached to this CAEP 2020 Annual Report. A similar document, distilled from the minutes of all division meetings in AY 2018 - 2019, entitled “Action Plans Summary: Fall 2018/Spring 2019” is also attached to this report. It serves to flesh out the narrative/timeline established in the CAEP tracking document.

Several other developments merit discussion in this section of the CAEP 2020 Annual Report. First among these is our continued work with the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) and the Montana Council of Deans of Education (MCDE), involving collaborative efforts to work at the state level and design statewide assessments. Progress has been made over the past year in refining and implementing the Montana Education Preparation Providers Continuous Improvement Collaborative (MEPP CIC) statewide protocol for a 3-year data collection cycle which address Montana’s ARM 10.58.313 and CAEP Standard 4. We wrote about this in our CAEP 2019 Annual Report last year, explaining that all eleven EPPs in the state have collaborated to create proprietary tools for addressing CAEP Standard 4. These tools include a statewide completers’ survey which is conducted in Year 1 of the 3-year cycle, and a statewide employers’ survey which is conducted in Year 2 of the cycle. In Year 3, a case study of selected completers will be used to document their impact on P-12 learning. AY 2018 – 2019 was the year for finalizing that protocol, within the MEPP CIC. Overall, the work done in developing this 3-year cycle has been highly deliberative, rigorous, and intentional.

As we look back over the last three years at trends and changes for our EPP, the trend in the number of completers who graduate from our EPP is worthy of note. During the 2018-2019 academic year, the University of Montana Western had 114 completers emerge from its teacher preparation program. When one compares this number to the previous year (AY 2017-2018), with 102 completers, this is an increase of 12% over the previous year. It should also be noted that the number of completers in 2017-2018 was a 20% increase over the previous year. The EPP experienced these substantial increases at a time when fewer and fewer undergraduates, both in Montana and nationwide, were expressing an interest in going into education. Furthermore, this has been a time period in which public opinion vis-à-vis the field of education has been notably negative, overall. Moreover, the university in which this EPP is housed, the University of Montana Western, has experienced declining and/or flat enrollments in recent years, as have nearly all the other institutes of higher education (IHEs) in the Montana University System (MUS). The recent addition of a PreK – Grade Three bachelor’s degree to our programs is responsible, at least in part, for the increased enrollments we are seeing. This degree can be earned either online or in a face-to-face environment, and it has attracted strong interest across the state. Similarly, the recent addition of a 2 + 2 partnership program between the University of Montana Western Education Division and Blackfeet Community College has also helped us to increase enrollments. But these two programs are not the sole factors which explain the increase we have seen in the number of candidates who complete our education programs. Last year, the EPP noted in the Annual Report that we need to do more to understand the increases we are seeing. Unfortunately, we make the same statement this year, and we note that our current self-study process does little to help us to understand the reason for these trends. We need to do more to address this issue, with an eye toward replicating the same results for the coming years, if possible.

As a result of examining our data over the past three years, we note another programmatic change that had nearly completed the curriculum proposal process during AY 2018 – 2019: the addition of a post-baccalaureate certificate program. The EPP is convinced that this new certificate program will not only increase enrollment and retention of post-graduate candidates, but it will help address the teacher shortage currently faced by the state of Montana. The EPP is confident in making this claim, because the certificate is offered as a fully online program, and it should contribute, in particular, to providing teachers for the most rural parts of Montana. Furthermore, we expect it to add even further to the completer rates addressed in the previous paragraph.

Finally, the EPP notes that although our Annual Impact Measures and our Annual Outcome Measures are widely shared by being posted to the university's website, their accessibility, visibility, and recency leave something to be desired. The EPP does not have direct control over navigation design, content development, and publishing, with regard to the website, and we need to work more swiftly and effectively with the Office of Marketing to address these issues. More broadly, there are other aspects of our interface with that office (and with the Office of Admissions)—generally related to marketing and recruitment—which need similar improvement and strengthening.

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)

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

There is a lack of co-constructed policies and procedures surrounding partnerships for clinical preparation.

During the 2017-2018 academic year, an innovative approach was undertaken in working with the faculty, principals, and superintendents who comprise the membership of our Advisory Council. Rather than convene an annual meeting, as the EPP has done in years past, the EPP agreed to divide itself into "Advisory Council Task Force" teams. These teams went into the field to meet with school leaders and faculty on their own campuses, rather than on the campus of UMW. A data collection tool for structured interviews was developed, based on the criteria embedded in CAEP Standard 2, and the questions in the tool addressed all three components of that standard. The qualitative data from these interviews were analyzed during one meeting of the EPP in Fall 2018. At a later meeting, a discussion of the findings was conducted in the EPP. The EPP agreed that a return to spring meetings of the full Advisory Council should commence in Spring 2019, and that this meeting would be more consistent with the CAEP Handbook and the expectations of CAEP Standard 2. Other findings from the data were incorporated into the EPP's ongoing work to co-construct arrangements and partnerships which support the partner schools and the EPP in efforts toward continuous improvement of our teacher candidates' preparation for effective participation in the field. These findings were used to inform the planning for an Advisory Council meeting on May 9, 2019.

At the May 9, 2019 Advisory Council meeting, two faculty members from Montana State University were invited to provide professional development (PD) for UMW Education Division faculty members and various school partner leaders and faculty. It had been determined (see previous paragraph) that the focus of the meeting should be on using the Danielson Framework for Teaching in an efficient, comprehensible, and economical way for performance reviews of either preservice teacher candidates or inservice teachers. Attendees at the meeting agreed that the Framework could be used to co-construct some sessions of shared PD which would bring both the P-12 teachers and leaders together with UMW faculty members to learn from and support one another. This, in turn, would better inform our mutual use of Danielson-based observation forms and/or school leaders' use of the Danielson-based Montana Educator Performance Appraisal System (EPAS).

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

Field experiences, particularly in secondary education, do not consistently prepare candidates to demonstrate a positive impact on all P-12 students learning and development.

The EPP proposed a University Teacher Education Council (UTEC) to the division, to heads of the various academic departments which help to prepare our candidates, and to the Provost in Fall of 2018, and this proposal was favorably met by all to whom it was suggested. The UTEC concept was based on the purpose and structure of a similar committee which exists at Montana State University. It was formed to assist the EPP in addressing Area for Improvement (AFI) #2 by providing a stronger working/communication relationship among the EPP and all the other UMW academic departments on which it depends and with which it partners. Clearly, stronger content area/TEP partnerships will help strengthen both content knowledge and pedagogy, which in turn will serve to enrich the experiences candidates have in their existing field placements. The UTEC is structured to meet once a semester, unless more frequency is needed. It met in Spring 2019, and accomplished the following: (a) Praxis II data were analyzed, and suggestions were made about ways to improve test scores. Departments requested an opportunity to see those data presented in other ways, with more background context, and that note was made for fall of 2019. (b) Scheduling issues were discussed, with an eye toward reducing the number of times that a K-12 or secondary education major must choose to take a core education course online in order to be able to take a less-frequently-offered upper-level course in the major, which is only offered in a particular "block" in UMW's block-scheduling system. Especially during 2018 – 2019, UMW education students expressed (via the Student Senate) that they were dissatisfied with the perceived frequency with which they "had to" take education courses online, for the type of reason just described. (c) The UTEC also briefly discussed how well UMW's general education courses prepare education students for their major and support the students' development of content knowledge and ability to respond positively to course rigor.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning

The EPP's Plan for Documenting Impact on Student Learning, as presented, only partially addresses the

components of Standard 4.

In other areas of this report, it has already been noted that a statewide effort is underway across all eleven Montana EPPs to meet CAEP Standard 4 by using a set of reporting measures incorporated into a 3-year cycle. These assessments will address all four Impact Measures which are part of the eight Annual Reporting Measures required by CAEP. During AY 2018 – 2019, considerable progress was made on this multi-faceted project. This academic year was devoted to working on further revision and refining of the case study, during meetings of the MEPP CIC, and in meetings and discussions at the EPP level. Across the state, EPPs used the timeframe of AY 2018 -2019 to analyze data from their first round of surveys which are part of the 3-year cycle. Unfortunately and inadvertently, the UMW EPP did not collect data from the first round of surveys during this academic year. This error was noted in Spring 2019, and plans were quickly made for the EPP to complete this round of data collection in the Fall, thus bringing the EPP back up to alignment with the MEPP CIC protocol. The CAEP 2021 Annual Report will reflect the collection and analysis of both rounds of survey data, and will also report on the discussions held at the EPP level to formulate the EPP's case study. Thus, in spite of a "glitch" in data collection, all elements of the MEPP CIC protocol will have been observed by the UMW EPP, and the program's plans for a robust self-study process and for documenting impact on student learning will proceed apace.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

The EPP's data-driven decision-making process for continuous improvement is not consistent across programs.

In August of 2018, the EPP reviewed a 2015 crosswalk of the Danielson Framework for Teaching, the EPP's conceptual framework, the InTASC Standards, and the set of critical assessments used to assess candidates across all elements of the Danielson Framework. Questions arose concerning how this crosswalk fits into our plans—now—for a revised quality assurance program which meets the expectation of CAEP Standard 5. Further examination and discussion of this crosswalk occurred later in the fall. No action was taken at this meeting. Even later in Fall semester, as the EPP met to analyze data from our Writing Assessments, additional questions arose concerning the coherence of our quality assurance program, and—in particular—whether or not the Writing Assessment should be included among our critical assessments.

In April of 2019, the EPP held an exhaustive examination of the 2015 Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) which was written in preparation for the 2015 CAEP accreditation visit. Numerous comments were made, and notes were taken concerning the various points at which the EPP has departed from the plans developed in 2015. It was confirmed that a number of new directions were taken, starting in late spring of 2016, and throughout AY 2017 – 2018, all of which departed from the CIP. Details concerning the decisions made during this time frame are listed in the tracking document entitled "CAEP Data Analyses and CAEP-Related Discussions," which is attached to this report. It became clear that the CIP was not followed, subsequent to achieving CAEP accreditation in Spring 2016, and no efforts were made to revise or correct the CIP to reflect the new directions being taken by the EPP. These questions were thus posed: What, now, are the goals of the EPP? What inquiry questions are now driving the work of the EPP at this point? What now informs the EPP's work on continuous improvement, and how is that reflected in a new quality assurance program? Work done at the May 9, 2019 Education Division Retreat was conducted to begin addressing these questions. (Again, see the "CAEP Data Analyses and CAEP-Related Discussions" document for further details.) Further explanation of the work being done to address this AFI and to craft a new quality assurance program will be found in the CAEP 2021 Annual Report, next year.

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?

In 2018 – 2019, the EPP regularly assessed data related to meeting all five CAEP standards. The “CAEP Data Analyses and CAEP-Related Discussions” document attached to this report, and the “Action Plans Summary—Fall 2018/Spring 2019” document (also attached to this report) provide support and documentation to bolster this claim. Following the CAEP Spring Conference of 2019, attended by three members of the UMW EPP, more focused work began on reducing the number of critical assessments to be used as part of our self-study process, and on designing a leaner and more efficient process of self-study, overall. A re-envisioning process was undertaken and is documented, and the EPP’s use of the Deans for Impact Data Diagnostic Tool (mentioned earlier) represents a systematized effort on the part of the EPP to construct a new, authentic, comprehensive quality assurance system which includes data from multiple measures, taken at multiple points in time. Improvement of our inter-rater reliability process related to Teacher Work Sample Evaluations is an important step forward in the EPP’s work. Additionally, the EPP has moved closer to the adoption of a dispositions evaluation tool, an assessment which the EPP did not have in place during AY 2018-2019, which was also noted in the previous Annual Report. Overall, the EPP has made strong strides this year in its work on data collection, use, and evaluation, and on its work toward effective demonstration of completers’ impact on P-12 student learning.

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
- 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
- 3.3 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

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  **Data_analyses_and_related_discussions_AY_2018__2019.pdf**
-  **Action_Plans__Summary__20182019_from_Connie_Beck.pdf**
-  **FINAL_MEPP_Case_Study_Guide_082019.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 2020 EPP Annual Report.

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

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Laura Straus

Position: Associate Professor and Accreditation Officer

Phone: 406-683-7040

E-mail: laura.straus@umwestern.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**