2019 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11564	AACTE SID:	3515
Institution:	Northern Michigan University		
Unit:	School of Education, Leadership & Public Service		

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	⦿	○
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	⦿	○
1.1.3 Program listings	⦿	○

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 licensure[1]

68

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]

26

Total number of program completers 94

---

[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://www.nmu.edu/education/

Description of data accessible via link: Accreditation information

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

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Advanced-Level Programs			☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

> *What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?*
> > *Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?*
> > *Are benchmarks available for comparison?*
> > *Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?*

Emerging long-term emerging, expected, or unexpected: The decline in secondary majors/minors in political science, economics, earth space science, and geography at a point where the programs are no longer sustainable. This decline is relfected in the decrease in unavailable clinical placements in these disciplines and poor performance on the MI Teacher Test for Certification (MTTC). Increased resources applied to the MTTC in social studies and integrated science (study guides, faculty mentors, hired peer tutors) showed an increase in MTTC scores. Program maintaining a 96% effectiveness rating and high levels of satisfaction from employers for new hires. Hiring trends remain positive and rural shortages are adding a level of complexity to student teaching and internship placements due to the need for filling positions. A work group has been established with local administrators to partner on a placement process that supports program expectations should a candidate be up for consideration as a paid intern/student teacher.

The Danielson four domains (planning, environment, instruction, and professionalism) remain strong with improvements for instruction from the last annual report showing an 11% gain. The increase in emerging/basic in professionalism and planning resulted in the 2 students responsible for the increase as passing student teaching to get to degree but not being recommended for certification. The interventions made with individual teacher candidates are working and resulting in candidates prepared to teach or an exit plan for those who are not.

Data are shared at monthly meetings of cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and teacher candidates. An annual report for the NMU campus, and our annual MDE Educator Performance Indicator (EPI) score report serve as points of dissemination to faculty and our clinical partners. These data also serve to feed our required 7-year accreditation report which is shared with all faculty and our clinical partners.

The process for training and support for the tool is effective. The process was reviewed by our national accreditor and the MDE who both affirmed that our process meets expectations for reliability and validity. No action plan for data collection is needed at this time.

80% target met in planning (95%), environment (93%), instruction (89%), and professionalism (94%).

Trends: 4% decrease in planning with 80% target remaining as met or exceeded; 5% gain in environment with 80% target remaining as met or exceeded; 11% gain in instruction with 80% target remaining as met or exceeded; and 1% gain in professionalism with 80% target remaining as met or exceeded.

Comparison to peer institutions not applicable.

MTTC Content Exams
Previous Report:
Areas with an N ≥ 10 that fell below the 80% expected pass rate were in the areas of Chemistry (78.6 NMU/83.2 State), Spanish (75 NMU/90.5 State), History (64.9 NMU/71.8 State), Reading (72.7 NMU/85.5 State), Social Studies Elementary (30 NMU/ 57.4 State), and Integrated Science Elementary (74.1 NMU/76.5 State).

Areas with an N < 10 that fell below the 80% target were French (50 NMU/74.1 State), German (33.3 NMU/77.1 State), Journalism (50 NMU/43.8 State), Geography (60 NMU/69.1 State), and Political Science (50 NMU/64 State). MTTC cautions about interpreting data for small populations as such data may not provide a valid indication of how examiners typically perform.

2018 Report Data:
The N ≥ 10 areas of increase were in Spanish (100%), Reading (100%), and Integrated Science Elementary (78.3%). The areas of Chemistry (55.6%), and History (56%) showed decreases with their overarching disciplines of Integrated Science Secondary (100%) and Social Studies Secondary (95.5%) showing increases from the last cycle for exams that are broader in content.

Areas with an N < 10 that fell below 80% were Social Studies Elementary (66.7%) showing a gain of 36.7% from last cycle and an outcome of .8% better than the state average. German was discontinued at NMU. Geography, Economics, and Political Science each had one (1) test taker, none of whom passed the exam.

Comparisons are available for other state institutions.
Overall MTTC scores for all tests show NMU 4th among public universities.
U of M Ann Arbor 95.5
Michigan State University 93.2
Grand Valley State University 91.2
Northern Michigan University 88.6
Saginaw Valley State University 87.7
U of M Dearborn 86.2
Oakland University 84.4
Eastern Michigan University 94.9
Michigan Technological University 91.2
Central Michigan University 83.8
U of M Flint 82
Ferris State University 84.5
Lake Superior State University 83.7
Wayne State University 79.4
Western Michigan University 79.9

We are using MTTC and Danielson findings to make determinations in the secondary fields of History, Geography, Political Science, and Economics to consider a Social Studies major only. Use practicing teachers and recent graduates to develop Social Studies Elementary study materials to keep the gains from the last cycle (36.7% increase) to better support test takers in achieving the 80% mark which has been elusive statewide with a state pass rate of 65.9%.

We will sustain the strategies implemented to move our scores in the areas that showed gains. Strengths here have been faculty created study materials, increased awareness to teacher candidates about test outcomes and cautions, and more contact with test takers who fail the first session to encourage them to study and develop a plan of action for the retake. Strategies have been effective as demonstrated by our increases in subject area exam results.

Data are shared with advisees, faculty, and clinical partners via email and at meeting sessions. Data are incorporated into the annual MDE scoring report. All of these data are shared with policymakers and MDE leadership who monitor actions in this area.

New grade level banding requirements from the MDE will require a revision of all initial and advanced licensure areas. Work groups comprised of alumni, faculty, staff, K12 teachers, local administrators and university administration will use program data and grade level banding parameters to draft program revisions for a broader review and input from current candidates, cooperating teachers, employers, and university faculty whose primary duties are not in teacher education. Special attention will be given to obtaining proposed program feedback from rural employers who, through focus groups, have requested more structured clinical hours for secondary education candidates that require integration across disciplines and working with populations of special needs.

The MDE EPI scores trends positive with data available for each institution in Michigan. NMU exceeds the state average in MTTC scores and in cooperating teacher and university supervisor feedback. The effectiveness ratings for this cycle were all equal across all institutions due to MDE turnover and data inconsistencies.

MTTC 3-Yr Cumulative Pass % Goal 2 Measure: SURV-TC and CS Surveys Goal 3 Measure: EFF- Educator Evaluations
Northern Michigan University 90.3 95.7 88.6

Minimum 66.7 85.9 71.8
Mean/ Average 87.8 94.6 81.7
Maximum 100 100.0 88.6
Median 88.4 95.4 82.0
Population Standard Deviation 5.9 3.1 3.1

MDE survey data from recent hires and employers show overall ratings in all areas to range from "Somewhat Agree" to "Strongly Agree" relative to preparedness to enter the profession and perform to expectations in the first year. Two of the 24 new hires responded that it was "Very Difficult" to find a teaching position. The program continues to increase its connectivity to job fairs, running its own regional job fair with 40 practicing administrators for mock and real interviews each semester.

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

3.1: The EPP lacks an explicit plan with goals and an appropriate timeline to recruit and support completion of high-quality diverse candidates from a broad range of backgrounds.

Aim North recruitment plan implemented fall 2018 with Chief Diversity Officer: A program designed to help students in the Detroit community get a head start on their journey to college. This program will allow students to take two college-level courses in their hometown, earn college credit, and complete some of the requirements needed for a college degree—in their summer after high school graduation.

Implemented a Title II rural residency grant fall 2017 to recruit and retain teachers to rural school settings. Candidate pool represented diversity across socio-economic status.

Partnered with the NMU Center for Native American Studies and the NMU Office of Diversity and Inclusion for the Reimagine STEM Summer Youth Academy summer 2018 to engage and recruit Native American students into STEM teaching tracks.

The Indigenous Women Working within the Sciences (IWWS) is a two-year pilot project funded by a National Science Foundation Inclusion across the Nation of Communities of Learners of Underrepresented Discovered in Engineering and Sciences (NSF INCLUDES) grant. The IWWS team will address two key challenges: 1) the lack of inclusivity of American Indian teaching methods within sciences education curricula, and 2) the low numbers of American Indian/Alaskan Native female students graduating from four-year universities, specifically within the STEM fields.

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

4.3: The EPP's plan to gather valid and reliable data to monitor employment milestones and satisfaction does not meet the acceptable level based on the CAEP Guidelines for Plans.

The program uses the Michigan Department of Education data for employer satisifaction, effectiveness ratings, and first-year out completer data as measures under the assumption that these state instruments are valid and reliable as they are used to determine annual scores for the MDE and policy makers. Additionally, the program conducts focus groups with alumni and employers each semester to gather program feedback regarding employability.

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

5.2 EPP created assessments are not rated at the acceptable level when reviewed using the CAEP minimum level of sufficiency.

Our program was accredited in November 2017. The program filed a complaint with CAEP that resulted in a meeting with the Michigan Department of Education, CAEP president, NMU legal counsel stated that a reasonable result would be to provide NMU with specific information as to which rubrics/assessment did not meet standards. This inquiry from NMU and resolution from CAEP was agreed upon as the CAEP site team requested all syllabi and materials since our last accreditation visit making it unclear as to what assessments did not meet standard. It has been two years since this statement was made by CAEP and NMU has yet to receive information regarding the AFI making it difficult to address this AFI in a substantive form.

The program does use Michigan Department of Education data for employer satisifaction, effectiveness ratings, cooperating/supervising teacher ratings, subject-area exam scores, and first-year out completer data as measures under the

assumption that these state instruments are valid and reliable as they are used to determine annual scores for the MDE and policy makers. Additionally, the program utilizes the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teacher which shows a "good" level of inter-rater reliability.

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

5.3 and 5.4. The EPP does not systematically disaggregate candidate performance data from admission through program completion and use the data for program improvement.

A system has been established by licensure area to track the following data points for candidate quality:
GPA for admission pre-methods; professional behaviors/dispositions (over three semesters at mid-term and end of semester); pre-methods GPA; methods GPA; content licensure GPA; overall GPA; Danielson Framework Evaluations (early, mid-term, final) assessed by student teacher/intern, cooperating teacher, university supervisor; MTTC subject area scores; practicing administrator interview feedback

Disaggregrated data are shared with the following stakeholders:
Danielson Framework results for cooperating teachers/university supervisors at monthly mentoring meetings; NMU campus community annual program report disaggregated by content area; a scholarly resource allocation report (three-year cylce) to the campus community, the public, and university administration; MDE outcomes (employer satisifaction, efficacy scores, effectiveness ratings, MTTC content scores); professional behaviors shared with candidates and program faculty once each semester; mock interview results shared with faculty, practicing administrators, and candidates once a semester; Danielson results shared with candidates on an ongoing basis throughout internship; MDE Educator Performance Indicator score shared publicly with aggregate data for employer, effectiveness, and cooperating/supervisor ratings and disaggregated by content area exam.

Two administrative professionals and the director of field experiences lead the collection and disaggregation of data. Committess that review data on a monthly basis are: Undergraduate Review Committee, Teacher Selection and Retention Committee, Secondary Education Committee, Upper Peninsula Center for Educational Develpoment Committtee (P12 partner committee), the Teacher Education Advisory Council (cooperating teachers and university supervisor P12 committee), Graduate Review Committee; on an annual basis Academic Outcomes for Learning Committee (campus-wide data review committee).

All curriculum revisions, grant proposals, and evaluation processes stem from committee and partnership review of program data as required by NMU policies and grant parameters. The Teacher Selection and Retention Committee is responsible for use of disaggregated data review by candidate to make evidence based selection and retention decisions.

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?

EXAMPLE ONE (attachments)
Strategic Resource Allocation Project, a major on-campus curriculum/program review initiative: Every major and minor on campus did a substantive review of outcomes based on resourcing, staffing, graduation completion rates, standardized test scores (where available), internship outcomes, employer satisfaction, credit hour production (sustainability), community need, current student survey results, and graduate survey results. Our programs submitted MDE and admission and progression data for individual candidates in addition to university data on staffing, credit hour production, and financial resources for this review. The initial review committee was comprised of faculty and staff from across university departments and then a second review team of university administrators. Current students and community members were engaged at the final phase of the year-long review process providing input through a public comment portal. The SRA outcomes report is attached as a PDF as is an action plan for our programs. This substantive review was completely data driven using a mixed methods approach for review. This was a peer-reviewed process completed through a systematic process using multiple data points. The complete process can be found at https://www.nmu.edu/sra/home

Strategic Resource Allocation
Process Model
Modeled after Robert C. Dickeson's Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services but customized to NMU
NMU's mission, vision, and strategic plan will be the guides for decision-making
Resource Assessment
Evaluation of all academic and non-academic programs and services, and resources allocated to them
Additional investments will be made in programs that are, or have the potential, to perform exceptionally well
Task Forces
Academic program review
Support functions review
Final, public report at completion
Task forces will make recommendations, not implementations
SRA Implementation Task Force (members: all Vice Presidents, Dean of Students, Assoc. Provost, Asst. V.P. Budget & Finance) will make implementation recommendations to the President. Implementation decisions will adhere to contracts and policies.
Focus on Data
Data will be collected and updated throughout the process
A database will be created that can be updated annually, through future strategic resource allocation processes
Transparency
All facets of the process will be shared widely and updated regularly, with the exception of the deliberations regarding individual programs and other inner workings of the task forces.
Period Q&A sessions
Scheduled university forums

EXAMPLE TWO (attachment)
Clinical Experiences Revisions: A major state-wide initiative was the rewriting of the clinical practice expectations for all EPPs. The data for this initiative included employer feedback surveys; effective ratings; focus group feedback from practicing teachers, administrators, and new teachers; statewide MDE data sets for all EPPs; representative feedback from committee members respresenting regions in the state; P12 student data; and pressing needs identified by employers for entry into the profession. NMU was an integral member of this committee and represented the rural school perspective in recommendations and policy development.
"Over the last two years, in support of goal 3 of the Top 10 in 10 Strategic Plan to "develop, support, and sustain a high-quality, prepared, and collaborative education workforce", the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) collaborated with a variety of stakeholder committees with the purpose of re-envisioning Michigan's teacher certification structure, updating teacher preparation standards, and revising the Teacher Certification Code. The MDE identified critical components of the teacher pipeline that facilitate the development of a highly effective education workforce. This led to the creation of a new model of preparation and induction that promotes the success and achievement of Michigan's PK-12 students and leverages Michigan's educator workforce as partners in the teacher preparation system. In alignment with that model, the Revised Teacher Certification Code increases emphasis on cohesive clinical experiences with children during initial preparation (R390.1123) and during the preparation of additional endorsements (R390.1129). A stakeholder committee was convened to develop a shared vision and language for clinical experiences in Michigan and to make recommendations for teacher preparation clinical requirements.
The clinical experience stakeholder committee began meeting in February 2018 with individuals representing educator organizations, educator preparation institutions, PK-12 teachers and administrators, the Michigan Legislature and the Governor's office, and key offices at the MDE As part of their tasks, the committee reviewed current research, educator organization policy briefs, and other state clinical experience frameworks. After this review, the stakeholder committee came to consensus on a set of goals and non-negotiables for teacher preparation clinical experiences in Michigan that reinforced the MDE's focus on PK-12 students first.

Stakeholders agreed that quality teacher preparation must involve a clinically rich program of study (Dennis, Burns, Tricarico, &

Van Ingen, 2017) that cohesively connects teacher preparation coursework to PK-12 students and schools. This connection shall provide candidates with a deliberate series of mediated, structured clinical experiences (Darling- Hammond, 2018; Zeichner, 2010; Grossman, 2010). These experiences must provide opportunities for teacher candidates to
engage all PK-12 students with a commitment to their learning and to increase participation and responsibility in the classroom under the supervision of an experienced mentor (Grossman, 2010).
Through these experiences, teacher candidates also connect theory to practice from an immersion into the materials of practice of teaching, which can include authentic student work samples, assessment results, or data sets (Grossman, 2010; Darling-Hammond, 2018). The following requirements stem from the consensus of the stakeholder committee and can be viewed in table form in Appendix A-G. (Complete document attached)"

This work will result in substantive clincial requirement changes in our program, documentation of clincial practice in the development of individual candidates, revised co-constructed partnership agreements for clinical practice, and the opportunity to develop non-traditional clinical practice environments such as a birth to eight structured experience for all elementary candidates, a middle college or dual enrollment teaching experience for all secondary candidates, and a coteaching/leading experience between teacher ed and social work candidates in family settings for all candidates. Strengths and weakeness were identified by the stakeholders on this committee to keep the best of current clinical practice and to adopt improved measures and length of stay in each clinical environment assuring that clinical practice was spread out over the entirety of a program and not lumped in at the end. This substantive change for clinical practice over time will provide a higher quality data set for each candidate, licensure areas, and the overall program. Work on new clinical agreements and course structures will coincide with the internal Strategic Resource Allocation conducted at NMU during this same time period. Clinical expectations will be embedded in coursework throughout the program at the initial and advanced levels. A process that engages faculty, clinical partners, alumni, and current students will be utilized and documented.

A complete clinical practices document is attached as evidence.

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

1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
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.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

   Education_SRA_Action_Grid.xlsx
   FULL.MDE.ClinicalRequirements.pdf
   SRA_Task_Force_Report__December_2018.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:	Joe Lubig
Position:	Associate Dean and Director
Phone:	9062271880
E-mail:	jlubig@nmu.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**