2020 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	24770	**AACTE SID:**	
Institution:	Vincennes University		
Unit:			

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	◉	○
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	◉	○
1.1.3 Program listings	◉	○

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

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 <u>initial</u> teacher certification or licensure[1]

22

2.1.2 Number of completers in <u>advanced</u> 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 22

---

[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://www.vinu.edu/data-reports-measures

Description of data accessible via link: This is the majority of our annual reporting data on our Education Department website

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	▓	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2

Link: https://www.vinu.edu/education-preparation-program-data

Description of data accessible via link: These data are our pass rates on licensing exams

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	▓	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3

Link: https://www.vinu.edu/accreditation-and-annual-reports

Description of data accessible via link: This page includes our Title II data as well as our Indiana HR 1388 data

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

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

Level Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
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?

Measure 1 is not posted publicly because we do not have data to make claims on P12 learning. This was the subject of one of our stipulations regarding Standard 4. We have created an instrument designed to give us these data starting in the 2020-21 academic year and will begin posting results to our website as they become available.

For the other measures, we have noted that we have remained relatively flat over the past few years in Teacher Effectiveness Ratings as evidenced by the State data from 2018 (n=40, 93% rated at effective or highly effective by their administrators) and 2019 (n=24, 96% rated at effective or highly effective by their administrators). We have recognized that we have a hole in our data as far as employer satisfaction is concerned - the data from the State is inconsistent in that we do not always get 10 responses on our completers. To that end, we have been working with our local school systems to develop a brief instrument designed at collecting data for teacher effectiveness and instructional skills, knowledge, and dispositions. We hope that these data will aid in filling some of our data holes, especially in years where we do not receive data from the State.

We can also point to our most recent Principal Survey results (n=11) which show general satisfaction with the training and education received by our recent completers, according to their principals. All 11 completers had their training at VU rated as either Satisfied or Very Satisfied by these principals. Areas of potential concern in this survey point to possible issues of pedagogical training, especially in the realm of assessing student performance and using student data to impact future curricular decisions. While the n values for these critiques are small (n=1 and n=2), they do represent areas that we should look into as an EPP.

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 Clinical Partnerships and Practice

EPP has insufficient data demonstrating tracking of clinical experiences with diverse students. (component 2.3)

During the course of conducting the EPP self-study during the 2016-2018 academic years it became self-evident there was a lack of tracking of clinical experiences with diverse students. This was also recognized by the Site Visit Team in its report. As a result, the EPP began the process of tracking candidate placements with the Clinical Experience Chart, our placement concordance and tracking sheet. Through this placement chart, we are working to ensure that candidates get a more diverse series of experiences by placing students in schools in rural areas and areas with high poverty in addition to the school corporations in our immediate vicinity.

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)**   3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity

EPP's recruitment plan was limited. (component 3.1)

During the site visit, the Site Team leader acknowledged that we recruit ALL students. Since the site visit, we have created an early college pipeline with Washington Community School Corporation. We have created a new relationship with Evansville Vanderburgh School Corporation which has a very diverse population. We are going to look into creating a relationship with the Multicultural Affairs department here at the University. The Education Department has contacted a Vincennes University Assistant Director of Admissions to discuss the recruitment plan for the University. The Department Chair will visit with the admissions person in Indianapolis to discuss a recruitment plan for students from that region of the state. Representatives from the Education Department at Vincennes University also attend "Be A Teacher Day" in Indianapolis which has 400 students from all over Indiana who are interested in becoming a teacher. The EPP also actively works within its own program to recruit Early Childhood majors within the University to give them information about our programs and to encourage them to continue their training in our BS programs in Special Education and Elementary Education.

CAEP: **Areas for Improvement (ITP)**   3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity

The EPP provided limited evidence of candidates academic achievement. (component 3.2)

Since the writing of the self-study report in 2018, the EPP has raised their internal standard for admission to the program from a GPA of 2.75 overall and 2.75 in Education courses to a 3.0 cumulative GPA and a 3.0 GPA in major courses. This sets our department as having some of the highest entrance requirements in the State of Indiana as evidenced by the most recent HEA 1388 comparison matrix, published by the State of Indiana (https://drive.google.com/file/d/1wDsm2tsNz_2pvkUbWFUTSOU7y7nKNqCy/view). We have also gone away from the CASA entrance exams for reading, writing, and mathematics since they were not determined to be valid and reliable and have switched to the PRAXIS Core exam. The PRAXIS Core exam is now the gateway requirement for entrance into the Education Program. The EPP will also use the ACT and SAT as an alternative pathway if students have them, and they meet the minimum requirement. The PRAXIS Core exam has been recognized by CAEP as being valid and reliable.

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

The EPP provided a plan that did not meet sufficiency criteria. (component 4.1)

The EPP acknowledges that there were significant data shortages and shortfalls at the time of the self study report's publication and at the site visit. During the site visit, much discussion was had about a case study approach to meeting the sufficiency criteria for assessing program impact and completer success. Since those initial discussions, Vincennes University has elected to take a different approach. At its November 2019 the EPP presented to its Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) the findings of the CAEP Accreditation Action Report. On the agenda were two questions:
1. How can we collect data on how our graduates are impacting student learning?
2. How can we track graduate ability to apply professional knowledge, skills and dispositions as measured through observation and or P-12 surveys?
During the discussion it became apparent TEAC members would be willing to provide the information we need from them regarding graduates impact on P-12 learning. Gauging TEAC feedback, the EPP developed a two-pronged approach to gathering program impact data. The first prong would involve the development and implementation of a "Program Impact Survey" to distribute to administrators of area schools were Year 1-3 Vincennes University graduates are employed. The second prong would be the distribution to, and collection of data from, Year 1-3 VU graduates of the psycho-social instrument, "My Class Inventory" (MCI) The MCI would be distributed twice a year.

The "Program Impact Survey" was presented to, and reviewed by, a TEAC member January 30, 2020 who approved the form and format. It was suggested that it be distributed shortly after the school year ends when administrators are assessing previous year data as well and beginning to make decisions regarding personnel for the upcoming year.

The "My Class Inventory" (MCI) instrument is a simplified for of the "Learning Environment Inventory" and is suitable for children in the 8 to 12 years' age range. Although the MCI was developed originally for use at the elementary school level, it also has been found to be very useful with students at the seventh grade level, especially among students who might experience reading difficulties. There are five scales - cohesiveness, friction, difficulty, satisfaction and competitiveness. Statistical information about the MCI information is available. Students' perceptions of the classroom psycho-social learning environment has a large impact on learning and behavior. While not directly acquiring individual student and classroom achievement data, Vincennes University would be gathering data on those aspects of students' perceptions that directly impact student achievement. This instrument would be distributed to our recent completers twice a year for completion - once during the first couple of weeks of the school year and once during the last month of the school year. By implementing the MCI twice a year we can measure the teacher's impact on student perceptions over the course of the year on the classroom psychosocial environment and their impact on student learning and behavior. Teachers of lower grades would have to read the questions to the students.

CAEP: **Stipulation (ITP)**   4 Program Impact

The EPP does not provide a plan for collecting data focused on completers' ability to effectively apply professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions as measured through observation and/or P-12 student surveys. (component 4.2)

The EPP acknowledges that there were significant data shortages and shortfalls at the time of the self study report's publication and at the site visit. During the site visit, much discussion was had about a case study approach to meeting the sufficiency criteria for assessing program impact and completer success. Since those initial discussions, Vincennes University has since elected to take a different approach. At its November 2019 the EPP presented to its Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) the findings of the CAEP Accreditation Action Report. On the agenda were two questions:
1. How can we collect data on how our graduates are impacting student learning?
2. How can we track graduate ability to apply professional knowledge, skills and dispositions as measured through observation and or P-12 surveys?
During the discussion it became apparent TEAC members would be willing to provide the information we need from them regarding graduates impact on P-12 learning. Gauging TEAC feedback, the EPP developed a two-pronged approach to gathering program impact data. The first prong would involve the development and implementation of a "Program Impact Survey" to distribute to administrators of area schools were Year 1-3 Vincennes University graduates are employed. The second prong would be the distribution to, and collection of data from, Year 1-3 VU graduates of the psycho-social instrument, "My Class Inventory" (MCI) The MCI would be distributed twice a year.

The "Program Impact Survey" was presented to, and reviewed by, a TEAC member January 30, 2020 who approved the form and format. It was suggested that it be distributed shortly after the school year ends when administrators are assessing previous year data as well and beginning to make decisions regarding personnel for the upcoming year.

The "My Class Inventory" (MCI) instrument is a simplified for of the "Learning Environment Inventory" and is suitable for children in the 8 to 12 years' age range. Although the MCI was developed originally for use at the elementary school level, it also has been found to be very useful with students at the seventh grade level, especially among students who might experience reading difficulties. There are five scales - cohesiveness, friction, difficulty, satisfaction and competitiveness. Statistical information about the MCI information is available. Students' perceptions of the classroom psycho-social learning environment has a large impact on learning and behavior. While not directly acquiring individual student and classroom achievement data, Vincennes University would be gathering data on those aspects of students' perceptions that directly impact student achievement. This instrument would be distributed to our recent completers twice a year for completion - once during the first couple of weeks of the school year and once during the last month of the school year. By implementing the MCI twice a year we can measure the teacher's impact on student perceptions over the course of the year on the classroom psychosocial environment and their impact on student learning and behavior. Teachers of lower grades would have to read the questions to the students.

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

EPP does not provide sufficient evidence of future meetings to address data and data driven results that are used in decision making. (component 5.3)

We now have an established Teacher Education – Advisory Council (TE-AC) team, where before participation in the council was sporadic and disorganized. This team, comprised of local teachers, administrators, special education professionals and alumni, meet on a regular basis (semiannually at minimum), both in-person and virtually, and have used their input to make changes to our programs through our structured discussions in these meetings and survey instruments that we give to the committee-at-large. Data are collected via these avenues at least twice a year.

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

EPP has insufficient documentation of external partners participation in program evaluation, improvements, or designing assessments. (component 5.5)

Since our site visit, we have established several protocols to document such interactions. First, we have constructed several surveys and collected data from the TE-AC meetings as well as the "Teacher Meet and Greet" meetings that are helping us design assessments and make curriculum improvements.

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

EPP did not provide documented evidence of a Quality Assurance System. (component 5.1)

Since receiving the final 2019 CAEP Accreditation Action Report the Chair of the Education Department at Vincennes University has met with the Provost to consult with and begin the creation of a quality assurance manual. The Chair of the Education Department has also been consulted for their input into the QAM. A draft QAM is being circulated amongst the members of the Education Department at the time of this submission.

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

EPP does not provide plans/or progress toward sharing and acting upon measures and data results of completer impact on P-12 student growth. (component 5.4)

In Vincennes University's EPP rejoinder of April 2019 it was acknowledged there was a lack of supporting evidence that demonstrated the EPPs "provide plans/or progress toward sharing, and acting upon measures and data results of completer impact on P-12 student growth".

A process has been initiated and implemented to begin the meeting process for the purpose of obtaining, discussing and decision making on the basis of data gathered from all concerned parties. In addition, work is being done to update our website to allow for the more timely dissemination of public data on the key aspects of program impact and success, as outlined in the annual report.

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

The EPP did not provide a quality assurance system that relies on relevant, verifiable, representative cumulative or actionable measures. (component 5.2)

Since receiving the final 2019 CAEP Accreditation Action Report, the Chair of the Education Department at Vincennes University has met with the Provost to consult with and begin the creation of a quality assurance manual. The Chair of the Education Department has also been consulted for their input into the QAM. As of the writing of this report, a draft QAM is being circulated amongst the faculty and stakeholders of the Education Department. In addition, a process has been initiated and implemented to begin a formalized meeting process for the purposes of obtaining, discussing data and allowing these data and the stakeholders involved in the department to be involved in the decision making process.

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?

As part of the on-going efforts by the EPP to improve its program, the EPP reviewed data gathered from student surveys and Teacher Education Advisory Council discussions and surveys. These data included questions regarding how well the candidate felt they were prepared for teaching across a number of areas. At the Fall 2019 TEAC meeting, discussions were held around a number of questions. The purpose of the discussions was to gain input from our advisory council to help in make decisions about our programs.

As the EPP reviewed the data, some of the strengths identified included the large number of field experience hours, the breadth of experiences, the candidate's developing of close working relationships through the program with both professors and other students, and the building of professional relationships. Some of the weaknesses identified included student unfamiliarity with some of the newer curriculum initiatives in area districts, some technology programs being utilized in schools, and in some cases, the candidates themselves expressed a desire for more field experience hours, especially in key parts of their training and development.

One of the major changes/additions made by the EPP was to increase the number of field experience hours prior to student teaching. The number of field experience hours in EDUC 290 – Initial Experiences increased from 30 in AY 2017 to 60 hours in AY 2018. Discussions are being held internally regarding whether to increase the requirement to 90 hours in future academic year, but those discussions are preliminary at this point. Additionally, we have implemented a more comprehensive tracking system to better ensure a broader set of experiences for candidates. Curricular adaptations have been made as well, inviting speakers "from the trenches" to present to classes to share current issues schools are facing and candidates will have to contend with upon entering the classroom.

These changes to the EPP curriculum occurred through increased field experience hours and using educators "from the trenches" has only been added in AY 2018 and 2019 and therefore there is no testing of the innovation. Anecdotal evidence from Teacher Education Advisory Council discussions suggests that there has been widespread support for the addition from candidates and K-12 partners.

After the 2018-2019 CAEP site visit, steps were taken by the EPP to improve student recruitment. Steps included the Department Chair coordinating with university recruitment offices, EPP faculty recording radio spots that promoted our programs and were later broadcast and the addition of an EPP Instagram account. In response to critiques by the site visit team during the accreditation cycle, the EPP increased their admission GPA requirement to 3.0 cumulative GPA and 3.0 GPA in all major-related course work (from 2.75 for each). This puts our EPP as having the highest entrance GPA in the State of Indiana for its education program, according to the most recent publication of the HEA 1388 Comparison Matrix (https://drive.google.com/file/d/1wDsm2tsNz_2pvkUbWFUTSOU7y7nKNqCy/view). As an additional measure, the EPP no longer uses the CASA basic skills test for entrance into the program. Instead, we have moved to the PRAXIS Core Assessment, a normed examination that has been previously approved by CAEP as being valid and reliable.

In research for our 2017-2018 CAEP Annual and in preparation for our 2018-2019 on-site CAEP visit it became apparent that there was no written documentation of our quality assurance system. While the system was well understood by the faculty at that time, documentation was not evident. Since that time, a quality assurance manual has been created. Each year, students and TEAC members are surveyed and analyzed by the EPP for potential program changes. In an attempt to get richer data from recent completers as to their impact on student learning, the EPP has adopted the My Class Inventory instrument (Anderson, 1971). This instrument, along with the adoption of the Program Impact Survey, (created and developed by the EPP and to be piloted in late Spring or early Summer 2020) will give a broad perspective in a number of program elements for possible modification.

The EPP reviewed data gathered from student and TEAC discussions and surveys. This data included questions regarding how well the candidate felt they were prepared across a number of areas. At its Fall 2019 TEAC meeting discussion was held around a number of questions. The purpose of the discussion was to gain TEAC anecdotal input from our partners.

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

> 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.

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or 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:	Jonathan Leonard
Position:	Assistant Professor
Phone:	(812) 888-5951
E-mail:	jleonard@vinu.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**