

2018 EPP Annual Report

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

Section 1. AIMS Profile

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

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

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

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2016-2017 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)²

Total number of program completers 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 2016-2017 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
No Change / Not Applicable

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.
No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited
No Change / Not Applicable

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
No Change / Not Applicable

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements
No Change / Not Applicable

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

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: <http://my.vinu.edu/education>

Description of data accessible via link: Education Department Webpage

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"/>							
Advanced-Level Programs	<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?

Due to the size of our program, trend data are hard to find and create in the impact measures domain due to the fact that even with a good response rate (all of our surveys to administrators and post-graduates have response rates at or greater than 20%), we are averaging fewer than ten responses per year for a number of these surveys. In some cases, we do not even have ten total responses over the three year period under study. For these reasons, longitudinal data have been hard to come by and trends have been hard to identify in some areas based upon these particular assessments and measures.

In spite of this, we are able to use some of our data collected by the State of Indiana and compare it with other colleges and universities in the state through the Indiana Department of Education website as well as the IDOE's own published statewide averages. IDOE collects four measures each year for every college and university in the state: Attrition Rate, Principal Survey, Teacher Survey on EPP Preparation, and an rating survey measuring how many teachers from each EPP receive ratings of "Effective" or "Highly Effective" in their first three years of teaching. The results for these four metrics are posted on the Indiana DOE website for each university as well as the statewide averages. Thus far, only the 2015-16 academic year data is available. 2016-17 data has been collected and will be posted by the state in the next few months.

For the first metric, the attrition rate, the statewide average retention+graduation rate in education was 93.8%. At VU, the

retention+graduation rate was 98.5%. The statewide average attrition rate for students who leave the program (but stay at the university) was 2.6%; the attrition rate for students who leave the institution entirely was 3.8%. At VU those same rates were 0% and 1.5% respectively. So compared to the other EPPs in Indiana, we are retaining more of our students and fewer are leaving. These are positive trends for our students and our program as a whole.

For the second metric, the principal's survey, this is a measure of completer performance in three essential domains - content knowledge, pedagogy, and dispositions. In addition to those Likert-style items, one other question is asked about the satisfaction of the level of training received by the teacher at their EPP. Ratings range on a four-point scale from Very Dissatisfied to Very Satisfied. The statewide average number of Satisfied and Very Satisfied ratings is 93%. VU, like several institutions in the state, had fewer than 10 respondents to this survey, so no data trends could be drawn. The DOE has stated that the timing of the state law requiring these surveys might have decreased response rates, so there is hope that more data will be available in the 2016-17 cycle.

The third metric was the completer survey. In this survey, recent completers of the program rate the EPP on how prepared they were in terms of content knowledge, pedagogy, and dispositional information. Completers then rated their EPPs on a four-point scale (Poor to Excellent) to describe how well they were prepared for their jobs by the EPP. The statewide average percent for EPPs rated at Good or Excellent in their preparation of candidates was 96%. VU had fewer than 10 respondents to this survey. Considering that we only had 21 completers that year, to get ten to take the survey would have required almost a 50% response rate which is somewhat high for survey research.

The last metric collected by the state is the evaluation of 1st, 2nd, and 3rd year teachers by their administrators on a scale of Ineffective, Improvement Necessary, Effective, and Highly Effective. Collection is done each of the first three years of employment following graduation. The data show that in this year, 71% of teachers in their first three years of teaching were rated as effective, 25% were rated as highly effective, making 96% of those teachers rated at either effective or highly effective. For VU, 68% of our completers were rated as effective and 32% were rated as highly effective, for a total of 100% of our completers being rated as effective or highly effective. Again, this is a positive for our program and our completers as we are rating above the state averages.

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.

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 3 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. The unit does not provide secondary candidates sufficient field experience opportunities at the middle and high school levels to observe in schools, work with students, and interact with families, (ITP) teachers, and other school professionals before clinical practice.

This has been fully recognized as an issue by this department and we are starting to make significant steps overall toward getting all of our students more field experience prior to student teaching, not just our secondary students. First, we have upped the number of observation hours in our initial experiences course (EDUC 290) from 30 hours to 60 hours of experience. This experience is not defined as being exclusively middle or high school experience. In addition, students will now do a 45 hour placement in a middle or high school resource room in EDUC 393/395 (Practicum in Special Education/Field Experience).

In addition to these, a 30 hour middle school observation/teaching experience is now being integrated into EDUC 421 (Math Methods I) and EDUC 431 (Science Methods I). A 30 hour high school observation/teaching experience is now being integrated into EDUC 422 (Math Methods II) and EDUC 432 (Science Methods II). Both of these field experiences include a mandatory lesson that must be delivered in the classroom placement. In total, we have changed the number of hours of pre-clinical experiences from 30 in EDUC 290 (with some unspecified numbers in upper level courses) to 165 hours total, some of which must be split between middle and high school experiences with a minimum of two lessons delivered in those experiences related to our methods courses. We believe this will help our candidates be more prepared for student teaching. We hope to implement these new plans starting in the Fall 2018 semester.

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. The unit cannot ensure that all candidates have the opportunity to interact with faculty members from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds. (ITP)
2. Secondary candidate placement does not include an opportunity to work with students from diverse backgrounds. (ITP)

1. For this AFI, we have worked to diversify our base of cooperating teachers to allow students more opportunities to work with faculty members from diverse backgrounds. We have also begun the collection of demographic data for our cooperating teachers for all of our student placements. This data collection began in the Spring 2018 semester. Early returns on those data indicate a cooperating teacher base that is 36% male, 64% female, 89% white, and 11% non-white (7% Hispanic and 4% African-American). While these returns are incomplete at this time, more data will become available as the semester progresses and as future semesters move forward. In addition to these experiences with affiliated faculty, efforts have been made in recent job searches to attract a diverse applicant pool. Job openings have been posted in The Chronicle of Higher Education as well as on higheredjobs.com, LinkedIn, and the Vincennes University website. Vincennes University is an Affirmative Action/Equal

Opportunity Employer. These efforts have yielded a very diverse pool of applicants. Our most recent job search has yielded several applicants from other countries and diverse backgrounds.

2. Recent efforts have been made to diversify the experience for all students in our programs, including those in the secondary education placements. In Fall 2016, we participated in a multi-university collaboration for cultural diversity simulations through the SimSchool program. We ultimately moved away from this program because we felt it was too limited in its diversity of experiences, especially for those in the special education fields. In Fall 2017, we used a Pearson video analysis tool in that same EDUC 293/295 course to provide a diversity of experiences for our teacher candidates. This program has been useful in providing different experiences than SimSchool, but has been lighter in terms of cultural diversity. In addition to these simulated experiences, work has been done by our placement coordinator to diversify the number and types of schools that our secondary candidates are placed into. We now have placements in schools with a variety of diverse backgrounds including rural, urban, and suburban schools, schools that are high achieving and low achieving, and schools that have a variety of socioeconomic factors. By increasing the number of courses that have required placement experiences and by increasing the variety of schools that are available for placement, our candidates should have a wide variety of experience with different kinds of students prior to their student teaching experience, plus whatever experiences that they gain from their student teaching.

Education coordinator works with placements of students to place students in a variety of types of schools including rural, high achieving, low achieving, high SES, low SES, etc.

In addition, we started a partnership for Vincennes Community School Corporation for an after-school program in their schools.

Where does HR advertise?

What data do we have on our cooperating teachers and their diversity?

Started collecting data Spring 2018 on Cooperating Teacher Data form sent with disposition forms.

What data can we acquire about current/recent applicants and their diversity?

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 5 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. The unit lacks sufficient evidence that professional education faculty members are actively engaged in scholarship. (1 TP)

The mission of Vincennes University and its nature as a predominantly two-year community college with seven baccalaureate programs puts the focus for faculty on teaching and classroom practice as opposed to original research and professional practices. While efforts have been made recently to involve our FTE faculty in professional development related to CAEP and other accreditation-related subjects, monies have not been available recently for professional development for classroom practices or scholarly works.

In addition, low enrollment and other budgetary factors have largely frozen professional development funds outside of those related to CAEP and accreditation. Along with workload (15 credit hours per semester term in classroom), advising (all FTE faculty have no fewer than 30 advisees), and recruitment/retention practices, there remains little time in our schedules to pursue more scholarly types of work.

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?

One of the pieces that we are proudest of in this latest academic year has been our work on improving the data artifacts that we are collecting from our candidates. As we approached our self-study deadline, our department decided to look at our assessments that were forged in the initial accreditation phase of NCATE to see how they stacked up to the sufficiency standards for CAEP. During a two-day retreat, our department looked at each of our assessments and compared them to the CAEP rubrics, to some alarming results. In short, we looked at our assessments objectively and determined that they were problematic. One of the biggest issues that we identified in those assessments was that the rubric being used to assess performance were incredibly vague, general, and lacked distinguishing features between the levels of performance to indicate how candidates differed from our expectations. In addition, we had no validity data to back our use of the assignments or their rubrics, and little internal reliability in terms of what the rubric terms meant and how to apply them to our candidates. Based on these concerns, it was determined that the majority of our assignments would need to undergo some form of change, either in format of assignment, construction of the rubric, or both. These were universal problems across elementary and secondary programs alike. As a result, we identified four assessments that needed the greatest attention the most quickly. These assessments were chosen because they were the most important assessments in the program and gave us the greatest information as to whether a candidate was truly ready to graduate and be an effective teacher. These assessments were our midterm and end-year Student Teaching Evaluations (evaluations conducted by the cooperating teacher at the middle and end of a candidate's placement), our Student Teaching Observation form (evaluations conducted by both University faculty members as well as cooperating teachers), our Project Learning Curve assignment (an assignment that requires candidates to construct a unit plan, an assessment plan for that unit, and do data collection and analysis on those data to show student learning), and our Lesson plan template and rubric. Over the course of the past five months, two of our faculty, one from Elementary/Special education and one from Secondary Education have worked on these four assessments. In most cases, this work required these individuals to not only rewrite the rubrics for the assessments, but to also completely reconstruct the assignment as well. In all cases, the rubrics for these assessments were moved from a simple number scale (both the Student Teacher evaluation and Observation form used a scalar survey-like metric for evaluation with no descriptions for the values being assigned) to a numerical rubric containing 3-4 items ranging from unacceptable to target. Each one of the indicator items has detailed, specific descriptions for the Unacceptable, Acceptable, and Target levels of performance. One of our rubrics, the lesson plan rubric, has a fourth level between the Unacceptable and Acceptable levels called "Developing." This level is used because unlike the other three assessments where the primary audience is teacher candidates in their final semester, lesson planning is a central skill that needs to be developed throughout the curriculum. Adding this additional level allows us to show candidates an extra level of performance that can be present in novice practitioners. As time progresses, we expect our candidates to move beyond that novice level, so the Developing level of practice is no longer needed. In addition to changing these assessments and rubrics, we have also done work in making our rubrics valid and reliable. For validity, we are using our strategic partners in K-12 and our TEAC committee to measure the utility of our rubrics. Using Lawshe methodology, partners are being sent surveys regarding our new rubrics and how they are to be used. For each indicator on the rubric, partners are being asked if the indicator is essential, useful (but not essential), or not useful. In addition, partners are asked to determine if the rubric items measure the indicator successfully and whether the levels of performance are different from each other. Thus far, validity studies have been conducted in this manner for our student teacher evaluation and our student teacher observation forms. Based on the feedback from these groups, we have made some changes to our rubrics and generated discussion with our panels on some of their feedback. With these studies nearing their end, we will pilot these new forms with our teacher candidates entering student teaching in the fall 2018 semester. For reliability studies, we have done two things. First, the involvement of the rest of our department in the development of these new assessments and rubrics has been paramount. By exchanging ideas with each other, we have obtained a better sense of the purpose of these assessments and how to use them. In addition, we are starting to implement a training module for cooperating teachers where we review our rubrics with them and train these cooperating teachers on how to score candidates. The Vincennes University Education Department has made an increased effort to ensure teacher candidates experience several placements with diverse populations. The Education Department faculty have reviewed data from teacher candidates and P-12 school partners and are moving towards a series of field experiences leading to the capstone student teaching placements. Beginning in Fall 2018, teacher candidates will be required to have 60 hours of observation in Initial Experiences (EDUC 290). Previously, the course required 30 hours of observation. In the course Practicum in Special Education (EDUC 393), candidates in

the K-6 dual licensure program, Elementary and Mild Intervention, will now be required to have 90 hours (30 hours previously) of supervised experiences. Also, beginning in Fall 2018, Math and Science secondary candidates will complete 45 hours in a middle or high school resource room. For the K-6 teacher candidates, Corrective Reading (EDUC 364) and Curriculum and Assessment: Today's Classroom (EDUC 350) will complete 15 hours within an after-school program. Candidates will administer assessments, identify areas of need, and prepare mini-lessons for individual K-6 students. In previous years, teacher candidates have had limited assessment experiences working with K-6 students in these two classes, but with an effective partnership with the school corporation, candidates will be enrolled in these two classes the same semester. In addition, K-6 teacher candidates will complete 15 hours of observation/teaching in a K-6 social studies and science classroom. This will be an additional requirement beginning in Fall 2018 for Teaching of Elementary Social Studies (EDUC 360) and Teaching of Elementary Science (EDUC 361). For secondary Math and Science candidates, a 30-hour middle school observation/ teaching experiences will be integrated into Math Method I (EDUC 421) and Science Methods I (EDUC 431). Thirty hours of high school observation/teaching placement will be added in Math Methods II (EDUC 422) and Science Methods II (EDUC 432). These experiences include a mandatory lesson which must be taught in the placement. These new plans will be implemented in the Fall 2018 semester. In summary, the number of placement hours for elementary (K-6) teacher candidates, has increased from 80 hours of pre-clinical experiences to 185. For secondary teacher candidates, the number of hours of pre-clinical experiences has increased from 30 in EDUC 290 (with some unspecified numbers in upper level courses) to 165 hours. The Department believes the reorganization and additional field experiences across the teacher education program are central to the preparation of teacher candidates to develop the skills, knowledge, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all K-12 students' learning and development.

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

- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 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
- 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
- x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

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 service activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

Section 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a successful transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful reflection regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPP's evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progress made on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use the Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level.

If there are no identified gaps, click the box next to "No identified gaps" and proceed to question 7.2.

No identified gaps

If there are identified gaps, please summarize the gaps and any steps planned or taken toward the gap(s) to be fully prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text applies.

In the last calendar year, we have recognized a significant gap in our assessments as it pertains to measuring the CAEP standards and meeting the sufficiency standards for CAEP. As we enumerated in the previous section, a lot of work has gone into revamping or replacing four of our common assessments and raising the bar for expectations on our candidates and their work. We have also worked in this timeframe to make our rubrics for these assessments for clear, eliminating the nondescript 1-5 scale for evaluation and inserting full text rubrics with defined levels of performance associated with them. In addition, two of our new rubrics have already undergone validity metrics using the Lawshe method. Those data are being analyzed and the rubrics are being refined in response to the feedback being received. These two evaluations are being used in a soft pilot this semester for our

elementary/special education candidates' second 8 week student teaching placements. After revisions, a full rollout will be conducted in Fall 2018. In addition to those, two more validity studies will be conducted within the next calendar year for our lesson plan template and rubric as well as our capstone assignment, Project Learning Curve. We will begin a soft pilot with these two assessments in Fall 2018 and a formal conversion once our research is in and some potential revisions are made.

In a similar vein to our assessments projects, we recognize that because poor assessments have been in use in recent years, we will have trouble meeting the mandates for two full years of data for all of the projects associated with several of these standards. While data does exist for these candidates in this timeframe, we recognize that those data may be insufficient to fully meet the criteria outlined by CAEP. Our upcoming pilot studies will provide us some preliminary data by the time of our site visit, but we will not have 2 full years of data with our new assessments/rubrics at the time of the visit.

In addition, attrition and a lack of communication between departmental members has also led to the inadvertent disappearance/deletion of assessment data for two years of Mathematics Education majors. While not all data has been lost in this, a majority of the key assessments in that program are missing for that two-year span. In response to this, our department has reacted by centralizing our data collection methodologies through our Blackboard management site on campus and archiving courses with key assessment data in their curriculum instead of overwriting them. We have also created a master course inside of Blackboard where students can upload their key assessments and have them stored in a central location for easy access by the department/university. We are looking into a way for faculty to upload information into that master site as well to allow additional coverage for the instances when students are unable to upload their materials themselves.

Finally, we have recognized through comparison of our program to others in the state and region that we are lacking field experience hours for our candidates before they get to student teaching. We have begun the process of implementing new and diverse experiences into the curriculum in response to our previous AFIs for Secondary Education, but also in recognition of this potential hole for our Elementary and Special Education majors as well. The number of pre-clinical field experience hours for our candidates will increase by 3-4 times our previous requirements starting in the 2018-19 academic year. In addition, we are pursuing a curricular change in our Secondary Education programs to require candidates to have a longer student teaching experience at 16 weeks (8 in middle, 8 in high school) as opposed to the 10 week placement currently utilized where a candidate may not necessarily see middle school teaching experience at all. This change is still in the preliminary phases, but we aim to have the change viable in our 2019-2020 catalog and moving forward.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the text applies.

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
- 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
- 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
- x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

Yes No

7.3 If no, please describe any changes that mean that the EPP does not continue to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

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 2018 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position: Assistant Professor

Phone: 812-888-4179

E-mail: cragle@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