2021 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11314	AACTE SID:	990
Institution:	East Tennessee State University		
Unit:	Clemmer College		

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

https://www.etsu.edu/coe/aboutcoe/cc_programs.php

Section 2. Program Completers

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

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure[1]

185

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]

21

Total number of program completers 206

---

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

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

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited

3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: https://www.etsu.edu/coe/educator-preparation/data-reports.php

Description of data accessible via link: Annual Reporting Data for CAEP Measures for Initial and Advanced Programs

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?*

4.1 Program impact was not reported on the 2020 TN Board of Education Report Card due to COVID. On the 2019 Report Card, ETSU Exceeded Expectations, which included metrics associated with TVAAS scores. For the 3-years reported, (2017-2019) 66% of the cohort received a TVAAS score of level 3 or above and 33.3% of level 4 or above exceeding the state avgs of 59.5 and 25.2. Progress in this area demonstrates ETSU completers, when compared to state EPPs, positively impact externally benchmarked P-12 students' growth scores across years.

In TNAtlas, cohorts from 2015-2018 show the % of our completers with TVAAS scores are level 3 and above (i.e., 66%) exceeds the state avg of 59.44%. These data indicate our completers are effective in obtaining positive student growth scores. Elem. Education, English, History, and Math exceed the state avg for TVAAS scores for level 3 or above. Middle Grades (MG) fell below the state score.

4.2 Metrics related to teaching effectiveness are not reported in the 2020 Report Card for 2019-2020 due to COVID. The 2019 Report Card rated ETSU as "Exceeds Expectations" for provider impact. Data for Classroom Observation Scores at level 3 or above across the last 3 data cycles show ETSU as performing above the state average.

From TNAtlas Insights Tool, observation scores of graduates at level 3 or above are higher than the state avg for Early Childhood, Elementary, History, and Comprehensive Special Education. Modified Special Education, MG, and Mathematics fall below the state avg with English falling 8.53% below the state avg. Observation scores can also be viewed in terms of avg indicator scores in which ETSU performed at similar levels as the state avgs for all areas with the exception of Content Knowledge. Content Knowledge exceeded the state avg with our institution scoring 4.083, higher than the 3.250 state value.

When combining observation scores with TVAAS scores (i.e., Level of Effectiveness, LOE), ETSU exceeds the state avg for LOE with our EPP scores being 95.1% at level 3 or above and 67.5% at level 4 or above. The state scores include 91.6% and 59.8%. For LOE scores 3 or above, Special Education, Mathematics, English, Elementary, Early Childhood, and Biology exceed state avgs while History and MG show similar results to state avgs. The above findings are reported for 2015-2018. Data from later years have yet to be released or are not available due to COVID.

4.3/A4.1: ETSU Exceeds Expectations for Employment on the 2020 Report Card. ETSU scored below the state avg of 92.5 with a 91.6 for completers who remained teachers in their 2nd year. While the performance on longer term retention rates is positive, in the last 3 cycles of data, we improved. In TNAtlas, for 2015-2018 ETSU completers are retained in the 2nd year at 94.2% and 86% in the 3rd year, exceeding the state avg for both metrics.

The Employer Survey was sent to principals who hired initial completers. Strengths and challenges were individualized for each set of teachers with the majority of the feedback being positive. Employers are satisfied with the quality of the teachers hired. Principals found teachers had difficulty recognizing learning misconceptions in a discipline and creating learning experiences to build accurate conceptual understanding, an area our EPP and LEA partners will further examine. Principals identified strengths including assessment, adapting instruction, designing instruction based on learners' prior knowledge and experiences, developing learning environments, using effective communication with individuals from diverse backgrounds and perspectives, possessing deep knowledge of student content standards and learning progressions in the discipline, planning for instruction based on assessment data, engaging learners with a range of learning and technology tools, using instructional strategies to support and expand learners' communication, and understanding the expectations of the profession. Many of these areas align with 4.4.

In the Reading program, employers felt strong about teachers who completed the program. Employers indicated completers were able to identify students' instructional needs, address those needs in differentiated ways, and design instruction based on those needs. They felt completers did an excellent job communicating with parents and colleagues regarding the needs of the learner. They felt completers were strong advocates for the profession and were very professional in their work.

In the School Librarianship program, employers felt confident in all areas surveyed. Employers felt individuals completers were able to advance students reading and motivation and progress as well as critical thinking, research and creative endeavors. Employers felt individuals have a strong ability to develop and facilitate equal access to print and digital collection for self-directed and collaborative interactions as well as to communicate with others to develop a strong library program. Completers also felt they could use a range of learning and technology tools to access, interpret, and evaluate information and advocate for the profession.

The Educational Leadership program received feedback from LEA partners who observed completers. Completers seem versed in learning theory and instructional strategies. They effectively use statistics and data in making strategic decisions for students. Completers have strong thinking skills and a working knowledge of case law. They build positive working relationships. They are committed to growth in learning, high quality academic study, and effective application of research. Completers could use additional work on budget development and to develop a thorough knowledge of Tennessee Code Annotated Title 49.

Completer milestone data are shared on our website. Data include a list of EPP Completers named Teacher of the Year as well as promotions, advanced degrees, and other recognitions.

4.4/A4.2: In initial programs, the Completer Survey was sent to completers who had been teaching for 1 and 3 years. While individualized strengths and challenges emerged, there were areas noted frequently. For example, programs' preparedness to help students understand and use multiple assessment methods was a challenge for 5 programs, yet some program completers identified the program as preparing them for such tasks. We targeted assessments within coursework and additional webinars/workshops to help students improve in this domain. Five programs identified the programs preparation for using a range of learning and technology to access, interpret and evaluate information as a challenge. Programs embedded technology requirements and emphasize Google Certification, digital learning, robotics, and computational thinking. For all programs, technology moved to the forefront given the pandemic. EPP resources were allocated to increase our access to technology and resources to enhance instruction using technology. Five of our programs' completers indicated a lack of confidence in using instructional strategies to support and expand learners' communication while five programs' revealed this as a strength. Activities to address learner communication will be added to coursework to help students develop a variety of methods to improve P-12 learners' communication. As a challenge, five programs' data identified program preparedness on seeking opportunities to draw on educational theory, policy, and research for analysis and reflection. Emphasis in coursework has increased given the alignment with students' effectiveness on lesson planning and the edTPA. Finally, a challenge across programs was Expectations of the Profession. A major targeted strategy for this challenge is the revision of our educational foundations courses to clearly address timely issues (e.g., diversity, trauma informed care). We are reinforcing the concepts in the Educator Disposition Assessment in coursework so students understand professional dispositions. Overall completers shared feedback highlighting strengths of programs and the EPP while providing areas to target for continuous improvement.

In Fall 2020 via the completer survey, Reading candidates felt confident in their ability to assess learners' needs using a variety of assessments, use information to design and differentiate instruction, and provide an effective learning environment. Completers felt positive about working and communicating with school personnel and families to support learner development and

achievement and to advance the profession. As a result of completer feedback the program will make changes to READ 5120 – Teaching Reading and Writing to include a module focusing on standards and how to teach critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to the discipline.

From the completer survey, Librarianship completers felt confident in their ability to develop and facilitate equal access to print and digital collections, communicating with students, teachers, administrators, and community members to develop a strong library program. Completers also felt they were able to use a range of learning and technology tools to access, interpret, and evaluate information as well as advocate for the profession.

In the Educational Leadership completer survey the lowest questions averaged to 3.65 (on a 4 pt scale), well above program expectations include: 1) strive for equity of educational opportunity and culturally responsive practices, 2) engaging families and the community, and 3) managing school operations and resources. Current plans for improvement of the program are based upon further discussions of these three areas with current candidates and LEAs. Greatest strengths identified in the survey included: 1) acting ethically and according to professional norms, 2) cultivating an inclusive, caring, and supportive school community, and 3) acting as an agent of continuous improvement.

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.

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?

5.3 The EPP has created a Quality Assurance System that integrates regular and systematic opportunities for ongoing program review. The EPP typically holds 6 data meetings a year to review key assessment data and other key reports within initial programs. Given that we submitted our self-study report this year, data meetings exceeded the typical schedule. Additional planning and data review meetings were held with advanced level programs.

Data meetings allow program faculty to assess candidate and completer performance against its goals and relevant standards that are defined by a college standardized criteria and instruments that are based on InTASC and other relevant standards. Criteria for key assessments such as the edTPA and Praxis examinations are set by the state. In addition, the state provides comparative data that allow some of our key assessments to be benchmarked relative to other institutions. At the data meetings, faculty receive individual cycles of data and 3-cycles of data combined, if available. By providing data in these formats, faculty are able to track results over time. Program faculty form action plans in Qualtrics by analyzing the data to identify strength areas, areas for improvement, and future goals that allow them to test innovations relative to the findings. Action plans outline a means for improving program elements and processes. Faculty review and evaluate the effectiveness of their prior action plans for continuous improvement purposes. Data templates are available for each key assessment to showcase disaggregated data and analyses for our licensure programs according to level (i.e., undergraduate or graduate), site (i.e., main campus or cohort location), and program type (i.e., traditional or job embedded). Each of the Initial and Advanced Programs has a timeline for reviewing data with established goals within the Initial and Advanced Programs. For example, all programs have a goal to increase candidates from underrepresented populations. The EPP regularly meets to evaluate our baseline criteria to determine if adjustments are needed to make data more actionable.

Beyond data meetings, data are shared with LEA partners in which discussion regarding the importance of the findings, relationship with what is being seen of our residency candidates and completers, and ideas are collaboratively generated to guide our EPP in additional program improvements. ETSU LEA Network meetings are held twice a year with each partnering school—Kingsport City Schools, Johnson City Schools and University School.

Candidate Demographic Data is collected as selection criteria for candidates proceeding through the educator preparation programs at both the initial and advanced levels. Initial licensure candidates at the undergraduate level are able to proceed through our educator preparation programs through Residency I. They must meet our GPA and teacher admission test score (ACT/SAT/Praxis Core) selection criteria prior to entering Residency I. Although not tracked at earlier levels of advisement, upon entry into the teacher education program (i.e., the time to determine whether a candidate desires a licensure or non-licensure program), our candidates progress through the programming having met our selection criteria. Those students who have not progressed in our initial programs have not done so due to no longer desiring to become a teacher, having not passed subject-specific Praxis examinations and dispositional issues in which candidates are counseled to another career path. At the graduate level, initial licensure and advanced level candidates must meet selection criteria prior to admission into the graduate program. It is very rare that students who do not meet these requirements apply for our programs. Therefore, it is unknown as to how the selection criteria impacts applications. Based on institutional data regarding test scores (i.e., ACT and SAT) for ETSU racially and ethnically diverse students, it can be presumed that those students interested in an education licensure path may find our state-imposed selection criteria as a barrier to pursuing these programmatic paths. Our need for additional candidates from underrepresented populations and high need endorsement areas has informed our recruitment and retention plan. We have increased our engagement with area LEAs around these two issues. We have also sought personnel preparation grants and training monies to incentivize students to come to ETSU. Our special education program and STEM areas have benefitted from such efforts.

Candidates experiencing an array of challenges including meeting progression points participate in our Student Support Initiative (SSI) aimed at giving them the greatest shot at success. Students who do not ultimately meet the progression points, even after great support from their program faculty to prepare them to do so, are advised to enter non-licensure routes for degree completion. Although we have always supported students who are experiencing challenges, we formalized the SSI. The SSI is a retention service to assist students who may be experiencing academic, personal, or financial difficulties. This process was especially helpful during COVID as we were able to identify students who had financial needs and supported them with textbooks, food, housing, and tuition support to ensure that they stayed in school. In addition, we have become more intentional about providing boot camps and workshops targeting skills and knowledge needed by our candidates with regard to edTPA and Praxis Content exams. Significant preparation and supports, which are data-informed, for the edTPA have been offered by our edTPA Coordinator and programs, which correlates with the great success that our students achieve on that key assessment. Within the edTPA designed supports, we also connect the workshops to TEAM and Lesson Plan content, which crosses over into other key assessments. Earlier coursework preparation for the TEAM and Lesson Plan also allows students to become familiar with terminology that builds their preparedness for the edTPA and for the classroom. These integrated and cross-cutting efforts have yielded positive results on students' performance on key assessments.

We have made great strides in involving LEA partners in our continuous improvement efforts. Clinical partnerships with our local LEAs have assisted us in making data-informed decisions that have guided innovation. A noteworthy effort is our year-long, internship model called the Kingsport Academy for Teaching (KAT). This program that offers an enhanced student teacher experience in which students are fully integrated into the school setting beyond that of a typical student teaching. The LEA provides students with a stipend for their additional efforts and responsibility. Data from this model of excellence indicated a reciprocal benefit to residency candidate and the school. With our partnering school system, we expanded the program internally across the district and into a broader array of licensure areas. We also expanded the program to another school outside of the district.

Our middle grades TVAAS data as described in 4.2 fell below the state average. LEA Partners were consulted regarding our MG completers' TVAAS and felt candidates may not know "how to add value to a student's education." It was also recognized as P-12 students reach higher grade levels, it becomes more difficult to add value. Based on feedback, the MG program faculty plan to evaluate coursework adding an assessment/evaluation component to courses and to include analysis of data sets and instructional action plans. These data will be monitored closely to determine if the coursework adaptations help to improve the TVAAS performance of our completers.

English completers performed well below the state avg for observation scores (TEAM) reported in the TNAtlas Insights Tool. In reviewing UG and MAT English TEAM scores as candidates, English majors score well. Based on the data a meeting with English mentors has been arranged to discuss how the program might improve to ensure completers' success. We will explore a workshop for English alumni and LEA partners to help English alumni and current English candidates become more successful on the TEAM.

For the data discussed in 4.24 above, interventions and efforts were put into place to address program needs. For instance, we targeted assessments within coursework and additional webinars to help students improve in that domain. Programs embedded technology requirements and emphasize Google Certification, digital learning, robotics, and computational thinking. For all programs, technology moved to the forefront given the pandemic. EPP resources were allocated to increase our access to technology and resources to enhance instruction using technology. For programs that found Expectations of the Profession to be an area of challenge, revision of our educational foundations courses will reinforce timely issues (e.g., diversity, trauma informed care). We will also further reinforce concepts from the Educator Disposition Assessment in coursework.

While the above showcases examples of using data to guide our continuous improvement at the EPP and program level, this process is engrained in our quality assurance system. At our data meetings, efforts that we have put into place from our last data review cycle are reviewed. It is determined whether our efforts have been effective, whether are needs are the same and any forward movement towards continuous improvement. Having our faculty and LEA partners involved in ongoing action planning has created a system in which all are knowledgeable and our processes are informed by key stakeholders and the data.

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

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
1.5 Model and apply technology standards
2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
4.3 Employer satisfaction
4.4 Completer satisfaction
5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
A.5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
A.5.5 Continuous Improvement
x.1 Diversity

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

📎 **edTPA_Disaggregated_Data_Templates.pdf**
📎 **Advanced_Programs_Disaggregated_Data_Templates.pdf**
📎 **Candidate_Demographic_Data_Disaggregated_Templates.pdf**
📎 **Completer_Survey_Disaggregated_Data_Template.pdf**
📎 **Diversity_Survey_Disaggregated_Data_Templates.pdf**
📎 **Educator_Disposition_Assessment_Disaggregated_Data_Template.pdf**
📎 **End_of_Program_Disaggregated_Data_Templates.pdf**
📎 **Lesson_Plan_Disaggregated_Data_Templates.pdf**
📎 **Mentor_Teacher_Evaluation_Survey_Disaggregated_Data_Templates.pdf**
📎 **PraxisII_Disaggregated_Data_Templates.pdf**
📎 **Principal_Employer_Survey_Disaggregated_Data_Template.pdf**
📎 **Supervisor_Survey_of_Mentor_Teachers_Analysis.docx**
📎 **TEAM_Disaggregated_Data_Templates.pdf**
📎 **Technology_Survey_Disaggregated_Data_Template.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 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a succe
transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful r
regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the fo
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 progre
on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may hel
the Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial lev
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
prepared by your CAEP site review in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text

---

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

Not applicable

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Q
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 Stand
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 2021 EPP Annual Report.*

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

Report Preparer's Information

Name:	Cynthia Chambers
Position:	Associate Dean of Educator Preparation
Phone:	4234397586
E-mail:	chamberc@etsu.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 reviews.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount 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 review report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

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

action.
☑ **Acknowledge**