

# 2019 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	10342	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	424
<b>Institution:</b>	Boise State University		
<b>Unit:</b>	College of Education		

## 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 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure<sup>1</sup>

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.)<sup>2</sup>

**Total number of program completers** 324

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

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

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

**Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2017-2018 academic year?**

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.
- 3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited
- 3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited
- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements
- Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:
- 3.6 Change in regional accreditation status
- 3.7 Change in state program approval

## Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

**Link:** <https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/2019-caep-annual-reporting-measures/>

**Description of data accessible via link:** See section: 1. IMPACT ON P-12 LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT (COMPONENT 4.1)

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

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2

**Link:** <https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/2019-caep-annual-reporting-measures/>

**Description of data accessible via link:** See section: 2. INDICATORS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS (COMPONENT 4.2)

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3

**Link:** <https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/2019-caep-annual-reporting-measures/>

**Description of data accessible via link:** See section: 3. SATISFACTION OF EMPLOYERS (COMPONENT 4.3 | A.4.1)

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4

Link: <https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/employer-satisfaction/>  
 Description of data accessible via link: Employer satisfaction survey information translated for a general audience.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5

Link: <https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/2019-caep-annual-reporting-measures/>

Description of data accessible via link: See section: 4. SATISFACTION OF COMPLETERS (COMPONENT 4.4 | A.4.2)

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6

Link: <https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/alumni-satisfaction/>

Description of data accessible via link: Alumni satisfaction survey information translated for a general audience.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7

Link: <https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/2019-caep-annual-reporting-measures/>

Description of data accessible via link: See section: 5. GRADUATION RATES

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8

Link: <https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/2019-caep-annual-reporting-measures/>

Description of data accessible via link: See section: 6. LICENSING AND STATE REQUIREMENTS

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

9

Link: <https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/licensure-information/>

Description of data accessible via link: Licensure and consumer information translated for a general audience.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10

Link: <https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/2019-caep-annual-reporting-measures/>

Description of data accessible via link: See section: 7. PLACEMENT RATES: INITIAL CERTIFICATION

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11

Link: <https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/placement-rates/>

Description of data accessible via link: Placement rate information translated for a general audience.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12

Link: <https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/2019-caep-annual-reporting-measures/>

Description of data accessible via link: See section: 8. CONSUMER INFORMATION: BOISE STATE EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS THAT LEAD TO LICENSURE

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

13

Link: <https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/2019-caep-annual-reporting-measures/>

Description of data accessible via link: See section: 8. CONSUMER INFORMATION: STUDENT LOAN DEFAULT RATES

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

14

Link: <https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/2019-caep-annual-reporting-measures/>

Description of data accessible via link: See section: 8. CONSUMER INFORMATION: STARTING TEACHER SALARIES IN IDAHO

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

15

Link: <https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/2019-caep-annual-reporting-measures/>

Description of data accessible via link: See section: 8. CONSUMER INFORMATION: IDAHO CERTIFICATION LOOKUP

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

16

Link: <https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/2019-caep-annual-reporting-measures/>

Description of data accessible via link: See section: 8. CONSUMER INFORMATION: NASDTEC INTERSTATE AGREEMENT

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

17

Link: <https://education.boisestate.edu/caep/2019-caep-annual-reporting-measures/>

Description of data accessible via link: See section: 8. CONSUMER INFORMATION: WHAT CAN I DO WITH MY CERTIFICATION?

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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?*

Boise State Teacher Education (TE) faculty have continued our work with completer case studies in order to focus on CAEP annual reporting measures connected to completer performance. Likewise, we continue to document completer placement status and employer satisfaction through shared and validated surveys across the state of Idaho. Alumni perceptions of their preparation are also met through surveys. With a focus on our work as TE across the professional life span, we have maintained more contact with completers and their employers, increased response rates on surveys, and continued our work with completer case studies through teacher induction programs that include signature assignments that mirror what occurred in program. In 2017-2018, Boise State TE faculty led a State Agency Higher Education (SAHE) Partnership Grant (Idaho State Board of Education in connection with Eligible Partnership Subgrants for Title II Part A Subpart 3 in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001) for a statewide induction project modeled after prior Boise State completer case studies. This statewide project also allowed for disaggregate data so each EPP could identify outcomes for its individual program completers across the state.

Metrics from this induction project included the Studying Practice and Student Learning (SPSL) unit study including Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and the Tripod Survey of Student Perceptions (Ferguson, 2012), teacher observations, focus group interviews, SPSL workshops to support teaching and learning, and principal evaluations, interviews, and surveys. Each of these measures has been used in each completer study, allowing for comparisons in data trends over time.

For example, in the last completer study (2015-2016), 75 percent of all SPSL units resulted in effective or highly effective results per the SLO measure. In 2017-2018, 77 percent of SPSL units were effective or highly effective. Per the tables on the website, most of the individual student performance increased per category. Focus students for Attention, Motivation, Academic (above or below grade level) were all higher than past years. Focus students who were selected for social-emotional or language acquisition issues did not have a higher percentage of students meeting SLOs. This tells TE faculty we should continue our focus on language acquisition as described in other areas of this report. However, we do see a higher percentage of teachers selecting language learners for differentiation, indicating the recognition of this need and the willingness to work to meet language learner needs. Most importantly, we note the increased trend of meeting language learner needs in program, per the S-PAT data, so we hope to see a similar trend in the completer data. Additionally, during preparation programs, a focus on Social-emotional learning and preparation has been added, hopefully affecting the impact outcomes in the next few years.

Completers reflections and goal setting on their SLOs were analyzed for themes, trends and patterns. A frequency count of focus group comments on SLO unit data found the most prevalent theme centered around assessment literacy (44% of all comments). Within that context, completers revealed they would like additional support and development in the area of assessment construction (especially around measurement validity), and effective use of formative assessment. This finding is currently being used to make revisions in our assessment courses for pre-service teachers. This finding also mirrors past completer study focus on a need for more preparation in the area of assessment design.

Reviewing the completer study observation data, we also note that the 2017-2018 observations scores were higher, on average, across domains than the 2015-2016 completer data. These FFT observations also indicated an increase across three observations from observation one to observation three.

The Tripod Survey of Student Perceptions (Ferguson, 2012) was again administered as an additional measure of teacher effectiveness. Students in K-12 classrooms complete a survey of their perceptions of their teachers on seven metrics. The Tripod survey was used in the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) study of Teacher Quality (2012) and had the highest correlation with student achievement of any of the measures tested (Ferguson, 2012). The survey measures seven components (scales): Care (7 items), Control (4 items), Clarify (8 items), Challenge (4 items), Captivate (4 items), Confer (7 items), and Consolidate (2 items). A score of 5 indicates a high level of agreement with the items on the scale.

In 2017-2018 Tripod survey data, Boise State completers earned higher scores, on average, in the constructs of care and challenge. The lower averages were identified in control and captivate. These averages mirror the 2015-2016 Tripod data.

When comparisons were made between completer study teachers' percent agreement and teachers from the MET Study (2010) whose student learning outcomes ranked in the 75th percentile, Boise State completer percent agreement matched or exceeded the MET study teachers in all constructs except Control. These scores are also higher than the 2015-2016 completer study Tripod data with higher percent agreement in the areas of captivate and consolidate.

Employer surveys indicate satisfaction with completers at a Proficient or Distinguished level. The percentages per InTASC categories are similar to prior years. Likewise alumni satisfaction indicates satisfaction with program preparation, yet with a lower rate than principal satisfaction. This trend has been evident across employer and alumni survey comparisons over time.

Completer placements also follow trends over time with a vast majority of Boise State completers who certify staying in Idaho (88%) and the majority of those candidates staying in the Treasure Valley (Idaho's Region III) to teach.

Boise State shares program data with program coordinators following the TE governance structures and reporting protocols. The completer data is also shared via these processes; however, this data is more widely shared with stakeholders and external meetings, including stakeholder advisory committees, State Board and EPP statewide meetings, and international and national

teacher education conferences.

Boise State TE faculty are pleased with the performance data and outcome measures indicating completers are well-started. We appreciate the support of area school districts with induction programs, employer survey participation and follow-up with completer placements. We continue to identify trends over time in completer study data. Completers continue to score lowest in Control from their k-12 students, and they rank highest in the area of Care. They are increasing their SLO effectiveness even as the need for assessment literacy is still identified by completers. Employers, however, indicate an increase in ability to differentiate instruction and work with technology even as these areas may be scored lower than other areas overall in completer data. Boise State TE faculty feel fortunate to have focus areas that align with AFI efforts and provide for triangulation of data and unit-wide focus.

We will continue completer case studies while also making progress with the Idaho State Department of Education in securing standardized assessment scores by teacher, which can be disaggregated by program completer. This data will help provide impact measures for future annual reporting. Likewise, collecting more years of impact data for advanced programs will allow for trend analysis outside of employer and alumni surveys. For example, all programs (initial and advanced) should soon begin using a shared Analytic Writing Continuum measure where writing is evaluated. Advanced programs could note if they have any shared trends across programs. Initial programs will continue to focus on technology, meeting the needs of English Language Learners and systematizing diverse clinical field experience placements. Most importantly, having the quality assurance systems in place and strengthening over time allows for multiple measures around teacher performance post program completion.

## 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)**

1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.

**There is limited evidence that all candidates are prepared to promote the learning of English Language Learners.**

In year two (2018) after the AFI with regards to 1.4 and “all candidates are prepared to promote the learning of English Language Learners,” Boise State is most excited to provide three cycles of data that demonstrate an INCREASE in rubric scores for “Planning for Academic Language” on our Standardized Performance Assessment for Teaching (S-PAT). The Professional Year S-PAT Handbook is uploaded in Section 6 and includes the Unit Template and the rubrics aligned with this performance assessment. Working with partners in the Linguistics department and socio-linguists in Literacy Education, teacher education faculty developed a focus on planning for academic language and using WIDA instructional supports in unit planning. The S-PAT requires identification of language demands in the unit template as well as language targets. A focus on language demands as supporting teacher understanding in the creation of language targets was identified after the last annual report cycle.

Likewise, the consideration of differentiation for language learners and language acquisition supports are identified in formative observation forms, and the reflective analysis connected to the S-PAT requires indication of meeting WIDA instructional supports and engaging qualities of instruction. The S-PAT rubric line for “Planning for Academic Language” encompasses an evaluation of the unit template language demands and language targets (in addition to content area learning targets) for all teacher candidates. Seminars preparing candidates for the S-PAT planning have focused on language acquisition planning and strategies to help scaffold candidate understanding and application of what they may have learned prior in coursework and diverse field experiences. In 2018 a focused effort was made to include the identification of language demands when planning language targets and differentiating instruction for all learners.

Boise State will keep the current S-PAT Unit template as we are still working on developing reliability of scoring and increasing validity of our data analysis for continuous improvement efforts. We have three cycles of data from this rubric for analysis and have demonstrated an increase in the rubric score for “Planning for Academic Language.” After implementing the revised rubric, engaging in professional development with university liaisons (who facilitate the planning and implementation of the unit of study along with its evaluation), and focusing on training for supporting teacher candidates and reliable evaluation, we note an increase over three semesters from 2.58 to 2.65 to 2.77 on a one to three scale with one being Unsatisfactory, 2 being Basic, and three indicating a Proficient score. In the past, the Teacher Education Unit has identified any score less than 2.5 as needing more attention in our program preparation. It is exciting to see the growth and the proficiency of our candidates across programs in preparing ALL students to work with language learners, attend to academic language demands, write and assess language targets.

Semester Fall 2017 (n=60) Spring 2018 (n=86) Fall 2018 (n=47)

Mean (1 to 3 scale)

for all candidates on 2.58 2.65 2.77

“Planning for Academic Language”

With demonstrated success in addressing preparation for language learners with ALL teacher candidates, we are now focused more on differentiating and scaffolding language learning strategies with different programs based on survey feedback from



candidates (exit survey) and the S-PAT evaluation data.

Additionally, we continue to build on our “Framework for Program-Wide Attention to Teaching English Language Learners” by naturally moving from gaining input from experts across campus to developing the expertise of teacher educators in the unit. We now have more faculty in the Literacy, Language and Culture Department who work within the area of language acquisition expertise. This has allowed for the more focused and scaffolded professional year seminars where secondary candidates (who do not have as many linguistics or literacy required courses) can have one disciplinary expert work with them while other more advanced candidates in terms of language acquisition (ie., elementary candidates) can have another seminar more focused on identifying language demands, language targets, and differentiated instructional strategies.

With attention to AFI #2 (Diverse Clinical Field Experiences), AFI #1 (“all candidates are prepared to promote the learning of English Language Learners”) has also been addressed as the more purposeful diverse clinical field experiences work has allowed for all secondary candidates to work in a service learning course connected to the Borah Bridge program (for refugee students new to the country and developing academic language skills). Likewise, as all teacher candidates have more intentional field experiences with diverse learners, the attention to working with all learners and attending to language, cultural, or other specific learning needs has a basis in theoretical understanding and experience with diverse populations.

### **CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)**

#### 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

#### **Not all candidates have clinical experiences with diverse P-12 learners.**

Boise State made significant progress during 2017-2018 school year toward ensuring all candidates have a quality diverse placement. We established a unit wide definition of diverse placements, adopted through the work of the CIT, Division of TE, and approved by the Teacher Education Coordinating Council.

"A diverse field placement provides an opportunity for teacher candidates to work in settings that reflect the existing diversity of P-12 students in the surrounding schools and community partnerships. Designating these settings as a diverse placement is part of a shared decision-making process with schools and community partners.

These settings may include:

Educational settings serving students of varied socio-economic levels (e.g., targeted and school-wide Title One schools)

Educational settings serving students who are culturally and/or linguistically diverse (e.g., migrants, refugees, English learners).

Educational settings serving students with a range of abilities, exceptionalities and risk factors (e.g., district-designated alternative schools, community schools, and partnerships)

Candidates could work one on one, in small groups or within a whole group setting within a service learning or clinical experience that is supervised and/or evaluated in close collaboration with partners. Candidates will engage in building respect and rapport (2a) along with engaging students in growth-oriented experiences (3c). Candidates will be expected to critically reflect on understandings, personal dispositions, and issues of equity with regard to their experiences in these diverse settings."

This definition allows us to track, via our data management system, individual candidate successfully completion of a field placement in a diverse setting during their program.

#### Required Diverse Placements in Early Programs

Service-learning has become a required component within the secondary and elementary programs. LLC 200 Cultural Diversity, required in Elementary and Elementary dual programs along with ESP 350 in the secondary programs now engage teacher candidates in a required service learning field placement that meets the definition of diverse placement approved by the unit. This placement includes signature assignments that help facilitate effective skills and positive dispositions when working with students in diverse setting. Extensive work between program coordinators with Boise State Service learning has resulted in

Alignment of placement selections with definition

Required signature assignments

Agreed upon policies and procedures for student placements

Creation of a recruitment video for candidates to select placements of interest.

Intensive collaboration between program coordinators, School District Strategic Partnership Coordinator, and Service Learning has resulted in new field placements for elementary candidates in five Title I schools strategically located in geographical quadrants of the district. These services include assistance with food, clothing, hygiene, medical care, early childhood resources, English language learning, an after-school soccer club, and parenting support. In addition, LLC 340, an early literacy course taken by all Elementary programs also requires a field placement in a diverse setting.

Secondary teacher candidates in early field experience courses have a required service learning component, often in Title I schools. Service Learning opportunities focus in schools with large refugee populations and through “bridge” programs for students new to the country or English language in high school settings. Secondary candidates have support in the schools and through a course on working with exceptional learners to reflect on their experiences through the DEAL model (Describe, Evaluate, Articulate Learning) and through sharing insights and key moments in class discussions and individual written reflections.

Early placements in diverse settings help teacher candidates gain experience working directly with diverse learners early in the



program as these placements require teaching episodes or direct interactions with students. During interviews for Application to Teacher Education, candidates express positive dispositions about working with diverse learners and a desire to continue working with diverse populations. Data collected from interviews have also indicated a need for more training in classroom management and culturally responsive instructional strategies before engaging in these early placements. We are working on organizing a concentrated training day prior to the start of the semester to better prepare students to engage in effective interactions.

### Purposeful Placements

We use our data management system (ie., Taskstream) to track placements across candidates and across sites. We prioritize diverse placements for candidates, such as transfer students, in their professional year experiences who may not yet have had this opportunity. We now work with partner school principal and mentor teacher representatives to move teacher candidates from more affluent buildings in one semester into Title I buildings in the next to ensure diverse learning experiences with established partners. The importance of placing candidates with high quality mentors in school communities that embrace diversity has been established. Goals included helping teacher candidates to develop skills for working with language learners and also to develop positive dispositions and confidence in their ability to serve students and families from backgrounds different from their own. After a pilot semester in Fall 2017, anecdotal evidence from the Professional Year Placement Orientation suggests early placements in diverse settings has led to more requests for Title I placements during the Professional Year.

### **CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)**

5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

### **There is inconsistent evidence that the EPP has established reliability and validity for EPP assessments.**

Boise State continued to work on its quality assurance system by continuing to assess reliability and validity for EPP assessments. A primary focus was the high stakes Standard Performance Assessment for Teaching (S-PAT) rubrics. Liaisons who are charged with assessing the S-PAT underwent professional development on the new rubrics from the team who created and engaged in content validation of the rubrics. These new S-PAT rubrics were used during Fall 2017, Spring 2018, and Fall 2018 semesters. S-PAT reliability was rated in three separate sessions related to rater agreement across four months of work: December 2018-March 2019 (see: "2018-2019 Initial Programs, S-PAT Agreement Tables" uploaded in section 6). S-PAT rating sessions used a three-point system (1-3) and allowed for whole points to be broken down to .25. That is, a score of "1" could be scored as 1, 1.25, 1.5 and 1.75. Some liaisons preferred to use this .25 system to increase measurement sensitivity and feedback.

In December 2018, 14 liaisons evaluated a selected S-PAT Unit Plan. In January 2019, seven raters evaluated a selected S-PAT Assessment plan, and in February 2019, eight raters evaluated a selected S-PAT Reflection. These scores were compared against a 'master' rater, and calculated for percent agreement by the actual number (i.e., scores down to .25), and by the whole number (e.g., a score of 2.25 recalculated as a 2). Across the three units, the percent agreement by the .25 number was low and varied. Scores ranged from 0% to 43%, indicating rater trainings on the S-PAT need to be improved. These trainings will be implemented during the 2019-2020 academic year. Also, across the three units, the percent agreement was higher for scores recalculated to the whole number. These scores ranged from 25% to 86%. To ensure validity and reliability of the S-PAT rubric, liaisons decided to score S-PAT sections using a score of 1, 2 or 3 only. This scoring will be implemented in 2019-2020, and agreement rates will be reviewed.

A second area for EPP created assessment was the continuation of the validation of the Analytic Writing Continuum (AWC) discussed in the 2017 Annual Report. During the 2018-2019 monthly meetings for the Teacher Education Coordinating Council (TECC), advanced program coordinators reviewed the AWC for use across program admissions (see: "2018-2019 Advanced Programs, AWC Agreement Tables" uploaded in section 6). They completed two rounds of rating sessions, one in November 2018 and one in March 2019. Ten letters of application from one program were used for the first rating session. After reviewing scores and agreement rates and formally discussing the validity of the rubric categories related to the purpose of the letters, program coordinators modified the AWC rubric for the second round of ratings. Instead of a 1-6 scale, coordinators collapsed categories into 3 points (1-2, 3-4, and 5-6). The second modification was to remove two of the AWC rubric categories that coordinators determined did not ensure validity related to the measurement. The second rating session included a sample of application letters from a different program. Agreement rates improved, and coordinators observing increased usefulness of the modified rubric. Percent agreement rates stayed the same or increased for each category except "Content".

For this reason, advanced program coordinators rejected the previous consideration of using one standardized writing prompt across all programs for admissions. Instead, they will ensure validity by reviewing current prompts within their own programs. Program coordinators will review the modified AWC rubric within programs and add additional categories as needed based on prompt revisions. In this way, advanced programs will have a shared rubric they can use to compare across generalized writing areas but will be able to specify within content-specific areas if needed.

Based on these analyses, program coordinators determined that 1) their writing prompts will be reviewed for validity within their programs to ensure that the questions ask what is being measured on the rubric, and 2) after ensuring validity, coordinators will proceed with rater agreement analyses within programs. Coordinators plan to train other reviewers in program to collect intra-agreement rates using the modified AWC rubric for 2019-2020, and results will be shared among program coordinators throughout the year. Initial program coordinators are also discussing the progression for using the rubric at interview and admission to teacher education with additional use at exit from the program in the "finishing foundations" capstone course. This course includes the written communication University Learning Outcome, and program faculty intend to use the AWC to demonstrate outcomes on this learning target.

A third key area added in 2018 was the focus on reviewing and revising the dispositions assessments for initial candidates. The Continuous Improvement Team (CIT) charged a Dispositions Task Force with reviewing the current rubric used at the TE Admission interview. The task force reviewed literature on teacher dispositions and other programs' dispositions assessments and rubrics. Task Force members evaluated case studies where they identified dispositional attributes and then sorted them into categories that emerged from collaborative inquiry. They determined to focus on dispositions of Care, Character, Pedagogical Stance, and Professional Commitment. They presented the categories to TECC for approval. In 2019, the Task Force is designing the Dispositions Rubric for validation. They will also identify a protocol for using it at program admission along with other potential areas across programs.

## 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?

Boise State Teacher Education 2018 activities stem from the areas for improvement cited in the last Accreditation Report: There is limited evidence that all candidates are prepared to promote the learning of English Language Learners. Not all candidates have clinical experiences with diverse P-12 learners. There is inconsistent evidence that the EPP has established reliability and validity for EPP assessments.

Teacher Education (TE) faculty identified four goals during 2018:

Focus on language acquisition. This focus on language acquisition allowed Boise State's TE Unit to work on the first two areas for improvement, namely to become more prepared to promote the learning of ELLs and provide more candidates with clinical experiences with diverse P-12 learners.

Key 2018 Activities included the following:

Hired more faculty in Literacy, Language, and Culture with language acquisition expertise

Continued to collect and analyze "Planning for Academic Language" data on teacher candidate unit and lesson plans. Data shows improvement across three cycles of data (Fall 2017, Spring 2018, Fall 2018)

Differentiated professional year seminars focused on language demands, language targets and instructional supports for language learners. The identification of language demands as a scaffold for writing language targets occurred in 2017. In 2018 the unit template was revised to include attention to language demands and language targets. In the future, consideration of overlap with

ELA learning targets and language targets will be considered.

Mapping attention to linguistic and academic language demands in teacher preparation coursework (e.g., Linguistics 305, new course LLC 300) and created a "signature assignment" in LLC 300. A Focus Visit from the State of Idaho includes attention to "State Specific Requirements," including the Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Standards. Literacy faculty have held "support sessions" and working meetings to identify where and how programs are and might increase focus on language acquisition and literacy standards across the TE unit.

(2) Core Practices Training Video Series. The continued work on this series created multiple opportunities for stakeholders across the TE Unit (mentor teachers, university faculty, university liaisons, teacher candidates) to articulate, model, and practice core teaching practices across teaching contexts (grade levels, subject matter, school settings). This work continues to provide opportunities for all stakeholders to be more aligned in expected teacher performance, which in turn, has created opportunities for more reliable assessments and self-assessment of teacher candidate learning and performance.

Key 2018 Activities include the following:

- Completed video training series
- presented series to TELG (Clinical Field Experience Group)
- plans for launch of video series so TE faculty can use prior to professional year
- purposeful distribution and integration across programs should occur 2019-2020

(3) Focus on EPP Assessments. The TE Unit continued professional development for liaisons who serve as evaluators for the S-PAT. In 2018, the second and third cycle of data (by semester) for the revised S-PAT rubric were collected and reviewed. Planning for academic language showed an increasing trend. All other categories also showed an increase from the first to third cycle of data. The Unit has used 2.5 as a target score for assessments. After the first review of S-PAT data a targeted focus was placed on technology integration as the rubric line, "Consideration of the use of technology," was scored at 1.91. TE faculty conducted an analysis of the required technology course and engaged in curriculum mapping to see where technology was a focus across other required courses in programs. Renewed attention was also placed on providing a rationale for using technology in instruction. The required technology course (EDTECH 202) has been revised to align with the new ISTE standards. The "State Specific Requirements" for the upcoming state review include Preservice Technology Standards so program coordinators are collaborating to brainstorm how and where technology pedagogy is emphasized in programs.

Technology was also a focus for liaison development in 2018. All liaisons were part of professional development where they each received an iPad for use in supervision work and monthly professional development on using different apps and supporting their candidates in using technology in instruction.

Continued review of the S-PAT scores for candidate integration of technology in their unit planning and implementation resulted in increases from 1.91 to 2.35 to 2.47. TE faculty will continue focus here and on differentiation of instruction for individual learners so these scores will average above 2.5.

Additionally, The Analytic Writing Continuum (AWC) is another validated writing assessment being adapted for use by initial and advanced programs. After review and interrater reliability assessment among initial program faculty, advanced program coordinators engaged in analysis of the AWC, selected three focus areas, and engaged in reliability scoring. The AWC should be used for writing assessment across all programs in 2019-2020.

A third focus for EPP created assessments was added in 2018 with an investigation of dispositions assessments across the country. A Task Force worked on validating dispositions criteria and categories by engaging in case study analysis and sharing across programs, program coordinators, and governing bodies (ie., TECC).

(4) Focus on Responsiveness to Data and Stakeholder Input

A final goal was to more purposefully connect continuous improvement efforts to program data and stakeholder input. TE faculty have been engaging in multiple improvement efforts with the emphasis on assessment and quality assurance systems. We agreed to ensure trend identification in and across programs before implementing large scale improvement efforts. The focus on language acquisition and technology are key examples of making changes based on a trend over time in data.

Candidates complete an exit survey each semester, and employer and alumni complete surveys after 1-2 years of having Boise State completers in the field. Emphasizing the need for these data points is also important so that we have external stakeholder feedback along with candidate self-report at the end of program. We look for evidence across assessment measures to inform change (ie., alumni and employers indicated a desire for more preparation in differentiated instruction, and a focus on differentiation in the S-PAT along with specific mention of instructional supports for ELLs.)

Most recently, exit survey data has indicated a continued trend in the emphasis on relationships in the professional year being key to success. With hiring of new liaisons, we are focusing on the professional development opportunities for clinical supervisors to be prepared to build relationships across candidates, mentor teachers, and within school districts. Because another trend in exit survey data includes a desire from completers to have more streamlined communication, new clinical experience structures are being designed for 2019-2020.

To assess performance as we work toward 2018 goals and our AFI, TE unit representatives meet regularly in various groups. The Teacher Education Coordinating Council (TECC) continues to be the governing body for the Unit. This body includes representatives from every TE program – initial and advanced. TECC has an executive committee, the Continuous Improvement Team (CIT), which oversees multiple projects and initiatives and reports to TECC at monthly meetings. TELG engaged in

technology training and will focus the formative observation forms for core practice attention. The Assessment and Accreditation Team focused on systems by creating Data Dashboards for each program to have a consistent space for maintaining data across semesters and metrics. Stakeholder advisory committees meet once each semester. The Fall 2018 meeting focused on clinical field experiences and an emphasis on diversity and relationships developed to support partner schools. The Unit has also added a "division of teacher education" work group that focuses on big picture improvement initiatives and reports to college leadership and TECC.

With the attention to a specific goal around responsiveness to data and stakeholder input, the TE Unit should be able to centralize its efforts around the overarching unit needs while at the same time allowing individual programs to make improvement efforts within individual programs. Data Dashboards allow program coordinators to view program data and trends over time. CIT will remain an overseer for overall unit improvement efforts and the distribution of unit-wide data for comparison of programs to the unit. Improvements will be documented by watching like data over multiple cycles before implementing further change. Reviewing impact measures (like employer and alumni surveys and completer case studies) will document performance assessment data for documented improvements.

#### 2019 Goals




Boise State's TE Unit has identified the following goals for continued work in 2019:

- Reliability training for S-PAT rubric evaluation
- AWC pilot to make recommendations for practice for at least three cycles of data
- Create a new dispositions rubric and finalize a shared admissions and interview protocol for initial programs. The pilot for the new dispositions rubric should be ready for implementation in 2020
- Continued attention to AFI progress. In particular, purposeful attention to data about diverse field experiences will be organized and generated to inform future placement processes. Likewise, the Unit intends to add questions to the TE Exit Survey to track completer responses about clinical field experiences.

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

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  
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  
5.2 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  
A.2.2 Clinical Experiences  
A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully  
A.5.3 Continuous Improvement  
x.2 Technology  
x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  **Professional\_Year\_SPAT\_Handbook\_(3).pdf**
-  **20182019\_Advanced\_Programs\_AWC\_Agreement\_Tables.pdf**
-  **20182019\_Initial\_Programs\_SPAT\_Agreement\_Tables.pdf**

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or s activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

Yes  No

6.3 Optional Comments

---

## Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

**Preparer's authorization.** By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2019 EPP Annual Report.

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

### Report Preparer's Information

Name: Jennifer Snow

Position: Associate Dean for Teacher Education

Phone: 2084261991

E-mail: jennifersnow@boisestate.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 complete 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**