

# 2018 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	10255	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	475
<b>Institution:</b>	Brigham Young University		
<b>Unit:</b>	Educator Preparation Program		

## Section 1. AIMS Profile

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

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

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

## Section 2. Program Completers

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

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to <u>initial</u> teacher certification or licensure <sup>1</sup>	554
2.1.2 Number of completers in <u>advanced</u> programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.) <sup>2</sup>	94

Total number of program completers 648

<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 2016-2017 academic year?

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP  
No Change / Not Applicable
- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.  
No Change / Not Applicable
- 3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited  
No Change / Not Applicable
- 3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited  
No Change / Not Applicable
- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements  
No Change / Not Applicable

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

## Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

**Link:** <http://epp.byu.edu/reports.php>

**Description of data accessible via link:** TEAC Accreditation Documents, TEAC/CAEP Annual Reports, BYU EPP Teacher Preparation Annual Reports, School Leadership Annual Reports, USBE Annual Reports, Title II Reports

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

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

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?

Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?

Are benchmarks available for comparison?

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

1. and 2.) In 2016-2017 Utah Valley University and BYU held a summit with our partnership districts to find a way to measure completer impact on P-12 learning and development as well as teaching effectiveness. In this summit and it's subsequent meeting a process of measuring these components was collaboratively created. District's will share Teacher Assignments, Teacher Evaluation Scores, and Student Performance. Each Fall the university will provide districts with a list of completer names and their CACTUS numbers. Districts will then share the following information: a) Overall Teacher Evaluation Score based on the Utah Effective Teaching Standards (UETS) which is based on INTASC standards. b) UETS Student Growth component. c) UETS Stakeholder Input component. d) UETS Observation Score component. e) State Testing: SAGE % Proficient English Language Arts (ELA), Median Growth Percentile (MGP) ELA, SAGE % Proficient Math, MGP Math, SAGE % Proficient Science, MGP Science, and Case Study information for non SAGE-tested subjects in 7-12. f) We began gathering this information July 2017. 3. and 4.) In both initial and advanced programs, we have tried various tools to gather employer and completers satisfaction as well as employment milestones. We are currently working on a systemic way to gather this information and then use it to improve our programs based on the data received. In our state consortium, Utah Teacher Education Assessment & Accreditation Council (UTEAAC), all 10 universities located within the state of Utah, have worked on an employer survey (UTEES) and a completer survey (UTES). Implementation of these surveys began Fall of 2017. 6). Advanced programs are not included in our Title II

report. We have plans in place for tracking this data by our 2022 CAEP Accreditation Cycle. 7.) In our initial programs, partnership districts provide information on teacher assignments including level, assignment, assignment percentage, LEA, and begin dates by July 1 of each year. Advanced programs track their graduates in various manners. Again we are working on a systemic way to collect and share this data. Currently this is not reflected in any of the reports we have displayed. 8.) Since BYU is a private institution student loan default rates and other consumer information is not released or shared by the university.

## 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.

**TEAC:** Weakness

2.1 Rationale for assessments

The program's assessment system is not yet fully developed.

We are continuing to build our MS Excel-based database for our student and alumni data which is helping to track multiple types of data, including data related to student learning outcome assessments.

We have developed and are currently collecting data using the following assessments:

- The Student Learning Assessment, Tracking and Evaluation (SLATE) system has been in place for the last four years, and are now transitioning to Key Assessments.

We redesigned our internship binder and have been collecting the following data in that binder since 2017:

- Log of Internship Hours
- Internship Journal
- Internship Activity Reflections
- Internship Leadership Project
- Mentor Principal Evaluations
- Comprehensive Exam Presentation
- Comprehensive Exam Reflection Paper

In addition to these data collected in the internship binder, we have been piloting the following surveys:

- The Alumni Survey has been designed to directly address student learning outcomes and program features.
- Disposition Survey, which was co-developed with our district partners.
- INSPIRE Graduate survey.

**TEAC:** Weakness

2.3 Influential quality control system

The Executive School Leadership Program (part time) track appears to lack parity with the Leadership Preparation Program (full time) track.

- Program Requirements: We continue to clarify in all program materials and meetings that students may choose to engage in additional internship hours if they have the available time (in either track), and that the program will help to facilitate a student's choice for additional internship hours. We have clarified that any additional internship hours are a function of student choice and not program design or requirement. Thus, both program tracks offer parity in facilitating the student's internship choices. (The choice for additional internship hours is a student's choice similar to a student's choice for a full-year Student Internship over Student Teaching.)

- Recruiting & Admissions: In recruiting meetings and materials, we highlight that the program requires the same curriculum and internship requirements in both tracks. We have created the option for students to apply to BOTH tracks, such that they have the final decision of in which track participate.

- Internship Training & Supervision: In student recruitment and orientation, we clearly inform students that both tracks participate in the Summer Mentor Training with their mentor principals, participate in the same additional internship training with their mentor principals during the year, and have the same extent of access to internship supervisors and internship supervision in the field.

- Student Surveys, Focus Groups & Exit Interviews: To inform both program improvement and perceptions of parity across both tracks, we invite students to participate in online surveys. We are developing more formal focus group and exit interview strategies.

- District Relations & Program Advisory Board: We continue to raise awareness and inform stakeholders of actual program parity to reduce the potential gaps that may exist with perceptions of lack of parity. We are actively and regularly communicating with the BYU/Public School Partnership Governing Board, meeting personally with district superintendents and administrators, and participating in open discussions with our Program Advisory Board.

- Public Relations: We have used our School Leadership Program e-newsletter to regularly highlight student achievements and administrative placements across both tracks. We have taken care to ensure that both tracks have parity of representation in all

public relations materials and activities.

**TEAC:** Weakness

2.3 Influential quality control system

There is unevenness in documentation and missing data across measures and across program options.

To address our AFI from our last accreditation visit, the BYU Educator Preparation Program (BYU EPP) went through a reorganization process and hired a director and associate director to lead the seven colleges that prepare educators at BYU. The BYU EPP directorate has worked with the EPP executive committee, the University Council on Teacher Education (UCOTE), and the Initial Programs Council (IPC), to identify policies and procedures that need to be updated and/or made more explicit. During the last year, UCOTE and IPC addressed such policy, procedural, and curriculum issues as the EPP professional core, formation of the data systems council, student teaching in the minor, technology instruction, multicultural education instruction, fingerprint and background checks for clinical evaluators, maintenance of EPP course syllabi, performance criteria on the Utah Teacher Candidate Performance Assessment and Evaluation System (PAES), Utah Teacher Education Student Survey (UTEES), Utah Teacher Education Employer Survey (UTEES), aligning the BYU TWS with CAEP requirements by reverting to the Renaissance Teacher Work Sample (RTWS), assessment due dates, and minor student teaching supervision. Working together, these councils are making our policies and procedures more transparent and visible to our faculty, staff, and students. To specifically address the “unevenness in documentation,” the EPP directorate has undertaken the development of an EPP handbook to make policies and procedures more explicit across the unit. They have also begun work on an EPP website to provide greater access and transparency to policies and procedures. The EPP office has hired a 20 hour a week student web developer, to help make the new website a reality. The handbook and website will address the unevenness in documentation across the EPP since there will be a single source of information. To improve data collection “across measures and across program options,” the EPP directorate has developed weekly assessment and data reports managed and distributed by the EPP support team. The impact of this report is evident in that 100% of the 2016-2017 assessment data were collected or accounted for. The BYU EPP has been developing its own in-house assessment and data system called mYlink. The EPP directorate believes that the ongoing development of mYlink will provide the BYU EPP with a system that will put in place mechanisms to ensure that all admissions, assessments, and student application data are collected and reported. During this last year, the BYU EPP and university's central Office of Information Technology (OIT) worked together to solve issues and problems in mYlink. A uniform ticketing system, Service Now, was adopted. OIT, EPP Support and OIT's 24-hour customer support services (OSC) use this system to report and problem solve issues. OIT and BYU EPP have determined the old mYlink system is outdated. Design plans and architectural structure of a new mYlink system have been created and resources will be devoted to maintaining the old system while creating a new system. The new system will be more user friendly and allow the use of data to inform decision making and continuous improvement of 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?

For the last five years, the BYU Educator Preparation Program (BYU-EPP) has joined with the other 10 educator preparation programs (EPP) in the state of Utah to develop a set of state-wide assessments. This effort has been coordinated by the Utah Teacher Education Assessment & Accreditation Council (UTEAAC). To date, UTEAAC has developed a clinical evaluation instrument called the Utah Teacher Candidate Performance Assessment & Evaluation System (PAES) that is based on the Utah Effective Teaching Standards (UETS), which are highly aligned to InTASC, and a set of surveys called the Utah Teacher Education Student Survey (UTES) and Utah Teacher Education Employer Survey (UTEES). The UTES was developed as a pre/post measure for program candidates and an alumni survey for program completers after the 1st and 3rd years of teaching, while the UTEES is an employer survey to be completed by employers at the end of completers 2nd year of teaching. The UTES/UTEES suite is also based on the UETS. UTEAAC has the plan to develop a state-wide disposition instrument and possibly a TPA. Ultimately, this suite of state-wide assessments would allow each participating EPP, including the BYU-EPP, valid and reliable instruments to produce evidence for CAEP standards 1, 2, 3, and 5.

The PAES was developed on the backbone of the Utah Teacher Observation Tool (UTOT) and connects preservice and inservice teacher evaluation together on a single rubric. The UTOT was developed by various stakeholders from across the state, including representation from Utah EPPs, lead by staff from the Utah State Board of Education (USBE) as Utah's inservice evaluation tool. The PAES and UTOT are a single 6-level rubric that uses the same 22 performance indicators that builds from a novice preservice candidate to a veteran, master teacher. The scale starts with Not Effective (0) and goes through Beginning (1), Developing (2), Preservice Effective (3)/Inservice Emerging Effective, Inservice Effective, and finally Inservice Highly Effective. The preservice Beginning (1) and Developing (2) levels of the PAES were developed by a diverse representation from the 10 Utah EPPs and included faculty members from ECE, ELED, SCED, and SPED as well as psychometricians, assessment specialists, and staff from USBE.

In 2016-2017, the PAES was piloted at 6 of the 10 Utah EPPs, including BYU. During the summer of 2017, the BYU-EPP hosted and led a 2 day PAES summit to carefully use the pilot data, evaluator feedback, and candidate feedback to refine the PAES. One key aspect of candidate feedback was that many of the items were not actionable, meaning that the candidates did not know how to improve their practice based on the results from the PAES evaluation. This was of great concern to the summit participants and a lot of time was spent reworking the items so that they were more action oriented for candidates. Both university and mentor teacher evaluators shared that the items were not parallel and the levels didn't properly build on each other. This too was of concern to the summit participants and a great deal of effort was spent to make each level parallel and build on the previous level. Additive language was incorporated into the rubric so that evaluators and candidates understood that the candidate must demonstrate all of the knowledge and skill associated with the 1st level before she could move to the next level. These two changes made a huge difference in the PAES.

In addition to a careful rework of each PAES item, the BYU-EPP conducted a series of confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) using Mplus statistical software on the factor structure and measurement model of the instrument using data from BYU, Utah State University (USU), and Utah Valley University (UVU). Combining data from all three institutions allowed for a more robust analysis. Because several of the item responses were not normally distributed, the variables were treated as categorical and estimated using WLSMV. McDonald's omega ( $\Omega$ ) was used for estimating the reliability of scores instead of Cronbach's alpha ( $\alpha$ ) to correct for the multidimensionality and nestedness within the measurement models. Multiple measurement invariance tests were conducted between the two groups of raters (mentor teacher and university supervisor) within each institution's sample. The 'cluster' command in Mplus was used to account for the multiple observations or clusters of data around individual teachers in each sample.

A series of paired-sampled t-tests were performed to compare summed scores of the mentor teacher (MT) and the university supervisors (US) within each institution's sample. Results indicate there was not a significant difference between the summed scores of the MT and the US within the BYU and UVU samples. However, there was a significant difference in summed scores at USU between the MT ( $M=56.22$ ,  $SD=5.68$ ) and the US ( $M=57.31$ ,  $SD=4.929$ );  $t(492) = -4.275$ ,  $p < .001$ . These results suggest that the mentor teachers and the university supervisors at USU may be interpreting the items on the PAES differently.

A CFA conducted on the BYU sample analyzing the three-factor model based on theoretical assumptions produced reasonably good model-fit statistics ( $\chi^2 = 841.067$ ,  $RMSEA = .056$ ,  $CFI = .938$ ,  $TLI = .930$ ). However, the three-factors were highly correlated, with correlations ranging from .767 to .966. Given the degree of correlation between the factors, it was reasonable to test whether a hierarchical model would account for the estimated correlation between the first-order factors.

A series of CFAs and chi-square difference tests were conducted on all three samples to compare nested models: the bifactor model; the model with three correlated, first-order factors; and the model with a single first-order factor. Unfortunately, a model with a second-order factor and three first-order factors was just identified and could not be compared in the analysis. The model-fit indices and the results of the chi-square difference tests on all three samples suggested that the bifactor model fits the data better



than the other nested models. For the BYU sample, the bifactor model value for  $\Omega$  was .976, indicating that approximately 97.6% of the variance in the total items was due to the general factor. For the USU sample, the bifactor model value for  $\Omega$  was .988, indicating that approximately 98.8% of the variance in the total items was due to the general factor.

Measurement invariance tests determined that measurement invariance was obtained within the RATER group in the BYU and USU samples. These results suggest that the factor structure and scale of the item responses does not differ between the two groups of raters (MT and US) in the BYU and USU samples. Unfortunately, the small sample size collected from UVU prevented a reliable analysis of the measurement model and invariance test for the raters at this institution.

This analysis provided evidence that the PAES is a valid and reliable measure of candidate performance. Given that the bifactor model fits the data better than the other tested models and the fact that the general factor tends to be dominant relative to the specific factors, a single, composite or summed score is appropriate for evaluating each teacher candidate. The score received by an individual student teacher can be interpreted as a measure of her teaching effectiveness; the higher the score, the more effective the student teacher is in delivering high-quality instruction. These results are very promising and more analysis is planned for the summer of 2018 using results from 8 of the 10 Utah EPPs.

The UTESS/UTEES is a 32 item survey aligned to the ten UETS. The first 25 items ask candidates/completers to evaluate how well they can do a certain constructs and tasks that aligns with the first nine UETS on a four-level scale from Not at All (0) through Minimally (1), Effectively (2), and Exceptionally (3). Items 26-29 ask candidates/completers to evaluate how extensive their understanding is of constructs from standard ten on a four-level scale from None (0) through Very Little (1), Sufficient (2), and Comprehensive (3). The remaining 3 items asks candidates/completers to rate how satisfied they are with their teacher preparation program on a 6-level satisfaction scale from Extremely Dissatisfied to Extremely Satisfied and two open-ended question that asks them share the strengths and areas for improvement of their preparation experience.

The UTESS/UTEES was developed by a diverse task force of representation from the ten Utah EPPs and included faculty members from ECE, ELED, SCED, and SPED as well as psychometricians, assessment specialists, and staff from USBE. The 1st version of the UTESS/UTEES was developed in 2015-2016 by taking all the items from the senior, program completer, alumni, and employer surveys being used by all 10 Utah institutions. Each item was tagged to 1 or more of the 10 UETS. The over 150 items were systematically discussed and those that didn't align well with the tagged standard or were a repeat of another item were eliminated until the survey was 40 items long. The first version of the survey items was then given to the faculty and a sample of students at each of the 10 institutions for editing and feedback. From their feedback the UTESS/UTEES was shortened to 29 items and piloted at a couple of the participating institutions during 2016-2017. From the pilots and additional feedback from faculty and students, the task force revised each item on the UTESS/UTEES and added the overall satisfaction item and the 2 open-ended items leading to the current 32 item survey. During 2017-2018, the current version of the survey is being piloted by 8 EPPs. Like the PAES, the BYU-EPP will host and led a UTESS/UTEES summit during the summer of 2018 to further refine the instrument from pilot data and respondent feedback.

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 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
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
- 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
- x.1 Diversity
- x.2 Technology

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

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

☒ Yes ☐ No

6.3 Optional Comments

---

## Section 7: Transition

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

identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

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

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

☐ No identified gaps

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

In preparation for an interim advance program site visit we have found that we need to work on establishing reliability and validity of our assessments. The gaps between what CAEP requires for accreditation and what TEAC required has been addressed for advanced programs in the creation of plans. This information has been included in our 2018 Advanced Programs Self-Study Report. For our initial programs which will be CAEP accredited in 2021, we have done a CAEP review on each of the standards. From this review we have identified 8 areas of focus we will be working on to close the gaps. Our areas of focus are as follows: 1) S1: Evaluation for Candidate Professional Dispositions; 2) S2: Framework for Partnership Advisory Councils; 3) S2: Framework for University Supervisor & Mentor Teacher Training; 4) S2: Evaluation for University Supervisors & Mentor Teacher Performance; 5) S3: Framework for Recruitment Plan; 6) S4: Analysis & Reporting of Completer/Program Impact; 7) S5: Quality Assurance System; 8) S5: Framework for Systematically Assessing Performance Against Goals & Standards. We are currently working on getting each of the focus areas in place so as to have three cycles of data. We are working with UCOTE, IPC, OIT, the Data Systems Council (DSC), Careers Services, and the Education Task Force Committee to close these gaps.

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

3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool  
3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability  
4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning  
4.3 Employer satisfaction  
5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures  
A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions  
A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation  
A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation

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

☒ Yes ☐ No

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

## Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2018 EPP Annual Report.*

☒ I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Terri Summers

Position: Associate EPP Director

Phone: 801-422-0115

E-mail: terri\_summers@byu.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 completion 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