

# 2018 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	10527	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	1975
<b>Institution:</b>	James Madison 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 2016-2017 ?

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 389

<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



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"/>

4

**Link:** <http://www.jmu.edu/coe/assessment/>

**Description of data accessible via link:** Survey Data

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

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

5

**Link:** <http://www.jmu.edu/coe/assessment/>

**Description of data accessible via link:** Biennial Measures

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

JMU has been submitting CAEP's annual EPP report since the first one in 2014, although submitting data for CAEP's 8 Annual Reporting Measures has never been a required component. The first two reports (submitted in 2014 and 2015, for 2012-13 and 2013-14 data, respectively) required that the EPP state whether they use or plan to use various types of data. These questions were discontinued in the 2016 and 2017 reports. Seven of the 8 required reporting measures: Impact on P-12 learning and development, results of completer surveys, graduation rates, ability of completers to meet state requirements, indicators of teaching effectiveness, employer survey data, and ability of completers to be hired will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

Impact on Student Learning is addressed throughout each program, with data about Impact on Student Learning being captured by USs and CTs during each student-teaching placement. The Student Teaching Performance assessment data contains findings of how candidates perform. Additionally, the EPP has been working hard to capture information about Impact on Student Learning once our completers are teaching in schools. In Virginia, Standard 7 of the Virginia Teacher Performance Assessment Standards is the specific standard on which practicing teachers are evaluated on Impact on Student Learning. Administrators must base their ratings of practicing teachers on the results of in class observations of teaching effectiveness. We are using various measures to capture employer data to ensure that principals and administrators are satisfied with the performance of individuals who completed their teacher education preparation at James Madison University. Additionally, we solicit completer feedback about how well JMU prepared them for working in a P-12 classroom in Virginia. Standard 4 contains more information about employer and completer data.

Evidence indicates a high candidate completion rate across all programs in EPP. Our 2017 Virginia Biennial Measures report shows no one exiting from initial programs in the biennium September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2017. Note that for this report, the definition of "exiter" is limited to individuals who have completed coursework but not state required assessments. Looking at EPP data of all applicants since January 1, 2015, (three cohorts of accepted candidates -- October 2014 cohort, January 2015 cohort, and April 2015 cohort), we noted that the retention rate is quite high: Fifty percent of the members of the October 2014 and January 2015 cohorts have successfully completed their programs (within the anticipated time frame of five years), and the other 50% remain active. Of the 141 candidates in the April 2015 cohort, 96% (N=135) remain active in or have successfully completed their programs.

Because all initial licensure programs require candidates to complete licensure requirements in order to successfully complete

their programs, 100% of initial candidates are eligible for licensure at the time of completion. Employment rate is more difficult to determine. Each summer, the Virginia Department of Education is able to provide the EPP with a list of which of our completers are employed within the state. This list does not reflect employment out of state or with private institutions. As of Fall 2016, 70% of 2014 graduates were employed with the state; 77% of 2015 graduates were employed with the state, and 72% of 2016 graduates (Spring semester only) were employed with the state. As mentioned above, these employment rates are a low estimate of the actual employment of our graduates, as the data reflect only Virginia public P-12 public school employment on a census date (October 1, 2016).

## Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

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

1. Candidates enrolled in the unit represent limited cultural diversity. (ITP) (ADV)
2. The composition of faculty represent limited cultural diversity. (ITP) (ADV)

The AFIs cited in the 2012 NCATE visit refer to the lack of diversity among the student body and faculty. In the intervening years, the unit has actively explored methods of increasing diversity of both students and faculty. First, a team explored some questions that we believed would inform our work in recruiting and retaining diverse students. Then an ad hoc committee developed a report in 2016-17 with the ambitious goal that staff and candidates will reflect the diversity of Virginia P-12 students by 2025. Currently, two recruitment and retention committees (one for candidates and one for faculty) implement the strategies as follows:

### Candidate Recruitment:

The minority population has been slowly increasing at JMU. Madison Achievement Scholarships provide options for first-generation and other underserved potential students for whom fulltime attendance at JMU is inaccessible.

In recent years, the EPP has developed formal articulation agreements with community colleges throughout the region. The goal of these agreements is to diversify the population of students who arrive at JMU because transfer students tend to be more diverse (racially, ethnically, and socio-economically) than traditional candidates. The EPP has enhanced its advising and support of transfer students, many of whom are first-generation college students who have limited socioeconomic resources.

The candidate recruitment and retention committee meets to identify admission barriers for underrepresented and socioeconomically disadvantaged candidates using multiple stakeholder input from admissions staff, advisors for traditional and transfer candidates, program faculty, and a local high school student. The committee has been working to gather data related to VA P-12 and EPP demographics. Current activities of the committee include developing authentic partnerships and programs with teacher organizations in high schools and attending and recruiting potential candidates at the Educators Rising State Leadership conference. Additionally, the committee has been working to develop programs such as low or no-cost conferences and summer camp opportunities to attract students of color to JMU's campus. For retention, creating supportive environments for our diverse students through programs and services such as learning communities, academic advising services, and focused Math support are some of the strategies utilized to support student success.

### Faculty Recruitment:

The EPP has worked closely with Human Resources and the Office of Access and Inclusion to ensure that we are recruiting from a diverse pool of faculty candidates. The EPP entered into a partnership with Morgan State University (an HBCU) to provide academic and financial support for a math education doctoral fellow as part of the Preparing Future Faculty program. These smaller efforts have begun to slowly increase the numbers of diverse faculty and created awareness for the college regarding both recruitment and retention of a diverse academic community. Since the last accreditation visit, the gender distribution in the college has remained steady (24% male, 76% female). The percentage of white faculty has dropped from 87% in 2012-2013 to 83% in 2016-2017. This is a small but notable drop while the university as a whole has maintained an 80% white census over these years.

### Conclusion:

The EPP is committed to increasing the numbers of diverse candidates and faculty through innovative programs and practices. JMU was honored as a Diversity Champion in 2017 for its efforts to create and sustain a diverse and inclusive campus culture (see [www.insightintodiversity.com/diversity-champions](http://www.insightintodiversity.com/diversity-champions)). We will continue to strive for increased diversity across all 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?

JMU has incorporated multiple measures to inform, modify and evaluate the quality and effectiveness of our programs. Our methods and systems allow us to disaggregate data by specialty licensure area. With the exception of information generated in field experiences, data are managed through the Dean's Office by the Director of Assessment and the Data Management Specialist, using a combination of PeopleSoft (the EPP's student information system) and Tk20 (now Watermark), an on-the-market data-management product used by the EPP that requires candidates to purchase an account upon their acceptance into teacher education. Field Experience information is collected via Tk20 online binders and managed by the Education Support Center (ESC). The ESC has a system of releasing binders and collecting data, prompting evaluators to respond prior to each deadline. The ESC compiles and disseminates data to stakeholders in order to evaluate candidate performance and to provide program feedback.

Through many iterations of refinement with Tk20's personnel and the university's student information professionals, we have achieved a system that has the capacity to provide reports for accreditation. For example, the Student Teaching Performance is generated from data inputted into Tk20 by both university supervisors and cooperating teachers, with aggregated and disaggregated results shared across programs in the EPP.

Our EPP has one unit-wide committee, the Professional Education Coordinating Council (PECC), that includes representation from the four departments within the college that house licensure programs, as well as from teacher-education programs that are not housed within the College of Education, such as Health and Physical Education, Music, Art, Dance, Theatre, and Foreign Languages. It is in this committee that unit-wide data is reviewed periodically, and changes made based on the findings.

In reviewing the PECC minutes in recent years, several examples of program modifications and changes are noted. First, to address candidate quality (CAEP Std 3), the dispositions assessment was improved and the data collection points reinforced to facilitate regular collection and review of data. Second, to address candidate quality, teacher ed admissions requirements were reviewed and adjusted: for example, PECC decided that VCLA should be used as an entry examination. This was done as a way to improve our administrative functioning. The VCLA is required for teacher licensure in VA. However, some candidates who were not planning to remain in VA decided to save time and money by not completing the assessment. By moving it to an entry requirement, we are able to guarantee that all candidates have completed this assessment. Third, based on feedback from Pk-12 school partners, an initiative was undertaken to prepare candidates to work in challenged schools with underrepresented students. Over the last 3 years, the EPP has had focused conversations with partner school systems, resulting in the incorporation of specific curricular and extracurricular opportunities such as poverty simulations, diversity symposia, and curriculum changes that focus on differentiation and diversity. Finally, the student teaching performance assessment was revised as a result of data review, when program and partner stakeholders recognized that the data provided by the former instrument were not aligned to InTASC, CAEP, and current professional standards.

Innovations tested and implemented

1. The Student Teaching Performance assessment yields the largest amount of data each semester, given that it is used across the unit for any candidates participating in Field Experience; each candidate is rated both in the middle of and at the end of for each placement (there may be one or two placements per candidate, depending on the program and duration or placement) and

the form is used by both the University Supervisor (US) and the Cooperating Teacher (CT). All USs attend a workshop prior to the start of student teaching each semester. During this workshop, the assessment is reviewed and discussed including the items, rubric, and scoring. USs are reminded of the importance of the following guidelines: a) use program specific reference guides during evaluation; b) fully read each option in the rubric; c) use 'meets expectations' as the target behavior ('exceeds' is NOT the expectation as that is more consistent with a practicing teacher). US are then expected to train cooperating teachers on how to use the assessment. Instructions are also given in the ST Performance Guide. Additional instructions (written and video) are in the process of being developed.

An area we are investigating is whether the two types of raters, USs and CTs, rate in a consistent manner. We looked at Fall 2013 Profile of Student Teaching data to determine rater agreement and leniency. A total of 205 mid-block ratings and 192 final ratings of student teachers were used for the analysis. Only data for those students with a complete set of ratings - from both the CT and the US -- were used in this study. For each of the 34 three-point items on the scale, rater agreement (exact agreement of scores) ranged from 49% to 93% for mid-block ratings, and 75% to 98% on the final ratings. The mean score for cooperating teachers on the mid-block assessment was 2.73 (on a 3-point scale) and the mean rating for university supervisors was 2.72 (same scale). The final assessment means were 2.89 for cooperating teachers and 2.90 for university supervisors. This analysis is being conducted again on the revised instrument, using Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 data, to determine whether raters are scoring similarly over occasions and tasks.

2. We used student teaching evaluation data to find out if mentor training was effective, anticipating that clinical faculty are more effective mentors than untrained mentor teachers, particularly in supporting student teachers with feedback. These research questions were addressed: Is mentor teacher training effective? If trained mentors are more effective than untrained mentors, in what ways are they more effective? If giving feedback is one of the most important behaviors for mentor teachers to practice, is there a difference in the feedback given to student teachers by trained mentors as compared to untrained mentors?

The majority of student teachers in this sample were female (80%) and graduate students (85.6%), but clinical faculty mentorship has little difference for gender ( $r = -.02$ ). Student teachers mentored by clinical faculty were consistently associated with receiving more feedback and a higher word count (except at time 1 [T1] feedback on preparation); however, these relationships were also not statistically significant and were very small in magnitude ( $r = -.03$  to  $.09$ ). Also, graduate students evaluated their mentor teacher slightly higher than undergraduates ( $r = .13$ ,  $p < .05$ ); however, the low  $r$  reflects low practical significance. Not surprisingly, feedback scores and word count scores at T1 and T2 and at each dimension correlated moderately to strongly because a high word count from a mentor at one dimension is likely to have a similarly high word count from that mentor at another dimension. Therefore, there is a high predictability for regarding the quantity of feedback in predicting the word count at each subscale and in total.

Overall, 74% of the student teachers provided general comments to evaluate their mentor teacher in Feedback on Placement. Thirteen themes emerged for effective mentorship from the general comments given by student teachers about their mentor teachers, matching eight themes found in the literature, with three new themes. Only one recurring theme found in the literature was not evident in any of the comments by student teachers - empathetic. The only theme of effective mentorship that was consistently found in all four of the dimensions on the Feedback on Placement evaluation was meaningful feedback.

We assessed whether there was a difference on how student teachers evaluated their mentor teacher based on when they were trained or untrained. An independent samples t-test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean score for evaluations on placements for students placed with an untrained mentor ( $M = 20.67$ ,  $SD = 3.643$ ) and students placed with a trained mentor ( $M = 21.38$ ,  $SD = 1.821$ ),  $t(320) = 2.317$ ,  $p < .05$ , 95% CI  $[-1.307, -.107]$  in support of H1; however, this finding has a small effect size, Cohen's  $d = 0.247$ , representing low practical significance.

This mixed methods study helped to better understand if mentor teacher training is effective. Two themes, clear expectations and timelines and meaningful feedback, emerged as indicators of more effective mentorship for trained mentors over untrained mentors. It was apparent in this study that many students placed with untrained mentors had wonderful experiences, and that some of the students placed with trained mentors did not, as evidenced by many of the comments in their evaluations. Nevertheless, findings of this study do begin to provide some evidence that mentor training does make a difference in creating more effective mentors. The themes found in the current study are currently included in the curriculum for mentor teacher training.

Additionally, even though meaningful feedback was shown to be more effective for trained mentors in this study, there were some major gaps. Mentor training should include practical strategies for increasing the quantity and quality of written feedback to support student teachers. There were multiple negative comments in this study indicating the absence of feedback, particularly with untrained mentors. It is our plan in the coming year for mentor training to use a feedback model proposed in this study as a skill purposefully added to training workshops.

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

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

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

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

Yes  No

6.3 Optional Comments

We recommend that the EPP report be waived during the calendar year the SSR is submitted.

## 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.

Meeting CAEP Standard 4, Program Impact, is challenging for the EPP given the barriers presented in the collection of the data needed to address the standard.

The Commonwealth of Virginia provides no support in collecting data needed to meet the four components of the standard. At this point, there is some data available regarding which districts employ our graduates; these data are made available to us annually based on who was licensed in the previous calendar year. Despite knowing where the EPP's completers are employed in a given year, the state has not developed a way to uniformly collect Teacher Performance Evaluation data, (done state-wide), aggregate it and return it to the EPP for accreditation reporting. Given that Virginia has determined that all EPPs must be accredited by CAEP, this data would be useful on a large scale.

Because of the failure of the state to assist with these efforts, each EPP must embark on a series of attempts that depend on resources not only at the EPP but also within school districts, given that some districts have a larger dedicated staff and better systems for employee data collection and retrieval.

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

- 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
  - A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
  - A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

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: Amy D. Thelk

Position: Director of Assessment and Evaluation

Phone: 540-568-3171

E-mail: thelkad@jmu.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing accreditation

or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.

## CAEP Accreditation Policy

### Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completer data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

### Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site visit report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

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

Acknowledge