



Indiana Department of Education

Dr. Katie Jenner, Secretary of Education

Summary of Indiana's Educator Preparation Provider Accreditation Requirements

Ensuring high quality educator preparation designed to meet the needs of 21st century educators and P-12 students is a high priority for the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE). IDOE is charged with ensuring educator preparation providers are innovative, rigorous, and aligned to state expectations. These, and other crucial elements, are incorporated within a regular review process, with staggered onsite campus reviews occurring approximately every seven years. The purpose of this document is to provide a brief, historical summary of the review process itself and required data or evidence demonstrating program quality and impact, as well as the timeline followed by providers.

Important Terms

- *Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)* is an organization providing professional standards for the accreditation of educator preparation programs. CAEP was organized in 2013 through a merger between the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). CAEP professional standards include standards for both initial and advanced licensure programs.
- *Educator Preparation Provider (EPP)* is an institution or entity approved to offer an educator preparation program in Indiana. A non-higher education entity may be approved to offer a transition to teaching program.
- *Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC)* EPPs must model standards for beginning teachers as incorporated within the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards.
- *Program* is a planned sequence of academic courses and experiences leading to a degree, a recommendation for a state license, or some other credential that entitles the holder to perform professional education services in schools. EPPs may offer several program options (elementary education, special education, secondary education in specific subject areas, building level administration, etc.).
- *Rules for Educator Preparation and Accountability (REPA) Educator Standards* are the developmental/pedagogical and content standards specific to each grade setting and content licensure program. EPPs must align each program(s) to the applicable standards and provide evidence of such during the accreditation review process. REPA standards are often referred to as state standards.
- *Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs)* is "a member of CAEP that is a national organization of teachers, professional education faculty, and/or other school professionals who teach a specific content area (e.g., mathematics or social studies), teach students at a specific developmental level (i.e., early childhood, elementary, middle level, or secondary), teach students with specific needs (e.g., special education teachers), or provide services to students (e.g., school counselors, school psychologists, or principals)" (<http://caepnet.org/glossary?letter=S>).
- *State Reviews* are coordinated by IDOE and include peer reviews of program areas without a SPA. The review process is closely aligned to the SPA process.



Indiana Department of Education

Dr. Katie Jenner, Secretary of Education

New EPP and Program Review Process

IDOE encourages the development of high quality and rigorous educational programs. All new proposals (EPP or program level) are reviewed via the Indiana Educator Preparation Program Review Team (INPREP). This team is comprised of representatives from various fields, including higher education, P-12 schools, administration, and/or a related content field. IDOE considers the recommendation of INPREP before advancing proposals to the Indiana State Board of Education for final approval. New EPPs are recommended for an initial three-year period of operation during which the provider must demonstrate evidence of seeking CAEP membership and eventual accreditation.

Existing EPP and Program Review Process

CAEP joint review teams (defined as including at least one state member of the onsite team) review program data, evidence, and other documentation to ensure provider alignment to the CAEP standards. Programmatic reviews include state standards specific to each content area and pedagogical setting.

Existing EPPs submit an annual report to CAEP using the online “Accreditation Information System” (AIMS) at <http://caepnet.org/aims>. EPP annual reports include:

- Contact information for EPP and programs (ensures contact information is accurate);
- Number of program completers;
- Description of any substantive changes to EPP and/or any program (if applicable);
- Display of candidate performance data;
- Candidate and program measures (assessments, data, etc.);
- Description or summary of how EPP and/or program(s) has/have addressed any areas for improvement (AFIs) and/or stipulations. AFIs are recommendations for improvement but less serious than a stipulation. Stipulations must be addressed and can adversely impact continued accreditation status;
- Summary of progress made toward goals or target level of performance as identified during previous accreditation visit.

The department reviews the above reports annually; EPPs not yet CAEP-accredited but approved by the state board follow the same report format as above; reports are submitted directly to IDOE for an annual review.

Sample EPP Data and Evidence

- Plan for recruitment of diverse candidates who meet employment needs;
- Admitted pool of candidates reflect the diversity of America’s P-12 students;
- Evidence candidates have high level of content knowledge and understand code of ethics, professional practice, and professional expectations;
- Evidence candidates are contributing to an expected level student growth and learning as measured by multiple measures (note, case studies are accepted);
- Employee satisfaction or surveys, as well as completer satisfaction measures;



Indiana Department of Education

Dr. Katie Jenner, Secretary of Education

Sample EPP Data and Evidence continued...

- Quality assurance and continuous improvement system in place, with data and other measures collected in order to assess and improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and growth.
- Evidence there are a variety of stakeholders (alumni, students, community leaders, etc.) involved in program quality improvement measures, including analysis and strategic planning.

Timeline

- Self-Study Report (SSR) - EPPs complete a self-study report in which evidence, including data reports, documents, and other items, make the case that the EEP is meeting the CAEP standards. The SSR is due six months prior to the visit and is reviewed by the on-site team members between its submission and the onsite visit.
- Formative Feedback Review (FFR) – Team members, with a team lead, provide a formative off-site review and identify gaps, possible areas for improvement or stipulations. In most cases, each team is comprised of four to six members, with each member assigned at least one standard.
- Self-Study Addendum – EPPs may respond to the FFR with additional information or supporting evidence or exhibits.
- On-Site Visit – After formative review process, the team conducts a three-day onsite visit during which they review additional evidence, data, and other items requested by the team. The team will interview a variety of stakeholders, including faculty, students, program completers, partners, mentors, supervising teachers and others. EPPs may not submit any additional evidence after the onsite visit is complete.
- Site Visit Report – Team members write a site visit report and then share the final draft with the EPP for factual corrections only.
- CAEP Rejoinder – EPPs may respond to the final site visit report with a rejoinder. While no new evidence may be provided, an EPP may refer to earlier submissions in response to the report, point out what reviewers may have overlooked in the evidence, etc.
- Lead Response to CAEP Rejoinder – The team lead provides a response to the CAEP rejoinder.
- Initial Review Panel – The semester following the visit (typically in October or April), an initial review panel will review the report. EPPs and state representatives, as well as the team lead, are invited to participate in a 20-minute conference call during which the EPP or others may respond to reviewer questions and or express concerns, ask questions, etc. Again, the EPP is not allowed to submit new evidence, but may refer to evidence provided prior to the end of the visit. The panel will determine whether areas for improvement (AFIs) or stipulations should be issued and whether the standards are met.
- Joint Review Team – The results or conclusions of the initial review panel members are then shared with the Joint Review Panel. Members of this team include representatives from the Initial Review Panel and any additional panelists. The Joint Review Panel presents final recommendations to the Accreditation Council.



Indiana Department of Education

Dr. Katie Jenner, Secretary of Education

Timeline continued...

- Accreditation Council – The final decision regarding accreditation status is determined by the Accreditation Council. This group or governance body may issue or revoke accreditation based on the findings of the Initial Review and Joint Review Teams.
- Accreditation Decisions –
 - *Accreditation* may be issued for seven years if all CAEP standards and components are met, even with AFIs. AFIs must be resolved prior to the next visit to avoid becoming stipulations.
 - *Accreditation with Stipulations* is granted for two years if all the standards are met, but with stipulations. Stipulations are more serious and must be addressed with a follow-up virtual visit in two years. The team will be not be comprised of any members of the original team and includes two to three individuals who review and consider removing the stipulation(s). If removed by the Council, the EPP will receive continued accreditation.
 - *Probationary Accreditation* is granted for two years when an EPP does not meet one of the CAEP standards. A probationary visit will occur.
 - *Revocation or Denial of Accreditation* – EPP accreditation may be denied (if an EPP is undergoing its first review) or revoked if lost. An EPP losing accreditation will be required by IDOE to wait one calendar year after the loss of accreditation before the EPP may reapply as a new EPP via the new EPP review process by INPREP (note earlier).
- *Appeal Process* – An EPP may appeal the denial or loss of accreditation. EPPs with accreditation will maintain accreditation status until the appeal process is complete.
- IDOE provides a summary to the Indiana State Board of Education and recommends continued state accreditation status based on the findings of the CAEP review process. The state board determines final state recognition status and duration for all new and existing EPPs and licensure programs.

Resources and Links

- CAEP Standards (2013) - <http://caepnet.org/standards/2013/introduction>
- Indiana Educator Preparation Programs Resources - <https://www.doe.in.gov/epps>
- REPA Educator Standards - <https://www.doe.in.gov/licensing/rep-educator-standards>
- REPA Approved Educator Preparation Programs - <https://www.doe.in.gov/licensing/rep-approved-educator-preparation-programs>

*A copy of the CAEP “one-pager” reference documents for the 2013 and 2022 versions, as well as the current advanced program standards, are included with this document.

2013 CAEP Standards

Standard 1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

1.1 Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

Provider Responsibilities:

1.2 Providers ensure that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice.

1.3 Providers ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies (e.g., National Association of Schools of Music – NASM).

1.4 Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards).

1.5 Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice.

Standard 2. Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.

Partnerships for Clinical Preparation:

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.

Clinical Educators:

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.

Clinical Experiences:

2.3 The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.

Standard 3. Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 4.

Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs:

3.1 The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America's P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently, STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.

Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement:

3.2 The provider meets CAEP minimum criteria or the state's minimum criteria for academic achievement, whichever are higher, and gathers disaggregated data on the enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year.

The CAEP minimum criteria are a grade point average of 3.0 and a group average performance on nationally normed assessments or substantially equivalent state-normed assessments of mathematical, reading and writing achievement in the top 50 percent of those assessed. An EPP may develop and use a valid and reliable substantially equivalent alternative assessment of academic achievement. The 50th percentile standard for writing will be implemented in 2021. As an alternative to cohort average performance on a nationally- or state-normed writing assessment, the EPP may present evidence of candidates' performance levels on writing tasks

similar to those required of practicing educators.

Starting in academic year 2016-2017, the CAEP minimum criteria apply to the group average of enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year. The provider determines whether the CAEP minimum criteria will be measured (1) at admissions, OR (2) at some other time prior to candidate completion.

In all cases, EPPs must demonstrate academic quality for the group average of each year's enrolled candidates. In addition, EPPs must continuously monitor disaggregated evidence of academic quality for each branch campus (if any), mode of delivery, and individual preparation programs, identifying differences, trends and patterns that should be addressed under component 3.1, Plan for recruitment of diverse candidates who meet employment needs.

CAEP will work with states and providers to designate, and will periodically publish, appropriate "top 50 percent" proficiency scores on a range of nationally or state normed assessments and other substantially equivalent academic achievement measures, with advice from an expert panel.

Alternative arrangements for meeting the purposes of this component will be approved only under special circumstances and in collaboration with one or more states. The CAEP President will report to the Board and the public annually on actions taken under this provision.

Additional Selectivity Factors:

3.3 Educator preparation providers establish and monitor attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. The provider selects criteria, describes the measures used and evidence of the reliability and validity of those measures, and reports data that show how the academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.

Selectivity During Preparation:

3.4 The provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates' advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach to college- and career-ready standards. Providers present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates' developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all of these domains.

Selection At Completion:

3.5 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development.

3.6 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate understands the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies. CAEP monitors the development of measures that assess candidates' success and revises standards in light of new results.

Standard 4. Program Impact

The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development:

4.1 The provider documents, using multiple measures that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. Multiple measures shall include all available growth measures (including value-added measures, student-growth percentiles, and student learning and development objectives) required by the state for its teachers and available to educator preparation providers, other state-supported P-12 impact measures, and any other measures employed by the provider.

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness:

4.2 The provider demonstrates, through structured validated observation instruments and/or student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.

Satisfaction of Employers:

4.3. The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data and including employment milestones such as promotion and retention, that employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.

Satisfaction of Completers:

4.4 The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.

Standard 5. Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

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.

Quality and Strategic Evaluation:

5.1 The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP standards.

5.2 The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

Continuous Improvement:

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.

5.4. Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.

5.5. The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.



2022 Initial Level Standards

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

The provider ensures that candidates develop an understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and facilitates candidates' reflection of their personal biases to increase their understanding and practice of equity, diversity, and inclusion. The provider is intentional in the development of their curriculum and clinical experiences for candidates to demonstrate their ability to effectively work with diverse P-12 students and their families.

R1.1 The Learner and Learning The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of the learner and learning at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate that candidates are able to apply critical concepts and principles of learner development (InTASC Standard 1), learning differences (InTASC Standard 2), and creating safe and supportive learning environments (InTASC Standard 3) in order to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

R1.2 Content The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of content at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided demonstrates candidates know central concepts of their content area (InTASC Standard 4) and are able to apply the content in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences (InTASC Standard 5) for diverse P-12 students. Outcome data can be provided from a Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) process, a state review process, or an evidence review of Standard 1.

R1.3 Instructional Practice The provider ensures that candidates are able to apply their knowledge of InTASC standards relating to instructional practice at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence demonstrates how candidates are able to assess (InTASC Standard 6), plan for instruction (InTASC Standard 7), and utilize a variety of instructional strategies (InTASC Standard 8) to provide equitable and inclusive learning experiences for diverse P-12 students. Providers ensure candidates model and apply national or state approved technology standards to engage and improve learning for all students.

R1.4 Professional Responsibility The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of professional responsibility at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate candidates engage in professional learning, act ethically (InTASC Standard 9), take responsibility for student learning, and collaborate with others (InTASC Standard 10) to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The provider ensures effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to candidate preparation. These experiences should be designed to develop candidate's knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to demonstrate positive impact on diverse students' learning and development. High quality clinical practice offers candidates experiences in different settings and modalities, as well as with diverse P-12 students, schools, families, and communities. Partners share responsibility to identify and address real problems of practice candidates experience in their engagement with P-12 students.

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation.

R2.2 Clinical Educators Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, and support high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and diverse P-12 student learning and development.

R2.3 Clinical Experiences The provider works with partners to design and implement clinical experiences, utilizing various modalities, of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on diverse P-12 students' learning and development as presented in Standard R1.

Standard 3: Candidate Recruitment, Progression, and Support

The provider demonstrates the quality of candidates is a continuous and purposeful focus from recruitment through completion. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation and that the EPP provides supports services (such as advising, remediation, and mentoring) in all phases of the program so candidates will be successful.

R3.1 Recruitment The provider presents goals and progress evidence for recruitment of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations that align with their mission. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address local, state, regional, or national needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields. The goals and evidence should address progress towards a candidate pool which reflects the diversity of America's P-12 students.

R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression The provider creates and monitors transition points from admission through completion that indicate candidates' developing content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical skills, critical dispositions, professional responsibilities, and the ability to integrate technology effectively in their practice. The provider identifies a transition point at any point in the program when a cohort grade point average of 3.0 is achieved and monitors this data. The provider ensures knowledge of and progression through transition points are transparent to candidates. The provider plans and documents the need for candidate support, as identified in disaggregated data by race and ethnicity and such other categories as may be relevant for the EPP's mission, so candidates meet milestones. The provider has a system for effectively maintaining records of candidate complaints, including complaints made to CAEP, and documents the resolution.

R3.3 Competency at Completion The provider ensures candidates possess academic competency to teach effectively with positive impacts on diverse P-12 student learning and development through application of content knowledge, foundational pedagogical skills, and technology integration in the field(s) where certification is sought. Multiple measures are provided and data are disaggregated and analyzed based on race, ethnicity, and such other categories as may be relevant for the EPP's mission.

Standard 4: Program Impact

The provider demonstrates the effectiveness of its completers' instruction on P-12 student learning and development, and completer and employer satisfaction with the relevance and effectiveness of preparation.

R4.1 Completer Effectiveness The provider demonstrates that program completers:

- effectively contribute to P-12 student-learning growth

AND

- apply in P-12 classrooms the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve. In addition, the provider includes a rationale for the data elements provided.

R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers The provider demonstrates employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with diverse P-12 students and their families.

R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers The provider demonstrates program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they encounter on the job, and their preparation was effective.

Standard 5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement

The provider maintains a quality assurance system that consists of valid data from multiple measures and supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based. The system is developed and maintained with input from internal and external stakeholders. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements, and highlight innovations.

R5.1 Quality Assurance System The provider has developed, implemented, and modified, as needed, a functioning quality assurance system that ensures a sustainable process to document operational effectiveness. The provider documents how data enter the system, how data are reported and used in decision making, and how the outcomes of those decisions inform programmatic improvement.

R5.2 Data Quality The provider's quality assurance system from R5.1 relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures to ensure interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement The provider includes relevant internal (e.g., EPP administrators, faculty, staff, candidates) and external (e.g., alumni, practitioners, school and community partners, employers) stakeholders in program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement processes.

R5.4 Continuous Improvement The provider regularly, systematically, and continuously assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, documents modifications and/or innovations and their effects on EPP outcomes.

Standard 6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity

The EPP has the fiscal and administrative capacity, faculty, infrastructure (facilities, equipment, and supplies) and other resources as appropriate to the scale of its operations and as necessary for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. **For EPPs whose institution is accredited by an accreditor recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education (e.g., SACSCOC, HLC), such accreditation will be considered sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 6.** If an EPP's institution is not accredited by an accreditor recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education, the EPP must address each component of ST 6 in narrative supported by evidence.

R6.1 Fiscal Resources The EPP has the fiscal capacity as appropriate to the scale of its operations. The budget for curriculum, instruction, faculty, clinical work, scholarship, etc., supports high-quality work within the EPP and its school partners for the preparation of professional educators.

R6.2 Administrative Capacity The EPP has administrative capacity as appropriate to the scale of its operations, including leadership and authority to plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs of study so that their candidates are prepared to meet all standards. Academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading policies, and advertising are current, accurate, and transparent.

R6.3 Faculty Resources The EPP has professional education faculty that have earned doctorates or equivalent P-12 teaching experience that qualifies them for their assignments. The EPP provides adequate resources and opportunities for professional development of faculty, including training in the use of technology.

R6.4 Infrastructure The EPP has adequate campus and school facilities, equipment, and supplies to support candidates in meeting standards. The infrastructure supports faculty and candidate use of information technology in instruction.

****Only For EPPs seeking access to Title IV funds****

Standard 7: Record of Compliance with Title IV of the Higher Education Act

Freestanding EPPs relying on CAEP accreditation to access Title IV of the Higher Education Act must demonstrate 100% compliance with their responsibilities under Title IV of the Act, including but not limited to, on the basis of student loan default rate data provided by the Secretary, financial and compliance audits, and program reviews conducted by the U.S. Department of Education.

Freestanding EPPs will need to provide narrative and evidence for all components of ST 7.

2016 CAEP Standards for Advanced Programs

Standard A. 1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

The provider ensures that candidates for professional specialties develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their field of preparation and, by completion, are able to use professional specialty practices flexibly to advance the learning of all P-12 students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

A.1.1 Candidates for advanced preparation demonstrate their proficiencies to understand and apply knowledge and skills appropriate to their professional field of specialization so that learning and development opportunities for all P-12 are enhanced, through:

- Applications of data literacy;
- Use of research and understanding of qualitative, quantitative and/or mixed methods research methodologies;
- Employment of data analysis and evidence to develop supportive school environments;
- Leading and/or participating in collaborative activities with others such as peers, colleagues, teachers, administrators, community organizations, and parents;
- Supporting appropriate applications of technology for their field of specialization; and
- Application of professional dispositions, laws and policies, codes of ethics and professional standards appropriate to their field of specialization.

Evidence of candidate content knowledge appropriate for the professional specialty will be documented by state licensure test scores or other proficiency measures.

Provider Responsibilities:

A.1.2 Providers ensure that advanced program completers have opportunities to learn and apply specialized content and discipline knowledge contained in approved state and/or national discipline-specific standards. These specialized standards include, but are not limited to, Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards, individual state standards, standards of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and standards of other accrediting bodies [e.g., Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)].

Standard A. 2. Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions appropriate for their professional specialty field.

Partnerships for Clinical Preparation:

A.2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of advanced program candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for advanced program candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for advanced program candidate outcomes.

Clinical Experiences:

A.2.2. The provider works with partners to design varied and developmental clinical settings that allow opportunities for candidates to practice applications of content knowledge and skills that the courses and other experiences of the advanced preparation emphasize. The opportunities lead to appropriate culminating experiences in which candidates demonstrate their proficiencies, through problem-based tasks or research (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, mixed methods, action) that are characteristic of their professional specialization as detailed in component 1.1.

Standard A. 3. Candidate Quality and Selectivity

The provider demonstrates that the quality of advanced program candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility so that completers are prepared to perform effectively and can be recommended for certification where applicable.

Admission of Diverse Candidates Who Meet Employment Needs:

A. 3.1 The provider sets goals and monitors progress for admission and support of high-quality advanced program candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America's teacher pool and, over time, should reflect the diversity of P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for school and district staff prepared in advanced fields.

Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully

A. 3.2 The provider sets admissions requirements for academic achievement, including CAEP minimum criteria, the state's minimum criteria, or graduate school minimum criteria, whichever is highest, and gathers data to monitor candidates from admission to completion. The provider determines additional criteria intended to ensure that candidates have, or develop, abilities to complete the program successfully and arranges appropriate support and counseling for candidates whose progress falls behind.

The CAEP minimum criteria are a college grade point average of 3.0 or a group average performance on nationally normed assessments, or substantially equivalent state-normed or EPP- administered assessments, of mathematical, reading, and writing achievement in the top 50 percent of those assessed.

An EPP may develop and use a valid and reliable substantially equivalent alternative assessment of academic achievement. The 50th percentile standard for writing will be implemented in 2021. The CAEP minimum criteria apply to the group average of enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year.

As an alternative to cohort average performance on a nationally- or state-normed writing assessment, the EPP may present evidence of candidates' performance levels on writing tasks similar to those required of practicing educators. EPPs continuously monitor disaggregated evidence of academic quality for each branch campus (if any), mode of delivery, and individual preparation programs, identifying differences, trends and patterns that should be addressed.

Selectivity During Preparation:

A.3.3 The provider creates criteria for program progression and uses disaggregated data to monitor candidates' advancement from admissions through completion.

Selection at Completion:

A.3.4 Before the provider recommends any advanced program candidate for completion, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the field of specialization, data literacy and research-driven decision making, effective use of collaborative skills, applications of technology, and applications of dispositions, laws, codes of ethics and professional standards appropriate for the field of specialization.

Standard A. 4. Program Impact

The provider documents the satisfaction of its completers from advanced preparation programs and their employers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

Satisfaction of Employers:

A.4.1 The provider demonstrates that employers are satisfied with completers' preparation and that completers reach employment milestones such as promotion and retention.

Satisfaction of Completers:

A.4.2 The provider demonstrates that advanced program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.

Standard A. 5. Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

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.

Quality and Strategic Evaluation:

A.5.1 The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP standards.

A.5.2 The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

Continuous Improvement:

A.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.

A.5.4. Measures of advanced program completer outcomes, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction. Outcomes include completion rate, licensure rate, employment rate in field of specialty preparation, and consumer information such as places of employment and salaries.

A.5.5. The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.

CAEP is accrediting an EPP, and an EPP should only be required to respond to Standard 5 once—not separately for initial and for advanced preparation. That is:

- When its documentation would include measures used in advanced preparation along with other multiple measures used in initial preparation.
- When it documents the quality of its data (for component 5.2), it would include measures used in advanced preparation.
- When it documents continuous improvement efforts (for component 5.3), its self-study report would include measures and their use in continuous improvement from advanced preparation programs.
- When the EPP documents stakeholder involvement (for component 5.5), information on advanced preparation is included along with that on initial preparation.

If an EPP conducts advanced preparation programs only, then it would document 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 for those programs alone.

This document was amended by the CAEP Board of Directors in December 2018.

**Indiana Department of Education
and
The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)
Partnership Agreement**

Whereas, CAEP is a nongovernmental, voluntary association committed to the effective preparation of teachers and other P-12 professional educators; and

Whereas, CAEP, through an autonomous Accreditation Council, accredits educator preparation providers (EPPs) and advances excellent educator preparation through evidence-based accreditation that assures quality and supports continuous improvement to strengthen P-12 student learning; and

Whereas, CAEP is a nationally recognized accreditor, having earned recognition by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), and is seeking recognition by the United States Secretary of Education, and, therefore, develops policy and procedures aligned with all applicable requirements of CHEA and, to the extent practicable, the U.S. Department of Education and

Whereas, the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) is responsible for implementing a regular review process for all new and existing Indiana Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs), including each individual licensure program housed within an EPP. The IDOE shares the results of each review with the Indiana State Board of Education along with a recommendation regarding continued state approval status.

Whereas the IDOE ensures program review and recommends program approval status, the Indiana State Board of Education holds all final authority in terms of state accreditation status and duration.

All licensure programs are expected to undergo one of the two review processes outlined in this agreement.

CAEP, and the State hereby enter into this agreement detailing the State's preferences with regard to program review options and review team composition for accreditation site review conducted by CAEP of EPPs operating within the State, and establishing the primary responsibilities each party has in supporting CAEP Accreditation activities involving all such EPPs.

1. CAEP Standards and Scope of Accreditation

The Parties understand and agree that:

1.1. The CAEP Board of Directors (CAEP Board or Board) has adopted standards (CAEP Standards or Standards) that serve as the basis for all accreditation reviews undertaken by CAEP. The CAEP Standards reflect the voice of the education field – on what makes a quality educator. The Standards and their components flow from two principles:

1.1.1. There must be solid evidence that the EPP's graduates (completers) are competent and caring educators, and

1.1.2. There must be solid evidence that the EPP’s educator staff have the capacity to create a culture of evidence and use it to maintain and enhance the quality of the professional programs they offer.

- 1.2. As a result of the ongoing critical self-review that CAEP undertakes to maintain and improve the quality of CAEP Accreditation, the CAEP Board will undertake a comprehensive review and revision of the CAEP Standards on a schedule set by the Board and may, as needed, make interim amendments to the Standards. In making any such changes, CAEP will seek stakeholder and public input, including input from the State and its EPPs.
- 1.3. It is the responsibility of the State and any EPPs seeking or continuing CAEP Accreditation to stay informed of any changes made to the CAEP Standards and the timeline(s) set by the Board for the implementation of or transition to new or revised Standards.

The CAEP scope of accreditation, defined in Accreditation Policy, distinguishes between two levels of educator preparation:

- 1.3.1** Initial-Licensure Preparation is provided through programs at the baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate levels leading to initial-licensure, certification, or endorsement that are designed to develop P-12 teachers. All Initial-Licensure Preparation programs within the Scope of Accreditation will be reviewed under CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure.
- 1.3.2** Advanced-Level Preparation is provided through programs at the post-baccalaureate or graduate levels leading to licensure, certification, or endorsement. Advanced-Level Programs are designed to develop P-12 teachers who have already completed an initial-licensure program, currently licensed administrators, or other certified (or similar state language) school professionals for employment in P-12 schools/districts. All Advanced-Level Preparation programs within the Scope of Accreditation will be reviewed under CAEP Standards for Advanced-Level Preparation.

2. CAEP’s Responsibility for Education Preparation Provider (EPP) Accreditation

The Parties understand and agree that:

- 2.1. CAEP, through the Accreditation Council, has sole responsibility for granting CAEP Accreditation to an EPP, and for supporting and overseeing NCATE- and TEAC- accredited EPPs through continuous accreditation and the CAEP eligibility processes described in CAEP policy.
- 2.2. The process required for national accreditation by CAEP is outlined in the policies and procedures of CAEP and the Accreditation Council, both of which may be revised from time to time. It is the responsibility of the State and any EPP seeking or continuing CAEP Accreditation to stay informed of any such changes as they may impact the CAEP Accreditation process from the time of their adoption or publication.

3. State’s Responsibility for Program Approval

The Parties understand and agree that:

- 3.1. The State has sole responsibility for program approval. In granting program approval, the State will utilize information generated from CAEP's review of an EPP, including but not limited to an Accreditation Council decision on CAEP Accreditation and the assignment of any Areas for Improvement (AFIs) and Stipulations, as described in Accreditation Policy. Although the State may elect to have state-specific standards and/or requirements incorporated into the CAEP review, consistent with the program review options outlined below, only information gathered on an EPPs compliance with CAEP Standards and requirements will be used by the Accreditation Council to make a decision.
- 3.2. The State will periodically review its program review requirements against the CAEP Standards and policies and will, in a timely manner, make CAEP aware of any conflicts or potential inconsistencies so that all parties to this agreement are aware of any such issues and can work constructively together to minimize any challenges that may arise from them.

4. Transition from NCATE and TEAC Accreditation to CAEP Accreditation

- 4.1. Beginning January 1, 2017, CAEP ceased operation of the NCATE and TEAC Commissions.
- 4.2. Unless the State requires CAEP Accreditation as a condition of State approval, EPPs holding NCATE or TEAC accreditation and meeting CAEP's requirements for continuous accreditation will not be required to meet CAEP Standards until the expiration of their current term of accreditation. All such EPPs are subject to the transition provisions described in Sections 4.2.1 to 4.2.6, below, and further defined in Accreditation Policy.

4.2.1. Annual Reports. All NCATE- and TEAC-accredited EPPs are required to submit annual reports through the duration of their current term using the CAEP annual report template provided in the CAEP accreditation platform.

4.2.2. Good Standing. An NCATE- or TEAC-accredited EPP in good standing is considered to be continuously accredited. Upon expiration of the EPP's NCATE or TEAC term of accreditation, the EPP's next accreditation review must be based on CAEP Standards, policy, and handbook, and carried out using the uniform CAEP Accreditation process. Any such EPP is not required to complete the CAEP application process so long as continuous accreditation is maintained.

- 4.3. Any accreditation review scheduled to take place during and after fall 2019, whether of a new applicant, for continuing accreditation, or following an approved extension, will be based on the CAEP Standards, policy, and handbook/workbooks, and carried out using the uniform CAEP Accreditation process.

5. CAEP Accreditation Cycle

The Parties understand and agree that:

- 5.1. The CAEP Accreditation cycle involves an EPP in continuous improvement and requires an EPP to

demonstrate that it meets CAEP's high standards of quality required to improve P-12 student learning.

- 5.2. Subject to the provisions of Section 4.2, above, to merit full accreditation by CAEP, an EPP must meet all CAEP Standards on the basis of sufficient and accurate evidence.
- 5.3. A site review, carried out by a review team (which also may be referred to as an evaluation team), is an essential part of the accreditation process. Members of the assigned team investigate the quality of an EPP's evidence, including the accuracy and consistency of the evidence provided in relation to CAEP Standards. In accordance with Accreditation Policy, CAEP may utilize a virtual site review or may have one or more review team members participating using electronic means.
- 5.4. The State elects that CAEP's reviews of EPPs in the State will be carried out using review teams composed as follows
 - 5.4.1. Joint Site Review Team.** For any site review except one required in conjunction with an accreditation decision of Accreditation with Stipulations or Probationary Accreditation, the composition of the Review Team will be as follows:
 - 5.4.1.1. For a Site Review involving only one level of accreditation (i.e., initial or advanced), the Joint Site Review Team includes four national site reviewers appointed by CAEP and up to three Site Review Team members appointed by the State.
 - 5.4.1.2. For a Site Review involving both levels of accreditation, initial and advanced-level, the Review Team will include five CAEP-appointed reviewers and up to four state-appointed site reviewers.
 - 5.4.1.3. For a Stipulation or Probation review, the Review Team is comprised of two persons. The state may choose to add one reviewer for a total of a three-person team. The lead reviewer is appointed by CAEP.
 - 5.4.1.4. The State shall provide CAEP with its recommended Review Team members within any timelines established by CAEP in the Accreditation Policy and handbook. If the state is unable to appoint members at least six months prior to the visit, CAEP will appoint from the national pool of site reviewers a CAEP only team. All such teams are led by a Review Team chair appointed by CAEP. Prior to assignment to any Review Team, an individual must have successfully completed CAEP Review Team training and must acknowledge understanding of, and agreement to, adhere to CAEP's code of conduct, including with regard to confidentiality and conflicts of interest.
- 5.5. Each Review Team shall include a P-12 practitioner, when possible. The State will make recommendations for P-12 practitioners through the CAEP accreditation platform.
- 5.6. At the discretion of the State, the State's teachers' association(s) may appoint one (1) representative per association to observe the Site Review. Any expenses associated with the attendance of an observer must be covered by the association(s) or State. Prior to participation, any observer must acknowledge understanding of an agreement to adhere to CAEP's policies and procedures regarding

Site Reviews and the CAEP code of conduct, including with regard to confidentiality and conflicts of interest.

- 5.7. All Site Review activities undertaken by a CAEP Review Team will be conducted in accordance with the policies and procedures of CAEP and the Accreditation Council.
- 5.8. CAEP is not responsible for Site Review expenses for state-assigned personnel.
- 5.9. An EPP that is subject to the jurisdiction of the State may choose from among any of the following program review options for CAEP Accreditation:
 - 5.9.1. Specialty Program Review with National Recognition.** The goal of the specialized professional association (SPA) Program Review with National Recognition is to align specialty licensure area data with national standards developed by SPAs in order to receive national recognition at the program level. The Review Team will consider the National Recognition decision available in SPA program level reports as evidence to meet the sufficiency criteria related to CAEP Standard 1. *Unless granted a waiver by the State, programs with a corresponding SPA are required to undergo the SPA review process. The State will provide information regarding the SPA-waiver request process, including forms and deadlines. Programs granted a waiver will be required to undergo State Review (see 5.9.2).*
 - 5.9.2. State Review by State Authority.** The State conducts program reviews for purposes of State approval and to inform CAEP Accreditation. An EPP ~~selecting~~ **undergoing** the State Review option will follow State guidelines. The State provides forms and instructions on how to meet all State standards for licensure/certificate program approval. Upon an EPP's completion of the State authority forms, trained reviewers are selected and assigned within appropriate content areas. Reviewers make recommendations for further action and/or approval. The State makes the final decision on the approval of any program.
- 5.10. The specific timeline established for the review of an EPP, as well CAPs consideration of any request for an extension, will be decided by CAEP and the Accreditation Council, as appropriate, on a case by case basis and in accordance with CAEP and Accreditation Policies.
- 5.11. Once granted full CAEP Accreditation, an EPP's term of accreditation shall be seven (7) years. Shorter terms are granted with a decision of accreditation with stipulations or probationary accreditation. Throughout its term, to maintain accreditation, an EPP must comply with CAEP and Accreditation Policies, including policies regarding payment of annual dues and the submission of annual reports.
- 5.12. An EPP for which the Accreditation Council issues a decision to deny or revoke accreditation may have a right to petition for an appeal subject to Appeals Policy. *EPPs for which an appeal is denied must wait at least one calendar year after the date of the original denial or revocation before reapplying as a new EPP via the new EPP approval process outlined by the State.*

- 5.13. The State will provide to CAEP its policy leading to a “Change in State Status.” The State will notify CAEP within thirty (30) days of action taken when a CAEP-accredited EPP has had a “Change in State Status” as a result of a decision on specialized professional association (SPA) program status by the State.
- 5.14. Accreditation-specific terminology and definitions used by CAEP as part of its EPP review and accreditation processes may vary from similar terms and definitions used by the State. Any definitions of key terms and glossaries created by CAEP are available on the CAEP website [<http://caepnet.org/glossary>]. The State should inquire with CAEP about the definition of any term if there is uncertainty regarding its meaning in the CAEP Accreditation context.

6. Opportunities for State Input

The Parties understand and agree that:

- 6.1. CAEP will afford the State multiple opportunities to provide CAEP, the Review Team, and members of the Accreditation Council with any information or data the State deems relevant to the accreditation of an EPP, as follows:
- 6.2. At least sixteen (16) weeks prior to any scheduled Site Review, CAEP will give the State notice of the upcoming Site Review. At any time, up to six (6) weeks before the scheduled review, the State may provide CAEP with comments and information on the EPP for consideration by the Review Team. EPPs will be given an opportunity to respond to any such comments prior to the Site Review.
- 6.3. At any time, the State may file a complaint regarding an EPP with the Accreditation Council for investigation and consideration as part of the EPP’s ongoing cycle of CAEP Accreditation. In accordance with Accreditation Policy, adverse action may result from any such investigation.
- 6.4. In the event an EPP within the State petitions for the appeal of an adverse action of the Accreditation Council, CAEP will notify the State that such petition has been received. Any notification of a decision made by an ad-hoc appeal panel will be made in accordance with Section 7, below, and the detailed notification provisions included in Accreditation Policy.

7. Decisions of the Accreditation Council and An Ad-Hoc Appeal Panel

The Parties understand and agree that:

- 7.1. The Accreditation Council makes decisions regarding the accreditation of EPPs at meetings held not less than two (2) times each year.
- 7.2. Following any decision of the Accreditation Council to deny or revoke the accreditation of an EPP, the EPP is promptly informed of its option to file a petition for an appeal and appeal requirements. Appeals criteria and process information are included in Appeals Policy.

- 7.3. CAEP provides written notice of each decision of the Accreditation Council and an Ad-hoc Appeal Panel in accordance with CAEP policies.
- 7.4. The written notice CAEP provides regarding its accrediting decisions, includes notice to the appropriate State licensing or authorizing agency which may be a party to this agreement. Specifically, such notice will be provided no later than thirty (30) days following a decision to award initial accreditation or to renew or continue accreditation. In the event of a final decision to place an EPP on probation, or to deny or revoke accreditation of an EPP, notice will be provided to the appropriate State licensing or authorizing agency at the same time notice of the decision is given to the EPP, but no later than thirty (30) days after the decision is reached. Within thirty (30) days of receiving notification from an EPP that the EPP has decided to withdraw voluntarily from accreditation or to let its accreditation lapse CAEP will provide the appropriate State licensing or authorizing agency with written notice.

8. Data Sharing

The Parties understand and agree that:

- 8.1. The CAEP Standards and process for CAEP Accreditation require an EPP to collect and share data. To the extent that the State maintains data necessary for CAEP's review of an EPP, subject to any data sharing agreement that may exist between an EPP and the State, CAEP expects that the State will make the relevant data available to CAEP at no cost, in a timely manner, with all personally identifiable information removed or redacted, and with all appropriate permissions to use the data for CAEP Accreditation activities.
- 8.2. In order to facilitate the reviews necessary for CAEP Accreditation, CAEP will provide the State and each dues paying EPP in the State with access to the CAEP accreditation platform, CAEP's data and information management system. Should the State or any EPP fail to pay annual dues to CAEP in a timely manner, CAEP reserves the right to suspend access to the CAEP accreditation platform until any outstanding dues are paid.
- 8.3. CAEP policies and the CAEP accreditation platform include information on the confidential nature of information maintained within the CAEP accreditation platform. All CAEP accreditation platform users must acknowledge CAEP's confidentiality policy and agree to adhere to it.

9. Partnership Dues, State Benefits, and Fees for Additional Services

The Parties understand and agree that:

- 9.1. The State will be responsible for payment of annual State Partnership dues (See Appendix A). Dues may be reviewed and updated annually by CAEP. Should the amount of the State's annual State Partnership dues be changed during the term of this agreement, CAEP will notify the State of the new dues amount and the effective date.
- 9.2. CAEP will provide up to three (3) individuals employed by the State with access to the CAEP

accreditation platform.

9.2.1. CAEP will also provide space within the accreditation platform for the Indiana DOE to house documents required for state specific reviews.

- 9.3. During each year covered by this agreement, CAEP will waive the CAEP Conference registration fee for one (1) designated State representative; however, the State or State representative must assume other expenses associated with conference participation.
- 9.4. During each year covered by this agreement, CAEP will assume all expenses for one (1) designated State representative to participate in the annual CAEP Clinic. A registration fee will be assessed for any additional State staff and they must assume other expenses associated with participation in the clinic.
- 9.5. CAEP offers states access to CAEP National Training for up to five (5) site reviewers a year, including training and travel (additional participants may be added based on need and on a cost-recovery basis). CAEP may also offer supplemental training opportunities for state reviewers. Supplemental training events that are arranged, including events in the State, will be provided by CAEP on a cost-recovery basis and with specific arrangements negotiated according to CAEP's policies regarding fees and expenses for training.
- 9.6. The State will work with associations that represent P-12 educators (NEA, AFT, NBPTS), EPPs, and education administrators to establish credit toward continuing education units or professional development requirements at the local district level in return for the State's P-12 educators' professional contributions to the work of CAEP as site review team members

10. State and CAEP Contacts

The Parties understand and agree that:

- 10.1. The State will designate a liaison to serve as the primary contact for CAEP throughout the term of this agreement.
- 10.2. CAEP will designate a liaison to serve as the primary contact for the State through the term of this agreement.

11. Agreement Term and Amendments

The Parties understand and agree that:

- 11.1. CAEP and the State enter into this partnership agreement for the five (5)-year period beginning January 1, 2021 and ending on December 31, 2025.
- 11.2. The Parties will review this agreement at least annually and, as necessary, propose any amendment deemed appropriate and which may be adopted upon the agreement of the Parties.

11.3. Should any provision of this agreement be determined to be in conflict with CAEP policy, including the policies of the Accreditation Council and Appeals Council, CAEP policy will be the prevailing authority and this agreement will be required to be amended to resolve the conflict.

11.4. Notwithstanding the annual review described above, this agreement may be modified by consent of the Parties at any point.

Christopher Koch, President
Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

DATE

By signing this agreement, the undersigned agrees to be bound by the terms outlined above, and affirms that he or she has the authority to enter into this agreement on behalf of the State.

State Authority

DATE

Appendix A: State Dues Structure

Beginning in FY18 (July 1, 2017), a new State Partnerships dues structure* takes effect. The new structure more fairly aligns and delineates (1) the collective resources required to service state partners in conjunction with their respective EPPs (fixed and proportional amounts), and (2) the variable resources required to administer the CAEP-State joint reviews for States that choose to participate in the joint CAEP Accreditation processes (variable amount).

Annual costs for supporting activities associated with State Partnerships have both fixed and proportional components which include costs associated with the CAEP Clinic, fall and spring CAEP Conferences, staff time, technology costs for maintaining workspaces within CAEP's accreditation platform, and other indirect expenses.

For the fixed and proportional amounts, states would be assessed \$3,000 annually to cover expenses for the spring convening and conference registration plus a portion of indirect expenses which are based on the actual percentage of CAEP member EPPs within each state.

For example:

State A has 20 CAEP member EPPs, or 2.2% of total CAEP EPPs. The proportional amount will be set at 2.2% of \$315,000 (current total), or \$6,900. Therefore, the total fees for State A will be: \$3,000 (fixed) + \$6,900 (variable) = \$9,900.

* This represents the dues structure in effect at the time this agreement is entered into by the Parties. CAEP reviews the dues structure annually and reserves the right to adjust the State's annual dues as needed to ensure that all costs of CAEP's accreditation activities are adequately covered. CAEP will

notify the State upon the adoption of any changes to this structure and the data on which any new dues structure will take effect.